

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/346954935>

English Renaissance Tragedy:., Kyd's The Spanish Tragedy And Marlowe's Doctor Faustus In Perspective

Article · January 2020

DOI: 10.36091/0550-021-001-014

CITATIONS

0

READS

167

1 author:



[Fuad Abdul Muttalib](#)

Jerash University

42 PUBLICATIONS 4 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

English Renaissance Tragedy: Kyd's *the Spanish Tragedy* and Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* in perspective

مأساة عصر النهضة الإنجليزية: مسرحية توماس كيد المأساة الإسبانية ومسرحية كريستوفر مارلو الدكتور فاوستوس في المنظور

Fuad Abdul Muttaleb *

Received Date: 25/8/2019

Acceptance Date: 5/1/2020

Abstract

In this paper, I shall be trying to investigate the nature of the English Renaissance drama through two prominent examples: Thomas Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy* (1556-1857) and Christopher Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* (1588-1593). In order to carry out this aim Kyd's play (probably performed 1586-7), will be looked at as the first successful English example of tragedy, for its force and originality was widely acknowledged, and Marlowe's play (probably performed 1592) as an artistic expression of the Renaissance spirit, a recreation of the Faust legend. The English idea of a Renaissance tragedy seems here to be a mixture of the ideas of Aristotle, Seneca, and English medieval tradition but with a significant step ahead necessitated by the Renaissance artistic and intellectual achievements. Thus to illuminate this process of transformation, the paper will start by tracing the development of the conception of tragedy, from classical times until the Renaissance period, and then spotlighting the close link between the native dramatic tradition and the classical influence with an eye on the English contribution. The critical approach followed can be described as descriptive and sometimes as historical in certain aspects. The texts of the two plays will be used as a primary source and other relevant critical works as a secondary source that sheds some light on the main topic.

Keywords: Tragedy, Classical Tragedy, Renaissance Tragedy, *The Spanish Tragedy*, *Doctor Faustus*, Christopher Marlowe, Thomas Kyd.

© All rights reserved to Jerash University 2020.

* Professor of English, Department of English, Faculty of Arts, Jerash University, Jordan.
Email: fuadmuttalib@jpu.edu.jo

English Renaissance Tragedy: Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy* and Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* in perspective

Fuad Abdul Muttaleb

Professor of English- Faculty of Arts- Jerash University

fuadmuttalib@jpu.edu.jo

Abstract

In this paper, I shall be trying to investigate the nature of the English Renaissance drama through two prominent examples: Thomas Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy* (1556-1587) and Christopher Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* (1588-1593). In order to carry out this aim Kyd's play (probably performed 1586–7), will be looked at as the first successful English example of tragedy, for its force and originality was widely acknowledged, and Marlowe's play (probably performed 1592) as an artistic expression of the Renaissance spirit, a recreation of the Faust legend. The English idea of a Renaissance tragedy seems here to be a mixture of the ideas of Aristotle, Seneca, and English medieval tradition but with a significant step ahead necessitated by the Renaissance artistic and intellectual achievements. Thus to illuminate this process of transformation, the paper will start by tracing the development of the conception of tragedy, from classical times until the Renaissance period, and then spotlighting the close link between the native dramatic tradition and the classical influence with an eye on the English contribution. The critical approach followed can be described as descriptive and sometimes as historical in certain aspects. The texts of the two plays will be used as a primary source and other relevant critical works as a secondary source that sheds some light on the main topic.

Keywords: Tragedy, Classical Tragedy, Renaissance Tragedy, *The Spanish Tragedy*, *Doctor Faustus*, Christopher Marlowe, Thomas Kyd.

مأساة عصر النهضة الإنجليزية: مسرحية توماس كيد المأساة الإسبانية ومسرحية كريستوفر مارلو الدكتور فاستوس في المنظور

د. فؤاد عبد المطلب
أستاذ في اللغة الإنجليزية وآدابها - كلية الآداب - جامعة جرش
fuadmuttalib@jpu.edu.jo

نبذة مختصرة

في هذه الورقة، سأحاول تبين طبيعة المسرحية المأساوية في عصر النهضة الإنجليزية من خلال مثالين بارزين: مسرحية توماس كيد المأساة الإسبانية (1556-1857) ومسرحية كريستوفر مارلو الدكتور فاستوس (1588-1593). ومن أجل تحقيق هذا الهدف، سيتم النظر إلى مسرحية كيد (ربما عرضت في عام 1586-1587) بكونها أول مثال إنجليزي ناجح للمأساة في عصر النهضة، فقد تم الاعتراف بقوتها وأصالتها على نطاق واسع، والنظر إلى مسرحية مارلو (على الأرجح عرضت في العام 1592) بكونها عملاً فنياً يعبر حقيقة

عن الروح الإنجليزية في عصر النهضة، فهي إعادة كتابة لأسطورة فاستوس الألمانية الأصل. ويبدو هنا أن الفكرة الإنجليزية لمأساة عصر النهضة هي مزيج من أفكار أرسطو، وسينيك، وتقاليد العصور الوسطى

الإنجليزية، ولكن مع إسهام كبير استدعته الإنجازات الفنية والفكرية لهذا العصر. وبغية إلقاء الضوء على عملية التحول تلك، ستبدأ الورقة بتتبع تطور مفهوم المسرحية المأساة، من العصور الكلاسيكية حتى عصر النهضة، ومن ثم تسليط الضوء على الصلة الوثيقة بين التقليد الدرامي الأصلي وتقليد عصر النهضة، والتأثير الكلاسيكي فيها مع التركيز على الإسهام المسرحي الإنجليزي. ويمكن وصف المنهج النقدي المتبع بأنه وصفي وأحياناً تاريخي في جوانب معينة. وقد تم استخدام نصي المسرحيين كمصدر أساسي للدراسة، وغيرها من الأعمال النقدية ذات الصلة كمصدر ثانوي يلقي بعض الضوء على الموضوع الرئيس.

الكلمات المفتاحية: مفهوم المسرحية المأساة، المأساة الكلاسيكية، مأساة عصر النهضة، مسرحية المأساة الإسبانية، مسرحية الدكتور فاستوس، كريستوفر مارلو، توماس كيد.

The Conception of Tragedy: An Introduction

Under the influence of different technical conditions and different aims and ideals, drama in general and tragedy in particular have assumed different forms in different times and places. It was thus customary for dramatic critics to distinguish sharply between different types of drama as tragedy and comedy, the classic and modern types. Since it is not possible to discuss all these types adequately, the focus here will be on the main dramatic types under examination. Tragedy is commonly known as a form of drama in which the protagonist undergoes a morally or socially significant struggle; in which the conflict is rather within a character than between characters or between a character and external forces; and in which the protagonist, although treated sympathetically, incurs guilt of which the expiation is part of the dramatic problem. The word “conception” here indicates the idea of what tragedy is like, or the basic understanding of its main principles. Hence, the question of tragedy is highly problematic: Classical tragedies, Renaissance, Neo-classical, and Modern tragedies, are not tragic in the same way. Though they do not resemble each other, the differences among them can be described. In discussing the nature of tragedy, we come to it, as Raymond Williams put it “by many roads. It is an immediate experience, a body of literature, a conflict of theory, an academic problem” ⁽¹⁾.

Classic poetic drama was associated with religious ceremonies and performed in the open air theatre during day time. Flourished in Attica in the 5th century B.C. It consisted of an alternation of dialogue and choral dances. Subjects were drawn from mythology which placed the interest of drama not on suspense but in the dramatic irony and religious and ethical instruction. Unity of action was more observed than those of time and place. Mainly three actors participated in the performance and the chorus had an important role in it. Violent action was usually reported by a messenger. Practically, tragic form underwent considerable transformation from the fifth century Greece until the very end of the sixteenth century England. Fuad A. Muttaleb has properly treated this point:

Each period of history has had its prevailing views which at times hardened into rigid rules, these then often became straitjackets. The neo-classical interpretations, socially and historically, had connections with

the class structure rather than a feudal world. Only kings, princes and people of an aristocratic noble birth led life of great importance to be treated in tragedies. This was based on the assumption that only people of such high rank could have sentiments noble enough to comply with the high requirements of the genre. Merchants, minor country gentry lawyers and then the ordinary people, craftsmen, shopkeepers, and servants were material for comedies.⁽²⁾

Renaissance drama flourished in Europe during the 17th century and was marked by certain qualities: breaking the rules of the three unities, the use of the chorus, the violence and bloodshed on the stage, the use of noble characters in tragedy and the use of modern English, mixing prose with poetry and comedy with tragedy. More importantly, it fell in its subject into open conflict between religious institutions and secular values. At the beginning of the 17th century, English dramatists were following the principles of drama exemplified by the tragedies of Seneca and the comedies of Plautus and Terence. For instance, Hamlet has been described as an exercise in the English Seneca, "what Kyd inherited from Seneca makes a very imperfect play. Shakespeare utilizes his inheritance to create a first class tragedy".⁽³⁾

The instructions of Horace in his epistle was one main source of the critical rules, and its representative was Sir Philip Sidney who exalted the aim of poetry as to teach and delight. Throughout its artistic life, the theatre of English Renaissance was haunted mainly by that of classical Rome, not only as a source of plots and devices, but as a standard to which writers aspired, or by which they were criticized. Nowadays, the Renaissance plays themselves are considered classics, classified on their own and edited for university students. But of course they had no such status then: the early modern dramatic canon was then chiefly Latin. So, the relations between the two kinds of dramatic writing, English and classical, were shaped by this distinction. Classical plays were encountered as printed texts that necessitated close attention to their language and structure; the modern dramatic repertoire, on the other hand, existed primarily in performance. So the opposition between Latin and English was also an opposition between drama (poetry) and theatre (amusement). Moreover, classical texts belonged to their authors, whereas new English plays, as we know, belonged to the companies. Drama is located in the mind of the dramatist; theatre in the bodies of the players. This is also a question of social class. Seneca and Plautus

mostly remained on the page, but when they were performed, it was not in the playhouse, but in the classroom, as part of a gentleman's education. Most English imitations of Seneca were by scholarly amateurs whose plays were for private recitation: the performance was not a public spectacle, but part of the cultural life of the aristocracy. In all these ways, the classical paradigm defined the actually existing theatre educationally, psychologically and socially.

Classical (Greek and Roman) Conception of Tragedy: An Historical Outlook

The conception of tragedy has changed along the centuries and with the change of civilizations and philosophies. A great deal of speculation and philosophizing exists on this subject. The concept, construction, and the object of tragic art was first introduced into theory by Aristotle:

Tragedy, then, is a process of imitating an action which has serious implications, is complete, and possesses magnitude, by means of language which has been made sensuously attractive, with each of its varieties found separately in the parts, enacted by the persons themselves and not presented through narrative, through a course of pity and fear completing the purification of tragic acts which have those emotional characteristics.⁽⁴⁾

The Greek idea of tragedy is to evoke pity and fear by presenting on the stage a story of calamity and grief which a hero—who comes of a ruling family (and is himself either a king or prince) suffers as a victim of fate, and on whose destiny the fortune of a whole city or country depends. To an ancient Greek audience, watching such a play was a metaphysical and social experience shared by all. They felt so much involved in the hero's misfortunes and sufferings they extremely pitied and feared. Unlike the Elizabethans, they did not consider death as a necessary culmination of such a tragedy. The calamity the hero suffered was considered by Aeschylus, Sophocles and Aristotle as destined by Fate, and so it was irresistible and an inexplicable manifestation of divine order. As such there was nothing that could be done about it and man had to bear his misfortunes according to the weakness or strength of his humanity. Man could, through fortitude and endurance, the evils of his lot. Man, however, was believed to have a chance for happiness by escaping disaster,

of course, not always and not in all cases and circumstances. The early Greek view of life was not wholly dark and pessimistic; but with the political and military decline of the city states and Greek power the view changed and the outlook became much darker.

Virtually, the Greeks were immensely aware of the influence of the external elements upon the human experience. This awareness is obviously central in their earliest literary or dramatic writings which have survived like the *Iliad* or *Oedipus Rex*. However, the idea of determinism is characteristically universal. Norman T. Pratt, Jr. explains in his chapter "Tragedy and Moralism: Euripides and Seneca," the difference between the classical and renaissance artists use of the divine force in their plays. He states that the Greeks:

Felt the instability of human fortune under the impact of bigger – than – human forces, but they were also strongly individualistic and insistent upon human prerogatives, whether the context be political or intellectual; this is perhaps one reason why the role of "fate" is a matter for such intense concern. In any event, on the whole matter there is a wide range of positions taken by individual poets, as well as other thinkers, and these must be analyzed in terms of the individual poem or drama. There was no orthodoxy on such issues comparable to that found in the Christian tradition.⁽⁵⁾

To consider gods or super powers governing the destinies of human being as active personalities or symbols in classical plays is a very serious matter. When these powers function as symbols manifested in the characters and actions of human beings, the dramatist is not suggesting that human action is determined absolutely by gods, but is universalizing the factors present in the human situation. That is why the symbolic role played by fate in tragedy is so intricate.

The Stoics, (a philosophic school founded by Zeno C. 310 B.C.) believed that man got nearer to the gods by obeying their will and that the more indifferent man is to suffering the less he feels it. One of the most notable of these Stoics is Seneca (d. A.D. 65). Seneca, the greatest Roman tragedian tried to revive Greek tragedy; and although some of his plays such as *Oedipus* and *Agamemnon* are imitations of Aeschylus and Sophocles, nevertheless, they have a different attitude towards disaster and fate. Gone is the religious and venerable submission of the heroes of Aeschylus

and Sophocles to the will of the gods, instead we have a stoical fortitude and patience against the badness of human lot. His consolation is philosophic and not religious as in Aeschylus and Sophocles. With Seneca, especially in his adaptation of the stories of Hercules and Prometheus, man had no chances whatsoever for happiness. The only way to make life bearable is by being patient and resigned and by showing fortitude and carelessness when receiving the blow of Fate; as this is the only way to defeat our bad lot. For by being master of oneself one becomes master of his fate. Eventually, death was not something to be dreaded, and so Seneca, like the Greeks but more clearly and emphatically, did not regard death as a necessary culmination of tragedy.

With the advent of Christianity a new idea of tragic fate was added. Christianity does not deny the badness of human lot but considers man's joy as a heavenly gift and calamity and misery as God's punishment and retribution for man's guilt resulting from his character and conduct. Christianity then regards catastrophe and calamity as the result of guilt and as a function of character and conscience. One expects such attitude towards human calamity to lead to more individualization of the tragic hero. But the fact is that the question of man and how far he controlled his destiny was left unsettled.

The question of how far man is master of his destiny remains unsolved and will probably remain so as long as our knowledge of man and the powers beyond man is limited. Raymond Williams in her remarkable book *Modern Tragedy* finds in Senecan tragedy with its emphasis on individual suffering and endurance greater possibilities for the tragedy of character we see in the works of Shakespeare and his contemporaries. He writes: "there is an important stress on the nobility of suffering and enduring misfortune, which provided a basis for the later transfer of interest to the suffering individual, away from the general action".⁽⁶⁾

The Renaissance revived the Greek and Senecan conceptions of tragedy and so the Elizabethan dramatists were confronted with the Christian, Senecan and Aristotelian views of tragic calamity. These dramatists never thought the matter through. Even Shakespeare, who perfected the tragedy of character never worked the problem out; and, although he tends to adopt the Christian view, is never free of the Aristotelian and Senecan conceptions. The Senecan doctrine is more clearly felt in the works of Shakespeare's contemporaries such as Marston, Chapman, Jonson, Webster and Ford. A. C. Bradley believes in his work *Shakespearean Tragedy* that in Shakespeare "The calamities of tragedy do not simply happen, nor are they sent; they

proceed mainly from actions, and these the actions of men". Nevertheless, he believes that it is not true to say that with Shakespeare "character is destiny" because many of Shakespeare's tragic characters "if they had not met with peculiar circumstances, would have escaped a tragic end, and might even have lived fairly untroubled lives".⁽⁷⁾ Marlowe's conception of human calamity is similar to that of Shakespeare but with ironic twist. It lacks Shakespeare's serene and quiet acceptance of such a world order.

The calamity Doctor Faustus goes through mainly results from his own aspirations. Had he not aspired to be "more than man", to "obtain a deity" he would have escaped disaster and no Mephistophilis would have appeared to him. That is basically the Christian conception: do not get on the wheel of fortune and you will escape being thrown down. But how far can man keep himself away from getting on the wheel of fortune and to what extent he is responsible for his own nature and disposition that keep him away or impels him to get on. Christian doctrines leave this issue unsettled. And here, in fact, Marlowe is most ironic. Doctor Faustus (like Macbeth) seems to be a victim of divine justice, but it is a justice which Marlowe does not seem to accept as fair.

English Renaissance Conception of Tragedy: Kyd and Marlowe as Two Examples:

There was no tradition of tragedy in English drama and little interest in it before 1580. The first English tragedy was *Gorboduc*, written by Thomas Norton (1532-1584) and Thomas Sackville (1536-1608) for performance by the Gentlemen of the Inner Temple at Whitehall before Queen Elizabeth on January 18, 1562. This was the first tragedy written in English and the first drama to be written in blank verse, which was to become the standard of poetic drama in the hands of Marlowe and Shakespeare.

Tragedy became popular in the 1580s, with plays based on the Latin tragedies of Seneca. Seneca used violence, bloodshed and spectacle which the Elizabethan playwrights made explicit where Seneca had been implicit. What they presented on the stage, Seneca had reported through a *nuntius*, or messenger. Other features of Seneca's tragedies that the Elizabethan playwrights borrowed were sensational themes such as the issue of revenge, the use of the supernatural and the use of soliloquies.

The plays written by Terence, Plautus and Seneca, which were often studied and acted by the students at the universities, exerted a powerful influence upon the developing English drama through the first group of educated, scholarly playwrights who began writing in the 1580s. Such playwrights as Terence and Plautus in comedy and Seneca in tragedy were used as models for original plays written for performance by the students of schools such as Oxford and Cambridge.

The interlude and the original English compositions following the Latin five-act pattern were written for sophisticated and learned audiences familiar with Latin comedy and aware of the scholarly nature of the drama. The Latin drama was important to the development of English drama for introducing classical elements and for eliminating moralizing and teaching from the drama. At the same time, the popular native drama, the miracle and the morality plays, were still being produced. The Elizabethans used both traditions to form a drama that appealed to both popular and sophisticated audiences.

The medieval concept of tragedy had been confined to the sense of general disaster that often befell a man and was related to the notion of Fortune and her wheel. A man's fall was tragic, but implicit in the metaphor was the idea that Fortune can also raise a man from the depths. The possibility that man may be responsible for his own destruction was not recognized. Moreover, tragedy was a term applied to narratives in prose or verse, as well as to dramatic presentations. By and large, English tragedy became popular with the plays of Thomas Kyd (1558-1594) and Christopher Marlowe (1564-1593).

Kyd's ' *The Spanish Tragedy*: The First Successful English Renaissance Tragedy

Although Kyd was not a university graduate as were the rest of the University Wits, his command of the classics was strong. He was born in London in 1558, the same year Elizabeth 1 ascended to the throne of England. But he did not live long to savour the continued popular success of his play *The Spanish Tragedy*. He died and was buried in London in August 1594 at the age of 36.⁽⁸⁾ His play, *The Spanish Tragedy*, was probably produced in 1586-87 and was tremendously-successful. It became the first of a long line of tragedies of the same type, for it was an easy kind of drama to imitate. It virtually initiated the genre of revenge to tragedy, and its dramatic fortune has been "marked by its historical position as the English theater's first

popular revenge tragedy".⁹⁾ Some indications of its success is the fact that it had gone through ten printed editions by 1634 and was constantly being revived for performance during this period. Its success led Shakespeare's company to respond with the first of Shakespeare's great tragedies, *Hamlet*.

The Spanish Tragedy is a tragedy of the Senecan type. Kyd's major contribution to the developing English drama was to give Latin drama popular appeal by the use of various tricks of stagecraft. He made everything vivid and spectacular. He used a well-made plot in which all lines of development are articulated and closely tied together for tragic treatment. He paid attention to character development throughout the play so that the characters remained consistent. The characters were psychologically interesting and Lorenzo, the Machiavellian villain, and Hieronimo, the person strangely mad, served as prototypes of characters for years.

Kyd retained the Senecan revenge theme, as Shakespeare was to do in *Hamlet*, the ghost, which was also used in *Hamlet* and the element of spectacle. Unlike Seneca, he did not restrict the violence to off-stage settings reported through the *nuntius*, or messenger. He keeps the *nuntius* but shows all of the bloodshed and horrors on stage. Eight murders or suicides, a public hanging and the biting out of a tongue provided the audience with the bloody spectacle that gave the play its popular appeal.

The Spanish Tragedy, an immensely popular revenge tragedy, is notable first for the number of persons involved at various times in the action. The list includes the Ghost of Andrea, a Spanish Nobleman; the figure of Revenge; the King of Spain; Don Cyprian, Duke of Castile; Lorenzo, the Duke's son; Bel-Imperia, Lorenzo's sister; Viceroy of Portugal; Balthazar, his son; Don Pedro, the Viceroy's brother; Hieronimo, Marshall of Spain; Isabella, his wife; Horatio, their son; a Spanish General; Don Bazulto, an old man; the Portuguese Ambassador; Alexandro and Villupo, Portuguese Noblemen; Pedringano, Bel-Imperia's servant; Christophil, Bel-Imperia's custodian; and other servants and citizens. The characters in Hieronimo's play (a play within a play) are: Soliman, Sultan of Turkey (Balthazar); Erasto, Knight of Rhodes (Lorenzo); The Bashaw (Hieronimo); and Perseda (Bel-Imperia).

The play opens on the Ghost of Don Andrea and the figure of Revenge, who acts as the chorus for the tragedy. Don Andrea is a Spanish nobleman, who is loved by Bel-Imperia and was killed in battle with the Portuguese. His ghost has arrived at the court of the King of Spain so that Revenge may inform him of the events that have

occurred since his death. They observe the king being informed of and saddened by the news of Andrea's death. Andrea learns that the Spanish won the battle when young Horatio captured Balthazar, Prince of Portugal and the man who had killed Andrea. They see both Lorenzo and Horatio claim credit for the capture of the prince.

The scene shifts to Portugal and the viceroy's discovery of the loss of his son. The first villainy occurs as Villupo lies to the viceroy and accuses Alexandro of treachery. The third scene returns to the Spanish palace where Horatio walks with Bel-Imperia and informs her of the nature of Andrea's death. After Horatio leaves, she decides to love him because he was Andrea's best friend and to swear revenge on the man responsible for Andrea's death. In a few moments, Horatio returns with his captive, Balthazar, and Balthazar's love for Bel-Imperia is revealed. The scene ends with a banquet attended by Hieronimo, Horatio and the Portuguese prince. As he observes the festivities, Andrea is galled by the sight of his slayer sitting amicably with his friends and loved ones. The act concludes with Revenge's promise:

Be still Andrea, ere we go from hence,
I'll turn their friendship into fell despite,
Their love to mortal hate, their day to night,
Their hope into despair, their peace to war,
Their joys to pain, their bliss to misery. (1. 5. 5-9)

The revenge theme begins in Act II. Lorenzo and Balthazar speak of the latter's love for Bel-Imperia. Lorenzo forces her servant to reveal that she loves Horatio. When the two hear this, they plot Horatio's death. Balthazar is motivated by the desire for revenge for his capture; Lorenzo by jealousy at having been outdone by Horatio in the capture of Balthazar. Pedringano takes them to a place where they see and overhear the lovers. In the following scene, the King of Spain plans to make political use of Bel-Imperia by marrying her to Balthazar. In this way, the two countries will become one through marriage as well as by military force.

Balthazar, Lorenzo and two servants break in upon a meeting of Horatio and Bel-Imperia. They hang Horatio in the arbor and stab him. Bel-Imperia is led away screaming about the murder. As they leave, Hieronimo enters, discovers his son's body and cuts him down from the tree. Isabella, Horatio's mother, also appears and

finds her dead son. In his grief, Hieronimo goes mad, but swears his revenge, symbolized by a handkerchief stained with his son's blood:

Seest thou this handkerchief besmeared with blood?
It shall not from me till I take revenge.
Seest thou those wounds that yet are bleeding fresh?
I'll not entomb them till I have revenged:
Then will I joy amidst my discontent,
Till then my sorrow never shall be spent. (II. 5. 51-55)

Act III further reveals Alexandra's treachery. The Viceroy orders Alexandra to be burned at the stake and all preparations are made. However, before the flames can be lighted, the ambassador returns from Spain, tells that Balthazar is yet alive and accuses Villupo of treachery in plotting Alexandra's death. Alexandra is released and Villupo sentenced to suffer torture and death.

In Spain, Hieronimo, bent on revenge, comes upon a letter to him in which Bel-Imperia reveals the identity of Horatio's murderers and entreats him to seek revenge both for himself and for her. Lorenzo becomes suspicious of Hieronimo and, to conceal their crime, plans to have Serberine murdered, for he fears that Serberine has revealed their crime to Hieronimo. That evening, Pedringano murders Serberine, but is apprehended by the watch and carried to the marshall, Hieronimo. Pedringano is sentenced to death and executed. Although Lorenzo and Balthazar think that he died without revealing their crime, he had written a letter to Lorenzo that the hangman intercepted and gave to Hieronimo. The letter revealed the truth of Bel-Imperia's assertion that Lorenzo and Balthazar had murdered his son. With this news, Hieronimo leaves to demand justice from the king.

The tragedy deepens as Isabella has gone mad at her son's death, and Lorenzo and Balthazar have imprisoned Bel-Imperia. Lorenzo and Balthazar convince Bel-Imperia that she must marry Balthazar or suffer the anger both of her father and of the king. Hieronimo does not pursue his plan to seek justice from the king. He keeps his knowledge to himself and assumes a mask of friendship to both of the villains. The act ends on a note of apparent harmony.

As the fourth acts opens, Bel-Imperia is chiding Hieronimo for not having acted to avenge his son's death, but he tells her that he has the plot worked out in his mind. At that moment, Lorenzo and Balthazar enter. They enlist Hieronimo's aid to present some entertainment for the king and the Portuguese ambassador. Hieronimo suggests the performance of a play, a special tragedy that he has written himself in which he, Balthazar, Lorenzo and Bel-Imperia will act. Meanwhile, Isabella, maddened by Horatio's death, enters the arbor and cuts down the tree on which they found Horatio hanging. Then she stabs herself and dies, as the play's fourth victim.

At the entertainment, Balthazar plays the emperor Soliman, Hieronimo a bashaw, Bel-Imperia a Christian girl captured and given to Soliman and Lorenzo a knight of Rhodes. Erasto and Soliman are very close friends, but the two come in conflict over the love of Perseda (Bel-Imperia). To solve the problem, the bashaw stabs and slays the knight. Perseda then slays the emperor and stabs herself.

Hieronimo's plan for revenge is revealed in the play's end when he reveals that Lorenzo and Balthazar are indeed dead, brings out the body of his dead son and exposes the crimes of the slain murderers. He announces that Bel-Imperia has slain herself and then he runs to hang himself. He is stopped by the king and the viceroy of Portugal, but, to prevent his revealing anything under torture, he bites off his tongue. The play ends with the Ghost of Andrea satisfied at the carnage that Revenge has wrought:

Ay, now my hopes have end in their effects,
When blood and sorrow finish my desires:
Horatio murdered in his father's bower,
Vile Serberine by Pedringano slain,
False Pedringano hanged by quaint device,
Fair Isabella by herself misdome,
Prince Balthazar by Bel-Imperia stabbed,
The Duke of Castile and his wicked son
Both done to death by old Hieronimo,
My Bel-Imperia fallen as Dido fell,
And good Hieronimo slain by himself:

Ay, these were spectacles to please my soul. (IV. 5. 1-12)

The play is, from a modern dramatic viewpoint, weak in certain respects. There is little motivation for many of the events. Spectacle seems to be included for its own sake. There is no attempt to study the characters as representation of human beings, so that there is little character development except what is necessary to advance the plot. Finally, the play contains no great verse as Marlowe's or Shakespeare's do, although it is written in competent blank verse. Kyd writes unsubtle dialogue, for his rhetoric is always inflated. There is little delicacy of emotion and the characters' feelings and thoughts are never adequately developed or conveyed.

These are weaknesses in the play, but they were among the features that contributed to its success and popularity. Spectacle, action, complexities of plot, interesting characters and a declamatory style of verse were the features that appealed to the audience. Peter Womack explains, "The clumsiness of *The Spanish Tragedy* counted for less in the long run than its supremely confident establishment of this pattern, which rendered revenge and drama inseparable for the next fifty years".⁽¹⁰⁾

Kyd's later plays were not as successful as *The Spanish Tragedy*. Had he never written another play, Kyd would still be an important figure in the development of English renaissance tragedy for, in his work and Marlowe's, the classic Latin tragedy was given a base of popular appeal that aroused dramatic excitement and provided the impetus for the popularity of tragedy that made Shakespeare's masterpieces possible.

Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*: A True Reflection of the English Renaissance Spirit:

Among all of the Elizabethan playwrights only Marlowe stands with Shakespeare. Virtually, it was from Marlowe that Shakespeare learned the techniques of stagecraft and the effect of blank verse as a medium for poetic drama. Marlowe's contributions to the English theater were three-fold. First, he brought to the stage a romantic vision. Like Spenser in poetry, Marlowe presented in his plays not the life of his contemporaries, but the magnificence of the Renaissance human spirit. His dramatic works *Tamburlaine* and *Doctor Faustus* reveal the ambitious spirit of man in a timeless setting. Second, all of his works show a mastery of dramatic action. In Marlowe's plays, things happen with an excitement of action and spectacle. The plots move forward with a powerful sense of drama, as in the concluding scene of *Doctor*

Faustus when the anguished and fearful, yet unrepentant, Faustus awaits the return of Mephistophilis and his own descent to hell. Third, Marlowe took the blank verse of the poets Sidney and Surrey and of the early tragedy, *Gorboduc*, and transformed it into the most fitting verse form for the expression of poetic drama in English. Shakespeare and Milton learned the possibilities of blank verse from Marlowe's use of it in his plays. Marlowe's first play was *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, which was an attempt at a kind of classical tragedy that, was unknown in his own day and may have been written for performance while he was at Cambridge. His first public play was *Tamburlaine* and in the prologue, Marlowe stated that his play was intended as an attack on the present form of the drama. The play was a great success and inspired a second part. Both were essentially one-man plays, in which all of the action focuses on the protagonist. This is one main characteristic of Marlowe's early plays, and may be the result of his dramatic talent that affected the foremost dramatists of the day, including Shakespeare. In his last play, *Edward II*, he showed an interest in character development and in character analysis. However, *Edward II* is not as dramatic as the first two plays. The reason may lie in the muting of the lyric speeches. One of the outstanding features of Marlowe's blank verse is his ability to voice in condensed form phrases of great lyric beauty. One of the often quoted illustrations of this power is the lines from *Doctor Faustus* describing Helen of Troy:

Was this the face that launch'd a thousand ships,
And burnt the topless towers of Ilium? (V. 1. 97)

It is commonly known in literature that Dr. Faustus is a man who sells his soul to the devil in exchange for a lifetime of magical power. Peter Womack illustrates the origin of the story that “took shape in sixteenth-century Germany, appeared in book form in 1587, and had been translated into English by 1592. The form of the play is dictated by the shape of the story: the first five scenes show Faustus devoting himself to the black arts, conjuring up a devil named Mephistophilis, and signing the fatal contract, and in the final scene a magnificent and terrible soliloquy takes us through the last hour of his life until, at midnight, the devils come to claim their property. The middle section of the play exhibits in

episodic fashion his twenty-four years of dearly bought success, culminating in his liaison with Helen of Troy".⁽¹¹⁾

Actually, the Faust legend is a mixture of anonymous popular traditions, largely of medieval origin, which in the latter parts of the sixteenth century came to be associated with an actual individual of the name of Faustus whose notorious career during the first four decades of the century, as a pseudoscientific mountebank, juggler, astrologer and magician, can be traced through various parts of Germany. The "Faust Book" of 1587, the earliest collection of these tales, is of prevalingly theological character. It represents Faust as a sinner and reprobate, and it holds up his compact with Mephistophilis and his subsequent damnation as an example of human recklessness and as a warning to the faithful to cling to orthodox means of Christian Salvation. From this "Faust Book", that is, from its tragedy and the Elizabethan Doctor Faustus was transformed.

In Marlowe's version, Faust appears as a typical figure of the Renaissance as an explorer and adventurer, as a superhuman aspiring for extraordinary power, wealth, enjoyment, and worldly eminence. A great deal has been written indeed about the process of dramatic transformation. Hiscock and Hopkins appropriately describe Marlowe's play, "which has been well termed the spiritual autobiography of an age, combines the formal features of the mediaeval morality play with the sense of spiritual doubt which will become perhaps the keynote of early modernity, and encapsulates arguably better than any other play of the period the sense of cultural indebtedness to Greece and Rome".⁽¹²⁾ In this respect, Peter Womack elaborates and adds that Faustus "is a tragic hero who expresses the aspirations of all humankind. We hear him dismiss every branch of human learning because his ambition has exhausted them all; impatient with the banality of everything that is permitted, he transgresses in search of infinite understanding, infinite power, and infinite pleasure. This is the Faustus whom Goethe could later adopt as the promethean representative of a whole civilization".⁽¹³⁾ It would be useful, moreover, to see this point in the light of a significant theoretical statement put forward by Jacque Derrida (1987) that paves the way for a discussion of the fundamental question which this study is trying to raise by referring to the beginning of the literary type of Faust. Derrida aptly argues:

[...] translation practices the difference between signified and signifier.

But if this difference is never pure, no more so is translation, and for the

notion of translation we would have to substitute a notion of transformation: a regulated transformation of one language by another, of one text by another. We will never have, and in fact have never had, to do with some 'transport' of pure signifiers from one language to another, or within one and the same language, that the signifying instrument would leave virgin and untouched. ⁽¹⁴⁾

The central idea of this play is the hero's choice to give his soul tragically to the devil in exchange for the granting of a particular desire. Marlowe's Faustus seeks supreme intellectual power. A. N. Jefferas, in his introduction to the play, pinpoints Marlowe's achievement through its representation of "the Renaissance desire for expansion of intellectual limits set against Christian inhibitions. Some knowledge was forbidden, and so the elements of witchcraft and black magic have a sinister effect. Against this larger scene Marlowe sets passionate individual moments of crisis in the life of Faustus, intense, memorable in the rich poetry of their language and emotionally effective in a way not achieved in drama before". ⁽¹⁵⁾

The play starts with a touch of Greek drama in the use of the chorus that often played a significant role. The chorus provides the audience with necessary antecedent information without hindering the play's development of and concentration on the main action. It describes Faustus' parents, his hometown, his intellectual excellence and his self-esteem, and speaks of Faustus' fate as the result of his overreaching.

The action begins with Faustus who, having mastered the courses of studies that he had chosen, debates what field he will devote himself to for the rest of his life. He considers medicine but concludes that, having already mastered the field and received great success and renowned as a result, there is little scope for his ambitions. Similarly, he rejects law as a mercenary practice inappropriate to the greatness of his intellect. Considering religion, Faustus is dissatisfied with the limitations placed upon a man by religious beliefs. Since religion seems to assert that all men are born in sin, and since sin leads to death, religion holds that all men are born to die. This appears too severe a limitation because Faustus is thinking in terms of immortality. He concludes that only the black arts of magic can satisfy his ambitions for "a sound magician is a mighty god." To this end, he commands his servant, Wagner, to summon his friends, Valdes and Cornelius, to instruct him in necromancy.

At this point, the two angels enter - the Good Angel and the Bad Angel. They enter on several occasions in the play and represent the externalization of Faustus' inner conflicts. The Good Angel begs him to desist; the Bad Angel encourages him in his plan. Caught up in visions of the wealth and power that this new knowledge can bring him, Faustus does not listen to the Good Angel and ignores his message. Valdes and Cornelius arrive and Faustus leaves with them to learn magic.

As his first act of magic, Faustus conjures up a devil and Mephistophilis appears. Faustus rebukes him for his ugliness and commands him to leave and reappear in the guise of a Franciscan friar. Mephistophilis does this. Faustus assumes that Mephistophilis' appearance was the result of magic, but the devil informs him that black magic is limited in its power over the inhabitants of hell. He appeared of his own free will because he heard Faustus cursing God, the Scriptures and Christ. Whenever a devil hears this happen, he flies to the scene in the hope of finding an ally in evil. He informs Faustus that only Lucifer has control over the inhabitants of hell. Faustus learns from Mephistophilis the true identity of Lucifer, learns of the pride and insolence that drove Lucifer out of Heaven and learns that Lucifer and all unhappy souls who conspire against God are similarly damned. Hell, Mephistophilis explains, is any place where heaven is not. Faustus commands Mephistophilis to go to Lucifer to announce that he will surrender his soul in return for twenty four more years of life in which he may "live in all voluptuousness," with Mephistophilis to serve him and do whatever he orders. Mephistophilis leaves to carry out the command.

Following a comic scene in which we see that even the servant, Wagner, has mastered the ability to conjure up devils at his command, we see Faustus debating the wisdom of his decision. Again the two angels appear, but again Faustus ignores the warnings of the Good Angel. When they leave, Faustus is determined in his course. Faustus is acting in full knowledge of the consequences of his action. He is deliberately choosing a path that leads to damnation and does so because the pleasures of the world are of greater appeal to him than the possible punishments of a hell after death or even the rewards of a heaven. Faustus' actions are not those of the unconscious sinner. He deliberately chooses his fate. When Mephistophilis' returns to tell Faustus of Lucifer's agreement to the terms proposed, Faustus prepares to sign the pact with his own blood. The scene ends with Mephistophilis satisfying Faustus' desires of the flesh and his intellectual desires. There is a moment when, in spite of this gratification, Faustus nearly repents. He says:

When I behold the heavens then I repent,
And curse thee, wicked Mephistophilis,
Because thou hast deprived me of those joys. (II. 1. 1-3)

The two angels appear in response to this uncertainty and Faustus' mental conflict is presented through their arguments. Again he refuses to repent. However, Faustus is not totally convinced of the decision he has made. He asks Mephistopheles who made the world and when Mephistopheles refuses to answer, Faustus himself admits God's power. Once again, the mental conflict is externalized with the second appearance of the two angels in this scene. Faustus calls upon Christ as his Savior and, at his words, Lucifer himself appears in anger to admonish him never again to call upon God because he has chosen to be Lucifer's creature. Faustus agrees and the possibility of salvation disappears.

The following scenes show Faustus' powers and his travels throughout the world. Marlowe has attempted to suggest the passing of a long period of time, for suddenly Wagner speaks of the impending death of Faustus who has arranged to leave him all of his goods. The twenty four years have passed and it is time for Faustus to die and give his soul to Lucifer. In these final scenes, Faustus again feels the need for repentance and the desire to escape the consequences of his pact. He speaks with an old man who seems to be an externalization of his conscience. When his conscience asks him to repent, he nearly does. However, Mephistophilis intervenes and Faustus remains constant to his bargain. The final scene is one of the most powerful and moving in English renaissance drama. Faustus waits for midnight and the arrival of Mephistophilis. Marlowe's blank verse vividly captures Faustus' anguish as he awaits the moment of inevitable payment for his choice:

Ah, Faustus,
Now hast thou but one bare hour to live,
And then thou must be damned perpetually.
Stand still, you ever-moving spheres of heaven,
That time may cease and midnight never come.

Faustus waits and laments:

The stars move still, time runs, the clock will strike.
The devil will come, and Faustus must be damned.
Oh, 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!
Ah, rend not my heart for naming of my Christ!
Yet will I call on him. Oh, spare me, Lucifer!

When the clock strikes, he cries out:

Now, body, turn to air,
Or Lucifer will bear thee quick to hell.
Oh soul, be chang'd into little water drops,
And fall into the ocean, ne'er be found.
My God, my God! Look not so fierce on me!

[the devils enter]

Adders and serpents, let me breathe awhile!
Ugly hell, gape not! Come not,
Lucifer! I'll burn my books! - Ah, Mephistophilis! (V. 2. 143-200)

The play ends with the chorus drawing an explicit moral lesson from the story of Faustus:

Faustus is gone: regard his hellish fall,
Whose fiendful fortune may exhort the wise
Only to wonder at unlawful things,
Whose deepness doth entice such forward wits
To practise more than heavenly power permits. (V. 3. 23-27)

Doctor Faustus is a very significant play from the point of view of the development of English drama, of the beauty of dramatic language and the intellectual debate it often suggests. Marlowe's central problem was to make a highly improbable situation probable and to create a character who would not seem so thoroughly evil that the audience could not sympathize and identify with him. Another serious problem was that of Faustus' salvation.

The first problem is solved in the opening scenes by Faustus' motivation for intellectual perfection. His desire is consistent with his high degree of education, revealed in the crucial opening speech. The second problem required that Marlowe introduce two angels, the good and the bad, who externalize Faustus' thoughts, emotions and desires. Faustus repeatedly pauses to reflect and, in so doing, he raises the question of the terrible consequences of his choice.

Thus, Faustus finally refuses to repent and without repentance there can be no salvation. In the final speech, Faustus insists that, despite God's presence and his own desire to be touched with the blood of Christ, there can be no salvation for him. He is convinced that God will not have him and thus, he never asks for forgiveness. His own interpretation of his actions damns him forever.

Practically speaking, the English conception of tragedy replaced the classical one at the educational and theatrical levels gradually when experiments proved the usefulness of anglicizing the English cultural background. The dramatic efforts to establish an English idea of tragedy as a replacement of the previous classical conception, especially in the universities contributed to bringing to light the 16th and 17th century religious and secular dramatic endeavours. Graduates with classical education, especially Latin, who imitated Seneca in tragedy and Plautus and Terence in comedy, made their contributions to establish a national dramatic tradition in which efforts of celebrities, social, political, moral, and artistic issues were amalgamated in national feelings and sympathies.

Characteristic of Marlowe's drama is the use of horror, cruelty, and violence. These, in his plays, can be traced back to Roman tragedy, particularly Senecan models, which are employed for theatrical as well as moral aims. A student of Marlowvian drama is usually quite aware of the instrumental use of violence in his works. This can be seen in *Doctor Faustus*. In this work, violence was used to accentuate the tragic final moment and make it as tense as possible. The horrible

ordeals that Faustus suffers in the final scene can be particularly examined as evidence of Marlowe's protagonist's tragic situation.

Reading an illuminating work *Marlowe Reshaped: Fashioning the Author and the Text*, in which Akram Shalghin considers the history of Marlowvian criticism, its main trends, pioneers and problems through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, shows that studies of Marlowe during the 19th century had a great concern with the defense of the dramatist's personality and stress on the national identity of the author than a critical reading of the texts. This is probably due to the fact that the author's biography played a decisive role in the criticism of the 19th century, and there was no controversy about Shakespeare's prime place in the canon. Critics, in fact endeavoured to expand the English canon so as to ensure Marlowe a significant place within its space. Consequently, he was considered, by the end of the century, as second only to Shakespeare. At the beginning of the 20th century and onwards, the new critics and formalists read Marlowe's texts closely, they focused on aesthetic and ethical values in them. They treated them as poems rather than plays by ignoring the theatrical dimension of the works. To them, literature was disinterested, sealed, and ambiguous entity which should be approached wholly for its verbal language; thus, Marlowe's literary and artistic devices should be endorsed to express a language that is not always void of national anxiety and concern with contemporary issues extrinsic to the text.⁽¹⁶⁾ One methodological point that should be noted is the social and political striking concerns that are invested in Marlowe's studies in the reading of cultural materialism and new historicism of Marlowe. Their readings try to demonstrate that literature can be used as a political platform to convey one's ideas and feelings. Marlowe's plays are thus not static texts, but they acquire new diverse meanings by virtue of their representation. Accordingly, critics can discover in the text what they are looking for and what they are always willing to recognize, the Marlowvian text can be made to perform several and antithetical tasks that reconditioned by factors not strictly relevant to it. ⁽¹⁷⁾

A dramatic work is naturally a construct of its various scenes and discourses. Approaching such a work often produces a pluralist outlook; and since the text comprises different scenes and discourses, every one of them tend to provide a point of entry into it. Reading the play in the light of the two opposing views, the religious or secular, rebellion or orthodoxy: the search for power and knowledge as a liberating action, or human actions, whatever their nature, as planned and predestined by God,

and transgressing them involves condemnation. In the dialectics of the two positions, different critical views can be recognized. Alan Sinfield draws a view from the religious doctrines of Protestant England maintaining that God, not human beings, controls the universe. In this view, Faustus: “had no chance”, Sinfield states, “perhaps the play shows the life of one of the reprobate whom God has, from everlasting, condemned to hell.”⁽¹⁸⁾ Although Sinfield adheres to the idea of subversion, the argument here indicates that the final aim of God in driving all of Faustus’s actions is to punish him. It says that the play had invested almost everything in the religious beliefs of its time. Of course, whether Faustus is predestined to be tortured or he is held responsible for his own actions depends on the play in performance and the audience’s questioning of his problem.

Jonathan Dollimore, almost like Sinfield, thinks that by drawing upon the complexity of man’s position in relation to God’s mightiness, the play dismantles the power of religious doctrines of its times. Dollimore comments: “It is a transgression which has revealed the limiting structure of Faustus’ universe for what it is, namely, ‘heavenly power’. Faustus has to be destroyed since in a very real sense the credibility of that heavenly power depends upon it.”⁽¹⁹⁾ However, Dollimore affirms, like Sinfield, that in the play’s conflicting discourses, “Dr. Faustus is best understood as: not an affirmation of Divine Law, or conversely of Renaissance man, but an exploration of subversion through transgression.”⁽²⁰⁾ The insistence on subversion in the play lead to dichotomy in Dollimore’s outlook on the protagonist punishment. The reason for this binary interpretation of the act of destruction, in a way or another, may be explained in terms of the emotional response resulting from the destruction of the protagonist at the end.

Moreover, Catherine Belsey does not overvalues Faustus situation, but she points out the paradox between the aspiring Faustus and the miserable, desperate one, between what Faustus who wants to become at the very beginning of the play and what he later desires to be. Belsey thinks that: “Faustus, in quest of wealth and dominion, sets out to become more than a man- and ends longing to be less.”⁽²¹⁾ This means that Faustus aspiration for knowledge is human and natural but his limitation which he finally came to realize is the source of his tragic failure. Thus, the tension, as Edward Snow argues, is caused by the sharp contrast between Faustus’s aspirations and his own limitations, a paradox that engulfs Faustus mainly with despair⁽²²⁾. All of these views are highly plausible as potential interpretative outlooks; however, the

question of the ability of Faustus to effect a change or to succeed in his strive lies not in his attaining knowledge and power but in the dialectics of existing reality, the power of economic and political factors as a determining factor of change. Soon Faustus dearly pays the price for his own craving for power and knowledge beyond the human limits. Briefly, the play is a product of its own times, yet interpretation of the text is always moving, it acquires gradually additional meanings due to its representation of the Renaissance spirit with its all aspects and intricacies. Every critic finds out in the play what he or she is able to see or extract, the text thus appears to deliver a number of opposed views conditioned, one way or another, by the interrelated tensions within it.

This explains perhaps why the overall dramatic mode of the play seemed incompatibly material and spiritual, objective and subjective, learned and popular, comic and tragic, medieval and renaissance. In other words, the artistic and intellectual hybrid nature, is not only due to the translation or adaptation of the legend but also to the theatre itself. In one sense, an Elizabethan play is a performance that unites its public as spectators and listeners and critics; the play is originally a written artistic work, a composition of a poet whose command of language reflects his learning and through which he addresses that part of the audience who has read the same story as he has read it. The tension can be seen in a further fluctuation in the play's critical reception: the problematic state of the text. Womack gives in this regard a textual and theatrical interpretation that:

There are two versions – one first published in 1604, and the other, significantly different and about 700 lines longer, in 1616. Both went through several reprints, and both have their supporters among twentieth-century editors. The textual debates are complex, but what they come down to is this: Faustus was a theatrical hit for decades after Marlowe's death, and since it was owned by several different casts, the script fluctuated and multiplied in response to their differing requirements. Here, then, is another instance of this play's lack (or refusal) of unity: it does not even have a single text. Rather, the printed record gives us the traces of several related performances, in which the work of the poet is in unresolved tension with that of the acting companies. The play has never

quite become literature because of the way it continued to belong to the theatre. ⁽²³⁾

More importantly, there are, still, two conflicting views encountering the consideration of Faustus' tragedy.

One of the most intensely debated questions concerning *Doctor Faustus* is its handling of the protagonist's rebellion against a divinely ordered world, and what the play reveals precisely in that respect. The arguments brought forth on this issue add more complexity to the already difficult question as to whether the play is a daring expression of scepticism on God's authority or a consolidation of it. ⁽²⁴⁾

When examining these two operating discourses within the play, the aim lies less in accepting one of these two opposed perspectives on its own than in considering them in relation to each other. This consideration can be met through answering a number of questions. Is the play a realization of God's authority when the rebellious spirit is silenced and punished in the last scene? Is the play an expression of the divine will and tolerance when it allows such rebellion in the first place? To what extent do these different discourses affect each other? Do the final scenes in which Faustus is dismembered provoke our condemnation or sympathy? Should the tragic ending be ignored since Faustus was a scholar with considerable achievement, or emphasized as a final result of a series of unacceptable acts? Has the proportionality between rebellion and punishment been taken into consideration in the overall construction of the dramatic scenes? These questions would definitely entail various and intricate answers; these and other questions that need answering are significantly relevant to the general portrayal of the protagonist challenge to the normative world and the tragic ending of an aspiring renaissance spirit.

In reading the play, the authenticity of words is another problem that should be also considered. The fact that *Doctor Faustus* exists in two copies tend to complicate the process of critical commentary rather than facilitate it. The 1604 copy (known as A text) can be read as a skeptical, interrogative, and subversive text, while the 1616 copy (known as B text), differing from the A text in the last three acts, mitigates the interrogation and can be read as a moral, orthodox Christian play. To support the view of an orthodox Marlowe play is to depend on the B text favored by

nineteenth century critics as Marlowe's own, conversely, to look for subversion, like Dollimore and Sinfield, is to define the A Marlowe's own. ⁽²⁵⁾ Where evidence in support of one attribution or another is absent, and while we are remote from the time of *Doctor Faustus*'s composition, opinions will remain mainly hypothetical. With no certainty as to which of these two plays is Marlowe's own, critics and readers incline to assign the text they are most comfortable with to Marlowe. By and large, it would be quite pertinent to state Dollimore's conclusive statement on the play:

Dr. Faustus is important for subsequent tragedy for these reasons and at least one other: in transgressing and demystifying the limiting structure of his world without there ever existing the possibility of his escaping it, Faustus can be seen as an important precursor of the malcontented protagonist of Jacobean tragedy. Only for the latter, the limiting structure comes to be primarily a socio-political one. ⁽²⁶⁾

Conclusion:

In our context, a dramatist's commentary on life and its predicaments is usually embodied in the whole spirit and tendency of action of the dramatic work. The world which the dramatist calls into being is one for which he is finally held responsible. It reveals the quality and temper of the author's mind, the direction of his thought, the lines of his interest and the general meaning which life has for him. The dramatist often has a claim for true portrayal of the surrounding world, but it is often possible to discover, more or less, the underlying philosophy of life and its challenges through a careful analysis of the artistic, intellectual and moral implications of his dramatic scenes. Tragic experience is born when the protagonist tries to answer an enigma or takes an attitude when facing a grave challenge. Tragedy is an artistic representation of this intense moment in human life.

There are three major events in the history of world drama in which human destiny is represented. These three events emerged in the ancient Greco- Roman world in the form of classical tragedy, in the renaissance tragedy in England and France, and finally in the modern tragic drama in the period of industrial capitalism, especially the late nineteenth century Europe. John Orr, in his book *Tragic Drama and Modern Society*, states the common nature of these three tragic moments that the significant thing they generate is "the predicament of human alienation, of which

tragedy is the supreme literary expression. Each of the three tragic modes contains its own distinctive historical expression of that alienation. The Greek mode is basically divine, the renaissance mode predominantly noble, while the modern mode is fundamentally social".⁽²⁷⁾

More specifically, history of English drama proved that Thomas Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy* was one of the first successful English Renaissance tragic representations and that Christopher Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* was also a true artistic reflection of the English Renaissance aspiration. Both plays have their impacts upon contemporary audience and cultural life and on the development of English tragedy years to come.

Endnotes

1. Raymond Williams, *Modern Tragedy* (London: Verso Editions, 1969), p. 13.
2. Fuad Abdul Muttaleb, "A Note on the Issue of Modern Tragedy: Chekhov's Plays in Perspective" *Jerash for Research and Studies*, Volume (16) No. 2, 2015, p. 466.
3. B.L. Joseph, "The Spanish Tragedy and Hamlet: Two Exercises in English Seneca", in *Classical Drama and its Influence*, edited by M. J. Anderson (London: Methuen, 1965), p. 134.
4. Aristotle, *Poetics*, trans. Gerald F. Else (U.S.A: The University of Michigan Press, 1983), p. 25.
5. Norman T. Pratt, "Tragedy and Moralism: Euripides and Seneca", in *Comparative Literature: Method Perspective*, Newton Phelps Stallkencht and Horst Frenz, (Eds.), (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University, 1961), p. 193.
6. Raymond Williams, *Modern Tragedy*, p. 21.
7. A. C. Bradley, *Shakespearean Tragedy* (London: Macmillan Press, 1992), pp. 7-8.
8. See, Andrew Hiscock, and Lisa Hopkins, (Eds.). *Teaching Shakespeare and Early Modern Dramatists* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), pp. 27-28.
9. Andrew Hiscock, and Lisa Hopkins, (Eds.). *Teaching Shakespeare and Early Modern Dramatists*, p.28.
10. Peter Womack, *English Renaissance Drama* (London: Blackwell, 2006) p. 131.
11. Peter Womack, *English Renaissance Drama*, p. 139.
12. Andrew Hiscock, and Lisa Hopkins, (Eds.). *Teaching Shakespeare and Early Modern Dramatists*, p. 50.
13. Peter Womack, *English Renaissance Drama*, p. 141.
14. Quoted by Fuad A. Muttaleb, in "Dramatic Transformation: The Hamlet-Type in Shakespeare's and Chekhov's Versions", *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, Volume 2, Issue 2, 2019, p. 17.
15. Christopher Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus*, introduction by Jeffares, A.N. (Beirut: York Press, 2007), (P. XVIII). References hereafter will be to this edition of the play.
16. See, Akram Shalghin, *Marlowe Reshaped: Fashioning the Author and the Text* (Berlin: Lap Lampert Academic Publishing, 2001), pp. 276-277.

17. Akram Shalghin, *Marlowe Reshaped: Fashioning the Author and the Text*, p. 278.
18. Alan Sinfield, *Literature in Protestant England 1560-1660* (London: Routledge, 2009), p. 115.
19. Jonathan Dollimore, *Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology, and Power in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), p. 118.
20. Jonathan Dollimore, *Radical Tragedy*, p109.
21. Catherine Belsey, *The Subject of Tragedy: Identity and Difference in Renaissance Drama* (London: Methuen, 1989), p. 71.
22. See, Edward Snow, "Marlowe's Doctor Faustus and the Ends of Desire", in Alving Kernan (Ed.), *Two Renaissance Mythmakers: Christopher Marlowe and Ben Jonson* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1977), 70-110.
23. Peter Womack, *English Renaissance Drama*, p. 142-43.
24. Akram Shalghin, *Marlowe Reshaped: Fashioning the Author and the Text*, p. 231.
25. See, Akram Shelgin, *Marlowe Reshaped: Fashioning the Author and the Text*, p. 232.
26. Jonathan Dollimore, *Radical Tragedy*, p. 119.
27. John Orr. *Tragic Drama and Modern Society*. (London: Macmillan, 1981), P. xi-xii.

Works Cited

- Abdul Muttaleb, Fuad. "A Note on the Issue of Modern Tragedy: Chekhov's Plays in Perspective" *Jerash for Research and Studies*, Volume (16) No. 2, 2015, pp. 461-492.
- ---. "Dramatic Transformation: The Hamlet-Type in Shakespeare's and Chekhov's Versions", *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, Volume 2, Issue 2, 2019, pp. 17-33.
- Aristotle. *Poetics*, trans. Gerald F. Else (U.S.A: The University of Michigan Press, 1983).
- Belsey, Catherine. *The Subject of Tragedy: Identity and Difference in Renaissance Drama*. London: Methuen, 1989.
- Bradley, A.C. *Shakespearean Tragedy*. London: Macmillan Press, 1992.
- Dollimore, Jonathan. *Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology, and Power in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Engle, Lars, Eisaman Maus, Katharine Rasmussen, Eric (Eds.). *English Renaissance Drama*, New York and London: Norton Company, 2002.
- Hiscock, Andrew, and Hopkins, Lisa (Eds.). *Teaching Shakespeare and Early Modern Dramatists*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Kyd, Thomas. *The Spanish Tragedy*. London: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2011.
- Joseph, B.L. "The Spanish Tragedy and Hamlet: Two Exercises in English Seneca", in *Classical Drama and its Influence*, edited by M. J. Anderson .London: Methuen, 1965.
- Marlowe, Christopher. *Doctor Faustus*, introduction by Jeffares, A.N. Beirut: York Press, 2007.
- Orr, John. *Tragic Drama and Modern Society*. London: Macmillan, 1981.
- Shalghin, Akram. *Marlowe Reshaped: Fashioning the Author and the Text*. Berlin: Lap Lampert Academic Publishing, 2001.

- Sinfield, Alan. *Literature in Protestant England 1560-1660*. London: Routledge, 2009.
- Snow, Edward. "Marlowe's Doctor Faustus and the Ends of Desire", in Alving Kernan (Ed.), *Two Renaissance Mythmakers: Christopher Marlowe and Ben Jonson*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1977, pp. 70-110.
- Stallkencht, Newton Phelps and Frenz, Horst (Eds.). *Comparative Literature: Method Perspective*. Carbondale: Southern Illionis University, 1971.
- Williams, Raymond. *Modern Tragedy*. London: Verso Editions, 1969.
- Womack, Peter. *English Renaissance Drama*. London: Blackwell, 2006.