

The Influence of Marlowe on Shakespeare.

by

M.D.Mawdsley

o o o

An Essay submitted for the Degree of

Master of Arts,

in the Department of English.

o o o

April, 1927.

Table of Contents.

- o -

- I. State of the Drama when Marlowe began to write.
- II. The Doubtful Plays.
- III. General Tendency of Marlowe's Drama...Romantic Tragedy.
- IV. New Conception of Tragedy...The Heroic Personality.
- V. The Machiavellian Element.
- VI. Conscience as a Factor.
- VII. The Weakling as a Hero.
- VIII. Unity.
- IX. Seriousness.
- X. The Chronicle History.
- XI. Use of Historical Material.
- XII. Blank Verse.
- XIII. Bombast.
- XIV. Lyrical Qualities.
- XV. Conclusion.

o o o

The State of the Drama when Marlowe began to write.

The aim of this essay is to determine the nature and extent of the influence exerted by Marlowe on the dramatic work of Shakespeare. Obviously the first step will be to examine the condition of the drama when Marlowe began to write in order that the changes in form and manner of expression which Marlowe inaugurated may later be appreciated. A brief survey of the condition of the drama at the beginning of the Elizabethan period will accordingly be attempted in this section.

The English drama had its origin in the dramatic elements of the church service.¹ From a few words interpolated into the liturgy on festival days rose the miracle plays and these rapidly passed from the church into the hands of the trade guilds. Under their management the plays arranged themselves in cycles representing the Biblical course of events from creation to judgment. The earliest tropes of which we have any record date back to the ninth century: the development in the church began probably about the middle of the 11th century and did not extend beyond the middle of the 13th. At that date the mir-

1. The material of this section is mostly based on the early chapters in Schelling's English Drama.

acle plays began to be played by the craft guilds. The non-Biblical elements in the plays in turn gave rise to the Moralities which showed greater originality in construction, but were characterised only by allegorical abstractions. By the Elizabethan period the miracle plays had ceased. Moralities, however, continued to be produced, and a new incentive was given to the use of the drama for moral purposes by the Reformation in England. In the later moralities, and in some of the abstract figures inserted in the first plays whose characters hovered on the borderland between abstractions and real personages, this propagandist note is felt. In Bale's King Johan, for instance, there is a tendency to confuse the characters with moral abstractions and by making John a defender of protestantism against the oppression of Rome to convert the whole into a didactic treatise. The pre-occupation with religious questions which was a feature of the Renaissance caused a sporadic continuance of the form up to the time of Shakespeare.

The influence of the Court on Elizabethan drama was also considerable. Queen Elizabeth was passionately fond of elaborate ceremonies and theatrical displays. The court accordingly became the centre of many pageants and masques which though performed at court all contributed something to the stage technique of the popular theatre, for while

not in themselves drama, they contained dramatic elements, and as no expense was spared in the lavishness of their production they contributed new ideas to the popular plays which were, of necessity, more simply staged.

The court plays were also much affected by classical influence. This arose from the interest in the plays of Seneca. "His heightened style, his moralising, his lofty commonplaces unctuously expressed, even his sensationalism, his blood and terror, all fell in naturally with the temper of the young romantic age. While his professional manner, show of technique, his conventional verse and rhetoric, equally suited the time."¹ Gorboduc (1562) was the first play written under Senecan influence and owing to this influence it was a tragedy in form, the first written in English. The theme, it is true, was English, but it was selected owing to its resemblance to Senecan themes. To this class belong such plays as Gascoigne's Jocasta (1566.) and Thomas Hughes' The Misfortunes of Arthur (1587.)

Classical influence also early affected English comedy. The first comedy was doubtless Ralph Roister Doister by Nicholas Udall which was intended for school production to replace the Latin plays of Plautus which it had been customary to give. A later Italian influence was soon felt. Gascoigne's Supposes acted in 1566 was the

1. Schelling - Eng. Drama, p. 41.

"the first successful adaptation of an Italian comedy and the earliest example of a play written throughout in English prose."² Lyly continued the type; he was a born courtier and his works contain many allegorical references to Elizabeth and events in court circles. Before Marlowe began to write, Lyly had already written such plays as Campaspe, Endimion, and Sappho and Phao. He introduced into his plays the interest of a composite plot but paid little attention to the connecting of the various stories which would have resulted in unity. He wrote his comedies after Gascoigne's example in prose which he employed with great elegance. George Peele also competed with Lyly in the writing of court comedy. Peele, however, was essentially a poet and the success of his dramas was largely dependent on the gracefulness of the poetry in which they were developed. His Arraignment of Paris belongs to this period. The later work of Peele was written for the popular playhouses where he sought to compete with Marlowe though the nature of his genius did not permit him to eclipse the work of his rival in popular favour.

The plays of the popular theatres were naturally less dominated by laws of dramatic construction than those produced at the Inns of Court. We find here an indigenous

1. Ibid p. 43.

form in the Chronicle history which was inspired by the patriotic feeling of the age and developed its theme in the epic manner without regard to dramatic construction. Its aim was to depict the events of national history and it did this by recounting at random all the incidents of a certain period, regardless of their coherence. As had been the case in the early miracle plays, moreover, a comic element, purely fictitious and unrelated to the main theme, was super-imposed on the historical material. The "earliest and rudest of the chronicle plays" ¹ was The Famous Victories of Henry V which Shakespeare later remodelled, and it was to this class that Peele later contributed his Edward I

The Senecan influence which was so pronounced in the court theatre was also felt in the popular playhouses. To this class belongs the anonymous play Loqrine, and a more modern Italian influence contributed to the production of Tancred and Gismunda which had appeared earlier in the Inns of Court but was re-written for the popular stage in 1591.

Mediaeval heroic romances also contributed material to the stage. Examples of this are Sir Clymon and Sir Clamydes and Greene's Orlando Furioso. Peele's Old Wives' Tale parodied the type.

1. Ibid p. 57.

These varied influences probably united to produce Kyd's Spanish Tragedy, the date of which is uncertain, but which certainly appeared early in Marlowe's career if not before he began to write.

Glancing over the field, then, we notice that the court plays were much under Italian influence, derived both from Seneca and from the later romantic plays of Italy. The greatest writer of court plays was undoubtedly Lyly who improved upon the dramatic structure of his predecessors. In the public theatres the same influence was also felt, but the popular movement was, as might be expected, away from rule to the development of an indigenous type. This was the chronicle history which exemplified the uncertainty of form which was a general feature of the popular drama. There was a lack of coherence in construction, and moreover, no attempt was made to keep comedy and tragedy as distinct types but the two were mingled without discrimination in the same play.

The same uncertainty that governed the construction of these plays was evinced in the style in which they were written. We have seen that Gascoigne and Lyly used prose for their comedies. The older custom had been to use what is known as the shymed fourteener of which the following is a typical example:

My counsaile grave and sapient with Lords of legall traine
 Attentive ears towards me bend and mark what shall be
 sain.

(Cambyses.)

The lines contained seven feet, and rhymed in couplets. The Senecan plays, however, beginning with Gorboduc were written in blank verse. This form which was still composed with great rigidity gave as yet no evidence of the possibility for subtle variation which it later revealed. No one form had therefore shown any tendency to supersede the other, but all three existed side by side and sometimes mingled in the same play. The hand of a genius was required to bring decision to the form of the drama, and determine the style in which it should be written. That genius was found in Christopher Marlowe.

o o o

II. The Doubtful Plays.

Before discussing in detail the nature of the relationship between Marlowe and Shakespeare, it is necessary to define the limits of our comparison. The way to establish satisfactory evidence is, obviously, to deal only with plays to which the authorship of Shakespeare and Marlowe has been definitely established. For the purposes of this essay, therefore, we will ignore the so-called 'doubtful plays' - that is, plays in which the responsibility of authorship has not been satisfactorily proved. There are certain plays generally assigned to Shakespeare which are thought by some not to be his, or at least not his alone; there are plays in which it is thought that Shakespeare and Marlowe collaborated; and, lastly, there is a third class of play assigned to Marlowe on insufficient evidence; all of which therefore will not enter into the discussion. It is perhaps as well, however, to indicate what these plays are, so that the legitimate basis of our investigations may be revealed.

First, then, must be considered Titus Andronicus. Fleay¹ thinks this may be by Marlowe and the assumption derives some probability both from the style and subject matter of the play. If not Marlowe's but Shakespeare's

1. Chronicle of the Eng. Drama, vol. II, p. 64.

then it may be said to have been written under strong Marlovian influence for the theme is one that would have appealed very much to him. It is full of horrors, and the titular hero dominates its every page.

Again it has been maintained that the old play on which Shakespeare based his Taming of the Shrew was written by Marlowe.¹ It would seem difficult to credit Marlowe with the humorous passages so foreign to his genius.

Next may be considered the Henry VI trilogy. The play on which 1 Henry VI² is based has been lost, but it was possibly by Greene. It has been thought that his ill-natured comments on Shakespeare may have been provoked by the latter's use of his play.³ However as Schelling points out the wars of York and Lancaster were the subject of a great popular interest at that time and in revising these plays for the stage, Shakespeare was merely following a general practice. The plays take their place in the historical cycle which beginning with King John goes on to its culminating point in Henry VIII so that they have an integral part in the series. We are fortunately possessed of the plays on which Henry VI Parts 2 and 3 were based. The first of these is called "The First Part

1. Ward p. 358.

2. Jusserand - A Literary Hist., vol. III, p. 186, note.

3. Schelling + Chronicle Play, pp. 74-97.

of the Contention betwixt the two famous Houses of Yorke and Lancaster with the Notable Rebellion of Jack Cade" and appeared in 1594; the third part was based on "The true tragedie of Richard Duke of Yorke with the whole contention betweene the two houses of Lancaster and Yorke" and appeared in 1595. In these plays there is no attempt at dramatic unity except such as is secured by successive treatment of the same characters in the different plays, and in the vilefication of the character of Joan of Arc, the historic method is frankly abandoned from low motives of national prejudice. It has been thought that Marlowe had a hand either in the writing or the revision of these plays. Whether this is so or not, it does seem undeniable that Shakespeare had a large part in the revision. Richard III seems to follow directly upon 3 Henry VI, and Shakespeare would not be likely to make his play fit so closely in a sequence altogether by another hand. Moreover Shakespeare's hand appears to be indicated by the nature of the alterations made in 2 and 3 Henry VI from the parallel passages in the older plays. Schelling would give Shakespeare only isolated scenes in 1 Henry VI such as would probably be assigned to "a young¹ and yet untried hand," and give him a larger share in the two later plays. Just how great a hand Marlowe had in the plays

1. Schelling - Chronicle Play, p. 84.

it is equally hard to determine. We feel that Shakespeare shows himself greatly under Marlowe's influence in Richard III and II, and it is possible that the earlier collaboration of the authors may have been partly responsible for the influence so undoubtedly sustained by Shakespeare.

Two other historical plays have been the subject of considerable discussion. Shakespeare's King John is based upon two older plays - one of which, The Troublesome Raigne of King John has been sometimes attributed to Marlowe, and even to Shakespeare himself.² The play is not divided into acts and the scenes follow without coherence. The minor characters are not sketched with any distinctness except for the Bastard Faulconbridge whom Shakespeare took over making the most of the character indications given in the older play. The incidents are practically the same in both plays. It is of interest to note the frequent quoting of Latin tags, so similar to the customary practice of Marlowe.

Another play of considerable literary interest is Edward III. It contains a romantic episode of Edward III's love for the beautiful Countess of Salisbury which has been assigned by many to Shakespeare on account of its vigorous portraiture. Fleay conjectures that Marlowe wrote the play

from Holinshed and that Shakespeare inserted the story of the countess.

Besides these plays in which the hands of Marlowe and of Shakespeare are variously seen, there are five plays sometimes attributed to Marlowe in addition to those commonly admitted to be his. The first of these is Loocrine, Ward considers that the style alone would prove this impossible. The next is Lust's Dominion. Marlowe's share in the authorship of this play would seem to be sufficiently disproved by the mention of the death in Act I of Philip II of Spain who did not die till five years after its supposed author. Marlowe is also believed to have had a hand in The Alarum for London, or Siege of Antwerp which was probably the work of Marston, perhaps under Shakespeare's supervision. The Maiden's Holiday was entered on the Stationer's Register in 1564 as by Marlowe and Day. We know, however, that various reasons influenced the Elizabethan printer in placing an author's name on the title page, and we cannot therefore assign full confidence to that alone. The play has been lost, being destroyed by Warburton's cook. Finally, Fleay would make Marlowe the author of The True History of George Scanderbague on the strength of an ill-natured reference by Gabriel Harvey. One of Fleay's main arguments for assigning these various plays to Marlowe appears to be that giving

Marlowe the same rate of production that holds in Shakespeare's case, he ought to have produced two plays a year, and in reality we have only seven plays by his hand. The argument, to say the least of it, is unconvincing.

None of these plays therefore will be considered in tracing the influence of Marlowe on Shakespeare. No conclusions based on such insufficiently authenticated authorship could be of value.

The plays that we can definitely ascribe to Marlowe are; 1. Tamburlaine the Great, Part I of which appeared in 1587 and was published in 1590. Part II appeared directly after the first part. 2. The Tragicall History of Doctor Faustus, about 1588- published 1604. 3. The Jew of Malta, after 1588 - published 1633. 4. Edward II, entered on the Stationers Register 1593. There are also two plays of inferior merit; The Massacre at Paris and The Tragedy of Dido, which last may have been an earlier work and was apparently finished by Thomas Nashe. It will be by examining these plays that conclusions will be drawn as to the characteristics of Marlowe's drama. An examination of Shakespeare's earlier plays will then be attempted to see in what respects they partake of these characteristics.

III. General Tendency of Marlowe's Drama - Romantic Tragedy.

The first step in our consideration of the relationship between Marlowe and Shakespeare will obviously be to examine the general tendency of Marlowe's drama and see whether Shakespeare's plays usually followed the same trend.

As we have seen there was great confusion both in style and form of the drama when Marlowe began to write. Marlowe's forcible nature constantly shows itself, and nowhere more than in the decided fashion in which he dealt with the problem. He decided at once and very definitely to follow the Senecan style of blank verse, and the influence he thus exerted on the style of succeeding dramatists will be dealt with in a later section. In form, however, he seemed to prefer the romantic tragedy to that in the Senecan tradition.

One way in which Marlowe shows this freedom from classical tradition is in his choice of subjects. It has already been remarked that the first English Senecan play was not based upon a classical story. Gorboduc dealt with English legendary characters, but the choice of theme as we have remarked was dictated by the resemblance of the story to the tales of the classic models. Marlowe made no effort to deal with classical themes but showed the greatest freedom in his choice of subjects. In his first play, Tambur-

laine, he found his material in Moslem tradition; The Jew of Malta and Doctor Faustus represent a still greater divergence from type. Neither Barabas nor Faustus belonged to the class of princes from which alone classic tradition selected the tragic hero. Barabas was a member of a down trodden and despised race; Faustus, a student in a German university. The great originality shown in choice of theme is therefore at once obvious. In Edward II Marlowe once more shows his freedom from classic tradition by going back to the subject matter of the chronicle histories. The Massacre at Paris is an original and daring innovation - an attempt to deal in the drama with the contemporary history of a foreign country. In his last play, alone, Marlowe selected a classical theme. The fact that he could write about classic subjects if he would, makes his avoidance of them the more striking. Moreover we know that he was given a classical education and he strews fragments of Latin liberally over his pages. His avoidance of classical themes, therefore, was deliberate.

The drama based on mediaeval romance such as Sir Clymon^o and Sir Clamydes had made two important contributions to stage technique. It had maintained an interest in serious story at a time when the native influence seemed to be directing its attention exclusively to farce, and it had focussed the attention upon a heroic personage.¹ For both

1. Tucker Brooke, p. 39.

these reasons it appealed to Marlowe. He was interested in depicting the resolute hero rather than in dealing with the plot interest of the Senecan play, and by choosing heroic romance as his theme, was able to satisfy his preference.

Moreover the heroic drama did not concern itself seriously with tragic form. Nor was Tamburlaine developed as a tragedy. "It did not," says Tucker Brooke,² "show any clear conception of that wise economy of tragic material which rejects all irrelevant horrors and so manages the rest as to heighten the climactic interest of the close. There is here no culmination of suspense as the play approaches the inevitable solution of a great problem. Rather we follow the progress of the mighty conqueror through a succession of breathless glories till arbitrarily the excitement drops and the play ends on the lowered key of peaceful marriage or triumphant death." The same attitude governs the arrangement of material in all Marlowe's other plays except Edward II. In Edward II he seems definitely to have directed his technique to the composition of a tragedy, but in his other plays he is concerned only with the life and death of a resolute hero. His plays, though constructed on the lines of the chronicle plays, have, however, greater unity owing to the controlling interest exerted by the pro-

1. Ibid, loc. cit.

tagonist. They achieve a sort of tragic unity, therefore, even though plot construction with Marlowe has been subservient to interest in the heroic character.

And this absorption with the individual is the dominant note of his tragedy. Tamburlaine deals with the conqueror whose amazing achievements held the audience breathless: Doctor Faustus conquered the field of knowledge through the aid of magic: The Jew of Malta amassed untold wealth. Even in his best constructed play, Edward II, Marlowe is concerned with the personality of his hero. The earlier writers of chronicles would have made the play a succession of unconnected events. Marlowe makes it a profound study of weakness of character. It is this concentration upon the individual that made Marlowe develop the psychological note in the drama, and paved the way for the profound study of a human soul which Shakespeare later gave us in Hamlet.

Not only was the romantic drama concerned with the individual, but it liked to depict the individual subduing overwhelming difficulties. Both these traits are marked features of the work of Marlowe and illustrate his emancipation from Senecan tradition. In Edward II, indeed, the hero fails to achieve the marvellous for in many respects Edward II represents tendencies not habitual to Marlowe.

yet even here, the resolute character of Mortimer satisfies the same romantic tradition.

We can sum up, then, by saying first, that Marlowe deliberately chose romantic subjects in preference to classical; second, that his handling of plot was in general accord with the loose chronicle manner; and, lastly, that he focussed his attention on his protagonist to the development of whose character he made the plot subservient.

In all this Shakespeare followed Marlowe's example. He had not the classical training that Marlowe had received and it is to be expected, therefore, that he would prefer themes drawn from native history or mediaeval romance. A consideration of his work will show that a very small number of his plays were drawn from classical themes: English themes provided him with fourteen; mediaeval romance with sixteen, and classical, with seven. This shows conclusively, therefore, that his general tendency was in the direction of the romantic theme. An examination of the Chronicle histories will show that with the exception of the two written in direct imitation of Marlowe's Edward II there is the loose development of the chronicle play. In this he goes farther than Marlowe, for while we have granted that Marlowe did not consciously aim at tragic form in his earlier plays, he did achieve it to some extent, by means of the unity imposed

by the central character. Shakespeare was more influenced by the careless structure of the native plays as might be expected from his less sound classical training, and therefore his histories were more markedly native in form than Marlowe's. Lastly, Shakespeare, too, was interested in the individual, and this concentration upon character is again foreign to the classical influence. The greater ability that Shakespeare possessed in depicting character caused him to go much further along these lines than did Marlowe, so that the psychological motives of his characters became one of the most absorbing interests of his plays. In all three ways, then, choice of subject, development of plot, and interest in character, Shakespeare followed the same tendencies as Marlowe, and, as we shall see, more or less directly under his influence. Just where this influence was exerted, and how far it extended, it will be our purpose to indicate in detail in the succeeding sections of this essay.

IV. New Conception of Tragedy - The Heroic Personality.

"Marlowe's choice and treatment of plots seem, indeed, dictated by a new conception of tragedy, as dealing not merely with a life and death, or a bloody crime or a reversal of fortune, but with the heroic struggle of a great personality doomed to inevitable defeat."¹

These words of Thorndike's may be taken as a guide for our investigations on this subject. The Senecan plays as we have seen dealt with stories of unnatural crime; the native plays recounted rambling tales of the life and death of the characters who gave their name to the plays. A glance at the plays which had preceded Marlowe will show that none of these dealt with "the heroic struggle of a great personality doomed to inevitable defeat." Marlowe's type of tragedy therefore originated with him. Let us examine Marlowe's tragic method, therefore, and then see where, and to what extent Shakespeare followed him.

Marlowe spent very little effort in describing minor characters. He was not at all interested in the interplay of character on character, though this is a very important field for the drama, since it is what actually occurs in life, and as the stage pretends to give a representation of life, this method would undoubtedly add to the reality of the

1. Thorndike - Tragedy, p. 90.

portrait. Later it became Shakespeare's achievement to show his characters influenced for weal or woe by those around them. His favorite method of depicting character was by developing dramatic contrast. Thus Cassius and Brutus offset each other: so do Prince Hal and Hotspur, or Richard II and Bolingbroke. By developing pairs of characters in this fashion he was enabled to show that one character might affect another and it is by recognising this great principle of life that Shakespeare has left behind so many characters who seem so truly alive, and who are sometimes even more familiar to us than those among whom we live. Marlowe, however, used a very different method. He picked out one leading character, conceived him as dominated by a powerful motive and pictured all the events of his drama as dependent upon that motive. Now, if Marlowe had drawn a character of only ordinary power and surrounded him as we have indicated by characters slightly sketched and important only through their relationship to the hero, he would have succeeded in making that hero stand out in bold relief even as Gulliver among the Lilliputs. But this was not enough for Marlowe. His exaggeration is two-fold - not only must the hero be surrounded by pigmies, but he, himself, must be a super-man, not a Gulliver at all but one of the race of Breddingnag.

This is by no means an exaggerated picture of his method, and we can readily appreciate that though his picture is hardly credible as a living portraiture, it is vastly impressive - especially if we can be brought to accept the possibility of existence for such a character. I shall hope to show later that in his one use of this method, Shakespeare did succeed in making him credible and thus brought the type to its highest possible development.

As we look at Marlowe's work to-day we can hardly admit that his heroes always are credible. The audience of a modern representation of Marlowe's Jew of Malta apparently found the task beyond their power.¹ But in Marlowe's time few in his audience questioned the matter so closely. They acclaimed with enthusiasm these super-men whose insatiable longings were after all the dramatic representation of the Renaissance spirit. An age which believed in the power of alchemy and searched for the fountain of eternal youth found nothing impossible. The avid interest with which such an audience acclaimed Marlowe's heroes exerted a powerful effect on the entire tendency of the drama, for an audience which had watched the accomplishments of Tamburlaine and Faustus would not

1. Blackwood's, Dec. 22, Vol. 212, pp. 833-4.

again admire tragedy of a less absorbing interest. Rambling narratives of "life and death", even the absorbing interest of Senecan crime, now had to give way to "the heroic struggle of a great personality doomed to inevitable defeat."

John Addington Symonds has given the term "L'Amour de l'impossible" to the overwhelming ambition of Marlowe's heroes. The leading motive he says is: "the love or lust of unattainable things; beyond the reach of physical force, of sensual faculty, of mastering will; but not beyond the scope of man's inordinate desire, man's infinite capacity for happiness, man's ever craving thirst for beauty, power, and knowledge."¹ The motive in each play may be thus summed up: in Tamburlaine it is the desire for world power; in Faustus, knowledge; in The Jew of Malta, riches; in Edward 11, affection; in Dido, love. In the same way, Guise in The Massacre at Paris is dominated by ambition. A few quotations will illustrate this dominance of insatiable desire. Tamburlaine says that he and his men,

in conceit bear Empires on our speares,
Affecting thoughts coequal with the cloudes. 2

Faustus exclaims,

O what a world of profit and delight,
Of power, of honour, of omnipotence
is promised to the studious Artizan?
All things that move between the quiet poles
Shall be at my command. 3

1. J.A.Symonds - Shakesp. Predecessors, p. 486.

2. Tamb. 1, I, ii, 260 3. Faustus, 81.

The Jew of Malta wishes for,

Infinite riches in a little roome. 1

Guise expresses the same inordinate ambition,

Set me to scale the high Peramides,
And thereon set the Diadem of Fraunce,
Ile either rend it with my nayles to naught,
Or mount the top with my aspiring winges,
Although my downfall be the deepest hell. 2

It is this intensity of desire which elevates the theme of Marlowe's drama. We can grant that his characters are often monstrous or absurd, but the drama is saved from the sordid or the ridiculous by the grandeur of the emotion by which it is motivated.

An examination of the career of Tamburlaine will serve to show both the monstrous and the absurd. Tamburlaine boasts,

I hold the Fates bound fast in yron chaines,
And with my hand turne Fortunes wheel about,
And sooner shall the Sun fall from his Spheare,
Than Tamburlaine be slaine or ouercome. 3

He carries a king about with him in a cage and yokes others to his chariots; he cuts his arm to show his children how to endure pain and stabs one of his sons because he is a coward. The death of Zenocrate moves him to a burst of fury:

What, is she dead? Techelles, draw thy sword,
And wound the earth, that it may cleave in twaine,

1. Jew of Malta, I, i, 72.
2. Massacre at Paris, 100.
3. Tamburlaine, I, ii, 369.

And we discend into th'infernall vaults,
 To haile the fatall Sisters by the haire,
 And throw them in the triple mote of Hell,
 For taking hence my faire Zenocrate. 1

And he destroys the town in which she died because it has robbed him of his love.

But the end of all this is defeat. With Tamburlaine the defeat comes as death which he cannot avoid with all his bluster,

"For Tamburlaine, the Scourge of God must die." 2

The same general tendencies might be observed in the careers of Marlowe's other heroes.

In what way has Shakespeare been influenced by this conception of tragedy? In one play he copies the method closely and that is in Richard III. Here we have the same type of protagonist, and his career offers an interesting parallel. Richard III is dominated by the same overwhelming ambition, and his career runs through as incredible a series of events as ever marked the course of Tamburlaine. Says Jusserand: "Corpses are brought once more all gory on the stage. If actual beheadings offer difficulties, at least all the preparations are made before us, the last speech of the victim is delivered in our presence, ... the axe falls behind the scenes, and the instant after the head is brought in." 3 And in the end Richard meets the

1. 2 Tamburlaine, II, iii, 3064.

2. 2 Tamburlaine, V, iii, 4641.

3. Jusserand, III, p. 189.

same defeat that overcame Marlowe's heroes, though here it comes in a fashion more akin to the conclusion of Doctor Faustus than of Tamburlaine. Tamburlaine's death is not conceived by Marlowe as a punishment for any laws transgressed; the dramatist has exhausted his material, Tamburlaine has blustered his way from one conquest to another and now that the material is exhausted, he must cease to be in order that the play may come to a close, and accordingly he dies. The death of Zenocrate might perhaps be regarded as a preparation for Tamburlaine's defeat but Marlowe makes no effort to use this scene to that end. It stands as an isolated incident in the midst of Tamburlaine's achievements, inspires a beautiful lyrical passage, but in no way prepares for the catastrophe. In fact, the death of Tamburlaine can not be regarded as a catastrophe at all, since there is no conscious art in bringing it about and it merely results from exhaustion of material. In Doctor Faustus Marlowe consciously prepares for the end by developing the growing sense of guilt in Faustus, and the growing horror of his punishment. A few lines quoted from the last scene will serve to show this.

The clock strikes eleven and in another hour the devil will come for his soul:

F. Ah Faustus,
Now hast thou but one bare hower to live,
And then thou must be damnd perpetually:

Stand stil you euer moouing spheres of heauen,
That time may cease, and midnight neuer come:

Then comes the effective passage from the Amores which Marlowe has inserted with unerring ear for harmony and grandeur:

O lente, lente curite noctis equi:

The starres mooue stil, time runs, the clocke wil strike,
The diuel wil come, and Faustus must be damnd.

Finally in spite of the devil's abjuration he calls three times on Christ:

See see where Christs blood streames in the firmament,
One drop would saue my soula, halfe a drop, ah my Christ.
Ah rend not my heart for naming of my Christ,
Yet wil I call on him: oh spare me Lucifer!

And the measure quickens with the last brief struggle:

Vgly hell gape not, come not Lucifer,
Ile burne my bookes, ah Mephastophilis. 1

Then all is over. The students enter to find only the mangled body from which the fiend has exacted his fearful price.

In the same way Shakespeare prepares us for the death of Richard. The resolution which has sustained him throughout his career, fails him at the close. We see him exercise his devilish power for the last time in his meeting with Queen Elizabeth. (Act IV, Scene iv.) Then Ratcliffe and Catesby enter to announce the arrival of Richmond's fleet, and Richard breaks down:

K.Rich Some light-foot friend post to the Duke of
Norfolk:

Ratcliff, thyself, or Catesby; where is he?

Cate. Here, my good lord.

K.Rich. Catesby, fly to the duke.

Cate. I will, my lord, with all convenient haste.

1. Dr. Faustus, 1419.

K. Rich. Ratcliff, come hither. Post to Salisbury;
When thou com'st thither, - (To Catesby) Dull,
unmindful villain,

Why stay'st thou here, and go'st not to the duke?
Cate. First, mighty liege, tell me your highness'
pleasure,

What from your Grace I shall deliver to him.

K. Rich. O! true, good Catesby; bid him levy straight
The greatest strength and power he can make,
And meet me suddenly at Salisbury.

Cate. I go.

Rat. What, may it please you, shall I do at Salisbury?

K. Rich. Why, what wouldst thou do there before I go?

Rat. Your highness told me I should post before.

Enter Stanley.

K. Rich. My mind is chang'd. 1.

He has no confidence in his followers nor any in himself.

He has not "that alacrity of spirit nor cheer of mind" 2

that he was wont to have; he is afflicted by the ghosts of
his former victims; till at last he cries out in despair,
"O Ratcliff! I fear, I fear." 3

Here then Shakespeare drew a typical Marlovian hero;
he dominates the play by the immensity of his desires; he
performs acts as incredible as those of Tamburlaine's; but
in the end Fate is too much for him and he meets defeat.
Finally the catastrophe which ends the play is drawn in
a similar manner to that in Doctor Faustus.

where Shakespeare succeeds more than Marlowe is
in the plausibility of his character. Richard III has
always been and still remains one of the most successful
plays for a great actor. Obviously the play of the super-

1. Richard III, IV, iv, 441 seqq.

2. Ibid, V, iii, 73.

3. Ibid, V, iii, 215.

man offers great possibilities for an actor; the personality of Alleyn must have helped considerably in the impression made by Marlowe's plays. But as already indicated, we to-day would refuse to believe in Marlowe's heroes. Yet we are still able to believe in Richard and to a large extent this is due to the "vigorous colloquialism of his speeches." "In the main," says Thorndike, "he speaks with a naturalness and directness far greater than was usual in tragic heroes, and the natural-speaking Richard often makes plausible and convincing the theatrical and rhetorical villain."¹ Moreover he is surrounded by characters who are not natural and by contrast with these he gains in credibility. From the very first, too, he appeals to our sympathy to palliate his crime. It is his deformity, says Richard, that has made him an outcast from mankind. We cannot withhold our pity as we realise how great has been his incentive to crime, and we feel that such incentive makes possible even such a career as his.

Richard III may therefore, be regarded as the final development of Marlowe's type of tragedy. It was impossible to ring many changes upon the one-man play. For one thing the type called for a certain sameness of treatment, for another, only a few characters could lend themselves to that form of development, and when these were exhausted

1. Thorndike p. 122.

the form would have to cease from lack of material. It left, however, one valuable contribution to dramatic form which will be dealt with later.

o o o

V. The Machiavellian Element.

Italy contributed a great deal to the Elizabethan stage. This influence was threefold, first through the Senecan plays, secondly through Italian romantic drama, and lastly through the doctrines of Machiavelli, and in all three cases one important result was the determination of the character of the stage villain. Accordingly this became one bequest made by the Elizabethan drama to the drama of succeeding times.^{1.}

Senecan tragedy was largely occupied with tales of unnatural sin. Apparently Elizabethan audiences revelled in scenes of appalling crime and a tragedy to be successful had to end with a stage strewn with corpses. Besides this inheritance from the drama of Seneca a similar trend was given by the introduction of a more modern Italian influence which added a touch of passionate romance to the same theme of unnatural crime. To this class belong such plays as Tancred and Gismunda. Lastly this phase of the drama was further encouraged by a great interest in the doctrines of Machiavelli. Machiavelli died in 1527 and almost immediately became regarded in European minds as the incarnation of diabolical cunning. The book, Il Principe which set forth his political convictions circulated widely in Europe,

1. Thorndike p. 310.

and its effect on political morals became immediately evident. Probably one reason why Machiavelli's doctrines spread so rapidly was that they were an adequate expression of a general tendency towards moral laxness in politics. Obviously a book will not become popular unless it does answer a need of its age, but there is no doubt that Machiavelli's doctrines intensified this tendency. Court-hope gives an instance of this. When King John of France failed to secure the amount of his ransom, he returned to captivity as the only honourable thing to do. After the spread of the Machiavellian doctrines, a later king of France, Francis I, did not hesitate to break his parole d'honneur, and seek to justify his action. This is a striking instance of the influence of Machiavelli. His influence in England was exemplified by the so-called Italianate Englishman who sought to put into ordinary practice the same principles. Since the doctrine of Machiavelli were so wide spread, one would expect to find traces of it in the drama, and especially so since it could easily be incorporated into the theme of the Senecan or romantic plays.

At least one play under the name of Machiavelli appears in the pages of Henslowe¹ and a number of allusions to him can be found in the Elizabethan writings. We

1. Diary pp 13-14 for 1591 and hence after Marlowe's play.

would expect Marlowe to be fascinated by the subject on account of the opportunity it gave him for the portraiture of another aspect of virtu. A touch of Machiavelli had appeared earlier, however, in one play which we still possess - Kyd's Spanish Tragedy. One of Lorenzo's motives for the slaying of Horatio would appear to be a desire to commit crime for its own sake. This, however, is but a subsidiary element in the play. In The Jew of Malta, Marlowe raises the theme to a dominant place by making his protagonist the exponent of Machiavellian doctrine. We believe, therefore, that Kyd first introduced the Machiavellian note in a play which probably preceded The Jew of Malta, but so far as we know, it is to Marlowe that the honour belongs of drawing the first protagonist dominated by Machiavellian motives.

Before going further, just what is meant by the 'Machiavellian note' had better be defined. It seems to be summed up by the twofold idea of crime and duplicity. The villain was not only to commit such horrible crimes as were to be included in the play, but he was to glory in doing them; carry out crimes without cause for the pure joy of plotting and giving suffering to others; be without compunction and without remorse.

The catastrophe in a tragedy does not pre-suppose

a wicked character who is its cause. Sufficient cause for a catastrophe may often be found in the nature of the circumstance of the protagonist, or in a combination of these two. The tragedy of Oedipus Rex, for instance was not precipitated from without, In our own literature, the non-kingly elements of the nature of Richard II are sufficient to explain his downfall without having to regard Bolingbroke as a villain who precipitates the fall. However the pre-occupation with crime of English Senecan tragedy necessitated a villain who could be responsible for a sufficient number of sudden deaths, murders and suicides to make the theatre a successful rival for the bear-baitings and cockfights which would otherwise attract the multitude. In the earlier plays, the villain had had a reason for committing his crimes; Porrex slew his brother in order to obtain the crown; Tancred was inspired by a desire to separate Gismunda from her lover. But the Machiavellian villain found a joy in the performance of crime quite apart from any benefits to result therefrom.

At the commencement of The Jew of Malta, the prologue is spoken by Machiavelli in person:

Albeit the world thinke Macheuill is dead,
 yet was his soule but flowne beyond the Alpes,
 And now the Guize is dead, is come from France
 To view this Land, and frolicke with his friends.
 To some perhaps my name is odious,
 But such as loue me, gard me from their tongues,

And let them know that I am Macheuill,
 And weigh not men, and therefore not mens words:
 Admir'd I am of those that hate me most.
 Though some speake openly against my bookes,
 yet will they reade me, and thereby attaine
 To Peters Chayre: And when they cast me off,
 Are poyson'd by my climbing followers.
 I count religion but a childish Toy,
 And hold there is no sinne but ignorance.

we are told with no uncertainty that the protagonist is to resemble Machiavelli in character:

I craue but this, Grace him as he deserves,
 And let him not be entertain'd the worse
 Because he fauours me.

Having spoken the prologue, Machiavelli then leaves the stage to Barabas who proceeds to carry out the twofold role of crime and duplicity. This duplicity, however, it must be understood extends only in the relationship between the protagonist and the other characters in the play. To the audience, the Machiavellian hero is engagingly frank in order that they may appreciate how completely he is deceiving the others. "Barabas", says Thorndike, "is conceived under the inspiration of Machiavelli and perhaps also of stage practice, as an intriguing villain with all the accompaniments ever since familiar in drama and fiction. He is the source of all evil, and utterly without conscience; he avows his villany (sic) to the audience and he works by crafty intrigue with the aid of an equally conscienceless accomplice."¹ A short survey of his career will illustrate his methods.

In the beginning of the play we have some sympathy for Barabas since his wrongs at least give motive for his hatred of the governor, but it is not long before his crimes seem to be inspired by a sort of universal hatred. The wrongs he has suffered at the hands of the governor are not a sufficient explanation of the motive which makes him set Don Mathias and Lodowick to slay each other, and he soon commits one crime after another without any motive at all. He poisons his daughter because she has deserted him and his hatred extends to the entire convent in which she has taken refuge; when the city is besieged he begins a lengthy coil of deception and intrigue which finally causes his own death by the instrument he has prepared for others. Barabas gives us a picture of his own nature in his conversation with Ithamore:

Bar. Hast thou no Trade? then listen to my words,
And I will teach that shall sticke by thee:
first be thou voyd of these affections,
Compassion, loue, vaine hope, and hartless feare,
Be mou'd at nothing, see thou pittie none,
But to thy selfe smile when the Christians moane. ¹

He describes his actions thus:

As for my selfe, I walke abroad a nights
And kill sicke people groaning under walls:..
and now and then, to cherish Christian theeves,
I am content to lose some of my Crownes;
That I may, walking in my Gallery,
See 'em goe pinion'd along by my doore.
Being young, I studied Physicke, and began
to practise first vpon the italian;
there I enric'h'd the Priests with burials,

1. Act II, 11932 seqq.

And alwayes kept the Sexton's armes in ure
 With digging graues and ringing dead mens knels:
 And after that was I an Engineere,
 And in the warres 'twixt France and Germanie
 Vnder pretence of helping Charles the fifth,
 Slew friend and enemy with my stratagems.
 Then after that was I an Vserer,
 And with extorting, cozening, forfeiting,
 And tricks belonging vnto Brokery,
 I fill'd the Iales with Bankrouts in a yeare,
 And with young Orphans planted Hospitals,
 And euery Moone made some or other mad,
 And now and then one hang himselfe for grieve,
 Pinning vpon his breast a long great Scrowle
 How I with interest tormented him.

Ithamore will not be outdone by his master but describes himself as occupied,

In setting Christian villages on fire,
 Chaining of Eunuches, binding gally-slaues.
 One time I was an Hostler in an Inne,
 And in the night time secretly would I steale
 To trauellers Chambers, and therecut their throats:
 Once at Ierusalem, where the pilgrims kneel'd,
 I strowed powder on the Marble stones,
 And therewithall their knees would ranckle, so
 That I haue laugh'd agood to see the cripples
 Goe limping home to Christendome on stilts.

It will be seen from this that Ithamore still further stresses the Machiavellian motif. In both characters the same joy is evinced at conceiving and executing evil, both are utterly without pity for their victim or remorse for their crime. Nor does Barabas break down when he sees himself foiled at last, but dies resolutely breathing forth his latest hate. The Machiavellian note is sustained to the end.

In the prologue to The Jew of Malta there is a reference to the Guise. This character appears in a later play

by Marlowe, The Massacre at Paris where though not the protagonist he is once more the exponent of the Machiavellian doctrine. He reveals himself in Scene 2, lines 91-166 as full of inordinate ambition which he cloaks under the guise of religion, and he too dies courageously.

We see, then, that Marlowe was much impressed by the Machiavellian type, and we are not surprised to find Shakespeare portraying the same character in one of the plays showing a Marlovian influence. The character of Richard III is developed in the Machiavellian manner. He declares his intentions on his first appearance:

I am determined to prove a villain,
And hate the idle pleasures of these days,
Plots have I laid, inductions dangerous,
By drunken prophecies, libels, and dreams,
To set my brother Clarence and the king
In deadly hate the one against the other:
And if King Edward be as true and just
As I am subtle, false, and treacherous,
This day should Clarence closely be mew'd up,
About a prophecy which says that G
Of Edward's heirs the murderer shall be.
Dive, thoughts, down to my soul: here Clarence comes. 1

Here we have all the Machiavellian characteristics; a frank confession to the audience of the intention to be a villain, a joy in deception of others and in the performance of evil deeds. The crimes that he commits and the deceptions that he practises would have rejoiced the heart of Barabas. Clarence regards him as his ally, when in reality

1. Richard III, Act I, 1, 30-41.

he is the instigator of his murder; Hastings goes unsus-
piciously to his death in the tower, congratulating himself
on having Gloucester's friendship:

Hast. His Grace looks cheerfully and smooth this
morning:

There's some conceit or other likes him well,
When that he bids good morrow with such spirit.
I think there's never a man in Christendom
Can lesser hide his hate or love than he;
For by his face straight shall you know his heart.

Stan. What of his heart perceived you in his face
By any livelihood he show'd to-day?

Hast. Marry, that with no man here he is offended;
For, were he, he had shown it in his looks. 1

Almost immediately Richard enters and Hastings is hurried
off to death.

Richard's duplicity and commanding magnetism are
both revealed early in the play. Anne, widow of Prince
Edward of Wales, enters following the dead body of Henry
VI. Her first speech is a long and terrible curse upon
Richard, the author of this deed and the cause of her
widowhood. When Richard enters, she reviles him and then
we are shown his amazing power over those he wishes to
influence. He is suave and patient, replying to her
insults by asserations of his love for her, till she
is interested by his very audacity. When she wishes her
eyes were basilisks that they might strike him dead, he
ventures everything by baring his breast and offering
her his sword that she may kill him:

1. Ibid, III^e ist, 48.

If thy revengeful heart cannot forgive,
 Lo! here I lend thee this sharp-pointed sword;
 Which if thou please to hide in this true breast,
 And let the soul forth that adoreth thee,
 I lay it open to the deadly stroke,
 And humbly beg the death upon my knees.

(he lays his breast open: she offers at it with
 his sword.)

Nay, do not pass for I did kill King Henry;
 But 'twas thy beauty that provoked me.
 Nay, now dispatch; 'twas I that stabb'd young Edward;
 (she again offers at his breast.)
 But 'twas thy heavenly face that set me on.
 (She lets fall the sword.)
 Take up the sword again or take up me.

When she fails to carry out her threat he knows that Anne
 is conquered, and it is a Machiavellian conquest for
 hardly is she off the stage before he exclaims:

Was ever woman in this humour woo'd?
 Was ever woman in this humour won?
 I'll have her; but I will not keep her long. 1

Before the play is over, Anne dies of a broken heart, and
 with equal perfidy Richard woos his niece through the
 mediation of her mother. His success in persuading Eliza-
 beth to favour his suit to her daughter only rouses fresh
 scorn for the victim of his duplicity:

Relenting fool, and shallow, changing woman! 2

Thus far then, Shakespeare followed the type closely. The
 conclusion, however, is not borrowed from Marlowe's
 pictures of Machiavelli, but is influenced by another
 aspect of Marlowe's art, and can therefore be ignored
 here.

1. Ibid, I, ii, 175 seqq.

2. Ibid, IV, iv, 432.

A trace of Marlowe's influence can again be seen in a play written during Shakespeare's maturity. Iago is not a Marlowean progeny in the same way that Richard III is, but he reveals Machiavellian characteristics which seem to have been inspired by the same source. Like Ithamore in The Jew of Malta he is a servant of the protagonist whom he deceives, and he confesses his duplicity in the first scene:

I follow him to serve my turn upon him;
 It is as sure as you are Roderigo,
 Were I the Moor, I would not be Iago:
 In following him, I follow but myself;
 Heaven is my judge, not I for love and duty,
 But seeming so, for my peculiar end:
 For when my outward action doth demonstrate
 The native act and figure of my heart
 In compliment extern, 'tis not long after
 But I will wear my heart upon my sleeve
 For daws to peck at: I am not what I am. 1

It might be Barabas who gives the advice of Act I, Scene 3, "Put money in thy purse." The series of crimes which Iago plans are in the Machiavellian tradition, and one scene is based on a very similar incident in The Jew of Malta. In the same way that Barabas incited Don Mathias and Ludowigo to kill each other, Iago incites Cassio and Roderigo. The similarity of this touch convinces us of the reality of the Marlowian influence even in a play so far removed from Shakespeare's period of apprenticeship.

We have seen then that Marlowe not only gave a
 1. *Othello*, I, i, 42seqq.

distinctly Machiavellian twist to the Elizabethan villain, but that he elevated him to the position of protagonist. In Richard III, Shakespeare developed his theme in a similar manner. Finally in the play of Othello though the Machiavellian character is no longer the protagonist, he reappears with a distinct trace of Marlovian influence in the character of Iago.

o o o

VI

VI. Conscience as a Factor.

The psychological element was not a factor in the English Senecan plays. If a crime was committed, the audience was informed of the motive, it is true, but neither the thoughts of the criminal before the crime nor his later re-action were dwelt upon, nor were the thoughts of those affected by the crime of any greater importance. A consideration of Gorboduc will reveal at once the truth of this. Here there is no insistence whatever on the psychological effect of the action. Though murders are committed, we are not concerned with the psychological ~~effect of the action~~ influence of these acts. One act becomes the motive for the next while apparent simplicity of motive and singleness of intention governs the action in each case.

It is perhaps natural that primitive drama should concentrate its attention primarily upon event, and that the re-action of the individual to event, should occupy the attention of a more cultivated period. The mind of an age of greater advance finds it impossible to contemplate intense physical suffering for with advance has come opportunity for introspection and as one enters into the feelings of the victims, refinement of torture becomes impossible. This tendency toward introspection which we find has accom-

paralleled the development of man in real life, shows itself in the drama by a greater emphasis upon the psychological effect of action on the characters in the drama.

Some preparation for this form of drama, however, was made by the old moralities. These delighted to represent good and evil angels struggling for the control of a man's soul. In these allegories, the good and evil which was in man's nature was personified and as real characters interfered in the course of the action.

What the psychological drama did, was to refine this material of the old moralities till the conflict became no longer external but internal. The firmly defined character of these external influences became, in the more highly developed form, the varying motives which ebb and flow in man's nature. Man's nature is not simple but complex - there is no clear-cut distinction between human impulses but all merge and inter-act to produce the final result. Recognition of this great truth will alone produce tragedy in its highest form. In this section, then, we will be concerned with three questions: who first recognised this principle in the drama, what was Marlowe's contribution, and where did Shakespeare copy from him?

The first play to devote attention to this feature was probably Kyd's Spanish Tragedy. The date of this play

is not definitely established, but while there is some doubt as to whether or not it preceded Tamburlaine, the majority of critics would place it before Doctor Faustus. Tamburlaine had no hesitations, no moments of doubt or distrust: the psychological aspect is entirely lacking in this play. In the Spanish Tragedy however, this feature is stressed in Hieronimo, who may be said to have been the precursor of Hamlet. His irresolution, his suspicion of the motives of those around him, the breaking down of his mind under the strain of his mental suffering, - all this is a new note in the drama, and all this may be found again in Shakespeare's masterpiece.

The one play of Marlowe's in which the psychological element appears is Doctor Faustus. This element, as we have pointed out, is lacking in Tamburlaine, and it is equally missing from The Jew of Malta. Meditation of a melancholy cast is found in Edward II but nothing approaching the absorption with mental reactions to outside events, which is what we mean by the psychological factor. It is possible that the entrance of this element in Doctor Faustus is traceable to the influence of Kyd, but the use made of it by Marlowe is original.

In The Spanish Tragedy as in Hamlet, the psychological absorption interferes with the possibility of action on

the part of one who has a great incentive to action - the avenging of a personal injury; that is, in both these plays it is still connected with the revenge element of the Senecan tragedy. In Marlowe, the psychological element appears as the working of conscience in the mind of one who has sinned; that is, it appears for the first time unconnected with the revenge element. It is this element of conscience which is new in Marlowe, and which is unique in Doctor Faustus of all his works. We have shown that, as a rule, Marlowe regards the action of his plays in an unmoral fashion; the rightness or wrongness of an action does not interest him, he is interested in the achievements of his characters only as these achievements are the result of the hero's virtu. In Faustus he rises higher, for the first time clearly differentiates between right and wrong, and brings out the idea of punishment for those who break the moral laws. The growth of this concern over the moral aspect of his action, it is interesting to trace in Faustus.

In the early scenes, we find Marlowe introducing, under the influence of the old moralities good and evil angels who attempt to influence the actions of Faustus. These angels may be considered as personifications of the two forces struggling for mastery in his brain, but they disappear eventually, giving room altogether to the mental

weighing of the arguments for and against his actions of which they had been the living embodiment. That they were intended to represent this struggle can be seen from their close co-ordination with the thoughts of Faustus. Here is their final appearance:

Fau. I, goe accursed spirit to vgly hell,
Tis thou hast damn'd distressed Faustus soule:
Ist not too late?

Enter good Angell and euill.

Euill A. Too late.

Good A. Neuer too late, if Faustus can repent.

Euill A. If thou repent diuels shall teare thee in peeces.

Good A. Repent, & they shal neuer race thy skin.

Exeunt (Angels).

Fau. Ah Christ my Sauour,
Seeke to saue distressed Faustus soule. 1

We notice here that their warnings are in the form that Faustus' own communings would have taken, but much greater force was given to the conception by the disappearance of these spirits and the consequent absorption in the mental struggle.

At first there is no trace of irresolution in Faustus. He exclaims proudly, (Scene

Had I as many soules as there be starres,
I'd giue them al for Maphastophilis: 2

Later comes doubt and hesitation, and this continual struggle between the two sides of his nature is the dominant interest in the play. Faustus has changed indeed when he exclaims:

Accursed Faustus, where is mercie now?
I do repent, and yet I do dispaire:
Hell stripes with grace for conquest in my breast,
What shall I do to shun the snares of death? 3

1. Dr. Faustus 688. 2. Ibid, 338. 3. Ibid, 1300.

But almost instantly he renews his bargain with Lucifer and begs pardon for having been false to his agreement. And so he fluctuates from joy in the power he has bought to fear at the thought of the price he must pay. The end is agony:

Oh God,
 If thou wilt not haue mercy on my soule,
 Yet for Christs sake, whose bloud hath ransomed me,
 Impose some end to my incessant paine.
 Let Faustus liue in hel a thousand yeeres,
 A hundred thousand, and at last be sau'd.
 O no end is limited to damned soules,
 Why wert thou not a creature wanting soule?
 Or, why is this immortall that thou hast?
 Ah Pythagoras metemscosis, were that true,
 This soule should flie from me, and I be changde
 Vnto some brutish beast: al beasts are happy,
 For when they die,
 Their soules are soone dissolud in elements,
 But mine must liue still to be plagde in hel:
 Curst be the parents that ingendred me:
 No Faustus, curse thy selfe, curse Lucifer,
 That hath depriude thee of the ioyes of heauen.

Here then is one of the first great studies of a soul in anguish.

The play of Shakespeare's which may be said to have been definitely influenced by this new tendency in Marlowe's drama, is Richard III. Shakespeare was always interested in character development and we find instance after instance of emotional conflict in his plays; take, for example, the pitiful effect of remorse on Lady Macbeth. In concentrating on this aspect of mental struggle Shakespeare was undoubtedly influenced by both Marlowe and Kyd. We have already suggested that Kyd's influence was probably supreme in Hamlet; the

1. Ibid, 1452.

emotional conflict in Macbeth, however, is more nearly akin to Marlowe's treatment in Doctor Faustus. This type of conflict he had learnt to handle by copying Marlowe's methods in Richard III.

The entire play, as we have already seen, was conceived in the Marlovian manner. At first Richard is pure Machiavelli: we can see no remorse, no mental conflict whatever throughout the whole period of his success. This appears, however, with the reversal of his fortunes. There is absolutely no explanation for Richard's break-down other than the feeling of remorse which cripples the power of his will. He himself tells us that the odds are all on his side:

K.Rich. Who hath descried the number of the traitors?

Nor. Six or seven thousand is their utmost power.

K.Rich. Why, our battalia trebles that account:

Besides, the king's name is a tower of strength,
which they upon the adverse faction want. 1

Yet when he falls asleep in his tent he is troubled by the ghosts of his former victims. The use of ghosts is, of course, a Senecan touch, but they may be regarded - like the angels in Faustus - as an attempt to give reality to the thronging visions which assail his mind. After they leave, Richard starts up and we see him assailed by the same horrible doubts that afflicted Faustus.

Have mercy, Jesu! Soft! I did but dream.

O coward conscience, how dost thou afflict me! 2

1. Richard III, V, iii, 9

2. Ibid, V, iii, 177.

And again,

My conscience hath a thousand several tongues,
And every tongue brings in a several tale,
~~And every~~ tale condemns me for a villain.
Perjury, perjury, in the high'st degree;
Murder, stern murder, in the dir'st degree;
All several sins, all us'd in each degree,
Throng to the bar, crying all, 'Guilty! guilty! 1

Note the suggestion that the ghosts were but thoughts flying through Richard's brain. The working of conscience throughout is very similar to that workings of conscience in Faustus. At the last he tries to throw off the influence of this remorse which is unmanning him:

Let not ^{our} babbling ~~dreams~~ affright our souls;
Conscience is a ^{word} that cowards use,
Devis'd ~~at~~ first to keep the strong in awe:
Our strong arms be our conscience, swords our law. 2

It is surprising how often the word 'conscience' does appear in the play. The last place where we would expect to meet it is in the speeches of the professional murderers, and yet note:

Sec. Murd. The urging of that word 'judgment' hath bred a kind of remorse in me.

First Murd. What! art thou afraid?

Sec. Murd. Not to kill him, having a warrant for it; but to be damn'd for killing him, ~~from~~ the which no warrant can defend me.....

First Murd. How dost thou feel thyself now?

Sec. Murd. Some certain dregs of conscience are yet within me.

First Murd. Remember our reward when the deed's done.

Sec. Murd. 'Zounds! he dies: I had forgot the reward.

First Murd. Where's thy conscience now?

Sec. Murd. In the Duke of Gloucester's purse.

First Murd. So when he opens his purse to give us our reward, thy conscience flies out.

Sec. Murd. 'Tis no matter; let it go: there's few or none will entertain it. 3

Again after the murder has been committed, Tyrell describes how the scoundrels were affected by the deed. "Both" he says, "are gone with conscience and remorse."¹ Professional murderers are the last people whom one would expect to be so affected, especially since in the drama they were little more than conventional figures. That they should have been used to intensify the motif of remorse, shows how greatly Shakespeare was affected by the idea of conscience in the drama.

The same theme reappears in another of the plays of this early period. King John is not a play which bears many signs of being composed under Marlowe's influence, but the same idea of remorse enters into it, though it does not play as big a part here as in Richard III. In Act IV, Scene iii, when John is questioning Hubert to whom he has entrusted the murder of the young prince Arthur, one of the nobles says of the king,

The colour of the king doth come and go
Between his purpose and his conscience,
Like heralds 'twixt two dreadful battles set. 2

As we have seen that this idea of remorse for crime is a new feature in Marlowe, this again must be considered as conceived under Marlovian influence.

One other feature must be mentioned before the subject is abandoned. It is a natural tendency in the drama of

1. IV, iii, 20

2. John IV, ii, 76.

psychological reaction to make a great use of soliloquy. This feature was brought into the English drama through Senecan tragedy, but its development is closely connected with the drama of mental emotion. An examination of Tamburlaine reveals the hero frequently expressing his intentions in speeches of great length, but invariably before others who act as auditors to his harangue. The idea of communion with self went hand in hand with the idea of a mental struggle. This mental struggle is most vivid when one is alone and hence has to be revealed in soliloquy. Kyd had realised this in The Spanish Tragedy and the first use of it in Marlowe comes in Doctor Faustus. It was also of value to express the machinations of the Machiavellian conspirators and hence reappears in The Jew of Malta. Richard III uses it for both purposes. At first it is the instrument by which he reveals his coolly-calculated crimes; at the end it is the instrument of his great emotional struggle. The soliloquies in Hamlet and Macbeth show the final development of this instrument. If the use in Hamlet owes little to Marlowe, the use in Macbeth would seem to be a development of Richard III revealing the same communings with conscience which distinguish its use in Doctor Faustus.

To sum up then. It may be said that Marlowe gave to the psychological drama which had been introduced by Kyd a new development by introducing the element of conscience.

It is in Macbeth that Shakespeare developed this form to its highest possibility, but in Richard III he appears to be acting very closely under the influence of Marlowe and he introduces the workings of conscience in another early play, King John. Finally the drama of psychological development both in Kyd and Marlowe made use of the soliloquy and this feature, too, was adopted by Shakespeare.

o o o

VII. The Weakling as a Hero.

It seems almost incredible that Marlowe, who gave us so many pictures of the resolute hero should first have employed irresolution as a tragic motive. Yet this is what we find in Edward II and the same theme was adopted by Shakespeare in his Richard II. Let us examine the nature and extent of this similarity.

It is easy to see why no previous dramatist had attempted to write a play with a weakling as the hero. The type did not lend itself to Senecan crime, and it was impossible as the hero of a romantic play, for both these needed a strong character. Weakness could only become interesting in the drama as the psychological motives to action began to absorb the interest of the dramatist and as we have seen interest in the analysing of motives began with Kyd and Marlowe. The characters of The Spanish Tragedy, however, were not weaklings so that this particular form of the psychological play is traceable to Marlowe alone.

The discovery of dramatic value in weakness of character rather than in strength is a distinct contribution to dramatic art, and Marlowe is more especially to be commended for the discovery since the type is not natural to his genius, which delighted in the actions of such supermen as we have already outlined. Our admiration increases,

moreover, as we realise not only that he first discovered this possibility but that working with so different a theme, he produced a play of such merit that it is by many regarded as his masterpiece.

Edward II, however, is not altogether apart from Marlowe's earlier heroes. He, too, is dominated by a single emotion, in this instance, a desire for affection. But instead of causing the protagonist to accomplish the impossible even though defeat came at last, this emotion in Edward is the cause of his weakness. The same emotion motivates Shakespeare's Richard II and with the same result. However, Shakespeare has given us a fuller picture of Richard's character than was drawn by Marlowe. It was not his method to disregard the complexities of human nature in order to bring out in bold relief one emotion only. Richard is a weakling, and he is passionately attached to his friends. But he is much more than this. We know him as loving his country with almost feminine feeling, as an unstable nature rising to heights of emotion, and sinking to the lowest depths of despair with little cause in either case, and chiefly we know him as a sentimentalist. It is interesting to note that though the trait is not so fully developed in Edward's character; yet it is not wholly lacking. Compare the following passages from the two plays:

O hadst thou euer beene a king, thy hart
 Pierced deeply with sence of my distresse,
 Could not but take compassion of my state.
 Stately and proud, in riches and in traine,
 Whilom I was powerfull and full of pompe,
 But what ~~vs~~ he, whome rule and emperie
 Haue not in life or death made miserable?
 Come Spencer, come Baldocke, come sit downe by me,
 Make triall now of that philosophie,
 That in our famous nurseries of artes
 Thou suckedst from Plato, and from Aristotle,
 rather, this life contemplatiue is heauen,
 O that I might this life in quiet lead,
 But we alas are chaste, and you my friends,
 Your liues and my dishonor they pursue.
 Yet gentle monkes, for treasure, golde nor fee,
 Do you betray vs and our companie. 1

The same thoughts pass through Richard's mind:

Of comfort no man speak:
 Let's talk of graves, of worms and epitaphs;
 Make dust our paper, and with rainy eyes
 write sorrow on the bosom of the earth;
 Let's choose executors and talk of wills:
 And yet not so, for what can we bequeath
 Save our deposed bodies to the ground?
 Our lands, our liues, and all are Bolingbroke's,
 And nothing can we call our own but death,
 And that small model of the barren earth
 Which serves as paste and cover to our bones.
 For God's sake, let us sit upon the ground
 And tell sad stories of the death of kings:
 How some have been deposed, some slain in war,
 Some haunted by the ghosts they have deposed,
 Some poisoned by their wives, some sleeping kill'd
 All murder'd for within the hollow crown
 That rounds the mortal temples of a king
 Keeps death his court, and there the antick sits,
 Scoffing his state and grinning at his pomp....2

So similar in thought and construction are the two
 plays throughout, that a comparison is almost inevitable.

We have seen the similarity of character in the two protag-

1. Edward II. 1876.
2. Richard II. III, ii. 144.

onists; let us next consider the use made of the minor characters, and finally examine the construction of the two plays.

For the first time in this play Marlowe makes an effort to abandon the one-man play and present a series of independent pictures. Hence a number of characters are given definite development; Mortimer, Gaveston, Spencer, and Isabella. are all developed beyond Marlowe's usual custom. Let us examine each of these characters in order to determine their place in the story of the weakling hero, and then turning to Shakespeare, see if he has made any similar use of his minor characters.

Two of the characters developed by Marlowe are the king's favorites - Gaveston and Spencer - and may therefore be compared with Bushy, Bagot, and Green, in Richard II. We have to admit that Marlowe's favorites are better characterised than Shakespeare's, but in both plays they perform the same function - it is the king's devotion to these favorites which is largely responsible for his downfall.

But if Marlowe achieved greater success here than did Shakespeare in his play we cannot feel that his portrait of Isabella was equally successful. It is hard to free her from a charge of inconsistency, and this is a fault of which Shakespeare's Queen cannot be accused. At first Isabella is a loving wife, neglected by her husband, and

bearing her neglect with exemplary patience. Suddenly she changes, becomes her husband's most violent enemy working for his downfall, and not hesitating to abet his death. The change is not sufficiently explained and from the point of view of dramatic construction is indefensible. It has however been suggested that this change in Isabella's nature was probably a part of Marlowe's plan "to enlist the audience on the queen's side at first, as a loving and injured wife, and then after the reverse action was under way... to intensify pity for the victim by every device."¹ If we accept this interpretation we are at once struck by the similar use made of the queen by Shakespeare. Here we have no inexplicable change of character, but the love of Richard's queen for her husband is used to intensify our pity for the fallen monarch fully as much as is the hate of Isabella in Edward II. Thus Shakespeare achieves the same end as Marlowe though by different and dramatically more defensible means. Marlowe depicts the callous attitude of the queen in order to awaken our sympathies for the king's troubles. In two scenes Shakespeare introduces the queen for exactly the same purpose, to awaken our sympathies for the king. The first scene where this is done is in the scene ~~of Isabella's husband~~ ~~with the gardener~~ just after Richard has fallen into Bolingbroke's hands (III. iv.) and the second

1. Schelling - Chron. Play pp 72-3, quoting from Ed. II ed. by McLaughlin, 1894, p.162.

is in the pathetic farewell ~~sence~~ ^{scene} between husband and wife, which follows upon Richard's deposition. (V;1.)

Lastly, Mortimer, Edward's chief enemy, can be compared ~~to~~ Bolingbroke in Richard II. In Mortimer, Marlowe drew a character of the type dear to his heart - he is the familiar embodiment of boundless ambition, though here reduced to second place. But he is not much more "than a vulgar intriguer for the crown, playing on the starved affections of a weak woman, seeking to pervert the young prince." ¹ Shakespeare showed greater art in his conception of the character of Bolingbroke. He was no "vulgar intriguer" but an effective foil to the weakness of Richard's character, possessing all the attributes of greatness suitable to a monarch, the absence of which have led to Richard's downfall. We admire his character and are tempted to overlook his shadowy claims to the throne as we appreciate his eminent fitness for the position. Here, then, Shakespeare has ~~definitely~~ parted company with Marlowe, and going definitely past the one-man tragedy has prepared the way for the fuller canvas of his later plays.

Next let us consider the construction of the two plays. In both there is the same attempt to arouse contempt for the hero in prosperity and pity in adversity. Marlowe's Edward II alienates his barons by his stubborn determination to restore

1. Schelling, Chron. Play, p. 69.

his favorite to power, he robs and imprisons the Bishop of Coventry who has opposed him, and treats his wife with unrelenting harshness. Shakespeare's Richard II wastes the nation's money on his favorites and then makes good the deficit by farming out his taxes and forcing the nobles to contribute large gifts to his coffers. He does not even hesitate to rob the lands of his good uncle, John of Gaunt, and in Shakespeare's play as in Marlowe's, it is this stubborn insistence on his selfish desires that precipitates the tragedy. In some ways we do not feel that Shakespeare managed the material of his play as well as did Marlowe, notably in the useless addition of a second challenge scene, and in the diffusion of interest caused by the introduction of Aumerle's conspiracy. To a large extent, however, the plays move along very similar lines. Thus the deposition scene in Richard II, IV, 1, parallels with the same scene in Edward II 1987, and a quotation from both will serve to show the similarity in construction.

In Marlowe's play, the king is besought to give up his crown:

Leices. My lord, why waste you thus the time away?
They stay your answer, will you yeeld your crowne?

In Shakespeare's, Richard is asked:

To do that office of thine own good will
Which tired majesty did make thee offer,
The resignation of thy state and crown
To Henry Bolingbroke.

and again:

I thought you had been willing to resign....
Are you contented to resign the crown?

in which we see the same irresolution on the part of the
abdicating monarch. In both, the king removes the crown and
then thinks better of his action:

Here, take my crowne, the life of Edward too,
Two kings in England cannot raigne at once:
But stay a while, let me be king till night,
That I may gaze vpon this glittering crowne,
So shall my eyes receiue their last content,
My head, the latest honor dew to it,
And ioyntly both yeeld vp their wished right...
Inhumaine creatures, nurst with Tigers milke,
Why gape you for your soueraignes ouerthrow?
My diadem I meane, and guiltless life.
See monsters see, ile weare my crowne againe...

In Richard II the nature of Bolingbroke is, as always, con-
trasted with that of the king:

Richard. Give me the crown. Here, cousin, seize the crown:
Here cousin,
On this side my hand and on that side thine
Now is this golden crown like a deep well
That owes two buckets filling one another;
The emptier ever dancing in the air,
The other down, unseen and full of water:
That bucket down and full of tears am I,
Drinking my griefs, whilst you mount up on high.

It is then that he is asked if he is not willing to resign
and hastily giving Bolingbroke all the insignia of royalty
breaks out:

Make me, ~~that~~ nothing have, with nothing griev'd,
And thou with all pleas'd, that hast all achiev'd
Long mayst thou live in Richard's seat to sit,
And soon lie Richard in an earthy pit!

God save King Harry, unking'd Richard says,
And send him many years of sunshine days!

This is a close parallel of Edward's:

Make me despise this transitorie pompe,
And sit for aye inthronized in heauen,
Come death, and with thy fingers close my eyes,
Or if I liue, let me forget my selfe.

There is a somewhat similar re-action, too, in both plays.

Edward relieves himself after abdicating by tearing up the paper which entrusts him as prisoner to Matrevis and Gurney. One feels at once that this is just the pathetically impotent thing a weakling would do. In the same way, Shakespeare's Richard II relieves his feelings by dashing to pieces the mirror in which he has sought to read the alteration in his countenance which ought to have accompanied the alteration in his fortunes.

Having noted the great similarity in the construction of these scenes, we cannot but be surprised that the scene in Shakespeare's play was forbidden during the early productions for political reasons, while in Marlowe's it escaped censure.

In both plays, the abdication scene marks a change in the dramatist's attitude towards his protagonist, for he now uses every effort to make us pity the deposed monarch. We have already noted the use made of the queen to this end. In Shakespeare's play we have also the affecting account of

the king's entry into London. (Act. V, Scene 11.) Moreover Shakespeare attempts to gain sympathy for his monarch by giving him at his death the resolution he lacked in life;

(Enter Exton and Servants, armed.)

K. Rich. How now! what means death in this rude assault? Villain, thine own hand yields thy death's instrument.

(Snatching a weapon and killing one.)

Go thou and fill another room in hell.

(He kills another: then Exton strikes him down.)

That hand shall burn in never-quenching fire
That staggers thus my person. Exton, thy fierce hand
Hath with the king's blood stain'd the king's own land.
Mount, mount, my soul! thy seat is up on high,
Whilst my gross flesh sinks downward, here to die.

(Dies.)

Exton As full of valour as of royal blood:
Both have I spilt; O! would the deed were good;
For now the devil, that told me I did well,
Says that this deed is chronicled in hell. 1

Marlowe's final scene is longer and shows his talent at its highest. His skill always lay rather in the development of individual scenes than in sustained effort, and it is in the portrayal of the crisis that he is at his best. Marlowe begins by over-accentuating the physical horrors of Edward's prison. This is done deliberately in order to gain our sympathies for the imprisoned monarch. Shakespeare had tried to gain our sympathies by showing us his weakling at last a man of action. Marlowe had convinced him of the advisability of gaining sympathy for the dying hero, and he showed his originality merely by using slightly different means to achieve the end which Marlowe had shown as desirable. Here is Marlowe's description of the king's prison. It

1. Richard II, V, v, 106.

would be almost nauseating were it not for the poet's skill:

Matr. Gurney, I wonder the king dies not,
 being in a vault vp to the knees in water,
 To which the channels of the castell runne,
 From whence a dampe continually ariseth,
 That were enough to poison any man,
 Much more a king brought vp so tenderlie.
Gurn. And so do I, Matreuis: yesternight
 I opened but the doore to throw him meate,
 And I was almost stifeled with the sauer.

To this horrible place comes Lightborn, the murderer:

Edward. Whose there, what light is that, wherefore
 comes thou?

Light. To comfort you, and bring you ioyfull newes.

Edward. Small comfort findes poore Edward in thy lookes,
 Villaine, I know thou comst to murther me.

Light. To murther you my most gracious lorde?
 Farre is it from my hart to do you harme.

Then Edward recounts the horrors of his imprisonment, and
 adds this piteous touch:

Tell Isabell the Queene, I lookt not thus,
 When for her sake I ran at tilt in Fraunce.

Then comes the end:

Light. O speake no more my lorde, this breakes my heart.
 Lie on this bed, and rest your selfe a while.

Edw. These lookes of thine can harbor nought but death.
 I see my tragedie written in thy browes,
 Let stay a while, forbear thy bloudie hande,
 And let me see the stroke before it comes,
 That euen then when I shall lose my life,
 My minde may be more stedfast on my God.

Light. What meanes your highnesse to mistrust me thus?

Edwa. What meanes thou to dissemble with me thus?

Light. These handes were neuer staine with innocent
 bloud,

Nor shall they now be tainted with a kings.

Edward. Forgiue my thought, for hauing such a thought,
 One iewell haue I left, receiue thou this.
 Still feare I, and I know not whats the cause,
 But euerie ionte shakes as I giue it thee:

O if thou harborst murther in thy hart,
 Let this gift change thy minde, and saue thy soule,
 Know that I am a king, oh at that name,
 I feele a hell of greefe: where is my crowne?
 Gone, gone, and doe I remaine aliuē?

Light. Your ouerwatchde my lord, lie downe and rest.

Edw. But that greefe keepes me waking, I shoulde sleepe,
 For not these ten daies haue these eyes lids closd.

Now as I speake they fall, and yet with feare
 Open againe. O wherefore sits thou heare?

Light. If you mistrust me, ile be gon my lord.

Edw. No, no, for if thou meanst to murther me,
 Thou wilt retorne againe, and therefore stay.

Light. He sleepes.

Edw. O let me not die yet, stay, O stay a while.

Light. Now now my Lorde.

Edw. Something still busseth in mine eares,
 and tels me, if I sleepe I neuer wake,
 this feare is that which makes me tremble thus,
 And therefore tell me, wherefore art thou come?

Light. To rid thee of thy life. matreuis come.

There is no doubt of the dramatic effectiveness of this. As a catastrophe it is undoubtedly more impressive than Shakespeare's.

With this then we may conclude our comparison. By examining the characters of the protagonists in each play, the use made of the minor characters, and the construction of the plays, we have been able to show a great many points of similarity. In the first place, it must be admitted that Shakespeare derived his idea from Marlowe; in the same way he aimed first to alienate and secondly to secure sympathy for his hero and to do this used, at times identical methods, at others different methods, yet aiming at such identical results that they too show the influence of Marlowe's work. Identical are the faults with which both

depict the monarch and the entire ordering of the abdication scene. One notices a similarity in the meditative caste of mind revealed by the kings in adversity: moreover both kings are surrounded by groups of three - favorites, queen, and opponent, who are used in much the same manner. Even where Shakespeare has used a different method he has aimed at the same effect, as has been shown in the pity gained for the deposed king in one play by the hate in the other by the love of his queen; and similarly through sympathy developed by the nature of the catastrophe - in the one play through accentuating the horrors of the prison; in the other through depicting the weakling as at last a man of action. We conclude, then, by admitting Shakespeare's great debt to Marlowe, both for the idea and the development of the weakling hero in tragedy.

o o o

VIII. Unity.

Marlowe's contribution to the drama has generally been considered to be along the lines of style rather than of form. The majority of critics agree that Marlowe's genius was not especially dramatic. J.Churton Collins even goes so far as to say that Marlowe's genius was the reverse of dramatic and that the exigencies of the period in which¹ he lived forced him to cast his work into dramatic form. However, even though much of this is true, it may be claimed that Marlowe first gave unity to the drama.

When he produced Tamburlaine in 1587, two types of plays were in existence - first, an indigenous type based largely on native history; second, a Senecan type. The first type made no attempt at unity of action; the story was told without any idea of dramatic art, events unfolding themselves as they occurred, without any intention on the part of the dramatist to select his material, eliminate what would not tend to the development of his theme, and arrange what was retained so that a dramatic effect might be produced. The Senecan plays, on the other hand, were more susceptible to controlling laws; they were intensely formal and it might thereby be expected that the material which composed them would have been selected with

1. Harrison - Shakesp. Fellows. p. 254.
J.C.Collins - Essays and Studies, p.

a view to unity. However this was not the case. Discrimination in this matter had not yet been reached and though the dramatist wrote in five acts, and restrained himself by many conventions associated with the type, he made no effort to restrict himself by what we would recognise as a law of dramatic unity. The treatment of one theme, and the subordination of everything in the play to that one theme appears to be due to the influence of Marlowe.

Only two other dramatists deserve mention in this connection. It must be admitted that Lyly contributed materially to plot construction, by developing the idea of a composite plot. However Lyly did not go the necessary one step further and knit the various parts of his plot firmly together. Marlowe's plot was never composite so that Lyly exerted no influence on him, but he did apparently aim at the unity that Lyly failed to achieve. The other dramatist who should be referred to here is Kyd. The Spanish Tragedy possesses distinct unity. The date of The Spanish Tragedy is not definitely known as has been before remarked, and we have no proof that it preceded Tamburlaine. If it could be proved that it did precede it, Kyd ought indeed to share with Marlowe the honour of giving unity to the drama. However, this one play of Kyd's, had it been unique in its use of unity, might have exerted no influence on the drama.

Marlowe consistently unified the material of his tragedies and we feel that it is attempts to emulate the popularity of these that caused the observance of the principle by his contemporaries.

We have already seen that it would be useless to look in the native plays for the principle of unity. Gorboduc will serve as an illustration of the want of unity in the English Senecan plays. The argument of the tragedy gives the following account of the plot; "Gorboduc, king of Brittain, divided his realme in his lifetime to his sonnes, Ferrex and Porrex; the sonnes fell to discention; the yonger killed the elder; the mother, that more dearly loued the elder for reuenge killed the younger; the peeple moued with the crueltye of the fact, rose in rebellion and slew both father and mother; the nobilitie assembled and most terribly destroyed the rebels; and afterwarde, for want of issue of the prince, whereby the succession of the crowne became vncertaine, they fell to ciuill warre, in which both they and many of their issues were slaine, and the land for a long time almost desolate and miserably wasted." Apart from the quantity of material which in itself would destroy unity, the arrangement of the material in the play shows a disregard for the principle. By the end of Act IV we have had the death of Ferrex and Porrex. At the beginning of Act V

we are apprised that since the completion of Act IV the Queen and Gorboduc have been slain by an uprising of the people and the act continues with the jumble of unrelated matter which has to be crowded into it.

Unity so palpably lacking up to this time, appears in Tamburlaine, but it must be admitted that in this, and in most of his other plays, Marlowe did not achieve unity consciously. Unity was produced indirectly through the nature of the protagonist, and this unity, then, - the first in English drama - may be called the unity of a powerful protagonist. Marlowe, as we have seen, was anxious to present pictures of a resolute hero - his plays are the plays of the super-man, to whom all else is subordinated, whether of event or of characterisation. Everything that happens throughout the play is dependent upon the protagonist and the minor characters only exist in relation to him. Here, then, is distinct unity, even though we admit that Marlowe did not consciously strive for it but achieved it indirectly.

It must be admitted that his unity is only achieved at a great cost. In the first place, the action suffers. Unity, as we understand it, would demand the treatment of one great crisis to the development and resolution of which everything in the play would be directed. Marlowe does not attempt to treat one crisis alone; his plays are com-

posed of many actions, each of which would be quite unrelated were it not for the dominating influence of the protagonist who performs them. The protagonist does secure a sort of unity for us which is a great gain in view of the chaotic series of events which would result were it not for his control. But Marlowe's conception of the character of the protagonist prevents him from conceiving an elaborate plot lest the interaction of its various aspects should remove the protagonist from his dominant position. Hence we have the unity of the compelling personality but no attempt at the higher unity which would include plot construction.

In the next place, characterisation suffers. Had Marlowe further developed his subordinate characters, attention would have been removed from the protagonist, the only type of unity that the drama had yet known would have been sacrificed, and hence, while we regret the shadowy characterisation of Marlowe's minor characters we appreciate the value of this shadowy characterisation in preserving the specious form of unity which Marlowe secured, and which after all, was a great advance over none at all.

Dramatic unity as we know does exist in plays of many well developed characters, all of whom are strong enough to influence the action. All that is needed is a force directing this energy toward one given purpose and

the result is unity of the highest type. Only in one play did Marlowe aim at this end, and that is in Edward II. We have already seen that the protagonist in this play was not of the type Marlowe generally selected; in this play too, he apparently attempted more careful characterisation than had been his custom, and in his plot he showed very great power of condensation and arrangement. Since the play varies so considerably from his usual type, we feel justified in thinking that he exerted more conscious technique in its construction and therefore that the unity which it has is the result of deliberate art and not of chance as had been the case in his earlier plays. Moreover, this unity as we have pointed out is unity of the highest type - the unity which is inseparable from great art. This play, however, will be considered at length in Sections X and XI. We can, for the moment, therefore, direct our attention to the unity of the controlling personality which is common to all his other plays, examine the value of this unity, and the use made of it by Shakespeare, leaving the influence of Edward II altogether out of the discussion.

That the unity of the compelling personality is common to all Marlowe's other plays is obvious at once. In Tamburlaine everything that occurs is dependent upon Tamburlaine's desire for world-conquest; it is this which motivates his various campaigns, explains his attitude to

his captives, to his sons, and even to the virgins of Damascus. The account of the varied incidents of a lifetime is no longer rambling and incoherent since everything in the play is unified to give one impression - world conquest. Yet that this occurs without intention is obvious. Marlowe tells his tale in the chronicle manner; he does not seem to be selecting material deliberately in order to give us a fixed impression, he is telling all the events that composed the life of his hero and he ends with the hero's death not, as we have seen, in order to get tragic effect, but in the chronicle manner, because his material is exhausted. Yet so completely is he dominated by the desire for world power - that even events narrated so entirely without selection, all tend to one purpose and give the effect of unity.

The same unity can be observed in all the other plays except Edward II. Now where was Shakespeare influenced by this manner of Marlowe's? Obviously in the one play which set forth the resolute personality - that is in Richard III. Here we have exactly the same technique. The other characters in the play are deliberately subordinated to Richard and he, alone, dominates the action; he brings about Clarence's downfall, marries Anne, murders Edward V and his young brother, executes Buckingham, and eventually falls in battle against Richmond. Here there is no attempt at sel-

ecting one great crisis and making it the subject of a unified play. The incidents of a lifetime are told in the chronicle manner and the play is unified only by the controlling influence of Richard's character. It is therefore absolutely in the tradition of Marlowe.

As usual, too, Shakespeare did not neglect the value of what he had learnt in the days of his discipleship but in the days of his mastery continued to make use of what he had found effective in the craft of others. Richard III may be considered as a direct attempt to copy Marlowe's methods and achieve unity in the same fashion. But Creizenach¹ points out that Shakespeare made use of a similar type of unity in nearly all the great tragedies. Only Lear may be said to have a composite plot. Othello, Macbeth, Hamlet, have a simplicity of design which results in a unity much akin to Marlowe's, and which if we cannot trace it directly to his influence, since Shakespeare had long emerged from the pupil stage when he composed these plays, yet makes use of the best that lay in the type.

In these plays the higher form of unity, which Marlowe perhaps barely understood and only once attempted, is the basis of the design. We no longer have a series of unrelated events, but the play presents one great action, which rises to a crisis and is eventually resolved with consummate art.

1. p. 254.

but Shakespeare has not forgotten the value of the unifying personality, and he is incorporated in the design in order that the simplicity of the conception may add to its force. And the unity of the controlling personality, thus welded upon the true conception of dramatic unity, has proved itself eminently forceful. Though we must admit, then, that in these plays, Shakespeare is far from a disciple of Marlowe but has become a conqueror in his own field, yet the germ of his method may be traced back to what he learned in his deliberate use of Marlovian unity in Richard III.

Our conclusion is, then, that Marlowe contributed to the drama, perhaps unconsciously, the first unity which can be traced in it. This unity was dependent solely upon the power of the protagonist, since the material of the drama was in no way unified, but remained the same series of unrelated events which had been familiar to the early chronicle plays. In Richard III Shakespeare copied Marlowe's method and in the days of his mastery incorporated the unity of the compelling personality with the higher unity of design in order to add force to his great tragedies.

IX Seriousness.

There was no very clear distinction in the minds of the Elizabethans between the various types of the drama. The native drama disregarded both comedy and tragedy in order to evolve an altogether new type - the chronicle play - and even in plays more closely in touch with classic example, there was no hard and fast distinction between tragedy and comedy. The title of a play by Thomas Preston will suffice to show the confusion of types that existed: "A lamentable Tragedie mixed full of pleasant mirth, containing the life of Cambises king of Persia, from the beginning of his kingdome, unto his death, his one good deed of execution, after that many wicked deedes and tyrannous murders, committed by and through him, and last of all, his odious death by Gods Iustice appointed."¹ Nor was there any attempt in the development of these tragi-comedies to use the comic element to further the plot. The comic passages were quite unconnected and served not only to cause a confusion of tone but to destroy unity. Sidney complains in his Apologie for Poetrie² that all their plays "be neither right tragedies, nor right comedies: mingling kings and clownes, not because the matter so carrieth it: but thrust in clownes by head and shoulders, to play a part in

1. Entered on Stationers' Register 1569-70.

2. Sidney..p.65.

maiesticall matters, with neither decencie nor discretion. So as neither the admiration and commiseration, nor the right sportfulness, is by their mungrell Tragy-Comedie obtained."

In the famous prologue to the first part of Tamburlaine where also he declares his intention to use blank verse for the writing of his plays, Marlowe declared his intention to lead his hearers from "such conceits as Clownage keeps in pay" to the tants of Scythian Tamburlaine, and thus at once separated himself from the confused tendencies of his age. Marlowe's muse was essentially tragic, and this concentration of interest on a tragic theme may have been occasioned by his inability to write comedy. "I must state my conviction," says Bullen,¹ "that Marlowe never attempted to write a comic scene. The muses had dowered him with many qualities - nobility and tenderness and pity - but the gift of humour, the most grateful of all gifts, was withheld." This is doubtless true. Certainly it would be impossible to point to a single comic scene in any of his plays which is indisputably by Marlowe's hand. But the achievement of purifying tragedy from the unrelated and often unworthy elements with which it had been adulterated was none the less great. He saw that the comic elements as they had been used in tragedy up to that time were weakening

1. Bullen's introduction to Marlowe's works...p. xxviii.

its effect and determined to raise tragedy to greater heights by writing in an elevated style and by clearing it of these baser elements.

Unfortunately the plays have not come down to us in an uncorrupted form. Apparently the Elizabethan audiences were not ready for tragedy in an undiluted form and comic scenes by other hands were interpolated into the original text. In the first edition of Tamburlaine which appeared in 1590, the printer, Richard Jones, thought it necessary to preface the play by an address in which he tells us that he has "purposely omitted and left out some fond and frivolous gestures of digressing, and, in my poor opinion, far unmeet for the matter, which I thought might seem more tedious unto the wise than any way else to be regarded, though haply they have been of some vain-conceited fondlings greatly gaped at, what time they were shewed upon the stage in their graced deformities: nevertheless now to be mixed in print with such matter of worth, it would prove a great disgrace to so honourable and stately a history."¹ Creizenach remarks that the text of Tamburlaine as we have it is "too good to have been based on a version taken down during the performance."² We have to believe, then, that the comic interpolations were in the manuscript received by the printer but the prologue leaves us no room to be-

1. Bullen's Edition p. 5.

2. Creizenach, p. 239.

lieve that they were by Marlowe's hand. The satirist, Hall, ridicules the effect of these inserted passages on the stage, performed by "a selfe-misformed lout" who "laughs and grins, and frames his mimik face, and justles straight into the prince's place."¹ We know how Shakespeare disliked the clown who dominated the action at inopportune times: "Let those that play your clowns," says Hamlet to the player, "speak no more than is set down for them; for there be of them that will themselves laugh, to set on some quantity of barren spectators to laugh too, though in the mean time some necessary question of the play be then to be considered; that's villainous, and shows a most pitiful ambition in the fool that uses it."²

The text of Faustus is unfortunately not as pure as that of Tamburlaine and here we have a number of scenes of buffoonery which detract from the effect of the play. They are not in accord with the spirit of Faustus, nor is the style Marlowe's - for instance, they are written in prose - and it is generally admitted that they are not by his hand. As the text of The Jew of Malta is also felt to be very corrupt, we feel justified in believing here, too, that it was not a part of Marlowe's plan to use the confusion of comedy and tragedy that was popular in his age. He announces his intention to present tragedy freed from all

1. Bullen, xxi

2. Hamlet, iii, ii, 43.

comic elements in the prologue to his first play, and the style of such comic passages as still remain in the text of his later plays justifies our belief that they are not by his hand and are therefore no indication of a change of intention.

It has been remarked that Marlowe almost certainly had no gift for the writing of comedy so that the elimination of comic passages from his work was no sacrifice of talent on his part. Shakespeare's comic muse, on the other hand, could be exceedingly happy, as we know, and therefore when he composed two plays entirely free from comedy, we are justified in regarding it as a tribute to the influence of Marlowe. In his later plays, Shakespeare developed a new type altogether. It was his contribution to the drama to use comic passages in his great tragedies as a sort of grotesque to enhance the tragic effect; all his later tragedies furnish instances of this. In Richard II and Richard III, however, he controlled his own tendencies through respect for Marlowe's example and produced two tragedies wholly free from any comic element. Schelling¹ remarks, also, that in revising the Troublesome Raigne in order to produce his play of King John, Shakespeare "reduced the comedy element of the older play to the single figure of the Bastard Faulconbridge." It is indeed very questionable that even Faulconbridge

1. Eng. Chron. Play, p. 48.

performs such a function here, and we feel once more that Marlowe's influence probably provoked the seriousness of this play. By the end of Richard II, however, Shakespeare was already weakening in his allegiance, and threw out a hint of the humorous characters that were to be included in the later plays.

Marlowe deserves great praise for thus raising the tone of tragedy. Even so learned a dramatist as Ben Jonson did not always see the distinction between tragedy and comedy.¹ Moreover writers who, like Marlowe, had not the skill to write comedy themselves often collaborated with others in order to produce the popular form of tragi-comedy. Marlowe always impresses us by the power of his decisions. Again and again he shows himself markedly original, and he apparently made up his mind unmoved by either example or favour. It is not to be wondered at that so forcible a nature should have left an impression upon the mind of his greatest contemporary, and occasionally we are struck by the convincing nature of this impression. Such is the case here, where Shakespeare by eliminating all comic elements from two plays, and moderating them in a third, confesses himself an apostle of Marlowe's.

o o o

1. Creizenach, p. 240

X. The Use of Historical Material.

The history play is a form of the drama which is distinctively English. Its origin can be traced back to the comic element in the miracle and morality plays. Being indigenous in growth, it was little affected by the Senecan tradition - though Gorboduc and The Misfortunes of Arthur can be quoted as plays based on legendary history developed in the Senecan manner. These, however, are not typical in form. The historical play was more susceptible to native influences such as the ballads of St. George or Robin Hood, and the Hock Tuesday Plays than to classical influences. It recounted the varied incidents in the life of some historic personality, without any attempt to fit the material into the form of either comedy or tragedy. The basis of the material might be either legendary - such for instance as in Lochrine, or The True Chronicle History of King Leir - or contemporary history - such as The Famous Victories of Henry the fifth. Moreover these themes were attacked in two separate ways; either with very little, or indeed no, attention to historic fact as in Greene's James IV or else with some attempt to follow historic truth as in The Famous Victories before mentioned. Properly speaking, it is only the plays dealing with current history, and

treating it with some attempt to follow historic truth that deserve the name of chronicles.

The majority of these history plays were produced during the reigns of Elizabeth and James. Schelling counts only about a dozen plays before 1590.¹ Two, possibly three, of these were written in the Senecan style and hence were not of the type as it later developed, two are pseudo-historical plays such as James IV, three are undoubted chronicle plays. In the next ten years, the historical play achieved its greatest popularity, owing to the increased national feeling after the defeat of the Armada in 1588. The plays were entirely of the people. Neither the Universities nor the Inns of Court took an active share in the development, and this probably accounts for the lack of a Senecan spirit which would probably have entered into them if their development had been left less in popular hands. They were produced in the popular theatres, a large number of them by Henslowe's companies, and practically all of Shakespeare's contemporaries contributed to the type.

Marlowe as we know made one contribution in Edward II, and practically a third of Shakespeare's work in the First Folio was classed under the heading of Histories. It will be of interest, then, to see what changes Marlowe introduced into the type, and to what extent Shakespeare made use of

1. Chron. Play, p.53.

his innovations.

Probably the best way to determine what Marlowe did for the Chronicle history is to examine a typical play by another author, and then contrast it with Marlowe's Edward II. Let us examine Peele's Edward I which was probably produced in 1590 about the same time as Marlowe's play. The national feeling which inspired the chronicle history as a whole is immediately obvious here. The note is struck in the speech by the Queene Mother which begins the play, and it is obviously a patriotic hatred of Spaniards which inspires the calumnious attack on Queen Eleanor of Castile. The play promises us in its sub-title the "sincking of Queene Elinor at Charingcrosse, and her rising againe at Potters hith, otherwise called Queene hith." Upon her first appearance the Queen is anxious to send to Spain for the costumes needed for her coronation, since she regards British costumes as inferior. She follows this up with a career of unnatural cruelty which culminates in the remarkable punishment described above. Apart from this quite unjustifiable perversion of history, the play offers us a series of unconnected events beginning with Edward's return from the Holy Land, continuing with the Welsh rebellion under Llewellyn, and various Scotch uprisings, mingled with a variety of other matter, such as various comic interludes,

and the romance of Gloster with Elinor's daughter, Ione.

We would not ask to-day that a dramatising of history should preserve untouched all that actually occurred. Reality is not often dramatically effective in itself but needs to be made so by artistic concentration and arrangement. In this play, however, we find history altered for no dramatic purpose at all, but altered for base reasons of national prejudice. Notice, too, that the chronicle manner militates against dramatic unity since a series of events in themselves unrelated are told merely because the chronicle history aims at presenting all that actually occurred. The idea of selecting from these real events for dramatic purposes does not seem to have occurred to the early writers of the type. Lastly note the inclusion of non-historic material in order to give comic relief. It is in just these three ways that Marlowe differed from his contemporaries. We have already dealt with his elimination of the comic element from tragedy. In the next section we will consider his conversion of the loosely constructed chronicle history into tragic form; and in this examine his method of handling historical material to produce dramatic effect.

The material which Marlowe incorporated into his Edward II extended over a period of twenty years. It would seem therefore that the haphazard chronicle method of dealing with it would be suggested at once, and particularly so

since in all his previous plays Marlowe had followed the chronicle method of relating a life and death in preference to selecting one dramatic incident, and he had bound together this unrelated material only by the dominating influence of his protagonist. In this one play, however, Marlowe showed real dramatic power in the arrangement of his material. His aim as has been already indicated was not to describe a whole life, but to depict the fall of a weakling, caused by the absence of the kingly qualities which were necessary to his position. To depict this, Marlowe had had to re-arrange his historic material in order to make it dramatically effective.¹ The troubles in Ireland in 1315 and 1316 have been made to occur at the same time as the trouble in Scotland in 1318, and both are attributed to the interference of Gaveston though he really had died before they occurred. In the same way, Warwick's life is extended in order that he may be made to pay the penalty for his share in Gaveston's downfall. Perhaps the most effective instance of Marlowe's power is the use made of Spencer in the play. His rank is lowered in order that he may parallel more effectively with the upstart, Gaveston, and he is made to follow Gaveston immediately in the king's favour, though he really belonged to the opposing faction till 1318. "We have here," says Schelling, "the artist's use of material

1. Eng. Chron. Play, pp66-7.

whereby the essential is distinguished with unerring tact from the non-essential and a truer and severer logic imparted to the sequence of events and to the characters and their relations to each other than can ever exist in life." ¹

In every instance that Marlowe has altered history, he has done so in order to increase dramatic effect, nor has there been any perversion of historic fact, but the result of this re-arrangement has been to make dramatically effective an historically accurate portrait. We object with reason to the perversion of the character of Eleanor of Castile in Peele's play since it is quite unnecessary to the dramatic effect. Marlowe in depicting the character of the queen attempts to justify her known treachery towards her husband by tracing it to his earlier neglect of her. This is a justifiable addition to historic material, because while not distorting historic truth, it does aid in giving dramatic consistency to the character. We know Isabelle was false to her husband; Marlowe tries to make her character artistically possible by suggesting the king's neglect as a motive. Peele deliberately distorts history with no dramatic justification whatever. It cannot be claimed, however, that Marlowe's skill was ever pre-eminent in the depicting of character. He does not altogether succeed in making Isabella dramatically consistent, but we do feel he attempts to do so and fails not for lack of the attempt but because

1. Ibid, p. 67.

his skill was not equal to the task. From this example, we can see, therefore, what is justifiable and what is not justifiable in the adapting of historic material to the drama.

In Richard II, Shakespeare handled a theme very closely akin to Marlowe's and in the same way he altered historic material to secure dramatic effect. A number of instances of this can be quoted.

(1.) In III, iii, Shakespeare describes an interview between Northumberland and Richard at Flint castle. In this interview he condenses the occurrences of two interviews, one at Conway, and another at Flint some time after.

(2.) When Norfolk's death is described, Holinshed does not tell us that he joined the crusades,

"Against black Pagans, Turks, and Saracens." 1
He does tell us that during his banishment, Bolingbroke engaged in battle against the infidels of "Prutzenland." This feat is transferred to Norfolk in order that our sympathy at Norfolk's death in banishment may be intensified and thus aid in alienating our sympathies from Richard who is about to be deposed.

(3.) Carlisle's speech opposing Richard's deposition occurs before the event in Shakespeare's play though
1. Richard II, IV, 1, 95.

it really occurred about a month after. This again is dramatically effective for it would destroy the unity to have Carlisle appear later in Richard's defence. Placed where it is, it adds to the dramatic effect by stressing the power of Bolingbroke who is able to arrest Carlisle for defending the king, and that it is dramatically effective is due to Shakespeare's skill in transposing it.

(4.) One of the most important ways in which Shakespeare alters Holinshed is by the use he makes of the queen to increase our sympathy for Richard. The scene with the gardener, III, iv, is purely Shakespeare's invention. So, too, is the pathetic farewell scene in V, i. In reality Richard and Isabelle met for the last time before Richard's departure for the Irish wars. Nor did she escape immediately to France after Richard's deposition, but was detained by Bolingbroke for some time. The use made of the queen is thus a distinct indication of Shakespeare's power to treat historic material with dramatic effectiveness.

(5.) The gardeners are non-historic characters introduced in order to increase our sympathy with Richard. The same is true of the groom who visits Richard in his imprisonment. A number of non-historic characters had appeared in Peele's play, but these were not used to advance the plot, but rather added an independent interest chiefly of a comic nature, hence they served to destroy not to create unity.

(6.) Holinshed gives us the basis for the use made of Exton, but his treatment by Bolingbroke after the murder is again an effective interpolation by Shakespeare.

(7.) The length of Richard's imprisonment has been considerably cut down. His captivity in the tower and his transference to Leeds are both overlooked. Richard had been imprisoned in both these places before being taken to Pomfret where he was killed.

(8.) The account of Richard's death follows closely one of the descriptions given of it. Shakespeare, however, deliberately chose this story in preference to some others because of the dramatic effectiveness of making his irresolute king at last exert himself, and gain further sympathy for his fate by the valour of his defence. 1

These are some of the principal divergencies from Holinshed in Shakespeare's play, and in each of them we see dramatic art being used in the compression, transposition, or addition resorted to. It is not out of place to comment that had Shakespeare gone further and removed the incident of Aumerle's conspiracy, he would have added considerably to the dramatic effect of the play. We see, however, a distinct attempt on the part of Shakespeare to make artistic use of his sources. In this he is far removed from the inartistic use we have remarked in Peele and is confessing

1. Shakespeare's Holinshed, pp. 77-130.

himself a follower of Marlowe. Marlowe had used greater skill in arranging his material since he had to compress the events of twenty years into the short space of five acts. The events of Richard II do not extend much over two years and hence less art was needed in reducing them to shorter compass. Both dramatists, however, were inspired by the same motive - the desire to use historic material with dramatic effectiveness.

o o o

XI. The Chronicle History.

Marlowe's second gift to the Chronicle History was his moulding of the inchoate form which it had been up to his time into the form of pure tragedy. We have already seen that he first appreciated the value of handling his historical material artistically, and by examining Shakespeare's use of the sources for his Richard II have seen a similar attempt on his part to give dramatic effectiveness to reality. But Marlowe went a step further. He made his Edward II purely tragic in form. Although Shakespeare continued to make artistic use of his material in all his chronicle plays, it is in only two of these and these his first two, that he keeps to the tragic form inaugurated by Marlowe. In all the succeeding history plays, though of course he rose far beyond the incoherence of Peele, largely because of his artistic use of material, he no longer attempted to give to his work the intense form of tragedy. His later histories are rather of the epic type, and full of the patriotic spirit which was present in all the Elizabethans with the single exception of Marlowe. The comic interlude supplied in Edward I by the friar and his Guenthan reappears in Shakespeare in the goodly fellowship of Falstaff and his Doll, Pistol and Bluellen, to mention but a few

whom we could ill spare from Shakespeare's creations. A hint of this change is given already at the end of Richard II when Bolingbroke asks the whereabouts of his son, though the play itself is free of any comic element. In his later plays, however, he breaks altogether from the influence of Marlowe and goes back to the manner of the earlier writers of Chronicle histories. It is in the two earlier plays of Richard II and Richard III that we find him, like Marlowe, making his historical material fit into the form of pure tragedy. Let us first examine how this is done by Marlowe in Edward II and then observe how nearly Shakespeare followed him.

In the first place, there is an utter absence of comic relief in Edward II. It is perhaps not amazing that this is so, since Marlowe's genius was obviously tragic and not comic, but in thus severing comic relief from the history play, Marlowe was doing something even more original than by his similar severing of comic relief from the tragedy proper. Classical example might inspire him to omit such elements from tragedy, but the history play as we have seen was not based upon the classical drama: it was a purely indigenous form, had risen from the comic element in the miracles and moralities and always had contained a comic element.¹ A similar absence of comic relief is observable

1. Note: We can except the one or two plays quoted above

in Richard III and Richard II and this is a convincing proof of Marlowe's influence, since here it can be due to no lack of ability to write a comic scene. Shakespeare's skill in producing comic characters might easily have led him to introduce them where they would not be amiss. Moreover Shakespeare deliberately introduced them into his great tragedies where there was far less excuse for their introduction. It is true he did not intend these scenes to provoke mirth in themselves but intended them to intensify the essentially tragic nature of his theme. However by introducing them at all he was following the native tendency as opposed to the classical. Not that Shakespeare had any intention to mingle comedy and tragedy as had been the case with the early dramatists, but he saw the possibility of the grotesque to enhance the tragic effect. Marlowe as we have seen, did not introduce the grotesque into his tragedies, and we feel this abstinence on the part of Shakespeare in the two history plays above mentioned must be due to Marlowe's influence, since he who used the comic element in his tragedies would hardly be expected to abstain from it in his histories where it was invariably present.

Another variation from the chronicle play in Marlowe,

(cont. fr. p. 93.) which were written in the Senecan manner and though based on historical themes were not in the chronicle tradition. Moreover these were plays of court and not of the popular playhouses.

is his neglect of the patriotic appeal. It has already been remarked that this was one of the distinctive features of the history play. These plays were the result of an increased feeling of nationalism which had directed men's interests to the history of their country, and their appeal lay through the national spirit rather than through any appeal which might lie in them as a form of art. In dropping this appeal, Marlowe again made a distinct departure from prevailing methods. Edward II interested Marlowe as material out of which could be constructed the one type of drama in which he was interested - the tragedy. The fact that the material he was about to use was historical did not affect his method of handling it. In the same way that he had abandoned the comic passages which had been the invariable concomitant of the history play, so too, he dropped the patriotic appeal and developed his material along purely tragic lines.

In Richard II Shakespeare did not follow him in thus abandoning the patriotic appeal. One of the passages which is interpolated by Shakespeare into his source is the famous speech in praise of England beginning, "This royal throne of kings, this sceptered isle."¹ This magnificent passage placed in the mouth of the dying John of Gaunt, breathes all the patriotic fervour that distinguished the Shakes-

1. Richard II, II, i, 40.

pearian age. In the later histories, too, when Shakespeare had shaken off Marlowe's influence altogether, and returned to the form of the chronicle histories, the patriotic note common to them is always present. It is not evident however in Richard III and it would seem that Marlowe's influence is responsible. The play in the Marlovian manner has a Machiavellian hero, and a psychological note of remorse; it is a history play which in the Marlovian manner is free of all comic passages, it is tragic in form and it lays no emphasis on the patriotic spirit. When Richard addresses his army, it is true, he attempts to stir national feeling against the French invaders, but that is nothing more than the form of encouragement he would be expected to use at such a time. Nor is the national feeling stressed in many other passages where it would have been easy to introduce it. The misrule of Richard II inspires John of Gaunt to a long lament on the vanished glories of his native land. Those who are against Richard III are inspired by personal wrongs - the death of a husband or a son; even the ghosts which appear to the two leaders before the battle do not strike a note of patriotism but recount their individual suffering under Richard's tyranny. Since this is so foreign to the chronicle type, and occurs in a play so much under Marlowe's influence, we feel that it, too, may be traced to him.

Next let us consider the careful arrangement of Marlowe's play in order to give tragic effect. Here there is no unconnected series of events held together only by the power of the protagonist, though this has been Marlowe's method up to this time and it might easily be expected here since it was the general method of the history play, but instead Marlowe has a definite design. He wishes to show the struggle and defeat of a weak king. The whole play is grouped about this central idea, and we have already seen how the historical material has been used to enhance the effect. In the first part of the play our sympathies were alienated from Richard by the emphasising of his shortcomings. After Edward's fall, however, Mortimer's character is revealed to us in a less favourable light. His vulgar ambition is now emphasised in order that our sympathies may turn to Richard, and to this same end we have the stressing of Isabella's cruelty, and the wretchedness of Edward's prison. The catastrophe of the play has been ranked among the most powerful in the whole range of literature.

The same tragic unity can be traced in the two histories of Shakespeare's which show Marlowe's influence.

Richard III dominates the play of which he is the protagonist. Here are no unconnected incidents, in the chron-

icle manner, but the entire play aims at the description of the gradual rise to power and the sudden fall of a tragic hero. When we examine Shakespeare's variation from his sources we are the more impressed by his determination to focuss attention on the career and character of Richard. The amazing scene between Richard and Anne (I,ii) is among the most important of Shakespeare's interpolations and it is also one of the most effective in bringing out the subtle villainy of the man. Another interpolation by Shakespeare is the widowed queen, Margaret. The full consideration of her use in the play belongs to a later section, but it is not out of place to notice here that she assists in stressing the tragic note by preparing us for Richard's overthrow. The fall of Richard then becomes a true catastrophe, completing a play which has kept closely to the lines of pure tragedy.

The same treatment is given to Richard II. The development here parallels exactly with the development in Edward II, even though the conclusion hardly possesses the same dramatic force. Since in his later history plays Shakespeare returned to the chronicle manner we realise how greatly he was influenced by Marlowe at the commencement of his career. The influence extends to the exclusion of all comic relief from both Richard II and Richard III.

though as we have seen such exclusion was not in Shakespeare's usual manner and was moreover a decidedly new note in the history play. It is felt as well in the absence of a dominant note of patriotism from Richard III, though this was common to all the other dramatists except Marlowe, and would seem almost demanded by a play whose theme was derived from national history. And finally it is Marlowe's ascendancy that is responsible for the moulding of his first two histories in the form of pure tragedy, a form which was not employed in the chronicle plays before Marlowe and was later abandoned by Shakespeare, himself, when he had passed beyond Marlowe's influence.

o o o

XII. Blank Verse.

One important contribution made by Marlowe to the English stage, was the employment of blank verse in the popular drama.

The first person to use blank verse in England was Surrey: the first person to use it in the drama was Sackville, but it is to Marlowe that we owe its use in the popular drama, and it is in his verse that we see for the first time that it is not a form to restrain the genius of a poet within formal lines, but that with its infinite possibilities for inflection and variety, it may be made a fit vehicle for the entire range of human emotion. It is impossible to think of Shakespearean drama robbed of the melody which is given to it by a verse which can be modulated to express the most whimsical fancy or swell to the grandeur of the deepest passion. Yet that so wide a range lay within the scope of this metrical form was not dreamt of till Marlowe had shown its flexibility, and Shakespeare with the musical instrument ready to his hand had but to breathe into it the fancies of his genius. When the achievements of Marlowe with blank verse are compared with the achievements of his predecessors, the greatness of the debt to him seems overwhelming. Let us first consider the introduction of blank

verse into England, then examine a few typical passages from the early plays which made use of it, and finally by comparing Marlowe's use of the metre, see how much Shakespeare owed to him.

The first use of blank verse in English was in the translation of the second and fourth books of the Aeneid by Surrey in 1557. It has been thought that he may have wished to find a metre which would give the effect of the Latin measure and decided upon iambic pentametre, using stress to take the place of Latin quantities. If this was his reason then his skill in discerning that the shorter line and the shorter measure would be more effective in English than a literal transposition of stressed and unstressed accents for the long and short syllables of the Latin metre is much to be commended, since it is a well known fact that dactyllic hexametre in English is a very turgid metre. It is not necessary to examine the form of Surrey's verse in detail; if the translation is not great poetry, it deserves praise as the first use of the metre in English.

The first use of blank verse in the drama was in Gorboduc which was given for the first time in 1562. The play contains many long speeches which make it read very heavily. Even where these speeches disappear for a few shorter passages of conversation, it is noticeable that

those conversing make use of entire lines - that is the poetical line is not broken up by the various speakers, but each makes use of a passage metrically complete in itself. For instance the following:

Clotyn. I thinke the world will now at length beware,
 And feare to put on armes agaynst their prince!
Mand. If not, those trayterous hartes that dare rebell,
 Leththem beholde the wide and hugie fieldes
 With bloud and bodies spread of rebelles slayne,
 The lofty trees clothed with the corpses dead
 That strangled with the corde do hang thereon!
Aros. A just reward! such as all times before
 Haue ever lotted to these wretched folkes.
Gwen. But what meanes he that commeth here so fast? 1

These lines are too formal to give any reality to the conversation. Notice the dull monotony of the lines, the accents observed with painful regularity, which give the impression that the thought has been enslaved by the metre. Such a condition is fatal for the poet who should not be shackled by his metre but use the form that fits his subject with greatest ease. To achieve freedom it is not necessary to abstain from all rule, but the medium should be sensitive, not restraining the emotion but fluctuating in response. If we had never had anything but the dull regularity of Gorboduc to pound out its measures across our literature, it would have been impossible as a vehicle for the drama which above all other forms requires a medium that will be sensitive to all the subtle variations of character which it is its purpose to depict.

1. Gorboduc, V, ii, 58.

Other plays beside Gorboduc used blank verse before Marlowe. An examination of the blank verse in Gascoigne's Jocasta (1566) and Thomas Hughes' Misfortunes of Arthur (1587) will show that in these plays it is equally formal. In Jocasta there are many examples of sticomythic dialogue. For example:

Ete. Whome thou art come to spoyle and to deface.
Po. O Gods, give eare unto my honest cause.
Ete. with forreine power his countrie to invade
Po. O holy temples of the heavenly Gods. 1

And this goes on at great length. While this breaks up the play into shorter speeches, it must be remembered that Gascoigne is not responsible since the play is an adaptation of one by Euripides; moreover this formality is as deadening as the longer speeches of Gorboduc. Very occasionally, too, a line is broken by placing it in the mouth of two speakers, but the metrical form of the line is rigidly observed, thus:

Sac. Now in thy sacred name I bowell here
 this sacrifice. Tyre. And what entrails hath it?

In The Misfortunes of Arthur an interesting attempt is made to break down the line unit:

Cador. Put case you win, what grief?
Arthur. Admit I do, what joy?
Cador. Then may you rule.
Arthur. When I may die.
Cador. To rule is much.
Arthur. Small, if we covet nought.
Cador. Who covets not a crown?
Arthur. He that discerns the sword aloft.
Cador. That hangeth fast.
Arthur. But by a hair. 2

1. Act II, Scene i.
2. Act III, Scene i.

The same formality exists, however. It will be noted that in nearly every case, the second passage spoken by a speaker is of sufficient length to make out the decasyllabon line if united to his first. Accordingly we feel that though there is a shortening of the hammer strokes, they beat on just the same; there is nothing vital in the measure.

The Arraignment of Paris (1584.) by Peele is composed in a mixture of rhyme and blank verse. Act V, Scene i, breaks into blank verse at line 1234:

Dian. It is enough, and goddesses attende:
There wons within these pleasaunt shady woods,
Where neither storme nor Suns distemperature
Haue power to hurte by cruell heate or colde,
Vnder the clymate of the milder heaven,
Where seldome lights Loves angrie thunderbolt
For fauour of that soueraygne earthly peere.

We can summarise the value of all these contributions to the form briefly as follows:

1. There is absolute regularity of accent.
2. The line is a distinct unit; there is no tendency to run on to the next line.
3. The speeches vary in length but are always rigidly formal consisting of;
 - a. very long speeches,
 - b. shorter speeches, each of which preserves intact the line unit.
4. Sticomylthic dialogue of the whole or part line.

With the exception of Peele's, these plays were not intended for the popular stage but were written in the Sen-

ecan tradition for the Inns of Court. The themes as we have noted were Senecan; the metre was very probably intended to be the English equivalent of Latin hexametre. In Peele's play there is uncertainty in the use of blank verse. Most of the play is composed of rhyming lines, as follows:

Iun. Pallas, the storme is past and gone, and Phoebus
 cleares the skies,
And loe, beholde a ball of golde, a faire and worthie
 prize.

Ven. This posie wils the apple to the fayrest giuen be,
Then is it mine: for venus hight the fayrest of the
three.

It is in this measure, the rimed fourteener, that the popular plays were written before Marlowe.

And yet in 1587, Marlowe, a young man of twenty-three, produced Tamburlaine which he definitely chose to write in blank verse announcing in the prologue his reasons for doing so:

From jiggling veins of rhyming mother wits,
And such conceits as clownage keeps in pay,
We'll lead you to the stately tent of war,
Where you shall hear the Scythian Tamburlaine:
Threatening the world with high astounding terms,
And scourging kingdoms with his conquering sword.

One would have expected a beginner to show deference to the users of the prevailing form by employing their metre in his early work, or at least to have shown some uncertainty in making a decision. Not only is this uncertainty absent, but Marlowe is so convinced of the value of the change, that he announces it boldly with a reference to the "rhyming

mother wits" who have not yet had the discernment to abandon rhyme. Had he been less successful in using the new measure, the introduction might indeed have seemed ostentations, but at once we find his style vital, pulsating, ready to follow the genius of its master through varying moods. There is no longer a monotonous beat, but an infinite variety, and the measure proves itself capable of such a range of feeling as the boastful speeches of the conquering Tamburlaine, and the exquisite love lyric in praise of Zenocrate. To obtain this effect, Marlowe did not scorn to use metrical devices familiar to those who had employed the metre before him, but he added many new features of his own. Examples both of new devices introduced by him and of his use of those already familiar, follow. A number are deliberately chosen from Tamburlaine to show with what ease Marlowe handled the measure even at the commencement of his career.

I. Varied, caesura: ¹

For there my palace royal / shall be placed,
whose shining turrets / shall dismay the heavens
And cast the fame of Ilion's tower / to hell.

2 Tamburlaine, IV, iv, 112.

II. Light (feminine) ending of line:

Beauteous rubies, sparkling diamonds. Jew, I, i, 27.

(note that the line seems to be trochaic
tetrametre.)

1. These references are taken from Bullen's edition. All other quotations from Marlowe were taken from Tucker-Brooke's edition since it was the latest text. Here, however, where a direct comparison with Shakespeare is involved, it was thought better to use a modernised version to parallel with the Oxford Shakespeare.

My bosom inmate! but I must dissemble. Jew, IV, i, 51.

III. Hexametre:

I must be pleased perforce, wretched Zenocrate.
I Tamburlaine, I, ii, 258.

Emperors and kings
Are but obeyed in their several provinces.
I. Tamburlaine, I, i, 56.

IV. Line with omitted syllable at commencement:

I, and body too but what of that? Faustus, V, 130.

V. Line with additional syllable at commencement:

Tell me, are there many heavens above the moon?
Faustus, VI, 35.

Bags of fiery opals, sapphires, amethysts. Jew, I, i, 25.

VI. Use of equivalents for metrical foot:

But fearful echoes thunder in mine ears,
Faustus, thou art damned! Then swords and knives..
Faustus, VI, 20

Abjure this magic, turn to God again:
To God? - he loves thee not -
Faustus, V, 10.

VII. Varied stress in a regular line:

Infinite riches in a little room. Jew, I, i, 36.

See where Christ's blood streams in the firmament.
Faustus, XVI, 78.

VIII. Irregular accentuation:

And by the love of Pylades and Orestes.
(the iamb is replaced by an anapaest.)

IX. Incomplete line:

Ah, half the hour is past! 'twill all be past anon!
O God!
If thou wilt not have mercy on my soul.. Faustus, XVI, 96

X. Line broken up for conversation:

Jew, I, ii, between Barabas and Abigail...248.
Edward II. II, v, 86.
 V, ii, 74.

XI. Stichomythia:

Faustus, III, 65. (This was not much used by Marlowe.)

XII. Run on line:

And from the bounds of Afric to the banks
 Of Ganges shall his mighty arm extend.
 1 Tamburlaine, V, ii, 523.

And sooner let the fiery element
 Dissolve and make your kingdom in the sky,
 Than this mere earth should shroud your majesty.
 2 Tamburlaine, II, iv, 57.

 It is our country's cause,
 That here severely we will execute
 Upon thy person: hang him at a bough.
 Edward II. II, v, 23.

(Note the greater ease of transition from line to
 line than was evident in Tamburlaine.)

XIII. Alliterating sound:

Barbarous and bloody Tamburlaine.
 Thus to deprive me of my crown and life!
 Treacherous and false Theridamas,
 Even at the morning of my happy state.
 1 Tamburlaine, II, vii. 1

These metaphysics of magicians,
 And necromantic books are heavenly.
 Lines, circles, scenes, letters, and characters:
 Faustus, I, 47.

XIV. Use of Rhyme.

Marlowe's play, Dido, contains a great many instances
 of rhyming lines, but it must be remembered that Marlowe
 did not work on this play alone so that too much should
 not be based on this. Rhymed lines begin to appear in
The Jew. Occasionally an effect is produced by the in-
 sertion of a rhyming couplet:

War. Alarum! to the fight!

St. George for England, and the barons' right.

Edward II. III,iii,53.

XV. Use of Prose:

In the majority of cases where prose appears in Marlowe's plays it would seem to be the work of another hand... interpolated comic scenes, for example. He did seem, however, to appreciate the effect of prose to indicate great emotional crises. One instance of this occurs in 1 Tamburlaine. V. ii, Zabina's speech on the discovery of the dead body of her husband.

Again in Faustus there is a fine passage in prose which would seem to be Marlowe's since it expresses the same emotion as the soliloquy which follows in verse. It is at the very end of the play, ll.1356 - 1418 in Tucker Brooke's edition.

XVI. Poor lines:

It is to be expected that such experimenting with a new metrical form occasionally resulted disastrously. A faulty text may account for some of these but we find it impossible to scan such a line as this:

Would it not grieve a king to be so abused.

1 Tamburlaine, II, ii, 5.

It is surprising, though, with what readiness Marlowe learnt to control his metre.

These examples give some idea of the variety that Marlowe managed to give to his metre. The variety that Shakespeare achieved is familiar to us all, but some instances of uses similar to examples given from Marlowe, follow chosen from the plays in which Marlowe's influence was the most marked:

I. Varied Caesura:

If not,/I'll use the advantage of my power,
And lay the summer's dust/with showers of blood
Rained from the wounds/of slaughter'd Englishman:

The which/how far off from the mind of Bolingbrokē
It is,/such crimson tempest should bedrench
The fresh green lap/of fair King Richard's land...
Richard II. III. iii, 42.

II. Light ending:

This was extremely popular with Shakespeare from the first and numerous examples can be given.

This blessed plot, this earth, this realm, this Eng-
land. Richard II. II, i, 50.

III. Hexametre:

And he himself not present? O! forfend it, God.
Richard II. IV, i, 129.

I that am rudely stamp'd, and want love's majesty.
Richard III. I, i, 16.

IV. Line with omitted syllable at commencement:

Speak with me, pity me, open the door.
Richard II. V, iii, 77.

V. Line with additional syllable at commencement:

Villain, thine **awn** hand yields thy death's instrument.
Richard II. V, v, 107.

VI. Use of equivalents for metrical foot:

I live with bread like you, feel want,
Taste grief, need friends: subjected thus,
How can you say to me I am a king?
Richard II. III, iii, 175.

VII. Varied stress in a regular line:

As is the sepulchre in stubborn Jewry
Of the world's ransom, blessed Mary's Son.
Richard II. II, i, 55.

VIII. Irregular accentuation:

But for our trusty brother-in-law and the abbot.
Richard II. V, iii, 137.

IX. Incomplete line:

Through brazen trumpet send the breath of parley
Into his ruin'd ears, and thus deliver:
Henry Bolingbroke
On both his knees doth kiss King Richard's hand.
Richard II, III, iii. 23.

Glou. Among this princely heap. if any here,
By false intelligence, or wrong surmise.
Hold me a foe;
If I unwittingly, or in my rage.
Have aught committed that is hardly borne...
Richard III, II. i, 53.

X. Line broken up for conversation:

Richard II. V, ii, conversation of Aumerle. York, and the Duchess.

Richard III., V, iii, conversation of Richard, Norfolk, and Surrey on Bosworth field.

XI. Stichomythia:

Shakespeare used this occasionally in his earlier plays, but it disappears as he advances. Both Richard II and Richard III contain examples:

Richard II, II, i, between Gaunt and Richard.

Richard III, I. ii, between Anne and Gloucester (an instance of half-line stichomythia.)

XII. Run on line:

It is noticeable that even though Marlowe achieves lines that run from one to the other, his work generally does use the line as a unit, and a run-on line only extends the pause a little further. Shakespeare's advance in the use of his metre is marked by the easier flow in the transition of thought from line to line. Jusserand gives the figures for run-on lines as 1 in 18 in Love's Labours Lost; and 1 in 3 in The Tempest.¹ Without necessarily accepting these figures, we can nevertheless state generally that the advance does seem to go hand in hand with the use of the metre.

1. Jussierand, p. 346.

XIII. Alliteration:

There are passages in Shakespeare's early plays where alliteration is carried to such excess that there is doubt in the minds of the critics as to whether it is done in deliberate mockery. It is noticeable that Marlowe is not lead away in this manner, but uses alliterating sound to add rhythm to the metre. Numerous uses of this sort can also be found in Shakespeare.

A heavy sentence, my most sovereign liege,
And all unlook'd for from your highness' mouth:
A dearer merit, not so deep a maim
As to be cast forth in the common air,
Have I deserged at your highness' hands.

Richard II, I, iii, 154.

XIV. Use of Rhyme:

It has been noticed that Marlowe did insert a few rhyming passages in his later plays though none at all appeared in his first. The reverse is the case with Shakespeare. The early plays seem to show a much bigger proportion of rhyme than the later. Jusserand gives 1028 rhymed lines in Love's Labours Lost; 579 blank verse. In The Tempest he gives 2 rhymed lines: in The Winter's Tale, none.¹ Shakespeare used rhyme effectively all through his plays to suggest completion, as at the close of an incident in a scene or to mark the end of the scene itself. Many examples can be given from Richard II. It is less common in Richard III though it is frequently used to end a scene.

XV. Use of Prose:

Later in his career, Shakespeare obtained some very subtle effects by the arrangement of prose and verse in contrast. The sleep-walking scene in Macbeth may be paralleled with the scene quoted from Tamburlaine as an instance of prose used to show agitation of mind. There is no prose in Richard II. We feel that this is probably due to Marlowe's influence since he did not customarily alternate prose and verse, as we have seen. There are a few uses in Richard III, but they do not seem to be particularly effective. The murderers use prose upon their first appearance, I, iv, but they use verse later on. The citizens speak prose in II, iii, .

I. Ibid, loc,cit.

It is hard to tell whether Marlowe's influence had anything to do with the use of prose in the scene referred to from Macbeth. It seems safer to conclude that Marlowe's influence is to be found in the very slight use made of it in the early tragedies.

XVI. Poor Lines:

Shakespeare, too, was experimenting with a new medium and occasionally came to disaster. Two lines can be quoted from Richard II.

We do debase ourself, cousin, do we not? III, iii, 127.
I will be satisfied, let me see it, I say. V, ii, 71.

In both dramatists, therefore, we have seen definite efforts to achieve variety, to make the rhyme a sympathetic medium for many emotions. Some of the effect was secured by a deliberate copying of what had been familiar in the classical drama, as for instance, the use of stichomythia; some of the attempts at metrical variation resulted in giving an appearance of artificiality, as for instance, the use of alliteration; but all were aiming in the right direction. It cannot of course be claimed that in the instances cited above Shakespeare was deliberately copying Marlowe's example. The examples were given to show, first, that Marlowe achieved great variety in the use of his metre; and secondly, that Shakespeare achieved a similar variety.

Marlowe settled the question of the style of the drama by the excellence of his blank verse. Before him, as we have seen, there was some uncertainty, after him there was none, for he used blank verse so well as to abolish

argument. When Shakespeare began to write, therefore, there was no question of the advisability of this or that style. Marlowe had established the form by his own pre-eminent success, and Shakespeare, in common with all the immediate followers of Marlowe, used blank verse as the inevitable form for tragedy.

Peele's blank verse, as we know, was often very graceful, but it lacked the grandeur which later appeared in Marlowe. It is this quality in Marlowe's verse which made it the fitting medium for the drama of the heroic personality. The grandeur, the sonorous and stately march of his verse, was carried over into Shakespeare. It is a quality that we recognise at once and that we associate, unconsciously perhaps, with the poetry of the Elizabethans. Yet, as we have seen, this quality was not common to those who employed blank verse before Marlowe but appeared for the first time in his work. Shakespeare, therefore, is indebted to Marlowe for the grandeur of his style.

Shakespeare, we may conclude by summarising, has a threefold debt to Marlowe for the qualities of his style. It was Marlowe who first settled that blank verse should be the medium for the drama, he led in showing the infinite variety of which the form was capable, and he first gave it the dignity and grandeur which we recognise again in Shakespeare.

XIII. Bombast.

- The grandeur which Marlowe gave to blank verse made it a fit vehicle to express the overwhelming ambitions of his protagonists, but in striving for grandeur, Marlowe easily fell into bombast. It would appear that at first he felt something of this sort to be necessary to displace the rhyme he had abandoned. He promised "high astounding terms" as a substitute in the prologue to his first play and the tendency to rant is thereby traceable to this intention. It is a marked feature of his early plays; Tamburlaine is full of it. Ben Jonson speaks of "flying from all humanity with the Tamerlanes and Tamer-Chams of the later age which had nothing in them but the scenical strutting and furious vociferation to warrant them to the ignorant gapers."¹ One of the famous scenes which partakes of this tendency is the one in which Tamburlaine addresses the captive monarchs who are drawing his chariot:

Holla, ye pampered lades of Asia:
What, can ye draw but twenty miles a day? 2

The absurdity of this struck even the age which had been swept off its feet by Marlowe's magnificent surge of poetry, and Shakespeare parodies it in Henry IV, Part II, by making Pistol speak of,

1. Timber, p. 41.

2. 2 Tamburlaine, IV, iii, 3980.

packhorses
And hollow pamper'd jades of Asia
Which cannot go but thirty miles a day. 1

This is a famous example, but the play is full of them. The tendency to bombast increases whenever Tamburlaine is on the stage but neither his followers nor his enemies are free from it.

Mycetes tries to speak in the same blustering tone as his great enemy, but we do not feel that he is altogether successful in keeping to it:

I long to see thee backe returne from thence,
That I may view these milk-white steeds of mine
All loden with the heads of killed men.
And from their knees even to their hooves below,
Besmer'd with blood, that makes a dainty show. 2

Somehow the word 'dainty' makes the entire speech seem forced and unnatural. Mycetes wishes to give an impression of the same lust for battle that is in Tamburlaine, but Tamburlaine's speeches are consistently vigorous, while Mycetes seems to suggest a coward trying to put on a blustering front to hide his fear. Tamburlaine could never have spoken the words uttered by Mycetes after his defeat:

Accurst be he that first inuented war,
They knew not, ah,,they knew not simple men,
Now those were hit by pelting cannon shot,
stand staggering like a quivering Aspen leafe,
Fearing the force of Coreas boistrus blasts. 3

This shows the close connection between the tendency to rant, and Marlowe's conception of the tragic hero. An

1. 2 Henry IV, II, iv, 176.

2. 1 Tamburlaine, I, 1, 84.

3. Ibid, II, iv, 664.

examinations of the quotations used to illustrate the character of the tragic hero in Section IV will show how much bombast is used to give the idea of grandeur which was inseparable from Marlowe's idea of the heroic personality.

The protagonist in Edward II differs from Marlowe's customary conception of the tragic hero. He alone is not a superman, and Marlowe's style in this play is accordingly more subdued than is his custom. It is true that Edward II contains in Mortimer the familiar type though here he is opponent and not protagonist. Mortimer, therefore, often uses bombast which is otherwise lacking from the general style of the play.

Since it is not definitely decided whether Dido belongs to the earlier or later period of Marlowe's career, it is hard to decide whether the style represents a recrudescence of the bombastic form, or whether it is representative of the same youthful period as Rambrulaine. It must be remembered, too, that as Nashe collaborated in the work, Marlowe need not be regarded as solely responsible for such lines as the following:

At which the franticke Queene leapt on his face,
And in his eyeli^{as} hanging by the nayles,
A little while prolong'd her husbands life:
At last the souldiers puld her by the heeles,
And swong her howling in the emptie ayre,
which sent an eccho to the wounded king:
whereat he lifted vp his bedred lims,
And would haue grappeld with Achilles sonne,

forgetting both his want of strength and hands,
 which he disdain'd whist his sword about,
 And with the wind thereof the King fell downe.. 1

It is hard to accept these lines as Marlowe's. They represent the bombastic style carried to utter absurdity, and we are inclined to believe that Shakespeare's description of the same scene in the player's speech in Hamlet was intended as a parody of this passage in Marlowe.

Bombast, then is the outstanding fault into which Marlowe's high-sounding blank verse tended to slip, and as we have seen this bombast is closely connected with the Marlovian conception of the tragic hero. One would expect, accordingly, to find Shakespeare making the same blunder in the play whose hero is conceived after Marlowe's example, that is in Richard III. It is rather surprising, therefore, to find that this is not the case. Richard, himself, as has been previously remarked is convincing largely because of the colloquialism of his speech. True he announces to us from time to time that he is about to commit a series of evil deeds, but the speeches in which he announces his intentions cannot be regarded as bombast because he actually does carry out what he has announced. When Tamburlaine tells us he holds the fates bound fast in iron chains, we are justified in regarding this as bombast but when Richard says:

1. Dido, II, 1, 539.

I do the wrong, and first begin to brawl.
 The secret mischiefs that I set abroad
 I lay unto the grievous charge of others...
 But then I sigh, and, with a piece of scripture,
 Tell them that God bids us do good for evil:
 And thus I clothe my naked villany
 With odd old ends stol'n forth of holy writ,
 And seem a saint when most I play the devil. 1

we are struck at once by the vigorous naturalness of his speech. It is this which gives the character greater forcefulness than Marlowe ever produced by the grandiloquence of his braggart speeches. It is true that many of the other characters in the play are unnatural; the queens seem to give a choric background to the vivid reality of Richard's actions, but this unreality is not obtained through Marlovian bombast, but, as we shall see, by passing from the dramatic mood to the epic. It is with a feeling of considerable surprise, therefore, that one relinquishes the search. Fearful deeds have been promised, but then fearful deeds have been done, and this is altogether different from bombast.

Are we to assume, then, that Shakespeare never fell into this error of style? In his later plays as we have seen he ridiculed it, and in one play he made most successful use of it in order to bring out a character contrast. Hotspur in 1 Henry IV is very bombastic in tone, and this language coming from him seems eminently suited to his fiery temperament. We are reminded of Guise by the famous speech:

By heaven methinks it were an easy leap

1. Richard III, I, iii, 324.

To pluck bright honour from the pale-fac'd moon,
 Or dive into the bottom of the deep,
 where fathom-line could never touch the ground,
 And pluck up drowned honour by the locks;
 So he that doth redeem her thence might wear
 without corival all her dignities. 1

Over his dead body, the prince of Wales says:

Fare thee well, great heart:
 Ill-weav'd ambition, how much art thou shrunk:
 When that this body did contain a spirit,
 A kingdom for it was too small a bound;
 And now two paces of the vilest earth
 Is room enough. 2

Here then it would appear that Shakespeare had made use of Marlowe's device in order to portray the boundless ambition which as we know was a marked feature of Marlowe's characters. Shakespeare seems to have seen that a natural style was necessary to give credibility to so unnatural a monster as Richard, and also to have appreciated the value of bombast to represent boundless ambition.

It is not, however, possible to say that Shakespeare used bombast only to heighten effect, and never fell into it as an error of style. In Macbeth, for example, an instance can be quoted where he makes an extremely forceful use of bombast to emphasise Macbeth's realization of his guilt:

Will all great Neptune's ocean wash this blood
 Clean from my hand? No, this my hand will rather
 The multitudinous seas incarnadine,
 Making the green one red. 3

But again in the same play, an instance can be quoted where

1. 1 Henry IV, I, iii, 201
2. Ibid, V, v, 87.
3. Macbeth, II, ii, 61.

his use is not successful, where one feels he has needlessly tortured the thought:

And pity, like a naked new-born babe,
Striding the blast, or heaven's cherubin, hors'd
Upon the sightless couriers of the air,
Shall blow the horrid deed in every eye,
That tears shall drown the wind. 1

It would appear, then, that Shakespeare early realised this quality in Marlowe's style, and though the surge of his imagination did occasionally impell him in the same direction, he never wholly abandoned himself to the impulse, and on a few occasions successfully used bombast to gain a specific effect. We can admit the influence, therefore, even though we also admit that the use was not identical.

o o o

XIV. Lyrical Passages.

By lyrical passages is not meant the introduction of lyrics into the drama by putting such verses into the mouths of the characters. This was a common device in the native drama and was later adopted by Shakespeare who wove many charming lyrics into his plays. In one play, indeed, The Merry Wives of Windsor, III, 1, it is a lyric of Marlowe's that is quoted. The first plays written in blank verse did not introduce lyrics in this fashion, and Marlowe followed them in this respect, singularly enough since he undoubtedly could have produced exquisite lyrics judging from the two we have by his hand. What is meant by the lyric touch is the occasional turning aside from the development of plot to give expression to a note of pure poetry.

That at heart Marlowe is first and always a poet is incontrovertible. He touched the heavy awkward metre of the drama and left it light and airy, sensitive to the finest shades of feeling. It was no longer a medium for the mouth-
ing of sententious rhetoric but became instinct with real life. It is this feeling for poetry which makes the lyric mood so often eclipse the dramatic in moments of deep emotion.

For instance, in Tamburlaine, Zenocrate is dead, and

the audience must be made to feel sorrow at her loss. Had Marlowe's mind been solely of the dramatic caste, he would have made the scene pathetic by the circumstances with which it would have been surrounded; her dying words would be given, the emotions of her friends would be represented, and in fine the audience would be brought to sympathy with the dying Zenocrate through the nature of the action. Her death would be an incident in the drama and dramatic means would be used to make it effective. But Marlowe seems to find the dramatic mood insufficient and he rises out of the drama altogether in a swell of pure poetry. This, it is true, he gains the sympathy that was dramatically necessary, but he gains it by other than dramatic methods.

Moreover he makes no attempt to suit the words to the character of his speaker. It is not dramatically fitting that the Scythian conqueror should be a poet; in fact it is not Tamburlaine speaking at all, but Marlowe sounding an infinity of changes upon the melody of the name of Zenocrate:

Now walk the angels on the walles of heauen,
 As Centinels to warne th'immortall soules,
 To entertaine deuine Zenocrate.
Apollo, Cynthia, and the ceaslesse lamps
 That gently look'd vpon this loathsome earth,
 Shine downwards now no more, but deck the heauens
 To entertaine diuine Zenocrate.
 The christall springs whose taste illuminates
 Refined eies with an eternall sight,
 Like tried siluer runs through Paradise
 To entertaine diuine Zenocrate.
 The Cherubins and holy Seraphins

That sing and play before the king of kings,
 Vse all their voices and their instruments
 To entertaine diuine Zenocrate.
 And in this sweet and currious harmony,
 The God that tunes this musicke to our soules:
 Holds out his hand in highest maiesty
 To entertaine diuine Zenocrate. 1

One does not feel that it is a conscious turning aside from the theme to a display of metrical skill - the poet has for the moment eclipsed the dramatist and Tamburlainess's loss of Zenocrate has inspired him to a lyric passage in praise of the loveliness of woman.

The same passionate feeling for beauty raises us above the troubles of Faustus to the lyric passage in praise of Helen:

Was this the face that lancht a thousand shippes?
 And burnt the toplesse Towres of Ilium?
 Sweete Helen, make me immortall with a kisse: ...
 O thou art fairer then the euening aire,
 Clad in the beauty of a thousand starres. 2

The sombre shades of this play lift but once and then only through the influence of a wraith, an insubstantial phantom of beauty who is of no value at all to the dramatist, but is overwhelmingly convincing to the poetic mind, so unceasing in its search for the ideal.

The lyric note is felt again even in so sordid a setting as The Jew of Malta, and here inspired by nothing higher than the love of a scoundrel for his paramour:

1. 2 Tamburlaine, II, iii, 2983.
2. Faustus, 1328.

Curt. I haue no husband, sweet, I'll marry thee.
Ith. Content, but we will leaue this paltry land,
 And sail from hence to Greece, to louely Greece,
 I'll be thy Iason, thou my golden Fleece;
 Where painted Carpets o're the meads are hurl'd,
 And Bacchus vinyards ore-spread the world;
 Where Woods and Forrests goe in goodly greene,
 I'll be Adonis, thou shalt be Loues Queene.
 The Meads, the Orchards, and the Primrose lanes,
 Instead of Sedge and Reed, beare Sugar Canes:
 Thou in those Groues, by Dis aboue,
 Shalt liue with me and be my loue. l

The lines are exquisite, but dramatically unfitted to the speaker. It is again Marlowe who speaks, the play and all its puppets have gone from his mind for the moment. These lines are especially interesting, moreover, as the nearest approach to an inserted lyric we have in Marlowe's works. They express the same emotion as his well-known lyric referred to above, and it will be noted that although the iambic pentameter is still retained, the blank verse is abandoned for rhyme.

The three examples quoted are among the most famous in Marlowe, but many other examples might have been chosen. Especially is this true of Tamburlaine. Compare for instance the romantic picture held out to Zenocrate, (I, I, ii, 278) beginning, "Disdains Zenocrate to live with me?", Tamburlaine's speech before setting out to Babylon, (II, IV, iii, 4076.) and the promises made by Callapine to his keeper, (II, I, iii, 2510.) Some of the effect of these passages is obtained by the skillful use of sonorous names, a trick

1. Jew, IV, 1805.

of which Milton later made a similar use. Even a casual glance through Marlowe's plays convinces us of the frequent use of lyrical passages.

And now how far did Shakespeare mingle the lyric strain with the dramatic?

An effective use can be cited from each of the two plays in which Marlowe's influence is most visible. In Richard II, John of Gaunt's speech (II, i.) is a purely lyrical outburst. In some ways, of course, the use made of the lyric is not Marlovian. For instance, the passage is used to stress patriotic feeling, and as we know, this feeling was altogether absent from Marlowe. Yet it is like Marlowe in that it rises quite above the necessities of the action on a lyric note of deep emotion. Again it is in perfect accord with the character of John of Gaunt, whereas we have noted that Marlowe did not pay much attention to the dramatic coherence of his lyric passages. But then Shakespeare's genius was dramatic as well as lyric and we would expect him to take a greater care than Marlowe to preserve unity of character.

In Richard III there is again a very fine example of the introduction of a lyric passage in the wailing of the three queens (IV, iv.) "It would be difficult," says Schelling, "to find in the range of the English drama a scene

reproducing so completely the nature and the function of the Greek choric ode." 1 The path of Richard has led upward till now. In the previous scene, however, there is a note of misfortune to come, and the theme is taken up by the mourning queens, so that though success crowns Richard's efforts in the conversation with Elizabeth which follows, we feel the note is false, and are drawn back almost at once to the deeper note of remorse and fear that is the prelude to the end. Once again it is worthy of remark that Shakespeare has not been carried out of his theme by the power of his poetry, but has used it to intensify the dramatic effect, whereas Marlowe merely substituted one effect for the other. Yet the lyric passage itself, is developed along very similar lines to Marlowe's. We have already noticed the use of anaphora in the repetition of the name of Zenocrate. The same device is used here with choric effect:

Q. Mar. Tell o'er your woes again by viewing mine:
 I had an Edward, till a Richard kill'd him;
 I had a Harry, till a Richard kill'd him;
 Thou hadst an Edward, till a Richard kill'd him;
 Thou hadst a Richard, till a Richard kill'd him;
Duch. I had a Richard too, and thou didst kill him;
 I had a Rutland too, thou help'st to kill him;
Q. Mar. Thou hadst a Clarence, too, and Richard kill'd him.

It will be noticed that this is a type of formal lyric quite different from the lyrical touches in Shakespeare's later plays, and more in accord with Marlowe's method of inserting unrelated lyrics. There is not the unconscious transition

1. Schelling - Chronicle Play, p. 94.

from lyric to dramatic that occurs for example in the description of Ophelia's death (Hamlet, iv, vii, 163.) The lyric passage stands distinct, while the story moves on as it were in another plane. There is then something of the aloofness of touch noticeable in Marlowe's lyrical passages, and the formality of construction is again quite in his manner.

To conclude. We feel that deep emotion often caused Marlowe to rise outside the limits of the drama to regions of pure poetry. Shakespeare did not so readily forget himself, and more often made his lyric flights intensify the dramatic effect, but in the Marlovian manner, these passages show the poet carried away from the dramatic to the lyric note, and in Richard III especially we feel the reality of Marlowe's influence in the construction and use of these episodes.

XV. Conclusion.

We have now concluded our survey and it only remains to summarise the nature and extent of the influence exerted by Marlowe on Shakespeare.

It has been shown that when Marlowe began to write there was uncertainty both as to the form the drama should take, and the style in which it should be written. Three definite influences were moulding the form of the drama: the classical influence received through the plays of Seneca; the modern Italian influence received through the romantic drama; and the indigenous historical plays inspired by the growth of a national feeling. The same confusion that existed in the subject of the drama existed in the form; prose, blank verse, and the rhymed fourteenner contending with each other for supremacy.

In determining what Marlowe did to bring order out of chaos, we discarded all the plays to which his authorship could not be definitely established in order that conclusions as to the style or matter of his plays might be based on as sure a foundation as possible. In the same way, the only plays of Shakespeare in which Marlovian influence was examined were plays to which Shakespeare's authorship was settled beyond dispute. In this way similar tendencies in the drama of Marlowe and Shakespeare could be examined without any fear

that the similarity might be due to their collaboration in the work in question, or to the extraneous addition of a third influence which might not be easily estimated. We restricted the examination of Marlowe's plays then to the two parts of Tamburlaine, Doctor Faustus, The Jew of Malta, Edward II, The Massacre at Paris, and in references to Dido allowed for the possibility of Nashe's influence. The Shakespeare plays considered, belong to the early period of his development though an occasional indication of Marlovian inspiration in his later work was referred to. Moreover the influences noted were not of the nature of parallel expressions, but were definite tendencies shown in the development of style and dramatic art.

In the romantic tragedy which became Marlowe's form of tragic expression, he developed the idea of the heroic personality. His plays were dominated by single figures who were each swayed by overwhelming ambitions. Every one of Marlowe's plays represented this form in some aspect or another, and Shakespeare in Richard III left one play of the type undoubtedly inspired by the Marlovian conception of the tragic hero.

In one of Marlowe's plays, The Jew of Malta, the moral outlook of the protagonist is affected by Machiavellian influences; that is, the hero in this play is a self-confessed villain, glorying in the performance of crime and the

ease with which he can deceive those around him. A note of Machiavelli had probably appeared before The Jew of Malta in The Spanish Tragedy, but Marlowe first made the Machiavellian character a protagonist so that Machiavellian motives are not merely incidental but dominate the play. In this Shakespeare followed him in his Richard III. Richard makes no pretence of hiding his evil intentions from the audience, instead he takes them into his confidence that they may appreciate how he exults at the credulous simplicity of those around him. His character is distinctly based on that of his prototype. Shakespeare's moral attitude, however, was too high to allow him to carry out this idea to the very end as Marlowe had done. In the conclusion of this play, therefore, other tendencies enter in, but these, too, are adopted from Marlowe.

It is a curious anomaly that Marlowe who had written a play in which the outlook was distinctly non-moral, since The Jew of Malta attempts no conclusions on the morality of the acts of which it is composed, should first have introduced conscience as a factor in the drama. It is this note of remorse on which Richard III closes; it is discoverable, also, curiously enough, in the words of the professional murderers not only in Richard III, but also in John, and it is traceable to Marlowe's Faustus. This is the first psychol-

ogical study of a soul in anguish, and it is not surprising that Shakespeare employed the same methods in the conclusion of his Richard III. Marlowe's refusal to estimate the morality of his Machiavellian protagonist makes that work impossibly melodramatic and unreal in its portrayal of human nature. Shakespeare's acceptance of ultimate moral values by the introduction of a note of remorse in the conclusion of Richard III makes the work at once great art, because it makes it accord with reality and gives it the high moral tone without which great art is impossible. It is noticeable, however, that in one play Shakespeare thus combines the two characteristics which were original to Marlowe's drama. The lasting nature of the influence, thus admitted, can be perceived, moreover, by the introduction of similar methods in the plays of his maturity. Thus Iago represents the Machiavellian element in a later play, and Macbeth is a splendid example of conscience as a factor in the development of tragedy.

Another type of protagonist to be found in Marlowe for the first time is the weakling. Shakespeare not only copied this idea from Marlowe, but he developed Richard II along parallel lines to Marlowe's Edward II. Entire scenes have been developed in a similar manner, minor characters have been introduced to produce a similar effect, and the

sympathy of the audience in both plays was first alienated from and then secured for the monarch by similar devices. The use of irresolution as a tragic motive was an original contribution to the drama. Shakespeare made a close study of Marlowe's methods of handling it in Richard II and later produced Hamlet as his final contribution to the type.

Marlowe made one more gift to the drama by giving it unity. With the exception of Edward II, which can be ignored here, this unity was incidental to his conception of the tragic hero. Shakespeare in his Richard III obtained unity by the same device of the powerful protagonist which was common to most of Marlowe's work, and the adoption of this tendency in a play so definitely under Marlowe's influence would also appear to have been inspired by Marlowe. The force of a unity so obtained, Shakespeare at once recognised, and it is noticeable that this type of unity plays a large part in most of his great tragedies.

Marlowe's definite refusal to admit horseplay and buffoonery in tragedy was another great gift to the drama. It is true that he had no gift for the writing of comic scenes, but the prologue to his first play seems to indicate that he rejected them deliberately as unfit for inclusion with a tragic theme. After all, if he had wished to include comedy and realised his own inability to write it, he had the

example of others to suggest collaboration in order to produce the heterogeneous combination of comic and tragic that was popular at the time. He never seems to have submitted to this mixture of types, and we believe that the comic scenes that did find their way into his plays were not included with his connivance. It is a convincing proof of the extent of Marlowe's influence that Shakespeare who could produce comedy so easily, and who later abandoned Marlowe's example and introduced comedy into his more serious plays, though not indeed on account of the same confusion of types, should have adhered strictly to the tragic form in the two plays which show most traces of Marlovian inspiration. There are no comic passages in either Richard II or Richard III.

Before Marlowe, the history plays being indigenous and thereby not subject to classical influences, were developed without regard to dramatic rules. Marlowe's genius, as we have seen, was essentially tragic, and though he wrote one play on a native historical theme, he showed his originality both by the artistic use he made of his material and by the elevation of the form from the loosely developed chronicle to tragedy. We have here none of the comic relief common to the chronicle plays, not even the note of patriotism which appears in all the Elizabethan dramatists except Marlowe. Shakespeare acknowledged the strength of Marlowe's

influence by making similar use of the sources for his histories, and by developing Richard III and Richard II as pure tragedies. In his later plays, Shakespeare went back to the loose chronicle manner, but these two were produced under Marlowe's influence and hence copied him in their form. Neither play, as already mentioned, contains comic passages though these play a large part in the histories written after Marlowe's influence was less felt. Moreover, even the patriotic note is not stressed in Richard III though it appears in Richard II and plays a prominent part in the succeeding plays. Both in the use of sources, then, and in the development of form, Shakespeare's early histories undoubtedly show Marlovian influence.

But besides influencing the form of Shakespeare's work, Marlowe also influenced the style. In the first place, Marlowe was the first to use blank verse in the popular drama. As we have seen there was much uncertainty at the time as to the style to be used, but after Marlowe's success, there could be no further question. He added variety to the stereotyped measure which blank verse had been, and he gave it a grandeur which made it a fitting vehicle of expression for the powerful motives by which his characters were dominated. Shakespeare used blank verse with the same power and there is no doubt that Marlowe taught him both what to aspire to in his verse and how to

achieve it. A comparison of the style of the earlier plays with that of Marlowe shows at times similar methods of producing effect. It is important to note, however, that Shakespeare very rarely slips into bombast though as we have seen he early learnt to make artistic use of it as an element of his style; on the other hand, Marlowe frequently abandoned the dramatic tone for lyric passages of great poetic beauty and this tendency is also visible in Shakespeare.. Moreover the lyric passage in Richard III resembles in its formal construction the lyrical passages in Marlowe's drama.

Our examination leads us to conclude, therefore, that the influence exerted by Marlowe on Shakespeare was very considerable in the matter, in the form, and in the style of his early plays, and that traces of his influence may be seen even in the work of Shakespeare's maturity. Marlowe is the only one of his contemporaries to whom Shakespeare ever referred, and this may perhaps be regarded as an acknowledgement of the influence that we have tried to define here. Throughout the whole of his career Shakespeare freely accepted from his predecessors and from his contemporaries suggestions with regard to both matter and form. It is but natural, therefore to find that, in his earliest period,

before his own manner had been fully formed, he should have adopted what impressed him most in the powerful work of his greatest predecessor.

o o o

Bibliography.

I. Editions of Marlowe.

Brooke, C.F. Tucker. The Works of Christopher Marlowe, 1 vol., Oxford, 1910.

Bullen, A.H. The Works of Christopher Marlowe, 3 vols., J.C. Nimmo, London, 1865.

Cunningham, Lt. Col. Francis. The Works of Christopher Marlowe, 1 vol., Albert J. Crocker, London, 1870.

II. Editions of Shakespeare.

The Oxford Shakespeare, edited by W.J. Craig, Oxford, 1916.

A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare, edited by A.A. Purness, Lippincott, London, 1907.

III. Other Plays.

Adams, J.Q. Chief Pre-Shakespearean Dramas, Barrag, London.

Ascoli, Geo. The Poets, edited by J.W. Lulline, Cambridge, 1907.

Hazlitt, Wm. A Select Collection of Old English Plays, 4th edition, Reeves & Turner, London.

Malone Society facsimiles, edited by J.W. Greg, Oxford, 1911.

IV. General References.

Adams, J.Q. Life of Shakespeare, Houghton Mifflin, New York, 1923.

Allen, J.M. (a sequence; v. infra sequence).

Baker, Geo. P. Dramatic Mechanisms in Marlowe (1911) in Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association Vol. IV, collected by J.E. Hartford, Oxford, 1915.

Boas, F.S. Shakespeare and His Predecessors, 5th Impression, Murray, London, 1922.

- Boswell-Stone, W.G. Shakespeare's Holinshed, 2nd. Edition, Chatto & Windus, London, 1907.
- Brooke, C.F.Tucker. The Tudor Drama, Houghton Mifflin, Cambridge, 1911.
- Butcher, Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art. 4th edition, reprinted with corrections, MacMillan, London, 1911.
- Collins, J.Churton. Essays and Studies, MacMillan, London, 1895.
- Courthope, W.J. A History of English Poetry, 5 vols. MacMillan, London, 1903.
- Creizenach, Wm. The English Drama in the Age of Shakespeare, Translated from Gesichte des Neuren Dramas, Lippincott, Philadelphia, 1916.
- Dowden, Ed. Transcripts and Studies, 2nd edition, Kegan Paul Trench, Trubner & Co., London, 1896.
- Ellis H. Shristopher Marlowe edited by Havelock Ellis, with a general introduction on the English Drama during the reigns of Elizabeth and James I by J.A.Symonds, Vizetelly, London, 1887.
- Elze, K. Essays on Shakespeare, translated by L.Dora Schmitz, MacMillan, London, 1874.
- Fleay, F.G. A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama, 1559-1642, 2 vols., Reeves & Turner, London, 1891.
- Greene, Robt. A Grotesworth of Wit bought with a Million of Repentance. The Bodley Head Quartos, edited by G.B. Harrison, John Lane, London, 1923.
- Harrison, G.B. Shakespeare's Fellows, John Lane, London, 1923.
- _____ The Story of Elizabethan Drama, Cambridge, 1925.
- Henslowe's Diary. Edited by W.W.Greg, two parts, London, 1904 & 1908.
- Henslowe's Papers. Edited by W.W. Greg, London, 1907.

Hotson, J. Leslie. The Death of Christopher Marlowe, The
Nonesuch Press, London, 1925. (2nd. Impression.)

Ingram, J. H. Christopher Marlowe and His Associates.
Grant Richards, London, 1904.

Jonson, Ben. Timber, The Temple Classics, 2nd edition,
Dent, London, 1902.

Jusserand, J. J. A Literary History of the English People
3 vols., Fisher Unwin, London, 1909.

Lee, Sidney. Christopher Marlowe, Reissue of Dictionary of
National Biography, Vol. XII, 1909.

A Life of William Shakespeare, New edition,
rewritten and enlarged, MacMillan, New York, 1916.

Raleigh, Sir Walter. The Age of Elizabeth in Shakespeare's
England, Vol. I, Chap. I, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1916.

Saintsbury, Geo. Shakespeare - Life and Plays. in The
Cambridge History of Literature, Cambridge, 1910.

Seccombe, Thomas. (& J. W. Allen) The Age of Shakespeare, Vol
1, Geo. Bell & Sons, London, 1903.

Schelling, Felix E. English Drama, Dent & Sons, London, 1914.

The English Chronicle Play, MacMillan,
New York, 1902.

Sidney, Sir Phillip. Apologie for Poesie (1595.) edited by
Ed. Arber, Constable, Westminster, 1901.

Smith, G. Gregory, Chap. VII, Cambridge History of Literature,
Vol. V, Cambridge, 1910

Spens, Janet. Elizabethan Drama, Methuen & Co, London, 1922

Symonds, J. A. Renaissance, Encyclopedia Britannica, Vol.
XXIII, pp 83-93, 11th, edition, Cambridge, 1911.

Introduction to Christopher Marlowe, v. supra
Ellis.

Shakespeare's Predecessors in the English
Drama, 2nd. ed. reprinted, Murray, London, 1924.

iv.

Swinburne, A.C. The Age of Shakespeare, 2nd. Impression, Chatto and Windus, London, 1909.

Contemporaries of Shakespeare, edited by Edmund Gosse and Thos. Jas. Wise, Heinemann, London, 1919.

Thorndike, Ashley H. Tragedy, Houghton Mifflin, Cambridge, 1908.

Ward, A.W. A History of English Dramatic Literature to the Death of Queen Anne, 3 vols., New and Revised Edition, MacMillan, London, 1899.

Wynne, Arnold. The Growth of English Drama, Oxford, 1914.

V. Magazine Articles.

Phoenix Society act Jew of Malta, under initials A.E., Blackwoods, Dec. 1922, pp. 833-4, Vol. 212, Leonard Scott Publication Co., New York.

Schelling, F.E. Doctor Faustus and Friar Bacon, The Nation, Jl. 1, 1915, pp. 12-13, Vol. 101, The Nation Press, New York.

Swinburne, A.C. Christopher Marlowe and some Minor Contemporaries, North American Review, May '16, 742-8, No. 203, New York.

Symons Arthur, A Note on the Genius of Marlowe, ^{The English Review}, Apr. 1923. 206-16, Vol. 36, London.