

The Marlowe Society of America

Marlowe Society of America Newsletter

Vol. 30, No. 1, Fall 2010



Ann Basso, Sara M. Deats, and Annette Stenning at the Marlowe and Shakespeare seminar at SAA in Chicago, 2 April 2010
(Photo by Roslyn Knutson)

A Message from the President

For selfish reasons, autumn has always been my favorite season. My birthday is in October, and as a native Arkansan I associate it with the crisp days and cool nights that people who live in more habitable regions enjoy soon after Labor Day. And fall means the start of a new school year, and who could not prefer that to the tedium of summer vacation? For the MSA as well, the fall of 2010 brings significant new opportunities.

I have been talking for some time about the significance for our membership in the revised MLA format, and I want to repeat here a plea I offer in the [presidential message](#) on our website: the MSA (and I) need for you to step up in January when the Call-for-Papers goes out (decisions by 15 March) and submit an abstract for one of the MSA / MLA joint sessions for 2012 (site: Seattle, 5–8 Jan. 2012). We know there will be the MSA session, plus a joint one with MRDS entitled “Medievalism and Marlowe.” I expect that there will be another joint enterprise with the ISA. I want my counterparts

in the MRDS and ISA to be blown away at abstract-submission-time by the engaging arguments of MSA scholars. I want the descriptions of MSA-sponsored sessions at that conference to read like advertisements for the quality of work Marlovians do.

Good news for all MSA members: we are changing our membership structure and payment options. Take a look at the [Membership](#) page in the Join Us tab on the website and you will see that the dues for all members for one year are \$30; for three years, \$75; and for students, \$15. There is no longer a different dues schedule for non-US members. This change has been made possible by our decision to deliver the *MSAN* primarily by electronic means. The old payment structure was based on the expense of international postage; e-copies eliminate that argument (members may still request a hard copy from the *MSAN* editor at no additional charge).

In addition, we have created a new category to reward long-time members. A “lifetime” membership is available for those who have belonged to the MSA for 20 years or longer on the payment of a one-time fee of \$100. Recognizing the benefits

of this new category, two past presidents have already signed up.

Finally, we have added PayPal to our payment options. Members renewing in January—US and non-US alike—may go to the [Membership](#) page on the MSA website and send their dues by clicking on the PayPal button. There is a drop-down menu to indicate preferences. Of course, members who do not wish to pay electronically may still send a check to our Membership Chair, Sarah Scott. But we believe that PayPal has an established record of financial security and is consequently a convenient means of payment. We are particularly pleased that PayPal can handle any currency, yet forward the payments to us in USD. Any member (new or continuing) needs to download the membership form and submit it to the Membership Chair; until we know how PayPal tells us who has paid, we need the form to verify the currency of your membership.

Please plan to attend one or both of the [MSA-sponsored sessions at MLA in Los Angeles](#) on January 7 (MSA: 3:30-4:45 pm) and 9 (MSA-ISA: 12:00-1:15 pm). See you there!

A Message from the Editor

This time, we offer four reviews (three books and a performance), the abstracts from the “Marlowe and Shakespeare” SAA 2010 seminar as well a fine narrative of its proceedings, suggestions for submissions for *Marlowe Studies: An Annual*, and the contents of two recent edited collections. For our next *Newsletter* (30.2, Spring 2011), we expect to publish the abstracts from the two upcoming MSA sessions in their final form. ([Here](#) is what we have so far.) We hope to solicit a brief essay that describes those events, and

more performance reviews if possible. We have made some updates to the website: more [archival material](#), including thirty different single-text editions from the nineteenth century, and an [entirely new page](#) devoted to Marlowe-oriented essays in *Early Theatre*. You can access every other issue of this publication that we have on our [Newsletter archives page](#). For those of you who may have copies of some of the missing issues, we’d appreciate it if you would scan them to .pdf form and send them our way so that we can get them up on the site.





MARLOWE SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Roslyn Knutson, President; Georgia E. Brown Vice President; M. L. Stapleton, Editor, *MSA Newsletter* and webmaster; Laura Grace Godwin, MSA Performance Editor; Kirk Melnikoff, Treasurer; Sarah K. Scott, Membership Chair; Charles Whitney, Editor, MSA Book Reviews; Paul Menzer, Secretary; Pierre Hecker, At-Large Member and Consultant.

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

Professor Roslyn Knutson (emerita) email: rlknutson@ualr.edu
Department of English, University of Arkansas at Little Rock
823 N. Midland St.
Little Rock, AR 72205

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:

Professor 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; 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:

Dr. 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:

Professor Charles Whitney email: whitney@unlv.nevada.edu
MSA Book Reviews Editor
English Department
University of Nevada
Las Vegas, NV. 89154-5011

MSA web site: www.marlowesmightyline.org

© 2010 Marlowe Society of America. All rights reserved



SAA 2010, Chicago; Seminar #9, Marlowe and Shakespeare, 2 April, 3:30-5:30

Leaders: Sarah K. Scott, Mount St. Mary's University, M. L. Stapleton, Indiana University-Purdue University, Fort Wayne ([Here is a link to pictures from the session](#))

The fifth session dedicated to the study of Marlowe's artistry at the annual meeting of the Shakespeare Association of America, and the first to examine specifically the process of influence between Shakespeare and Marlowe, convened in the Burnham Room of the Chicago Hyatt Regency on a spectacularly warm and sunny Good Friday, 2 April at 3:30 p.m.* The session, jointly led by M. L. Stapleton and me, set out to investigate the critical tradition linking the two writers that incorporates a mythology of influence and rivalry. We wanted to know whether our seminarians understood Shakespeare scholarship to have largely determined Marlowe's reception, following conventional scholarly thinking, and, if so, whether it was an inevitability. Have Marlowe studies reciprocally framed the reception of Shakespeare? Why has "value" been privileged, with Shakespeare as Marlowe's "superior," Marlowe as Shakespeare's "equal"? Our seminar emphasized the conception of influence as a process rather than an end in itself, and sought to examine and reexamine evidence of its existence between the two authors.

Thirteen participants contributed essays that collectively engaged all but three of Marlowe's dramatic and poetic works (*The Massacre at Paris*, *2 Tamburlaine*—and most strangely—*Hero and Leander*) and several of Shakespeare's plays and his sonnets. We explored relationships among texts, and theatrical tools, such as stage objects and music, to map a range of analogues and dissonances by examining linguistic parallels, dual perspectives, literary and cultural antecedents, and dramaturgical practices. In our discussions, we applied a variety of methodological treatments to investigations of historical or aesthetic influence pertaining to an array of topics. We recognized that our work contributed to a larger critical context, extending back to the work of A. P. Rossiter (1946), F. P. Wilson (1953), Nicholas Brooke (1961), and Harold F. Brooks (1968).

The two-hour meeting yielded a rich diversity of subject matter, and, given the session's interdisciplinary nature, very little (if any) time was spent on conventional textual issues, such as differences between the A- and B-texts of *Doctor Faustus*. Moreover, scant discussion based on value judgments or arguments claiming that one's artistry was an improvement of the other's reflected a pronounced reluctance on the part of the group to make such assessments of worth. The subject of the seminar inspired new treatments of the relationship between the artists. A study of dissonances in *Edward II* and *Richard II* as it relates to Helgersonian "forms of nationhood," for instance, led to a realization of the differences of the playwrights' world views, as well as dramaturgical treatments of geography, eschatology, and the exotic. Comparisons of religious, political, and personal relations in *The Jew of Malta* to those in *The Merchant of Venice*—as well as to those in *Doctor Faustus*, *Hamlet*, and *Othello*—helped us consider how we define genre in Marlowe's work, and, most

interestingly, led to a discussion about his attitudes towards family and kinship. The course of such conversation led us to recognize with greater awareness the importance of combining performance studies with textual studies, in general, and the nature of influence, in particular. Another lively line of inquiry emerged as participants sought to determine whether Shakespeare is paying tribute to Marlowe or parodying him, and what parody really means, while simultaneously recognizing both playwrights' sometimes perverse treatment of their classical, medieval, and early modern literary antecedents. This investigative thread opened with taking the measure of *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, and led to the *Elegies*; combined, their treatment in the session composed the most concentrated examination of classical Marlowe. Furthermore, we recognized Marlowe as quite clearly having influenced Shakespeare's plays throughout his early, middle, and late career, from *Titus Andronicus* to *Henry V* to *The Tempest* in the forms of character development, stage properties and music, and set pieces.

Twenty auditors in total joined our meeting, at one point outnumbering the participants. When invited to join the conversation in the last twenty or so minutes, several of our colleagues contributed valuable insights on the idea of Marlowe-Shakespeare influence as well as on Marlowe studies in general. In response to the difficult question of what Shakespeare specifically learns from Marlowe, posed by my co-chair several times throughout the conversation, Pierre Hecker (Carleton College) argued that from Marlowe, Shakespeare learns to pitch questions and to write dramas focusing on antiheroes. Roslyn Knutson (University of Arkansas, Little Rock) underscored the importance of recognizing that questions of "influence are necessarily complicated by the number of lost plays (and their dramatists) that he knew but we don't," with *The Famous Victories of Henry V*, *The True Tragedy of Richard III*, *The Troublesome Reign of King John*, and *King Leir* in mind. This suggests, then, that we search for Marlowe's art in Shakespeare, in part because his works survive. Robert Darcy (University of Nebraska, Omaha) relayed his appreciation for the group's interrogation of problems of unconscious and conscious influence in Shakespeare, and questioned the degree to which we are predisposed to believe Shakespeare intentionally set about to rewrite Marlowe by way of scholarly suggestion. Moreover, he asked whether more work might be applied to the study of Shakespeare's direct references to Marlowe, such as in *As You Like It*, *Troilus and Cressida* and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*.

The session proved an enjoyable experience that led all of us to engage more fully in our own interests as well as those of others. The field of Marlowe studies was well served. As our discussion deepened (and continued later at the hotel bar), many of us contemplated new directions for the future to be taken up at another time, perhaps during a sixth meeting at a

future SAA. Participants expressed the need to consider more fully Marlowe's dramaturgical influence on the work of his near contemporaries other than Shakespeare, such as Jonson and Middleton, as well as on later playwrights in the years leading up to the present day. Perhaps the most compelling idea to emerge was a desire for more narrowly focused inquiries into specific literary and cultural moments, such as the dramatic milieu of the late 1580s and early 1590s.

Sarah K. Scott
Mount St. Mary's University

Seminar #9 Abstracts

1. "Barabas and Shylock: Together on Stage," Ann Basso, University of South Florida

My paper explores the performance history of *The Jew of Malta* when presented in repertory with *The Merchant of Venice*. The plays were performed together for the first time in the United States in 2007 by Theatre for a New Audience and again by the York Shakespeare Company in December of 2009. The Royal Shakespeare Company first paired them in 1964, and they have been put on together in Germany as well. Both plays center on commerce and feature a Jewish character, but do they really have that much in common, and how well do they work together when performed in repertory?

2. "Place and Nature in *Edward II* and *Richard II*," Robin Bates, Lynchburg College

My paper will look at place and nature in *Edward II* and *Richard II*. History plays of this period not only depict historical events in order to investigate the qualities that constitute a good ruler, they also explore what constitutes England and what it means to be English. *Edward II* and *Richard II* have very different relationships to place, geography, and the natural world, and I plan to explore how this figures in their constructions of Englishness.

3. "The Two Magicians," James Biester, Loyola University Chicago

The Tempest so effectively invites comparison with Shakespeare's earlier works that we may underestimate another sense in which it can be seen as retrospective or even nostalgic: in its evocations of the work of other playwrights, in particular Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*. These evocations are admittedly not the direct, verbal echoes of Marlowe that James Shapiro and others have carefully traced in the plays of Shakespeare's early and middle career, but simply by choosing to write a play whose protagonist is a magician, Shakespeare entered what his contemporaries would have recognized as indisputably Marlowe's territory, just as Jonson did soon after in *The Alchemist*. Unsurprisingly, what is often most striking is how differently Shakespeare handles an action, motif, or set-piece that has a demonstrable analogue in Marlowe's play, yet through these contrasts we gain insight

*The history of Marlowe at SAA is as follows: "Marlowe and Middleton," led by Douglas Bruster, 24 March 1995, Chicago; "The Place of Marlowe," led by Emily C. Bartels, 27 March 1997, Washington, D.C.; "Marlowe Today" led by David Riggs, 8 April 2000, Montréal; "Marlowe as Maker," led by Sara Munson Deats and Georgia E. Brown, 17 March 2005, Bermuda; "Marlowe and Shakespeare," led by Sarah K. Scott and M. L. Stapleton, 2 April, 2010, Chicago.

into one form of inspiration for a play that has unusually few sources.

4. "Mars or Gorgon? Tamburlaine and Henry V," Sara M. Deats, University of South Florida

The dialectical structure and multiple perspectives of Shakespeare's interrogative dramas have long been a commonplace of early modern criticism. However, in my essay, "Marlowe's Interrogative Drama: *Dido*, *Tamburlaine*, *Faustus*, and *Edward II*," I argue that before Shakespeare created his famous dual aspect characters, Christopher Marlowe anticipated Shakespeare's signature complementarity, etching rabbit / duck portraits every bit as multifaceted and perplexing as those limned by Shakespeare. My paper for this seminar will expand upon this statement by comparing the multifaceted portraits of Tamburlaine and Henry V, two ruthless and successful warriors created by Marlowe and Shakespeare respectively, both appearing on the early modern stage in times of national crisis and both, throughout the years, arousing ambivalent responses in critics and audiences alike. In this paper, I will predicate Tamburlaine, an oxymoronic blend of the godlike and the devilish, as a model for Shakespeare's Henry V, part ideal Christian Prince, part master Machiavel.

5. "The Queer of Malta: Barabas's Homoerotic Desire in Light of Shakespeares *Othello*," John Ellis-Etchinson, University of Louisiana-Lafayette

My paper argues for the potential influence of Marlowe's Barabas on Shakespeare's Iago. Not only are these two characters' motivations and demeanors remarkably similar, the relationship that Barabas builds with his slave, Ithamore, parallels the one Iago develops with his commander, Othello. In this respect, though, the latter's roles are rhetorically inverted, with Othello, the Moor, being Iago's social and political better. By examining Barabas's relationship with his self-proclaimed "love" and "second self" in light of Shakespeare's miscegenated pair, evidence mounts to support a queer reading of Marlowe's protagonist in *The Jew of Malta*, which brings Barabas away from the realm of solely ethnic / religious Other and places him in the realm of sexual Other as well (3.4.14-15).

6. “Marlowe’s and Shakespeare’s Staged Books: Incarnate Texts and their Cruxes,” Brett Foster, Wheaton College

Having just finished a project on books as stage objects (and “expressive forms”) in Shakespeare’s plays, and realizing Marlowe’s influence but having little space to address it, I would like to prepare for SAA seminar #9 a short paper that considers, with a few examples from the plays, Marlowe and Shakespeare together. I will argue that there is a kind of conversation to be found within their paired texts, about books as stage properties, about their cultural influence and theatrical potential. This emphasis may reveal certain details in individual plays. Is there significance, for example, in Faustus’ last cry “I’ll burn my books,” which echoes Envy’s earlier comment? And how do Faustian volumes get picked up by Shakespeare, in works ranging from *2 Henry VI* to *The Tempest*? I will benefit from earlier work by Frederick Kiefer, as well as James Kearney’s recent study *The Incarnate Text*.

7. “With a Lute, Disguised’: Music as a Theatrical Tool in *The Jew of Malta* and *The Taming of the Shrew*,” Lizz Ketterer, University of New Mexico

David Lindley argues that though Shakespeare “actually says nothing particularly original about music,” he does say it “better than most.” This paper will consider the question of influence and originality in the use of music as a theatrical tool by examining two particular musical performances: Barabas’ lute performance in *The Jew of Malta* and Bianca’s music lesson in *The Taming of the Shrew*. The performance history of both plays in the Elizabethan theatrical world, the influence of ideas about the affective and effective powers of music in the social world of the period, and the ability of each performative moment to offer information about Early Modern theatrical practice will provide the means by which the relationship of these two musical performances shall be explored. Does Shakespeare say it “better,” or use music more originally as a theatrical tool, than Marlowe? I don’t propose to answer such a subjective question in this paper, but look forward to hearing responses to the desire to question the inherent privilege of the Shakespeare canon that animates many of my inquiries.

8. “Trojans in Drag in Shakespeare’s *Troilus and Cressida* and Marlowe’s *Dido, Queen of Carthage*,” Sarah D. Rasher, University of Connecticut-Storrs

Why couldn’t early modern dramatists interpret the *Iliad* and *Aeneid* with a straight face? Much has been made of the satirical, burlesque, and even camp aspects of both *Troilus and Cressida* and *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, and I argue that this commonality reveals a conflicted relationship between early modern drama and classical epic poetry: great reverence for Homer and Virgil, but also an inability to adapt them without sarcasm and excess. Both Shakespeare and Marlowe depict an ancient Greek world overwhelmed by emotion and erotic desire—not only a way of bringing the classical masters down to earth, but of calling into question prescriptions of masculine behavior at odds with early modern experience.

9. “*Doctor Faustus and Hamlet*,” Barbara Parker, William Patterson University

My paper will argue the probable influence of Marlowe’s *Faustus* on Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*. Both protagonists have initially studied at Wittenberg, site of radical Protestantism and the Reformation; both undergo a figurative conversion to Roman Catholicism via the agency of the Devil; and both ultimately experience an ill-fated return to Calvinism: the demonic Calvinist God solicited by the dying Faustus refuses to allay the sinner’s agony and withholds the single drop of blood that will save his soul, while Hamlet’s embrace of predestinarianism incurs his belief that Heaven enabled his murder of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern; his pointless death (and multiple tangential deaths); and Denmark’s consequent takeover by a foreign prince. In both plays, accordingly, Roman Catholicism and Calvinism emerge as equally untenable, demonic, and lethal.

10. “Marlowe the Sonneteer,” M.L. Stapleton, Indiana University-Purdue University, Fort Wayne

I am revisiting a topic that interested me long ago: Marlowe’s rendition of Ovid’s *Amores* in both its surreptitiously published forms, *Certaine of Ovids Elegies* and *All Ovids Elegies: 3 Bookes*, was essential to Shakespeare’s conception of the sonnet sequence, especially the (un)reliability of the lover as our guide through a fractured narrative in which a man attempts to portray a woman he cannot possibly understand (through no fault of her own). Also, it seems significant that the Bishops, as part of their Ban, interdicted and burned the *Certaine* text in the same year that *The Passionate Pilgrime* was published, 1599, which contains the first versions of the Ovidian sonnets #138 and #144, something that completely escaped me the first time I wrote on the subject. This year was significant in many other ways, of course, for Shakespeare as dramatist, for Marlowe’s posthumous reputation, and for political and publication-oriented reasons, as well.

11. “Plotting Mortality: Marlowe’s Maps and Shakespeare’s Globe,” Annette Stenning, Simon Frasier University

In *2 Tamburlaine*, Marlowe turns geographic representation of space into a dramatic plot through his use of Ortelius’ *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum* (1570) thus demonstrating a connection between mapping and the theatre as two relatively new spatial representative arts. And while early modern cartographers plotted out this world, Catholic and Protestant theologians debated the geography of the otherworld just as Marlowe’s doctor of divinity attempts to pin down constructions of the afterlife when he asks Mephistopheles (who gives no satisfaction) “where is the place that men call hell?” and similarly, in *Hamlet*, Shakespeare’s questionable ghost refuses to tell the “secrets” of his postmortem habitation. My paper will explore representations of geographical, theatrical and eschatological space in *2 Tamburlaine*, *Doctor Faustus*, and *Hamlet*, examining Marlowe’s influence on Shakespeare’s “distracted globe” theatre.

12. “‘Let me have a wife’: The Tragedy of Family in *Doctor Faustus* and *Othello*,” Matthew Theil, Auburn University

Debate continues about whether *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus* can be considered a tragedy, whether the play succeeds as a tragedy, how the tragic action works, etc. I believe that *Faustus* and *Othello* present similar obstacles to sympathy and understanding, and I hope to illuminate the nature of the tragic in both by comparing them. Specifically, both plays seem to present a similar epistemological crisis and an impoverished attitude towards family that make them atypical as tragedies and characterize them as exemplars of a certain type of tragedy.

Marlowe Studies: An Annual

We’ve had quite a response for our 2011 submissions, and we’re working now on 2012, actively soliciting contributions from Marlovians everywhere, our Board happy to read what you send. We seek essays on topics we see less frequently, such as performance studies and theater history; poetical method and craft in the corpus; reception history; the nineteenth-century editorial tradition; and the less heralded works, such as *Lucan*, *Massacre*, *Elegies*, and *Dido*. We expect to have a contents page up soon on both websites, once the entire rostrum for the 2011 incarnation is set. We’ve included a .pdf version of our postcard in this mailing that we hope you’ll print, pass on in emails to your colleagues, or post on your office door. Our staff is in the process of advertising to as many institutions in North America and Europe as possible for subscriptions. We hope you can help us out in any way you can, and invite you to subscribe.

General Editorial Information: we solicit essays on scholarly topics directly related to the author and his role in the literary culture of his time. Especially welcome are studies of the plays and poetry; their sources; relations to genre; lines of influence; classical, medieval, and continental contexts; performance and theater history; textual studies; the author’s professional milieu and place in early modern English poetry, drama, and culture.

All manuscripts should be of article length (20-25 pp.), be prepared according to the dictates of *The Chicago Manual of Style* (16th ed.), and include an abstract of approximately 100-150 words. List name and affiliation on a separate cover sheet, but include only the essay’s title on the manuscript itself to facilitate blind reading of submissions. We use Word (.doc or docx) and Rich Text (.rtf) as file formats. Include complete contact information, including electronic mail and street addresses.

13. “The Narratological Ventures of Shakespeare and Marlowe,” Jacob A. Cedillo Tootalian, University of Wisconsin, Madison

I am interested in alternative schemes for conceiving of the narratological strategies of Renaissance writers. The discourse of expressive artistry has its limitations for describing the relationship of influence between Marlowe and Shakespeare’s dramatic works. In my paper, I will analyze the portrayals of commercial endeavors in *The Jew of Malta* and *The Merchant of Venice* in an effort to understand adventure as an ideology as much at work in the London public theater as in the mercantile sea trade. Tracing the dramaturgical implications of casting Marlowe and Shakespeare as playwright-adventurers, we can conceptualize the composition of these plays in terms of risk-driven narrative calculations in order to establish the pragmatic dimensions of their dramatic artistry.

Marlowe Studies prefers essays that present well-focused arguments. We do not consider unrevised conference papers or dissertation chapters, material submitted elsewhere simultaneously or previously published, or articles on the authorship “controversy” in popular culture (i.e., that Marlowe wrote Shakespeare, or vice versa). Although a shorter article is not unwelcome, we do not publish notes or book reviews.

Please submit manuscripts in electronic mail attachment to:

The Editors
Marlowe Studies
Department of English and Linguistics
Indiana University-Purdue University, Fort Wayne
mstudies@ipfw.edu

Our websites:
<http://new.ipfw.edu/marlowe/> OR www.marlowestudies.org



Image used with permission from Brandeis University Special Collections.

Keith M. Botelho. *Renaissance Earwitnesses: Rumor and Early Modern Masculinity*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. xiv + 199 pp.

Keith Botelho begins *Renaissance Earwitnesses: Rumor and Early Modern Masculinity* with a prefatory chapter that issues a moral imperative, one that will little surprise contemporary readers. Given the contents of the study that follows, the admonition can be understood as transhistorical, for we are told that, to dispel rumor, earwitnesses are as much in need now as they were in Renaissance England. Earwitnessing means, essentially, “the sifting and distilling of information” (2). The Preface warns specifically that, since contemporary “media is susceptible to reporting and printing unauthorized information” (xi), it behooves “a discerning public” (xiv) to pierce rumor and arrive at the truth through “aural discernment” (xiv); failure to do so obscures the meaning and veracity of information and makes indeterminate its authority. To assist us in our endeavors to be responsible earwitnesses, Botelho directs us to two websites that he has found helpful: Politifact.com and Snopes.com (xiv).

Having established that the potency of rumor is transhistorical and that the reaction to it, unfortunately, has remained inveterate, Botelho opens his discussion with an introductory chapter that undertakes to examine early modern considerations of rumor or fame and the sensory activities needed to discern truth from falsehoods (“Buzz, Buzz: Rumor in Early Modern England”). He asserts that earwitnessing is more important than any visual means in driving away the fog of ambiguity that inescapably encompasses rumor. During the late sixteenth and first half of the seventeenth centuries, the period that Botelho is most interested in, earwitnessing was particularly important in order “to maintain male informational authority” (2). And such authority, understandably, contributes to strengthening the image of masculinity within the predominantly patriarchal system then in place.

Taking issue with stereotypical notions of gender roles, Botelho denounces the myth that women are chiefly the rumormongers. He posits instead that men are equally to blame for rumor and loose talk; in fact, “Men thus generate their own anxieties about hearing because of their engagement and investment in producing rumors” (5). Furthermore, Botelho believes that the relationship between earwitnessing and masculine identity becomes a prominent focus of early modern drama, itself based on auricular communication. Distinguishing gossip from rumor, Botelho contends that early modern dramatists readily take up the cause for increased earwitnessing, demonstrating that male informational authority does not derive from denunciations of stereotypically female gossip but from breaking through the ambiguities of rumormongering among men to discover a bedrock of truth. On the early modern stage, “the innate ambiguity of rumor forecasts the breakdown of communication and masculine authority” (11). But complicating this cheerless dictum is the

presence of Queen Elizabeth. Botelho asserts that the Queen, herself savvy about the uses and abuses of rumor, rose above prescribed gender roles to manifest a non-traditional position: “Elizabeth embraced the characteristics of Rumor and Fama [reputation], becoming *the* paradigm of the earwitness of the early modern period” (22).

Probably of most interest to Marlovians is Chapter One (“Table Talk: Marlowe’s Mouthy Men”) in which Botelho contextualizes Marlowe’s concern in his dramas with his male protagonists’ failures of earwitnessing. The chapter praises the Humanist tradition as exemplified in Juan Luis Vives and Roger Ascham. With its emphasis on discernment, this tradition influenced sixteenth-century English university curricula, to which Marlowe would have been subject. Botelho also points out that Marlowe himself was subject to rumors, beginning with his extracurricular activities on behalf of the Queen during his student days at Cambridge, and that, as a dramatist, he quickly became the subject of rumors and that they did not stop with his death. Moreover, because of Marlowe’s (putative) own loose talk, he very likely had a hand in bringing about his death; according to Botelho, the poet/playwright’s engaging in “table talk and his own transgressive tongue... ultimately cost him his life” (29). Botelho further claims that “Kyd’s assertion of Marlowe engaging in table talk foregrounds an anxiety about male speech gone astray as well as the concomitant anxiety about the failures of earwitnessing” (28) and that such “anxieties are at the center of Marlowe’s canon” (28). He tells us, too, that Marlowe finds in rumor a dramatic path: *Dido, Queen of Carthage, The Massacre At Paris, and Edward II* all portray “the unreliability of spoken and written news” and show how the “male characters struggle to control rumors” (29). Before treating these three plays in detail, Botelho indicates his purpose, saying “Marlowe showcases the dual fears of the feminization of the male ear and the hazards of men engaging in unauthorized information while claiming that the uncontrolled social conversation of men threatens male authority . . . And, as Marlowe insists, the only way to recoup male sovereignty is through becoming an earwitness, not only to other men but also to women” (29). In these three plays, “it is the uncontrolled speech of men and the failures of earwitnessing that threaten to undermine and destroy male authority” (36). The single Marlovian exemplar of earwitnessing is Edward III who is discerning in listening to his counselors and in being able to separate fact from rumor. Given Botelho’s clearly articulated interests, his analyses of the three plays fall nicely into place. Some Marlovians, however, might find this chapter’s characterization of the imprints of rumor and loose talk on Marlowe’s life and works less clearly limned than Botelho claims. Yet, the discussion nevertheless invites a worthwhile perspective on both Marlowe’s biography and his body of work.

The next two chapters examine plays by Shakespeare. The first (“Bruits and Britons: Rumor, Counsel, and the Henriad”), after laying the groundwork with *Gorboduc*, focuses on Shakespeare’s second tetralogy. If *Gorboduc* can

be seen as a play about “the failures of counsel” (56), Shakespeare moves in an opposite direction, portraying Henry IV and Henry V as figures who, unlike Richard II, listen judiciously to all counsel, even that which includes falsehoods and rumors; the happy upshot is that they are thereby able to sharpen their powers of discernment. “Earwitnessing thus establishes authority in a world of unauthorized information” (56), a world in which women, too, are given credibility as counselors—e.g., the French Queen Isabel and Princess Katherine in *Henry V*.

The second of the chapters on Shakespeare (“I heard a bustling rumour’: Shakespeare’s Aural Insurgents”) abundantly demonstrates that several of the women in Shakespeare’s plays manifest their resistance to masculine authority by not speaking but by listening with discrimination. They thereby undermine masculine authority and overturn the stereotypical notion of women as the primary embodiment of loose talk. In empowering women, as Botelho phrases it, “Shakespeare effectively uproots earwitnessing from the male domain” (76) and, consequently, prevents men from exercising their authority. Lavinia’s “speechless power” (24) is the first example cited; Cordelia and *Measure For Measure*’s Isabella come next, followed by discussions of the silent statue of Hermione and Emilia and Desdemona in the willow scene (4.3)—among other pieces of evidence from these latter two plays. The chapter concludes with two examples of insurgent females who become earwitnesses in the face of male rumors, Imogen in *Cymbeline* 1.6 and Helena in *All’s Well That Ends Well*.

Botelho turns next to the plays of Ben Jonson (“Nothing but the truth’: Ben Jonson’s Comedy of Rumors”). He contends that Jonson was well aware that rumors were created by men as well as women; as a result, he depicts the failures of aural perception in both genders and, with equal importance, in various spaces as well. Botelho contends that Jonson’s well known displeasure with the audiences of his plays led him to see to the publication of his works in the hope that readers rather than spectators would be the perfect auditors: “The Jonsonian fantasy is to have auditors rather than spectators apprehend his works, as he believed in the powers of audition over vision in discerning truth” (99). Although Botelho does not say so, Jonson’s division of an audience into auditors and spectators in the Prologue to *The Staple of News* is too severe and shortsighted. At least in theory, audience members can be both auditors and spectators, even if not simultaneously. The sensory and emotional response of a spectator may block a reflective response during the course of the play. But earwitnessing can come later, perhaps after the audience member has left the theater and is thinking about what was said rather than what was seen. In carefully tending to the publication of his works, Jonson hoped that his readers would hear what they might have missed in viewing the plays. Whether this hope is mere fantasy, Jonson’s opposition to spectacle in drama and his disagreements with Inigo Jones stem in part from a belief that aural failures are on the increase. His highly critical view is that, more often than not, audiences incline to being merely spectators, not interested in

hearing the moral issues being raised.

The plays that Botelho chooses to demonstrate Jonson’s “emerging fixation on listening” (24) are *Epicoene*, *Bartholomew Fair*, *The Staple of News*, *The New Inn*, and *The Magnetic Lady*. The first two were written before Jonson’s 1616 to 1626 hiatus from penning dramas, but there is nevertheless a notable thematic continuity with the three written later. Of particular significance to Botelho is the range and distinctness of the spaces that rumor inhabits in the five selected plays: the fair, the home, the staple, and the inn. Jonson’s inclination is to satirize these places as “spaces of unauthorized information” (126). In *Bartholomew Fair*, for example, he “uses the space of the fair, another unofficial space of the exchange of information, to articulate his anxieties about information control and authorization” (107). *The Staple of News*, first performed late in 1625, sustains Jonson’s penchant for a comedy of rumors but also strikes a note that returns us to the concerns that Botelho expressed in his Preface: “Jonson voices his skepticism about journalism and his frustration with the burgeoning news business, infiltrated by rumor, as he satirizes its unwieldy birth in the place of the Staple” (115). One cannot help but agree with Botelho’s view that, from Jonson’s perspective, the only way of establishing truth ultimately is through authorized publications such as his own works (114).

The conclusion to the book is a brief chapter that discusses Elizabeth Cary and *The Tragedy of Mariam* (“Contrary to truth’: Elizabeth Cary’s Tragedy of Rumor”). Botelho characterizes Elizabeth Cary as an exemplar of earwitnessing, one reason, perhaps, why her closet drama, in contrast to Jonson’s spotlight on the comedy of rumors, focuses on the tragedy of rumors. She joins the group of male dramatists Botelho has considered throughout the book as a firm believer in earwitnessing; like the others, she indicates in her play that it is the only sure way to squelch rumor.

Renaissance Earwitnesses contributes to the development of the recent interest in aurality in Renaissance drama, acknowledged more generally as a basic ingredient of early modern sensory culture. Moreover, the book draws into its discussion the related perspective of gender criticism. Written in a style that makes for refreshingly easy reading, the study manages to mark a trail that readers will find worth following. My only question is whether the evidence that is supplied is not in excess of the conclusions. I found myself persuaded of general points well before all the evidence had been amassed. A side effect of this reaction was a certain sense of repetitiousness. Even so, there is little question of Keith Botelho’s excellence as a scholar. Instances in the evidence he supplies and in his examination of individual plays indicate a scrupulous, perceptive, wide-ranging mind equipped to analyze both literary and non-literary materials. My hope is that in future projects he will be able to apply these capabilities to a richer subject matter.

Robert A. Logan
University of Hartford

Sara Munson Deats, ed. *Doctor Faustus: A Critical Guide*. London: Continuum Press, 2010. 200 pp.

Seldom does a critical guide come along that is as useful to undergraduates and first-time readers as it is to advanced graduate students. *Doctor Faustus: A Critical Guide* is the rare exception. Edited by Sara Munson Deats, author and editor of several books on Christopher Marlowe, the guide provides readers with extensive histories, guides to critical research and resources, and new scholarship on the play. Deats's introduction succinctly outlines the sources for the play and provides a quick overview of the dominant interpretative and performative crux: does *Doctor Faustus* promote Christian orthodoxy or heterodoxy? After delineating the evidence for both sides of the argument, Deats asserts that Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* may be the first "dialogical drama that inscribes the multiplicity and indecidability of human experience" (14). This interpretive dilemma provides a sort of textual through-line as the guide traces performative and critical histories and opens up new lines of inquiry, frequently turning back to the vexing problem of how to read or perform a play where ideas guide the plot, rather than character development.

The guide is comprised of the introduction and eight additional chapters: two chapters focus on past interpretations, both performative and critical in nature; two chapters focus on current critical research and resources; and four chapters outline "new directions" in Faustian criticism. In the first chapter, "The Critical Backstory," Bruce E. Brandt provides readers with the critical history, beginning with the A-text (1604) vs. B-text (1616) controversies. After tracing 400 years of debate over which quarto should be considered primary, Brandt goes on to scan critical arguments concerning dating, co-authorship, structure and genre. Brandt, like Deats, takes up the interpretative crux, delineating the arguments for critics who view the text as ultimately skeptical versus those who see *Dr. Faustus* as moralistic and didactic. The remainder of the chapter focuses on the arguments surrounding specific themes. Though an entire book could be written on the ideas in this chapter alone, the essay concisely offers a quick overview of the kinds of debates that have taken place in *Faustus* criticism. This chapter is most useful for undergraduates, who are just learning how to enter into the critical conversations.

David Bevington's "The Performance History," on the other hand, is particularly valuable for graduate students, theater practitioners, and theater historians. Bevington begins his chapter with William Prynne's 1633 second-hand report of the extra devil at the Belsavage Theater. As Bevington notes, this report, like the early theatrical performances themselves, is of uncertain veracity and cannot even be definitively linked to Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*. Clearly, though, there are several early modern anecdotes linking supernatural occurrences to Marlowe's play. In addition to surveying several first- and second-hand accounts of performances, Bevington also goes on to discuss the staging differences between the A- and B-texts, a section that is of particular use for future productions. Later in the chapter, Bevington outlines the most historically significant theatrical productions and finishes the chapter with

brief précis of several modern theatrical, radio, and television productions.

In addition to chapters focused on the play's critical and performative history, the book also includes four chapters that offer new lines of inquiry in Marlowe studies: Andrew Duxfield's "Doctor Faustus and Renaissance Hermeticism," Toni Francis's "Imperialism as Devilry: A Postcolonial Reading of *Doctor Faustus*," Andrew James Hartley's "'What means this show?' Staging Faustus on Campus," and Georgia E. Brown's "The Other Black Arts: *Doctor Faustus* and the Inky Worlds of Printing and Writing." Duxfield's and Brown's chapters are especially strong. Duxfield focuses on the play's allusions to occult texts and practitioners. As the earlier chapters demonstrate, the play's engagement with the occult has fascinated critics, historians, and spectators throughout its 400-year history. Duxfield farms a plucked-over field and manages to make it bear new fruit. Arguing that historians and critics have not paid enough attention to Marlowe's engagement with the *Corpus Hermeticum*, Duxfield sees within the *Hermeticum*'s teachings a way to offer "a new perspective on Faustus's intellectual ambition and dissatisfaction with academic learning, and also a potential synthesis between readings of the play as a celebration of an admirably ambitious human being who oversteps his mark, and those that interpret it as a moral tale about the punishment of a foolish and faithless sinner" (96-7). Georgia Brown's chapter focuses instead on the materiality of printing and writing as well as the "relationship between textuality and corporeality" (140). In particular, Brown's chapter "draws on the study of material culture, the new critical movement that studies physical objects, in an attempt to recover early modern understanding(s) of writing" (144). Brown expertly walks the reader through the complicated ways in which writing is both material and ideological and places in the text where these fields overlap and, indeed, collapse. While Duxfield's essay focuses on finding a synthesis between two traditionally disparate ways of interpreting the text, Brown complicates our own understanding of the "rift between writing and performing in the Renaissance," astutely observing that the play's "meaning is not deducible from the text alone, but neither is it deducible from performance and spectacle alone" (156).

In addition to the critical chapters, the guide includes two very useful chapters for researchers: Robert Logan's "The State of the Art: Current Critical Research" and Sarah K. Scott's "A Survey of Resources." While the purview of Logan's chapter concerns past "tendencies" and "patterns" in *Faustus* studies as well as a bulleted outline speculating where future criticism might head, Scott's chapter gives a more in-depth survey of recent scholarly and pedagogical works. Both chapters provide useful bibliographies, and Scott's chapter also gives short, concise annotations to the listed sources.

The guide is only 191 pages, excluding the index, and yet, there really is something in it for everyone. What it lacks in depth, it makes up for in breadth. While no one person would find every chapter useful, every kind of reader--from those unfamiliar with the play to those adding their voices to the critical conversation--can find extremely valuable and cutting-

edge information about the history and current critical conversations pertaining to *Doctor Faustus*.

Trish Thomas Henley
University of Cincinnati

***Christopher Marlowe the Craftsman: Lives, Stage, and Page.* Sarah K. Scott and M. L. Stapleton, eds. Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate, 2010. 261 pp.**

Christopher Marlowe the Craftsman is the fifth collection of essays to be published under the auspices of the Marlowe Society of America. This much-anticipated collection contains fifteen essays by emerging and established scholars, some of whom are applying their critical skills to Marlovian matters for the first time here. The collection—or volume, as the editors call it as they meticulously and graciously locate it in a variety of critical contexts—“observes current trends, resisting interpretative homogeneity to offer a cohesive, interdisciplinary approach” (3). The volume’s aim is to “provide readers with a variety of entry points that encourage the engagement of mutually illuminating lines of inquiry” (3). The essays “inquire into the continuing dispute regarding the facts of Marlowe’s life, the textual difficulties that emerge from the staging of his plays, the critical investigations arising from analyses of individual works, and their relationship to those of his contemporaries” (11). This is reflected in the organisation of the essays under the three subheadings of *Lives, Stage, and Page* (x 2), as follows:

- *Lives*: Scholarship and Biography (contributions by Robert A. Logan, Richard F. Hardin, J. A. Downie, and Rosalind Barber)
- *Stage*: Theater, Dramaturgy (contributions by Alan C. Dessen, Meredith Skura, Sarah. K. Scott, and Ruth Lunney)
- *Page*: Texts and Interpretations: Marlowe the Ovidian (contributions by Stephen Booth, M. L. Stapleton, Robert Darcy, and Dympna Callaghan)
- *Page*: Texts and Interpretations: Marlowe’s Reach (contributions by Brett Foster, Carolyn Scott, and Paul Menzer)

The glue that holds the essays together as a volume is the overarching view of “Marlowe as *artifex*, as maker of plays, poems, and mythologies” (1).

Christopher Marlowe the Craftsman offers all Marlovians infinite riches in a not-so-little-room. By “not-so-little-room” I do not mean that the volume is large or long. Rather, I mean that the essays in this volume reach beyond its pages to pages elsewhere—some written, some being written, some yet to be written. But let us begin with the riches.

Readers can take from *Marlowe the Craftsman* individual essays that simply delight their minds. You will choose your favourites. Two of mine are Dympna Callaghan’s “Marlowe’s Last Poem: Elegiac Aesthetics and the Epitaph on Sir Roger Manwood” (159-178), and Stephen Booth’s “On the Eventfulness of *Hero and Leander*” (125-136). Callaghan’s

essay demonstrates that in Marlowe’s “commitment to the Latin origins of his poetic enterprise, [he] self-consciously inhabited the uncannily parallel universe of Augustan Rome,” and of Ovid’s exile (160). She encourages us to look to Ovid’s *Tristia* as a means to explore Manwood’s epitaph because Marlowe, at the time of writing it, was, like Ovid, contemplating death (166). She concludes that the epitaph “may constitute, whether literally or imaginatively, the poetic record of [Marlowe’s] fear of assassination” (176). This brief outline does not of course do justice to Callaghan’s essay, but it does serve to introduce what will no doubt prove to be a germinal study in this emerging area of Marlowe scholarship. Stephen Booth’s essay is a joyously unencumbered close reading of *Hero and Leander*, which, he asserts, “generates more mental events in its listeners per square metric foot than any other poem [he] knows anywhere in English literature—or any other” (125). The “eventfulness” Booth finds, then, is not of the poem’s story, “in which lots and lots of events *almost* happen—but do not happen,” but “of the minds of listeners and readers,” their experience of the poem (125; emphasis in original). Booth works energetically through the poem to show us the devices Marlowe uses to create experience, for example, the couplets “crowded” with syllabic events “for the listening mind that the listening consciousness comprehends without noticing” (127). Booth seems to gather his energy from that in the poem, drawing us—no, that’s not the right word—dancing us through *Hero and Leander* with his own eventful language of the mind as he talks of “fireworks of mental events”, and of the poem as a “semantic gymkhana” (129, 136). Resistance is useless; you *will* read this essay.

My choice of Callaghan’s and Booth’s essays is not entirely self-indulgent, for when put alongside some of the other essays in the volume, they demonstrate the usefulness of *Christopher Marlowe the Craftsman*, the ways in which it can enrich scholarly work and the academic experience of students. The key here is the provision of “a variety of entry points that encourage the engagement of mutually illuminating lines of inquiry.” Clever editorial work has constructed a volume that invites readers to move around in it rather than move systematically through it. For instance Callaghan’s essay, with the importance it places on when Marlowe wrote the epitaph to Manwood, draws readers from the *Page* section of the volume to the biographical essays in the *Lives* section. Or the other way around. Booth’s close reading of *Hero and Leander* may be an end in itself but it also showcases the fundamental skill from which all academic work proceeds. That is reason enough to use it to teach, and not just Marlowe. But give it to students together with Sarah K. Scott’s “*The Jew of Malta* and the Development of City Comedy” (91-108), backed, as it is, with an immense amount of critical reading and research, and you give them experience of the pleasures, rigours, and rewards of scholarly work. From Scott’s essay you could then move to Richard F. Hardin’s “Marlowe Thinking Globally” (23-32), to the intervention it makes in studies of Marlowe’s representation of the Other with its argument that in Marlowe’s *Canterbury* there was “no anti-Stranger xenophobia like that evident in London” (26). And so on for as long as you will.

Infinite riches to be sure, but the network that encourages readers to discover them is not confined to the pages of the volume, which brings me to *Christopher Marlowe the Craftsman* as a not-so-little room. All of the essays “engage current trends in criticism” but they also “simultaneously complement [the contributors’] previous work and future projects” (4). A clear case in point is Ruth Lunney’s “Speaking to the Audience: Direct Address in the Plays of Marlowe and His Contemporaries” (109-124). A taste of a work in progress, Lunney’s essay complements her 2002 study with a new focus on the ways in which Marlowe “transformed the soliloquy and liberated the aside” (109). Thus the essays in the volume reach back to pages already written, to those being written, and to those yet to be written—yet to be written by the volume’s contributors but perhaps more important, yet to be written by the new scholars who will take Marlowe studies through the twenty-first century. *Christopher Marlowe the Craftsman* links these future scholars to present ones and a perpetually growing intertext of Marlowe criticism. The volume’s first essay, “Marlowe Scholarship and Criticism”

(15-22) presents Robert A. Logan’s sage guide to where these future scholars might begin their own mutually illuminating lines of inquiry: close reading in the light of ambiguity as a major artistic device in Marlowe’s work; audience reception; Marlowe’s links with other early modern dramatists and writers apart from Shakespeare; theater and stage history (21-22). With essays such as Booth’s, for example, the collection provides models of such work for these future scholars. Guide, model, access point to an intertextual system of Marlowe scholars and their work—the greatest success of this volume is its commitment to the future of Marlowe scholarship, a commitment proudly on display in the inclusion of “Was Marlowe a Violent Man?” (47-62) by Rosalind Barber, a doctoral student. Given the aims of the Marlowe Society of America, that is as it should be. *Christopher Marlowe the Craftsman* is very well done indeed.

Lucy Potter
The University of Adelaide, South Australia

MSA Theater Reviews

Doctor Faustus at the Royal Exchange Theatre, Manchester

Architecturally, Manchester’s Royal Exchange is very distinctive: a separate glass and steel structure situated within the enormous hall of a former cotton exchange. As an in-the-round theatre with three tiers of seating, it’s ideally designed for plays from the early modern public stage, so I looked forward to seeing how *Doctor Faustus* would work in this environment.

It would be no exaggeration to say that the single most important feature of the production, advertised neither in publicity material nor in the programme, was its use of the B-text. Indeed, the production team embraced the implications of this decision with considerable enthusiasm, staging a *Faustus* that privileged visual spectacle and physical action as much as (if anything, more than) psychological insight or theological speculation.

Faustus was played by Patrick O’Kane, a wiry actor whose height was accentuated by heels and whose shaven head suggested the human skull on his desk. (He has a Northern Irish accent; when announcing his intention to taunt the Pope he varied this into an imitation of the Rev. Ian Paisley, who denounced John Paul II as the Antichrist.) From the beginning, it was evident that this Faustus would be less introverted than is sometimes the case. The whole of his opening speech was delivered in the presence of Wagner (Stephen Hudson), to whom lines like ‘Where is Justinian?’ were directed, and this changed the dynamic of the scene considerably. Throughout the production, Wagner had a considerable level of involvement in Faustus’s magic, helping him prepare for his incantations by bringing on a bucket full of blood (presumably from whatever it is that Faustus has sacrificed). Faustus dipped in a goblet and drank.

The Mephistopheles that first appeared in answer to his conjuring was a huge wraith of black cloth, forming the three dimensional outline of a bearded head, that dropped from the ceiling. Though visually effective, this was the first example of a recurrent tendency in the production to have Lucifer and his (or, in this instance, her: Gwendoline Christie) agents appear from above rather than, as per tradition, from below. This seemed to be driven by considerations of spectacle rather than theology, although it did make the world of the play appear one from which God was entirely absent. The humanoid figure by which the wraith was replaced was not a friar but a bearded, unassuming priest played by Ian Redford, and later on when he embraced the despairing Faustus and made soothing noises, like a father to a child who was having a nightmare, it looked as if an interesting relationship might develop between the two. However, the development from this figure of trust to the co-jester of the Rome scenes and then the chuckling sadist of 5.2 was not very convincingly accomplished.

I don’t know whether the Rome scenes were directed with Pope Benedict XVI’s impending visit to the UK in mind, but director Toby Frow offered no concessions to papal dignity, most notably when Faustus made Pope Adrian (Ian Midlane) feign masturbation with a salami sent to him by the Bishop of Milan. Interestingly, though, the cursing of Faustus by the friars was not treated purely as slapstick – there was an air of anxiety, an awareness that while the curses may have been ineffectual, they reminded Faustus of his real spiritual crimes and future damnation. The scene ended with a genuine shock when a demonic arm (not a prop but the appendage of a concealed actor) emerged from a large roast pig on the Pope’s banqueting table.

Indeed, at times the production was not so much B-text as B-movie. There was a large cast of supporting devils, played as

grey, zombie-esque figures. The first half of the play ended spectacularly as hordes of these twitching undead tormented Benvolio (Jamie de Courcey) and his accomplices. At this point, I was beginning to hope that while I was being denied the *Faustus* I had expected, the play I was getting might have its own distinctive pleasures, and that I might gain some insight into the B-text's appeal to early modern audiences. Indeed, in the second half the emphasis on spectacle interestingly informed the treatment of Faustus, by now a broken figure whose despair was temporarily alleviated only by opportunities for exhibitionism. His injunction to the horse-courser 'ride him not into the water' was delivered in the exaggerated monotone of a stage hypnotist, and after the same character had run off, terrified, with Faustus's gory leg, Faustus unfolded his real leg with mordant aplomb. While he saw the Duke of Vanholt's invitation as an indignity, he seemed compelled to embrace the opportunity to perform; the occasion was a sybaritic masked ball at which Faustus's explanation of the grapes' provenance was humiliatingly drowned out by the noise of partying. And Helen of Troy (Coral Messam) was interestingly staged as a jointed doll, her face a mask; while she discomfited the scholars, she fascinated Faustus, whose attempts to reach out to her were a pathetic index of his psychological collapse. The two of them knelt on the floor, their gestures mirroring each other, until they joined in an embrace that culminated in Faustus stabbing her. The devil-marionette collapsed as if its strings had been cut, and was eventually bundled off by Mephistopheles.

Unfortunately, after this point the production ran out of steam altogether. With no-one left to perform to, Faustus simply did not know what to do with himself: 'I'll leap up to heaven' was taken literally, while 'Gape, earth' was the cue for desperate scrabbling at the ground. This was disengaging and absurd rather than effective: one wished that *noctis equi* would hurry up. Throughout the final scene, a red-lit coffin was visible in the centre of a stage that had opened up when the Good Angel (David Hobbs), straight after telling Faustus of the heavenly joys that could have been his, slid inexorably away from him on the moving boards. After the shocks and spectaculars of the play, I wondered what on earth would happen at midnight; but rather than being torn to bits by devils, Faustus simply walked slowly into the coffin and reclined in it, in the manner of Dracula, before the stage slid shut over him. This had the further unfortunate effect that when the rest of the cast came on for their applause, the stage had to open up again for Faustus to get out (if the coffin had been empty, that would have been something).

While the audience of this matinee production (especially the under-25s – it is an A-level text this year) seemed to enjoy themselves thoroughly, my (Marlovian) companion and I were unconvinced, largely because the production's efforts to be entertaining were at the expense both of the intellectual and the emotional content of the play. Better acting might have helped: while O'Kane was reasonably convincing as Faustus the entertainer of princes, he was less so as Faustus the scholar and magician. As has been mentioned already, his core relationship with Mephistopheles was imperfectly developed, while Wagner's ubiquity was not really explained. The comic

scenes relied on accents (Irish, Scottish, Welsh) and stereotypes to an extent that is disappointing in 2010. I am glad to have seen this production, as it gave me an idea of the kind of play *Doctor Faustus* can be when the 1616 text is taken seriously. However, it did not leave me hoping that future directors would follow its example.

Tom Rutter
Sheffield Hallam University

Doctor Faustus, by Christopher Marlowe
Royal Exchange Theatre, Manchester, England
8 September – 9 October, 2010

Toby Frow (director); Ben Stones (designer); Mark Jonathan (lighting designer); Richard Hammarton (composer and sound designer); Darren Lang (magic consultant); Malcolm Ranson (fight director); Andy Rogers (assistant director)

The cast included: Gwendoline Christie (Evil Angel, Lucifer, Duchess of Vanholt); Jamie de Courcey (Second Scholar, Raymond, Benvolio); David Hobbs (Good Angel, Bruno, First Soldier, Duke of Vanholt, Old Man); Stephen Hudson (Wagner); Gavin Marshall (Dick, Beelzebub, Duke of Saxony, Alexander the Great); Coral Messam (Hostess, Helen of Troy); Ian Midlane (First Scholar, Pope, Frederick); Dyfig Morris (Valdes, Archbishop of Rheims, Martino, House Courser); Rory Murphy (Robin, Cardinal of Padua, Second Soldier); Patrick O'Kane (Faustus); Ian Redford (Mephistopheles); Jonathan Tafler (Cornelius, Inkeeper, Emperor of Germany)





We now enjoy tax-exempt status.

For details, visit the [website](#).

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.

A Reminder to Our Members: We'd like to be a better resource of information and notices for all scholarly activity related to Marlowe. To accomplish this, we depend on your support and involvement as members of the MSA. If you know of a germane performance or event, pass it on to us. Email the Newsletter editor directly: stapletm@ipfw.edu. We also wish to increase our membership rolls and to expand our range of contributors. If you have an idea for a brief essay or review, do pass it on to us.

