



Marlowe Society of America Newsletter

Vol. 31, No. 1, Fall 2011

A Message from the President

Exciting Developments in the Months Upcoming

Finally the air has the texture and fragrance of autumn, and trees are showing touches of full November color. Such seasonal progress puts fresh energy into the business of the MSA.

Elections: A ballot with officers for 2012-15 was circulated in early October, and it is included also with this Fall newsletter. You may print out either of these and return the copy to the MSA president (me: Roslyn L. Knutson), by 1 December 2011 (address: 823 N. Midland St., Little Rock, AR, 72205, USA). Or, if you don't mind your ballot being identified, simply e-mail me with your vote (RLKnutson@ualr.edu). The slate offered for your consideration is as follows: President, Paul Menzer; Vice-President, Bob Logan; Secretary, Lucy Munro. (FYI: the remaining officers have agreed to continue their service, for which the MSA is most grateful: Sarah K. Scott, Membership Chair; Kirk Melnikoff, Treasurer).

The MSA @ MLA: The MSA is sponsoring two sessions in Seattle in January 2012, and information about them can be found below, as well as in the following links to our website embedded here.

"Medievalism and Marlowe," co-sponsored with the Medieval and Renaissance Drama Society, is scheduled for Thursday, 1/5/12 @ 3:30-4:45 p.m. **"Booking Marlowe,"** sponsored solely by the MSA, is scheduled for Friday, 1/6/12 @ 3:30-4:45. Both have superior lineups, and we look forward to your attendance with prospective new members in tow.

The Seventh International Marlowe Conference: The international Marlowe conference will take place at the Blackfriars playhouse in Staunton, VA, June 24-28, 2013. Special events in conjunction with the conference are in the planning stages. I can assure you that the program will be packed with fresh scholarship and the after-hours

with theatrical delights at the Blackfriars itself and other Staunton venues. Watch the MSA website for details.

Even more important: Start thinking about what you want to present at the international conference. You are in charge of the quality, and the program committee will welcome abstracts for individual papers as well as packaged sessions. For the latter, think of the context in which your work shines, contact the scholars who do that sort of work, and send us your grouping as a done deal. Until you have further information, send your proposals to me @ RLKnutson@ualr.edu and I will see that they are forwarded to the Program Chair.

Marlowe Studies: An Annual: the MSA urges you to support the annual by submitting your latest work and asking your library to subscribe. Log on to www.ipfw.edu/mstudies or contact mstudies@ipfw.edu for details.

A Message from the Editor

We have a substantial issue for you that includes three book reviews, three performance reviews, a narrative, an interview, the abstracts for the upcoming MSA sessions at MLA in Seattle in January, a presidential message, and the requisite section from the MSA bylaws governing the election process. We have also had a change in personnel. Our new Book Reviews editor is David McInnis of the University of Melbourne. Our new Performances Editor is Ann McCauley Basso of the University of South Florida. Both have done a magnificent job finding good books and theater as well as people to write for us. We welcome and commend them for their efforts. Please help them out by suggesting books and performances related to Marlowe that should be perused as well as colleagues to write reviews.

MARLOWE SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Roslyn Knutson, President; Paul Menzer, 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; 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; 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:
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:

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 Editor:

Ann McCauley Basso email: ann.basso@gmail.com
MSA Performances Editor
New College of Florida
University of South Florida
Tampa, FL 33620-9951
Performances website: marloweinperformance.weebly.com

MSA web site: www.marlowesmightyline.org
© 2011 Marlowe Society of America. All rights reserved.

Interview with Douglas Morse on His Film Production of *The Jew of Malta*

Director Douglas Morse is currently in post-production of his film version of *The Jew of Malta*. I interviewed him on March 25, 2011, and portions of that conversation are available on the Marlowe in Performance [website](#). Here follows some other moments from our discussion.

What made you choose *The Jew of Malta*?

I saw a production of the play (York Shakespeare, 2009), and I thought it was one of the most wonderful plays I'd ever seen. It was funny; it was cynical, and to me, very visceral. The idea that no one had ever made a film adaptation of it was astounding.

How do you think Marlowe compares to Shakespeare for an actor, as far as the difficulty of the language?

I think the language is much less difficult. The plain way to put it is it's extremely accessible; there's not the kind of barrier that there would be for some people with Shakespeare. Marlowe is a brilliant storyteller, and his verse is lovely. Shakespeare's verse is dense and so fraught with imagery. His ability to take one word and have it mean four different things at once, every one a layer deeper, is unparalleled. They're both geniuses.

The lines are perhaps a bit easier to speak and not as dense.

No, they are not as dense, and I'm not as familiar with the Marlowe canon, but in *The Jew of Malta*, most of the characters are not aristocracy. The only one who comes close is Katherine, and she only speaks a couple of lines. Shakespeare deals with the aristocracy, and he elevates the language of social class, the aristocracy in his plays have very sophisticated, very poetic language, while Marlowe isn't dealing with that. I think there's no impetus to work with that level of poetry in *The Jew of Malta*. There's one speech I think is hilarious. Ithamore gives one the most beautiful speeches, one of the most poetic speeches when he talks about his fantasy life with Bellamira. I was very, very moved by that. This base-born slave has a dream, and it's beautiful language. Of course I'm going to undercut that by having her take care of his sexual needs while he's waxing poetic, because that's how they're manipulating him to get the money from Barabas.

Many people, especially non-Marlovians, seem to think that this play is anti-Semitic; what would you say to that opinion?

To label the play as anti-Semitic would not be understanding the play as a whole or Marlowe's point of view as a playwright because there's a different perception of the piece of literature, understanding the characters' points of view and the author's point of view, as you know. You can generally tease out the author's point of view if you look at the piece closely enough, but to imagine Ferneze, the Christian

governor, as somehow the winner over Barabas would not be really looking at what is happening to Ferneze and his island. He doesn't come out as the victor, as having saved the day or his people, nor does he come out as a spiritual leader. This is not a play that's saying any one group is better than the other; it's saying that this is a ridiculous religious or human struggle that only can only end in death and misery, which not so ironically, is kind of the end of Marlowe's life.

How do you see Barabas?

He is very witty. He is extremely funny, and I don't think we laugh at him at any point. I think that all the time the audience is with him on the joke and on the journey, and I think that's the point. Ferneze is smarter than anyone else in the play, but then he makes many mistakes. He doesn't even include Barabas in his calculation about the danger of the Turks. He understands the Turks, but he does not understand Barabas, and that leads to the death of his son. It leads to the destruction of Malta itself. Ferneze is able to sort of wiggle it out with one last play, but I think that's luck more than anything else; there's one last window of opportunity when Barabas makes a miscalculation, and then he dies in his own trap.

In the clip that you have on your website ([jewofmalta.com](#)) and that we've posted on the Marlowe in Performance site, Seth Duerr as Barabas stares directly at the camera as he speaks. The scene is simply done but very engaging.

Yes, it's riveting. If the performance is perfectly done, then the camera will be able stay on him. I saw an actor yesterday to play Bernadine—this was an audition, but he nailed it. I told him that there are two pieces of information to understand Bernadine. First you have to realize Marlowe's view of hypocrisy and sin, the world he has created in *The Jew of Malta*. Then you take one line from Ithamore when he says, "Have not the nuns fine sport with the friars now and then?" and Abigail brushes him off. After Abigail dies, saying, "witness here that I die a Christian," Bernadine says, "and a virgin too, that grieves me most." I was reading an article just fifteen minutes ago about the Jesuits settling a sexual abuse scandal. Marlowe saw similar corruption in the church. Why else would Bernadine say "a virgin too, that's what grieves me most"? He wanted to have sex with Abigail. She's dead, and he didn't get a chance while she was alive. So I told the actor that he is there to hear her confession. He's a man of God, and I don't want to take that away from him. Bernadine really believes, but he also wants to have sex with her. So the actor has to play those two very conflicting problems. You see this going on. You don't know exactly what it is, but you see this pain, torture, and conflict in his face, and if we can capture that on film, that last line will come and—hopefully—everybody will get it, and then they'll laugh. That release of this uncomfortable energy.

Do you plan to make any textual cuts or transpositions?

No, I won't make any cuts for a couple of reasons. One, this is an educational piece designed for people to use in a university environment, and I think you need to present the entire play. The second reason is that people who make cuts don't know what they're missing. In other words, Marlowe may intend something that we can look at on the page and not understand. Then when it is finally filmed and cut and put into the piece, I could think, "How could I have ever thought of cutting this?" With *Everyman*, I got a lot of pressure to cut *Everyman*'s repetitive soliloquies, and I said no, we're not going to cut them for the same two reasons. We needed academic integrity. Also, I couldn't be sure why they were there. I had to see, and what I discovered was that *Everyman*'s repetition was a way for him to come to grips with what he was facing. It's a rhetorical device, like a child saying again and again, "Why not, why not, why not?" It's his process of coming to terms with what he's going through, and if you were to cut them down or cut them out, you would lose that journey and the rhythm of the play. It would take a more linear approach. It's already a linear play, but it would become even more so, and I don't think it would be nearly as effective.

A Refreshingly Marlowe Summer

By the time you are reading this, I hope to be fully recovered from leading a seven-week, summer study-abroad program in England for the college where I teach. I had my first experience on such an excursion as the third "apprentice" faculty member a few years ago, but this was my first time as a co-director, and let me tell you, to have a role of leadership and responsibility for 35 students overseas – involving their educational goals, tourist's contentment, and personal safety – is to occupy a very different travel universe. It has been deeply enjoyable, but also very exhausting, from the student who didn't realize she was supposed to retrieve her suitcase at the Heathrow baggage claim (!) to the bus that never showed up on a (thankfully) sunny Monday morning. An hour in, we took turns getting coffee to lift our spirits, and when our wait topped three hours, the group made the best of it and recited poems together. The coach company cited a motorway accident, a water-main break on Edgware Road, and London traffic generally. Really, who knows? But enough— you likely know at least the rough shape of this particular beast of condensed summer curriculum and experiential learning, and some of you may have had firsthand experience directing or teaching on such a trip. When you are fortunate enough to have the coach arrive as scheduled, it feels a little like being a part of the latest Rolling Stones tour, and after only a couple of visits, the mass affliction of "over-cathedraled" doldrums can hit a group hard. Truly, it's the sort of naïve, disaster-inviting academic enterprise that leaves you wondering why the great satirists of our profession, Kingsley Amis, say, or David Lodge or Jane Smiley, have never bothered to immortalize it, bad meals, sandal blisters and all.

The other day, preparing for our program's visit to Stratford, where we were going to visit some Shakespeare landmarks and see the RSC's *Macbeth* that evening, I mentioned a stop at

You are planning to release the film next year, correct?

I think 2012 is reasonable, although at this point our backstop is educational distribution; that's what we expect, and that's what we know we can get. Is there a demand for *The Jew of Malta* in the art-house circuit? I don't know. Is there a demand for it in the film festival circuit? I don't know. Is there some outlet on cable television? I still don't know. Those things need to be explored, once we have a finished film, what other distribution opportunities might exist. A lot of festivals have a Jewish sidebar or some kind of emphasis on a certain subject. I'm thinking that we might have some success with that. Certainly the film is a great jumping-off point for discussions of race, prejudice, anti-Semitism, even though according to [James] Shapiro, anti-Semitism is different. I think it's better just to say prejudice or hatred towards someone that is a different religion or race.

Ann McCauley Basso
New College of Florida
University of South Florida

Anne Hathaway's Cottage. "Anne Hathaway has a cottage in England?" asked my 12-year-old daughter. I was temporarily stunned into silence, wondering why she would suddenly show so much interest in this particular facet of literary history. And then I realized she was thinking of the young American film actor. "No, honey, not *that* Anne Hathaway," I answered glumly. Despite her tweeny disregard, Shakespeare of course continues to do quite well as touristy England's literary icon. The *Much Ado* performance we attended at The Globe was sold out, and at one point I counted *five* different productions of *As You Like It* onstage throughout the UK. I have seen his mug, courtesy of the ubiquitously reproduced Chandos portrait, faintly smiling from many a DK guide book this summer, and the number of "Shakespeare University" or "Shakespeare College" store-front language-center signs in and around London may lead one to believe that he was England's precursor to John Dewey, rather than its greatest Renaissance playwright— greatest from Stratford, anyway. In Stratford itself, on the other hand, there is a clear push to make the lately unveiled, still debated Cobbe portrait, with its fresh-faced, more gentlemanly sitter, the new iconic image of the Shakespeare industry. It appears on the official Birthplace Trust guidebook, and is featured prominently in the exhibit therein. Only one thing this summer has overshadowed Shakespeare, one book, and no, it's hardly the King James Bible, which is enjoying various 400th-anniversary exhibitions throughout the UK and stateside. It's that other cultural pillar—*Harry Potter*, the final film of which opened here in early July. My daughter has seen it. Twice. She tells me Anne Hathaway does not appear in it. Neither of them. But now to the optimistic point: as an enthusiastic Marlovian, I am pleased to say that amid my classroom scrambles and hapless pathfinding I have been repeatedly pleased to notice various tell-tale signs this summer of Christopher Marlowe

and his works. Most prominently, The Globe Theatre's season featured a new production of *Doctor Faustus* in repertory, directed by Matthew Dunster. I will defer comment on the performance itself to the separate review in this newsletter, but what a pleasure it was to see the visuals everywhere on display—fliers facing front and back, creating little portrait duels between Paul Hilton as Faustus, brooding with hands crossed, and Arthur Darvill as Mephistopheles, starting intently with challenging look, with opened hand revealing a ball of fire. The program features "Some Key Dates in the Life of Christopher Marlowe," as well as short essays by Neil Rhodes, Martin Wiggins, Farah Karim-Cooper, and Kirsten Shepherd-Barr.

If it is unusual enough to see a Marlowe play staged at The Globe, try for a minute to wrap your mind around the fact that there were *two* productions of *Doctor Faustus* occurring on Bankside this summer, something that was not true even in the late 1580s or early '90s. Because of a matinee showing at The Globe on the night our group attended that *Much Ado* performance, we signed up for a tour that focused on the excavations of the Rose, located down Bear Garden and around Maiden Lane. Stepping off the street, we entered the cramped, unfinished box-office area of the current Rose playing space, and were met with various portraits of Marlowe, on the wall, on a guide of the Rose excavations, on fliers for its current *Faustus* production, everywhere. We proceeded to a landing that looked over the darkened excavation space, consisting of a semi-circular trail of red lights, as in an airplane aisle, faintly marking the measurements of the Rose's stage dimensions. As I backed away from the railing, I realized that the current Rose company's stage was right here, however modest, in this wooden space resembling a backyard deck: a desk was at stage right, and an empty bookcase sat to the right, against the railing. We were standing on the stage of the summer's other *Doctor Faustus* in London. A little while later, I caught word of a show called *Dark Angel*, not by Marlowe but about him, staged by the troupe Nobody's Perfect and playing in Lichfield.

Other excursions with our students led to other Marlovian encounters. It was my first time in Westminster Abbey for several years, and so I finally saw in person the controversial window dedicated to Marlowe in Poets' Corner. The pane weighs in on the conspiracy theories surrounding Marlowe's death by inserting a "?" beside his year of death, 1593. My students, who were discovering Marlowe and reading *Faustus* for our Shakespeare course, took delight in this sign of critical

hubbub. In Canterbury, we dedicated most of our time to the cathedral and St Augustine's Abbey nearby, but I could not resist dropping by the King's grammar school and showing our group where the young Marlowe was first learning his Latin and putting to memory many mythological characters and names of exotic locales. Seeing the place, they appreciated better how this Kentish provincial had stormed the London stages with *Tamburlaine*. Marlowe was scarce, of course, in Stratford, unless we count the curiously present "Marlowe's" restaurant on High Street, or the occasional book to be found here or there—*Who Killed Kit Marlowe?* (Sutton) or, even more randomly and minimally, at the RSC bookshop, a black-and-white illustration on the UK edition of James Shapiro's *Contesting Wills*, which features on its cover a gallery of possible candidates for the "real" Shakespeare. Marlowe finds himself among Mary Sidney, Francis Bacon, the Earl of Oxford, and others. We have not visited Cambridge yet, but following our scheduled visits at King's College Chapel and the Trinity's Wren Library, I plan to march my class over to Corpus Christi College, where I hope to point out the memorial to its former student and fiery writer.

Finally, it has been heartening to find so many Marlowe items on display, and overall they remain far more prevalent in UK bookshops compared with American booksellers. Whether at new or used bookstores, in England one regularly encounters copies of Charles Nicholl's *The Reckoning*, and various Marlowe biographies. Even more centrally, the drama sections frequently have multiple copies and editions of *Doctor Faustus* available, reflecting that play's still privileged place as an exam text in the English curriculum. I noted for the first time, at Foyles on Charing Cross Road, the New Longman edition, featuring on its cover Jude Law, and including within photo stills from the same production. At various Waterstones stores around London, the New Mermaids edition was displayed in the "Drama" section to tie in with the current Globe production. Finally, at Blackwell's Books in Oxford, I discovered a *Doctor Faustus* production available in DVD, filmed live at Greenwich Theatre and a part of the Stage to Screen series. It stood next to a copy of Derek Jarman's *Edward II*. I was pleased in each case to see testimony to Marlowe's resilience, but also humbled to be reminded, for example, how less central *Faustus* is in the American curriculum, or to consider fully how fairly marginal the examples are, however much I do appreciate them and, I trust, how much others will as well.

Brett Foster
Wheaton College



FAUSTUS DOWNUNDER (2011)

Would you hazard your soul for twenty-four years of youth—complete with all its egotism and urges—and a devil to attend on you? Faustus (Ben Winspear) does, in the recent co-production of *Faustus* by Bell Shakespeare¹ and Queensland Theatre Company, in which the old—most notably the cynical, lecherous, opportunist, “bent cop” Mephistopheles (John Bell)—repeatedly betray the young. This is a morality play largely scripted by the devils, from the mocking slide-show which accompanies the Prologue to the “ephemeral and crude” illusions of the “shows” to the smug conclusions of the Epilogue.² And yet—there is more.

The 2011 “Downunder” version was more attentive to the Faust legend than psychology.³ The play was adapted and directed by Michael Gow, acclaimed playwright and director, who sought to meld Marlowe and Goethe, incorporating the Gretchen story from Goethe’s *Urfaust* (the earliest version of *Faust, Part One*, written in his mid-20s), which offers Faustus the experience of sincere emotion after his descent into foolery and lechery. The extended episode is located between the first and second warnings of the Old Man (or, here, Faustus’s Mother, presented effectively in a wheelchair and on life support).

The use of Goethe is supplemented by a variety of musical, filmic, and (especially) literary material which responds to the Faust legend or gives emotional resonance to the action, including works by Schubert, Gounod, Berlioz, Liszt, Mahler, and “some death metal for good measure”;⁴ F. W. Murnau’s silent film of 1926 and newsreel footage of war and dictators; Satan’s great speech from Milton’s *Paradise Lost*, Donne’s Holy Sonnet 23 (“Batter my heart”), the King James Bible, Dryden’s translation of Lucretius—and Marlowe’s own “Come live with me” for the wooing of Gretchen (Kathryn Marquet) in a potent demonstration of using rhetoric to deceive a maid.

Yet the production is also insistently theatrical. The richness of the “literary” material is outperformed by the variety of staging techniques, with rapid switching between styles of action: songs, puppetry, microphones, the video projection of action behind the front curtain, lumpy animal-like masks for the devils, and plentiful doses of farce engineered by Mephistopheles and Co. Not all is farce, however. One of the most affecting moments occurs when Vanessa Downing (Hecate and others) stands simply at the front of the stage to sing Schubert’s beautiful song of Gretchen at the spinning wheel (composed when he was 17) while this production’s Gretchen tosses in sexual torment on her virginal bed with its fluffy soft toys.

Staging and action take their cues from the notion that “where we are is hell” to offer a bleak vision of the world as a place of lost ideals, of deception, disguise, and loneliness. The message is reinforced by the extract from Lucretius (via Dryden) which Mephistopheles recites over the body of Faustus: for the guilty there is always “The avenging horror of a Conscious mind [that] makes a Hell on Earth, and Life a death.” It is thus the devil rather than Faustus who gets the last word.

The set reflects this disheartening vision; it is framed by bare scaffolding with a series of curtains, dingy, black, and red, and a projection screen at the rear. Props are minimal and their use consciously artificial, so that the audience are always aware of the devils manipulating their victim. The small cast of six actors—the three “devils,” Lucifer (Jason Klarwein), Hecate, and Beelzebub (Catherine Terracini), each play several roles—move the stage furniture (office chairs, a bed, and a wooden cross and mannequins on wheeled stands).

The production is most indebted to Marlowe at beginning and end, although the Pope, Alexander, Helen, the Emperor, and a bunch of grapes all make their (less-than-glamorous) appearances, the first three as battered mannequins wheeled onto the stage to be violently or sexually assaulted. Much of the “farcical knockabout”⁵ in the Marlowe versions has gone—along with the magicians, servants, clowns, knights, horse-courser, and all but one scholar. Faustus is, in effect, detached from his sixteenth-century social context and its imperfect inhabitants to be delivered into the hands of devils for much of the play. Later, the world of Gretchen, with its German Romanticism, secret liaisons, and small-town bigotry, offers a different kind of action which is emotionally potent but—with its neatly rhyming couplets and hints of comedy of manners—oddly out of tune.

The “mighty line” is spoken well (this is a decidedly professional production) with the final soliloquy particularly compelling, but the eloquence must compete at times with visual distractions: Faustus as ageing scholar (paunch, spectacles, untidy white wig) “settles [his] studies” while pacing around petulantly tossing books on the floor; his apostrophe to Helen is set against a series of attempted consummations with the mannequin, a female devil, and finally the male devil. And—to the disappointment of this reviewer at least—Faustus’s blood did not congeal to be made to stream again by magical fire; indeed, the “blood” (or was it red ink?) streamed profusely until a piece of paper was slapped on the arm to indicate the bond-signing. The actor of Faustus (Winspear) explained the omission in a question-and-

answer session after the performance as a production choice: congealing blood was considered redundant when Faustus could see the warning “*Homo fuge.*” I’m still disappointed.

What, then, of Faustus himself? The almost-caricature of the aging academic is transformed into the possessor of a toned, youthful body in tight black jeans, full of restless energy but naïve and gullible, the dupe of devils. Winspear’s Faustus watches the devils’ shows dutifully, but he is bored with learning. He displays an adolescent glee in his power over Pope and Emperor (he knocks the Pope’s head off) but becomes most animated when tempted by Lechery (Catherine Terracini). It is not until he meets the innocent, gawky schoolgirl, Gretchen, that he appears to feel deeply and honestly, even if his love is blighted by dishonesty and selfishness. That he does develop emotionally if not perhaps in wisdom is seen in his farewell to the doomed Gretchen in prison and in his despair at her loss, cogently expressed through Donne’s sonnet. The possibility of redemption through love (as in Goethe) is glimpsed, only to vanish in the farce of Helen.

This was a production in which the dominant stage presence was the vastly experienced John Bell as Mephistophilis,

watching Faustus with pained forbearance and Gretchen with lecherous anticipation. It was one which valued Marlowe as a poet rather than a dramatist, but which also, ironically, offered its modern audience something of the same mix of morality and entertainment as the early stage versions. In all, it was an absorbing—and at times engaging—theatrical experience.

Ruth Lunney
University of Newcastle, Australia

NOTES

1. Bell Shakespeare is an Australian cultural institution which aims to “make Shakespeare accessible to all Australians.” The company tours productions of Shakespeare and conducts an extensive educational program.
2. “Creating hell,” Program notes, *Faustus*, June-July 2011, p. 18.
3. Compare the several “modernizing” approaches to the “mighty line” discussed in Lois Potter, “What Happened to the Mighty Line?: Recent Marlowe Productions,” *Shakespeare Bulletin* 27.1: 63-68.
4. Gow, quoted in John Kinsella, “The Many Faces of Faust,” *The Australian*, May 27, 2011, p. 17.
5. “Writer’s Note,” Program notes, *Faustus*, p. 8.

FAUSTUS

Bell Shakespeare and Queensland Theatre Company Co-Production
Adapted and directed by Michael Gow

Brisbane Powerhouse, June 2011; Sydney Opera House, June-July 2011;
Illawarra Performing Arts Centre, Wollongong, July 2011

Cast: John Bell (Mephistopheles), Vanessa Downing (Hecate), Jason Klarwein (Lucifer),
Kathryn Marquet (Gretchen), Catherine Terracini (Belzebub), Ben Winspear (Faustus)

Doctor Faustus at The Globe Theatre, London

Avid Marlovians may have been especially excited to see the Globe Theatre’s recent *Doctor Faustus*, and understandably so. It marks the first time a Globe season has included Marlowe’s most famous play, and the venue hearkens back to earliest performances, associated with the Belsavage, The Theatre, The Rose, and the Fortune. Moreover, London itself has long been a supernatural city— associated with John Dee and Thomas Harriot, and where some early anecdotes about *Faustus* in performance mentioned Lucifer’s terrifying thunder or additional devils turning up. Just as relevantly, if figuratively, Thomas Thorpe tells Edward Blount, in the preface to Marlowe’s Lucan translation, how the author’s textual ghost walks the churchyard around St Paul’s, amid the printers’ stalls. Even today, East London writer Ian Sinclair seems convinced in *London Orbital* that the city’s great ring road emits a sinister energy; his latest book, *Ghost Milk*, applies its title to sites being built for London’s 2012 Olympics. I saw this *Faustus* show on a Friday evening in late

June, and the breeze blowing in could have been mistaken for a gentle first wave of a conjuration.

This production was highly watchable, mainly enjoyable, but not in any way frightening or distressing in the way great tragedy can be. It was a loud, colorful, often quite funny and visually striking performance, but ultimately it had one broad level of operation and did not achieve the play’s potential for poetic and dramatic heights. Personally, I was intrigued throughout, curious but never once ravished. Early audiences experienced something more intense, those old anecdotes suggest. They speak of a “fearful sight” or describe how this or that event “frighted the audience.” At least two or three early reviews of this production gave an easy answer for this difference; modern audiences do not believe the play’s basic premises, as Elizabethans did, and so *Faustus* cannot have the same effects. I always want at some level to resist this easy resignation in the face of an ok-but-not-great staging of Marlowe’s play. Although I hate to be a cultured despiser or

under-appreciator of anyone devoted to theater, in this case the main reason for this production's failure to produce greater terror or higher poetry resides in the two main actors, Paul Hilton as John Faustus and Arthur Darvill as Mephistopheles.

Both figures were pale and thin, one with a slight beard, the other with a cropped haircut. Hilton looked more like a Jedi Knight than the intellectually puffed up figure in the famous 1616 woodcut, with prideful smirk, ruffs, and a bellowing, fur-lined gown. Darvill appeared more the part in his almost daintily assembled dark outfit, complete with pointed collar and maroon fabric here and there. Both begged for a pair of skinny jeans, and would have fit right into a folk-rock or alt-country concert. This may be a bit fey of me, but I must render the assessment that both actors were merely competent and not excellent. Most noticeably, Marlowe's great lines and speeches were heard and appreciated but could not be savored. When Mephistopheles tells Faustus, "Why, this is hell, nor am I out of it," I found it and the powerful following lines as easy to disregard as Faustus does. Now, it's in the script that Faustus finds this all underwhelming, but the audience is prone to respond differently. We've all seen and heard actors who provide an electrifying presence to this diabolical character and his ominous lessons.

That said, there is much to praise in director Matthew Dunster's vision, and much was entertaining in the nearly three-hour performance. Spectacle and farce were brought to the foreground. In this way the production, which shows allegiance to the B-Text, resembles another recent B-Text staging of *Faustus* in Manchester, which Tom Rutter reviewed in a past *MSA Newsletter*. If the main storyline left something to be desired, dramatically, the secondary plot was unexpectedly engaging, thanks to strong performances by Felix Scott as Wagner, Pearce Quigley as Robin, and especially Richard Clews as a dim-witted, good-humored, at-times scene-stealing Dick. (His enormous male organ, seen through his breeches, certainly helped, and often had the audience nervously laughing.) At one point a whole village of rustics appeared onstage, and became involved in Faustus' tricking of the Horse-Courser. Even Hilton as Faustus signaled this overall lighter tone early: he reacted to the first half of the Romans 6 verse ("The reward of sin is death") with pronounced exasperation—"That's *hard*"—drawing many laughs.

Paul Wills' designs made possible surprises of staging and, at climatic moments, a rewarding visual anarchy. For example, early in the play, as Faustus contemplated his career choices, his focus upon single books gave way to a stage full of black-clad figures, in ornate velvet hats and dark glasses, holding oversized folios and moving in unison. They were something between a chorus and a collective allegory for Faustus' restless, not entirely trustworthy, learning. They also had something of the solemnity of the Oompa-Loompas in *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory*, and the mischief of the figures in the *Spy vs. Spy* comic strip. Books as stage objects were prominent throughout: they were stacked high on Faustus' desk, and repeatedly Mephistopheles and Faustus drew forth a ball of flame from a book opening. The particular visual felt

just right: ostentatious, impressive at first, but also including within it the seed of its being a disappointment—there's something uninspired and desperate in the act. It may be that Dunster chose to emphasize books because of the Globe season's theme—"The Word is God"—a nod to the 400th anniversary of the King James Bible. In a metatheatrical irony, Faustus cannot complete the couple of biblical verses he quotes, while this season the King James Version (*all of it!*) has been recited from The Globe's stage in a series of reading events.

Several other visual choices are worth recording. The Good and Bad Angels were neither typically handled nor easily forgotten. Instead, they enacted very physical, involved sword fights over Faustus. Armed, wearing armor, they resembled giant manga warriors or samurai characters out of Quentin Tarantino's *Kill Bill*. The Good Angel, for instance, wore tall, highly stylized wings, overarching and right-angled. Elsewhere, Helen first entered as a piecemeal puppet statue, and one alluring temptation of Faustus was staged as something out of *Les Liaisons Dangereuses*—aristocratic men and women paired up, sultry, wearing, white wigs and masks, and cream-colored gowns and trousers. Before intermission, the procession of the Seven Deadly Sins represented the high point of spectacle. One by one the sins emerged from the trap door, and were opposite in appearance from those skeletal figures familiar from photos of Clifford Williams' RSC production in 1968. Here, the Sins were extravagant in their excesses. Covetousness was bejeweled, Lust appeared in leather lingerie, and Gluttony in his fat suit belched and farted, even as he wallowed among other sins in a stage-floor orgy. One student of mine nicely described this pile up as the "combined hydraulic effect of sin."

One of the more subtle visual effects involved Faustus' increasing resemblance to his companion Mephistopheles, and eventually both wore skullcaps and capes. They exited the stage hand in hand as the first half ended, and the next act began with them side by side, as if mountain biking together, traveling from Wittenberg to Rome on giant dragons, slowly rolling downstage. Dunster maintained the intensity, at least early in the second half, by staging an extremely violent version of the B-Text's papal-palace scene. Papal guards conveyed Bruno, the rival pope, through the groundlings. He appeared chained, nearly naked, and heavily beaten. The guards tortured him further on the thrust stage: they gouged an eye, and extracted teeth with pliers; one tormentor threw a bloody mass inches from the faces of some groundlings. All of this took place before the imperious yet too-refined pope, and led the audience to cheer for Faustus and Mephistopheles when they dressed as cardinals and the slapstick with the feast commenced.

There was a lot more: transformations into stags, apes, and dogs; a slick decapitation of Faustus; diabolical puppets; a funnily bearded Lucifer; and creepy, goat-horned, fur-robbed, stilt-walkers that passed through the audience. These last figures were the closest things to give an impression that not just the stage, but the entire theater had been taken over by something dreadful. On the other hand, all of this visual

business eventually wears one down: by the time demons seized Faustus and carried him through the Hell Mouth upstage, I was indeed ready for the show to end. (Incidentally, this summer's RSC production of *Macbeth* in Stratford found more varied, interesting uses for a hell mouth, involving Macbeth and Seyton, but also Banquo and Macduff and his dead family.) Perhaps the reminder I most took away from this *Faustus* production was how incredibly mixed in genre and

scene Marlowe's *Faustus* is, and how medieval it can still feel, this play likely first staged in the late 1580s. This medieval emphasis makes the production a fitting pairing with another of this season's plays, the poet Tony Harrison's *The Globe Mysteries*.

Brett Foster
Wheaton College

***Faust/us* at the Edinburgh Fringe Festival, August 2011**

Amidst the hustle, bustle, and gloriously massive overcrowding of Fringe-frenzied central Edinburgh, along the Royal Mile, Cowgate, and Grassmarket, one can still find a moment in which to reflect on the eternal verities (or non-verities) of Marlowe's remarkable drama. Curiously, Marlowe's name appeared nowhere in the advertising or promotional material related to the performance billed as "The world premiere of an innovative new solo version of the classic tale of a man who sold his soul." And yet, fusing animation, mixed media, stripped-down script, and viscerally physical theatre, Marlowe lurked within the technological matrix of this very interesting, fast-paced, one-hour production titled *Faust/us* from DBS Productions in the UK.

The slash mark within that title—call it *virgule* and you are already damned—might suggest interchangeable alternatives, or it might indicate other fractional possibilities within this wide-reaching play. That there exists a bit of Faustus in all of *us* comes as no surprise but this production at the Sweet Grassmarket venue in the Apex City Hotel, forced consideration of other possibilities as well: a classic either / or suggesting Faustus or *us*—choose one. Or, more generally, the slash might have suggested other take-it-or-leave-it dichotomies: yes / no, right / wrong, tragedy / comedy, heaven / hell. Caught between all these possibilities (and more), actor Calum McAskill, in white lab coat, with all the credibility of a TV doctor, beamed pleasure at the voice of the bad angel and loathing at the voice of the good angel. There seemed to be little back story. He really, really liked evil; he really, really disliked good. But fragmentary assertions and knee jerk responses seemed most appropriate within this purposefully jagged multimedia presentation

That white lab coat made itself the perfect screen on which to project images of terror—some well known, others less so—but also turned itself into an apron for the appearance of "Gretchen" who seemed at once to be the embodiment of Faustus's wife as promised by Mephistopheles but also an aspect of Faustus's own being who also gives birth to something at once beautiful and terrible within that lab coat-bed sheet. Throughout the performance, one felt many cuts and slashes to the script but the production itself gave back

plenty of graphic meaning in terms of theatre actor and screen projector, interactive physical and visual technology. At times, McAskill's lip-synching to sound recordings and gesture-synching to projected images seemed to indicate a deeper, terrible, hard-wired discipline. The experience felt like a horrible dance—or a life lived—perhaps nowhere as much as within McAskill's writing bodysuit entanglement through which he grotesquely danced all the Seven Deadly Sins. You had to see it to believe it.

You also had to hear it to believe it, especially Hell as an incoming phone call. McAskill picked up the ringing phone with all the lugubrious regret of a professor on too many committees. Somewhat fatalistic but also honestly curious, he spoke the lines of interrogation-conversation with which Faustus attempts to hold Mephistopheles' attention and perhaps even learn something. The devil's responses, however, came through as loud, crackling, indecipherable static. If you know the words of the lines themselves—and the static played out their duration perfectly—the conversation got more and more disturbing. Finally, in response to Faustus's "Now tell me, who made the world?" the line went dead.

Something died in Faustus too at that moment. But the production remained lively and suggestive throughout, projecting words, lines, circles, images, faces, shadows, and much more including visuals from silent cinema, newsreels, offbeat animation, even Japanese science fiction—not to mention pop music, medieval sacred music, and some effective white noise—all mixed in by technical collaborator J. D. Henshaw in a *mélange* of visual and verbal data that kept pace with the words and informed the actions of the play. At the end, that white lab coat got ripped up the middle of the back slowly and suggestively to form good-bad angel wings. And yet there was no place to which to fly. This production was artful, intelligent, stimulating, and just a wee bit gleefully over the top—as *Doctor Faustus* will always be when played within a register of sincere, exploratory self-conscious inquiry.

Rick Bowers
University of Alberta



MSA Book Reviews • David McInnis, University of Melbourne •

Book Reviews Editor

Adrian Streete, *Protestantism and Drama in Early Modern England*. Cambridge University Press, 2009. 310pp. Hardback (ISBN-13: 9780521760171), Paperback (ISBN-13: 9781107402775) (released 2011), Adobe eBook Reader (ISBN-13: 9780511636875) (released 2011).

We are now almost a decade on from Ken Jackson and Arthur Marotti's 2004 diagnosis of the "turn" to religion in early modern studies. The work published since then has made it clear that the "turn" is not the brief interlude that some may have hoped for but has instead become a much-travelled highway within historicist criticism. The scholarship of those years has confirmed how necessary understanding religion is to comprehending Tudor-Stuart England, and how far into the culture scripture and theology permeated. But we have also learned how difficult a properly nuanced understanding of the relationship between religion and literature really is. It goes far beyond one-to-one connections, straightforward avowals of dogma or the straightforward appropriation by authors of specific ideas or terminology. In light of this, Adrian Streete's formidable *Protestantism and Drama* is a necessarily difficult book, whose greatest strength is that it pushes towards that complexity, understanding that the doctrinal conflicts that defined the era were important not only in themselves, but actually changed the conceptual categories within which people thought and lived.

If the premise that one is saved *sola gratia* was the first principle of the Reformation it was not, Streete argues, the most important concern of English Protestantism at the turn of the seventeenth century. As Streete has it, the crucial matter was Christology: the correct ontological understanding of the person of Christ, of the relationship between his human and divine natures and, by extension, of the gulf between him and sinful humanity. It is not that other theological questions are swept aside but rather that Christology is, to use Streete's own language, the most appropriate "lens" (82) through which to view the more familiar matters of soteriology, iconoclasm and political theology. In particular, the Christological shifts engendered by a century of Protestant thought had an enormous bearing on subjectivity and representation. Protestantism's emphasis on interiority and its radical view of sin and the inability of any person to truly imitate Christ or to mediate between him and another meant that the role of Christ himself in the conceptual universe became a troubling paradox. Christ is the only true mediator, but he is also wholly other. Where does that leave Christians who are supposed to be changed into his likeness or dramatic artists who are to fashion other likenesses themselves?

Part One of Streete's book focuses on the theological pressures that altered early modern understandings of subjectivity and representation. Streete is deft in shuttling between the epochal figures of the continental Reformation and those writers in England who domesticated and extended their ideas (I particularly admire his recurrent use of Fulke Greville's poetry as a kind of Reformed touchstone). He begins with Erasmus and Luther. The former stressed that the late medieval imperative to imitate Christ must be an internal phenomenon while the latter went much further, eschewing the very possibility of imitation. For Luther the Christian is only made righteous through the transmission of the "alien righteousness" of an utterly alien Christ (73). When a man contemplates the crucified Christ, he sees not the loving savior of mankind, but a reflection his own wickedness.

Calvin and his followers are more important for the England of Marlowe and Shakespeare, and so Streete discusses Calvinist subjectivity at length. The focus here is on what came to be called the doctrine of limited atonement, which asserts that Christ died not for all humankind (whether or not they seek forgiveness) but only for the elect. Streete describes Calvin's hesitancy in affirming this conclusion, and the enthusiasm of successors like Beza and Perkins, rushing in where their master had feared to tread. The consequences were sobering: the question for the Calvinist, or would-be Calvinist, was not simply the abstract, "Am I elect?" It was rather the more personal, "Did Christ die for me?" (99). The result, Streete claims, was a Reformed culture wherein grace was de-emphasized (it was, after all, no longer available to all) and where "the relationship between Christ and his subject was being stretched almost to the breaking point" (103). This meant that Calvinism implies "a fundamental shift in Western metaphysics," an "ontological uncoupling of divine subject from human object" (107, 109).

The chapters on theology make a convincing case for the crisis in subjectivity for which Streete argues, demonstrating historical acuity and a sustained depth of analysis. Streete follows his theological table-setting with two short chapters that explain the changes that the crisis in subjectivity made on matters of representation, perception and, ultimately, drama. He then turns to the tragic stage in three chapters on *Doctor Faustus*, *Richard II* and *The Revenger's Tragedy*, claiming that "this theologically derived anti-theological subjectivity was to provide the very stuff of dramatic representation itself" (139). The Marlowe chapter makes the most straightforward application of the theological framework, which is natural enough given that *Faustus* is the only play in the period that can be said to be more or less directly "about" theology.

Streete goes to the root of the problem: under what doctrinal system is Faustus damned? As someone who has himself grasped the nettle of soteriology in that play, I appreciate Streete's desire to treat the familiar subject from a fresh angle. He asserts that the doctrine of double predestination was a "deeply Christological" one in the period (146). Faustus' crisis reflects the fact that "the increasingly absent Christ" (141) now seemed at an infinite distance while the doctor himself could only play the role of parodic anti-Christ. The question of Faustus' motivation is not as clear as it could be here: does he recognize the Christological dilemma and act accordingly, or are his motives shaped by cultural shifts of which he is not fully conscious?

The chapters on the two remaining tragedies undertake a fascinating exploration of the political dimension of the upheaval in Protestant subjectivity. *Richard II* in these terms is "a deeply ambivalent confirmation of monarchical absolutism" (165). The monarch's traditional role is to be God's representative, but now God has been ontologically divorced from his creation while the act of representation has become fraught. There may be some slippage in categories here, or simply terminology: the doctrine of the divine right of kings was folded into the rhetoric of monarchical absolutism, but the two are not co-extensive. But this is a rather fine-

Lisa Hopkins. *Drama and the Succession to the Crown, 1561-1633*. Farnham and Burlington: Ashgate Publishing, 2011. 178pp. [Hardback ISBN 978-1-4094-0647-1](#), [ebook](#)

In February of 1593, the incorrigibly outspoken MP Peter Wentworth was confined to the Tower where he would remain until his death in 1597. The reasons for his imprisonment were a series of dogged attempts to present to Elizabeth I a "pithie exhortation" to name her successor. Towards the end of Elizabeth's reign, public discussions over who would succeed the ageing queen were prohibited, having been declared an act of treason by Parliament. As Lisa Hopkins argues in *Drama and the Succession to the Crown, 1561-1633*, however, there were ways around this prohibition. The fate of Peter Wentworth and the criminalization of discussing the succession might have modified these discourses, but they certainly could not prevent the public airing of this most sensitive of political issues.

The English renaissance stage, with its repertoire of dramatic scenes featuring native and foreign rulers, proved to be the most congenial of discursive mediums for the discussion of this pressing political issue. In this relatively short study, Hopkins surveys a large number of dramatic texts (canonical and non-canonical) in a variety of genres, scanning them for their contribution to the necessarily covert discussions on succession.

The strength of Hopkins's thesis lies in her recognition that the "succession issue" was not limited to debating the identity of the heir-in-waiting, but often provoked a range of questions about forms of government, national and religious identities, and notions of political obligation. For Hopkins, because of the strong cultural prohibitions against both revolution and

grained distinction. If I have a deeper objection about the book it is a familiar one: in these last two chapters in particular, too little room is given to the plays themselves. It is not that Streete should have pared down the discussion of his historical claims but that further application of those claims could only be welcome. The discussion of *The Revenger's Tragedy* is especially brief, which is unfortunate given what we know of Middleton's Calvinism (though in fairness, Streete acknowledges Middleton's growing interest in religious subject-matter as his career progressed [219]). This complaint, though, is itself a testament to the value of Streete's project which is ultimately about giving us a cultural framework through which we can better perceive the subtleties of early modern drama: about how characters regard themselves, their identities, their obligations, and how they were in turn regarded by the spectators. *Protestantism and Drama in Early Modern England* is a learned and closely argued book with the potential to open up other arguments and lines of inquiry. It should be useful not only to students of Renaissance theatre, but to anyone interested in the extraordinarily permeable border between theology and literature in the period.

David K. Anderson
University of Oklahoma

ISBN 978-1-4094-0648-8. Studies in Performance and Early Modern Drama series.

regicide, "the only possible moment for change of any sort would be that when one ruler died and another succeeded" (10). Hopkins extends this expansive concept of succession to the chronology of her study. Beginning with the plays of Marlowe, who died ten years earlier than Elizabeth, Hopkins suggests that widespread anxieties over the end of the Tudor dynasty were mounting after the execution of Mary, Queen of Scots. The succession of James I, instead of settling burning questions on the transmission of political authority, generated several more. His Scottish birth, while rendering him unfit to succeed under the terms of Henry VIII's will, simultaneously raised concerns over the union of his kingdoms. While James's fruitful marriage might have allayed anxieties surrounding the provision of heirs plaguing the Tudor dynasty, Hopkins argues instead that his having more than one son generated debate over the division of his kingdoms, fuelling resistance to James's politics of union—a resistance that persisted towards the end of Charles I's reign. The study that begins with Marlowe thus ends with the often neglected history plays of John Ford in the 1630s.

Hopkins moves adeptly through an array of questions devoted to political succession, ranging from broad concerns over dynastic decline to the minutely specific parsing of the merits of one claim for succession over another. Opening her study with the drama of Marlowe, Hopkins tantalizingly speculates on his acquaintances with two contenders for Elizabeth's throne: Ferdinando Stanley, Lord Strange and Arbella Stuart. The problematic transfer of power from one political body to another often takes center stage in the *Tamburlane* plays, *The Jew of Malta*, *The Massacre at Paris*, and *Dido*. Hopkins

notes the broad concerns the plays display about questions of political succession, while pointing to specific allusions that place discussions of succession in a narrowly English context. For instance, she suggests that lines in *The Jew Of Malta* make a direct allusion to Lucas de Heere's painting, *The Allegory of the Tudor Succession* (1572), a gift made by the queen to Sir Francis Walsingham. Readers expecting closer readings of Marlowe's texts will be disappointed, since Hopkins appears less interested in a detailed articulation of the intricate ways that Marlowe enacts questions of succession than in establishing that the drama actually participated in such a conversation. The Marlowe chapter thus comprises a broad survey of succession allusions in his corpus, followed by comparisons with similar expressions in *Gorboduc*, *Lochrine*, and *Hamlet*. Scholars looking for sustained and in-depth readings on the politics of Marlowe's drama might nevertheless find Hopkins's approach useful for furthering more specific inquiries, less author-centered and more engaged with the question of political and cultural anxieties.

Hopkins's non-canonical approach leads to an interesting arrangement of her argument, by theme rather than chronology. After establishing the dramatic stage as a prominent medium for discussions on the succession in her opening Marlowe chapter, Hopkins proceeds by revealing how recurring plots and character types used across the dramatic repertory function as dramatic set-pieces for the exploration of succession anxieties. In an intriguing chapter entitled "Romans and Fairies," for instance, Hopkins traces the ancestry of the fairy king Oberon to tease out the complex relationship between Britain's native "faery" lineage and its Roman descent. Plays of the period often exploited such connections to enact discussions on political legitimacy, national identity, and dynastic change. *A Midsummer Night's*

Robert Logan, ed. *The University Wits: Christopher Marlowe*. Farnham, Sussex: Ashgate, 2011. 554pp. ISBN: 978-0-7546-2857-6.

Among the six volumes of republished essays, articles, and book chapters in Ashgate's newly released series on the university wits, *Christopher Marlowe*, prepared by the series editor Robert Logan, will be of most immediate interest to members of the Marlowe Society of America. Logan's lengthy introduction opens by discussing Marlowe's life and works in relation to the oeuvre of other university-educated playwrights, especially Nashe, Greene, and Peele. Admitting that the term "university wit" is a critical invention, Logan sensitively considers the extent to which Marlowe might be considered the most innovative author among a group of his contemporaries recognized for their contributions to the development of English commercial theatre. The brief overview of scholarly arguments about Marlowe's biography, plays, and poems that appear in this introduction, accompanied by detailed bibliographical notes and a lengthy list of works cited and recommended for further reading, constitutes a lucid, compact précis of major critical developments over the past century.

Dream is thus placed alongside Greene's *James the Fourth* and Davenant's *The Tragedy of Albovine*. Later chapters continue the thematic study, devoting attention to the Robin Hood character, concerns over female succession, the recurrence of the names Antonio and Sebastian, and the concept of twin kingdoms.

Hopkins's broad survey of a large number of plays using the structuring device of thematic categories does not offer a sustained reading of any one text or how it asked and answered questions about political succession. This is largely the point of her thesis, that early modern drama only managed to allude delicately to succession debates, with the task of overt discussion being too perilous for playwrights to undertake. The book will be a useful resource for scholars looking for a concise summary of the varied dimensions to the problem. Hopkins's innovative and sometimes idiosyncratic thematic categories might also lead to the discovery of unexpected connections between familiar and unfamiliar plays that could be extended beyond the parameters of her given chronology. For example, her chapter on the recurring appearance of a pair of characters named Antonio and Sebastian might productively be deployed for a reading of John Dryden's 1690 tragicomedy written in the aftermath of the succession of William and Mary to the throne. Antonio was the disputed heir of the famous Don Sebastian of Portugal, whose death at the battle of Alcazar gave rise to a succession crisis ending in Portugal's conquest by the Spain of Phillip II. Hopkins has helpfully drawn attention to a large range of suggestive political allusions in early modern drama that can be investigated further by those so inclined.

Brandon Chua
University of Melbourne

The second half of the introduction justifies the volume's organization of five hundred pages of reprinted materials into five parts. The opening section on biography, which includes a chronology from Constance Kuriyama's *Marlowe: A Renaissance Life* (2002) and a chapter from Matthew Proser's *The Gift of Fire* (1995), could be assigned to a class in need of an introduction to established facts and ongoing debates. The fourth part, "Essays on Individual Works" presents one or two pieces on each of Marlowe's plays and major poems. Among these selections, Sara Munson Deats's chapter on *Dido Queen of Carthage* (1997), Judith Weil's on *The Massacre at Paris* (1977), and Georgia Brown's on shorter poems and translations (2004) stand out both for presenting strong arguments and for offering insights about less frequently discussed texts.

The remaining (and arguably less clearly focused) sections include "Initiating Controversy: Challenges to Familiar Assumptions about Marlowe" (part two), "Essays on More than a Single Work" (part three), and "Essays on Particularized Interests" (part five). It is not immediately apparent why Richard Wilson's essay from *Constructing Christopher Marlowe* (2000) that investigates new historical readings of Marlowe's plays is a better example of "Initiating

Controversy” than “Essays on More than a Single Work.” Nevertheless, welcome inclusions across these sections include both Lukas Erne’s 2005 *Modern Philology* article “Biography, Mythography, and Criticism: The Life and Works of Christopher Marlowe,” which thoughtfully challenges longstanding critical assumptions, and Stephen Greenblatt’s now classic chapter from *Renaissance Self-Fashioning* (1980) entitled “Marlowe and the Will to Absolute Play,” with which so many subsequent arguments engage. The final section is remarkable for its emphasis on theatre history. Evelyn Tribble’s article on “Marlowe’s Boy Actors” (2009) and Roslyn Knutson’s essay on “Marlowe’s Reruns: Repertorial Commerce and Marlowe’s Plays in Revival” (2002) will give those more accustomed to thinking about other aspects of Marlowe’s work much food for thought.

It seems churlish to comment that a volume of such length and scope might benefit from additional material. That being said, anyone who wishes to have students consult this text will want to note that since all pieces are reprinted in facsimile from the book or journal in which they first appeared, no corrections have been made and no contextual explanations have been added. The few typographical and formatting errors replicated are minor distractions, but editorial notes would be desirable in places, if only to caution less expert readers from relying on certain elements of older scholarship. For example, while I was pleased to encounter T.S. Eliot’s 1932 essay on Marlowe, I would assign it to a class only after pointing out that Eliot’s attribution of *Arden of Feversham* to Kyd—and thus his use of it as evidence of how Kyd’s blank verse differs from Marlowe’s—is not now widely accepted. Had Logan presented such commentary in notes, this would be an even more useful resource for those attempting to familiarize themselves with Marlowe’s works as well as Marlowe studies.

The decision not to reset the selections before republishing them was surely that of the press. It is unfortunate that this production choice precluded Logan from offering detailed

discussions of each essay, particularly since, as is made clear in his introduction, he deliberately sought out pieces not readily available in other collections. Such republication is still necessary even in an age of electronic scholarly resources. Online databases like JSTOR make recent journal articles available electronically to almost anyone who uses a university library, and the Internet Archive and Google Books offer access to many out-of-copyright books and to excerpts from more recent texts. However, it has become increasingly difficult to get libraries to obtain more recent but out-of-print books, so the inclusion of fourteen book chapters and essays from edited collections among the twenty-two selections found here is cause for celebration.

Simply on the basis of its contents, I would say that this volume should be welcome on the shelf of every Marlowe scholar. It is a handy reference for research purposes and would be of use in graduate and advanced undergraduate classes. However, the \$275 (U.S.) price for this book will put it out of the reach of most individual scholars. It seems more realistic, therefore, to suggest that libraries’ acquisitions departments be approached with requests to purchase this volume as part of the University Wits series. The 10% discount offered to those who order all six books encourages librarians to make this set part of their reference or circulating collections. The volumes on Greene (edited by Kirk Melnikoff), Lodge (by Charles C. Whitney), Lyly (by Ruth Lunney), Nashe (by Georgia Brown), and Peele (by David Bevington) make significant contributions to the study of early modern English drama by reprinting a range of scholarly work on authors not previously the focus of such lengthy collections of original or republished essays. In sum, *Christopher Marlowe* is an admirable volume, but Robert Logan might be commended even more for his work as general editor of the University Wits series.

Erin E. Kelly
University of Victoria (BC)

MSA at MLA, 2012, Seattle: Abstracts

310. Booking Marlowe

Friday, 6 January 2012, 3.30-4.45 p.m., Washington State Convention Center, Room 307
Program arranged by the Marlowe Society of America
Presiding: Roslyn L. Knutson, University of Arkansas, Little Rock

1. “Anonymous Marlowe,” Adam G. Hooks, University of Iowa

Authorship is usually an act of naming: an authorial reputation is built through the act of attribution. This paper, however, seeks to subtract Marlowe’s name by taking seriously the initial—and anonymous—publication and circulation of his poetry. His translation of Ovid’s *Amores* was published surreptitiously, and the critical concern with the work has

focused primarily on its censorship by the Bishops’ Ban in 1599. Reading the *Amores* without, or at least beyond, Marlowe allows for a more comprehensive account of the work’s place in the Ovidian milieu of the 1590s. Likewise, “The Passionate Shepherd to his Love” was attributed to Marlowe in a single printed miscellany, and this attribution has obscured the multitude of ways the popular poem circulated. The poem did not require an author, and was familiar enough that reading the poem as Marlowe’s alone severely limits our understanding of its place in other economies. This paper argues for the crucial importance of looking at these poems as they first appeared—without Marlowe’s name attached to them—in order to recover their multiple material forms and meanings, and to change the way we conceive of and construct Marlowe’s authorial reputation.

2. “Leander’s Index: Marlowe, Books, and Passion,” Sarah Wall-Randell, Wellesley College

In *Hero and Leander*, Marlowe describes Leander after his first night with his beloved, his passion as it were written on his face: “Therefore even as an index to a book / So to his mind was young Leander’s look” (2.129-30). Marlowe’s bookish simile reflects the sixteenth-century rise of the alphabetical index as an innovative print-culture technology, a way of organizing and managing information. This paper will place Leander’s look in the context of similar metaphors of the index in the work of sixteenth-century poets including Ariosto and Shakespeare. Like other figures of the index, Leander’s look stages a kind of comic deflation, undercutting heightened affect with quotidian rationality and supplanting sovereign agency with the inert anonymity of an object. At the same time, the idea of the index offers these poets a rich medium for representing interiority and the self, playing with ideas of knowability and readability. Ultimately the poetics of the index lead to a way of modeling interiority and the mysteries of affect in the print age.

3. “Nicholas Ling, Elizabethan Republicanism, and *The Famous Tragedie of the Riche Jewe of Malta* (1594),” Kirk Melnikoff, University of North Carolina at Charlotte

This essay will consider the potential terms of *The Jew of Malta*’s earliest reception as a book, four decades before the first extant print edition was published by Nicholas Vavasour in 1633. Though Ling and Millington may never have brought Marlowe’s tragic farce to press, they did register their intention to do so on May 17th, 1594 when they entered the play in the Stationers Register as “the famous tragedie of the Riche Jewe of Malta.” Ling was likely the prime mover of the project, publishing a large variety of material until his death in 1607, including numerous works by Michael Drayton and close to a dozen collections of sententiae. Starting in 1594, Ling also appears to have begun specializing in texts having pervasive Republican themes, works by the likes of Kyd, Lodge, Henry Middleton, Drayton, Shakespeare, and Goslicius. This essay, of course, will not be the first to associate Marlowe with Republican thought in the later years of Elizabeth’s reign. It will, however, be the first to suggest that *The Jew of Malta*-as-book may have initially been read according to the varying terms of this discourse.

102. Medievalism and Marlowe

Thursday, 5 January 2012, 3.30-4.45 p.m., Washington State Convention Center, Room 316

Program sponsored jointly by the Marlowe Society of America and Medieval and Renaissance Drama Society
Presiding: Robert A. Logan, University of Hartford

1. “Marlowe’s *Ars Moriendi*,” Andrew McCarthy, University of Tennessee–Chattanooga

In the later Middle Ages, concern over the moment of death was repeatedly articulated in the *ars moriendi* tracts, texts that

emphasized the dying Christian’s preparation for judgment in the afterlife. This paper will detail Marlowe’s conversance with this tradition, revealing a playfully subversive understanding of the artful death. Questioning the supposed comfort provided by these “how-to” manuals, Marlowe repeatedly depicts characters in situations where they are forced to contemplate their impending deaths. Tellingly, neither Edward nor Faustus finds any comfort, physical or spiritual, in their final moments. In *The Jew of Malta*, however, we see the complexity of Marlowe’s thought on the subject as Barabas, a character who is virtually obsessed with the artful death, orchestrates and executes a number of intricately plotted murders until he falls victim to his own machinations. In this way, Marlowe’s plays provide us access to his relationship with the later Middle Ages, specifically his suggestion that old comforts must give way to new understandings of one’s place—albeit a lonely and often tragic one—at the end of our lives.

2. “A Medieval *Tamburlaine*: Marlowe and the Legacy of the Crusades,” Lee Manion, Yeshiva University

Marlowe’s *Tamburlaine* is a key transitional text in early modern drama; little attention has been paid, however, to how both parts of the play bridge the medieval and early modern periods via their reconfiguration of crusading history and rhetoric. *Tamburlaine*’s historical subject was intensely scrutinized by fifteenth-century authors who drew upon crusading’s flexible vocabulary for negotiating relations among Christian rulers and who subsequently extended that vocabulary to include other Eastern forces as allies against the Turks. By reexamining the play’s representations of Christianity in comparison with medieval and early modern crusading texts, this paper stresses how Marlowe’s drama remains largely continuous with late medieval notions of crusading. Altogether *Tamburlaine* can be viewed as similar to other early modern works, such as James I’s *Lepanto* and Peele’s *Battle of Alcazar*, that valorized Catholic and pagan heroes through allegory in order to imagine, however unfeasibly, an allied Christendom.

3. “Marlowe and Medieval Albania,” David McInnis, University of Melbourne

Lost plays are rarely considered in discussions of the spate of conqueror plays unfairly known as the “weak sons of Tamburlaine” (*Alphonsus, King of Arragon*; *Selimus*; *Wounds of the Civil War*) which mimicked Marlowe’s language, sense of spectacle, or new hero (Tamburlaine). The lost *True History of George Scanderbeg*, entered in the Stationers’ Register in 1601 (but probably composed in the late 1580s) occupies a unique position in this series of conqueror plays, in that it has sometimes been attributed to Marlowe himself, and its medieval Albanian protagonist has strong affinities with the historical Tamburlaine. This paper assesses the evidence for Marlowe’s authorship, recuperates the historical narratives about Scanderbeg (as known to Marlowe’s contemporaries), and considers the repertorial implications of a dramatization of this medieval figure.

Marlowe Studies: An Annual

We've had quite a response for our 2011 submissions, and we're working now on 2012 and 2013, 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*. 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. 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. *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.

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.

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

website: <http://new.ipfw.edu/marlowe> or
<http://www.marlowestudies.org>

Excerpt from the MSA By-laws Governing Elections

ARTICLE VI. Nominations to Elective Office. Section 1. The Nominating Committee

Nominations for elective offices shall be made by the Executive Committee, which shall become the Nominations Committee. In this case the Chair of this special committee shall be an officer other than the President or the Vice-President of the organization.

This committee shall prepare a list of nominees for the elective offices and in addition shall solicit names from the general membership for the various slots. These solicitations shall occur in the Spring prior to the election, which shall take place in the Fall before the conclusion of the current four-year

period of office. The actual completed list of nominees shall be presented to the President, who will then present it to the membership with sufficient time for returns to be mailed (or e-mailed) to the Organization's main office and for results to be announced at the December meeting and in the subsequent NEWSLETTER.

To be placed on the nominations list, a member must be nominated by at least three members, one of whom may be the prospective nominee. Functionally, the same rule applies to the Executive Committee in its selections, since a majority of three would be required to nominate a candidate. All candidates must be members in good standing of MSA.

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.



Photograph by Roslyn L. Knutson

Christopher Marlowe