1999

Tragedy and the forbidden in the works of Christopher Marlowe

Scott Wilson
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Wilson, Scott, "Tragedy and the forbidden in the works of Christopher Marlowe" (1999). *Master's Theses*. 1905.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.fm92-zw8j>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/1905

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

TRAGEDY AND THE FORBIDDEN
IN THE WORKS OF CHRISTOPHER MARLOWE

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of English

San Jose State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

Scott Wilson

August 1999

UMI Number: 1396206

**Copyright 1999 by
Wilson, Scott**

All rights reserved.

**UMI Microform 1396206
Copyright 1999, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.**

**This microform edition is protected against unauthorized
copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

UMI
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48103

© 1999

Scott Wilson

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Harvey Birenbaum".

Dr. Harvey Birenbaum

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "John Pollock".

Dr. John Pollock

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "William Wilson".

Dr. William Wilson

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "William Fish".

ABSTRACT

TRAGEDY AND THE FORBIDDEN IN THE WORKS OF CHRISTOPHER MARLOWE

by Scott Wilson

This thesis discusses the nature of tragedy and forbidden knowledge in Christopher Marlowe's plays. Employing the critical methods of Jungian Psychology and Harvey Birenbaum's description of tragedy, Marlowe's plays are examined for their presentation of Self and Other. Archetypes and archetypal tragic patterns are identified and described within Marlowe's plays.

Each of Marlowe's heroes forbids or distances certain truths about himself and others from his own consciousness through fierce resistance to the truth. Hubris and resistance are shown to be natural reactions by a hero to a world that seems deliberately opposed to his will. Heroes that can integrate both what is other within themselves and the otherness outside themselves are shown to be truly tragic. While having tragic elements, Tamburlaine and The Jew of Malta are not fully tragic plays. The integrity of their heroes allows Edward II and Dr. Faustus to be tragic in their dramatic scope.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Forbidden Knowledge	5
Tamburlaine: The Tyrannical Self	8
The Shadow Archetype in <u>Tamburlaine Part II</u>	8
The Presence of the Other in <u>Tamburlaine Parts I and II</u>	13
Tragic Elements in <u>Tamburlaine Part II</u>	17
Barabas: The Self-Centered	24
The Shadow Archetype in <u>The Jew of Malta</u>	24
Tragic Elements in <u>The Jew of Malta</u>	28
Edward: The Tepid Self	32
The Shadow Archetype in <u>Edward II</u>	32
Control and Tragic Confrontation in <u>Edward II</u>	36
Faustus: The Forbidden Self	48
The Religiously Forbidden in <u>Dr. Faustus</u>	48
Critical Responses to <u>Dr. Faustus</u>	52
Archetypes in <u>Dr. Faustus</u>	56
Control in <u>Dr. Faustus</u>	71
Tragic Elements and Confrontation in <u>Dr. Faustus</u>	78
Conclusion	85
Works Cited	88

Introduction:

Christopher Marlowe revolutionized Elizabethan theater through his efforts to create plays and characters that would thoroughly engage and captivate an audience by incorporating themes of the forbidden. He and the other so-called "University Wits" prepared the way for the advent of Shakespeare's works. Although not a University Wit, Thomas Kyd wrote the first play setting Elizabethan drama on its course: The Spanish Tragedy. Marlowe himself created characters driven by purpose, passion, and power. They defied the realities that bound them and demanded that the world conform to their vision. Harry Levin has described them as "overreachers all" (23). As overreachers they transgress the bounds set down by both God and Elizabethan societal expectations.

Marlowe's characters were far more human than the stock characters portrayed in the medieval mystery cycles and morality plays and the early Tudor "interludes." The characters of these traditions were created primarily to teach a given religious lesson. They were not expected to be ambiguous, but to act in accordance to a divinely ordered world with clearly defined conceptions of right and wrong. Where Herod was assured a damnable end after the murder of the innocents, Tamburlaine suffers no divine destruction after ordering the massacre of the Egyptian virgins (Cole 17-8). Douglas Cole explains that the mystery cycles portrayed a world permeated with God's grace and justice: "The medieval audience of the mystery cycles was assured, as was St. Augustine, that all things work together unto good--suffering, evil, and sin" (16). Stock characters did not question the wisdom of traditional religious teachings as Faustus does.

Although the works of Robert Greene and other early Elizabethan playwrights were a step above the didactic and religious mystery cycles and morality plays before them, they did not present characters with the depth and daring in Marlovian theater. Greene's Friar Bacon simply could not transgress Christian teachings as does Faustus. Marlowe's

characters might well have been calculated to shock an audience and undermine their values, but the plays fascinated them as well.

Emily C. Bartels reads Marlowe's texts as deliberate and political subversions: "While Marlowe himself exploited the cultural fascination produced and promoted along with imperialism, he did so in a way that challenged the idea of otherness and helped turn the theater into a place where hegemonic constructs were more often questioned than confirmed, more often subverted than supported" (10). I would argue that while England was becoming an imperial nation, Marlowe may not have made a direct, conscious connection between expansionism and his choice of characters typically *other* than his sixteenth-century audience. He may not have intentionally created characters in contrast to current political and economic forces. It seems likely that, having chosen "Others" as characters, he dissolved some of their otherness by revealing them to be selves. Indeed, it is difficult to identify with the tragic hero or the tragic sense if the hero remains *other* to oneself. It seems likely that Marlowe would have portrayed others as selves since Marlowe himself may have felt "othered" or marginalized by Elizabethan society: "As a spy, possibly an associate of the freethinking School of Night . . . probably a homosexual, and certainly a playwright, Marlowe was alienated within his society and demonized by accusations that are by now a well-known part of the Marlowe myth" (11).

Out of his own colorful character and far-ranging intellectual interests, Marlowe made invaluable contributions to the English stage and influenced all who would follow him. Levin is quick to point out that "Many of [the Elizabethan playwrights'] conventions were Marlowe's innovations" (8). "[Shakespeare's] biggest debt, of course, was to Marlowe," writes Kenneth Muir, "Marlowe's tragic heroes, larger than life as they are, influenced Shakespeare's" (2). Muir is quick to point out that Marlowe was in turn

influenced by Shakespeare's earliest work (2). He further notes an influence on Shakespeare's writing style as well as an evolution in Marlowe's own work:

Marlowe . . . modified the drumming decasyllabon, so that Faustus's final soliloquy is more daringly irregular than any verse written by Shakespeare before the end of the sixteenth century; and the verse of Edward II is much closer to ordinary speech than that of Tamburlaine. (2)

Writing only a handful of plays, Marlowe virtually revolutionized Elizabethan theater, creating powerful and unique characters as well as new techniques of verse dialogue.

Marlowe demonstrates well Carl Jung's argument that the greatest artists are those who live lives and create work that run counter to the values of their culture and age. They pick up on the archetypes that have lain dormant in the historic halls of art and present them anew to an age in need of them. Jung describes this phenomenon as a revolutionary one:

The normal man can follow the general trend without much injury to himself; but the man who takes to the back streets and alleys because he cannot endure the broad highway will be the first to discover the psychic elements that are waiting to play their part in the life of the collective. (Spirit 85)

Marlowe seems to have met this description both in his personal life and in his artistic life.

Jung goes on to explain the need for such a one to explore his unconventional interests:

Here the artist's relative lack of adaptation [to societal expectations] turns out to his advantage; it enables him to follow his own yearnings far from the beaten path, and to discover what it is that would meet the unconscious needs of his age. Thus, just as the one-sidedness of the individual's conscious attitude is corrected by reactions from the unconscious, so art represents a process of self-regulation in the life of nations and epochs. (85).

Certainly Marlowe's choice of themes meets the above description of the great artists of an era. Shakespeare would ultimately carry this role further for the Elizabethan age, but in the early years of his career he had a powerful, and more clearly unconventional rival in Christopher Marlowe.

While popular Elizabethan consciousness was absorbed in its cultural and conventional ideals, Marlowe wrote plays that challenged its assumptions. In a deeply

stratified society, Marlowe presents the figures of a Scythian shepherd who rises above his origins and conquers most of the known world. Although homosexuality was not to be discussed in general settings, Marlowe portrays Edward II as a human being that suffers for his sexual proclivity as well as his political misjudgment. At a time when Protestant thinking criticized Catholicism for being superstitious or pagan, Marlowe goes a step further and daringly challenges religious orthodoxy by adapting the German Faust legend to the stage while developing the archetype of the magician who willingly sells his soul to Satan for power and knowledge. Underlying the conventions of Elizabethan society were unconscious desires and fascinations that Marlowe was able to bring to the stage and in so doing bring into consciousness. His exact views on these themes are even now subject to debate, but what can be known is that Marlowe tapped his era's unconscious assumptions and fleshed them out in characters and plots that proved enormously popular, possibly because they were largely forbidden and thus the subject of great, if concealed, fascination. Even if one did not approve of his work and ideas, as many in fact did not, they could not be simply ignored. The plays demanded thoughtful examination by their audiences. Such attention must have put many in a position where they had to evaluate their beliefs and traditions--even if only to embrace them all the more fiercely. In so doing they would have had to ask questions of themselves as well as of the playwright and the world that informed such beliefs. Thus, the forbidden can fascinate one and foster exploration of the Self even as it threatens one's religious schema.

Forbidden Knowledge:

For the purposes of this thesis, forbidden knowledge describes primarily those elements that the tragic hero refuses to recognize about himself or the world around him. Society would have one suppress certain facets of the self. What the heroes cannot accept in themselves, they project onto others. They do not allow themselves to acknowledge their own limits or the limits imposed on them by outside forces: other people or natural laws. Each hero forbids himself knowledge about archetypal projection and tragic consciousness; both of these terms will be explained as they relate to each text discussed.

Marlowe's dramas play on themes of the forbidden and work on conscious and unconscious levels. In the split between consciousness and the unconscious the unconscious becomes forbidden. The unconscious by nature is *other* to consciousness; whenever the conscious mind is threatened in some way by the unconscious, consciousness always protects itself from disturbing or unsettling contents. Tragic heroes find some knowledge threatening to both their power and the way they understand the world.

The forbidden seems to bring its own form of fate upon the hero once it is acted on. The forbidden transgressed, the hero must face the consequences of such a transgression. Interest in, even obsession with, the forbidden is natural. Jung describes the psyche as compensatory in that what is suppressed from consciousness becomes irresistibly attractive. The forbidden haunts the hero, as it does the reader/auditor, in a tension between danger and possibility that demands exploration. The danger of consequences and their realization, however, loom large throughout the tragic, even as the possibilities of forbidden knowledge and power bid one onto the paths and depths of the forbidden.

In the development of personality we cultivate a certain image of ourselves that we would have others share; so too the tragic hero. We maintain a positive image of the Self

and even defend such an image. Similarly the tragic hero admits no error until all hope seems to have forsaken him.

The tragic hero cannot help but be drawn to the forbidden. Its possibilities, though often illusory, are too great not to be tried. As will be demonstrated in the works of Marlowe, the hubris that carries the hero forward wills both realization and destruction. While hubris reaches for realization and possibility, destruction of the hero and his plans is necessarily implicit in it. Hubris bolsters resistance to recognized consequences, if only unconsciously recognized, so that the hero can live and act fully in the pursuit of fulfillment. Even if the means are dangerous or wrong, especially toward others, the hero goes forward, even on the wrong path, only to reach the right end: tragic realization and integration. The pursuit seems absolute both in its consequences and possibilities.

Resistance often manifests itself in the form of control of oneself or of others. Exercising control over one's appetites is considered a virtue, especially appetites for pleasure or power. Control can also depend upon a certain amount of denial of even having such desires. This is especially true for what is socially forbidden. Denial often leads to indulgence, as it becomes at once despised and irresistible; what consciousness forbids, the unconscious demands. Control extends beyond the Self in the need to have others and the forces beyond oneself comply to the Self's desires or expectations. For these reasons the hero, especially the Marlovian hero, attempts to control others and mold them to his wishes just as all people attempt to control those around them. Forbidden knowledge often promises control of the world outside ourselves with God-like power and insight.

In the realm of tragedy there is little room for moderation or the middle way. Extremes become the norm, both extremes of ambition and opposition. One does not want merely provisional power or control, but absolute power and control; one is not merely

rebuffed by otherness, one is crushed and destroyed by it. Absolutes characterize the forbidden as well: one does not just want great knowledge, one wants the knowledge of God. It is not just the power to please others or the self that is desired--it is both. Similarly the penalty for seeking the forbidden is death, damnation, destruction. But such experiences tell one something about the tragic hero and his world and something about oneself and one's place in the world.

While forbidden knowledge is a central theme of Dr. Faustus, the theme is in Tamburlaine, The Jew of Malta, and Edward II as well. Marlowe reveled in the forbidden and defied convention throughout his literary career. His plays introduced themes and characters at once shocking in their words and actions and enlightening in their predicament. Each of the heroes in his works forbids himself knowledge of his own limitations, limitations the reader must recognize within himself as well.

The Marlovian hero/self exists in a world of otherness and opposition. In Marlowe's plays Others take the form of archetypes and enemies. Ideally the Self would recognize and integrate what is *other*. Marlowe's heroes are generally unable to do so, while the sensitive auditor/reader can recognize and internalize Otherness. As archetypes the Other lies within the Self, while as forces outside the Self they exist as an important element of the human condition.

Tamburlaine: The Tyrannical Self

The Shadow Archetype in Tamburlaine Part II:

In English theater the Shadow and other archetypes had been primarily restricted to religious contexts before Marlowe incorporated them into his plays. Although present in the morality plays and the mystery cycles, Marlowe presented them in a secular context, liberating them from a strictly Christian setting. While having some religious elements, Tamburlaine is a largely secular play that employs the Shadow archetype.

Jung's archetype of Self incorporates the ego and the Shadow:

Empirically, the Self appears in dreams, myths, and fairy tales in the figure of the "supraordinate personality" . . . such as a king, hero, prophet, savior, etc. or in the form of a totality symbol Therefore, the Self appears as a play of light and shadow, although conceived as a totality and unity in which the opposites are united. (*Psychological* 460)

The Shadow is one of the strongest archetypes making up the Self.

According to Jung the Shadow consists of those elements we do not wish to recognize within ourselves. Because it is not recognized, it seems to be *other* than the Self. The act of reading/auditing myth or literature can help facilitate recognition of the Shadow within oneself: "[The] process of coming to terms with the Other in us is well worthwhile; because in this way we get to know the aspects of our nature which we would not allow anybody else to show us and which we ourselves would never have admitted" (*Mysterium* 496). Acceptance and admission of the Shadow is a difficult procedure: "The shadow is a moral problem that challenges the whole ego personality, for no one can become conscious of the shadow without considerable moral effort. To become conscious of it involves recognizing the dark aspects of the personality as present and real" (*Aion* 8). We are not always comfortable with this side of the Self because it represents those things that society and civilization find repugnant or distasteful. Society sets certain moral

constraints on the individual, labeling certain behavior acceptable and other kinds reprehensible. So it is that the Elizabethan audience would have enjoyed the spectacle of Tamburlaine, but condemned the Machiavellian character of the hero, as Robert Greene does when he refers to the "atheist Tamburlaine." While there may be a natural tendency to judge a character, it will be shown that such a tendency only serves to distance one from the tragic experience.

Because it is experienced as *other* and because it is difficult to integrate into one's own personality, the Shadow archetype is often violently resisted and lends itself to projection onto other people:

Experience shows that there are certain features which offer the most obstinate resistance to moral control and prove almost impossible to influence. These resistances are usually bound up with projection, which is not recognized as such. . . . While some traits peculiar to the shadow can be recognized without too much difficulty as one's personal qualities, in this case both insight and good will are unavailing because the cause of the emotion appears to lie, beyond all possibility of doubt, in the other person. (Jung *Aion* 9)

It has surely always been true that one is able to identify the faults of another while being slow to recognize those same faults in oneself. Jung goes on to explain that one does not really create these projections because they originate in the unconscious: "It is not the conscious subject but the unconscious which does the projecting. Hence one meets with projections, one does not make them" (*Aion* 9). So it is that one meets with a Shadow figure in drama and literature. If a character cannot recognize a Shadow element, the reader might well be able to do so to the extent that he or she is free from the projection and able to recognize it in another.

The discussions of Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*, *The Jew of Malta*, and *Edward II* that follow will be primarily limited to the negative aspects of the Shadow where characters are

divided by projection. A discussion of the Shadow's positive nature will be presented in the chapter on Dr. Faustus.

Recognition and acceptance of the Shadow lead one toward a state of integration as the opposites are reconciled within the Self. These features might be ambitions, desires, or interests opposed to the ego within the same Self. As the hero of a work achieves some degree of integration in a narrative, so too, however vicariously, may the reader. One can recognize on the plane of fiction valuable truths relevant to one's own life. One cringes or celebrates as much for oneself as for the character as one participates in the fiction from a safe distance. This is not to suggest that fiction leads one toward psychic integration as analysis might, but rather suggests that fiction has a deep effect, consciously and unconsciously, on its audience. By focusing one's attention on fictional events, literature may stimulate recognition of unexplored elements of the Self, or if not recognition, at least the experience of such elements as they appear in fiction.

While not having the psychic or dramatic depth of the work of Shakespeare, the dramatic works of Marlowe do present archetypal figures. His characters have an unusually strong sense of self. Tamburlaine relentlessly pursues his imperialistic and domineering ambitions. Barabas seeks both wealth and revenge with equal lust and determination. Edward abandons himself to his favorite just as readily as Mortimer persecutes and undermines him for doing so. Each of these characters meets opposition and works against it, encountering a Shadow figure in his opponents. Some of these figures are more strongly developed than others, but each establishes a Shadow relationship to the hero.

In both parts I and II of Tamburlaine, Marlowe portrays a character dominated by a will to power or *libido dominandi* as Harry Levin describes it (39). Throughout Part I Tamburlaine is the seemingly invincible shepherd of base birth that becomes a military hero

and ruler of the highest power. Kingdom after kingdom falls before his army and the force of his character. The governments and the armies of Turkey, Arabia, and Hungary give way before him. Tamburlaine's primary Shadow figure emerges in Part II as his own son, Calyphas. Most of Tamburlaine's identity has been invested in a will toward conquest, so much so that he fears his own sons might not have the drive to succeed as he has done:

. . . methinks their looks are amorous,
Not martial, as the sons of Tamburlaine.
Water and air being symbolized in one
Argue their want of courage and of wit,
Their hair as white as milk and soft as down,
Which should be like the quills of porcupines,
As black as jet, and hard as iron or steel,
Bewrays they are too dainty for the wars. (1.4.21-28)

So difficult is their nature for him to accept that Tamburlaine, if only for a moment, wonders about their legitimacy and the fidelity of his wife. He finds their figures so unmanly that they "Would make me think them bastards, not my sons" (1.4.32).

The king cannot accept anything less than heroically valorous sons, wanting no son unwilling to wage war and conquer nations. He would have his heir be of

A mind courageous and invincible:
For he shall wear the crown of Persia,
Whose head hath deepest scars, whose breast most wounds,
Which being wroth, sends lightning from his eyes,
And in the furrows of his frowning brows,
Harbours revenge, war, death, cruelty. (1.5.73-8)

Allowing for a bit of hyperbole, it is clear that the father expects his sons to be as strong and powerful as he is himself; although, being the scourge of God, perhaps he does see himself this way. He cannot accept that his own progeny should differ from his own nature: "Bastardly boy, sprung from some coward's loins, / And not the issue of great Tamburlaine, / Of all the provinces I have subdued / Thou shalt not have a foot . . . " (1.5.69-72). Calyphas simply cannot hope to win his father's approval or love unless he takes on the same warlike behavior and mission. When their father dies, the boys will

be expected to assume the legacy of conquest.

Calyphas cannot bring himself to take on the duties of battle. He is worried about the dangers of training for war as they may result in personal injury: "My lord, this is but dangerous to be done, / We may be slain or wounded before we learn" (3.2.93-4). To which the king can only respond with loathing: "Villain, art thou son of Tamburlaine, / And fearest to die . . . And canst thou, coward, stand in fear of death . . . And wilt thou shun the field for fear of wounds?" (3.2.95ff). Here is the stronger father's worst fear: a son afraid of war.

Such suspicions are only reinforced by the boy's behavior at the time of battle as before his brothers he refuses to fight. On the day of battle he sleeps late within his tent. His brother, Celebinus, warns, "If my father miss him on the field, / Wrath kindled in the furnace of his breast, / Will send a deadly lightning to his heart" (4.1.8-10). His father is so strong that his chest is a very "furnace." Calyphas is quick to rationalize his choice by arguing that their father neither really wants nor needs their presence at the battle:

Away ye fools, my father needs not me,
Nor you, in faith, but that you will be thought
More childish valorous than manly wise . . .
You do dishonour to his majesty,
To think our helps will do him any good. (4.1.15ff)

This is, of course, exactly what his father will not tolerate in a son: one ready to share in the king's glory but unwilling to earn it in the heat of battle.

Calyphas, a man fearful of action and war, stands in direct contrast to Tamburlaine. Tamburlaine's extraordinary character is juxtaposed to his son's rather ordinary sensibility. Calyphas has both fear and a refined conscience, neither of which is appropriate to the man of valor and victory:

I know sir, what it is to kill a man,
It works remorse of conscience in me,
I take no pleasure to be murderous,
Nor care for blood when wine will quench my thirst. (4.1. 27-30)

He prefers a life of safety and luxury to one of bravery and butchery. Even worse, his own conception of what it is to be a man places thinking over action, directly contradicting his father's nature. He tells his braver brothers, "Take you the honour, I will take my ease, / My wisdom will excuse my cowardice" (4.1.49-50). He does not seem to realize that his father really does expect, indeed demands, something quite different from him. He is all that the king hates and cannot accept. The two characters remain relentlessly divided and there can be no integration or acceptance between father and son, between ego and Shadow.

Calyphas emerges as the Shadow to his father's manly and warlike elements being all that Tamburlaine will not tolerate in himself: the boy is a coward, the father, a hero. Tamburlaine cannot accept the idea of an unmanly heir carrying on in his place when he dies. The situation is a direct threat to his authority because the boy humiliates his own father before his loyal subordinates, challenging the unstable ego which must protect itself against the shame that drive it on. The son as Shadow is not so much a projection of the father as an archetype combining with the ego to form fragmented elements of the Self. Here the Self is split into bravery and cowardice, strength and weakness, action and thought. The Other as Shadow is not integrated in Tamburlaine; it is kept at a safe distance and consistently denigrated.

Marlowe does, however, bring the Other forward in Tamburlaine in the characters that are conquered. The pathos of their reality stands in contrast to the willful pride of their conqueror.

The Presence of the Other in Tamburlaine Parts I and II:

Marlowe's portrayal of kings and people under Tamburlaine's rule manages to evoke a sympathetic response in the reader/auditor. Their plight is presented in desperate

dialogue and vivid scenes. Marlowe may have also intended to question the relationship between Self and Other in much of his work. In the other plays, each of his central figures would have been controversial to the Renaissance stage: a hostile Jew, a homosexual, and a black magician. Each of these striking characters would ensure successful stage production, but each also tends to present the Other as a Self in his own right because Marlowe conveys something of the other's experience, inclining us to partial sympathy with them.

Harvey Birenbaum describes three different ways to portray the Self in a world of otherness in tragedy: the Aristotelian, Hegelian, and Jungian models. As described, each model says something about the Other as well as the Self. "The Aristotelian model presents the self alone and unitary in a world of other . . . The play is constructed to stress the utter aloneness of the Self in both its hybris and suffering, both of which have a magnetic quality, for the aloneness which is the hero's problem is also his strength" (Tragedy 57). The Aristotelian model encompasses Sophocles's *Oedipus* and Shakespeare's tragedies, as well as Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta* and *Dr. Faustus*.

Hegelian tragedy presents more than one Self in the drama:

The Hegelian model . . . experiences the simultaneity of two or sometimes three centers of Self, each an other to the other but no one qualifying fully as an independent tragic hero. Here we focus on the fact that no point of view has ultimate reality. Life is felt to be tragic because we are vitally dependent on the outside in spite of our uniqueness as selves. (57)

Tamburlaine is just such a tragedy. While *Tamburlaine* is the primary focus of the play, those conquered by him are portrayed with a certain sympathy, lending them Selfhood as well (58).

The model based on Jungian psychology and myth study posits the Self in many or all characters:

The Jungian model presents the Self diffused through all or most of the characters, all more or less flat and fragmentary. Here the other is

completely internalized, the uniqueness of the Self being less emphatic than the horror of being diffused among forces that are mutually destructive and inescapable . . . the other is always a projection of the self and someone's otherness is always one's own experience. (59)

The previous (and later) discussion of the archetypes in Marlowe's works cover some of this ground: Edward and Kent as ego and shadow combine forming one self as do Faustus and Mephastophilis.

Marlowe presents the plights of those conquered by Tamburlaine in such a way as to render the Other as something of a Self as well. In Part I the imprisoned king Bajazeth and his queen Zabina come off as selves as they are imprisoned by the mighty warrior.

Having once been a powerful king, Bajazeth laments his imprisonment:

O life more loathsome in my vexed thoughts . . .
O dreary engines of my loathed sight,
That sees my crown, my honour and my name,
Thrust under yoke and thralldom of a thief! (5.2.1911ff)

As he speaks one cannot help but sympathize with the character when his authority is crushed and he is locked and caged like a beast. Upon seeing her husband dash his head against the bars of his prison and die, Zabina takes upon herself the same fate, hoping to meet with her daughter and husband in death. As her dialogue slips into prose, her words are rendered all the more powerfully:

. . . tear me in pieces, give me the sword with a ball of wildfire upon it.
Down with him [Tamburlaine], down with him! Go to my child, away,
away, away . . . Tamburlaine, Tamburlaine, let the soldiers be buried.
Hell, death, Tamburlaine, hell, make ready my coach, my chair, my jewels,
I come, I come, I come! (5.2.246ff)

The words evoke the misery of life and a longing to be rid of it. These characters do not remain static others but rather become rounder selves in their turn of fortune.

Tamburlaine Part II presents similar plights and selves. The second part presents a couple parallel to Bajazath and Zabina in the form of the Captain of Balsera and his wife Olympia. Her husband mortally wounded in battle, Olympia vows suicide and kills her own son, fearing that Tamburlaine's rule will promise an infinitely harsher fate:

These barbarous Scythians full of cruelty,
And Moors, in whom was never pity found,
Will hew us piecemeal, put us to the wheel,
Or else invent some torture worse than that,
Therefore die by thy living mother's hand. (3.4.19-23)

This decision cannot be easy; it may not have been just; but the mother does what she can to spare her child from the merciless Tamburlaine. Though promised an easy life and future, Olympia cannot live under Tamburlaine because she is now without both the husband and child she loved so much. She tricks Theridamas, her would-be lover, into stabbing her, and she dies.

The play's greatest moments of pathos are achieved with the literal yoking of men in the place of horses to the tyrant's coach and the slaughter of innocent virgins. These men are not even allowed a voice as Theridamas argues that they should be given bit as well as bridle (4.2.43-7). While forced into a position of otherness, they maintain a certain selfhood in their subjugation. Though upset to be so humiliated, Orcanes is far more concerned about the fate of the concubines of the conquered kings:

Injurious tyrant, wilt thou so defame
The hateful fortunes of thy victory,
To exercise upon such guiltless dames
The violence of thy common soldier's lust? (4.2.77-80)

He pleads for an end to this final indignity. His concern raises him from otherness to the status of Self with a sense of justice and conscience.

Though Tamburlaine's victories are celebrated in the work, though he is the central figure, the valor and glory of the conquest are nullified by scenes that evoke sympathy for the victims. The others cannot remain merely *other* in these passages. They become selves, albeit minor selves, demanding attention and understanding. Marlowe makes much of simple and short scenes that undermine the glory of battle in the senselessness of subjugation. The portrayal of the other does not demand a simple moral condemnation of the tragic hero. It does however serve to blur the line between Self and Other.

Although Tamburlaine has succeeded by the force of his will and physical prowess, both are to fail him as forces beyond himself lead him to recognize his own finite nature. It is through a process of resistance, confrontation, and realization that Tamburlaine becomes a tragic hero.

Tragic Elements in Tamburlaine Part II:

Tamburlaine Part II portrays Tamburlaine as a tragic hero that resists and recognizes his own limitations and fate. Applying Birenbaum's discussion of tragedy in Tragedy and Innocence to Marlovian drama provides valuable observations about the nature of Marlowe's tragedy. Birenbaum's interpretation of tragedy differs from popular schools of criticism in that his interpretation is largely an experiential one. He does not see the need for critics to judge or condemn literary characters for their mistakes because their plight portrays the human condition in all its frailty, limitation, and essential humanity.

Birenbaum distinguishes his own interpretation of tragedy from others: "Critics often distance themselves from the tragic experience by blaming the hero for immoral behavior . . . when they ought to be sharing the terror, shock, and virtual nausea of confrontation with life" (Tragedy 11-12). Engaged by a character, one shares the tragic experience through the hero's situation:

As we encounter the play, they [the heroes] unfold their fictive consciousness in our own minds, which encompass their individuality with our aesthetic sense of the whole work. Then our feelings consort with one another according to the configuration these characters produce in their own "persons." Tragedy is about the feelings it arouses. (Tragedy 7)

While reading or viewing Tamburlaine one identifies with both the hero's quest and plight. His situation becomes one's own because the hero's actions and reactions are experienced within the reader's self with a sense of sympathy and urgency. Tamburlaine's will to control become one's own ambitions for the duration of the work.

Through the experience of tragic drama, then, one can have direct knowledge of the self: "Tragedy is . . . empirical, affirming knowledge only where it is learned im-mediately --without the mediation of philosophical speculation or moral presuppositions" (Tragedy 8). Since each tragic hero mirrors the plight of the self, the process can be understood only through participation; tragic knowledge cannot be attained when it is filtered or distanced by moral or philosophic points of reference. One cannot experience the horror of tragic knowledge so long as it remains an objective event deliberately kept outside of oneself. The tragic play must be experienced and its truths internalized, for only if we can see that we are inherently capable of "immoral" choices and actions, can we participate in the hero's dilemma, the hero's disgust, and outrage.

While one is bound to morally judge Tamburlaine's murder of his own son, it is more important to be engaged by the hero's awesome passion and realize that this is where such passion leads. The tragic experience requires a suspension of the moral sense so that one can appreciate in a hero qualities that seem morally dreadful as well as all that is conventionally laudable. Without such a suspension the hero's dilemma becomes merely that of an Other. As a Self, his experience is direct, it must be owned on some level, preceding judgement and must simply be owned. As a tragic figure Tamburlaine's desires are necessarily absolute, therefore, and his rule and command must be complete. He seizes power from all other rulers; partial power will not suffice. It is for this reason that his son must die if he does not conform to the heroic ideal.

The conception of a "tragic flaw" is something of a fallacy in Birenbaum's take on tragedy, for it implies a retreat to judgment:

The hero's hybris cannot be seen fairly as a "flaw" so long as that term has a judgmental--and therefore alienating--force. The hero has the sensitivity to fear life as it really is, to be repelled by the sordidness in favor of constructive idealism. But he becomes at some point clearly as grotesque as what he fears. The nightmare, naturally, is himself. (Tragedy 38)

Such a reading is appropriate to Tamburlaine's murder of Calyphas. The hero is so enraged that his son should avoid bloodshed that he murders the boy. Ruthlessly asserting his control, Tamburlaine behaves with frightening hubris. Rather than a flaw in an otherwise noble character, however, hubris is a natural attribute of the mind:

It can be seen more clearly and less moralistically as that "normal" condition of unconsciousness through which most of us manage our lives--or, more emphatically, that condition when its claims are pressed with heroic integrity. (Tragedy 37)

Hubris is part of oneself, it protects the Self from the threat of the terrible, painful truth about oneself and one's place in the world: one cannot control all that is *other*. It is magnified and thus rendered more recognizable in the hero of a tragic work, but it is part of how one functions in a world that often seems set against one's demands, hopes, and desires. Thus, we can even identify with a character as proud and merciless as Tamburlaine.

Hubris feeds the will of Tamburlaine, giving him a sense of purpose and invincibility with which to face a world of otherness. In Tamburlaine Part I the hero's history is one of continuing success. Tired of being a mere shepherd, he leads an army to conquer many nations, impervious to failure all the while. From the start he seems to have all on his side: "For fates and oracles of heaven have sworn, / To royalize the deeds of Tamburlaine" (2.3.7-8). Witness to conquest after conquest, one is inclined to agree. What is more, he argues that he has at his command the very forces of reality:

I hold the fates bound fast in iron chains,
And with my hand turn Fortune's wheel about,
And sooner shall the sun fall from his sphere,
Than Tamburlaine be slain or overcome. (1.2.174-7)

Throughout, Tamburlaine claims to be no mere soldier, but a self allied to the heavens. He is a warrior so strong that few can oppose him, and those that try pay a heavy price, for he is, as he says, the scourge of God. Even when one might expect divine retribution for the

slaughter of innocent virgins, there is none; Tamburlaine reigns in victory it seems, because that is his destiny.

In his hubris, therefore, the hero rejects his limitations, forcing this knowledge into the unconscious:

Unconsciousness perpetuates itself, the restricted mind resisting reality with all the aggression that made the truth unconscious in the first place.

The hybristic hero resists knowledge of himself with a power as mighty as his ignorance. (Tragedy 48)

In tragedy the major limitation is mortality itself. In Tamburlaine Part II a reckoning with the death of his wife prefigures his own struggle against the inevitability of death. When the death of his beloved Zenocrate approaches, Tamburlaine resists it with the same violence with which he has waged war. Zenocrate accepts death as she explains:

I fair my lord, as other empresses,
That when this frail and transitory flesh
Hath sucked the measure of that vital air
That feeds the body with his dated health,
Wanes with enforced and necessary change. (2.4.42-6).

It is not just his enemies or his cowardly son that Tamburlaine resists, but death itself: "May never such a change [from life to death] transform my love / In whose sweet being I repose my life" (2.4.47-8).

Resistance is possible through the illusion of control. The tragic hero thinks that forces and people outside oneself are malleable to one's own will: "Hybris asserts a limited truth, that man can make of his life what he wishes. But the full truth is that he is limited" (Tragedy 41). Where Tamburlaine Part I portrays the hero as one who has all at his command, the sequel tells a different story. In it are found forces and people that the hero simply cannot bend to his will. So used to victory is he that he cannot understand that there are things beyond his control. Mighty in war, Tamburlaine rages against his ultimate enemy, death, but he is powerless to stop it:

What, is she dead? Techelles, draw thy sword,
And wound the earth, that it may cleave in twain,
And we descend into the infernal vaults,
To hale the Fatal Sisters by the hair,
And throw them in the triple moat of hell,
For taking hence my fair Zenocrate. (2.4.96-101)

Where once the fates seemed to be on his side, he now wants to punish them for his loss--a loss that shows just how powerless he is. He stands disconcerted when his sword fails to change matters:

What god soever holds thee in his arms,
Giving thee nectar and ambrosia,
Behold me here, divine Zenocrate,
Raving, impatient, desperate, and mad,
Breaking my steeled lance, with which I burst
The rusty beams of Janus' temple doors. (2.4.109-114)

Having no way to revive his beloved, in anger and impotent rage he can only punish those who are clearly not responsible: "As I have conquered kingdoms with my sword, / This cursed town will I consume with fire, / Because this place bereft me of my love" (3.1.136-9). He is so desperate and disgusted that he is driven to an act that cannot really restore his wife but only compound the number of deaths.

Having exercised hubris and control, the hero must now confront the limitations of reality. Each self, hero and reader, experiences the confrontation in tragedy:

The method of tragedy lies through confrontation between the restricted self-protective state of consciousness, within which we ordinarily live, and the open, painful state of consciousness that we habitually ward off. The confrontation unfolds the potentialities of consciousness in one process of passion. (Tragedy 36-7)

The world catches up with the hero and the reader/auditor participating in this world of painful potentiality, for the experience of a difficult reality can no longer be escaped.

"Dramatic action dramatizes this confrontation (makes it happen) and the transition from the closed state to the open that must grow out of an honest challenge" (Tragedy 37). Having experienced the confrontation, the reader as Self must feel, with the hero, the grief and the rage of being mortal.

Tamburlaine's ultimate confrontation comes at the end of the second part. He realizes that he can no longer resist mortality as death comes for him. He finds that no amount of bravery or battle can turn death away. Feeling that the Fates have been unfeeling or unfaithful to him, as people are likely to do at the approach of death, the tragic hero continues to fight what simply cannot be avoided:

What daring God torments my body thus,
And seeks to conquer mighty Tamburlaine?
Shall sickness prove me now to be a man,
That have been termed the terror of the world . . .
Come let us march against the powers of heaven,
And set black streamers in the firmament,
To signify the slaughter of the gods. (5.3.41ff)

He is horrified at the injustice of death especially because he feels that he still has so much to accomplish. He would go on like Alexander until there are no more worlds left to conquer. Although his threat to war against the heavens is empty, it is spoken with conviction. Indeed, death is his one true mortal enemy. From this world he would go on to conquer the world of the afterlife and reign in victory.

As a tragic hero Tamburlaine has the fortitude to find fault with mortality itself. He is shocked and incredulous before his enemy--the greatest other of them all. Having warred for so long, he seems to think of no other response to the approach of death than to do battle with it. Even if the struggle is absurd, it is, however, also heroic. If he must die, he will do so valiantly.

Just as the hero's resistance to reality and mortality is absolute, the tragic situation seems absolute. The knowledge that Tamburlaine forbids consciousness and the realization that must be integrated in the end is the basic fact that nothing is so certain and absolute as death. He must resist it because he cannot avoid it and this truth must be felt before it is understood by the intellect.

One fights hubristically against tragic knowledge because it is by its nature painful:

"The tragic sense evokes a complex of feelings organically interrelated: shame, horror, disgust, grief, rage--and the sense of their encompassment" (Tragedy 6). Birenbaum explains that the self, both hero and reader/auditor, begins in unconsciousness, where tragic knowledge is resisted; then one allows for the experience of tragic consciousness where the above feelings are present and active; a third stage allows for the integration of tragic consciousness where it is accepted and understood. This stage of integration may be likened to the Buddhist conception of joyful participation in the suffering of the world.

Birenbaum argues that catharsis facilitates the integration of tragic consciousness into a state of fuller consciousness where what was rejected now seems natural:

Catharsis . . . purges us not out of feelings, but into them, and it leads us into our feelings in such a way that we are prepared to accept them provisionally in a state of poise. What is purged is our resistance, the anxiety or guilt which ordinarily devalues our experience, frustrating and obscuring it. (Tragedy 12)

The experience of catharsis requires that one participate mentally and emotionally in the tragic drama, overcoming the denial which normally protects one. There is a sense of shock and horror when one realizes one's uncompromising dilemma and the limits that dilemma imposes on the Self: the experience of Tamburlaine's state: "Raving, impatient, desperate, and mad" (2.4.112). To be immersed in such an experience allows for a valuable revelation: life does not work toward one's ends and does not suit the ego. Although reality functions independent of our wishes, acceptance of this truth can be integrated and validated emotionally as well as intellectually as in the Christian wish that "Thy will be done and not mine own." It is the moment when the hero concludes, "For Tamburlaine, the Scourge of God, must die" (5.3.248). As the hero submits to death, the ego recognizes a greater power.

Barabas: The Self-Centered

In The Jew of Malta Barabas refuses to see others as real people--as selves. He sees others only as instruments to acquire wealth and take revenge. Barabas sees the world in such a way that he forbids each Other the status of a Self. As the play progresses, the world seems to become wholly *other* to Barabas. His relentless desire for revenge of the most evil sort prevents him from being truly tragic.

The Shadow Archetype in The Jew of Malta:

Marlowe's revenge tragedy The Jew of Malta presents a Shadow archetype of another sort. Being the hero/villain of the play, Barabas does not play a Shadow to another character; he is rather the Shadow projection of the Elizabethan theater audience. The character takes the part of the Jew as Shadow. Marlowe creates an especially evil character in Barabas. Some of this evil plays on the stereotype of the Jew in Christian culture and Elizabethan drama. Emily C. Bartels argues that Marlowe's portrayal of the Other in society is largely subversive of Elizabethan values (82-108). This becomes especially clear as none of the male characters in the drama are truly virtuous, whether they be Christian, Islamic, or Jewish. Indeed everyone seems to be scheming and plotting at the expense of someone else in the play: Malta's governor wants to fleece the Jews; the friars want Barabas's money; Ithamore, the Turk, turns on Barabas while Pilia-Borza schemes against both Barabas and Ithamore.

There is, of course, another element contributing to the sense of evil in the work in that the play is a revenge tragedy in which pleasure is found in vicious retaliation. When one is wronged, there is a natural tendency to wish for revenge on the Other. Our own Shadow element readily lends itself to fantasizing and plotting revenge. The Other is seen as undoubtedly evil and deserving of retribution. Some of this, no doubt, is due to one's

hubris. Once wronged, one's sense of personal justice is offended and hubris demands an equalizing response toward the other. The tragic hero has within himself that sense of offended justice and the necessary strength to achieve revenge. Hamlet, of course is the best known revenge hero, showing how the noble hero ultimately takes action by accident even though he vacillates. Although few people carry out revenge as severely as do the characters of revenge tragedy, like the heroes of Seneca, Kyd, or Marlowe, the heroes and their actions hold a subversive fascination for their audience. The Shadow aspect of ourselves readily identifies with the revenging hero, despite religious decrees aimed at curbing such an impulse, such as "Vengeance is mine saith the Lord" or "Turn the other cheek." The Shadow within the Self disregards such maxims and encourages the desire and fantasies of revenge.

Since the advent of Christianity as a state religion in Rome, the Jew has traditionally been the subject of Shadow projection. Hebrew slavery in Egypt suggests even earlier origins. The Jews have been labeled greedy people, infidels, and "Christ killers." The leaders of the Spanish Inquisition had them tortured, banished, or murdered. Their history is one of persecution and exile. The "final solution" propounded and enacted by Nazi Germany was an especially grisly and reprehensible result of such projection. Hitler was the most nefarious person to encourage such projection:

. . . Hitler's anti-Semitism bore no relation to facts, it was pure fantasy . . . The Jew is no longer a human being, he has become a mythical figure, a grimacing, leering devil invested with infernal powers, the incarnation of evil, into which Hitler projects all that he hates and fears--and desires. (Bullock 40)

Different selves have projected the Shadow onto different groups and races throughout human history. This would seem to be a normal condition of the unintegrated psyche.

Marlowe's work builds on some Elizabethan stereotypes of the Jew: "Jews were, of course, demonized as the Anti-Christ or devil, and accused of carrying out ritual

murders, especially of Christian children, desecrating the Christian host, blaspheming, and the like" (Bartels 84). Some of this accounts for one of the play's best remembered passages, a portion of dialogue between Barabas and Ithamore in which Barabas celebrates his penchant for cruelty and evil:

As for myself, I walk abroad a-nights,
And kill sick people groaning under walls;
Sometimes I go about and poison wells . . .
Being young I studied physic, and began
To practice first upon the Italian:
There I enriched priests with burials . . .
And in the wars 'twixt France and Germany . . .
Slew friend and enemy with my stratagems. (2.3.178ff)

This passage is replete with Shadow projection of the most exaggerated sort as the Jew becomes the very incarnation of evil, to be despised by virtuous Christians. Denied any sense of a connection with others, the shadow is perceived as an absolute threat to the largely Christian community. Marlowe continually has Barabas demonstrate his own evil as when he instructs Ithamore on the necessity of duplicity and corruption representing his twisted ambitions as virtues:

First be thou void of these affections,
Compassion, love, vain hope, and heartless fear,
Be moved at nothing, see thou pity none,
But to thyself smile when Christians moan. (2.3.173-6)

Nevertheless, the Jews are readily subject to unfair treatment. When the Turks in Marlowe's play demand tribute from the Island of Malta, the Christian governor immediately plans to tax the Jews heavily in order to cover the cost of such tribute. When the knights come to collect the tax, Barabas asks if all residents are paying the same amount of tax, for which he is rebuked and condemned as a Jew:

No, Jew, like infidels.
For through our sufferance of your hateful lives,
Who stand accursed in the eyes of heaven,
These taxes and afflictions are befallen,
And therefore thus we are determined. (1.2.65-9)

Barabas stands "hateful" and "accursed" before the Christians holding power in Malta. Marlowe questions the basis of the Christians' society when Barabas asks "Will you then steal my goods? / Is theft the ground of your religion?" (1.2.97-8), however, the lines underscore Barabas's greed while undermining the Christians' intentions.

The governor of Malta, Ferneze, acts as a specific Shadow to Barabas. From the start of the work he plans and schemes his way through political power. Claiming Christianity as his faith, he sets himself in opposition to Barabas, justifying whatever he does to the Jews of Malta. His own "policy" (playing on the English conception of Machiavellian political manipulation) works much like Barabas's policy where diabolical means are justified by their ends. He mercilessly taxes the Jews, plays the Spanish against the Turks for tribute and protection, and ultimately turns Barabas's trap upon Barabas himself. Both Ferneze and Barabas believe they are acting efficiently and correctly. Projecting his own evil on those who oppose him, Barabas sees the governor as an evil intriguer while believing himself justified in his own designs:

It's no sin to deceive a Christian;
For they themselves hold it a principle,
Faith is not to be held with heretics;
But all are heretics that are not Jews. (2.3.13-16)

Barabas distrusts both Lodowick and Mathias as suitors to his daughter, Abigail. As gentiles they are unworthy of her. But then, it is hard to imagine Barabas letting go of any of his possessions, and to him Abigail is yet another possession to anyone, Jew or gentile. They, he assumes, must be scheming against him and are subject to his sense of justice. All who oppose him become the Shadow.

The single-minded devotion to corruption and revenge works well for the development of a character as Shadow or Other but tends to take away from the character's status as a tragic hero. As the murders accumulate Barabas loses any claim to sympathy and becomes entirely too *other* to warrant the reader's understanding. While he begins the

work with some strong tragic characteristics, the play cannot be said to be truly tragic in scope.

Tragic Elements in The Jew of Malta:

The Jew of Malta has some tragic elements but fails to be tragic on a grand scale. It begins in the tragic mode and drops off after the second act. Some critics detect the work of another playwright either completing or embellishing the work of Marlowe, often asserting that the play lacks the unity and quality of Marlowe's other dramatic work. F. P. Wilson suggests that Marlowe wrote only the first two acts, leaving the final three to be completed by a less gifted writer (40). T. S. Eliot argues that the play is not so much a revenge tragedy as a farce, although the humor in the play is more suited to the taste of an Elizabethan audience than a modern one:

If one takes the Jew of Malta not as a tragedy, . . . but as a farce, the concluding act becomes intelligible; and if we attend with a careful ear to the versification, we find that Marlowe develops a tone to suit this farce, and even perhaps that this tone is his most powerful and mature tone. (16)

Eliot further argues that the humor in the play is more suited to the humor of an Elizabethan audience than a modern one (16). David Bevington finds that the work is built on the model of a homiletic tragedy popular in an earlier era (145). Barabas takes the part of the tragic Vice, wholly evil and without conscience. As in the Vice play, Barabas is doomed to a justly deserved death: he is boiled in a cauldron. Bevington argues that Marlowe creates a far more ambiguous drama out of the older form, for those who are supposedly good are not now so clearly praiseworthy: Ferneze does begin the work by unjustly taxing Malta's Jews at an exorbitant rate while pronouncing divine justice at the end of the play (157). Although the Christians may not deserve such severe revenge as Barabas enacts upon them, they are not wholly innocent either.

Barabas begins the play as the victim of the governor's plans to make the Jews pay most of Malta's tribute to the Turks. The Jews are told to either pay or convert to Christianity: sell out your religion and you can keep your money. When Barabas objects to the conditions set down, the governor orders that all of his wealth and property be seized (1.2). Thus he begins the play with sufficient motivation for revenge: he is being taxed merely because he is Jewish. He has every right to be outraged by the governor's policy and the Maltese Christians' warped sense of justice.

The single strongest tragic attribute that Barabas manifests is hubris, especially in his need to control events and other people. This is clear in the way that he carefully and meticulously plans his acts of revenge. He is single-minded, indeed maniacal, in his pursuit to have others pay for wrongs done to him. He carefully orchestrates the murder of one friar so as to make another friar think that he is responsible for the death of the first; he arranges matters in such a way that Mathias and Lodowick kill each other, and he has an entire convent poisoned. Like the traditional Vice character, he sets up each of these deaths in such a way that he himself is not directly involved.

The hero/villain's drive for control extends to his daughter. Abigail loves her father faithfully until he contrives the death of her beloved Mathias. When Barabas is deprived of all he owns, she feels for his loss: "Not for my Self, but aged Barabas: / Father, for thee lamenteth Abigail" (1.2.233-4). She wants to address the administrators hoping she can "rent [sic] their hearts with the tearing of my hair, / Till they reduce the wrongs done to my father" (1.2.238-9). At this point she, the one virtuous character in the play, condemns all those who plot against one another on Malta: "I perceive that there is no love on earth, / Pity in Jews, nor piety in Turks" (3.3.47-8). It should be noted that she does not mention Christians; her father seems to have suffered by them more than she.

Even knowing how he has hurt his daughter, Barabas cannot allow himself to understand her abandonment of him. Learning that she has forsaken her faith and entered a convent, the betrayed father vows revenge when he should try to understand her:

O unhappy day,
False, incredulous, inconstant Abigail!
. . . Ne'er shall she grieve me more with her disgrace;
Ne'er shall she live to inherit aught of mine,
Be blest of me, nor come within my gates,
But perish underneath my bitter curse,
Like Cain by Adam, for his brother's death. (3.4.26ff)

He returns once more to his policy, using it against his own daughter, and sends Ithamore to poison the entire convent. If he cannot control her, he will have her dead.

With the murder of his daughter, Barabas becomes more monstrous than tragic. Harry Levin argues that it is this event that breaks the connection between hero and audience: "Here with the disaffection of Abigail, he abandons any claim upon our sympathy and vies with his new accomplice, Ithamore, in the *quid pro quo* of sheer malignity" (75). With Barabas it becomes impossible to remain morally neutral toward the hero/villain. One cannot help but condemn the extremes of his revenge.

While hubris is a natural response to a difficult, seemingly impossible world, Barabas goes to unnatural lengths to satisfy his insatiable desire for vengeance. His efforts become humanly incomprehensible. Tragedy portrays a world of absolutes, and Barabas's demands for revenge and control are absolute; they are so single-minded as to permanently drive the recognition of Others' interests from the hero/villain's mind. Marlowe did, however, create a play with entertaining events and twists, even if the hero goes beyond the role of the wronged avenger to that of an evil genius.

The Jew of Malta does not lead to a sense of catharsis. One is steeped in the horror of Barabas's ambitions, but one does not experience the desire and horror as part of

oneself; they remain largely foreign and bizarre. After Barabas admits his intrigues his end allows for no recognition or integration of the Other:

. . . had I but escaped this stratagem,
I would have brought confusion on you all,
Damned Christian dogs, and Turkish infidels . . .
Die life, fly soul, tongue curse thy fill and die. (5.5 84ff)

He dies cursing, forever at odds with the world to which he opposes himself.

Edward: The Tepid Self

The Shadow Archetype in Edward II:

Edward II presents a king more interested in indulging his love for a minion than fulfilling his responsibilities as a king. His nobles object to Pierce de Gaveston's coming to England and, being the king's favorite, diminishing their power. Edward is quick to chastise the barons for their threats and insubordination, while equally quick to lavish power and titles upon Gaveston. Such favoritism creates a rift in the court that leads to the king's overthrow and the temporary ascension of the most vocal baron, Mortimer.

Edward can be said to have two Shadow figures. One, Mortimer, stands in direct contrast to Edward's ambitions and interests, while the second, Edmund, is the brother who betrays him. With all the strength of his hubris, Edward forbids the voices of dissent from altering his power or his interest in Gaveston. Archetypal works present the Self diffused in different characters where each takes on an aspect or archetype of the Self. Jung argues that consciousness and the unconscious exist in a compensatory relationship wherein what the ego refuses to recognize or admit is pushed into the unconscious, where it gathers strength in proportion or direct compensation to its repression:

The contents that are excluded and inhibited by the chosen direction sink into the unconscious, where they form a counterweight to the conscious orientation. The strengthening of this counterposition keeps pace with the increase of one-sidedness until finally a noticeable tension is produced . . . The more one-sided the conscious attitude, the more antagonistic are the contents arising from the unconscious, so that we may speak of a real opposition between the two. (Psychological 419)

In Edward II, Edward takes the part of the central ego in the work and Mortimer becomes the unconscious Shadow archetype balancing the narrow focus of the ego, Edward. The

more Edward attempts to avoid, ignore, or even control Mortimer (his resistance to Mortimer takes all three forms) the more powerful Mortimer becomes in the play.

From the start of the work Mortimer sets himself against Edward's plans because the King wants his exiled lover, Gaveston, to return to England: "Mine uncle here, this Earl, and myself, / Were sworn to your father at his death / That he [Gaveston] should ne'er return into the realm" (1.1.81-3). While Edward's first concern seems to be centered on his minion, Mortimer enters the play contending that he is primarily interested in the state, as Gaveston threatens its traditional principles of order and the King's public responsibilities. Mortimer and the other barons are worried about Edward's interest in Gaveston because they perceive a reduction in their own influence and power in the realm. The worry is in fact realized as Edward confers on him the titles of Lord High Chamberlain, Chief Secretary, and Earl of Cornwall (1.1.153-55). Mortimer is quick to condemn such action: "Were all the earls and barons of my mind, / We'll hale him from the bosom of the king, / And at the court-gate hang the peasant up" (1.2.28-30). He is a "peasant" because Mortimer and the other barons continually maintain that Gaveston is "base born" and does not deserve high titles and power.

While the King seems primarily interested in pursuing his personal interests and relationships (here in the form of Gaveston's affection), Mortimer becomes increasingly devoted to the acquisition of power. Edward's possession of power seems accidental compared to Mortimer's aggressive pursuit of it. Before the thirst for power sets upon him, Mortimer seems to desire only the safety and solidity of the state. Upon hearing the Queen's complaints after Gaveston's exile, Mortimer relents and agrees to let Gaveston return so that he might be quietly murdered and the kingdom preserved: "And therefore though I plead for his repeal, / 'Tis not for his sake, but for our avail, / Nay, for realm's behoof, and for the king's" (1.4.241-3). A few lines later he returns to this theme: "This

which I urge is of a burning zeal / To mend the king and do our country good" (1.4.256-

7). Still later, Mortimer is quick to point out that the funds of the crown have been misspent on fine clothing for the King and Gaveston as well as other frivolous pleasures:

The idle triumphs, masques, lascivious shows
And prodigal gifts bestowed on Gaveston,
Have drawn the treasure dry, and made thee weak,
The murmuring commons overstretched hath. (2.2.157-60)

The King lets things go while his Shadow, having very different ambitions and concerns, continues to defy him, rising in power while doing so. Of course, as he acquires more power, the state becomes less a concern and his own ambition becomes all.

Mortimer is far more practical than Edward. Politically astute, he recognizes danger in Edward's pursuit of self-indulgence. He is by nature stronger willed than Edward, taking a tough and masculine role in direct opposition to Edward's effeminate nature. When he sees opportunity, he seizes it, asserting command. The crown is all and the desires of others are secondary considerations at best. Mortimer allows nothing to get between him and his rule.

Edmund, Earl of Kent, acts as a more traditional Shadow figure in that he quarrels with his brother, the King, for a time but is ultimately reconciled with him. Jung defines the Self as sometimes existing in a "*complexio oppositorum*," a union of opposites that often occurs between "hostile brothers, or . . . the hero and his adversary" (Psychological 460). The Shadow archetype in the form of hostile brothers was most familiar in the story of Cain and Abel. As a secular work, Marlowe's presentation of the archetype allows some integration of the opposites, whereas the religious version, in which good and evil are distinct, cannot.

When the drama opens, Kent readily defends his brother: "Yet dare you brave the king unto his face; / Brother revenge it, and let these their heads / Preach upon poles for

trespass of their tongues" (1.1.123-5). By the second act Kent's patience and faith in his brother have begun to slip:

My lord, I see in your love to Gaveston
Will be the ruin of the realm and you,
For now the wrathful nobles threaten wars,
And therefore, brother, banish him forever. (2.2.208-11)

Edward sends his brother away, and Edmund sides for a time with Mortimer's followers. Even his own brother must wonder at an "Unnatural King, to slaughter noble men / And cherish flatterers" (4.2.8-9). As the brothers become enemies, Edmund becomes a Shadow representing a not unreasonable concern about the King's priorities.

However, Edmund increasingly comes to distrust Mortimer's seizure of power and manipulation of the young prince, allowing a rare moment of integration of disparate elements in Marlovian theater as he comes to regret his disloyalty and worries about the brother he has abandoned. Seeing that all is going astray, Edmund finds himself asking honest questions:

Edward, alas, my heart relents for thee.
Proud traitor Mortimer, why dost thou chase
Thy lawful king, thy sovereign with thy sword?
Vile wretch, and why hast thou, of all unkind,
Borne arms against thy brother and thy king? (4.5.11-5)

He is no more pleased with the behavior of the Queen: " . . . for Mortimer, / And Isabel do kiss while they conspire. / And yet she bears a face of love forsooth; / Fie on that love that hatcheth death and hate!" (4.4.21-4). While earlier Kent had worried about his "unnatural king" and his favoritism of "flatterers," he now laments a kingdom gone astray: "Oh miserable is that commonweal where lords / Keep courts, and kings are locked in prison" (5.3.63-4). Although Edmund is prohibited from meeting with Edward before his death, he is reconciled to his brother by his decision to protect Edward's young son, the prince, who becomes increasingly dependent on him.

Control and Tragic Confrontation in Edward II:

Edward II portrays a king tragically split between serving the needs of the Self and accommodating others. Edward forbids himself the knowledge that others are selves and refuses to see others' concerns as legitimate. Mortimer too, is a Self, but he is not as fully tragic as Edward is.

As Mortimer gains power, his confidence grows stronger. He begins with the conviction of just action against a failing king. The power gained, he comes to believe that he can master the forces around him. He tells the Queen that they should place the Prince on the throne so that they might cement their own position: "Think therefore, madam that imports us much / To erect your son with all speed we may / And that I be protector over him" (5.2.10-12). Having seized the realm, he believes that he has finally mastered people in power:

The prince I rule, the queen do I command
And with a lowly conge to the ground
The proudest lords salute me as I pass;
. . . Now all is sure, the queen and Mortimer
Shall rule the realm, the king, and none rule us;
Mine enemies will I plague, my friends advance,
And what I command, who dare control? (5.4.47-9)

Much like Tamburlaine, moved by his own sense of power and significance, he describes himself as having the fates at his command: ". . . Mortimer, / Who now makes fortune's wheel to run as he please" (5.2.52-3). Clearly, Mortimer has come to a place where he thinks that he has control of the people and events in his life. Arguing that the king is not fit to hold power, and that he has fought his own way through difficult circumstances to achieve power, Mortimer believes that he is doing what is right. Like Tamburlaine in relation to Calyphas, Mortimer takes a strong, more masculine stance against the weak and effeminate Edward because Mortimer cannot and does not allow himself to act that way.

As Shadow, Edward is everything that Mortimer hates and won't tolerate in himself: he is sensual, weak-willed, and partial to favorites.

Mortimer's power is, however, short lived and his end is not truly tragic. He does not have the fortitude to rage against the forces that seem so unjust to him. Rather, he seems mystified by his own fall. He refuses to be intimidated by a mere child: ". . . I will rather die, / Than sue for life unto a paltry boy" (5.6.56-7). Mortimer sees himself as a victim of the inescapable motion of a wheel binding the fortunes of men who would attempt daring ambition:

Base fortune, now I see, that in thy wheel
There is a point to which when men aspire
They tumble headlong down; that point I touched
And seeing there was no place to mount up higher
Why should I grieve at my declining fall? (5.6.59-63)

His fall belongs to *de casibus* tragedy of the late medieval period which places fate above the actions of men. Although Edward's decline is a humanistic tragedy in the Renaissance vein, Marlowe portrays the older tradition through Mortimer while asserting through Edward's fall a newer sense of tragic responsibility. Edward's situation allows the King to recognize his personal limits and integrate that truth into his sense of self.

Marlowe presents Edward as a king overwhelmed by the forces of otherness. The consciousness of the drama as shaped by the playwright forbids tragic consciousness until moments of critical confrontation. King Edward is caught between dual drives: while he wants to rule as supreme sovereign with the rights of power, he also wants to indulge his love for Pierce de Gaveston, even if his favoritism threatens civil strife in England. These contrary drives divide and torment Edward throughout the work and are only resolved with his removal from the throne and subsequent death.

Some critics make homosexuality the focus of their discussion of the play. Emily Bartels, for example, finds that the barons want to punish Edward, at least partly, for his

homosexuality: ". . . the peers need some unmistakable way of criminalizing the king's action. Sodomy, especially as figured in the boldly extravagant Gaveston, provides the way" (159). Discussing Edward's sexual preference, other critics, favor a psychoanalytic approach. Citing several psychoanalysts, Matthew N. Proser believes that Edward submits to masochistic acts to forestall the threat of castration:

Thus fear of actual physical mutilation and the loss of the most intense erogenous zone and with it sexual potency is an underlying anxiety that motivates the masochist. In the case of the homosexual masochist, such as Edward, the provoking acts against the father surrogates [barons] are actually perverse claims upon their attention, and even their affections, which contain in them the seeds of their own punishment. They are at bottom erotic seductions meant to substitute homosexual acts for castration itself. (Proser 22)

Sara Munson Deats applies the theories of Lacan to Edward:

Read through the lens of Lacanian theory, Edward resembles the child who misidentifies the image in the mirror (the imago) as its totalized and unified Self. However, instead of finding his completion in his own reflection, the King misrecognizes Gaveston as the Imago who can restore his lost plenitude. (183)

Edward's homosexuality does, however, play on the theme of forbidden knowledge and adds to his *otherness* for the reader. A psychoanalytic approach is bound to analyze Edward as though he were a real person rather than a fictional character in a play. The text shows that misrule is the real issue of contention: the King's preference may not be approved, but it is the *consequences* of Edward's all-consuming passion that disturb the barons.

While Edward may "resemble" a child in Lacan's sense, and while sexuality is a concern in the play, it is not the controlling theme; nor is it the most important aspect of Edward's personality. His favoritism and misrule are the primary concerns.

Another aspect of Edward's love gets closer to the issue of political power. Critics have taken seriously Edward's offers to share the kingdom with Gaveston. W. Moelwyn

Merchant describes the "ominous words" "*share the kingdome* with thy dearest friend" [emphasis Merchant's] as the shattering of a kingdom's integrity" (xxii). Sara Munson Deats notes "Most heinous of all, the King volunteers to reenact the sin of Gorboduc and Lir [sic] by abdicating and dividing his Kingdom" (182). Words spoken to this effect by Edward are not to be taken literally, however; Edward may be guilty of misrule, but not Lear's intended division of the kingdom. His power is central to his sense of identity and he does not give it up until he has to.

Ultimately the play must be seen in tragic terms, for this way it demonstrates the predicament of selfhood. Harvey Birenbaum discusses two fundamental and contrary concerns within the Self. On one level of experience the self is *other* to those outside: "Knowledge, pleasures, and all good things are justified only when they are shared. The character of our lives is shaped by society. We are all other people" (Art 77). On another level one's Self is one's primary consideration, essentially opposed to others: "In all their useful or intimidating otherness, other people are my experience of them. Life is most right when it feels richest, therefore, when my appetites are gratified, when my feelings are most intense, or when there is some special inner poise" (77). Reconciling the interests of these two perspectives is problematic: "Ordinarily, therefore, I remain split, alienated, living daily by evasion or compromise, by trying to commit myself to one side or the other, or by picking a value here and a rule of conduct there, insisting that whatever I affirm is the truth" (78).

Discussing some of Shakespeare's plays, Birenbaum describes an important split in the reader's sense of consciousness:

. . . the plays organize our consciousness into a focus, on the one side, upon the experiencing Self in its own right, with its autonomous prerogatives, and, on the other side upon the order of objectivity which our minds confront. The features of symbolism and the qualities of stylization play upon our imagination to such an effect and they can do so because we watch or read as imagining selves, involved in the plays through our own

consciousness. The dramatic emphasis that results lies upon the strange irreconcilability of the two orders, their continual tendency to impose upon one another, and the frustration of our continual dependence upon them both. (78-9)

Such a split is apparent in Marlowe's portrayal of Edward II as he is divided between his duty as a king and the desire for personal gratification, between Self and his being *other* to other selves. Birenbaum describes these dual drives as "one impulse toward integrity and another toward accommodation" (79). Such a split is inherent in the nature of all selves. Edward, however, clearly favors the realm of the personal Self to the exclusion of accommodation when it would be more prudent to accommodate. He begins with efforts to control others until he is confronted by Otherness, yielding a crisis of identity and integrity.

In Edward II the forces of otherness take the form of young Mortimer and the rebellious barons. They would have the King accommodate their demands: primarily the banishment of Gaveston and an end to any possibility of Gaveston exercising power. The "others" dare to dictate the interests of their king: "Rebels! will they appoint their sovereign / His sports, his pleasures, and his company" (3.2.174-5). These different directions of the Self, that of the personal and that of the public, are absolute in their demands. Integrity of Self requires that one both serve the Self and yield to the Other, though these realms might be in contradiction. It presents a paradox for the Self as both realms need to be satisfied. One senses the impossibility of meeting both obligations even as a sense of commitment, even devotion, develops on both sides. Edward's position is tragic in that he is trapped inescapably between these two absolutes.

In the first scene of the play Marlowe introduces tension between Edward and Gaveston on one side and the barons on another when Edward's letter to Gaveston invites him back to England from the exile his father had imposed: "My father is deceased; come Gaveston, / And share the kingdom with thy dearest friend" (1.1.1-2). The barons' position is taken by Mortimer Junior (1.1.81-3). Their position is only further cemented as

Edward confers titles and power onto Gaveston (1.1.153-5). The barons believe Gaveston to be too lowly in station to deserve any such power or titles. Lancaster describes him as ". . . that base and obscure Gaveston" (1.1.100). After he and Gaveston assault the bishop, Edward gives Gaveston charge of him as well as the cleric's property and income, further alienating the barons. Throughout the play Edward must balance his interest in Gaveston against the dangers of such an interest. He must continually wonder: "I cannot brook these haughty menaces; / Am I a king and must be overruled?" (1.1.133-4). Hubristically forbidding the encroachment of otherness onto his desires and ambitions, he maintains a nearly complete integrity of Self in this one-sided approach to rule.

Though threatened by Mortimer and the other barons, Edward continually makes pronouncements about his ability and need to control the rebels. Like Tamburlaine before him, Edward resists the knowledge of his own limitations as a king--as a mere fallible and uncertain man. When challenged by the barons and the Church, Edward boasts:

Why should a king be subject to a priest?
. . . I'll fire thy crazed buildings and enforce
The papal towers to kiss the lowly ground;
With slaughtered priests may Tiber's channel swell
And banks raised higher with their sepulchres;
As for the peers that back thy clergy thus,
If I be king, not one of them shall live. (1.4.94ff)

When even the Church, which was the original proponent of Gaveston's exile, challenges Edward's judgment, Edward claims he will have revenge.

To resist being overwhelmed by others, Edward attempts to either ignore or control others. He continually pronounces his intention to act as king by reining in all those who would be insubordinate: "I will have Gaveston, and you shall know / What danger 'tis to thee to stand against your king" (1.1.95-6). Some of these statements are followed with force while others are not. At times he admits his limitations, as when he rejects Gaveston's plan to place Mortimer in the tower: "I dare not, for the people love him well"

(2.2.234). Although Edward can acknowledge this much about the power of the Other, he cannot see the Other as a genuine threat to his position as king.

Though mindful of the power of the barons, Edward argues that being the king, he has power to decide between gratification and accommodation. In a moment of sarcastic anger he mocks the barons' demands:

. . . then lay hands upon your king;
Here Mortimer, sit thou in Edward's throne,
Warwick and Lancaster, wear you my crown;
Was ever king thus overruled as I? (1.4.35-9)

Though these words are uttered in jest, the king clearly takes issue with the threat to his power--the demands of the Other are not to be accepted. In a willful refusal to accommodate others, Edward stands his ground: "Ere my sweet Gaveston shall part from me / This isle shall fleet upon the ocean / And wander to the unfrequented Ind" (1.4.48-50). Though the threat is exaggerated, it is just this flamboyant devotion that Mortimer plays on as he argues that Edward's personal desires endanger England's strength.

While Edward devotes time and attention to Gaveston, England is threatened by foreign powers. Edward dismisses the threat:

Mortimer Junior:
Nothing but Gaveston; what means your grace?
You have matters of more weight to think upon;
The king of France sets foot in Normandy.
Edward:
A trifle; we'll expel him when we please. (2.2.6-10)

Later Mortimer argues: "The haughty Dane commands the narrow seas, / While in the harbour ride thy ships unriggered" (2.2.168-9). Lancaster adds that the English people are turning against their king and his favorite in their pursuit of pleasure: "The northern borderers seeing the houses burnt, / Their wives and children slain, run up and down, / Cursing the name of thee and Gaveston" (2.2.179-81). Still later, when Edward is apprised of the French seizing Normandy, he responds:

... if this be all,
Valois and I will soon be friends again.
But to my Gaveston: shall I never see,
Never behold thee now? (3.3.66-9)

Again and again, concern for Gaveston takes precedence over foreign threats to England. Continually resisting the knowledge that he is endangering his position as king, Edward does not allow the plans and designs of others to be forced upon himself: "The headstrong barons shall not limit me; / He that I list to favor shall be great" (2.2.261-2). His own integrity demands that he be true to himself and not give in to the demands of the other.

Marlowe rearranges English history a bit by collapsing the events of Gaveston's execution and the French military advances under Valois. In so doing, he raises the tension between Other and Self to tragic heights. The Other, taking the form of both foreign intrusion and civil insurrection, mounts its forces against a king intent on maintaining both his power and his will. Although Edward's order to have several barons decapitated further alienates the English people, such acts should not completely alienate an audience, for Edward is not so much capricious as determined to maintain his will. Such determination is inherent in the tragic hero.

Confrontation:

The moment of confrontation for Edward takes place when he is imprisoned and stripped of royal power. He cannot escape the knowledge of limitations as his control ultimately fails: "I wear the crown but am ruled by them, / By Mortimer and my unconstant queen" (5.1.29-30). It is at this point that despair and death overtake him as he clings to his crown and all it seems to imply:

... hapless Edward, thou art fondly led;
They pass not for thy frowns as late they did,
But seek to make a new-elected king,
Which fills my mind with strange despairing thoughts,

Which thoughts are martyred with endless torments,
And in torment comfort find I none,
But that I feel the crown upon my head,
And therefore let me wear it yet awhile. (5.1.76-83)

Though his efforts are futile, the hero rages against the seeming injustice perpetrated by his jailers and accusers:

I'll not reign, but whilst I live
Traitors begone, and join you with Mortimer,
Elect, conspire, install, do what you will.
Their blood and yours shall seal your treacheries. (5.1.86-9)

Upon giving up the crown, Edward resigns himself to limitation and mortality:

. . . now, sweet God of Heaven
Make me despise this transitory pomp
And sit for aye enthronized in heaven;
Come death, and with thy fingers close my eyes,
Or if I live, let me forget myself. (5.1.107-11)

The Self surrenders to Otherness.

The reader is given a clear vision of Edward's experience:

My daily diet is heart breaking sobs,
That almost rents the closet of my heart;
Thus lives old Edward not relieved by any,
And so must die, though pitied by many. (5.3.21-4)

Edward does take some responsibility for his own plight and vows to die noble in spirit if not in a noble fashion:

Oh Gaveston, it is for thee that I am wronged,
For me both thou and both the Spencers died,
And for your sakes a thousand wrongs I'll take,
The Spencers' ghosts, wherever they remain,
Wish well to mine; then tush! for them I'll die. (5.3.41-5)

Dying for others and the wrongs done to them lends meaning to his own death.

Furthermore, it is at this point that the King accepts his death after actively averting and then denying his fall from power for so long. Birenbaum describes tragedy's movement as one from resistance to acceptance: "The movement is from an unstable, Self-protective

condition, through a process of attrition and suffering (ordeal, passion) to a poise of integration, where what has been actively feared is now actively embraced" (Tragedy 12). Though Edward does not wholly embrace his own culpability, he does resist, suffer, and ultimately accept his death.

Throughout much of the play Edward desperately wants to believe in the absolute power of monarchy, much like Shakespeare's Richard II as Birenbaum describes him (Art 163-200). The crown becomes the controlling symbol in both plays. Birenbaum notes that Richard II depends upon a symbolic reading of life, an assumption that symbols are inherited with a sense of their own integrity. It is the crown that makes up much of Edward's identity, for he thinks that having the crown, he *should* have the power to entertain Gaveston as well as the power to suppress the barons' demands. Birenbaum defines symbolic integrity as:

. . . the conviction that life's coherence depends upon a real continuity between image and meaning, between subject and object, between self and the world experienced. In tragedy, the self observes in horror its symbolic world disintegrating. All the customary means of interpreting experience become inadequate and consciousness is completely isolated, forced to know its own bare forked being. (Art 174)

Edward's identity as a king is assured as long as he knows he *is* king; his crown reflects the fact that he is more than a mere person. In the objective world, however, he is only a man and men are subject to fallibility and mortality. As a mortal man he is subject to the tyrannic power of otherness whether in the form of Mortimer or his own mortality.

Edward feels that he *should* have power, he *should* be right, or the concept of a "king" is meaningless. Because the world is not as it *should* be, because words and symbols cannot be trusted, reality seems tragic.

The tragic element is clearly evident in Edward's wish for genuine authority. He once desired that the sun should move time faster so that his own plans might go forward all the sooner:

Gallop apace bright Phoebus through the sky,
And dusky night, in rusty iron car,
Between you both, shorten the time, I pray,
That I may see that most desired day
When we may meet those traitors in the field. (4.3.43-7)

Later, as his authority slips away, he wishes he had the power to slow or stop the motion of time so that he might prolong his final moments as England's monarch:

Stand still you watches of the element,
All times and seasons rest you at a stay,
That Edward may be still fair England's king,
But day's bright beams doth vanish fast away,
And needs I must resign my wished crown. (5.1.66-70)

If only the King did have such power, if only the symbolic significance of divine right could be counted upon in one's time of need, then he might know some security. It feels as though both divine and terrestrial forces have plotted Edward's end: ". . . heaven and earth conspire / To make me miserable; here receive my crown" (5.1.96-7). Edward has learned through horrific experience--jailed and standing knee-deep in muck and human waste--the impotence of his title. As he is removed and taken to the Tower, the certainty of his rule is undermined: "Must! 'tis somewhat hard, when kings must go" (4.4. 82). He relinquishes the crown, so important a part of Edward's identity, as the forces of otherness close in. Birenbaum notes that Richard II realizes the significance of the crown only when power slips away from *him* (Art 169).

Having resigned, Edward expects that his wishes will be carried out in the objective world as easily as they have been in his mind, where the destruction of signifiers means the destruction of the signified. Tearing up the writ that demands his resignation, he wishes that the destruction of Mortimer were so easy:

By Mortimer whose name is written here;
Well may I rent his name that rends my heart.
[Tears the paper]
This poor revenge hath something eased my mind,
So may his limbs be torn as this paper:
Heed me, immortal Jove, and it too. (5.1.139-43)

Albeit impossible, even absurd, he wishes the tearing up the paper would equal the destruction of the man.

When addressing his demonic executioner, Lightborn, Edward expresses the ultimate discontinuity between his former title and his fallen state: "Know that I am a king; oh at that name / I feel a hell of grief: where is my crown? / Gone, gone! and do I remain alive?" (5.5.88-90). He is mystified by the knowledge that he is no longer the king, and yet he remains very much alive. He cannot understand how to separate the two levels of symbol and reality. Between the two, his title and his identity, lies the depth of tragic consciousness. Finally, all resistance is purged from Edward as he finally meets his end: "I am too weak and feeble to resist; / Assist me, sweet God, and receive my soul" (5.5.107-8). He yields to the force of mortality even as his ego has been effaced and surrendered.

The crown may imply kingship, but as Edward finds himself in devastating circumstances, royal authority seems meaningless itself. He finds that a king's position must be supported by others, or it is only a title:

But when I call to mind I am a king,
Methinks I should revenge me of the wrongs
That Mortimer and Isabel have done.
But what are kings when regiment is gone
But perfect shadows in a sunshine day? (5.1.23-7).

Without the support of others, those who demand accommodation, the crown becomes no more than a shadow, lacking any substance or authority. In the end the Self is smothered by otherness; however, Edward retains fully tragic integrity as he submits to death. As a tragic hero he resists the knowledge of limitation for a time, and his resistance lends him the stature of hubris, with which he asserts his own being against the forces of life. When he recognizes the limits of his power within the confines of mortality, however, he integrates this knowledge, not as a king but as a man.

Faustus: The Forbidden Self

The Religiously Forbidden in Dr. Faustus:

While much of the discussion of forbidden knowledge in this thesis has concentrated on psychological themes, Dr. Faustus incorporates a religious conception of forbidden knowledge. When choosing to adapt for the stage Spies's Faustbuch, translated into English as The Faustbook, Marlowe surely recognized the forbidden nature of his subject matter. The play celebrates the audacity and integrity of the hero's choice to sell his soul and take up the forbidden arts of black magic. Having treated the forbidden topic of homosexuality and royal Self-indulgence in Edward II, portrayed the forbidden pursuit of absolute power in Tamburlaine, presented a mistreated though diabolic Jewish hero in The Jew of Malta, he then chose the subject of explicitly forbidden knowledge in Dr. Faustus. Though the tragedy's hero is German and the action largely takes place in Germany, staging such a play in Reformation England was a bold and perhaps calculated foray into the forbidden on Marlowe's part. The Church looked down on the theater to begin with, and Marlowe chose a demonic subject, pushing the limits of what was considered suitable subject matter for production as far as they might be pushed. A discussion of just how forbidden magic was at the time follows.

In England the Reformation brought on a critical scrutiny of the then common practices of magic. The Anglican Church would become more and more opposed to the presence of magic and magi in a Christian nation, and they increasingly came to see the Catholic Church and its practitioners as aligned with magic and the forces of Satan on earth. Although Catholicism had not specifically condoned the practice of magic, astrology, and alchemy, it had not condemned them as outright heresy either, while the English Church became vigorous in its assertion of orthodoxy over such practices.

Keith Thomas exhaustively details the relationship between esoteric magic and Christianity in England and elsewhere from the time of the Reformation through the seventeenth century. Because there was some question about the origin of the power used in magic employed to locate lost items, tell the future, and cure illnesses, the common magician could be condemned at any time: "The Church did not deny that supernatural action was possible, but it stressed that it could emanate from only two possible sources: God or the Devil" (255). Naturally, the arcana of the magician was assumed to be of a diabolical origin: "Those persons who sought to use objects for purposes which nature could not justify were guilty of idolatry, superstition, and at least implicitly of soliciting the aid of the Devil" (256). Even those who might have blended their magic with the sanctioned faith or used it as a source of constructive power were suspect: "Village wizards who used Christian prayers to heal or to divine the future now seemed as diabolical as those whose techniques were blatantly derived from pagan tradition" (256).

The Anglican parish was expected to depend on God and not to procure the work of local magi: "The Elizabethan Injunction of 1559 . . . forbade the laity to employ 'charms, sorcery, enchantments, invocations, circles, witchcraft, soothsaying or any such like crafts or imaginations invented by the devil' and banned their resort to magicians 'for counsel and help'" (Thomas 258). Some thirty years before Marlowe adapted the Faustbook, the Elizabethan court banned such pursuits as those described there. Seeking the help of those practitioners left one liable to religious prosecution:

Any individual known to have employed such techniques, or reputed to have dabbled in any other kind of magical activity, was supposed to be reported to the bishops or archdeacons by the incumbent and churchwardens of the parish in which he lived; and so was anyone who could be proved to have been one of the wizard's customers. In the Church's eyes it was as much an offense to take one's problems to a sorcerer as to be one. (258)

Because the service or knowledge obtained from the magician was thought to derive from Satanic power, the church did not take such matters lightly.

The enforcement and prosecution of such laws, however, seem to have been less strict. While the local clergy were expected to record the names of sorcerers in their parish, few names were in fact entered in such records, and when called upon to submit these records, most were found to be blank (Thomas 261). Those who were convicted of sorcery usually suffered no more than a sentence of penance before the parish, or at most, excommunication (263).

Forms of popular magic still typically employed in Elizabethan England were astrology and alchemical Hermeticism. Astrology seems to have been the most popular and respected type of popular magic: "At the beginning of the sixteenth century astrological doctrines were part of the educated man's picture of the universe and its workings" (Thomas 285). Because the constellations of the heavens revolved in such a strict and predictable fashion, it was thought that they must also exercise some power over people and events on earth, a power of divine origin. Seeing that the stars and planets moved in fixed orbits that were in fact predictable, astrologers thought it natural that celestial influences could also be predicted by one knowledgeable in such matters (285-7).

At the time Marlowe wrote, astrology was very much in vogue: "Interest revived with the mathematical renaissance pioneered by John Dee and the Digges family during the reign of Elizabeth I, and was more or less sustained until the end of the seventeenth century" (288). Common people were interested in astrology and it became something of a trade in its own right. One popular form of astrology was the use of almanacs as a reference for astrological movement, calendar dates, and prognostication.

Although very popular, astrology was not immune from persecution, for practitioners were thought to be trafficking with the Devil. Though not singled out, it was nevertheless liable for prosecution:

Astrology was not specifically banned in the statutes against witchcraft, but so long as its technicalities remained abracadabra to the lay public there was always a risk that the practitioner might find himself arrested for sorcery . . . When witchcraft became a statutory offense again in 1563, astrologers reincurred the risk of prosecution. (Thomas 347)

More radical, the Puritans were quick to separate all realms of life into a world divided equally between the Godly and the Satanic.

Much like astrology, hermetic magic and alchemy had a strong tradition before the Elizabethan era; they would both survive into the nineteenth century, albeit with a declining popularity. Beginning in Egypt and Greece in the pre-Christian era, alchemy and hermeticism entered the West in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries through Western mysticism. The emphasis on the transformative element of alchemy lent itself to comparison with transubstantiation, allowing it to be investigated and pursued by Catholics as well as Protestant authorities.

Alchemical teachings and writings were introduced to the West by Islamic mystics and alchemists who inspired monastic Christians (de Pascal 57-8). While most people associate alchemy with material change of lead into gold, the art has long been recognized as a religious and mystical quest wherein the baser self could be transformed into a more noble being. Those who hoped to complete the work had to become as pure as the metal they wished to transform: "Alchemy was associated with asceticism and contempt for the world" (de Pascal 269).

The Church of England naturally took a critical position on alchemy:

The attitude of most orthodox Calvinist clergy to alchemy was distinctly hostile. They distrusted it for the same reason they were suspicious of all kinds of magic: it was an arrogant attempt to transform nature which could only play into the Devil's hands. . . . Most seventeenth-century

Puritans condemned alchemy as diabolical. (Thomas 270)

They were especially concerned about the Hermetic practice of conjuring spirits (226).

Once again, the clergy did not trust the magical element--God created the world as He did and man was not to interfere with it. But it is just this sort of power for which Faustus longs. He is not content with the professions of philosophy, medicine, or law, for alone, or in combination, they are not enough to satisfy his aspirations. It is partly this deeply felt longing that makes Faustus a tragic hero. Longing for the power and knowledge beyond the mediocrities of ordinary life, he yearns for some ultimate and absolute knowledge, and all the books written on any subject cannot satiate his desire. Finally, it is the profession most proscribed that he chooses. It alone seems to provide the path to the absolute.

Critical Responses to Dr. Faustus:

For many years scholars have argued whether Faustus is ultimately damned or saved. Those that argue damnation have focused much attention on the sin or sins that lead to Faustus's fate. Basing their interpretations on a tragic flaw of a grievous nature, they have argued that Faustus's committing a particular sin or series of sins must lead him to Hell. Reading the text in a modern context, when the reader is far removed from the religious teachings of the time, makes it difficult to determine just where it is that Faustus seriously goes astray. Christianity lists and categorizes the sins that one might commit, and different critics have extrapolated from the hero's actions specific sins that he seems to have committed, ranging from fleshly indulgences to spiritual transgressions.

W. W. Greg, one of the greatest Marlovian scholars of the twentieth century, has argued that Faustus's unforgivable transgression is demoniality:

Love and revenge are alike insurance against salvation. Helen then is a spirit and in this play a spirit means a devil. In making her his paramour Faustus commits the sin of demoniality, that is, bodily intercourse with demons. (106)

Before conjuring Helen, Faustus had previously explained to the courtiers present that all shades he conjures are not substantial bodies but only spirits. Helen therefore is not Helen (105-6). Demoniality was thought to be an unpardonable carnal sin and having engaged in it, Faustus is forever damned.

The sin of despair is an abandoning of faith in God's love or forgiveness. Arich Sachs maintains that it is this sin above all others that damns the impenitent Faustus:

It is a religious despair of salvation, seen as springing from the primordial guilt of Pride but sufficiently recurrent in the play to justify our regarding it as Faustus's main transgression . . . Faustus's loss of trust in personal salvation is explained by his conviction, reiterated throughout, that God hates him. Paradoxically, it is precisely this conviction that does indeed earn him God's hatred. (626)

To despair of salvation is also to presume to know God's will. Sachs finds that Faustus's despair is all but determined by his own nature: "He is constitutionally incapable of hearing both sides of faith's paradox [that one is born in sin, continues to sin, but may be redeemed not by action but by faith]; he can hear only the premise of sin, not the conclusion of redemption" (641). Faustus is not condemned for a single infraction, Sachs argues, but because his despair is a form of pride. Faustus rejects God's grace and mercy not just once but repeatedly. Ultimately, he is a man half in love with damnation: "Faustus emerges from my reading of the entire play . . . as a man utterly seduced by the prospect of his own damnation, hypnotized by it, made incapable of salvation by the fascination of his own doom" (647).

Discussing the importance of the seven deadly sins in Marlowe's play, Sherman Hawkins notes that, after the shades of the sins are paraded before him, Faustus successively indulges in each: "From the pageant Faustus learns to know the sins abstractly and objectively. In subsequent scenes he comes to know them concretely and intimately, by actually committing each of them in turn" (195). Furthermore, Hawkins further relates the sin of sloth to that of despair:

. . . sloth means more than drowsy idleness. The sin was first identified with spiritual dryness, *acedia*, the terrible spirit of despair. Later it came to mean neglect of spiritual duties such as confession, the work of self-examination and penance which is the most onerous labor of fallen man. (203)

Hawkins finds that the final sin, lust, confirms his damnation:

The union of Faustus and Helen is a foretaste of the everlasting oneness with evil which is the reverse of . . . union with God. Faustus's participation in evil reaches its appropriate climax in this act of carnal and spiritual knowledge. (203)

Although Faustus's passion is for sufficient knowledge, his consuming interest in evil blinds him from knowledge that can really be meaningful: "The awareness of evil absorbs and overpowers all other knowledge--of himself, of the world, of the creator of both" (208).

Joseph T. McCullen argues that Faustus never truly acquired the knowledge that he claims in the first act of the play in law, medicine, and theology: "He has not, indeed, mastered any of the aims of learning sufficiently to make it a guiding principle of his life. . . Both his words and his actions show that his tragedy results from culpable ignorance, and not from any superior attainments that set him at odds with conventional thinkers" (9). McCullen further argues that Faustus's decision to ignore supernatural signs of damnation displays a fundamental lack of intelligence: "He even ignores the significance of *homo fuge* . . . written on his arm, because he is without the wisdom to read these signs aright"(12). When Mephistophilis argues that God's justice, despite his mercy, demands Faustus's damnation, McCullen protests: "This is his opportunity to use his one unquestioned talent, the ability to dispute. But unable to muster the knowledge and courage to exercise it, he succumbs to fear and rededicates himself to the devil" (14).

Gerald H. Cox contends that Faustus's acts against God's will by committing sins against the Holy Spirit:

. . . the play shows us the spectacle of a sinful man gradually transformed into a hardened sinner, and in working out Faustus's sins in terms of a progressive committing of the six sins against the Holy Spirit, each was held sufficient for damnation, and Faustus commits not one but all six . . . (137)

Cox describes the six sins against the Holy Spirit: "Faustus is guilty not only of presumption and despair . . . but also of impenitence, obstinacy, resistance to the known truth, and envy of a brother's spiritual good" (120). He argues that an appeal to Christian doctrine settles the conflict in favor of certain damnation.

While theologically sound, Cox assumes that Faustus's acts exclude him from the status of a truly tragic hero: "Each of his sins against the Holy Spirit should alienate the audience, and the dramatic nadir of his sinful progress occurs when he begs Mephistophilis to torture the Old Man. We may sympathize when a character harms himself, but we react differently when he injures others" (136). Faustus's plight, Cox believes, could have been avoided:

Faustus's tragedy is one of free will gone wrong, and consequently nearly every one of his decisions moves him further from repentance and also makes the need for repentance that much more crucial. Contributing to this dual perspective of ours is the feeling, at first gradual, but then growing more insistent, that this could be otherwise. (137)

Each of the critiques summarized above depends on the conception of a tragic flaw. The question seems to be just where the flaw lies. Gregg locates Faustus's mistake in demoniality; however, it seems more likely that this is a symptom of Faustus's need to experience all that is forbidden. I would argue the same for Hawkins's faulting Faustus for indulging in the seven deadly sins. Where Sachs believes that Faustus needs to repent, I would argue that Faustus forges a certain integrity in his resistance: he cannot bring himself to subscribe to another's rules, nor would he be Faustus if he did so. He maintains his resistance until the final hour of confrontation when resistance gives way to recognition of his own responsibilities. In criticizing Faustus for lacking wisdom, McCullen makes Faustus seem more foolish than heroic. He underestimates, I believe, the drive for the

forbidden; for Faustus such a drive is an all-consuming one that will not settle for merely human domains. Rather than a deplorable lack of wisdom, Faustus's drive can be read as an act of heroic hubris that allows Faustus to go forward in the pact. Whereas Cox finds that Faustus alienates himself from his audience by indulging in sins against the Holy Ghost, I would argue, as I have done above, that to distance oneself from the hero of the work is to deny the tragic experience, because each movement into forbidden territory may, in fact, draw one further into the psychic experience. While the audience may realize that things could be otherwise for Faustus, I believe that Marlowe crafted a certain experience leading to a specifically tragic consciousness that could not emerge were the hero to behave otherwise. Indeed, tragedy inevitably requires that Faustus be drawn to damnation despite the possibility of salvation. One does not need to determine the exact error Faustus makes, but one should identify with Faustus's drive for the forbidden, in both its allure and its anxieties. One need not be more judgmental than the author and should allow as much identification with the hero as the author makes possible.

Archetypes in Dr. Faustus:

Marlowe introduced to English theatre the archetype of the magician willing to sell his soul for power and knowledge. The magus had been an archetypal figure in mythology for hundreds of years before Marlowe's play; the legends of Simon Magus, King Solomon, and Merlin were and are familiar representatives of it. The archetype being as old as Aeschylus's Prometheus, Michael Grant argues that western civilization has had an obsession with the Promethean hero (200-13). Although the pact with evil would have already been familiar to Elizabethans through the story of Judas's betrayal of Jesus for thirty pieces of silver, such a figure was yet to make an appearance in Elizabethan theater. Marlowe delivered one, developing his tragedy from German legend.

The one definite source for Marlowe's drama is The History of the Damnable Life and Deserved Death of Doctor John Faustus, an English translation of Spies's Faustbuch, printed in 1592. The text tells the story of a Doctor Faust who, having taken a theological degree and losing interest in his vocation, turns to black magic and a pact with Satan for knowledge and power. The English Faustbook is a straightforward morality narrative, justifying Faustus's damnation as being inevitable after he forsakes the grace of God. Marlowe's drama, however, is not so straightforwardly moralistic. Indeed, the damnation of his Faustus is distinctly ambiguous. Marlowe rearranges many of the events of the German source; his more important changes make Faustus a more sympathetic character. Rather than a didactic religious lesson, the result is a true tragedy celebrating the human drive for the forbidden.

The English Faustbook has Mephistopheles dictate the conditions of the pact between Faust and Satan. Marlowe's Faustus draws up his own contract, setting his own terms, becoming more directly responsible for his own fate. When Mephastophilis comes to him, Faustus readily lists his demands and cites the conditions under which they should be met. Although he sets his own fate, it is not clear that Faustus fully realizes the consequences of what he has agreed to. This creates a sense of dramatic irony, as it is clear to the audience what he has done while he himself dismisses such disturbing thoughts, and this irony is more pathetic than judgmental.

Throughout the play Marlowe conveys uncertainty about Faustus's fate, where the source announces his fate from the onset: "there is no hope of his redemption" (34). King-Kok Cheung makes a compelling argument that in Dr. Faustus religious despair depends on the possibility of salvation:

. . . although Faustus wills with all his might to forsake God in favor of the Devil, his despair, in tormenting and in evoking the alternative of repentance, works dialectically to keep alive the possibility of salvation.
. . . The play's power lies in the painful suspense which can be

experienced even by an audience that knows the outcome. Despite despair, or rather because of it, Faustus's spiritual welfare remains in doubt till the final scene. (195-6).

Despite the assertion by Cheung and others that Faustus is damned in the end, some critics have argued that he is ultimately saved. Marlowe's ambiguity throughout serves to defy a positively moralistic reading. Throughout much of the play, he allows Faustus to waver between choosing to be damned or deciding to repent.

In a number of scenes in the Faustbook, Faust asks about the nature and geography of Hell; the answers given by Mephistopheles are long and detailed, leaving Faust in fear of the punishment to come. With a master stroke Marlowe has Mephastophilis describe Hell in more existential terms:

Why this is Hell, nor am I out of it.
Think'st thou that I, who saw the face of God,
And tasted the eternal joys of heaven,
Am not tormented with ten thousand hells
In being deprived of everlasting bliss! (3.77-81)

Douglas Cole notes that his damnation takes the form of deprivation, specifically the deprivation of God's love and presence, rather than the Hell of physical damnation and a fiery end (191-3). The focus here is not just on a damnable end but the tragic nature of life as it is lived.

The Shadow:

While representing aspects of what one believes to be evil within the Self, the shadow, Jung argues, is not wholly negative:

It has been believed hitherto that the human shadow was the source of all evil, it can now be ascertained upon closer investigation that the unconscious man, that is, his shadow, does not consist only of morally reprehensible tendencies, but also displays a number of good qualities, such as normal instincts, appropriate reactions, realistic insights, creative impulses, etc. (Archetypes 266)

These aspects of the Shadow illustrate a closeness to nature and a primitive state of the psyche never fully lost, no matter how sophisticated one is. In myth and literature the Shadow can appear as a character more closely related to nature or closer to a primitive state of the psyche's development. In the Babylonian Epic of Gilgamesh one can see the Shadow in the nearly wild or feral character of Enkidu in contrast to the civilized and royal personage of Gilgamesh. The same elements can, of course, be found in the same character, as in Robert Louis Stevenson's Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde.

The Shadow can provide a person with valuable energy and insights for the psyche that might otherwise remain unconscious. When life becomes complicated or difficult, the Shadow archetype can assert itself within the psyche and provide answers to dilemmas:

In the end one has to admit that there are problems which one simply cannot solve on one's own resources. Such an admission has the advantage of being honest, truthful, and in accord with reality, and this prepares the ground for a compensatory reaction from the collective unconscious; you are now more inclined to heed a helpful idea or intuition, or to notice thoughts which had not been allowed to voice themselves before. (Archetypes 21)

The Shadow can provide an answer in moments of critical difficulty or uncertainty:

. . . the helpful powers slumbering in the deeper strata of man's nature can come awake and intervene, for helplessness and weakness are the eternal problem of mankind. To this problem there is also an eternal answer; otherwise it would have been all up with humanity long ago. (21)

Encounters with the unconscious help one to see possibilities for the Self. The unconscious is a stratum "where I am indivisibly this *and* that, where I experience the other in myself and the other-than-myself experiences me" (22). This Shadow emerges as the forbidden within oneself, but by relegating it to the unconscious, one banishes awareness of these elements. Recognizing the Shadow, therefore, helps us recognize the unseen forces within the Self: ". . . if we step through the door of the Shadow we discover with terror that we are the objects of unseen factors. To know this is decidedly unpleasant, for nothing is more disillusioning than the discovery of our inadequacy" (23). These

revelations are similar to the tragic truth of one's final limitations; one resists both violently.

Marlowe's play begins with the hero at a crossroads in life. Until this point Faustus has pursued the ends of a scholar and a Christian:

So soon he profits in divinity,
The fruitful plot of scholarism graced,
That shortly he was graced with doctor's name,
Excelling all, whose sweet delight disputes
In heavenly matters of theology. (Prologue, 15-19)

He wonders about the value of some elements of his education:

Is to dispute well logic's chiefest end?
Affords this art no greater miracle?
Then read no more, thou hast attained the end;
A greater subject fitteth Faustus' wit.
Bid *on kai me on* farewell . . . (1.8-12)

Logic dispensed with, he thinks of medicine: "Physic farewell" (1.27). He then turns to theology: "When all is done, divinity is best" (1.37). After reading and decidedly misconstruing some biblical verses, he announces:

Why then belike we must sin,
And so consequently die.
Ay, we must die an everlasting death.
What doctrine call you this? Che sara, sara:
What will be, shall be! Divinity adieu! (i, 44-48)

Faustus has exhausted the conventional and honorable vocations, finding that they hold little reward for his greater expectations of being more than man.

So it is that he turns to forbidden pursuits of esoteric doctrine:

These metaphysics of magicians,
And necromantic books are heavenly!
Line, circles, schemes, letters and characters!
Ay, these are those that Faustus most desires. (I, 49-52)

It is ironic that Faustus praises as "heavenly" that which the teachings of the conventional Church would have condemned. But Faustus has tired of the ordinary path and wants something more which these esoteric teachings seem to promise. Having pursued divinity as a scholar, he would now usurp the place of the divine, being a mere man no more but a

great magician. Faustus's life has stagnated, and now the energy provided by the Shadow can awaken interest in new paths:

Philosophy is odious and obscure,
Both law and physic are for petty wits;
Divinity is basest of the three,
Unpleasant, harsh, contemptible and vile.
Tis magic, magic that hath ravished me. (I, 106-10)

The forbidden has so captivated Faustus that he compares it to a lover who embraces him.

Faustus's Shadow manifests itself in the form of the fallen-angel-become-demon, Mephistophilis. Once Mephistophilis had been in the presence of the divine but he chose to side with Satan. Thus Mephistophilis embodies the very path Faustus had avoided so long and now chooses to follow. Faustus is not conscious of his blasphemy and the ultimate futility of his rebellion. There is inevitably a certain amount of denial present in oneself when encountering the Shadow. As Jung is quick to point out, that meeting with the Shadow is a difficult experience:

To become conscious of it [the shadow] involves recognizing the dark aspects of the personality as present and real. This act is the essential condition for any kind of Self-knowledge, and it therefore, as a rule, meets with considerable resistance. (Aion 8)

Since consciousness forbids this element of the Self, there is a certain amount of denial present in oneself when encountering the Shadow. When Mephistophilis describes for Faustus the quickest way to summon a demon, he allows the Shadow element to appear to him: "Therefore the shortest cut for conjuring/ Is stoutly to abjure the Trinity, / And pray devoutly to the prince of hell" (3.53-5). Then when Faustus first summons Mephistophilis, he cannot bear to look upon him in his diabolical form:

I charge thee to return and change thy shape,
Thou art too ugly to attend on me;
Go and return an old Franciscan friar,
That holy shape becomes a devil best. (3.24-7)

There is, of course, the irony of unconsciousness in his command and also Protestant humor at Catholic expense. However, Mephistophilis is not just Faustus's personal tempter, he embodies evil itself. As Jung asserts, there is a difficulty in meeting with pure evil compared to reckoning with the Shadow side of oneself:

With a little self-criticism one can see through the Shadow so far as its nature is personal . . . it is quite within the bounds of possibility for a man to recognize the relative evil of his nature, but it is a rare and shattering experience for him to gaze into the face of absolute evil. (Aion 10)

Faustus is not willing to look at Mephistophilis in the form of a demon, for it is too ugly, but he can be faced in a more familiar form: the Franciscan friar, who Mephistophilis asks for light-heartedly.

By following the course of Lucifer and Mephistophilis, Faustus is set to shape his life in direct contrast to what the study of divinity has taught him:

Faustus:

Was not that Lucifer an angel once?

Mephistophilis:

Yes, Faustus, and most dearly loved of God.

Faustus:

How comes it then that he is prince of devils?

Mephistophilis:

O, by aspiring pride and insolence,
For which God threw him from the face of heaven. (3.65-9)

The fate of Faustus will now also mirror that of the fallen angels, not only in his aspiration for what is forbidden but in the desperation that is all he will achieve. Marlowe gives Mephistophilis's description of Lucifer's fall a touch of pathos, for once Satan had been loved by God. He prepares us, therefore, for a sense of Faustus's ultimate tragic predicament. Because there lies in the collective unconscious a more objective truth than in consciousness (Archetypes 22), the Shadow, Mephistophilis, can advise Faustus of the danger into which he is entering: "O, Faustus, leave these frivolous demands, / Which strike terror in my fainting soul" (3.82-3).

The role of the Shadow in Dr. Faustus is clearly paradoxical. Although he puts Faustus's soul at great risk and leads him undoubtedly on a dark path leading to damnation, it is Mephistophilis, as a Shadow figure, that offers him explicit awareness of the consequences:

. . . I shall wait upon Faustus whilst he lives,
So he will buy my services with his soul . . .
But Faustus, thou must bequeath it solemnly,
And write a deed of gift with thine own blood,
For that security craves great Lucifer.
If thou deny it, I will back to hell. (3.31 ff)

Before committing himself, Faustus is told he will forgo his soul, but he continues to avoid any knowledge that does not consciously please him.

As a theologian, Faustus would have been expected to reject temptations of the flesh in favor of more spiritual ambitions. Mephistophilis plays on his forbidden desires, and by promising him such experiences, he awakens within Faustus the sensuality and fantasies of worldly power that his studies have repressed:

I'll cull thee the fairest courtesans,
And bring them every morning to thy bed:
She who thine eyes shall like, thy heart shall have . . .
Hold this book, peruse it thoroughly:
Thy iterating of these lines brings gold;
The forming of this circle on the ground
Brings whirlwinds, tempests, thunder and lightning.
Pronounce this thrice devoutly to thy self,
And men in armour shall appear to thee,
Ready to execute what thou desirest. (5.150ff)

If he cannot readily see that he is damned, it is because he must first experience all that had been forbidden to him by religious teachings.

The Wise Man Archetype:

A second archetype present in the text of Dr. Faustus is that of the Wise Old Man. The archetype can take a number of forms: "The wise old man appears in dreams in the

guise of a magician, doctor, or priest, teacher, professor, grandfather, or any person possessing authority" (Archetypes 216). The Wise Old Man appears in fairy tales and fiction as well, normally during a period of indecision or uncertainty:

The archetype of spirit in the shape of a man, hobgoblin, or animal always appears in a situation where insight, understanding, good advice, determination, planning, etc., are needed but cannot be mustered on one's own resources. The archetype compensates this state of spiritual deficiency by contents designed to fill the gap. (216)

As a function of the spirit, the Wise Old Man makes conscious knowledge within the Self needed at critical moments. When a situation seems desperate in a fairy tale or dream, the "wise man" provides instructions or directions to the hero or dreamer

In Marlowe's drama the archetype takes form literally as the Old Man. When Faustus's life draws near its end, the Old Man appears to advise him:

Ah Doctor Faustus, that I might prevail
To guide thy steps unto the way of life,
By which sweet path thou mayst attain the goal
That shall conduct thee to celestial rest. (7.25-9)

He describes repentance as the path Faustus most needs--"Tears falling from repentant heaviness" (12.30)--emphasizing that Faustus need not despair of God's saving grace: "Ay, stay, good Faustus, stay thy desperate steps! . . . Then call for mercy, and avoid despair" (12.43-7). In the end the archetype becomes the Wise Old Man rejected, as Faustus chooses intercourse with a demon in the form of Helen of Troy. Unlike Faustus, the Old Man is able to resist the dangers posed by devils sent to strike fear into him, and presumably to likewise resist despair, whereas Faustus cannot learn from an Other but must go his own path in the tragic manner.

The Trickster Archetype:

While Marlowe has often been criticized for his use of comedy in the middle portion of Dr. Faustus, the play does not thoroughly break down or lose its serious purpose.

Thomas McAlindon notes that critics have found it hard to reconcile the presence of low comedy in a drama of serious nature (85). Robert Ornstein, however, argues for the value of the comic elements in the drama: "The ironic comedy in Doctor Faustus is more than reassuring. Its intention, I think, is both didactic and comic. Simultaneously nonsensical and profound, it clarifies our perception of moral values" (166). This is especially clear in the relationship between Faustus and his servant Wagner, who mirrors in parody much of Faustus's ambitions. Throughout the work, the contrasts between hero and clown create an irony between one's expectations and the realities of Faustus's bargain: one expects grand knowledge and experiences for Faustus, but he receives no more than the clowns do from the ever-deceptive Lucifer.

The clown is a variant of the Trickster archetype, which Jung compares to the spirit of Mercurius in alchemy, the role of the shaman, and even the activities of poltergeists (*Archetypes* 256). Playing tricks upon others, he is liable to end up the "wounder wounded" (256). This archetype may be related to the Shadow as it partakes of unrefined, low, and often lewd behavior not associated with civilized humanity (262).

Jung notes that the mystery of the Trickster figure represents a lower stage of consciousness:

So long as consciousness was itself Trickster-like, such a confrontation [between that of a higher and a lower state of consciousness] could obviously not take place. It was possible only when the attainment of a newer and higher level of consciousness enabled him to look back on a lower and inferior state. (*Archetypes* 263)

One rises above simpler modes of thought by recognizing the place of more primitive forces, just as one becomes more conscious by recognizing the unconscious. Paul Radin describes the Trickster's role and function in much early mythology, especially among the Native Americans:

Trickster is at one and the same time creator and destroyer, giver and negator; he who dupes others and who is always duped himself. . . He

knows neither good nor evil yet he is responsible for both. He possesses no values, moral or social, is at the mercy of his passions and appetites, yet through his actions all values come into being. (xxiii)

While Marlowe's characters are not directly creative or destructive, their amoral and uncontrollably instinctual nature do lead to a sense of the play's higher values. The Trickster has, however, never wholly disappeared, although Jung finds it hard to explain why the figure continues to appear in literature: "The explanation is rather difficult because two contrary tendencies are at work: his desire on the one hand to get out of the earlier condition and on the other hand not to forget it" (*Archetypes* 268). He explains, however, that this archetype survived in early forms of drama:

Medieval customs demonstrate the role of the Trickster to perfection, and when they vanished from the precincts of the Church, they appeared again on the profane level of Italian theatricals, as those comic types who . . . entertained the far from prudish public with ribaldries in true Rabelaisian Style. (260)

These same types appear in Elizabethan drama as mischievous servants or rustic clowns. One thinks also of the drunken porter of *Macbeth* or even of Shakespeare's Falstaff when considering modified Trickster figures on the Elizabethan stage. David Bevington argues that the appearance of these figures in *Dr. Faustus* is a carryover from the devil characters of the Vice tradition (180-1). This, combined with the tendency of the archetypes to reappear throughout history, explains why Marlowe introduced Trickster figures in the play.

Aside from Wagner, the Trickster figures of *Dr. Faustus* are Robin, Rafe, Faustus himself, and Mephistophilis. Each seems to have his own agenda, and each has varying degrees of success in his acts of trickery. As with the whole of the drama, magic and the dark arts comprise the vehicles of such trickery. Interspersed between the very serious scenes in which Faustus and Mephistophilis work together, scenes portraying the comical acts of Wagner, Robin, and Rafe reflect the main action, and by contrast, emphasize just how serious it is.

The first comical scene (iv) takes place between Wagner, Faustus's assistant, and a character called simply the Clown. In it the theme of selling one's soul is treated comically, parodying the contract yet to be made between Faustus and Lucifer. Seeing that the Clown is down in circumstances, Wagner jokes: "Alas poor slave, see how poverty jesteth in his nakedness! The villain is bare, and out of service, and so hungry, that I know he would give his soul to the devil for a shoulder of mutton, though it were blood raw" (4.6-9). To which the clown returns, ". . . I had need have it well roasted . . ." (4.11-2). Both Faustus and the Clown would give up their souls for very different ends while displaying the same lack of judgment.

Having stolen one of Faustus's books, Robin hopes to perform magic just as Faustus is supposed to be able to do. His goals begin as low as having women appear naked before him, providing alcohol for Rafe, and causing a certain Nan Spit to give herself to Rafe as well. By scene eight Robin finds that he has become the Trickster tricked. While attempting to avoid payment to a vintner, Robin conjures Mephastophilis; upon so doing, he finds himself in great fear of the demon and asks him, "Will you take sixpence in your purse to pay for your supper and be gone?" (4.42-3). Mephastophilis then turns Robin into an ape and Rafe into a dog (4).

With the aid of Mephastophilis, Faustus, too, becomes something of a Trickster, as in Scene Seven, where Mephastophilis casts a spell making Faustus invisible so that he can remove the Pope's food and strike him in the presence of his Friars. In Scene Nine a knight plagues Faustus with insults as he conjures the spirit of Alexander; Faustus takes revenge by magically attaching horns to the knight's head. Scene ten has Faustus set what Birenbaum calls a "trap of commitment" on the horse-courser. This is an archetypal motif popular throughout mythology. He describes the trap of commitment in this way: "[Those setting the trap] propose some form of personal commitment, such as an oath or a promise,

that absolutely requires an ironical conclusion, so that the end turns the linear intention completely inside out" (Myth 71). One common form is the taboo that will inevitably be broken. The taboo appears when Faustus sells the horse-courser a horse that cannot be taken into water. The horse-courser does just exactly what he is told not to do:

Now, I thinking my horse had some rare quality that he would not have me know of, I, like a ventrous youth, rid him into the deep pond at the town's end. I was no sooner in the middle of the pond, but my horse vanished away, and I sat upon a bottle of hay, never so near to drowning in my life! (10.34-39).

The conditions set in these traps are of necessity always violated.

What the Trickster archetype can reveal to one is the coarse but engaging energies of the Self that are discouraged by the good sense of consciousness. Jung writes:

The so-called civilized man has forgotten the Trickster. He remembers him only figuratively and metaphorically, when, irritated by his own ineptitude, he speaks of fate playing tricks on him or of things being bewitched. He never suspects that his own hidden and apparently harmless Shadow has qualities whose dangerousness exceeds his wildest dreams. (Archetypes 267)

The danger to Faustus, of course, is damnation. The greatest Trickster of the play, and of all Christian history for that matter, is Lucifer, whose trickery is blamed for man's fall from Eden. In Marlowe's play, Lucifer convinces Faustus, by means of the contract, that there is no salvation available to one who has willingly bargained with him. Ignoring the Christian meaning of God's grace, Faustus ignores also the illusory nature of the power granted to him, a point I will return to in my discussion of control in the play.

The Anima:

Jung argues that each Self is composed of masculine and feminine aspects: men have within them a feminine element, the Anima archetype, and women have within them a masculine element, the Animus archetype. Typically these archetypes are projected onto an Other, often the beloved of a man or woman: "What is not-I, not masculine, is most

probably feminine, and because the not-I is felt as not belonging to me, the Anima-image is usually projected upon women" (*Archetypes* 29). Individuation requires that the Self recognize and integrate these seemingly *other* sides of the Self.

The Anima appears in dreams and myth in a variety of images many of them negative:

The nixie is an . . . instinctive version of a magical feminine being whom I call the *Anima*. She can also be a siren, *melusima* (mermaid), wood nymph, Grace, or Erlking's daughter, or a lamia, or succubus who infatuates young men and sucks the life out of them. (*Archetypes* 25)

Jung elaborates on the numinous quality the Anima possesses:

Occasionally she causes states of fascination that rival the best bewitchment, or unleashes terrors in us not to be outdone by any manifestation of the devil. She is a mischievous being that crosses our path in numerous transformations and disguises, playing all kinds of tricks on us, causing happy and unhappy delusions, depressions and ecstasies, outbursts of affect, etc. (26)

The Anima gives rise to the well-known dichotomy between whore and saint in myth and literature; she may appear as an evil seductress or an exalted, nurturing feminine figure and is frequently experienced as both by mythological and literary heroes. In *Dr. Faustus* the Anima archetype takes the form of the shade Helen of Troy. She is, of course, merely a projection of the ideal feminine, and Faustus exalts the demon/woman with his now-famous words:

Was this the face that launched a thousand ships,
And burnt the topless towers of Ilium?
Sweet Helen, make me immortal with a kiss:
Her lips sucks forth my soul, see where it flies!
Come Helen, come, give me my soul again.
Here will I dwell, for heaven be in these lips,
And all is dross that is not Helen! (12.81-7)

As both projection and demon she takes on a numinous quality as described by Jung: "With the archetype of the Anima we enter the realm of the gods, or rather, the realm that metaphysics has reserved for itself. Everything the Anima touches becomes numinous--

unconditional, dangerous, taboo, magical" (Archetypes 28). Where the negative Anima sucks the life out of men, Helen sucks forth the soul of Faustus. Although he is speaking in metaphor and hyperbole, we are aware that, with tragic irony, the image is literally true.

Helen is the sole feminine character in *Dr. Faustus*, and even she is no more than a demon in the form of a woman. His sensual description expresses his longing for a passionate fulfillment that cannot be realized. But being a scholar, Faustus naturally chooses an image of classical feminine beauty as well as an object of masculine desire. The fact that she has no lines emphasizes that she is only a projection of womanhood. While Faustus sees her as an angelic lover, the reader recognizes her demonic origin. The main point, however, is that she serves as the angelic/satanic counterpart to Faustus's masculine ego. Although he has explained to others that he can only summon shades, he cannot admit to himself that she is no more than that.

The Self:

The alternatives for salvation exhausted, Faustus calls upon his Shadow in his final words: "ah, Mephistophilis" (13.115). It is here that the last archetype is presented: the Self. As Faustus calls upon his demonic counterpart, the former theology student is united with an image of evil. Jung describes the archetype of the Self as often being a marriage of disparate elements:

When it represents a *complexio oppositorum*, a union of opposites, it can also appear as a united duality, in the form for instance of *tau* as the interplay of *yang* and *yin*, or of the hostile brothers, or of the hero and his adversary (arch-enemy, dragon), Faust and Mephistopheles [Goethe's *Faust*], etc. Empirically, therefore, the Self appears as a play of light and Shadow, although conceived as a totality and unity in which the opposites are united. (Psychological 460)

Here consciousness/ego admit and combine with the unconscious to form a Self: the ego, Faustus the theology student, combines with the Shadow, in the form of Mephistophilis as

demon, to form a unified Self. In tragedy the hero incorporates tragic knowledge in death-- here, beyond death, in damnation. Through suffering and a sense of horror, the archetypal factors are unified in a conclusion that is emotionally and dramatically satisfying.

Control in Dr. Faustus:

"The more of the world we have come to control," Birenbaum explains, "the more we rely on our powers of control and on the world we have put in order" (Myth 99). Tragic heroes overestimate their ability to control what is *other*, imagining themselves to have more control than they actually do. Where Tamburlaine had exercised control through military dominance, Barabas through wealth and vengeance, and Edward through the unbridled power of the crown, Faustus attempts control of the forces around him through supernatural power. Like the three heroes before him, however, absolute control simply is not possible for Faustus. While consciousness forbids awareness of archetypal forces within oneself, it also, tragically, keeps one from seeing the futility of controlling people and forces outside oneself. Limitations cannot be overcome, even with the power of magic, but Faustus refuses to recognize that the power conferred by Satanic means is only an illusion that is every bit as futile as any other form of control. Faustus wants control over the forces of otherness, whether they appear in other people or the natural forces and supernatural forces that underlie one's being. Birenbaum notes: "In tragedy the two dimensions [of Self and Other] are locked together in a death grip. Broadly the whole environment is *other*, but as drama, of course, a play focuses on the Self's relation to other persons" (Tragedy 56). Faustus would control Mephistophilis and have him be his attendant and means to power, but Faustus has to confront the forces of otherness in the form of divine will and his own mortality.

Control is a natural aspect of hubris, which demands that the world conform to one's desires, as Birenbaum notes: "Hybris asserts a limited truth, that man can make of his life what he wishes. But the full truth is that he is limited" (*Tragedy* 41). Furthermore, mortality and limitations seem *other* to the tragic hero:

In the hybristic condition, the dynamics of mortality must be sensed as *other* and hostile forces. The resistance itself projects a vision in which life and the gods (its masters) are tyrannical, unfair, grotesque. Here one has the hybristic illusion of the free will to fight an opponent. (49)

Perhaps such a condition is nowhere more evident than in Faustus. The forces outside himself are felt to be *other* and he wishes to master them; even God seems an opponent as Faustus sides with Satan and invokes demonic power. Yet the knowledge that Faustus forbids himself, as do all selves, is knowledge of the myriad limitations that cause one to founder in a sea of otherness, an otherness that often feels supernatural and animated by an unrelenting force of opposition dedicated to frustrating one's own will.

The prologue of *Dr. Faustus* prepares one for what will follow as the ambitious scholar turns from God to darker elements: "And glutted more with learning's golden gifts, / He surfeits upon cursed necromancy: / Nothing so sweet as magic is to him" (24-27). The prologue has already described Faustus's rise to scholarly success and the taking of a doctoral degree, but having done so, Faustus wants still more. Levin describes such a drive as a will to knowledge, "libido sciendi" (113). Faustus will overreach toward forbidden knowledge as he attempts to wield god-like power.

The play opens with Faustus musing on what he has been able to do even though he was born of parents "base of stock": having surpassed that limitation, he wants to overcome many others. Levin notes that Faustus begins with a catalogue of accomplishments of the Elizabethan era: "His introductory soliloquy is no mere reckoning of accounts but an inventory of the Renaissance mind" (113). The Renaissance allowed the exploration of new fields of knowledge and accomplishment, but, as is only human,

Faustus wants more. He will not settle for particular accomplishments, but wants absolute knowledge, the knowledge of God, knowledge infinite, for the finite has left him with unfulfilled desires:

Yet art thou still Faustus, and a man.
Couldst thou make men to live eternally,
Or being dead, raise them to life again,
Then this profession [of medicine] were to be esteemed. (1.23-6)

He finds that law and medicine, undertaken primarily for money, offer no satisfaction and derides one "Who aims at nothing but external trash! / Too servile and illiberal for me. / When all is done, divinity is best" (1.35-7). Then he finds himself bidding "Divinity, adieu!" (1.48). Rather than study theology and the revelations it seems to promise, he would rather aspire to a state of divinity itself. Once knowledge had seemed a great answer to his longings, but it leaves him still mortal, and mortality has been the real problem for him. What he has received is merely hypothetical, technical, or practical; what he turns to Mephistophilis for is absolute and definite knowledge that can solve the problem of death, and this is knowledge that must be experienced to seem real.

Like many before him, Faustus turns to the realm of magic for power and knowledge because the esoteric arts, presumably those of Hermetica, Kabbalah, and astrology, promise a power like that of God:

These metaphysics of magicians,
And necromantic books are heavenly!
Lines, circles, schemes, letters, and characters!
Ay, these are those that Faustus most desires.
O what a world of profit and delight,
Of power, of honour, of omnipotence
Is promised to the studious artisan! (1.49-55)

Clearly, Faustus finds real excitement and promise in these speculations when he readily describes as "heavenly" esoteric texts that would have been condemned and banned outright by those of the "heavenly" profession, the clergy. Not only are power and honor

promised, but even “omnipotence,” and Faustus must have nothing less. Faustus desires knowledge, therefore, both as an end in itself and as a means of power:

All things that move between the quiet poles
Shall be at my command; emperors and kings
Are but obeyed in their several provinces,
Nor can they raise the wind, or rend the clouds;
But his dominion that exceeds that of this
Stretcheth as far as doth the mind of man:
A sound magician is a mighty God. (1.56-62)

The desire for power increases as he thinks of yet more things that might be at his command; he even wants to control the elements as Christ calmed the sea and storms. Seeing how enamored he is of this kind of power, one can also see why, at times, Faustus does believe he can control his own fate.

Thus Faustus dismisses the three great realms of traditional study for something so radically different that it ravishes the mind of its would-be practitioner. Faustus thinks of Agrippa before him, as Marlowe invokes the dark presence of magi before the Elizabethan audience (1.17). He summons two adepts of the art and explains that he has not yet discovered a subject that has satisfied his appetite for knowledge (1.107-10). The two are eager to supply him with the arcana of the arts:

Then haste thee to some solitary grove,
And bear wise Bacon's and Albanus' works,
The Hebrew Psalter, and New Testament;
And whatsoever else is requisite
We will inform thee ere our conference cease. (1.149-52)

By Marlowe's time Roger Bacon's pursuits were considered forbidden, so too the use of sacred texts for purposes other than Church-sanctioned edification and salvation, and it is through these that Faustus believes he will be able to acquire the power he desperately wants.

The means to Faustus's pursuit of the forbidden, Mephistophilis is central to all that follows in Faustus's damnable career. Faustus readily believes that Mephistophilis will satisfy his wishes:

How pliant is this Mephistophilis,
Full of obedience and humility,
Such is the force of magic and my spells.
Now Faustus, thou art conjuror laureate
Thou canst command great Mephistophilis. (3.30-4)

He is awed by the presumed great power of "the force of magic and my spells." So desirous of power is he that he takes it for granted that a mere summoning has given him control over an actual demon:

I charge the wait upon me whilst I live,
To do what ever Faustus shall command,
Be it to make the moon drop from her sphere,
Or the ocean to overwhelm the world. (3.37-40)

His wishes spoken, however, Faustus meets with his first challenge and limitation as Mephistophilis explains:

I am servant to great Lucifer,
And may not follow thee without his leave;
No more than he commands must we perform.
. . . I came now hither of my own accord. (3.41-3 ff)

Now Faustus should begin to realize that Mephistophilis is no more free of others than any one else; limitations underlie the whole of Faustus's dealings with the devil, but he is not ready to admit this. The unconscious realizes that control is not truly possible, nor ultimately desirable--yet consciousness forbids such knowledge because it constructs a vision of reality whereby one can control much of one's world.

The contract between Lucifer and Faustus provides an illusion of control but has a strong undertone of limitation. Faustus is quick to demand control over Mephistophilis and thereby all that is Other:

. . . Mephistophilis shall be his servant, and at his command . . .
Mephistophilis shall do for him, and bring him whatsoever . . .

he [Mephistophilis] shall be in his chamber or house invisible . . .
he shall appear to the said John Faustus at all times, in what form
or shape soever he please . . . (5.96-104)

Having demanded all of the above, his own concession sounds like an afterthought:

I, John Faustus of Wittenberg, doctor, by these presents, do give both body
and soul to Lucifer . . . and furthermore grant unto them that, four and
twenty years being expired . . . full power to fetch or carry the said John
Faustus, body, and soul, flesh, blood, or goods, into their habitation
wheresoever. (5.104-10)

Faustus draws up a contract for himself laden with limitation: it will give him great power and control for twenty-four years but at the expense of being under Lucifer's dominion for eternity. Later, Faustus seems to think that he can renege on the contract whenever he might choose, but although theology seems to be on his side, his own pride will not let him do so. The hubris which cements his fate raises his struggle to a heroic level and gives him the integrity of one pitted against forces by which he refuses to be controlled.

The limitations of so great a power become readily apparent when there are some things that Mephistophilis cannot truly supply; for example, when asked to bring Faustus a wife, Mephistophilis dismisses such a request: "How, a wife? I prithee Faustus, talk not of a wife" (5.142). Wives are, of course, taken in holy matrimony, something far beyond the power of Mephistophilis, although he does supply a "DEVIL, dressed like a woman, with fireworks" (scene 5, stage direction). Understandably, Faustus is not amused. Mephistophilis then promises to supply him with women enough (5.150-5). Even for the price of his soul, so much of what he asks for is denied.

The very knowledge that Faustus bargained for comes bound with critical limitations, as when Mephistophilis presents him with books on astronomy and esoteric doctrines with which he is already familiar (5.175). After asking questions about the order and nature of the universe, Faustus again finds that he is told nothing valuable or new: "Tush, these are freshmen's suppositions" (5. 231). Even when he inquires about the creation of the world, he is met with evasion, as demons cannot speak of God (5.241-7).

The promise of knowledge and power can only be delivered in the form of illusion, an illusion that Faustus maintains until the end. He will make the most of his bargain, and does what he can to believe that he has bested the devil.

Even in his greatest moments Faustus continually meets with limitation. Though he has gained some degree of knowledge and has had some amusing experiences, all that he possesses is an illusion. The Chorus grants Faustus some fame and recognition for the knowledge he has acquired:

They put forth questions of astrology,
When Faustus answered with such learned skill,
As they admired and wondered at his wit.
Now is his fame spread forth in every land. (Chorus 3.9-12)

However, the exact nature of this knowledge must remain a mystery. One criticism that has plagued all versions of the Faust legend is that their authors do not provide any real forbidden knowledge (Smeed 81-3). Any detailed discussion of this knowledge is not possible because Marlowe, of course, could produce none; hence the reader must be satisfied with a report of knowledge and fame. Though Faustus has access to Mephistophilis, furthermore, the knowledge and power are not truly his: they are rather on loan in the form of a demon's aid and revelations. The words of the chorus are tempered by limitations when Faustus himself must admit to the Emperor that all he can produce is illusory: "But, if it like your grace, it is not in my ability to present before your eyes the true substantial bodies of those two deceased princes which long since are consumed to dust" (9.42-4). Where Faustus had longed for the power to raise the dead (1.25), he now concedes, even after making the devil's dangerous bargain, that he can only produce mere shades of those now dead. He has no more power over the dead or mortality than any other man.

Faustus had hoped that mastering black magic would mean mastering reality itself. He cannot be satisfied with an ordinary role in the world. What others aspire to, he mocks;

he insists that grander things were meant for him, but the pursuit of such dark paths yields only illusion and frustration. All of his efforts at control are, as the scene with the horse-courser demonstrates, only so much straw.

One can recognize and understand Faustus's need for such knowledge and power, no matter how forbidden. Although the desire might be largely unconscious, everyone wants, even demands, a certain amount of control over what is *other*, including death itself, but reality does not conform to one's demands, no matter how sincerely one prays, how hard one works, or how determined one might be. The forces of reality cannot be bargained with. This is tragic knowledge, and although it is difficult to confront and seems "impossible" to live with, it is just these limitations that define one's existence. Rather than achieving absolute control, our consciousness can in fact come to accept our finite nature with a deep and integral appreciation for our mortal existence.

Tragic Elements and Confrontation in Dr. Faustus:

Tragic consciousness, as defined by Birenbaum, is that state of mind in which we experience the painful vision feared by the self-protective ego (*Tragedy* 19). The hero, representing the Self, begins in a state of unconsciousness where one identifies oneself with one's ego, rationality, and superficial consciousness (19). Tragic consciousness is forbidden by consciousness until a moment of confrontation, when the tragic hero is forced to recognize his own place in relation to a world of otherness. Hubris, a function of consciousness, avoids tragic knowledge until it can be averted no longer. Thus, Faustus confronts his own mortality and the limitations that it implies in the final moments of the play; he can resist his fate no longer.

Perhaps more explicitly than other tragic heroes, Faustus sets the terms of his own confrontation and the death that inevitably follows. The contract signed, Faustus finds

himself consciously time-bound for a period of twenty-four years. For that time he may live to the fullest while being continually haunted by the fate that awaits him, and here and again, through his hubris, he believes that he can escape that fate in the end.

Throughout Dr. Faustus, Marlowe leads one toward a state of tragic consciousness. Faustus signs the contract because he cannot do otherwise. He *must* have what can only lead to damnation. Birenbaum explains tragic inevitability as a synthesis of free will and determinism (Tragedy 46-50). The duality is resolved in the imperative to experience oneself truly: "In his revelation, tragic man discovers finally that there is will other than free will--the will to be what one must, what, in fact, one already is" (49-50).

Through the character of Faustus and in the play itself, Marlowe establishes a state of consciousness fraught with tension between danger and possibility. The pact with Lucifer promises absolute knowledge and power even as it threatens absolute death and torment--and the play between these two poles, vitality and mortality, runs through the whole work. Even as Faustus acquires knowledge and exercises power, he often pauses to wonder about the state of his soul. The tension also serves to draw the reader into the work as the fictive experience probes a reality within one's own psyche.

Two ways in which Faustus resists his fate are false confidence and intellectual rationalization. Both paths minimize the threat to consciousness posed by the unconscious awareness of impending doom, the fatal destruction of the ego. Driven by hubris, Faustus cannot really believe there is a genuine threat to him, as when considering the possibility of damnation, he asks, "What god can hurt thee Faustus?" (5.25). Before signing the contract, his blood congeals, causing him to question the deed for a moment, but he proceeds defiantly, asking "Why shouldst thou not? Is not thy soul thine own?"(5.69). Finding confidence in himself, he cares for neither God nor Satan, for he believes the

decision is only his own. Though his position is seriously foolish, it is, nevertheless, courageous.

Faustus also manages to convince himself that there is little danger of real harm, with reasoning that overrides religious fear. When Mephistophilis honestly describes the horrors of Hell, Faustus chooses to dismiss them all as superstition: "Thinkest thou that Faustus is so fond to imagine / That after this life there is any pain? / Tush, these are trifles and mere old wives tales" (5.133-5). He argues materialistically that the threat of damnation is only imaginary, because sensation ceases upon death with nothing beyond. Still later, he argues that he can escape any punishment by simply choosing another religious conception of Hell: "This word damnation terrifies not him, / For he confounds hell in Elysium: / His ghost be with the old philosophers" (3.69-61). His classical learning described a different afterlife than that of Christianity, and he believes that he need only think of it to be safe.

The tragic hero goes forward with selective vision for a time, choosing to see only what fits his or her vision of reality. Faustus's resistance to the prospect of damnation extends even to ignoring the revelation Mephistophilis provides about the mind's own entrapment of itself: "Why this is hell, nor am I out of it" (3.77). Although most of the information that Mephistophilis gives Faustus is not very helpful, he does impart a valuable truth to Faustus: as Christianity teaches, Satan is the lord of this world, and the world itself is hellish when it separates one from God. Ironically, Faustus is supplied with this information even before he signs his soul away. Mephistophilis expands on this theme later when he adds that: "Hell hath no limits, nor is circumscribed / In one self place; for where we are is Hell, / And where Hell is, must ever we be" (5.121-3). Even after having heard this revelation, Faustus still proclaims later: "Come, I think hell's a fable"

(5.127). He does not want to recognize the implications of Mephistophilis's words until it is too late to profit from them, but only then will he be convinced of their truth.

Faustus denies his fate also through belief that God will ultimately have mercy on him. This becomes clear when the good and evil angels whisper messages to him, and he thinks to himself, "Ay, God will pity me if I repent" (5.192). Finding that Mephistophilis cannot really give him all the knowledge he is seeking, Faustus attempts to break the bargain: "Ah Christ my Saviour, seek to save / Distressed Faustus's soul" (5.257-8). He has signed a contract in his own blood, met with Satan himself, and enjoyed power supplied by Satan, yet he still resists the inevitability of damnation: "Tush, Christ did call the thief upon the cross; / Then rest thee, Faustus, quiet in conceit" (10.28-9). As time begins to run out, he argues that there is still hope. Birenbaum notes the necessity of such assumptions of survival:

Ordinarily, we all live this way, along the linear pursuits of goals and gratifications made possible by myriad vague compromises, avoidances, surrenders, by arbitrary assumptions or beliefs that are from one point of view really quite desirable. (Tragedy 38)

Denial allows Faustus to continue to live, but he is denying the choice he knows he has made.

Faustus's tragic recognition comes as he utters his concluding soliloquy, and it is only at this point that Faustus fully realizes his fate. Birenbaum argues that the hero's death reflects the importance of life:

. . . Tragedy is not about death itself, it is about mortal life. . . . The literal demise of the hero is the symbol of this conscious commitment to mortal life and the proof of his sincerity. This death is both the effect and the evidence of his mortality as well as his assent to it. (Tragedy 61)

At such a moment all becomes clear; tragic knowledge reigns over illusion. Though Faustus may be proud, intelligent, and ambitious, all of these attributes fall before the realization that death awaits him. Through Marlowe's rhythms and images one experiences

Faustus's mounting horror at fever pitch, just as the hero does, until the catharsis comes as one participates in his dread destiny, in feelings of horror and loss. Although he attempts to blame others for his misery and to call upon forces beyond, a clear recognition comes to him: "Ah Faustus, / Now has thou but one bare hour to live, / And then thou must be damned perpetually" (13.56-61). Up to this point he has managed to resist his fate by one mental maneuver or another, but suddenly he knows that he is damned. Without such a conviction, no confrontation would be possible or necessary. Birenbaum finds that the tragic hero finally allows death to come and accepts responsibility for his life: "... he wills that it happen to him, offering himself for destruction or at least acknowledging that his own desires have led him to it" (*Tragedy* 63). For Faustus it is the latter as he laments, "Now hast thou but one bare hour to live." Having this conviction, Faustus asks for the impossible, that time itself come to his aid. Now, if only he had *time*, he might repent:

Stand still, you ever-moving spheres of heaven,
That time may cease, and midnight never come.
Fair nature's eye, rise, rise again, and make
Perpetual day, or let this hour be but
A year, a month, a week, a natural day,
That Faustus may repent and save his soul. (13.62-7)

But then, reality dictates otherwise and Faustus realizes the futility of such a hope: "The stars move still, time runs, the clock will strike, / The devil will come, and Faustus must be damned" (13.69-70). As the all-important minutes pass, Faustus knows more and more clearly the value of life. His life, however, has led to one moment, which collapses all his illusions and shows how impotent his resistance to the truth has been.

Next, Faustus frantically turns to God for salvation: "O I'll leap up to my God! Who pulls me down? / See, see where Christ's blood streams in the firmament! / One drop would save my soul, half a drop: ah my Christ--" (13.71-3). But Faustus knows that he has signed away his soul, and he believes that he cannot truly repent in the final hour. At this point he turns to Lucifer for help: "O spare me, Lucifer!" (13.74). As he does so he

seems to see the inescapable fury of God: "Where is it [Christ's blood] now? Tis gone: and see where God / Stretcheth out his arm, and bends his ireful brows" (13.76-7). Finding no help there, he hopes the very earth and ground he stands on will provide refuge: "Then will I headlong run into the earth: / Earth gape! O no, it will not harbor me" (13.81-2).

With no response possible, Faustus goes on to call upon the natural forces that surround him:

You stars that reigned at my nativity,
Whose influence hath allotted death and hell,
Now draw up Faustus like a foggy mist
Into the entrails of yon labouring cloud,
That when you vomit forth into the air
My limbs may issue from your smoky mouths,
So that my soul may but ascend to heaven. (13.83-9)

In desperation he will turn to any force that might provide help, no matter how absurd it might be to believe that these forces can actually hear him. There is an agony of dawning realization driving him as he utters these lines. Venturing into the Christian realm of heaven and hell, he cannot now confound hell in Elysium, and he renounces the Satanic forces for some sort of succor from the skies. Like the reality that awaits him, the stars are cold and indifferent; they cannot be of any help to him. All his forbidden experience necessarily ends in death: presumably he now knows why it was forbidden.

As Faustus attempts to mediate mortality, despair becomes desperation; however, just as he must find a way out, the sources of salvation seem suddenly uncertain. One senses not only the panic but also the pathos of these moments--why couldn't things be different? Having once bargained with Satan, he now hopes to bargain with God for a lighter sentence than an eternity of damnation:

O God, if thou wilt not have mercy on my soul,
Yet for Christ's sake, whose blood hath ransomed me,
Impose some end to my incessant pain:
Let Faustus live in hell a thousand years,

A hundred thousand, and at last be saved. (13.91-4)

But then he realizes that hell is no purgatory where one serves a sentence and is then granted salvation: "O, no end is limited to damned souls!" (13.95). His incessant pain begins even as the soliloquy takes shape. Each time Faustus turns to a new hope, he is confronted with the knowledge that he cannot escape mortality any more than he can escape the other limitations with which he has lived.

One's mind races with Faustus in his final hour as it is reduced to some sixty lines of soliloquy. As the confrontation with mortality at last sets Faustus on a frantic search for some means of salvation, the reader participates in his plight and one's mind moves as quickly as his in his plea for life and salvation: "tragedy is the vicarious experience of my own death" (Birenbaum *Tragedy* 52). Imagining Faustus's experience, each reading self seems to die with the hero; as apprehensions about death are aroused, consciousness and the unconscious confront one another. The tragic confrontation yields not so much a moral judgment, therefore, as knowledge about one's finite nature, that one is essentially bound by time, and that the unconscious knowledge of mortality haunts every moment of one's existence. Though one's own choices may not have been damnable, one realizes the absolute responsibility one has for them. Normally such knowledge is resisted or driven into semi-consciousness or the unconscious, but here, through Faustus, one is forced to reckon with all the terms of mortality. In exhausting his alternatives for salvation, Faustus has exhausted his means of resisting tragic knowledge. The resistance is indeed purged. The control is released. The absolute knowledge that he sought is given him in the comprehension of tragic existence, the only absolute knowledge entails tragic knowledge. This is not what Faustus had bargained for, and yet it is. He continues to protest through to the end, but now he clearly realizes what he is protesting against, and his struggle expresses the pain and the horror that make that knowledge real.

Conclusion:

Necessarily limited and inherently hubristic, consciousness's narrow focus does not always allow one to recognize archetypal projections or human limitation. Tragic heroes resist the truth about themselves and the world in which they live; doing so lends them a certain integrity and fortitude.

Marlowe's heroes demonstrate the limitations of consciousness as they repress knowledge about themselves by projecting onto others what is forbidden in them, while refusing to recognize their own limits. The archetypes are dramatic symbols of unconscious forces within the Self. While the unconscious appears to be chaotic, consciousness attempts to assert orderly behavior for the Self as well as for the world outside.

Because unconscious forces are denied, they are also perceived as *other*. People and forces outside the Self seem absolutely set against the hero and are experienced as others who threaten to absorb him. As a natural response to this otherness, the hubristic hero sets his own vision and will against all that is consciously comprehensible. His commitment to overcoming these elements is rigorous and absolute, for he forbids acceptance or integration of what is *other* all the way to his end. Paradoxically, if he has the fortitude, he can integrate tragic knowledge by his resistance to it.

Steeped in battle and triumph, Tamburlaine refuses to see Others as Selves. On those who oppose him, he casts the Shadow. Calyphas sees the world differently than his father, and because he does so, his father cannot tolerate him as his son and murders him. Others are not people to Tamburlaine; they are forces to be conquered.

Unable to accept limitations and death, the proud warrior would control them with the same brute force with which he dominates people who oppose him. His wife's sickness and death mystify him and his response to her death, and his own, is to declare

war on what he does not understand. He cannot and does not integrate knowledge of death and he dies much the same man that began the play.

The Jew of Malta, himself a Shadow figure to the Christian society, is surrounded by those who would fleece and betray him, though he does the same in return. These Others, as *other*, represent Shadows of himself. He feels alienated by his own daughter because she adheres to virtue and is unwilling to bend to his will. In the end his will remains all that is left of him.

Barabas, however, cannot completely manipulate the will of others, even as he wages his own war of absolute revenge against those determined to control him. Although successful for a time, he cannot design flawless revenge because there are factors beyond his control. Cursing his enemies, he also dies an essentially unchanged man unable to accept or integrate limitations.

Edward II cannot balance his desire for self-indulgence with the need to maintain his authority as king, and his Shadows become *other* when they question his priorities. Acting as a check on his indulgent nature, Mortimer becomes a dangerous enemy. Similarly, Kent, the brother who attempts to advise him comes to threaten his own interests and plans. Each represents a voice that should be heeded within Edward's Self, but Edward will not listen.

The King finds that he cannot control others, either by ignoring their demands or asserting the power of the crown. Jailed and powerless, Edward recognizes that he is merely a man subject to forces beyond himself and, unlike Tamburlaine or Barabas, he displays a capacity for change and recognition.

For Faustus, the Shadow provides a means of exploring undeveloped elements of himself. The strict training of the cleric forbade much of what the Shadow awakens within Faustus; he drops the rigors of ascetic life in favor of a genuine exploration of forbidden

desires and magical practice. Rather than being bound by an authoritative God, he would take on a God-like role himself.

Faustus is, however, fated to discover that he has the same limitations as the rest of humanity. Unable to control the laws of nature any more than he can control others, he is inescapably bound to certain mortality. Nevertheless, he forges a kind of integrity as he resists the horrible truth of both death and damnation. This integrity is reinforced as he rages against the truth and as he ultimately recognizes his fate. Giving in to his fate requires a heroic sensitivity to the horrible, impossible nature of tragic truth. The finite nature of his existence permeates his consciousness.

With heroic resistance, each of Marlowe's heroes forbids knowledge consciously. Though each resists, not all are capable of integrating the truth of the Shadow as the tragic hero can do. Consciousness naturally forbids recognition of forces within or outside the Self that seem difficult or dangerous, and Marlovian heroes display a particularly strong resistance to these forces as they forbid painful truths. In Marlowe's works, therefore, forbidden knowledge is central to knowledge of the Self.

Works Cited

- Aeschylus. Prometheus Bound. In Three Greek Plays. Trans. Edith Hamilton. New York: Norton, 1937.
- Bartels, Emily C. Spectacles of Strangeness: Imperialism, Alienation, and Marlowe. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1993.
- Bevington, David. From "Mankind" to Marlowe: Growth and Structure in the Popular Drama of Tudor England. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1962.
- Birenbaum, Harvey. Art of Our Necessities: Form and Consciousness in Shakespeare. New York: Peter Lang, 1989.
- . Myth and Mind. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1988.
- . Tragedy and Innocence. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1983.
- Bullock, Allan. Hitler: A Study in Tyranny. New York: Konecky, 1962.
- Cheung, King-Kok. "The Dialect of Despair in Doctor Faustus" In "A Poet and a Filthy Playmaker": New Essays on Christopher Marlowe. Ed. Kenneth Friedenreich, Roma Gill, and Constance B. Kuriyama. New York: AMS P, 1988. 193-202.
- Cole, Douglas. Suffering and Evil in the Plays of Christopher Marlowe. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1962.
- Cox, Gerald H. "Marlowe's Doctor Faustus and 'Sin Against the Holy Ghost'." Huntington Library Quarterly 36 (1973): 119-137.
- de Pascalis, Andrea. Alchemy the Golden Art: The Secrets of the Oldest Enigma. Rome, Italy: Gremese, 1995.
- Deats, Sarah Munson. Sex, Gender, and Desire in the Plays of Christopher Marlowe. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1997.
- Eliot, T. S. "Christopher Marlowe." Marlowe: A Collection of Critical Essays. Ed. Clifford Leech. Twentieth-Century Views. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1964.
- Grant, Michael. Myths of the Greeks and Romans. Cleveland: World, 1962.
- Greg, W.W. "The Damnation of Faustus." Modern Language Review 41 (1946): 103-108.
- Hamilton, Edith. Mythology. Boston: Little, 1942.
- Hawkins, Sherman. "The Education of Faustus." Studies in English Literature 6 (1966): 193-209.

- Jung, C. J. Aion: Research into the Phenomenology of the Self. Trans. R.F.C. Hull. 2nd ed. Bollingen Series 20. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1969.
- , The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious. Trans. R. F. C. Hull. 2nd ed. Bollingen Series 20. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1969.
- , Mysterium Coniunctionis: An Inquiry into the Separation and Synthesis of Psychic Opposites in Alchemy. Trans. R. F. C. Hull. 2nd ed. Bollingen Series 20. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1970.
- , Psychological Types. Trans. H. G. Baynes. Bollingen Series 20. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1974.
- , Psychology and Alchemy. Trans. R. F. C. Hull. 2nd ed. Bollingen Series 20. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1968.
- , Spirit of Man in Art and Literature. Trans. R. F. C. Hull. 2nd ed. Bollingen Series 20. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1966.
- Levin, Harry. The Overreacher: A Study of Christopher Marlowe. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1952.
- Marlowe, Christopher. Doctor Faustus. Ed. Roma Gill. New York: Norton, 1968.
- , Edward II. Ed. Moelwyn W. Merchant. New York: Norton, 1967.
- , The Jew of Malta. Ed. T. W. Craik. New York: Norton, 1966.
- , Tamburlaine. Ed. J.W. Harper. New York: Norton, 1971.
- McAlindon, Thomas. Doctor Faustus: Divine in Show. Twayne's Masterwork Studies. New York: Twayne, 1984.
- McCullen, Joseph T. "Dr. Faustus and Renaissance Learning." Modern Language Review 51 (1956): 6-16.
- Merchant, Moelwyn W. Introduction. Edward II. By Christopher Marlowe. New York: Norton, 1967.
- Muir, Kenneth. "Marlowe and Shakespeare." "A Poet and a Filthy Play Maker": New Essays on Christopher Marlowe. Ed. Kenneth Friedenreich, Roma Gill, and Constance B. Kuriyama. New York: AMS P, 1988. 1-12.
- Ong, Walter. Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the World. New York: Routledge, 1982.
- Ornstein, Robert. "The Comic Synthesis in Doctor Faustus." Faust: Sources, Works, Criticism. Ed. Paul A. Bates. New York: Harcourt, 1969. 150-3.

- Proser, Matthew N. "Edward's Peril's: Masochism in Marlowe's Suffering King." Literature and Psychology 34 (1988): 17-25.
- Radin, Paul. The Trickster: A Study in American Indian Mythology. New York: Routledge, 1972.
- Spies, Johann. Faustbook. Faust: Sources, Works, Criticism. Ed. Paul A Bates. New York: Harcourt, 1969. 9-40.
- Sachs, Arich. "The Religious Despair of Doctor Faustus." Journal of English and German Philology 63 (1964): 625-647.
- Smeed, J. W. Faust in Literature. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1987.
- Thomas, Keith. Religion and the Decline of Magic. New York: Scribner's, 1971.
- Wilson, F. P. Marlowe and the Early Shakespeare. London: Oxford, 1953.
- Wutrich, Timothy Richard. Prometheus and Faust: The Promethean Revolt in Drama from Classical Antiquity to Goethe. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1995.