



Marlowe Society of America Newsletter

Vol. 32, No. 1, Fall 2012

A Note from the Editor (revised!)

Before you proceed to our eleven pages of fine book reviews, abstracts for the upcoming MLA in Boston at the New Year, and a performance review, please keep **four** things in mind (as opposed to the **two** things I asked you to remember in the first version of this *Newsletter*).

1) The MSA has created a partner page with Ashgate so that MSA members receive a 20% discount on all titles. Please see this link: <http://www.ashgate.com/default.aspx?page=4773>
You'll need this code at checkout: MARLUS20

2) The Grandfather Films production of *The Jew of Malta* is ready to go! Its official premiere is 12 November at 5.40 p.m. in NYC at the [Quad Cinemas on W 13th St](#). Want to buy it? [Click here](#). The trailer? [Click here](#).

3) The editors of *MS:A* and the Executive Committee of the Marlowe Society extend their thanks to current members who requested their free copies of the 2012 edition of the annual. For subscribers who are already Marlowe Society members in good standing, the individual rate has been reduced from \$45 to \$30. If you are interested in subscribing, please see the [MS:A webpage](#). Backorders of the 2011 issue are at the regular rate. *MS:A* is sponsored and supported by the College of Arts and Sciences at Indiana University-Purdue University,

Fort Wayne. We are happy to accept essays for consideration for 2013. If you are interested in submitting your work, visit the [website](#), and query the editorial staff by [email](#). Those who are planning to present at the International Conference next summer are more than welcome to revise their presentations into essays that can be submitted for consideration for publication. Please think of us as a venue for your work.

4) The Marlowe Society of America solicits papers for its [Seventh International Conference](#), to be held on June 25-28th, 2013, at the Blackfriars Playhouse in Staunton, VA. Hosted by MSA President Paul Menzer, the conference will feature keynote presentations by Susan P. Cerasano (Colgate University) Laurie Maguire (Magdalen College, University of Oxford), Leah Marcus (Vanderbilt University), and Garrett Sullivan (Penn State University). Papers should be no more than fifteen minutes in length and present original research on any topic concerning the works of Christopher Marlowe. Please send an abstract (500 words max.) by email to the conference Program Chair, Professor Jeremy Lopez, University of Toronto. The professional productions by the American Shakespeare Center will complement special events, workshops, screenings, and productions designed especially for conference attendees, such as a fully staged production of *The Massacre at Paris*.

MARLOWE SOCIETY OF AMERICA

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

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

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

New memberships and renewals: 1) Use the PayPal option on the [Membership web page](#), or

2) send your check, payable to The Marlowe Society of America, to:

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:

Professor 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

© 2012 Marlowe Society of America. All rights reserved.

Abstracts for 2013 MLA Session in Boston

615. Marlowe and His Others

Saturday, 5 January, 5.15-6.30 p.m.

Liberty B, Sheraton

1. "Sensing *Massacre's* Others," Patricia Cahill, Emory University

This paper addresses the "others" of *The Massacre at Paris*, a text that, in its mangled form, is itself alien within the body of Marlowe's dramatic works. At first glance it would seem to be easy to identify the "others" of *Massacre*: for a predominantly Protestant audience, the Catholics who carry out the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre would surely count as strangers. Yet, I want to re-think the category of otherness in *Massacre* so as to demonstrate how the play invites playgoers to feel self-estrangement. Specifically, I suggest that, just as the play depicts a massacre victim invited to put on the poisoned gloves of another, so, too, the play's re-visiting of the 1572 events may have enacted a kind of sensory assault on early modern audiences who were asked to identify in unsettling ways with the victims of massacre. In discussing this sensory assault, I argue that sensation is by its very nature incommensurate with boundaries, and I also draw on scholarly insights into the senses as having a peculiar relationship with time. Calling attention to the play's performance of sensory dangers and temporality gone awry, I show Marlowe's exploration of massacre as an event that cannot be neatly confined. Indeed, I argue that encrypted in the play's opening scene's invitation to a "hearing of the mass" is Marlowe's summoning of the audience to the acutely terrifying experience of experiencing the "soundscape" of massacre. Through its sensory performances, so I ultimately propose, Marlowe's drama insists upon the permeability of playgoers' bodies and thus the failure of the most basic categories of otherness.

2. "Stranger to Profit: The Anti-Capitalist *Jew of Malta*," James J. Marino, Cleveland State University

Marlowe's Barabas encloses "infinite riches in a little room" but he never manages to exchange his riches for anything of value. He makes only a single purchase in *The Jew of Malta*, buying the slave Ithamore, but that purchase is a failure; Barabas cannot securely command Ithamore's labor. Instead, Ithamore's blackmail demands reverse the conditions of chattel slavery; instead of purchasing unlimited service for a discrete initial fee, Barabas risks paying endlessly for a discrete initial period of service. A play obsessed with money presents money as worthless; there is nothing for Barabas to buy. Barabas is not the mercantile capitalist that he appears, and his dangerous Otherness does not spring from his wealth.

He plays the subversive, destructive Other in the marketplace as in the rest of Malta, a menace to business as to security and peace. He initially strives not to expand his wealth but to concentrate it so thoroughly that it loses its exchange value, entombed in "priceless" objects whose full worth can never be redeemed. Later he focuses on the destruction of economic value at any cost to himself, in a parodic reversal of mercantile practice. Most tellingly, he works to destroy his daughter Abigail's value upon the marriage market, first by ordering her into a nunnery and then by murdering her suitors; he describes her as a diamond to be bargained for, but is intent on losing his bargain. And given another prize beyond market value, the governorship of Malta, he seeks to throw it away as quickly as possible, whatever it costs him.

3. "Dr. Faustus' Leg," Genevieve Love, Colorado College

This paper uses *Faustus'* horse-courser scene to anchor an account of the play's various articulations of theatrical ontology. A number of the play's theatrical effects are allied with conjuring, that is, with bringing things into being. Andrew Sofer notes the play's use of conjuring to evoke the threat and thrill of theatre: "Faustus's spells enact theatre's potential to escape from the character's (and actor's) control and unwittingly bring into being that which it names." As Sofer goes on to explain, conjuring, performative speech, "mirror[s] the ontological ambiguity of performance itself." Does conjuring, does theatre, engage in "representing" or "doing"? *Faustus* also includes theatrical effects that might be said to reverse the energy of conjuration: effects of dematerialization, decorporealization, disappearance. The horse-courser scene focuses on disintegration: the horse purchased from Faustus "vanishes," transformed into a "bottle of hay"; when the horse-courser attempts to rouse the sleeping Faustus to confront him about his loss, the offstage decorporealization of the horse is echoed by the (supposed) disaggregation of Faustus' body, as the man "pulls Faustus by the leg, and pulls it away." Here, the effects and power of theatre emerge not from bringing-into-being but from a challenge to the coherence of being. The threatened failure of bodily integrity, as well as Faustus' deployment of a prosthesis, appeal to a discourse of physical disability. How do the brief suggestions of both amputation and prosthesis in the horse-courser scene shape the play's notion of theatrical presence? What is the relationship between those forms of histrionic power that conjure, and those that disintegrate, being?

Review: *Dido, Queen of Carthage* at the American Shakespeare Center

Much has been written of the parodic nature of Marlowe's *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, but the Actor's Renaissance Season production of Marlowe's earliest work at the American Shakespeare Center's Blackfriars Playhouse in Staunton early in 2012 questions those assumptions. While the acting company engaged Marlowe's comedy where they found it, their treatment of Marlowe's text interrogates Donald Stump's dismissal of the play as "full of youthful derision," and presents *Dido, Queen of Carthage* as an earnest, if early, attempt at tragic writing by Marlowe.

The special rules of the Actor's Renaissance Season (ARS) attempt to re-create the staging practices of the early modern acting company more closely than other ASC productions. Actors work without a director, and with a rehearsal period of about two weeks. *Dido, Queen of Carthage* benefited from being the last show to open in the ARS, which by admission of members of the acting company, is a time when they are more focused on solving performance problems than figuring out what plays mean. Without a forced reading of *Dido* as parody, or the inclination to read it as such, the performers treated the text as a straightforward tragedy.

The triple suicide that concludes *Dido, Queen of Carthage* is commonly cited as the clearest evidence for Marlowe creating the play as a parody of Vergil, but in the ASC's production, there is no hint of comedy. The technical challenge of the play's conclusion is achieved through suggestive staging rather than special effects: Dido (Sarah Fallon) descends into the trap

while foreboding music underscores the scene. While the ARS company has tried to suggest a bonfire with two large pieces of kindling "ignited" by safety torches, Fallon's Dido is here consumed neither by burning passion nor a phallic wound: she walks into a smoldering pit. Dido's suicide in the trap resonates as something darker than Marlowe has written and than his sources suggest. Iarbas' (Aidan O'Reilly) and Anna's (Brandi Rhome) subsequent deaths, with the same music underscoring the scene, continue in that vein, and foreshadow the complete destruction of North African civilization in the absence of a strong queen. The scene is not at all funny, and carries with it all the gravitas one would expect from a great queen's tragic death.

No discussion of *Dido, Queen of Carthage* is complete without treating on the marathon block of text given to Aeneas to describe the fall of Troy and his subsequent escape. Interrupted only sporadically by Dido in his narrative, Aeneas may have what is effectively the longest monologue in early modern play writing, and Rene Thornton Jr, as Aeneas, is both captivating throughout and visibly exhausted by the conclusion. We might think less of Dido for seeking some "pleasing sport" to cheer herself if we didn't want the same exact thing after enduring Aeneas' grief. The ensuing love affair between Dido and Aeneas is thus a brief respite between tragedies, made all the more potent by a company of actors who make us believe, even if just for a moment, that fate might spare them this time.

Tony Tambasco, Mary Baldwin College



MSA Book Reviews • David McInnis, University of Melbourne •

Book Reviews Editor

Kirk Melnikoff, ed. *The University Wits: Robert Greene*. Farnham, Sussex: Ashgate, 2011. ix-xxxvii; 569 pp. Hardback ISBN: 978-0-7546-2858-3 (\$325 / website price \$292.50).

Robert Greene and Christopher Marlowe are inextricably bound in the scholarship on early modern English drama. Although Greene had been a professional writer for nearly a decade by 1588, his protest that year about Marlowe and Tamburlaine in *Perimedes the Blacke-Smith* made public a rivalry over theatrical style, a rivalry about which Marlowe himself was silent. Subsequently, scholars have couched much of their analysis of Greene's dramatic talent in comparisons of *Alphonsus King of Aragon* with *Tamburlaine* and *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* with *Doctor Faustus*. If not Marlowe, then Shakespeare is the measure against which Greene's drama has

been judged. Inevitably in such comparisons Greene has been the loser.

The Marlowe-Greene-Shakespeare bond is manifest in the selections for "Greene and Drama," in *Robert Greene*, edited by Kirk Melnikoff for the series, *University Wits* (gen. ed., Robert A. Logan). In varying degrees, the essays in this section evaluate Greene's plays in the context of Marlowe and Shakespeare, with passing reference to the theatrical marketplace. Alone, these essays perpetuate the scholarly line that runs from contempt for Greene's dramatic skills to faint praise. However, in the context of essays on the standing of Greene in his own time, his "middlebrow strategy" for a readership (xxx), his success in making authorship a profession, and his accomplishments in the genres of romance

and confessional pamphlets, Greene is a winner. Specifically, the section called “Early Reception” is a reminder that Greene’s contemporaries admired the inventiveness, volume, and commercial appeal of his work. In the section called “Greene, Print Culture and Authorship,” essays by Steve Mentz and Lori Humphrey Newcomb examine Greene’s achievements unapologetically as evidence of entrepreneurial energy, not lackluster talent. The selections in “Greene’s Early and Mid-Career Fiction,” “Greene, Romance and Gender,” “Greene’s True Crime,” and “Greene and Repentance” demonstrate that his many popular and profitable prose works undermine the caricature of Greene informed primarily by his perceived ineptitude as stage poet.

In a review of Robert A. Logan’s *Christopher Marlowe* in the *University Wits* series, Erin Kelly delicately points out some shortcomings due to choices by Ashgate (*MSAN* 31.1 [Fall 2011]: 12-13). Chief among these is the decision to reprint the essays in facsimile, with resulting kaleidoscopic shifts in format, font, and type size. In the *Greene* volume, the most annoying instance is the facsimile of Johnstone Parr’s essay, originally published in *PMLA* (1962). The piece is a data-driven tracking of Greene’s college classmates, but it is hard on the eyes because the folio-sized and double-columned original is here reduced to print as small as the 4-point type used by newspapers for stock exchange listings. Kelly cites also the absence of editorial notes to provide a context for each piece. In *Robert Greene*, headnotes would have lightened the work load of Melnikoff’s fine introduction and placed editorial commentary on individual selections where it would have immediate relevance.

The publishing industry in recent years has shown a great affection for collections of already published scholarship (such as this series on the *University Wits*); their obvious value is in tracing developments in the scholarly conversation on a given author. In the “Greene and Drama” section, Melnikoff chooses five essays that span the scholarly landscape from 1955 (Irving Ribner) to 1999 (Kent Cartwright). With one exception, the essays cover Greene’s settled dramatic corpus, plus a play attributed to him (*Selimus*). The exception is the collaborative project, *A Looking Glass for London and England*. For commentary on that play in the *University Wits* series, readers must seek out *Thomas Lodge*, edited by Charles Whitney, who engagingly labels the play, “retro-cool” (xxx). Perhaps intentionally, Melnikoff muffles the disrespect of the scholarly community by burying the harshest criticism of Greene’s plays at the end of the drama section. Ribner’s essay, “Greene’s Attack on Marlowe: Some Light on *Alphonsus* and *Selimus*,” is chronologically first (1955), but Melnikoff puts it next to last. Marlovians know that essay to be typical of its time as a celebration of Marlowe’s achievement in *Tamburlaine* at the expense of Greene’s “servile imitations” (416). Concluding the group of drama criticism is the “The Comedy of Greene and Shakespeare” by Norman Sanders (1961). Its attitude is marginally less disdainful than Ribner’s; it praises Greene’s late plays, but only because “unfettered by Marlowe’s influence” those works may claim some kinship with Shakespeare (428). As buffer to Ribner and Sanders, the drama section opens with essays that find genuine strength in

Greene’s work: Al Braunmuller on *James IV* (1973), Kent Cartwright on humanism in *Friar Bacon* (1999), and Ian McAdam on masculinity and magic in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* (1998).

By virtue of conspicuously missing topics, collections of republished scholarship also suggest where the critical conversation may go next. One such absence is dramaturgy, and in this area valuable work has already been done. In *Writing Robert Greene* (2008), co-editors Melnikoff and Edward Gieskes invited new essays on Greene’s dramaturgy by Alan Dessen and Melnikoff, respectively (see Frank Ardolino’s review in *MSAN* 28.2/29.1 [Spring/Fall 2009], 11-12). Another is commerce. The essays in *Robert Greene* on Greene’s middlebrow strategy in prose suggest openings for future work on middlebrow theatrical perspectives such as repertorial competition and commercial longevity. Still another topic is the Greene Apocrypha. Ribner’s essay treats *Selimus* as Greene’s, but attributions need fresh attention due to developing methodologies of detecting authorship. Any change in the Greene canon may prompt a reassessment of the authorial timeline as well as the contributions of newly canonical plays to company commerce and the book trade. Also missing from the drama section of *Robert Greene* is any attention to lost plays. Yet at least one lost play, “Job,” has been attributed to Greene; and one, “Cloth Breeches and Velvet Hose,” appropriated the narrative of Greene’s prose work, *A Quip for an Upstart Courtier* (for details, see the *Lost Plays Database*). In light of appropriations in extant plays (e.g., by Shakespeare), Greene’s fingerprints are probably on other lost plays through source material and/or commercial theatrical context.

Melnikoff has done the scholarly community a great service by assembling a substantial and coherent collection of essays that illustrate the positive treatments of Greene’s prose contrasted with the shabby treatment of the drama. His introduction implies that further rehabilitation of Greene may come as the playwright is freed from debilitating comparison with the aesthetics of Marlowe and Shakespeare and evaluated in terms of the stage and print markets for which he wrote.

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

Tom Rutter. *The Cambridge Introduction to Christopher Marlowe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. Pp. xiv + 149. ISBN: [Hardback—978-0-521-19634-5](#) (\$75.00); [Paperback 978-0-521-12430-0](#) (\$19.99).

For writers of “Introductions” such as Tom Rutter’s, a major problem can be the uncertainty that attends the selection of content. Who exactly is the audience and how much knowledge do they already possess? Presumably, Rutter’s *Introduction* is written for college students and teachers who have never seriously encountered the poet/playwright. In some respects his book fulfills that aim; but its insights are also sophisticated enough to be of value to scholars who, inescapably, have grappled with the difficulties of establishing

biographical truths and interpreting puzzling texts. Rutter frequently writes to those who are already familiar with the works (more so than to those familiar with the biography) and have some knowledge of early modern history. Fortunately, he appears less concerned with what might appeal to a targeted audience than with the intellectual integrity of his observations.

Throughout his monograph, Rutter adheres faithfully to what I take to be his two overriding principles:

1. Making indelibly clear what we know and what we do not know of Marlowe's biography and of the ambiguities in his works. Whether in discussing Marlowe's life, the degree of his knowledge of Machiavelli (or that of the audiences, for that matter), the means by which we assess Marlowe's portrayal of homoeroticism in *Edward II*, or the closeness with which Burgess's novel, *A Dead Man in Deptford*, and its upcoming film version misconstrue the facts of Marlowe's biography, Rutter is exemplary in keeping before us the distinction between fact and fiction, truth and speculation.

2. Giving his readers a sense of the sixteenth-century context in which Marlowe wrote. This goal includes addressing the poet/playwright's literary heritage, the poetry and drama of his contemporaries, his awareness of the sociopolitical and religious climate, and the commercial, aesthetic, and moral demands of the theatre culture of his day.

The book opens with a timeline of "Key Dates," helpful in maintaining a clear historical progression of events that both bear on or involve Marlowe. The first chapter, entitled "Life and historical contexts," considers Marlowe's life in Canterbury; his birth and early education; his years at Cambridge University and his translations of Ovid, including a section on what the Privy Council defensively called his "good service" to Queen Elizabeth and his "faithful dealing"; his presence in London and the success of *Tamburlaine*; his brushes with the law; his patronage; the accusations of his atheism, the Baines note, and his death. In this chapter, Rutter fulfills both of his aims admirably, for he is scrupulous in distinguishing between fact and speculation and fearless in cutting down unruly Marlovian myths with documented realities. As a result, the chapter, balanced and well-reasoned, reveals how relatively little we actually know of Marlowe's biography.

The next chapter begins the survey of Marlowe's works—specifically, the two *Tamburlaine* plays. Rutter places Part 1 in a sixteenth-century context by showing how it fits into traditions inherent in Robert Wilson's *The Three Lords and Three Ladies of London*, apparently written at about the same time as *Tamburlaine*. But he also shows how *Tamburlaine* breaks new ground, as the Prologue to the play declares that it will. Of particular excellence is the analysis of the style of the play; he shows just what the playwright has done to cause Jonson to give permanent fame to his predecessor's style with his well-known phrase "Marlowe's mighty line." In addition, Rutter points out that the power of language in the play is not only a stylistic trait but a major subject in its content.

Linguistic power is felt in both personal and political situations, whether in persuading Zenocrate to return Tamburlaine's potent expressions of love or in breaking political allegiances. The chapter also covers Marlowe's political subversiveness (31) and the uncertainty of Elizabethan responses to the figure of Tamburlaine as a conqueror; is he to be thought of "as ally, threat or fantasy" (33) or some combination thereof? A similar uncertainty exists in attempting to understand how early modern audiences responded to religion in the play.

The chapter continues with a discussion of Part 2 of *Tamburlaine* which, because it "appears to undo many of the effects of its predecessor" (37), makes critical discussion of the play "problematic" (37). Rutter also explains the complexities of the ending of the play, concluding persuasively that it does not present a moral lesson. Overall, the chapter handsomely illuminates the ambiguities of the two plays without trying to superimpose resolutions on them. Instead, he invites a variety of moral and aesthetic responses grounded in as much as we can ascertain about the two plays from relevant early modern contexts.

The following chapter tackles *Doctor Faustus*. At the outset, Rutter informs us that he wishes to locate the play "in the historical moment within which Marlowe lived and wrote" (41). He begins by discussing the uncertain date of the play and its chief source: P. F's *The History of the Damnable Life and Deserved Death of Doctor John Faustus*. Then, continuing with a demonstration of his stipulated aim of contextualizing Marlowe's works, he discusses magic and science in relation to Faustus, shrewdly pointing to the irony that, at the time Marlowe wrote the play, people did not see magic and science as conflicting. He next goes on to show how, when it comes to understanding religion, Faustus is a self-deceived fool, a bad scholar, or both (48). Ultimately, Faustus's behavior is ambiguous because of the uncertainty of his motivation: is he "a scientist-magician motivated by the desire for knowledge and power"; is he "a despairing fool who deliberately or unintentionally misreads the scriptures"; or is he "a would-be rebel who consciously seeks damnation as a means of exerting control over his spiritual destiny" (50)? Rutter then proceeds to an analysis of Scene 7 in which the Good and Evil Angels fight over Faustus's soul, his purpose being to examine "the techniques Marlowe uses to make a theatrical problem of Faustus's psychology" (51). Again, Rutter is incisive on what we can know about the character and what we cannot. He concludes, "while the overall structure of *Doctor Faustus* may seem conformist, depicting the punishment for crimes against the ultimate authority, at its heart is a cynical probing of the state's use of terror to promote obedience" (54).

The chapter turns next to "the play's thematic interest in theatre itself" (54). Rutter notes that the pageant of the Seven Deadly Sins does not instruct Faustus; it only entertains him. Is Marlowe therefore expressing his view that dramas have a less morally beneficial effect on audiences than a purely pleasurable effect as entertainment? Is Stephen Gosson right in criticizing the theatre for promoting the worship of heathen

idols (56)? A motif running throughout the book is Marlowe's implicit premise that theatre entertains without making or even wanting to make a moral imprint on audiences. The last section of the chapter focuses on audience response in relation to the two texts of the play. In comparing the 1604 and 1616 versions, Rutter shows that the latter implies changes in audience tastes. He also explains the religious differences in the two texts, showing how the 1616 version lets God's indifference, silence, and detachment off the hook and puts the blame for not repenting squarely on Faustus's shoulders. Finally, Rutter is thoroughly persuasive in demonstrating that both texts are needed to understand the continuing popularity of the play and that neither one can be designated authoritative.

The next chapter pairs *The Jew of Malta* and *The Massacre of Paris*. Although Rutter gives solid reasons for linking *Jew* with *Massacre* (62), the pairing nevertheless seems arbitrary; he could just as well have coupled *Jew* and *Tamburlaine*. Rutter characterizes Barabas as a mix of three traditions: a Machiavel (but noticing that he is not one really), a Vice character, and a psychologically realistic figure. He then turns to *Massacre* and to the Guise as a true Machiavel, contrasting the Guise and Barabas. The ensuing discussion proceeds to a focus on religion, race, and nationality in the two plays, the comparisons being based on the premise that both Barabas and Guise are "other" figures in relation to Marlowe's presumed initial audiences. Rutter concludes the chapter with "The place of the audience." Here, he suggests that early modern audiences liked violence even if they found it morally repugnant. Moreover, he posits that the *Jew* and *Massacre* "entertain us in ways that force us to question what it is that we are enjoying, and emphasise that theatrical pleasure and moral approval are two entirely different things" (77). He ends with an assertion that Marlowe's cynicism toward religion and politics in the two plays can be understood as verifiable and, hence, accurate.

The following chapter begins with an explanation of why twenty-first-century views of *Edward II* tend to be wrong: (1) because it is inappropriate to apply notions of homosexuality to Renaissance texts; (2) because the relationship between Edward and Gaveston is only one element in the downfall of the king; (3) and because "*Edward II* is a play about politics and public life as much as it is about private sexuality—indeed it is about the disastrous intersection of the two" (79). Rutter then astutely explains in detail how the full title of the first edition of the play in 1594 indicates that Marlowe's initial audiences thought differently about history from the way we do (79-86). He follows up this discussion with an examination of sexuality, gender, and social status, all major, complex issues that inevitably figure into any interpretation of the play. The final section of the chapter asks whether the play is "Late Marlowe?" "The previous sections of this chapter have treated *Edward II* very much in relation to its time, considering Elizabethan ways of writing history, Elizabethan notions of sexuality, gender and class, and Elizabethan political tensions. This final section, by contrast, examines it in the context of Marlowe's career" (93). Rutter makes clear how this play differs from Marlowe's others in not being "dominated by a

single charismatic figure" (93), by being more natural and colloquial stylistically (no speeches of "high astounding terms"), by giving prominence and complexity to a female character, and by focusing on "the uncertainty that surrounds its characters' inner feelings" (96). This is one more chapter that, because of its admirable focus, organization, and range, speaks with freshness about familiar scholarly issues. The following chapter considers *Dido, Queen of Carthage* and Marlowe's poetry. It begins with a discussion of Marlowe's translation of Ovid's *Amores*, also known as the *Elegies*. Marlowe very likely began translating Ovid while in college and perhaps kept refining the poems before they were published. Although there is some unevenness in the translated verse, "Not only is Marlowe's translation of Ovid stylistically ahead of its time; it is a sequence that is very much about style, about the power of rhetoric to shape our perceptions of the world" (101). Rutter maintains that by translating Ovid, Marlowe also learned about the use of language for deception.

In discussing *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, Rutter is careful to point out that we do not have a certain date of composition, that, according to the title page, "it was 'played by the Children of Her Majesty's Chapel,'" and that it seems to have been the product of dual authorship, Marlowe and Nashe. Rutter concentrates his examination on the differences between Virgil's telling of the story in the *Aeneid* and Marlowe's, asserting decisively: "As a source text, the *Aeneid* could hardly be more different from the *Elegies*" (103). In considering the differences between the epic poem and the drama, Rutter examines the influence of the youthful playing company on the characterizations of the play, in part to explain why "The masculine world of epic is transformed into a drama dominated by a woman, in which male characters are cut down to size" (105). He then elaborates on the differences between Virgil's focus and that of Marlowe and Nashe (105-07).

The next section, on the translation of Lucan's *Pharsalia*, begins with the assertion that, whereas Virgil's poem praises empire and *Dido* "emphasises both the questionable rationale and the human cost of imperial ambitions" (107), Lucan favors the republic. Marlowe's "translation of Lucan helped make republicanism imaginable for his English contemporaries" (108). In translating Lucan, he was exploring topics central to his age's political and intellectual life (108). "As well as adapting his verse to his Latin source, Marlowe adapts his Latin source to the idiom of a contemporary dramatist" (109).

In introducing "The Passionate Shepherd to His Love," Rutter first explains the classical origins of the pastoral tradition of the poem. Then, examining the poem itself, he points to the ambiguity of the speaker and the person spoken to—their gender, in particular. He finds that "...it is the inherent ambiguity, flexibility and indeterminacy of Marlowe's poem that makes it so beguiling, as well as so open to rewriting and imitation by Raleigh and others" (112). He concludes his discussion with a comparison to Raleigh's response (112) and an affirmation of the richness of the ambiguity of Marlowe's poem (112-13).

The section devoted to *Hero and Leander* opens by pointing out that, as in “The Passionate Shepherd,” there is a tension between what is natural and what is artificial (113). Before turning to the subject of the relationship between nature and art in Marlowe’s descriptions of Hero and Leander (114), Rutter compares Marlowe’s poem with Musaeus’s version of the tale (113-14), declaring, “Marlowe’s poem insists on the un-reasoning, irrational nature of desire” (115). The remainder of the discussion centers on the tension between naïveté and knowingness in the relationship of the lovers, the parallel between the narrator’s strategies with readers and Hero’s with Leander, and the comedy that results as a result of the reader’s sexual knowledge as opposed to Leander’s lack thereof.

The final chapter of the book, “Marlowe’s Afterlives,” “aims to provide a sense of some of the meanings that Marlowe has had both for readers and for other artists in the time since his death” (118). The first of three sections covers “early modern responses to Marlowe and his work”; the second, “some examples of his plays’ afterlife in performance”; and the third, “two appropriations of Marlowe in non-theatrical media” (118). Rutter then begins with Chapman’s and Petowe’s continuations of *Hero and Leander*—evidence of Marlowe’s power to stimulate other writers. But, he contends, as with the poetic responses to “The Passionate Shepherd,” that the responses to *Hero and Leander* are very different in spirit from Marlowe’s. The same is true of other works influenced by Marlowe. For example, Greene’s response to *Tamburlaine*, *Alphonsus King of Aragon*, is strongly moralistic, quite unlike its predecessor. Rutter lists other reactions to Marlowe’s life and works, including Shakespeare’s in *As You Like It* and the artistry of Ben Jonson. In discussing Marlowe on stage, the chapter focuses on *The Jew of Malta*, *Doctor Faustus*, *Tamburlaine*, and *Dido*. But instead of giving us a detailed performance history, Rutter pinpoints “a small number of productions that seem to offer insights into how specific aspects of the texts might be addressed in performance” (124). The final section, “Marlowe in Other Media,” uses as representative examples Derek Jarman’s 1991 film version of *Edward II* and Anthony Burgess’s *A Dead Man in Deptford*, both appealing choices.

A slight difference between Rutter’s view and mine is the degree to which he humanizes Dido, Barabas, and Hero. I see these characters as puppets on a string, fulfilling artistic needs of the moment, more than figures to be responded to with psychological consistency or depth. But probably this difference arises out of the innumerable ambiguities in characterization that pervade Marlowe’s poetic and dramatic works, ambiguities that clearly signal a major device of artistry. It almost goes without saying that, in their elusiveness, Marlowe’s ambiguities allow for, even invite, such differences in response.

On the whole, I have found this book a model of excellence in its scholarship, intelligence, and suggestiveness. It is remarkably fresh in the focus of each chapter, wide-ranging in scope, flexible and detailed in supplying illuminating contexts,

and thoroughly engaging in the persuasive candor of its well-supported observations. I recommend it without reservation.

Robert A. Logan
University of Hartford

Brian Gibbons, ed. *Christopher Marlowe: Four Plays. New Mermaids. London: Methuen, 2011. Pp. xxx+594. ISBN: 978 1 408 14949 2.*

In 2011, the intrepid minds at Methuen embarked on a new venture entitled *New Mermaid Anthologies*: the compiling of previously published New Mermaid editions into “themed,” multi-play volumes. Brian Gibbons’s *Christopher Marlowe: Four Plays* is the first of these offerings, and it will soon be joined by William C. Carroll’s *Thomas Middleton: Four Plays*. In coming years, bookstore shelves will also be stocked with *City Comedy*, *Revenge Tragedy*, and *Plays of Sex and Death*. Marketed as an “indispensable student edition ideal for study and classroom use,” Gibbons’s Marlowe compilation includes the annotated play texts of four solid modern editions: Anthony B. Dawson’s *Tamburlaine Parts I and II* (1997); James R. Siemon’s *The Jew of Malta* (2009); Martin Wiggins and Robert Lindsey’s *Edward II* (1997); and Roma Gill and Ros King’s *Doctor Faustus*. It offers as well a new introduction by Gibbons, an abbreviated chronology of Marlowe’s life and works, and a short “Further Reading” list. At the end of his acknowledgements, Gibbons tells us that the series will recall “the enterprise of Havelock Ellis, while beginning anew” (viii). Havelock Ellis, Marlovians may remember, helped inaugurate the Mermaid collection series at the end of the nineteenth century with a collected edition of Marlowe’s plays.

In the volume’s short, sixteen-page introduction, Gibbons presents Marlowe not simply as a radical minded, ground breaking poet but also as a precocious child of his time, his major plays variously and ironically alluding to the “discoveries” of New World colonialism, to the social tensions and theological debates of the Reformation, and to sixteenth-century encounters between Muslims and Christians. In this, Gibbons’s introduction successfully gives readers tastes of Marlovian scholarship, old and new. Moving methodically from *Tamburlaine* to *Doctor Faustus*, Gibbons also occasionally stumps for Marlowe’s twenty-first-century relevance, commingling the scenic structure of *Tamburlaine* with the techniques of film editors and the comedy of *The Jew of Malta* and *Doctor Faustus* with the dark ironies of *Dr Strangelove*. Marlowe’s potential in performance gets some attention in the introduction’s section on *Edward II*. There, Gibbons discusses the play’s “extraordinary pace” on stage through the example of Toby Robertson’s 1958 Cambridge Marlowe Society production of the play. In his overviews of *The Jew of Malta* and *Doctor Faustus*, Gibbons could be accused of indulging a bit too much in plot summary, but it probably bears remembering that the volume is very consciously directed not at experts but at students. While Gibbons ultimately proves admirably flexible and current in his critical approach, he at the same time is surprisingly unwilling to see Marlowe and his work in

collaborative terms. This, however, is not entirely a bad thing. One could certainly question both his failure to cite Chapman's additions to *Hero and Leander* and his parenthetical challenge to Nashe's involvement with *Dido Queen of Carthage*—"The title-page of its first edition, published much later in 1594, gives (dubiously) Thomas Nashe as co-author" (xxv). Based as it is in the recognition of a continuum between comic tonalities in *The Jew of Malta* and *Doctor Faustus*, though, Gibbons's decision not to mention the possibility of a *Doctor Faustus* A-text comic collaborator is as refreshing as it is warranted.

As much as it benefits from what for the most part is Gibbons's elastic critical perspective, *Christopher Marlowe: Four Plays* at the same time suffers greatly from the absence of competent copyediting. It is, of course, the rare book that is able to avoid entirely the occasional typo and/or formatting error. But errors here are anything but occasional. Gibbons's introduction is plagued not simply by faulty transcriptions, comma splices, misspellings ("Shakespeare" [xv]; "Bahktinian" [xxiii]), strained syntax, and inconsistent paragraph breaks but also by what can only be described as a befuddling misuse of the colon whereby it often recurs twice, even three times, in a single sentence. To these editorial oversights in the introduction can be added a failure to ensure that the parenthetical note references within the play texts were fully updated as well as the passing over of two incorrect renderings of contributing editor James R. Siemon's name (vii, 590). Even the volume's back cover is not immune from errors. There, the attentive browser will find comma splices at the beginning and end of the volume's summative blurb along with an unfortunate "Robert Lindsay" for *Edward II* coeditor Robert *Lindsey*.

Gibbon's abbreviated chronologies of Marlowe's life and works provide most of what one would expect, but his bibliography of "Further Reading" is at best a mixed bag. His selective lists of Marlowe bibliographies, biographies, monographs, and criticism collections are relatively complete, though missing are J.B. Steane's *Marlowe: A Critical Study*; Paul Kocher's *Christopher Marlowe, a Study of his Thought, Learning and Character*; Patrick Cheney's award-winning *Marlowe's Republican Authorship*; Deats and Logan's *Marlowe's Empery*; and any mention of Lisa Hopkins. Less forgivable are the lists of "Criticism on Separate Plays," from which students are apparently supposed to glean that almost no significant articles were published on *Tamburlaine*, *The Jew of Malta*, *Edward II*, or *Doctor Faustus* after the year 2000. And it certainly would have been preferable to exclude any mention of film versions of Marlowe's plays than serve up, at the end of the *Edward II* list, the sorry single entry "There is a DVD of the Derek Jarman film" (xxx). Given these limitations, it's difficult to be enthusiastic about this new Marlowe offering. While this volume has some selling points (namely an affordable price, a competent introduction, and a set of well edited and annotated texts), it is also very clearly a hastily produced product. That said, generalist readers interested in Marlowe's major plays could possibly benefit from the collection, as could high school students and undergraduates in a lower-level literature survey.

More advanced students, however, would be better served buying the New Mermaid single-play editions of Marlowe. While this New Mermaids Anthology may pledge to provide "a full introduction to the plays analyzing their contexts, themes and stage histories" along with "[b]ackground information to the life and times of the author," the reality is that taken together, the New Mermaid single editions of Marlowe do an infinitely better job of delivering on such promises. For students, this would be an extra \$30 well spent.

Kirk Melnikoff,
UNC at Charlotte

Evelyn B. Tribble. *Cognition in the Globe: Attention and Memory in Shakespeare's Theatre*. NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. Pp.xv+200 . Hardback ISBN: 978-9-230-11085-4 (\$80).

In *Cognition in the Globe*, Evelyn B. Tribble offers "a thick description of a particular social and material moment which configures the boundaries among insides, objects, and people in a very particular way, often off-loading the attentional and mnemonic demands of the enterprise onto technological and social structures" (8). The focus is on London theatre of the 1590s and early 1600s, tracing developments in the infrastructure of playing and the attendant shifts in playwrights' styles of writing: Shakespeare, for example, is seen to eventually favour irregular rhythm and short or shared lines towards the end of his career (84), where in his early days of writing plays, it was more prudent to incorporate "rhetorical mnemonic markers" like rhyme and antitheses into set speeches in order to assist the players in their task of memorisation (76). The study represents an innovative contribution to our understanding of performance practices, establishing a productive conversation between early modern studies and the cognitive sciences. By focusing on Distributed Cognition/Extended Mind theories, Tribble eschews pejorative terms like "conventional" or "formalized" in favour of a systems-based approach that more positively acknowledges the advanced technical skill and expertise of those involved in the playing "system". At the same time, her model of cognition provides a corrective to older studies of memory predicated on "the erroneous assumption that perfect verbatim recall is consistently possible" (8), elucidating instead the important differences between contemporary and early modern theatrical practices and situating each in its "material, social and environmental surround" (12).

Tribble introduced the concept of "Distributed Cognition" in an article for *Shakespeare Quarterly* which takes as its focus "the mnemonic demands that the repertory system made on its participants" ("Distributing Cognition in the Globe, *SQ* 56.2 [2005]: 135). In that article, subsequently revised in the present book, Tribble applies to early modern theatre studies a framework propounded by Edwin Hutchins in his maritime study *Cognition in the Wild*, in which he discusses the "relationship between cognition seen as a solitary mental activity and cognition seen as an activity undertaken in social settings" (qtd. in *Cognition* 4-5). Noting the flawed critical tendency to "view cognition as individual rather than social"

and thus assume “that properties of the system as a whole must be possessed by each individual within it,” Tribble introduces cognitive anthropology insights to instead argue that “cognition is distributed across the entire system” (“Distributing Cognition” 135). This view situates cognition in its social and environmental context rather than limiting cognitive activity to an individual’s physical body. It considers internal processes like memory alongside physical objects and environments, and argues that “[n]o one of these elements, taken alone, has sufficient explanatory power; it is only through examining their interplay that we can come to a satisfactory account of the early modern theatrical system” (*Cognition* 7).

Accordingly, Tribble considers the cognitive properties of the playhouse as the physical environment in which the individual participates, and thus as part of a system that aims to “reduce cognitive demands upon individual agents” (*Cognition* 19). For example, with allowance for exceptions when dialogue activates spatial meaning, she generally supports a hypothesis in which the protocol for players’ entrances and exits usually consists of entering from one door and exiting from the other (as opposed to players remembering which door they had entered from and re-using it to leave the stage): “The more thinking that can be off-loaded onto the environment, the more mental energy is available for the other attentional demands of playing” (*Cognition* 33). A strength of Tribble’s model is its capacity to acknowledge greater complexities, such as the potential for dialogue to modify exits. She concludes: “The ways in which the dialogue meshes with the constraints of the stage space, the conventions governing it, and the social space of the stage itself must all be taken into account. Dialogue and stage movement can *potentiate* space, turn it from neutral to highly localized and laden with significance” (*Cognition* 34–5). In attending to the “cognitive life of things” (as John Sutton calls it), Tribble’s model of the playing system exceeds the limitations of the individual and even that of collaborative interaction, emphasising how technologies and the physical environment can be cognitively rich.

Chapter 1, “The Stuff of Memory”, looks at the physical environment of the playhouse’s space and objects, addressing questions of entrances/exits and enigmatic material artefacts including plots and playbooks, and placing them meaningfully within a system that actually uses “lacunae and redundancies” to structure activity (20). Information underload is here seen as a positive advantage to the system. The second chapter proceeds to examine gesture and language through the lens of

Sean Lawrence. *Forgiving the Gift: The Philosophy of Generosity in Shakespeare and Marlowe*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 2012. Pp. x + 244. ISBN: 978-0-8207-0448-7 (\$58).

In *Forgiving the Gift*, Sean Lawrence argues that the assumptions underlying New Historicism, especially as seen in the work of Stephen Greenblatt, are overly narrow and secular, constricting our understanding both of early modern drama and of our own lives. Lawrence’s premise is laid out in an opening prologue that discusses Faustus’s decision to

mnemonic scaffolding, arguing for the importance of “fluent forgetting” (76) and insisting that “in the absence of long rehearsal times and other material carriers for memory, the production and encoding of gesture—the coupling of action with accent—is a powerful tool for the player and one of the foundations of his expertise” (97), rather than being merely a rigid and stylised formality. Chapter 3 engages with the social structure of playing companies and the introduction of novices/apprentices to the playing system; an instance where the parallel, in Hutchins’ maritime study, of the new sailor contributing to the management of the ship’s business, proves instructive. “Enskillment” is the key term here, as the system that supports players is also seen to indoctrinate and train them by providing appropriate “scaffolding”. Rather than boy actors being a liability or deficit, Tribble argues that “the training and enskillment constantly going on within the plays ... enabled the development of high levels of sophistication in the female roles” (128). Marlovians will recall that Tribble has previously explored how Marlowe’s writing of boy parts contributed in this manner to the enskillment and induction of boy actors to the theatrical system (“Marlowe’s Boy Actors,” *Shakespeare Bulletin* 27.1 [2009]: 5-17). That analysis is here situated in the broader context of environmental scaffolding, and how “a cognitively rich environment constrains possible choices and prompts the agent to perform the proper action” (138).

Tribble’s book emphatically shifts attention from theatrical models predicated on central control (a prompter, a playwright) to a distributed system model of playing. It positively values the pragmatic “cognitive thrift” of information underload in playing artifacts like cue scripts and plots, and recognises the benefits of a system whose product exceeds the sum of its parts. Apprentice players and experienced players with significant impositions on their memories are each seen to benefit from a system that reduces their cognitive loads and distributes the burden across the environment of the theatre. In proposing “an ecological model” of playing that focuses on “the interplay of a wide range of factors governing the [playing] enterprise” (155), Tribble’s book opens up productive avenues of interdisciplinary inquiry and offers a fresh and compelling account of the early modern playing system.

David McInnis,
University of Melbourne

adhere to his pact with Lucifer rather than to accept the gift of saving grace. The alternatives, in Lawrence’s reading, are both possible, for theologically and legally the pact is not binding, and the play insists upon the possibility of salvation. Thus, in choosing to abide by the pact, Faustus reveals his commitment to a belief in the legitimacy and power of exchange, and he rejects the idea of grace, which is “a pure gift that is not chosen, earned, or reciprocated” (xxiii). Faustus’s position, Lawrence argues, is similar to our own. Many postmodern writers mistrust the idea of generosity, and the criticism of early modern drama, especially as embodied in New

Historicism, has been dominated by an acceptance of the ubiquity of exchange. The result, he maintains, is not merely that criticism has been blind to the early modern period's belief in generosity and the gift, but that the current adherence to the exchange "model limits not only how one can read the plays but also how one can understand the world in general" (xxiii).

Lawrence's first chapter provides a theoretical framework for his argument by interrogating Marcel Mauss's now classic ethnological understanding of gift giving as an exchange demanding recompense. The discussion qualifies Mauss and provides an alternative understanding of gift-giving by drawing upon the philosophies of Jacques Derrida, Emmanuel Levinas, and Paul Ricour. However, despite the revisions and questioning of continental philosophy, Lawrence finds that it is Mauss who has most strongly influenced the criticism of early modern drama. The focus on exchange and circulation has led, he acknowledges, to many "brilliant readings of a wide range of texts, not only by Greenblatt, but indeed by an entire generation of critics" (33). It is, though, not a stance that Lawrence can admire, since "[t]he assumption that all gifts call for return, which Mauss enumerates in ethnology, leads critics to ignore or explain away acts of generosity" (37). Lawrence cannot accept a secular vision of the world in which "we are condemned to view each other exclusively or merely primarily as participants in exchanges" (37).

After his initial focus on theory, Lawrence argues his case through readings of five plays in addition to *Faustus*: Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice*, *King Lear*, *Titus Andronicus*, and *The Tempest*, and Marlowe's *Edward II*. What he finds is that Shakespeare and Marlowe's explorations of exchange relationships reveal that characters like Faustus, King Lear, Edmund, or Shylock who rely too strongly on exchange have embraced a worldview that impoverishes their human relationships, while characters such as Antonio, Edward, Titus, and Prospero reflect "a generosity that does not exhaust itself in exchanges" (192). Overall, Lawrence reads closely, providing interesting and nuanced interpretations of his chosen texts. Readers may not always agree, but will find Lawrence's analysis to be consistently intriguing. To give just three examples supporting his thesis that exchange is

insufficient to understand early modern drama, Lawrence's reading of *Titus Andronicus* maintains that "since Lavinia's social value has been defaced" by her violation and mutilation, "her claim upon the attention of Lucius, Marcus, and especially Titus . . . is not reducible to a product of exchange" (144). Their concern to understand what she is trying to tell them must therefore read as a sign of generosity. Similarly, Lawrence concludes that Prospero's forgiveness of his enemies in *The Tempest* is truly generous, for it is not dependent on their repentance. There is no exchange. Moreover, he finds that Prospero evinces no sign that he himself desires to leave the island, and indeed, that he sees nothing to look forward to in Milan except his impending death. Rather, Lawrence argues that Prospero leaves for his daughter's sake, sacrificing "his own life along with his enormous power on the island so that Miranda may reach maturity and enjoy marriage" (166). The action is pure generosity, for Miranda will never even know that his action was a sacrifice. Finally, Lawrence approves of Edward's gifts to and elevation of Gaveston, arguing that his "love of Gaveston expresses itself in excess and generosity" while the "[o]ther characters turn love, friendship, and the gifts through which both are expressed into the sorts of gift-exchanges that Mauss describes, constructing an entire society on gift exchange . . ." (127). Marlowe's play is thus seen as transgressive not only in its violation of "the heteronormativity of the Elizabethan period and the power structures of feudalism," but also in its violation of "the assumptions of exchange that govern politics, social order, and criticism" (142).

For Lawrence, insights such as these three reveal a drama that stands in opposition to postmodern suspicion of the gift. Recognition of this, he believes, provides us a way "to explore other and potentially liberating ways of living in our world" (193). For him, the reduction of gift to reciprocal exchange is our version of Faustus's pact. What we need, he concludes, is a criticism that shows that "we have ethical obligations beyond those chosen by ourselves or imposed by our cultures" (193).

Bruce E. Brandt
South Dakota State University

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.