

FAUSTUS IS GONE: REGARD HIS HELLISH FALL?

A THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF
TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES AND FINE ARTS

BY

ROBERT JAMES CLOUGHERTY, JR., B.A.

DENTON, TEXAS

AUGUST 1985

CONTENTS

Preface.....	iv
Chapter I: The Downward Cycle of Damnation.....	1
Chapter II: Exeunt Chorus.....	13
Chapter III: Ascent from the Cave.....	25
Chapter IV: Faustuses of Milevis and Wittenberg.....	49
Chapter V: The New Epilogue.....	64
Works Cited.....	74

PREFACE

Writing about Marlowe has been a thrill for me in that I now feel that I better understand not only the dramatist but the man--a man of great artistic and intellectual abilities. As a man, however, he was subject to the same battle of appetites, emotion, and reason that we all face; it is through his humanity that I have come to understand his work as the work of a very human man.

To explain my motivation in a Marlovian sense would be impossible, yet there are many to whom I am indebted; without their help, this study would still be a pile of papers on the living room floor and a screaming echo, silently crawling through my head. This study is not an end but the beginning of a life time project.

I must first thank my wife Lea, without whom none of this would have been possible. For her endless typing, inspiration, and encouragement, I owe her for the salvation of this project. In particular, I must thank her for her patience; on so many occasions, she placed this project ahead of herself.

I must thank Dr. J. Dean Bishop for serving on my committee and for all of his stylistic assistance in this

study and in all of my writing. Dr. Bishop was a great help the entire time I was working on my degree.

I must thank Dr. Leslie Kreps for all of his assistance and patience with my sometimes never-ending questions. I must also thank him for all of his assistance in my time at Texas Woman's University.

Finally, I must thank Dr. Florence Winston for all of her effort and dedication to this project; Dr. Winston served as chair of the committee and as my mentor. Her patience and understanding were, are, and always will be appreciated. Dr. Winston provided a constant springboard for all of my ideas and helped me in keeping this study under control. Dr. Winston gave of her own time to this project and followed it from beginning to end. What you see before you would not have been possible without her.

To all who have helped, I thank you.

Terminat auctor opus;

Gratias tibi Domine!

CHAPTER I

The Downward Cycle of Damnation

In The Marlovian World Picture, W.L. Godshalk writes that "After a century of intensive criticism, Doctor Faustus has undoubtedly revealed most, and perhaps all of its esthetic secrets" (169). Unfortunately, if we accept the existing criticism of Faustus, Godshalk is a little too close to being correct. However, acceptance of Faustus' damnation does not present a clear-cut, consistent view into the play. The present criticism on Doctor Faustus all begins on this assumption--that Faustus is damned at the end of the play; the existing criticism based upon this assumption (providing no support for it) is self-contradictory and often faultily reasoned. To examine the play by questioning this initial premise opens the play up to entirely new worlds of criticism.

Since existing criticism finds its roots ultimately in sin, an orthodox notion of sin will serve best to understand the criticism and assure that nothing is missed within the doctrine. In the Gospel of Matthew (22: 37-40), Christ tells that the two greatest

commandments are to love God and your fellow man; on this basis, all sins can be divided into sins against man and sins against God.

Those critics who view Faustus as being damned for using necromancy are essentially within the realm of sins against man. If Faustus uses the magic on earth, then it must be his fellow man that he is using it against. Reed argues that signing a devil's compact would be looked upon as the worst of sins by an Elizabethan audience (92). James Smith turns back to the medieval idea of curiosity as a vice; Smith supports this idea by arguing that the Seven Deadly Sins do not affect Faustus as they would another person, for Faustus is doing nothing more than collecting sensations (29). Smith recognizes the point of damnation as the signing of the compact; he argues that at the point Faustus decides to sign, he enters into spiritual death as this activity kills his soul (26). W.W. Greg, in "The Damnation of Faustus," supports the idea in arguing that the first clause of the contract ("that Faustus may be a spirit in form and substance" II.i.96) stipulates that Faustus becomes a devil (101). While Faustus has free will, he uses it to kill his soul. Smith invokes St. Augustine to support his argument of curiosity as a sin, and even recognizes the parallel between Faustus and

Augustine's involvement with the Manicheans (29-30); however, if we take Smith's logic to its ultimate conclusion, we will discover Augustine burning beside Faustus, and the entire conversion of Augustine either did not matter, or did not exist. Smith also parallels Faustus with the fallen Angels and argues that free will keeps all of them in hell; he argues that the devils would not leave hell if given the opportunity since they desire only what will bring them more suffering (31-32). If Smith is correct, then Faustus must only desire misery and suffering in which case many events in the play would have to be reversed. For instance, if it was suffering that Faustus desired, he would not desire the beauty of Helen; he would desire the ugliness of the female devil which Mephistophilis brings him when he asks for a wife. Faustus would also not desire more time to repent in the final soliloquy, he would welcome the gates of hell without hesitation nor would he command Lucifer not to come. The final argument Smith makes is that a happy ending is demanded by the play, yet Marlowe refuses to provide one, and that Marlowe does try to save Faustus, but he cannot because he is already damned (27). To use Smith's own authority (he does go as far as to argue that the theology of

Augustine influenced Marlowe in writing Faustus), the very existence of The Confessions and Augustine's canonization after a life in Carthage (which featured two concubines and as many illegitimate children) negate the idea that the moment of damnation comes with the committing of sin. Smith does not create a valid case for the damnation of Faustus; therefore, he relies on the traditional premise to validate his arguments.

Another argument in this realm is the idea of the sin against nature. This argument views Faustus as in rebellion against "the essential fact of things" as Helen Gardner argues (36). Faustus' joins legion with the devil in an error of will; the act further deforms the will so as to prevent repentance (Gardner 37). Gardner also argues that Faustus sins in that he is the aspiring mind which is rebelling against creation (38). This argument is based on the idea that the perverted will cannot repent; I find three flaws in the argument. First, it assumes that all intervention, such as the inscription on Faustus' arm and the warnings of the Good Angel, is wrong when it tells Faustus that he can be saved. Second, it contradicts Augustine, as discussed above. Third, when Gardner arrives at the argument that it is despair which delivers Faustus to

damnation in the final scene (38), the argument becomes self-contradictory. If there is no hope for salvation, then there is no despair, simply realization.

The third argument in the realm of humanity is the Icarus figure. It is argued that Faustus tries to over-reach into knowledge which is forbidden to him. In "The Fall of Icarus," Ashton argues that his wings begin to melt when Mephistophilis refuses to give him the knowledge he desires (Ashton 349). Perhaps Bradbrook better explains it when she argues that Faustus seeks knowledge, but only gets information (School of Night 104). Meehan parallels Faustus with Lucifer; she argues that just as Lucifer got ugliness for love of his beauty, Faustus has his intellectual desires destroyed by physical lust. Meehan uses the Helen of Troy scene as the epitome of this point (75). Three arguments serve to refute these contentions. First, it assumes that Faustus gains no knowledge in the play (an issue which will be discussed at length in Chapter III). Second, it assumes, again, that the celestial intervention is invalid. Third, it violates the views of the soul which were held by the Renaissance Neo-Platonists. When Helen sucks forth Faustus' soul, he notes how it flies: "Her lips suck

forth my soul: see where it flies!" (V.i.111). A flying soul would indicate salvation. Pico wrote in his

Oration:

...it was a saying of Zoroaster that the soul is winged, and that, when the wings drop off, she falls again into the body; and then, after her wings have grown again sufficiently, she flies back to heaven (qtd. in Brockbank 112).

Thus, Meehan's argument turns and actually becomes an argument for salvation rather than damnation.

The final argument within this realm would be the idea of witchcraft. Kocher argues that Marlowe had no choice but to use an orthodox view of damnation since he uses The English Faust Book as his source (192).

However, as Beatrice Brown argues, with a playwright like Marlowe, the use of one source is rare (83).

Furthermore, we have already encountered the argument of the intervention of Augustinian theology. The second argument which Kocher uses is that an unrepentant witch cannot cry and he emphasizes this by adding, "no tenet of the witchcraft creed is more universal than this" (167). While Faustus is unable to cry during the visit of the scholars, he is able to cry after they

leave as Mephistophilis notes when he asks: "What, weep'st thou?" (V.i.238). Thus once more an argument for damnation provides evidence for salvation.

When we turn to sins against God, we must begin with an analysis of how God is viewed in the play. Sanders argues that we do not have a loving God in the play; rather, we have "either the avenging Jehovah of the Old Testament, or his Christian offshoot, the Calvinist tyrant of mass reprobation" (228). The weakness in this argument lies in the fact that it goes no further than the combination of all arguments so far. All of the opportunities provided to Faustus for repentance contradict this hypothesis.

The major argument on the theological side is that of despair. The despair argument says that Faustus has every opportunity to repent, but because he does not believe that God can forgive him, he does not. Bradbrook believes that there are very strong forces working for Faustus' repentance; however, the concept of despair runs throughout the play. Bradbrook argues that it is the despair which lets the devils secure Faustus' soul; even though he wills to repent, he cannot ("Marlowe's Faustus" 19). To use despair as an argument, one must prove that after Faustus is gone,

he never repented; this argument, therefore, requires the support of the Epilogue. The epilogue and its relation to the idea of damnation will be discussed in the next chapter.

Atheism is an argument often used for Faustus' damnation; it is argued that Faustus is damned for turning from God. Mahood argues that "Faustus has turned from God; God has not turned from him" (107). Cutts argues that despite Faustus' attempt to fake his way out of believing in Christ, he can not do so as Christ is "conspicuous by his absence" (118). Sanders denies the idea of atheism when he argues that the fear of God which Faustus reveals is an element of the theism which we believe that he rejects (229). Sanders offers the strongest argument for theism through the idea of antithesis. Sanders writes: "The reality of Lucifer, who commands the sensuous world and who is in hell, necessarily implies the reality of Christ and heaven" (87). Therefore, if Faustus believes in the devil, then he must believe in God and is not an atheist.

One line of argumentation views Faustus as the antithesis to Christ; while no one critic develops the argument in full, hints and scattered pieces of evidence

suggest it. C.L. Barber approaches this idea when he discusses the notion of tragedy. He argues that tragedy must have a social perspective which often times comes through the use of ritual; the tragic hero abuses the ritual for motives which the ritual itself is designed to control in the first place. Three elements in the play which would show either a thesis or antithesis relationship between Faustus and Christ shall be used. Bradbrook notes Faustus' use of "Consummatus est" (the Last words of Christ in the Gospel of John); while some would see this as Faustus making a mockery of Christ, in actuality, Faustus is paralleling Christ; as the Apostles' Creed says that Christ descended into hell, Faustus descends as well; the argument does not consider the possibility of the resurrection of Faustus. Barber argues that the kissing of Helen is an imitation of Holy Communion (101); however, if this is true it acts as a reconciliation since Faustus' soul rises towards the firmament where he is to later see Christ's blood. Holy Communion also served as the forgiveness sacrament in the early days of the Church as well, thus the symbolism shifts to one of forgiveness as well as reunion. Third, Cutts argues that Faustus' final soliloquy parallels the agony in the garden (194); this

analogy has many supports for it: Faustus has just had the last supper with the scholars, the scholars are sleeping outside, and most important, each desires for the coming incident not to happen as they desire not the agony.

Faustus truly has no choice as no matter whether he repents or he does not, the devils are going to tear him to pieces (Godshalk 191-92). Faustus is not the anti-thesis of Christ; rather, he is the Christ-figure.

Throughout the critical history of Faustus, a popular critical mode has been to look at the play as part of the morality play tradition. While there are morality play elements within the play, having the elements of a morality play no more makes Faustus a morality play than mushrooms and cheese make an omelet quiche. Philip Henderson argues that the construction of Faustus "is as simple as a morality" (128); Farnham, however, refines it into a medieval morality "with a late Renaissance temper" (4). Salgada argues that Faustus is thoroughly medieval with Faustus serving the role of everymen (46); Reed strengthens the case against Faustus when he argues that the anti-Christ in the morality plays was usually a sorcerer (87). This latter argument finds its weakness in its base. Within the morality plays, the chorus figures occasionally

under the name of Doctor serve "as explicators of doctrine or to bridge the gap between Old and New Testaments" (Davenport 8); this adds a further parallel as it is Christ that sets the difference between the Old and New Testaments. Many critics point out the morality play elements; Boas points out as examples: the Good and Bad Angels and the Seven Deadly Sins (CM 211); the Old Man can also be looked upon as the Morality figure of Virtue (Reed 92); however, it must be recalled that these are only elements. The morality play hypothesis must also rest its case within the realm of the final Epilogue.

Salgada views the Epilogue as a standard morality convention (22); he also argues that it insures the certainty of Faustus' meaning; interestingly, the lines he chooses to quote are the last five lines of the Epilogue (46). Farnham also chooses to view the Epilogue as "the moral of a morality play" (11); he views the Epilogue as an orthodox warning, and argues that Faustus has received damnation for violating this warning (11). Kocher also argues that the "Christian sense of the play is confirmed by the Epilogue as a solemn seal" (114). The only evidence we have remaining within this critical tradition now rests upon

the Epilogue. Let an examination of the Epilogue be a solemn seal upon the damnation hypothesis.

Exeunt Chorus

Thomas Bushell Entred for his cōpye vnder the
 handes of master Doctor Barlowe,
 and the Wardens a booke called
 the plaie of Doctor FAUSTUS
 vjd (III.670).

13

the first week of 1601 would have undoubtedly tried to publish it before 1604. The third, and most convincing, argument finds its basis on the title page of the 1604 edition. The title page cites the play as having been acted by the Earl of Nottingham's men; this can be seen in the entry for the 1604 edition in the STC:

Marlowe, Christopher. The tragicall history of
D. Faustus. As it hath bene acted by the
Right Honorable the Earle of Nottingham
his Servants. London, Printed by V.S[immes]
for T. Bushell, 1604. (STC 17429)

The Earl of Nottingham's Men (who had become known as the Lord Admiral's Men on 22 October 1597) were known as Prince Henry's Men at the printing of the 1604 edition (Fraser and Rabkin 295). Jump explains the discrepancy in that the title page could simply be a reprint from an earlier edition (xxvi).

The 1604 text is the oldest surviving edition of the play; it is referred to as the A text by textual critics. The A text is extraordinarily abbreviated in that it contains 1500 lines--550 lines shorter than the 1616 text (Boas DF 2-3). The difference lies in the fact that many of the comic scenes of the 1616 edition are not in the 1604 edition. These scenes will be discussed

individually as they relate to matters herein. While the 1604 text was not subject to the scrutiny of the censors which the 1616 text was, it is still believed to be highly inaccurate due to the theory that the text is based upon a memorial version from the play's original performance (Fraser and Rabkin 295). Other theories on the cause of the brevity exist, such as the idea that it was used for plays in the outer provinces, which carry little weight.

The 1616 edition, known as the B text, is accepted by the majority of scholars to be the most accurate (with certain emendations based upon the 1604 text); Jump theorizes that the 1616 text was based upon a manuscript and the 1611 reprint of the 1604 text, rather than memory, which would explain the recalling of several scenes (Jump xxxi-ii). The major argument against this theory is not a direct refutation but a counter-causality. Opponents to Marlowe's authorship of the additional scenes argue that the scenes were done by William Birde and Samuel Rowley. Opponents base this argument upon the entry in Henslowe's diary that on 22 November 1602 he paid £4 to Birde and Rowley for further additions to Faustus (Boas DF 28). Fraser and Rabkin argue that the additions must have been quite

substantial due to the amount they were paid (295); however, this argument ignores two important elements. First, these additions in 1602 would have been in time for a 1604 edition; second, a theatre-owner such as Henslowe would be more likely to part with a manuscript which he would consider outdated (one which is Marlowe without the additions) before the edition with the additions which he would have in store for his actors to use in a revival of the play. Greg, however, feels that the last few of the foul papers were either mutilated or illegible (Doctor Faustus: A Conjectural Reconstruction V). The other popular argument against the additional scenes of the 1616 edition is their comic nature; many contend that Marlowe had no sense of humor; however, arguing that Marlowe could not write the comic scenes since he wrote no comic scenes in other plays is much like arguing that Marlowe did not write Doctor Faustus because he has no other plays with a necromancer as the hero. Opponents to Marlowe's sense of humor also seem to somehow have missed the two friars, Jacomo and Barnardine, trying to force Barabas to confess his wrongs in Act IV, scene i of The Jew of Malta.

The only real difficulty with the 1616 text is the censor's hand which can be seen as the culprit

responsible for the aesthetic differences between the 1604 and 1616 texts. Jump argues that evidence for the existence of an editor lies in the "conspicuous censoring of much that might be thought profanity" (Jump xxxi-ii). The problems created by the censor can be worked out through emendations based on the 1604 text.

On the basis of this evidence, all line citations within this paper are from Fraser and Rabkin's edition which is based upon the 1616 edition with emendations from the 1604 quarto. Emendations are made only where the 1616 suffers from censorship or reveals composers' errors; however, the 1604 edition is not given priority in other instances where it may expand or differ from the 1616 edition (Fraser and Rabkin 296).

One point which all editors raise is that no edition probably reflects the text as written by Marlowe, yet the text requires us to leave in the work of other hands for two reasons: no one can accurately prove what is not Marlowe; therefore a present, though unmentioned, idea comes about that if it contributes to the play, it is best left alone. Unfortunately, these editorial practices provide a reliance on the printed text as the base while ignoring author intent. Lines shown to be "non-Marlovian" which affect the meaning

of the play must be removed. Specifically, the scene with the scholars after the death of Faustus and the Epilogue, upon which the meaning of the whole play rests, must be carefully analyzed to assure that we are reading the play as Marlowe intended it and not how the censor or publisher would have wanted it.

While the final scene (v.i. 332-350) is of questionable origin, it does not provide the absolute idea of damnation which the epilogue does; in fact, if we look at the scene in isolation, it can be viewed as evidence for the salvation of Faustus. Arguments against the authenticity of the scene come out of Fredson Bowers' textual notes in his edition of Doctor Faustus. Bowers questions this scene on the basis of two arguments: the style is not overtly Marlovian and with the final scene, the soliloquy becomes redundant. Bowers argues that "Marlowe could have written this scene but he need not have" (135). Therefore, Bowers theorizes that the scene was written by Birde and Rowley as one of their additions (xx 251). M.C. Bradbrook also holds the opinion that the first scene is written by another hand (Bradbrook in Farnham 21).

The significance of the last scene as evidence for the theory of Faustus' damnation is questionable;

actually, it can be turned around and looked at as contributing to the salvation hypothesis. Three points of evidence exist in this scene which are used in the damnation hypothesis: the fire, the scholar's opinion, and the condition of Faustus' body. The fire image is voiced by the third scholar: "At which self time the house seemed all on fire" (V.i.342). This argument supports the salvation hypothesis in two ways. First, fire is the symbol of the Holy Spirit as in the Acts of the Apostles 2:2-4, when the Holy Spirit comes to the Apostles in tongues of fire and is preceded by a rushing wind; the house also remained intact despite the fire as in the burning bush which burned yet did not consume which was the manifestation of God to Moses in Exodus 3:2-4. Second, in the theory of elements in the Renaissance, fire was considered the highest element.

The second piece of evidence is the third scholar blaming the fire on demons: "With dreadful horror of these damned fiends" (V.i.343). Again, two weaknesses exist within the argument. First, it is the voice of the character and therefore, not necessarily the voice of Marlowe; it is also based on observation and opinion neither of which have to be accurate. If we accept the words of each character as true, then the arguments

would force us to side with the devil. The second flaw in the argument is that the scene with the scholars is one of high Aristotelean moralising, invoking pity and fear (Bluestone From Story to Stage 247-8). If we accept the salvation hypothesis, we must realize that a great deal of the orthodoxy in the play is irony and accept the Aristotelean nature of this last scene as irony as well.

The third piece of evidence, the condition of Faustus' body, actually becomes a positive argument for the salvation hypothesis. Faustus' body is torn apart as the scholars note:

2 Schol. Oh, help us heaven! see, here are
Faustus' limbs,

All torn assunder by the hand of death.

3 Schol. The devils whom Faustus served have
torn him thus: (V.i.337-39).

Two pieces of evidence exist earlier in the play which show that the condition of Faustus' body is found in the condition that it is due to repentance. First, in his contract with the devil, Faustus signs over both body and soul to be taken to hell:

I, John Faustus, of Wittenberg, Doctor, by
these presents, do give both body and soul to

Lucifer Prince of the East, and his minister
 Mephistophilis: and furthermore grant unto
 them that, four and twenty years being expired,
 and these articles above written being
 inviolate, fullpower to fetch or carry the said
 John Faustus, body and soul, flesh, blood, or
 goods, into their Habitation wheresoever
 (II.i.104-110).

The fact that Faustus' body remains and is not carried off to hell (as the stage directions would indicate) exists as proof that the contract did not remain intact. The body being torn to pieces reflects nothing about the soul (and the body is the only tangible evidence which exists); Mephistophilis conceded this point when he says of the old man:

His faith is great; I cannot touch his soul;
 But what I may afflict his body with
 I will attempt, which is but little worth"
 (V.1.96-98).

Furthermore, the destroyed body can be seen as a proof that Faustus did, in fact, repent; it fulfills an earlier threat Mephistophilis made when Faustus attempted to repent: "I'll in piecemeal tear thy flesh" (V.i.85). (The fact that Mephistophilis keeps this

threat in the first person singular explains the last line of Faustus: "Oh, Mephistophilis!" (V.i.331).

To allow these arguments to stand, we must examine the Epilogue which contradicts them. Some editors, such as Fredson Bowers, believe that the Epilogue does belong to Marlowe (Bowers 158). However, an examination of the consensus of opinion and previously unconsidered evidence reveals that the Epilogue must be ruled out as a Marlovian creation. Fraser and Rabkin add a footnote to the last four and a half lines of the Epilogue which reads: "The injunction that follows is often denied to Marlowe on the grounds that it is too positive" (322, n.2). The Epilogue would seem to be added out of necessity, to satisfy the ortodox requirements of the day; W.W. Greg, while attributing the Epilogue to Marlowe, sees it as a necessary concession (qtd. in Bluestone From Story to Stage 248). Willard Farnham sees the Epilogue as carrying two separate tones, and therefore doubts that the last four and a half lines are Marlowe's. The first three and a half lines put Faustus into a classical tradition and look from the point of view of tragedy, while the last four and a half lines take the Christian view-point and look at Faustus as a morality play (Introduction to Twentieth Century Interpretations of Doctor Faustus 11).

Frederick Boas considers the last four and a half lines "non-Marlovian" in both tone and in the style of the final couplet (175).

An examination of the diction of the last four and a half lines of the Epilogue finds it uncharacteristic of Marlowe. An examination of The Marlowe Concordance reveals that one-third of the "major words" in the Epilogue are unused elsewhere by Marlowe; of the eighteen major words, six are used nowhere else. The word deepnes is used nowhere else but in Faustus. While the word exhort is used in Hero and Leander, it is in the Second Sestiad which was written by Chapman and not Marlowe. Marlowe uses the noun fiend quite often; however, the adjective fiendful makes its only appearance in the Epilogue of Faustus. A radical difference can be seen in the word intice; in every other work, Marlowe contracts it to 'tice (such as in Dido with the line "That I may tice a Dolphin to the shoare," 1658). The word permits is another which is used in the Epilogue of Faustus only. Finally, while the word wise is used a great deal, it can be found as a noun only in the Epilogue of Faustus. The obvious conclusion is that someone other than Marlowe wrote the last four and a half lines of the Epilogue.

The impact of these conclusions is obvious; without the Epilogue, damnation can not be proven; to make an assertion about the results of Faustus' life requires the reader to look at his development throughout the play. As Max Bluestone points out, "Faustus' ambiguous end requires an explanatory Epilogue" (From Story to Stage 251). Without this explanation, we must look to the development of Faustus as a character and at the theological background which Marlowe would bring with him to the play.

CHAPTER III

Ascent From the Cave

The standard interpretations of Doctor Faustus create a play which is flawed in structure--either Faustus is damned when he signs his compact (causing the play to climax in the first act) or Faustus is damned at the end of the play (causing the play to climax in the first act and hold that note until the end). Unfortunately, neither structure is very good. What we expect from a work is a cyclical nature; we expect to see the play going in different directions at different times. As Aristotle argues,

...one may string together a series of characteristic speeches of the utmost finish as regards Diction and Thought, and yet fail to produce the true tragic effect; but one will have much better success with a tragedy which, however inferior in these respects, has a Plot, a combination of incidents, in it. And again: the most powerful elements of attraction in Tragedy, the Peripeties and

Discoveries, are parts of the Plot
(1450^a 28-35).

A play going in one direction would be much like a symphony in which each successive note is higher than the next. As Northrop Frye argues in the Anatomy of Criticism, "the fundamental form of process is cyclical movement" (158).

If an audience views Faustus as damned from the signing of the compact, then there is no suspense to the play and it quickly degenerates into "simple entertainment." One alternative suggestion is that the suspense is held by an uncertainty of the outcome of the action--that the audience is never quite sure whether or not Faustus will repent (Lily B. Campbell "Doctor Faustus: A Case of Conscience" 455). If we accept this theory, we are unsure of the final fate of Faustus; once more we are dependent on the scholars and the Epilogue.

With these facts in mind, we must examine the structure of the play to see if Faustus makes an upward movement at the end (to counterbalance the downward movement at the opening) and question whether he has returned to a point where salvation is possible, if not assured. This chapter, therefore, will concern itself with how Platonism, which was witnessing its "rebirth"

during the Renaissance (Taylor 25), and the Anglican theology of the day, concerning salvation and damnation, apply to the play.

The most applicable Platonic idea is the chain of being and becoming; in the Renaissance, this idea was considered through the metaphor of a ladder. (The author acknowledges his debt to Grube and his book Plato's Thought for refining Plato's ideas on the first four steps; individual references would be too numerous and do an injustice to Grube and his work.) We find ourselves dealing with six steps in the ladder. The first four bring us to the philosopher, and the last two bring us to the point of wisdom--to the "Forms" or "Ideals." The realm of being (the first two steps) consists of "things" while the realm of becoming (the second two steps) is concerned with "ideas." Similarly, each of these is divided into two steps. In the realm of being, which is also referred to as belief, there exists the shadow and spectre stage (Plato refers to this step as imagination; in this step and the next, Plato's terms are deliberately avoided to eliminate any possible confusion) and physical objects (which Plato refers to as belief). The becoming stage is divided into Thought and Understanding. The final two steps

occur once understanding has been achieved; there is an intervention of divinity, and wisdom is then achieved. Before individuals touch the first step of the ladder, they are in the realm of ignorance; they are not being as they affirm things which are not true; each step of the ladder affirms a particular truth. The realm of being is based on things and imitations of things. The first step affirms shadows and spectres such as images in a mirror or anything which is a copy or imitation of physical objects. The cave dwellers in Plato's "Myth of the Cave" are on this first step. Individuals on the physical object step are able to comprehend with the senses only. Individuals on this step are able to know all physical phenomena and are able to distinguish that phenomena from imitations.

The becoming stage is based upon ideas and their imitations. Thought on this step requires the ability to comprehend physical representations of abstract ideas, for instance, being able to understand the "idea of a line" when seeing an imitation of one drawn on paper. A person in the understanding step realizes all of the truths which the philosopher is able to attain; the understanding goes beyond the premises discovered in the earlier steps and grasps absolute truth.

While Plato would include the divinity and wisdom steps within the understanding step, their separation becomes important in determining where Faustus stands within this step. The divinity step includes the belief in a god or gods who are not detrimental to the character. Plato believed that theology was necessary for proper moral development--an idea he attempted for the first time in the Laws (Taylor 99). The final step of wisdom is the ability of the philosopher to comprehend the Forms or Ideals.

Applying this formula to Doctor Faustus allows us to see the cyclical structure of the play and make a valid argument for the salvation of Faustus. Using this formula, Faustus begins at understanding; he progressively rejects each step until he hits ignorance and then rises to wisdom.

Faustus begins at the stage of understanding. In his opening soliloquy, we find Aristotle representing the understanding step. Faustus tells himself to "live and die in Aristotle's works" (I.i.5.). Faustus makes his first error in quoting Ramus instead of Aristotle, and he rejects philosophy, feeling that "A greater subject fitteth Faustus' wit" (I.i.ii). Ironically, Faustus rejects philosophy by bidding "being and not being"

farewell; he is well on his way to dropping off from becoming into the realm of being. The evidence that Faustus' presence in the understanding step is shallow is revealed by his analysis of divinity--a step which he has not yet achieved (except in name). Plato warned of three forms of religious belief which are dangerous to the individual: a belief in no god, a belief in a distant, uncaring god, and the belief in a venal, greedy god (Taylor 99-100). This list progresses downward; it is better to believe in no god than a distant god and better to believe in a distant god than a greedy god. While Faustus does not enter the realm of the third and worst (a sign of hope for him), his arguments can be seen in the realm of the first two. When Faustus argues that there is no way that we can be saved from death, we must assume that he believes that there is no god to save man, or that God is too far removed from man to care enough to save him.

The step of thought is illustrated through medicine; in fact, Faustus acknowledges a connection between the medicine and the philosophy it imitates when he argues "Ubi desinit philosophus ibi incipit medicus"; (I.i.13). Faustus looks through the ideas of medicine into the physical imitations of it:

Be a physician, Faustus; heap up gold,
 And be eternized for some wondrous cure!
Summum bonum medicinae sanitas,
 The end of physic is our body's health.
 Why, Faustus, hast thou not attained that end?
 Is not thy common talk sound aphorisms?
 Are not thy bills hung up as monuments,
 Whereby whole cities have escaped the plague,
 And thousand desperate maladies been cured?
 (I.i.14-22).

Faustus does not desire the truths of medicine; rather, he aims only at the physical manifestations of it.

Interestingly, Faustus has shown that he is still in thought and becoming, yet before he rejects this step, which will place him in being, comes the realization of his humanity: "Yet art thou still but Faustus, and a man" (I.i.23). Faustus is caught between the physical (things) and the spiritual (ideas) just as man is caught on the Great Chain of Being between Beasts and Angels. Faustus, however, chooses to continue his trip downward as he rejects medicine because it can not provide eternal life. He rejects ideas in favor of an eternity of physical life.

Faustus enters becoming by allowing law to parallel

physical objects. Both quotations from Justinian deal with inheritances. Faustus rejects this field for its physical nature. He argues: "This study fits a mercenary drudge, / Who aims at nothing but external trash; / Too servile and illiberal for me" (I.i.34-36). After rejecting medicine for its lack of physical power, Faustus rejects law because it provides only physical rewards.

When Faustus discourses on religion we see that he is in the shadow and spectre stage; what Faustus performs is not a true argument of natural religion but an imitation of one. When Faustus quotes half-verses of Scripture, particularly those which would provide the answer he seeks in the next line, he reveals that he is not a divine and has yet to achieve the divinity stage. Theology's placement after law reveals his inability to comprehend it in its proper place. Faustus' objections to the various disciplines should not carry him down to divinity but up to it.

After rejecting divinity, Faustus immediately falls into ignorance as he enters necromancy. The ignorance of Faustus shows in his third line on divinity; he describes the books as "Lines, circles, letters, and characters" (I.i.52). This description shows Faustus' inability to

comprehend anything within the books. Also, if we assume that one may understand the thesis from the antithesis, then we can see here that Faustus' lack of ability to understand necromancy reflects his inability to comprehend divinity. Once Faustus has decided on a course of magic, he reveals the true sign of stating untrue facts. He emulates on how he will be more powerful than emperors and kings, yet later in the play we see him as subservient to an emperor and a duke. He says that the devils will resolve him of all ambiguities, yet Mephistophilis is able to provide him with no more knowledge than Wagner could have. Faustus proceeds through a list of all that he will use his magical powers to do, yet he is never able to fulfill any of these desires.

While all critics will agree that Faustus sinks down, the most important question is does he rise up? Following the formula as explained so far, it is possible to see Faustus ascend. One of the requirements of ascent, however, is through conflict. Socrates argued that tension of mind enables one to rise from ignorance; therefore, rising on the chain is difficult and "intellectually painful." (This sentiment is later echoed by Milton when he writes "How happy if knowledge were no burden.") Faustus suffers

through the pains of conflict of mind as he moves upward from step to step.

The ascent of Faustus begins with the conflict of the congealing blood; as Faustus begins to write the agreement, his blood congeals when he tries to write; his immediate reaction is to question: "what might the staying of my blood portend? / Is it unwilling I should write this bill?" (II.i.63-64). The conflict continues when he has finished writing the deed (he is able to write once more after Mephistophilis brings him a chafer of fire); Faustus looks at his arm and asks:

But what is this inscription on mine arm?

Homo, fuge! whither should I fly?

If unto God, he'll throw me down to hell.

My senses are deceived; here's nothing writ;

Oh, yes, I see it plain; even here is writ,

Homo, fuge! yet shall not Faustus fly

(II.i. 75-80).

The confusion of mind is illustrated by his not understanding whether or not it is a sign in the first instance and whether or not he sees it is the second instance. It must also be noted that the conflict in this case is obviously some form of divine intervention; each subsequent form of confusion is begun by a lesser

and lesser "force" (indicating that Faustus needs less help as he moves up the ladder). It is this first conflict, however, that raises Faustus back into the realm of being in the stage of shadows and spectres.

After Faustus has signed his compact with the devil, he begins to discourse with Mephistophilis on hell. It is during this discussion that Faustus reveals the evidence that he is back within the realm of shadows and spectres; despite the physical evidence of Mephistophilis, which would confirm the existence of the fallen angels, Faustus still doubts the very existence of hell. Even though Mephistophilis initially warns Faustus from necromancy due to the pain of damnation, Faustus insisted on plodding on. Mephistophilis expands upon the pains of hell after the compact is signed:

we are tortured and remain forever:
Hell hath no limits, nor is circumscribed
In one self place; but where we are is hell,
And where hell is, there must we ever be:
And, to be short, when all the world dissolves,
And every creature shall be purified,
All places shall be hell that is not
heaven (II.i.120-26).

Faustus responds with denial again: "I think hell's a

fable" (II.i.27). Faustus is not looking at the true evidence but only at the imitation or copy of it; Mephistophilis indicates to Faustus that he himself is the evidence: "But I am an instance to prove the contrary; / For I tell thee I am damned, and now in hell" (II.i.136-37); Faustus, who simply sees the spectre of the devil, refuses to accept this statement: "Nay, and this be hell, I'll willingly be damned: / What! sleeping eating, walking, and disputing!" (II.i. 138-39). Faustus is unable to distinguish the spectres and shadows from physical objects.

Act II, scene ii immediately introduces the conflict of mind. This time, Faustus initiates it himself and finds his support in the form of an angel. Faustus announces that he "will renounce this magic and repent" (II.ii.10); as soon as Faustus says this, both the Good and Bad Angels appear. In this debate the Good Angel gets the better of the Bad Angel and even brings Faustus to admitting "Be I a devil, yet God may pity me; / Yea, God will pity me, if I repent" (II.ii.15-16). The only response the Bad Angel is able to make is that "Faustus never shall repent" (II.ii.17). While Faustus announces in the next line: "My heart is hardened, I cannot repent" (II.ii.18), he continues in trying to

rationalize his decision to himself, and it is not until 14 lines later that he is able to announce firmly: "I am resolved; Faustus shall not repent" (II.ii.32).

Faustus remains in the physical object stage for longer than any other stage. Evidence for this stage can be seen in two ways. First, we can see Faustus looking only at the physical side of events in the Papal court scene. When the friars take out the bell, book, and candle to perform the excommunication Faustus says: "Bell, book, and candle,--candle, book and bell,-- / Forward and backward, to curse Faustus to hell!" (III.ii.97-98). While it would appear that Faustus sees beyond the physical into the deeper meaning behind it, we see that his recognition is simply sarcasm as the next line equates the ceremony to "a hog grunt, a calf bleat, and an ass bray" (III.ii.99). He is not able to see beyond the tangible which he can perceive with his senses. Second, Faustus is clearly within the realm of physical objects as he is able to distinguish between the imitations and the actual objects. In the scene at the Emperor's court, Faustus, on the Emperor's request, conjures up the Emperor Alexander and his paramour Darius; when the Emperor tries to embrace them, Faustus tells him that

"These are but shadows, not substantial" (IV.i.106).

Faustus has reached the peak of being and must now re-enter becoming.

Just as Faustus realized his humanity as he slid down from becoming into being, his ascension from being into becoming can be seen as an awakening. Faustus enters into becoming in Act V; his last words in Act IV are: "But I have it again, now I am awake: look you / here, sir" (IV.v.116-17). Faustus has now awakened and is ready to come forth from the cave.

As Faustus progresses from being to becoming, the sources of conflict change from celestial to human. The conflict which inspires Faustus into thought comes from an Old Man. The Old Man's first speech pleads with Faustus to repent; the opening of the speech serves as its warning: "O gentle Faustus, leave this damned art, / This magic, that will charm thy soul to hell" (V.i.39-40). Faustus answers that despair has the better of him, yet he reveals the conflict and tension of mind in their ensuing dialogue; the Old Man tells him that an angel hovers over him with a vial full of grace, and he tells Faustus to call for mercy. Comfort comes to Faustus from the words, yet he asks the Old Man to leave him alone to ponder his sins. The conflict is seen in Faustus' speech

when the Old Man leaves:

Accursed Faustus, where is mercy now?

I do repent; and yet I do despair:

Hell strives with grace for conquest in my
breast:

What shall I do to shun the snares of death?

(V.ii.79-82).

This conflict is the strongest so far as Faustus is at the polar ends of the spectrum with repentance and despair on each side.

We witness Faustus in the stage of thought through the true Renaissance Neo-Platonist concept of beauty. The Neo-Platonists felt that one could climb the ladder to the forms through the beauty of a woman. One began by appreciating the outer beauty which led to an appreciation of the inner beauty and thus to her spiritual beauty. From this progression, one finally understood the Form of Beauty. It is also important to note that for the Neo-Platonists, woman's nature was the universal soul. A woman was considered to be the source of all worldly virtue and a man could only achieve virtue through her (Harrison 163-64). Faustus is able to see a physical representation of the perfect beauty through his vision of Helen of Troy. Faustus acknowledges this beauty:

"Here will I dwell, for heaven is in these lips, / And all is dross that is not Helena" (V.i.113-14). The three scholars who Faustus had Helen appear to earlier support his testimony. The second scholar sees her beauty as being above his level (he is not at the thought step yet): "Too simple is my wit to tell her praise" (V.i.29). The third scholar acknowledges Helen as the ultimate model of beauty; he describes her as a queen "Whose heavenly beauty passeth all compare" (V.i.33). The first scholar sees her as a Form: "Now we have seen the pride of nature's work, / And only paragon of excellence" (V.i.34-35). Most critics add this scene in with evidence of Faustus' damnation; however, while Helen does suck out Faustus' soul, it does not sink down to hell; rather, it ascends as if to heaven: "her lips suck forth my soul: see where it flies" (V.i.111). Using this as evidence for damnation would require the soul to sink towards hell.

Before Faustus can rise to Understanding, he must pass through the tension of mind once more. While the last form of tension came from the Old Man who seemed to symbolize humankind, the next conflict comes from specific human beings--the three scholars. On the evening he is supposed to be damned at midnight, Faustus is visited by the three scholars; each scholar plays a different role

in trying to get Faustus to repent. The first scholar acts only as Faustus' "straight man"; he asks the questions which reveal Faustus' reasoning to us, such as "O my dear Faustus, what imports this Fear?" (V.i.167); he also acts in the role of providing minor pieces of advice, but only to the other scholars and not to Faustus. When the third scholar offers to stay with Faustus, the first scholar advises him to "Tempt not God" (V.i.218). The third scholar acts as "common sense"; he does not quite understand the situation, yet tries to play a role within it. He looks at Faustus' problem as being physical. The third scholar offers two possible causes of Faustus' melancholy, the first too much time alone, and the second over-eating. When he finally understands, he adopts a form of "foolish courage." He asserts "God will strengthen me; I will stay with / Faustus" (V.i.216-17). It is only the second scholar who makes a genuine appeal to Faustus to repent; he makes three challenges. When Faustus asserts that he is damned, the second scholar responds: "Yet, Faustus, look up to heaven; remember / God's mercies are infinite" (V.i.175-76). The second plea the second scholar makes is when Faustus asks what will happen to him "being in hell forever" (V.i.189). The second scholar does not go along with Faustus' despair,

but rather he counsels: "Yet, Faustus, call on God" (V.i.190). The third plea the second scholar makes occurs when Faustus says that nothing can rescue him; the scholar responds by saying: "Pray thou, and we will pray that God may / have mercy upon thee" (V.i.223-24). The peak of Faustus' tension of mind is revealed in his last lines to the scholars: "Gentlemen, farewell: if I live till morning, I'll / visit you; if not, Faustus is gone to hell" (V.i.225-26). The "if" clause reveals Faustus' first sign of hope in the play.

The final soliloquy of Faustus provides evidence for his presence in and moving up through the understanding step. Faustus reveals his ability to reason in his command to the heavens to stop. The idea is based on the two following syllogisms:

Planetary movements cause time.

Planetary movement stops.

∴ Time stops.

and

Faustus goes to hell at midnight.

Midnight does not come.

∴ Faustus does not go to hell.

Faustus' reasoning capacity shows that he is within the realm of understanding; now he needs the intervention of

divinity; the skies must open to him.

Throughout the play, Faustus has always had a ceiling over his head. Earlier in the play, Mephistophilis confirmed that there is a heaven above the stars; he explains the levels of the universe to Faustus as "The seven planets, the firmament, and the imperial heaven" (II.ii.60-61), yet when Faustus views the heavens, he can see no farther than the machinery. The Chorus tells us that:

Learned Faustus,
To find the secrets of astronomy
Graven in the book of Jove's high firmament,
Did mount him up to scale Olympus' top,
Where sitting in a chariot burning bright,
Drawn by the strength of the yoked dragons'
 necks,
He views the clouds, the planets, and the
 stars,
The tropic zones and quarters of the sky,
From the bright circle of the horned moon,
E'en to the height of the Primum Mobile
(III.prologue.1-10).

In the final soliloquy, God moves from the imperial heaven to the firmament and Faustus at last has a view

of salvation: "See, see, where Christ's blood streams in the firmament! / One drop would save my soul, half a drop: Oh, my Christ!" (V.i.287-88).

Faustus now has the intervention of divinity which allows him to stand at wisdom. Now, he is able to look at forms; he sees the elements which are outside of the great chain of being (Tillyard 37). If the elements are outside of the great chain of being and are the basis for all which exists (i.e., each Form would have a particular balance of these elements), then they must be seen as a part of the Forms. Faustus calls upon each of them. He begins with the lowest of the elements, earth:

Mountains and hills, come, come, and fall on
me,

And hide me from the heavy wrath of God!

No, no!

Then will I run headlong into the earth:

Earth, gape! Oh, no, it will not harbor me!

(V.i.293-97).

Rather than sinking down upon rejecting an idea, as Faustus did in his opening soliloquy, he rises through the elements. He reveals his ability to grasp abstract ideas, in this case the immortality of the soul, when

he says: "No end is limited to damned souls!" (V.i.312). Faustus then commands his soul to "turn to air" (V.i.324). From air, he turns to water with the command: "O soul, be changed into small water-drops" (V.i.326). Finally, in his last line, Faustus gets to the highest of the elements--fire: "I'll burn my books" (V.i.331).

The final soliloquy is best understood when we see how Platonism affected the "non-Calvinist" theology of the day. The Catholic and moderate Protestant churches believed that grace was for all who sought it and that all could seek it. An example of this thinking can be seen in Thomas Morton's Treatise of Repentance which was published in 1597:

This way or ladder whereby we are to clime up to regeneration, hath foure steps, for so we will make a homely and familiar division of it.... The first step which is to be made by this carnal man now repenting, is to get the true knowledge of his owne estate, to wit, how sinfull and wretched he is in himselfe by nature, and at this present. The second step is humiliation or contrition, wrought in him by the due consideration of his own estate. The third,

is a full purpose or resolution of mind to seeke for grace and regeneration. The fourth and last part, is the diligent using of the meanes appointed by God, for the obtaining of grace: the which meanes are three in number. The first is amendment of life: the second, the hearing of Gods word: the third is praier, or inuocation of the name of God (qtd. in Kocher 109).

Applying these steps to the ascent of Faustus assists the salvation hypothesis. The steps must be applied individually.

Faustus has shown signs of being in the first step since his signing of the compact; however, it is during the final visit of the scholars that Faustus makes a total confession of all that he has done:

God forbade it, indeed; but Faustus hath done it: for the vain pleasure of four and twenty years hath Faustus lost eternal joy and felicity. I writ them a bill with mine own blood: the date is expired; this is the time, and he will fetch me (V.i.201-05).

The confession shows Faustus both within the first step and on the edge of the second step.

Faustus reveals the true evidence of the second

step once he is into his final soliloquy. Faustus' consideration leads him into admitting: "Now hast thou but one bare hour to live, / And then thou must be damned perpetually" (V.i.275-76). Faustus has a full realization of his sin. Faustus next needs to enter the third step by seeking grace; he does this within the soliloquy as he declares: "Oh, I'll leap up to my God!" (V.i.286). Faustus has completed the first three steps and is on the road to salvation.

While Faustus does complete all of the required steps of the fourth step, he does not follow the order which Morton sets forth. Faustus first goes to the second step of hearing the word of God. Faustus' seeing Christ's blood in the firmament shows that he has heard God's word of salvation which he did not hear when he rejected divinity in his opening soliloquy. Faustus then goes through the step of invoking God's name. He cries out: "My God, my God, look not so fierce on me!" (V.i.328). Faustus now only needs to follow through with the amendment of life which he does in the last two lines: "Ugly hell, gape not! come not, Lucifer! / I'll burn my books!" (V.i.330-31). In these two lines, Faustus amends his life. First, the command to hell and Lucifer

serves as a rejection of them. Second, burning necromantic books is the only way to denounce the art (Kocher 168).

Faustus does not only sink, as most criticism would have it; rather, he rises again. Faustus achieves salvation by going above the point where he began the play and through the steps of repentance. This Platonic strain had entered England with Catholicism and remained within Anglican theology. Its source in St. Augustine had never really changed as Thomism had never totally caught on in England (Taylor 23). The next chapter will consider this Platonic/Augustine thought.

CHAPTER IV

Faustuses of Milevis and Wittenberg

The connection between Marlowe and St. Augustine is indisputable. Marlowe was well versed in, if not heavily influenced by, Augustine. An examination of Augustinian doctrine in Doctor Faustus will assist in developing the case for the salvation of Faustus. Augustine influences both the content and the structure of the play.

A direct familiarity with Augustine came to Marlowe through his education as a divinity student at Cambridge. Augustine's influence had come to England with Catholicism and survived the Reformation to influence the Anglican theology which Marlowe was studying. While Marlowe was studying at Cambridge, the Lady Margaret Professor of Theology was Peter Baro, a man who held the highest esteem for St. Augustine (Cole 194). Also, Marlowe, whose father was a shoe maker, had his education financed through an Archbishop Parker scholarship; besides providing living quarters and a stipend for board, the Parker scholarship allowed recipients access to the Archbishop Parker collection (Bakeless 46).

This collection in the Corpus Christi College Library contained an eight-volume edition of Augustine's works, the largest collection of any theologian in the printed book collection at the time; Marlowe more than likely would be familiar with the work (Cole 195).

As mentioned in the previous chapter, since Thomism never totally caught on, Augustine was the primary theologian for England. The Neo-Platonism of Augustine was particularly appealing to the sixteenth-century humanists; they found their interest in Augustine aroused (Fiore 1). Augustine and Neo-Platonism were all pervasive in Renaissance thought. One example can be seen in the writings of Erasmus, who used the teachings of the ancient fathers (Artz 64). Another, perhaps more pertinent example, can be seen in Sir Walter Raleigh. Marlowe and Raleigh are known to be acquaintances through the School of Night (Bradbrook School of Night 12). Raleigh himself relied heavily on Augustine in his writings; three ideas serve as examples: Raleigh took his ideas on the substance of the soul from Augustine; Raleigh quotes Augustine on the ignorance of the dead concerning the living, and he frequently cited Augustine on the size of the Ark (Strathmann 118; 124; 187). Bowden, in The Religion of Shakespeare, acknowledges the

presence of Augustinian doctrine within Shakespeare's sonnets (222). The ideas of Augustine were pervasive throughout the age of Marlowe; the rise of Calvinism assisted the revival as religious controversy and debate gathered speed.

Marlowe's interest in Augustine would also be reinforced by his Catholic leanings. Shakespeare revealed his Catholic leanings in his writing (Bowden 345); however, Marlowe revealed his own in his actions and daily conversation as well. One of the first controversial incidents in Marlowe's life surrounded his receiving his Master's degree. Marlowe had gone abroad to Rheims, the center for English Catholics, supposedly to spy on the English who were at Rheims; a large number of Catholic scholars from Cambridge had taken refuge here between 1580 and 1592 (Boas CM 26). Such a job would probably have required Marlowe to pose as a student convert; to do so would have required an understanding of the Catholic point of view on Marlowe's part (Barber 96). When Marlowe returned from Rheims, Cambridge was not going to give him his degree. While the reasons for this are unknown, the University probably based it on a suspicion of Catholicism (Bakeless 221-22). The Privy Council, however, intervened directly on Marlowe's behalf;

their testimony on Marlowe's behalf explicitly addresses the question of Rheims:

Whereas it was reported that Christopher Morley was determined to haue gone beyond the seas to Reames and there to remain, their Lordships thought good to certify that he had no such intent, but that in all his actions he had behaued him selfe orderlie and discreetlie wherebie he had done her Majesty good service, and deserued to be rewarded for his faithfull dealinge. (Acts of the Privy Council, June 29, 1587; qtd. in Bakeless 80.)

The Rheims incident is not the only evidence for Marlowe's Catholicism; his own statements provide further proof.

Towards the end of Marlowe's life, while charges of atheism were flying all around him, government spies were following him and making reports on him. Two particular statements which Marlowe made stand out. First, he once stated that "all protestants are hipocriticall Asses" (Harleian MS. 6848, f. 185 and 6853, f. 188; qtd. in Bakeless 4). Marlowe also revealed his bias towards Catholicism when he stated:

That if there be any God or true religion, then it is with the Papists, because the service of

God is performed with more ceremonies, as elevation of the mass, organs, singing men, shaven crowns, &c. (Harleian MSS. qtd. in Bowden 345).

These Catholic leanings would have provided an additional interest in Augustine.

When Marlowe first came upon the English Faust Book, not only would the ideas of sin and damnation bring Augustine to the mind of a former divinity student, but the name Faustus would return him to the life of Augustine, specifically to the Manicheans and the Manichean bishop, Faustus of Milevis. Ironically, in Doctor Faustus, Mephistophilis shows the characteristics of Augustine's Faustus. When Augustine began to find flaws within the gnosis promised by the doctrine of Mani, he also discovered that his fellow Manichees could provide no answer either; they promised that an expert, Faustus of Milevis, was on his way and could provide the proper answers (Hackstaff xxiii). Doctor Faustus is in a similar situation; he identifies himself: "I, that have with subtle syllogisms / Gravelled the pastors of the German church" (I.i.113-14). John Faustus finds his fellow Manichees in the form of Cornelius and Valdes; they can not answer his questions and subtly refuse to accompany him in his questioning of

the power of necromancy. Faustus reveals that his inclination towards magic stems from "not your words only, but mine own fantasy" (V.i.104). When Faustus asks Cornelius and Valdes to perform "some demonstrations magical" so that he may learn the trade, Valdes' first response is "Then haste thee to some solitary grove" (I.i.151, 154). Faustus turns to necromancy, as Augustine turned to the Manichees, to gain knowledge. Doctor Faustus states, as one of his first reasons for turning to necromancy, that he wishes spirits to "Resolve me of all ambiguities" (I.i.81). Just as Faustus of Milevis fails Augustine, so too, Mephistophilis fails Faustus of Wittenberg.

Faustus of Milevis offered little help or resolve to Augustine's questions; Mourant argues that Faustus probably provided "little more than evasive answers to the more searching questions of Augustine" (14-15). In Doctor Faustus, Mephistophilis tries to provide evasive answers to Faustus; when Faustus asks where hell is, Mephistophilis responds "Under the heavens" (II.i.117). Both Faustus of Milevis and Mephistophilis provide simple answers which can satisfy neither Augustine nor Faustus of Wittenberg. In The Confessions, Augustine said of Faustus: "I found him first utterly ignorant of liberal sciences, save

grammar, and that but in an ordinary way" (69). In the same way, Doctor Faustus is dissatisfied with the knowledge of Mephistophilis; when Faustus gets frustrated in his discussion of astronomy with Mephistophilis, he rebukes:

These slender questions Wagner can decide:
 Hath Mephistophilis no greater skill?
 Who knows not the double motion of the planets?
 That the first is finished in a natural day
 (II.ii.49-52).

At the end of this speech Faustus adds: "those are freshmen's questions" (II.ii.55-56). Finally, the use of wrong knowledge enters as a factor. Augustine found errors in the writings of Manichaeus:

When then he was found out to have taught
 falsely of the heaven and stars, and of the
 motions of the sun and moon (although these
 things pertain not to the doctrine of religion),
 yet his sacreligious presumption would become
 evident enough, seeing he delivered things
 which not only he knew not, but which were
 falsified, with so mad a vanity of pride, that
 he sought to ascribe them to himself, as to a
 divine person (Confessions 67-68).

As a Manichean, Augustine would have accepted this false astronomy, before he began questioning it, in much the same way that Faustus accepts what Mephistophilis says. This would explain why Marlowe used the Ptolemaic concept of the universe when he was well-versed in the Copernican (Bakeless 58). Faustus' observation of the universe can not be used as evidence as it could simply be shadows that he sees as the emperor saw of Alexander and his paramour.

In the same way that Mephistophilis characterizes Faustus of Milevis, Faustus of Wittenberg parallels Augustine. Both Faustus and Augustine are guilty of falling for the Manichean heresy. The first element in the Manichean heresy is that evil, like good, has its own integrity; it is a heresy in that it denies the omnibenevolence of God (Hackstaff xx). Faustus reveals elements of accepting the heresy in three ways: first, in his opening soliloquy Faustus denies that God will save man, which would question His omnibenevolence. Second, Faustus speaks of Belzebub as one would God when he says: "There is no chief but only Belzebub" (I.iv.59). Third, Faustus offers to build Belzebub a church:

The God thou serv'st is thine own appetite,
Wherein is fixed the love of Belzebub:
To him I'll build an altar and a church,

And offer lukewarm blood of new-born babes

(II.i.11-14).

By equating the devil with God, Faustus is guilty of the Manichean heresy. The Manichees also viewed man as a microcosm of the dualistic universe; Faustus reflects this at each point of tension of mind discussed in the last chapter.

The second element in the belief of the Manichees is that they believe the spirit to be material (Hackstaff xxi). Faustus accepts this idea in his agreement with the devil in which the first condition is "that Faustus may be a spirit in form and substance" (II.i.96). Faustus is not yet able to comprehend the duality between spirit and substance which he later reveals at the Emperor's court.

The Manichees denied the omnipotence of God; they believed that evil existed out of limitations of goodness. Faustus also accepts this idea by accepting Lucifer's argument against repentance: "Christ cannot save thy soul, for he is just: / There's none but I have interest in the same" (II.ii.93-94). Through passive acceptance, Faustus adopts the idea that the reach of God can not extend to him.

Manicheanism opposed Christianity; the method of

attack they used parallel Faustus' rejection of divinity in the opening soliloquy. First, Manichees believed that "salvation" was achieved by reason, not through any form of faith or revelation which they believed to be superstition (Hackstaff xxii). This idea makes Faustus' use of a syllogism to refute divinity all the more understandable. Second, the Manichees would argue against Christianity by finding what they thought were contradictions within scripture (Hackstaff xxii). Faustus follows this same course in the opening soliloquy. Rather than rising to accept paradox through faith, Faustus follows the strict Manichean polemic.

The final Manichean element to consider is its pride in its knowledge of astronomy, particularly its knowledge of the wandering courses of the planets (Hackstaff xxiii). The one area which Faustus tries to learn from Mephistophilis is astronomy, and in that discussion, six out of the seven questions Faustus asks concern the planets--three of the six deal with motion (II.ii.33-69). As with Augustine, the details of the astronomy lead away from the Manicheans; in Faustus' case, it leads to his command to Mephistophilis: "Now tell me who made / the world" (II.ii.70-71).

Just as Augustine had fallen into Manicheanism, he

rose to become a saint; so too does Faustus. Peter Fiore cites three elements within the Christian myth which Augustine develops from: the "paradisal life," the Fall, and the paradisal life finally recovered (1). As discussed in the last chapter, at the beginning of the play, Faustus is at the entry of understanding--his paradisal life; we have seen Faustus make the Manichean fall; now we must see if he rises as Augustine did.

In Book VII of The Confessions, Augustine discusses his own conversion as a five step ascent. These steps are best summarized by J.B. Collins:

1. The consciousness of an intense, yet ill-defined longing for God.
2. A search for the changeless Truth and immutable Light.
3. He contemplates the visible objects of nature, but they are only to assist him in his quest. He finds them without exception subject to change and decay. God is not there.
4. Turning then by introspection, he analyzes the faculties of his own soul.
5. He finds God at last, both in and above his own soul (26-27).

It must be noted that to Augustine, to ascend to

perfection required a contemplative, passive life, not activity (Fraser The Dark Ages 90).

Faustus enters the first step with the ill-defined longing for God immediately after he discusses astronomy with Mephistophilis. When Mephistophilis is unable to tell him who created the world, Faustus gets to the lines: "Think, Faustus, upon God that made the / world" (II.ii.79-80). After an interjection by the Good and Bad Angels, Faustus cries out: "O Christ, my Savior, my Savior, / Help to save distressed Faustus' soul!" (II.ii.91-92). In each case we see that Faustus' longing is ill-defined. In the first instance, Faustus must think on God and knows no course of action; in the second instance, Faustus wants Christ to intervene when Faustus has made no effort towards repentance.

The prologue to Act III brings with it Augustine's second step. During the prologue, we are told of Faustus' trip to discover the secrets of astronomy; obviously, if Faustus had accepted what Mephistophilis told him, there would be no need to make such a trip. Faustus makes his trip to discover the Truth and the Light. It is during this trip that Faustus is able to see "E'en to the height of the Primum Mobile" (III.prologue.10). After returning from this trip, he does not rest for long;

rather, he takes off once more "to prove cosmography" (III.prologue.20). Faustus needs to discover the truths for himself and can not accept it on the word of Mephistophilis.

The third step of Augustine parallels the third, thought, step of Plato; Augustine describes his passage through this step in The Confessions:

And thus by degrees I passed from bodies to the soul, which through the bodily senses perceives; and thence to its inward faculty, to which the bodily senses represent things external, whitherto reach the faculties of beasts; and thence again to the reasoning faculty, to which what is received from the senses of the body is referred to be judged (Book VII 110).

Again, Helen serves to show Faustus passing from physical to spiritual beauty. Helen, due to her spiritual beauty, is able to stand above all else and make Faustus proclaim: "all is dross that is not Helena" (V.i.114). Faustus can now be seen on his way to right living in the Augustinian sense. Augustine says of the good man in On Free Choice of the Will: "Since, moreover, he does not dare to love these things [material goods], he does not

grieve when they are lost; rather, he despises them utterly" (I.xiii.91). Since Faustus now despises all that is below Helen, he is well on his way up the ladder.

Faustus turns into his soul with introspection in the beginning of his soliloquy. It is important to note that Faustus is alone in his study for the last two steps; therefore, he is given the time for passive contemplation. Faustus cries out: "Oh, I'll leap up to my God! Who pulls me down?" (V.i.286). While many would say it is the devil who holds him down, it is impossible to be so in Augustinian doctrine. Augustine writes: "no vicious spirit overcomes the spirit armed by virtue" (On Free Choice of the Will I.x.72). What holds down Faustus' arms is his pride. Augustine believed that a prideful attempt at ascending to God would be fatal ("Augustine" 1053).

In order to achieve the final step, Faustus must humble himself before God. Faustus, who tried to climb the chain of being, does this when he wishes to move down; in his soliloquy he says: "Ah, Pythagoras' metempsychosis, were that true, / This soul should fly from me, and I be changed / Unto some brutish beast!" (V.i.315-17). It is after Faustus humbles himself that he truly feels the presence of God which he reveals in

the line: "My God, my God, look not so fierce on me!" (V.i.328). This leads to his repentance in the final line.

Augustinian doctrine will attempt to clear up one point on Faustus' vow to burn his books. It may be argued that Faustus does not fulfill the action; however, according to Augustine, the Will is enough. Augustine argues throughout Book One of On Free Choice of the Will that it is the Will that determines whether we are good or evil; thus, Faustus' will to burn the books would serve the same function as the action. We have repentance.

CHAPTER V

The New Epilogue

The salvation of Faustus does not only open the play to the reader, it opens the world to the play. The salvation does not exist out of aesthetics, but out of necessity. W.H. Auden once wrote that each technical advance requires a similar advance in metaphysics; living in an atomic age with internal combustion metaphysics, we have a clear idea of the concept of confusion. In the Renaissance, the developments which were stemming out of humanism, science, and exploration required a new metaphysics which a saved Faustus would seem to provide.

The implications of a saved Faustus also affect the play as literature--particularly with genre assignment. Historically, Faustus has been viewed as either a morality play or a tragedy; however, if we use Northrop Frye's "Theory of Modes," we find that Faustus actually turns out to be a comedy. Frye argues:

[T]here is a general distinction between fictions in which the hero becomes isolated from his society, and fictions in which he is incorporated into it. This distinction is

expressed by the words "tragic" and "comic" when they refer to aspects of plot in general and not simply to forms of drama (35).

If Faustus is damned, the play is tragedy as he is separated from the saints whom the Good Angel shows him in the fifth act; if Faustus is saved and is able to join them, then it flows over into comedy.

Beyond these ideas, let us examine the implications and purposes for the individual chapters. While the chapters are arranged into a syllogistic chain, each one serves as an independent syllogism which makes its own argument and contribution.

The review of criticism in chapter I was designed so as to show the contradictory nature of existing criticism. All of the existing critics agree in the conclusion of Faustus' damnation; however, they disagree severely on the premises which take them to this point. In order to claim the truth of a syllogism we must have a validity of method as well as established truth for all premises. If one premise is either false or undetermined, then the conclusion is undetermined. When we have two contradictory premises, we must assume that the truth of each is undetermined. With this idea in mind, an inconsistent chain of reasoning based upon

undetermined premises naturally leads into an undetermined conclusion; therefore, damnation must be questioned if not rejected.

The larger purpose of chapter I is to shine light on existing methods of criticism. We cannot accept criticism which is based upon an unfounded hypothesis. No one would accept reasoning which is based upon an assumed major premise; to discover a proper major premise it must be arrived at by either a prior deductive syllogism or through an inductive argument (all deduction, when carried to its ultimate roots, will find induction as its creator). An inductive survey of a work of literature's elements must first be taken before any arguments can be advanced. Further, we must now open up what I shall refer to as "thesis testing criticism." Whenever the critic sits down to work, all possible interpretations of the play must be examined to determine the most valid interpretation. Even when, and especially when, there is a particular premise upon which the work is based, the premise must be inverted and the work read in a new way. It is only by accounting for all possible counter-interpretations that a valid interpretation can be brought forth. It is much like trying to raise a sufficient cause to a necessary and sufficient cause;

the ascension must come from ruling out all possible counter-causalities. To make one interpretation the most valid, we must rule out all the others which are possible. Also, by examining all other possible interpretations, we will find many premises which will support the valid interpretation. I am in no way attempting to assert that there should only be one "standard" interpretation of a work of literature; however, I am arguing that all works of criticism which are to be advanced must be tested against the universe as a whole and not simply against themselves. The critic is not just a bridge from the writer to the reader; rather, he is the mason who must fit the brick of this work within the wall of existing literature. The brick must not only fit within the wall, but it must also match the continuity of the wall in all directions.

The textual examination of the Epilogue in chapter II questions the validity of the only evidence within the play to support the ideas of damnation in a valid way. Even without the textual criticism, the very nature of the Epilogue -- it is the only place where the Chorus moralizes instead of narrating -- violates all precedents for it within the play. While

the debate of the scholars following Faustus' death is examined here as well, it is shown to fall within the scheme of a possible salvation hypothesis, and, therefore, its validity does not need to be tested. The Epilogue, however, must necessarily be tested as the entire meaning of the play and the damnation hypothesis rest upon it. The true question of this second chapter is towards a set of standards for textual criticism.

In the field of textual criticism, we must not forget that author's intention must be given priority over the printed base. The idea discussed above, thesis testing criticism, must be examined without the questionable passage. Therefore, let the new standard for textual criticism be that passages of questionable authority which affect the interpretation of the play be made contingent upon contextual interpretation without the passage; also, passages which lack authority entirely and either moralize or interpret in order to provide the only possible evidence for a particular interpretation must be struck entirely. Finally, this chapter is a call for textual and literary criticism to be brought together and used so that one may support the other in those gray areas

which appear so often in each field. The more we specialize ourselves, and separate one from the other, the more we invalidate the effects and justification for each. All literature must be looked at as a whole and cannot be isolated into specific modes of criticism -- particularly when the modes provide contradictory answers.

Chapter III witnessed the use of the Platonic paradigm of being and becoming. A play which asks moral questions must be examined in the light of moral philosophy; Faustus is as much a question of ethics as it is theology; in fact, it serves in many ways as an ethical examination of theology in a time of great religious controversy. The fact that so many of the elements of the various theologies of the day appear within the play serves to indicate that Marlowe may be seeking what he would consider to be the superior doctrine. Of the three elements of religion which Plato cites -- mythological, ceremonial, and natural -- only natural religion serves within the meaning of the play. While elements of Christian mythology play a role within the structure and surface of the play, they do not play a role in the meaning as they would in the medieval morality play. There is no ceremony within the play

except the conjuring and the Papal court scenes; the conjuring is spectacle (it is the context of the deed which is important and Mephistophilis does tell Faustus that he did not conjure him, that he came of his free will), and the ceremony of the Papal Court serves simply through Faustus' not understanding the ceremony.

Natural religion, the philosophical debate on religion, serves as the basis for Doctor Faustus. Many theological questions are raised such as free will versus predestination; thus we must return to the "thinkers" on religion to validate or invalidate the ideas within the play. The rebirth of Platonism (which influenced the humanism of which Faustus is a great part) would also reinforce the use of Platonic dogma.

In the Defense of Poesie, Sir Philip Sidney argues that poetry is superior to history and philosophy because it stands as a fusion of the best elements of each; therefore, if we understand the elements which are being used (i.e., the philosophical or historical train of thought behind the author), then the meaning which both the work and the elements are trying to convey become that much clearer. We need to understand the premises to understand the conclusion -- pre-existent knowledge as Aristotle refers to it in the

Posterior Analytics. Our intellectual nature requires us to see relationships between things; therefore, as Freud argues in Totem and Taboo, when we do not understand a relationship between things (do not have the pre-existent knowledge), we create our own, often wrong, relationships. For instance, prehistoric man used to believe that solar eclipses were caused by a demon trying to swallow the sun; his automatic response was to make as much noise as possible to scare the demon off; it worked. The sun came back, but he did not have the knowledge which he needed to understand the situation. This once more leads us into the rationale for thesis testing criticism; because something works, it is not right; we need the pre-existent knowledge.

The third chapter also seeks to open the play up to new paradigms for criticism. For instance, Kohlberg's theory of moral development can also be applied specifically to Faustus; Faustus advances from a reward/punishment stage up to finally doing what is right through repentance. The question of "democratic theology" comes to rise in Faustus; who decides whether Faustus is saved, the authority (God) or the masses of the congregation (the audience)? The purpose of this chapter is to open the play of Doctor Faustus

to all possible schools of thought to be fused through the thesis testing method.

The fourth chapter which follows the Augustinian paradigm supports the validity of the interpretation of the thesis testing method. Three independent paradigms -- Platonic, Anglican, and Augustinian -- support the salvation hypothesis in a consistent manner indicating the same trend running throughout the play, whereas existing criticism can not decide at what point the damnation is solidified if at all. The use of Augustine is particularly important due to its influence on Marlowe (in some instances right down to structure of phases). If we see The English Faust Book as the history and Platonic Augustinianism as the philosophy, then we are better to understand the work through Sidney's paradigm.

In "For a Theater of Situations," Sartre argues that the most moving thing a play can show is the free choice of a mode or way of life; Marlowe achieves this effect -- not only with Faustus, but with his audience. As argued above, three individual, theological paradigms are applicable; no one theory can be viewed as exclusive; even the damnation hypothesis can not be applied consistently as the critics can not agree

at what point the damnation occurs. Faustus must be taken out of the realm of moral pronouncement; if we view salvation as equally workable as damnation, we see the question of Faustus' final judgement placed as an intellectual demand upon the audience. Thesis testing criticism requires that literature be viewed as a process rather than a product. Particularly in Doctor Faustus, we must resist the temptation to force the gray areas into the realm of either black or white; one must deal with the ambiguity as ambiguity rather than attempting to reconcile it to a particular hypothesis. We must let each ambiguity serve as a split in the branches of the tree diagram. Whether Faustus is damned or saved becomes secondary; it does not matter which we choose; what matters is that we see Doctor Faustus open to both.

Works Cited

- Aristotle. "De Poetica." Trans. Ingram Bywater.
Introduction to Aristotle. Ed. Richard McKeon.
New York: Modern Library-Random, 1947. 624-67.
- Ashton, J.W. "The Fall of Icarus." Philological
Quarterly 20(1941): 345-51.
- Augustine. The Confessions of St. Augustine. Trans.
Edward B. Pusey. London: Collier, 1961.
- . On Free Choice of the Will. Trans. Anne S.
Benjamin and L.H. Hackstaff. Indianapolis: Bobbs-
Merrill, 1964.
- "Augustine." New Catholic Encyclopedia. 1967 ed.
- Bakeless, John. Christopher Marlowe: The Man in His
Time. New York: William Morrow, 1937.
- Barber, C.L. "The Form of Faustus' Fortune, Good or Bad."
Tulane Drama Review 8(1963-64): 92-119.
- Bluestone, Max. From Story to Stage: The Dramatic
Adaptation of Prose Fiction in the Period of
Shakespeare and His Contemporaries. The Hague:
Mouton, 1974.
- Bluestone, Max, and Norman Rabkin, eds. Shakespeare's
Contemporaries. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice, 1961.

- Boas, Frederick S. Christopher Marlowe: A Biographical and Critical Study. Oxford: Clarendon, 1940.
- , ed. Doctor Faustus. By Christopher Marlowe. The Works and Life of Christopher Marlowe. Gen. ed. Robert H. Case. 6 vols. London: Methuen, 1930-33.
- Bowden, H.S. The Religion of Shakespeare. 1899. New York: AMS, 1974.
- Bowers, Fredson T., ed. The Complete Works. By Christopher Marlowe. 2 vols. Cambridge: The University Press, 1973.
- Bradbrook, M.C. "Marlowe's Faustus." Farnham 17-22.
- . The School of Night: A Study in the Literary Relationships of Sir Walter Raleigh. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1936.
- Brockbank, J.P. "The Damnation of Faustus." Leech 112-19.
- Brooke, C.F. Tucker. The Life of Christopher Marlowe and The Tragedy of Dido, Queen of Carthage. London: Methuen, 1930.
- Brown, Beatrice D. "Marlowe, Faustus and Simon Magus." PMLA 54(1939): 82-121.
- Campbell, Lily B. "Doctor Faustus: A Case of Conscience." Selected Papers of Lily B. Campbell: First Published in Various Learned Journals, 1907-1952. New York:

- Russell, 1968. 453-75.
- Cole, Douglas. Suffering and Evil in the Plays of Christopher Marlowe. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1962.
- Collins, Joseph B. Christian Mysticism in the Elizabethan Age, with its Background in Mystical Methodology. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1940.
- Cutts, John P. The Left Hand of God: A Critical Interpretation of the Plays of Christopher Marlowe. Haddonfield, NJ: Haddonfield House, 1973.
- Davenport, W.A. Fifteenth-Century English Drama: The Early Moral Plays and Their Literary Relations. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1982.
- Farnham, William, ed. and intro by. Twentieth Century Interpretations of Doctor Faustus. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice, 1969.
- Fiore, Peter A. Milton and Augustine: Patterns of Augustinian Thought in Paradise Lost. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1981.
- Fraser, Russell. The Dark Ages and the Age of Gold. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1973.
- Fraser, Russell, and Norman Rabkin, eds. Doctor Faustus. By Christopher Marlowe. Volume I: The Tudor Period. Drama of the English Renaissance. 2 vols. New York: MacMillan, 1976. 295-322.

- Frye, Northrop. Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays.
Princeton: Princeton UP, 1973.
- Gardner, Helen. "The Damnation of Faustus." Farnham 35-42.
- Godshalk, W.L. The Marlovian World Picture. The Hague:
Mouton, 1974.
- Greg, W.W. "The Damnation of Faustus." Leech 92-107.
- , ed. The Tragical History of the Life and Death of
Doctor Faustus: A Conjectural Reconstruction. By
Christopher Marlowe. Oxford: Clarendon, 1950.
- Hackstaff, L.H. Introduction. On Free Choice of the Will.
By Augustine.
- Harrison, John Smith. Platonism in English Poetry of the
Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. New York:
Columbia UP, 1908.
- Henderson, Philip. Christopher Marlowe. 2nd ed. New
York: Barnes, 1974.
- Jump, John D., ed. Doctor Faustus. By Christopher
Marlowe. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1962.
- Kocher, Paul H. Christopher Marlowe: A Study of His
Thought, Learning, and Character. Chapel Hill:
U of North Carolina P, 1946.
- Leech, Clifford, ed. Marlowe: A Collection of Critical
Essays. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice, 1964.
- Mahood, Molly M. "The Tragedy of Renaissance Humanism."

Bluestone and Rabkin 103-11.

The Marlowe Concordance. Comp. Charles Crawford. New York: Burt Franklin, 1911.

Meehan, Virginia. Christopher Marlowe: Poet and Playwright. The Hague: Mouton, 1974.

Mourant, John A. Introduction to the Philosophy of Saint Augustine: Selected Readings and Commentaries. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1964.

Reed, Robert Rentoul, Jr. The Occult on the Tudor and Stuart Stage. Boston: Christopher, 1965.

Salgado, Gamini. English Drama: A Critical Introduction. New York: St. Martins, 1980.

Sanders, Wilbur. The Dramatist and the Received Idea: Studies in the Plays of Marlowe and Shakespeare. Cambridge: The University Press, 1968.

A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad: 1475-1640. Ed. A.W. Pollard and G.R. Redgrave. 1926. London, 1946.

Smith, James. "Faustus as Allegory." Farnham 23-34.

Strathmann, Ernest Albert. Sir Walter Raleigh: A Study in Elizabethan Skepticism. New York: Columbia UP, 1951.

Taylor, Alfred Edward. Platonism and Its Influence. New York: Cooper Square Publishing, 1963.

Tillyard, E.M.W. Elizabethan World Picture. New York:
Vantage, 1944.

A Transcript of the Company of Stationers of London:
1554-1640. Ed. E. Arber. Vol. III. London, 1876.