

FEATURES OF RENAISSANCE INDIVIDUALISM AND REFERENCES
TO MACHIAVELLIAN POLITICS IN CHRISTOPHER MARLOWE'S
*THE JEW OF MALTA, THE TRAGICAL HISTORY OF DOCTOR
FAUSTUS AND TAMBURLAINE, THE GREAT*

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

AYŞE PIRIL ERYILMAZ

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
ENGLISH LITERATURE

MAY 2007

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Prof. Dr. Wolf König
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Assist. Prof. Dr. Dürrin Alpakın Martinez-Caro
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assist. Prof. Dr. Bilge Zileli (Atılım University, EL)_____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Dürrin Alpakın Martinez-Caro (METU, ELIT)_____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Nurten Birlik (METU, ELIT)_____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name: Ayşe Pırıl ERYILMAZ

Signature:

ABSTRACT**FEATURES OF RENAISSANCE INDIVIDUALISM
AND REFERENCES TO MACHIAVELLIAN POLITICS
IN CHRISTOPHER MARLOWE'S *THE JEW OF MALTA*,
THE TRAGICAL HISTORY OF DOCTOR FAUSTUS
AND *TAMBURLAINE, THE GREAT***

Eryılmaz, Ayşe Pırıl

M.A., Program in English Literature

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Dürrin Alpakın Martinez-Caro

May 2007, 74 pages

This thesis analyses the Machiavellian concepts of cunning, cruelty and opportunism as well as self-determination and individualism with regard to the major characters in Christopher Marlowe's plays, *The Jew of Malta*, *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus* and *Tamburlaine, Parts 1 and 2*. The thesis then examines these characters' scales of achievement as individuals who challenge the established order. Finally, the thesis clarifies whether these characters are theatrical representatives of the Renaissance individual or not. Therefore, this paper primarily revolves around the analysis of the five concepts and how they give shape to the characters.

Keywords: Marlowe, Machiavelli, Renaissance

ÖZ**CHRISTOPHER MARLOWE'UN *MALTALI YAHUDİ,*
DOKTOR FAUST'UN TRAJİK ÖYKÜSÜ
VE *TİMURLENK* ADLI OYUNLARINDAKİ
RÖNESANS BİREYSELÇİLİĞİNİN VE
MAKYAVELCİ YAKLAŞIMIN YANSIMALARI**

Eryılmaz, Ayşe Pırıl

Yüksek Lisans, İngiliz Edebiyatı Programı

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Dürrin Alpakın Martinez-Caro

Mayıs 2007, 74 sayfa

Bu tez, Christopher Marlowe'un *Maltalı Yahudi*, *Doktor Faust'un Trajik Öyküsü* ve *Timurlenk* (Bölüm 1 ve 2) adlı oyunlarındaki ana karakterlerin sergiledikleri Makyavelci kurnazlık, gaddarlık ve çıkarıcılık ile kararlılık ve bireysellik özelliklerini incelemektedir. Ardından, kurulu düzene karşı gelen bireyler olarak, bu karakterlerin başarı dereceleri analiz edilmektedir. Son olarak, bu çalışma, söz konusu karakterlerin Rönesans insanının teatral yansımalarını içerip içermediklerine açıklık getirmektedir. Dolayısıyla, bu çalışma, öncelikli olarak beş özelliğin incelenmesi ve bu özelliklerin karakterleri nasıl şekillendirdiği üzerinedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Marlowe, Machiavelli, Rönesans

To My Mother(s)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Dürrin Alpakin Martinez-Caro for her never-ending support and concern, her inspiring suggestions and unfaltering belief in my study. It was a pleasure to write this thesis under her guidance.

I would also like to thank Assist. Prof. Dr. Nurten Birlik and Assist. Prof. Dr. Bilge Zileli for their most valuable and enlightening suggestions and comments.

Moreover, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to teachers working at TED Ankara College Foundation High School and especially to Enise Yavuz for their support of my graduate study and for the help they provided during the preparation of this thesis.

Finally, I am greatly indebted to my family and friends for their patience, encouragement and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	v
DEDICATION.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. MACHIAVELLIAN POLITICS AS REFLECTED BY MARLOWE ...	8
3. INDIVIDUALISM AND SELF-DETERMINATION	41
4. CONCLUSION.....	67
WORKS CITED.....	71

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Christopher Marlowe can be considered a figure of Renaissance for having provided works with the simple and artistic use of the English language and for his themes in which the individual rather than religion is on the foreground. In the Middle Ages, the English language was not a medium for the literary field, and works were produced in Latin; however, as many people became literate in Renaissance, works began to be produced in English which made it possible for the average reader to understand and enjoy a book. Marlowe also wrote his poems and plays in English. Hilton mentions that, “English-speaking theatre ... began with Marlowe” (1). He structured his lines using *blank verse*, which from then on, became the basis for writing poetry. Moreover, as book production was in the hands of the Church in the Middle Ages, the subject matter of works was religious. Plays that were performed were mostly Moralities and Mysteries with messages reminding the importance of being faithful, obedient and virtuous. Therefore, Hilton considers Marlowe “the first great dramatist,” (18) who had “no precedents ... to follow as a professional playwright” (18). In this sense, Marlowe opened up a new way for the development of English drama. His themes appealed to both audiences and successors as they depicted either comically or tragically the struggles of individuals to reach their worldly aims despite religion which was an unshaken tower. In terms of their themes, the seven plays that Marlowe could produce in his short life time,

probably stem from a private fascination with ‘forbidden’ knowledge, with ambition and with the disruptive leaps of the human imagination which the Elizabethan political and religious establishment would readily have interpreted as seditious (Sanders 148).

Because of exploring the provocative sides of his themes, Marlowe was labeled “seditious” (48) as well as atheistic. The first criticisms on

Marlowe were based on the assumptions that his work was a reflection of his character and thought.

so confidently was Marlowe's presence detected in his literary productions, so closely was he identified with his major dramatic creations, that critical views of his achievements as an author were undoubtedly influenced from the start by his reputation as a man (Tydeman and Thomas 1).

Therefore, labeling Marlowe as an 'atheist' remained as one of the major criticisms on the playwright, and the concern with religious conflict in his works was believed to reveal his faithlessness. However, both the conflict and the use of religion as a subject in his plays should be regarded as natural because probably not only Marlowe but many Elizabethans also suffered from the radical changes in the church and from the shifting ideas of people on religion.

Marlowe's first production, *Tamburlaine, the Great*, which he is believed to have written in 1587 while he was still a student at Cambridge, immediately became a "wildly successful play" (Hopkins 2000) and was soon afterwards followed by *Tamburlaine, Part 2*. Then, his four other plays *The Jew of Malta*, *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus*, *The Massacre at Paris* and *Edward II* followed. Both *The Jew of Malta* and *Edward II* are known to have influenced Shakespeare in the writing of his plays. Marlowe's other works are *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, a play partly based on direct translations from Virgil; "Hero and Leander", a "mythological erotic poem" (Abrams 793) which he left unfinished and was completed by George Chapman; several other poems, and translations from Ovid and Lucan.

Marlowe's plays attracted attention and admiration because of their "calculated exaggeration, coupled with a far greater control of metrical pace and inventive poetic effect" (Sanders 148). However, in the 17th century, they were neglected because:

educated taste changed the nature of English drama, and the criteria by which it was assessed. The Neo-classical standards of restraint, harmony of elements, balance and proportion also brought demands for a more explicit dimension of moral didacticism (Tydeman and Thomas 5).

Under such criteria, 17th century critics believed Marlowe's work lacked structural unity and a realistic story line.

Marlowe was reconsidered after more than a century by Romantic critics who "were now less insistent that artists should observe strict 'decorum' in what they wrote about and in what techniques they employed to achieve their ends" (6). Most of these critics were in agreement about Marlowe's talent as "one of the greatest poets in the world whose work was cast by accident and caprice into an imperfect mould of drama" (11). Therefore, the consensus was that the verses in Marlowe's plays were impressive; however, the structure of the plays was defective. Therefore, at the beginning of the 20th century, the view on Marlowe was that he was a "humourless dramatist with exceptional poetic gifts who never learnt to construct a play or create a three-dimensional character" (13).

In the 20th century, criticism on Marlowe began to change and more applause was granted to the works of the poet. His plays were believed to "contain a comprehension of experience ... singularly Marlovian" (Knoll 2). Behind them was "an imaginative presence, a poet with an original perception and expression" (2). His work was analyzed from many different perspectives among which were politics, sociology, psychoanalysis and structuralism. Steane has defined Marlowe as "a serious, thoughtful man, a scholar, and a writer deeply concerned with suffering and evil; an ironist and a detached observer" (9). Therefore, it can be concluded that 20th century critics focused more on the analysis of the themes and the point of view of their representation rather than the structure of the plays. Moreover, the ambiguous nature of Marlowe's presentation of his subject matter found proof from Carol Leventen Duane, who believes that "Marlowe's characteristic moral ambiguity may result from his deliberate, controlled,

and masterly presentation and manipulation of multiple perspectives” (51). Stephen Greenblatt has stated that Marlowe’s plays “spurn and subvert his culture’s metaphysical and ethical certainties,” and that “in his turbulent life and ... in his writings, Marlowe is deeply implicated in his heroes though he is far more intelligent and self-aware than any of them” (qtd. in Tydeman and Thomas 109). From a new historicist point of view:

it was in Marlowe’s texts that new historicists found basis for their arguments. The individual who tried to aspire to “unclosure in closure” providing that complete freedom was not possible as one was limited by language and society which also limited the complete individuality of the self. That’s why all characters echoed their constructed selves and each time became more and more limited (Downie and Parnell 10).

Those many different approaches which have been employed to analyse the playwright’s texts prove that:

the images of Marlowe the rebel, the iconoclast, the atheist, the wish-fulfiller have been complemented by the emergence over the last 60 years of Marlowe the Christian apologist, the secular moralist, the bitter ironist, the clear-sighted arbiter of human endeavour, the sardonic castigatior of human folly and weakness... He is now seen by many critics as more involved in evaluating personalities, weighing the worth of their achievements, setting their original aspirations against the ultimate value of their actions (Tydeman and Thomas 104).

It can be concluded that both as a poet and as a playwright, criticism on Marlowe has continued from his first analysis in the 16th century till current times. Critics have found it possible to work on his texts according to the different stances in critical approach. This possibility to analyse the works by subjecting them to different critical approaches of different eras has not worn itself out. As his work can at all times be kept fresh for new criticism, it deserves to be analysed as an important construction of the Renaissance period in England.

The Renaissance movement caused much upheaval when it began in Italy. There were power struggles among provinces as to which wealthy family would rule the country. Provinces were in the hands of different

people who, far from compromising, fought severely for ultimate power. As an active figure in politics, Niccolò Machiavelli also wanted his ideas to be supported for the well being of Italy. He wrote *The Prince* as a guide book for the leader of Italy who he believed could put an end to the political disputes in the country. According to Machiavelli, the way to do this was to embody the right characteristics that a leader should possess and among them were cunning, cruelty and opportunism.

Such political disputes were common in England as well. Marlowe must have been influenced by these, and undoubtedly his characters bear resemblances to the type of people Elizabethans were. In other words, his characters show the characteristics of cunning, cruelty and opportunism of political figures as well as the self determination of anyone who wanted to assert their individuality. The need to realize one's self as an individual must have been a natural outcome of Renaissance with its emphasis on self-attained knowledge, inquiry and worldliness. Therefore, the Elizabethan mind was in conflict whether to move on as the possessor of free will or to keep back relying on religion to determine its role in the world. Marlowe's works will be analysed in terms of their depictions of these concepts in order to put forth the meaning they convey, regarding how these concepts were understood at the time and how Marlowe's characters exemplify them. Therefore, this study will be divided into two chapters where Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta*, *The Tragical History of Dr. Faustus* and *Tamburlaine, Parts 1 and 2* shall be handled in terms of Machiavellian politics, individualism and self-determinationⁱ.

With this aim, Chapter 2 will explore the Machiavellian politics of cunning, cruelty and opportunism focusing on two characters from each of

ⁱ Throughout the thesis, references to Marlowe's plays will be made from J. B. Steane's *Christopher Marlowe, The Complete Plays*, the 1984 edition. The text of *The Tragical History of Dr. Faustus* will be based on the B edition which includes the farcical scenes of the clown and the baser characters. In Chapter 2, references will be made from Quentin Skinner's translation of Machiavelli's, *The Prince*, the 1981 edition.

Marlowe's three plays mentioned above. The chapter will borrow relevant quotations from Machiavelli's *The Prince* and analyse how the characters in Marlowe's plays conform to what is said in the quotations. Therefore, the analysis of this chapter will mainly be based on the comparison of the works of the two writers. In *The Jew of Malta*, analysis of the characters is expected to reveal that although Barabas seems to be the leading Machiavellian figure, he is actually undone by Ferneze, a more clever Machiavellian in disguise. Barabas's Machiavellian means are basically based on the devouring need to take revenge; hence, they issue from a personal necessity. Throughout the play, this necessity leads Barabas to put himself into funny situations in which his Machiavellian evil turns to laughter. However, Ferneze's Machiavellian means do not mainly depend on personal reasons. They are more the results of his position and responsibility as the governor of Malta. Therefore, they are always on the background of his virtuous intentions to rule the city well. Furthermore, they are cleverly extended to the manipulation of religion and politics, when necessary. In *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus*, the aim will be to clarify Faustus's blindness to accept that he is never as powerful as God on earth. His power is always exceeded by Mephostophilis, the true Machiavellian figure who manipulates Faustus. Whereas Faustus's Machiavellian means are too much on the foreground, just like those of Barabas, Mephostophilis's are hidden similar to those of Ferneze. Therefore, the main character of this play is also defeated by another Machiavellian in disguise. In the *Tamburlaine* plays, Tamburlaine is portrayed as the embodiment of the Machiavellian concepts. His tactics that lead him to ultimate power and success stem from his firmness of character as opposed to all his enemies. Therefore, he beats every other emperor whom he confronts and proves to be the strongest Machiavellian.

Chapter 3 will merge the Machiavellian concepts discussed in the previous chapter with the concepts of individuality and self-determination that the major characters of the plays possess. Mainly, the chapter will

explain how the major Marlovian characters conform to the concepts of individuality and self-determination. In this sense, relevant parts of the plays will be explored so as to clarify the degree of the characters' progress towards realizing themselves. Therefore, the analysis will be text-based where the starting point for each character will be regarded as the moment when they rebel against a limiting force. From then on, their actions to get closer to their aims will be discussed in terms of the struggle they put forth to overcome the limits of the established rules of the society and religion. All the three characters, Tamburlaine, Barabas and Faustus, turn their backs on religion in order to realize themselves. Moreover, they easily disregard the social structure if this act will get them closer to their aims. Barabas can make a slave his accomplice and dare to kill friars, nuns, soldiers and noble young men without the slightest hesitation. Faustus can rate himself above any authority and mock men of religion; Tamburlaine can challenge prophets and proudly burn their books. The characters will be revealed as determined, rebellious and courageous; however, their success and rightness will be questioned.

On the whole, the aim of this thesis is to analyse Machiavellian characteristics of cunning, cruelty and opportunism as well as Renaissance individualism and self-determination with regard to the major characters in Christopher Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta*, *The Tragical History of Dr. Faustus* and *Tamburlaine, Parts 1 and 2*. As a result, the thesis aims to clarify these characters' positions as either successful or unsuccessful beings that have or haven't been able to establish their personalities and aspirations. Consequently, the thesis will conclude to what degree these characters are representatives of a Machiavellian figure and a Renaissance individual. Hence, the thesis will clarify whether Marlowe's characters were successful in their self-realization and conformity to the era.

CHAPTER 2
MACHIAVELLIAN POLITICS
AS REFLECTED BY MARLOWE

This chapter aims to analyse the Machiavellian politics of cunning, cruelty and opportunism employed by two characters in each of Christopher Marlowe's three plays, *The Jew of Malta*, *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus* and *Tamburlaine The Great, Parts 1 and 2*. The analysis will clarify Marlowe's dramatic usage of Machiavellian understanding. Thus, it will be possible to form a picture of Marlowe's theatrical commitment to Machiavelli's ideas and his deviation from them. Two characters from each play will be compared to one another so as to show which one is more Machiavellian. The chapter will conclude with a brief examination of the extent to which the characters succeed or fail in their Machiavellian means. As a result, the chapter will pave the way to the following chapter which will explore these characters' self-realisation within the Renaissance concept of man focusing on the concepts of individuality and self-determination.

Marlowe and Machiavelli were contemporaries who experienced the chaotic, yet enlightening period of Renaissance. The new ideas that the movement put forth were considered to be contraversial and threatening to the established rules of societies. They were on the verge of a large scale change that was mostly felt in the religious and political spheres. Living in such surroundings, both Marlowe and Machiavelli must have observed that leaders needed clever minds in order to pursue their aims successfully. Thus, Machiavelli was against "the humanist conception that moral means achieve desirable ends" (Ramsay 184), and he based his book *The Prince* on the notions that would render a leader successful and help him reach his aim. When the notions were analysed, they came to stand for "the doctrine that 'the end justifies the means'" (175). Therefore, Machiavelli was immediately labeled as "a man inspired by the devil" and "an immoral

writer” (175). His book is universally accepted as an important piece of the era, and reading it, one easily recognises the similarity of Marlowe’s characters to the ideal type of prince that Machiavelli tried to mold. He criticized leaders for their “fatal inflexibility in the face of changing circumstances” (Skinner 15), and suggested that “they would have been more successful if they had sought to accommodate their personalities to the exigencies of the times, instead of trying to reshape their times in the mould of their personalities” (15). The main argument here is that a leader should be able to change his behaviour and tactics in accordance with the requirements of the situation so as to be successful. Therefore, Machiavelli encourages the leader to deviate from ethical norms when it is necessary to do so, and “as an innovator, radically breaking with medieval and ancient thought” (Ramsay 175), he advises the leader to feel free to “[invoke] bad means to reach a good end” (Kocis 215). In order to do this, Machiavelli redefines the concept of *virtù*ⁱ. In his understanding *virtù* means “the requisite quality of moral flexibility in a prince” (Skinner 40) by which the prince should show “willingness to do whatever is dictated by necessity – whether the action happens to be wicked or virtuous – in order to attain his highest ends” (39). Similarly, Marlowe’s major characters turn out either to be successful or unsuccessful embodiments of the qualities of cunning, cruelty and opportunism that Machiavelli focused on within the broader concept of *virtù*, and in this way the plays open up to a comparative analysis.

The term Machiavellian owes its existence to Niccolò Machiavelli’s book, *The Prince*¹. Written in 1513, the book sets forth several characteristic properties that a leader should possess in order to be successful in office. The concepts of cunning, cruelty and opportunism appear among these

ⁱ In Machiavellian understanding, the concept of *virtù* cannot be translated as standing for the classical notions of virtue and goodness. It is a problematic word with many connotations and it should be understood as a concept that was formed based on the “rejection of conventional humanist morality” (Skinner 46). Therefore, it includes both the practice of virtue and vice as long as they are vital for princely glory.

characteristics. Machiavelli believes that every success-oriented leader should disregard the immorality of these concepts and should embody them.

As Victor Anthony Rudowski states:

it is permissible for a ruler to act in a manner contrary to the moral codes that govern relations between ordinary persons whenever the interests of the state are at stake. From this premise it can be argued that the perennial moral conflict between ends and means loses its validity in the sphere of politics (10).

Inevitably, because of its malignancy, Machiavellian thought has been the subject of debate among a number of critics². Whether Machiavelli should be condemned for the tactics he teaches or purified for the honourable motive of saving his country that he had in mind while writing the book, would be the subject of another paper. Nevertheless, he ends up saying that all means – whether they are ethical or not – are to be employed by a leader to gain and maintain power. He comes to this conclusion from his starting point that men are evil in nature and states that it is beneficial for any leader to treat them accordingly: “If all men were good ... but because men are wretched creatures who would not keep their word to [the leader], [the leader] need not keep [his] word to them” (Machiavelli 100; ch. 18). Therefore, the leader also needs to be evil in order to secure his place. Furthermore, this requires a separation of politics from morals because “a man who wants to act virtuously in every way necessarily comes to grief among so many who are not virtuous” (Machiavelli 91; ch. 15). According to Machiavelli, among many people who are evil, it is a must that a leader should also have a manipulative mind. Therefore, to clarify how a leader should make correct use of his logic and conduct, and how he should keep power in his hands, Machiavelli emphasizes cunning, cruelty and opportunism as important concepts with which the leader should be endowed.

In Machiavellian terms, one of the means of reaching and keeping power is intelligence. It stands both for the ability to deceive, and, when necessary, for the ability to murder as long as these actions prove beneficial

for preserving order and do not arouse hatred in the nation towards the leader. In other words, treachery and killing which lead to glory can be excused and forgotten since glory covers up the means by which it is achieved. However, if the cover up is not so reliable as to be labeled glory and villainy shows through; then, power gained under such terms will be short-lived and will destroy the leader (Machiavelli ch. 17). Thus, Machiavelli's idea of intelligence leads to cunning and cruelty both of which should be disguised under a harmless pretext.

Machiavelli describes his idea of cunning with his metaphor of the lion and the fox. According to the author, a leader should have the strength of a lion and the cunning of a fox to maintain power because

the lion is defenceless against traps and a fox is defenceless against wolves. Therefore, one must be a fox in order to recognise traps, and a lion to frighten off wolves (Machiavelli 99; ch. 18).

In other words, a leader needs a strong, manipulative mind just like that of a fox, as well as physical strength similar to that of a lion in order to keep power. Moreover, it is important to know how to pretend but even more important is to “know how to colour one's actions and to be a great liar and deceiver. [Because] men are so simple... that the deceiver will always find someone ready to be deceived” (Machiavelli 100; ch. 18). For this reason, the leader should keep his real intentions to himself and appear to be thoroughly trustworthy.

Although Machiavelli wrote his book as a guide to the King of Italy at the time, the term Machiavellian came to stand for any immoral person aspiring for power. In this sense, not only figures of state, but also common characters in Marlowe's plays show Machiavellian traits. The most popular Machiavellian character is Barabas, the major character of Marlowe's play *The Jew of Malta*. Opposing to Barabas's being a true Machiavellian figure, Irving Ribner argued that Barabas only shows “pseudo-Machiavellian aspects ... that bear no relation to anything Machiavelli ever wrote” (351), and that he is just “a stage villain with no real political intentions” (352). It

is true that Machiavelli's intention was to reform the politics in Italy; however, in *The Prince* he also discussed several characteristics that a leader needed in order to be successful while leading the reform. Thus, Machiavelli was not only trying to give shape to a leader suitable to his political ends, but, from a broader perspective, he was trying to shape a human being. Similarly, Marlowe might not have limited himself to Machiavellian men of state, but he might have formulated a broader understanding of the Machiavellian character on stage. Braunmuller and Hattaway define Barabas as "a stage Machiavel, an evil figure who casts aside all the moral imperatives of his age" (103). Barabas's Machiavellian means is stated at the very beginning of the play in the "Prologue" by Machevill himself, whose aim in appearing on stage is to:

present the tragedy of a Jew,
 Who smiles to see how full his bags are cramn'd;
 Which money was not got without my means.
 I crave but this, - grace him as he deserves,
 And let him not be entertain'd the worse
 Because he favours me ("Prologue" 30-5).

Marlowe's Machevill is on stage to say that the play the audience is about to experience is the tragic story of a Jew who is too fond of money – money that he earned by employing Machiavellian means. Machevill also asks the audience not to be unfair to the Jew for "favouring" ("Prologue" 35) him, but to judge him "as he deserves" ("Prologue" 33). Therefore, right at the beginning of the play it is made clear that the play's major character is Machiavellian. However, Machevill's manner is also "secretive" (Sales 92) because "his tongue guards the play's secret that Ferneze [the Governor of Malta] employs a subversive creed to control subversion" (92).

As confirmed by Machevill, power means money for the Jew. As the play opens, he is found counting his money and at once reveals that he lives for material possession. The play takes place in Malta, where the Jew has prospered through trade with many different countries, and he explains what his present wealth adds up to:

Give me the merchants of the Indian mines,
 That trade in metal of the purest mould;
 The wealthy Moor, that in the eastern rocks
 Without control can pick his riches up,
 And in his house heap pearl like pebble stones,
 Receive them free, and sell them by the weight!
 Bags of fiery opals, sapphires, amethysts,
 Jacinth, hard topaz, grass-green emeralds,
 Beauteous rubies, sparkling diamonds,
 And seld-seen costly stones of so great price,
 As one of them, indifferently rated,
 And of a carat of this quantity,
 May serve, in peril of calamity,
 To ransom great kings from captivity.
 This is the ware wherein consists my wealth (I.i.19-33).

Barabas states that his wealth is uncountable, and that he gets the will to live from his wealth. Therefore, the major offense against him would be to take away even the smallest amount of his money. This mistake is made by Ferneze, the Governor of Malta. Ferneze is expected to pay some money to the Ottomans in order that they remain in peaceful terms with the island. However, he cannot afford that amount of money, so he decides to take it from the richest inhabitants on the island, the Jews. The Jews are to give half of their wealth to the state; whoever refuses will be made a Christian and his wealth will be confiscated. Ferneze, who has no good reason to ask for the Jews' property, bases his ideas on the grounds that the Jews, as non-Christians, are a "sufferance" (I.ii.66) to them. He pretends that they have encountered misfortune because of their religious beliefs:

For through our sufferance of your hateful lives,
 Who stand accursed in the sight of heaven,
 These taxes and afflictions are befall'n (I.ii.66-8).

On the other hand, Barabas, who considers the sudden taxes as "theft" (I.ii.99), refuses to give his money away and accuses Ferneze and his knights of hiding their malice behind a holy pretext:

Will you, then, steal all my goods?
 Is theft the ground of your religion? (I.ii.98-9).

Tydeman and Thomas believe that “if anyone in the play conforms to the Machiavellian code ... it is not Barabas, but Ferneze” (62). Thus, they echo Ribner’s idea of Barabas being a “pseudo Machiavellian” (351). Robert Ornstein argued that Marlowe’s understanding of power was “philosophical” and contrary to Machiavelli’s “pragmatic” understanding, it “had momentous intellectual seriousness”. In this sense “Marlowe, who established the Machiavellian hero-villain on the Elizabethan stage, could not fix his attention on the petty arena of politics or on the paltry goal of wealth and political sovereignty” (1379). Therefore, if the Machiavellian character is interpreted as an individual rather than just a political figure, both Ferneze and Barabas are Machiavellian characters. Ferneze is confronted with a character almost as clever as himself who immediately realises his real intention. As a citizen Barabas thinks that “religion / hides many mischiefs from suspicion” (I.ii.290-1). For him, being taxed because of one’s different religious beliefs is unfair, and he considers Ferneze a trickster for not finding a better solution to maintain peace in his city.

Because of his impertinence, Barabas loses all his fortune and his house, becomes a nunnery. Converting a Jew’s house into a place of worship for Christians implies an insult rather than serving an honourable intention. Ironically, Ferneze allows Barabas to continue living and earning his money on the island:

Ferneze: Yet, Barabas, we will not banish thee,
 But here in Malta, where thou gott’st thy wealth,
 Live still, and if thou canst, get more
 Barabas: Christians, what or how can I multiply?
 Of naught is nothing made.
 First Knight: From naught at first thou cam’st to little wealth,
 From little unto more, from more to most.
 If your first curse fall heavy on thy head,
 And make thee poor and scorn’d of all the world,
 ‘Tis not our fault, but thy inherent sin (I.ii.104-13).

As Barabas argues that he cannot survive without some of his previous possessions and struggles to save his money, Ferneze and his knights cleverly say that this penalty has rightly fallen on him because of his

“inherent sin” (I.ii.13) which is the sin of being a Jew. In the eyes of Barabas, who can see through Ferneze, he is unfair for condemning and insulting a man for his religion by taking away all his money and converting his house into a nunnery. Thus, it is this mistake - as he believes it to be - that arouses the Machiavellian spirit in Barabas and makes him do every cruelty and villainy to get back the power of which he has been unjustly robbed. According to Sales, “Barabas’s revenge is the product of Ferneze’s revenge” (103). Therefore, he immediately starts to plot in order to get back his rights. The inevitable feelings of hatred and revenge lead him to believe that:

Barabas is born to better chance,
And fram’d of finer mould than common men,
(...)
A reaching thought will search his deepest wits,
And cast with cunning for the time to come;
For evils are apt to happen every day (I.ii.223-8).

His Machiavellian spirit has been aroused and from this moment onwards he will employ “diabolic power of theatrics that [will threaten] the well-being of Maltese society” (Ide 259). As Greenblatt states, Barabas’s

actions are always responses to the initiative of others: not only is the plot of the whole play set in motion by the Governor’s expropriation of his wealth, but each of Barabas’s particular plots is a reaction to what he perceives as a provocation or a threat (*Absolute Play* 69).

Thus, having been wronged, Barabas himself reveals his own cunning mind:

Having Ferneze’s hand, whose heart I’ll have,
Ay, and his son’s too, or it shall go hard.
I am not of the tribe of Levi, I,
That can so soon forget an injury.
We Jews can fawn like spaniels when we please,
And when we grin we bite; yet are our looks
As innocent and harmless as a lamb’s.
(...)
Now will I show myself to have more of the
Serpent than the dove, that is more knave than fool (II.iii.16-22, 36-7).

Just as Machiavelli talks of not revealing one's true intentions to others and appearing good all the time, Barabas compares the Jews to dogs and lambs. No one can understand when they mean well or ill, remedy or harm. Accordingly, Barabas decides to kill Ferneze's son and to make Ferneze suffer, but he will appear nice to both so that his evil is not brought out into the open.

Although Barabas takes a demonic stance only after he has been wronged, Ferneze appears to be corrupt right from the beginning of the play. Janet Clare defines Ferneze as "the play's true Machiavel" (81) and for Stephen Greenblatt he is "the very embodiment of 'unseen hypocrisy'" (*Absolute Play* 78). This *hidden* Machiavellian character actually makes one big mistake which Machiavelli advises a leader to be careful of. According to Machiavelli, "above all a prince must abstain from the property of others; because men sooner forget the death of their father than the loss of their patrimony" (97; ch. 17). Despite this mistake, Ferneze is never blamed by the citizens because his "Machiavellian tactics are employed in the service of the state rather than the self" (Sanders 164). In other words, his behaviour is for the nation's good; thus, it is justifiable. He reveals "how "absolute evil" can be masked by the appearance of piety and loyalty, and how such a mask can serve as a weapon of intrigue" (Duane 55). Therefore, no matter how villainously Ferneze acts to preserve peace by tricking Barabas, he ends up being worshipped because the result of his action brings peace to the country, which is a result that covers up his unjust means. Ferneze's actions prove that he "is close to the spirit of Machiavelli's own writings" (Sales 94), and that he has the cunning mind which Machiavelli believes every good leader should have. Moreover, he can cover up the means of reaching his aims because the results are always beneficial to the city; yet, they are beneficial for him as well. Therefore, "though he strains for the honest governmental sense, the relevant irony persists: fulfilling the league demands Machiavellian policy towards the Jews" (Babb 88-89). In this

sense, throughout the play “pseudo-piety is characteristically employed to mask greedy cunning” (Tydeman and Thomas 61) by Ferneze.

Ferneze’s tactics in political manoeuvring also provide clear proof to his Machiavellian spirit. When he is given the opportunity by the Spanish Vice-Admiral, he “repudiates his covenant with the Turks, though [keeps] the Jew’s money” (Babb 89). Moreover, his “crafty maneuver” (Ide 267) is at its highest in the final act of the play when he “breaks his word to both Calymath and Barabas in keeping with the rules of conduct recommended in *The Prince*” (Sales 94). Therefore, he “demonishes both Turks and Jews as a way of defining and policing the margins of Maltese society” (110). In this sense, his friendship is extended as far as it serves as a way of fulfilling his intentions. On the whole, he only relies on his own powers and never thinks about sharing his status with another person or revealing his mind to others.

Mephostophilis, the ‘seeming’ servant of Dr. Faustus, in *The Tragical History of Dr. Faustus*, is very similar to Ferneze. Although Dr. Faustus is the character who shows Machiavellian characteristics after having acquired supernatural powers on earth, he is ceaselessly fooled by Mephostophilis, again another *hidden* Machiavel, at least for Faustus, if not for the audience.

At the beginning of the play, as a learned scholar Dr. Faustus gets no gratification from subjects such as philosophy, law, physics and religion and searches for a more challenging kind of knowledge which he finds in the exercise of black magic:

Philosophy is odious and obscure.
Both law and physics are for petty wits.
Divinity is the basest of the three,
Unpleasant, harsh, contemptible and vile.
‘Tis magic, magic that hath ravished me.
(...)
And I,
(...)
Will be as cunning as Agrippa was,
Whose shadow made all Europe honour him (I.i.105-9, 111, 116-7).

Faustus wants more than what worldly things can offer him and believes that exercising black magic will bring him the honour and power that he desires. With this intention in mind, he asks his friends, who are informed about necromancy to teach him how to practise the art. As a result of his studies, Mephostophilis, Lucifer's servant, appears to him. Faustus orders Mephostophilis "to do whatever [he] shall command" (I.iii.36) believing that his "conjuring speeches" (I.iii.45) have brought Mephostophilis to earth. However, Mephostophilis has come "in hope to get his glorious soul" (I.iii.49), and he tells Faustus that he is "a servant to great Lucifer / And may not follow [Faustus] without his leave" (I.iii.40-1). Moreover, he accepts to become Faustus's servant only if Faustus gives his soul to Lucifer. Faustus, who believes that he is about to surpass human limits, willingly gives his soul away:

Faustus: Go, bear these tidings to great Lucifer,
 (...)

 Say he surrenders up to him his soul,
 So he will spare him four and twenty years,
 Letting him live in all voluptuousness,
 Having thee ever to attend on me,
 To give me whatsoever I shall ask,
 To tell me whatsoever I demand,
 To slay mine enemies and to aid my friends
 And always be obedient to my will (I.iii.87, 90-7).

At this point Faustus does not hesitate to turn his back on religion in order to gain "power, honour and omnipotence" (I.i.53). The 24 years on earth that he will spend having limitless power is much more important than the capturing of his soul by Lucifer. However, for Lucifer, giving Mephostophilis to the service of a human being is not as important as what he will get at the end of 24 years. Therefore, he sees where the opportunity in reaching his aim of adding one more soul to Hell lies, and he cunningly gets hold of that soul.

Although God gives Faustus chances to repent in several parts of the play, he is never allowed to realise them, for he is confronted with a cleverer Machiavellian than himself: Mephostophilis. This character, as the devil's

(...)

Faustus: Villain, have I not bound thee to tell me everything?

Mephostophilis: Ay, that is not against our kingdom, but this is
(II.i.69-70, 73-4).

The power given to Faustus can never transcend the boundaries of the knowledge which is only possessed by God. Mephostophilis cannot satisfy his curiosity on subjects that only God can answer. Moreover, “Lucifer and Mephostophilis ... actively prevent Faustus from acquiring any knowledge that might threaten their power” (Sales 160). Despite increasing his knowledge on subjects such as astronomy, geography and botany, “he never attains the powers or the knowledge which magic promised. On the stage, he is never more than a master of illusions, pranks, and magic shows, ... who parodies divine omnipotence” (Ornstein 1380).

Another Machiavellian device that Mephostophilis employs so as to make sure Faustus does not repent is fear. Every time the Good Angel appears to Faustus assuring him that “God will pity [him]” (II.i.12) if he repents, Mephostophilis arouses fear in Faustus calling him a “traitor” (V.i.72), and tells him to “revolt”, otherwise he will “in piecemeal tear [his] flesh” (v.i.73). Once again Mephostophilis echoes Machiavellian thought where fear of a leader and of punishment restrains one from ever betraying him (Machiavelli ch. 17).

Another of Marlowe’s characters who is manipulated by a cleverer Machiavellian than himself is the brother of the King of Persia, Cosroe in the play *Tamburlaine, Part 1*. According to Ribner, the play “presents an important political doctrine, a doctrine very close to Machiavelli’s actual thought” (353). As the play opens, Cosroe immediately gives his mind away. His brother is considered to be an unsuccessful King, and it is Cosroe’s intention to take his place:

The plot is laid by Persian nobleman
And captains of the Median garrisons
To crown me Emperor of Asia
But this it is that doth excruciate my soul,
To see our neighbours, that were wont to quake
And tremble at the Persian monarch’s name,
Now sits and laughs our regiment to scorn (*Tam* 1.I.i.110-7).

Although Cosroe's actual desire is to wear the crown, he hides behind the pretext that this is something necessary because Persia has lost prestige as a result of his brother's incompetent politics. Thus, he is crowned Emperor by his lords:

Magnificent and mighty prince Cosroe,
We, in the name of other Persian states
And commons of this mighty monarchy,
Present thee with th' imperial diadem (*Tam* 1.I.i,136-9).

Cosroe's brother, the King of Persia is unaware of the traitorous ceremony that Cosroe and his men are plotting behind his back. Being offered the crown, Cosroe does not hesitate to accept it:

Well, since I see the state of Persia droop
And languish in my brother's government,
I willingly receive th' imperial crown
And vow to wear it for my country's good
In spite of them shall malice my state (*Tam* 1.I.i.155-9).

Cosroe acts as though he were accepting the crown because of his anguish for the poor state of Persia and that he was dedicating himself to restore its honour, whereas he is actually making use of a pretext to conceal his ambition for power. Therefore, Cosroe proves to be a true Machiavellian, who pursues his passion hiding it behind a dignified scheme.

Having become the King, Cosroe sets out to find Tamburlaine, a shepherd, who "is driven by a desire to conquer" (Hutchings 190). This shepherd aims to conquer Asia, Egypt and Africa and has already started taking over dominions one by one. He has already become a threat to many emperors, including Cosroe. However, Cosroe underestimates Tamburlaine and thinks that he will be content with working for a King;

He that with shepherds and a little spoil
Durst, in disdain of wrong and tyranny,
Defend his freedom 'gainst a monarchy,
What will he do supported by a king,
Leading a troop of gentlemen and lords,
And stuff'd with treasure for his highest thoughts (*Tam* 1.II.ii.54-9).

Cosroe does not realise that freedom means more to Tamburlaine than working for a king. He is preoccupied with finding a way to get rid of his brother and believes that Tamburlaine will willingly help him because this will bring him the title of the King's knight and also give him a chance to prosper. According to Sales, Cosroe trusts his "'stratagem' of forming an alliance of convenience with [Tamburlaine]" (62). However, this means that he "ignores Machiavelli's warnings against making friends with real, or potential, enemies" (62). When they meet, Tamburlaine agrees to help Cosroe, who in turn promises him and his men "honour and nobility" (*Tam* 1.II.iii.41):

Cosroe: When she that rules in Rhamnus' golden gates,
 And makes a passage for all prosperous arms,
 Shall make me solely emperor of Asia,
 Then shall your meeds and valours be advanc'd
 To rooms of honour and nobility

Tamburlaine: Then haste, Cosroe, to be king alone,
 That I with these my friends and all my men
 May triumph in our long-expected fate (*Tam* 1.II.iii.37-44).

Cosroe is too proud to think of anyone as his equal and fails to understand the undertones in Tamburlaine's words. Tamburlaine is actually mocking Cosroe who believes he will be "king alone" (*Tam* 1.II.iii.42) and who attributes Tamburlaine and his men roles as the Emperor's lords. When he agrees to help Cosroe, Tamburlaine shows the first signs of being a Machiavellian figure, but contrary to Cosroe, who has foolishly revealed his desire to him, Tamburlaine keeps his intentions to himself and uses the opportunity given to him by Cosroe to gain his reliance further. Thus, Tamburlaine helps Cosroe to fight against his brother, who flees from the battleground after seeing mighty Tamburlaine. Cosroe, having asserted his kingship, sets off to Persia. It is only then that the "devilish shepherd" (*Tam* 1.II.vi.1) Tamburlaine reveals his real intention to his friends:

I am strongly mov'd,
 That if I should desire the Persian crown,
 I could attain it with a wondrous ease:

(...)
 I'll first assay
 To get the Persian kingdom to myself;
 (...)
 And, if I prosper, all shall be as sure
 As if the Turk, the Pope, Afric, and Greece,
 Came creeping to us with their crowns a-piece (*Tam* 1.II.v.75-7, 81-2,84-6).

As the true possessor of the Machiavellian cunning mind, Tamburlaine helps Cosroe in the battle against his brother and this way he gets a chance to assess their skills at combat. Seeing that they are no match for himself, he decides to declare war on Cosroe, and he tells his men to inform Cosroe to “turn... back to war with [Tamburlaine and his men], that only made him king to make [them] sport” (*Tam* 1.II.v.100-1). Finally, Cosroe is killed in the hands of “barbarous and bloody Tamburlaine” (*Tam* 1.II.vi.1) which are only two of the many labels that occur throughout the two parts of the play and that stress Tamburlaine’s cruelty.

According to Machiavelli, there are two types of cruelty:

cruelty used well or badly. We can say that cruelty is used well ... when it is employed once for all, and one’s safety depends on it ... Cruelty badly used is that which ... as time goes on, rather than disappearing, grows in intensity (65-66; ch. 8).

In other words, to use Kocis’s terms “constructive cruelties” (123) bring glory and are not wicked whereas “destructive cruelties” (123) cause hatred and barbarism; hence, they are wicked. Consequently, what Machiavelli understands from wickedness is brutality; otherwise, wickedness is termed as the ability and necessity to secure one’s place. Moreover, a leader should exercise cruelty to be feared because when his subjects do not fear him, they

worry less about doing an injury to one who makes himself loved than to one who makes himself feared. The bond of love is one which men ... break when it is to their advantage to do so; but fear is strengthened by a dread of punishment which is always effective (Machiavelli 96-97; ch. 17).

After turning Mathias against Lodowick, he turns Lodowick against him as well:

Lodowick: Barabas, is not that the widow's son?

Barabas: Ay, and take heed, for he hath sworn your death (II.iii.284-5).

He cleverly manipulates the young men, and then he sends a letter to each as if either one had written it to the other. In the letters it is written that they challenge each other for their love. After receiving the fake letters, the two men meet for the love of Abigail and kill each other. Hence, the cruel and wicked appetite of Barabas is fed. However, as his daughter learns that the two friends have died because of Barabas's plotting, she leaves him and joins the nuns. Therefore, Barabas loses the only person dear to his heart because of his cruelty by which none other than himself benefits; if it can still be beneficial to him after losing his daughter.

Another "destructive cruelty" (Kocis 123) that Barabas commits is to strangle a friar and to have another hanged as the former's murderer. When Barabas learns that his daughter has confessed to a friar that he was the cause of Mathias and Lodowick's deaths, he decides to kill the friars who know the truth.

Now I have such a plot for both their lives,
As never Jew nor Christian knew the like;

(...)

But are not both these wise men, to suppose
That I will leave my house, my goods, and all,
To fast and be well whipt? (IV.i.120-1, 125-7).

Here Barabas once again echoes Machiavelli, who says that people to be deceived are easy to find (100; ch. 18). Although the friars act according to the Machiavellian code by trying to use the knowledge they have to get "their hands on Barabas's worldly goods" (Sales 103), they become "easy prey for the more accomplished Barabas. [Thus], the victimizers are transformed into the victims" (105). Eventually, Barabas tricks the friars saying that he wants to repent for his sins and that he will give away all his money if only he can be pardoned by God.

O holy friars, the burden of my sins
 Lie heavy on my soul! Then, pray you, tell me,
 Is't not too late now to turn Christian?
 (...)
 Would penance serve for this my sin,
 I could afford to whip myself to death
 (...)

All this I'll give to some religious house,
 So I may be baptiz'd, and live therein (IV.i.51-3, 61-2,78-9).

As the friars fight for the money, Barabas assures both separately that his money will be theirs. The friars' fight for the money shows that "the monastic orders of the Catholic Church ... are as fond of appropriation as any other faction" (Hiscock 13). Therefore, although the friars become "victims" (Sales 105), the play exhibits "the impotent covetousness of the Christians" and "the disparity between their religious claims and deeds" (Babb 87).

Similar to Barabas, Faustus's heart gets more and more bitter in the course of time, and his deeds, which he does only for his own entertainment, turn into mere wickedness. When he is in Rome, he tricks the Pope wickedly simply for fun. The Pope is to celebrate a victory and Faustus wants Mephostophilis to make him "an actor" (III.ii.76) in the show:

Faustus: Then in this show let me an actor be,
 That this proud Pope may Faustus' cunning see
 Mephostophilis: Let it be so, my Faustus...
 ...then devise what best contents thy mind
 By cunning in thine art to cross the Pope,
 Or dash the pride of this solemnity,
 To make his monks and abbots stand like apes,
 And point like antics at his triple crown,
 To beat the beads about the friars' pates,
 Or clap huge horns upon the cardinals' heads,
 Or any villainy thou canst devise,
 And, I'll perform it (III.ii.76-8, 80-8).

Having acquired more power than any other individual on earth, Faustus starts to use it demeaningly, and his actions become grotesque. All

the things that Mephostophilis suggests doing to the Pope, to his cardinals and friars are foolery and humiliating.

The Pope has captured Bruno, who has been made the new Pope without the Church's consent, and the Pope asks his cardinals to go and find what punishment the scriptures give him. Faustus and Mephostophilis put the cardinals to sleep and appear to the Pope in their shapes. Stating that the scriptures condemn Bruno of heresy, they are asked to take him away, and thus they save him from the Pope. When the real cardinals, who are unaware of what has happened, return, they are accused of treachery which actually Faustus commits against Christianity:

Pope: By Peter, you shall die
 (...)

Hale them to prison, lade their limbs with gyves!

False prelates, for this hateful treachery,

Cursed be your souls to hellish misery (III.iii.50-5).

Faustus lets the cardinals be taken away to prison and delights in the unjust punishment of innocent figures.

Moreover, the Pope is very proud of himself and appears to be using religion as a pretext to keep his authority. Because Bruno has been made Pope without his consent, he plans to excommunicate both Bruno and the German Emperor who crowned him:

Pope: He grows too proud in his authority,
 Lifting his lofty head above the clouds
 And like a steeple overpeers the Church.
 But we'll pull down his haughty insolence (III.ii.134-7).

The Pope is too proud believing himself to be the highest power on earth. His pride clearly shows itself when he says, "Is not all power on earth bestowed on us?" (III.ii.153). Faustus is similarly proud of punishing the representative of God on earth with devilish means and for thinking that he can trick God. Ironically, neither character is powerful. The Pope, who believes that he has all the power on earth as the representative of God, is tricked by another who has shunned all belief in God. And Faustus, despite

having denied God, is tricked and punished by another who is less merciful and much crueler. Nevertheless, Faustus's "quarrel with Christianity continues. The Church for him is still a place of superstitious rites and false authorities" (Ornstein 1383). Yet, this breaking up does not bring him ultimate power, and he is punished at the end of the play. Moreover, although the Pope can hide behind his pretext as a man of God, Faustus has nowhere to hide and is completely evil. The Pope approaches to being a Machiavellian very much like Ferneze in that his use of "religion hides many mischiefs from suspicion" (I.ii.290-1).

There are several other instances in the play where Faustus uses his powers for the disgrace of others and rejoices in their cruelty. Yet, again this cruelty is never the type that Machiavelli favours, for it is only for Faustus's entertainment, and its results show no glorious benefits. At a feast with the German Emperor and his men, Faustus is asked to show them characters from mythology. As they wait for the apparitions, Benvolio, who does not trust Faustus, mocks him and in return Faustus humiliates him by placing horns on his head.

Faustus: Why, how now, Sir Knight? What hanged by
the horns? This most horrible! Fie, fie! Pull in your head
for shame; let not all the world wonder at you.
Benvolio: Zounds, Doctor, is this your villainy? (IV.ii.87-90).

Faustus degrades Benvolio because the knowledge he possesses has made him so proud that he wants to be honoured by everyone. Then, Benvolio seeks for his revenge and cuts Faustus's head off. However, it is a false head, and Faustus rises again calling forth some devils to punish Benvolio and his men. His pride makes him take vengeance from all those who distrust and dishonour him. In other words, Faustus uses all the power that he gains only for his own good, either to entertain himself and his friends, or to punish his enemies. In this sense, he comes near to being a Machiavellian figure for whom keeping power in his own hands is of utmost importance and who would do anything – good or evil – to keep that power.

Moreover, as the most powerful person on earth, no one can take revenge from Faustus, and just as Machiavelli says the injuries that he does to people are “of such a kind that there is no fear of revenge” (38; ch. 3). Although no one on earth can avenge himself on Faustus, he is the only one who benefits from the cruelty he does, and this causes others to feel hatred towards him. As a result, he leads himself to self-destruction at the end of the play when he is taken into Hell. As Ornstein states, “Faustus’ choice of necromancy is foolish as well as self-destructive” (1380).

His self-destruction comes at the end of his 24 years on earth. Death encounters Faustus in the same cruel way that he exercised on people, and his “limbs [are] all torn assunder by the hand of death” (V.iii.6-7). Mephostophilis proves to be not only deceitful and tricky but also cruel. However, contrary to Faustus’s cruelty, which makes several people dislike him, Mephostophilis’s cruelty is put into practice only once. It acts as a means of revenge of all those people whom Faustus has wronged and as a type of revenge Faustus can never avenge himself of. Therefore, the grotesque cruelty Faustus continually exercises returns to him harshly, but the cruelty exercised by Mephostophilis remains unavenged and proves beneficial to Lucifer. In this sense, cruelty applied by Faustus can be termed “destructive” (Kocis 123), whereas cruelty employed by Mephostophilis is “constructive” (123).

As *Tamburlaine* is based on Tamburlaine’s will to gain power throughout the world, cruel scenes are natural from the beginning to the end. Tydeman and Thomas comment on the play as “a spectacular but not very cogent glorification of conquest, cruelty and slaughter” (17). The reason why they regard it as a rather *weak* glorification can be discussed elsewhere, yet the amount of cruelty-behind-the-scenes does prove that “Marlowe was deeply attracted to savage episodes in his sources” (Clare 76). The cruelty employed by Tamburlaine is both constructive and destructive. Tamburlaine has set out to conquer every part of earth from east to west; therefore, he is a threat for other kings. He is constantly confronted by others who want to

overthrow him, so he has to kill them in order not to be killed. Moreover, killing the enemy in war is “constructive” (Kocis 123) in order to avoid a counter attack. Every time Tamburlaine makes up his mind to conquer a place, he first asks the king to surrender and attacks only if he does not yield. When he is about to attack his wife’s city, Zenocrate pleads him not to because of fearing her father’s death. Tamburlaine is so possessed with being the sole emperor of all the kingdoms from East to West that even his wife’s pleas remain futile:

Zenocrate: Yet would you have some pity for my sake,
 Because it is my country’s and my father’s.
 Tamburlaine: Not for the world, Zenocrate, if I have
 sworn (*Tam* 1.IV.iii.123-5).

However, he assures her saying that there is one way by which no harm will be done to them. If they yield, they will all be safe from Tamburlaine’s wrath:

Content thyself: his person shall be safe,
 And all the friends of fair Zenocrate,
 If with their lives they will be pleas’d to yield (*Tam* 1.IV.iv.93-5).

Tamburlaine’s tactics of attack are first to ask for a surrender from his enemies in peaceful terms. If they refuse the offer, he confronts them in the battlefield. If his enemies are still persistent, he kills all the inhabitants of the city under siege.

The first day when he pitcheth down his tents,
 White is their hue, and on his silver crest,
 A snowy feather spangled white he bears,
 To signify the mildness of his mind,
 That, satieth with spoil, refuseth blood.
 But, when Aurora mounts the second time,
 As red as scarlet is his furniture;
 Then must his kindled wrath be quench’d with blood,
 Not sparing any that can manage arms.
 But, if these threats move not submission,
 Black are his colours, black pavillion;
 His spear, his shield, his horse, his armour, plumes,
 And jetty feathers, menace death and hell;

Without respect of sex, degree, or age,
 He razeth all his foes with fire and sword (*Tam* 1.IV.ii.50-64).

Tamburlaine's tactics of attack can be understood with the colours he uses to reveal them. White stands for his mind to capture the city peacefully, and the tents he puts up are all white; red stands for his wrath if his offer of surrender has been refused. The colours of his camp change into red and his soldiers get ready to shed blood. Finally, his camp, his armour, his horse and shield turn into black if the city still does not surrender, and he kills everyone including the women, children and the elderly. His determination to conquer reveals to what extent he is capable of cruelty in order to reach his aim.

However, Tamburlaine's use of cruelty cannot always be justified. Tamburlaine's treatment of his prisoners, Bajazeth and his wife Zabina, surpasses cruelty and shows his barbarity. Cunningham suggests that Marlowe's "figures ... are fascinated not only with what can be done *by* a willful ruler but also with what can be done *to* another's body" (209). Therefore, Tamburlaine exercises mental and physical torture on all his captives. After having beaten Bajazeth in battle and conquered the territory of the Turks as well, Tamburlaine puts Bajazeth in a cage in which he always stays in the presence of Tamburlaine and provides him entertainment. He is humiliated and treated harshly to which no one objects:

Tamburlaine: Bring out my footstool.
They take Bajazeth out of the cage (*Tam* 1.IV.ii.1).

As the stage direction makes clear, Tamburlaine uses Bajazeth as a footstool to ascend to his throne. Being treated thus, Bajazeth finally kills himself by beating his head against the bars of the cage. A similar scene is repeated in the second part of the play, where Tamburlaine uses his prisoners as horses to his carriage, and besides degrading them, he also treats them mercilessly. Again the stage directions show Tamburlaine's barbarism:

Enter Tamburlaine, drawn in his chariot by the Kings of Trebizon and Soria, with bits in their mouths, reins in his left hand, and in his right hand a whip with which he scourgeth them (Tam 2.IV. iii).

Another unjustifiable cruelty that Tamburlaine shows is, when he orders his men to kill and hang the bodies of the girls who have come to plead for mercy so that he does not destroy their city. However, Tamburlaine does not answer their pleas on the grounds that the city didn't surrender to him on their own will and that now is his time to attack. Not answering these pleas and killing the girls violently establishes the "destructive" (Kocis 123) side of Tamburlaine's cruelty more firmly:

Pity our plights!...
 Pity old age, within whose silver hairs
 Honour and reverence evermore have reign'd!
 (...)
 O, then, for these, and such as we ourselves,
 For us, for infants, and for all our bloods,
 That never nourish'd thought against thy rule,
 Pity, O pity, sacred emperor (*Tam 1.V.ii.17-9, 33-6*).

Tamburlaine does not care for these pleas because as Clare states, "in Tamburlaine the protagonist's absolutism is exposed in a succession of pitiless acts of cruelty" (80). The absolutism Clare talks about is Tamburlaine's determination to gain power throughout the world, and he does not plan to stop until he reaches his aim:

I that am term'd the Scourge and Wrath of God,
 The only fear and terror of the world,
 Will first subdue the Turk, and then enlarge
 Those Christian captives which you keep as slaves
 (...)
 as I live, that town shall curse the time
 That Tamburlaine set foot in Africa (*Tam 1.III.iii.44-7, 59-60*).

Ribner has also commented on Tamburlaine's absolutism stating:

Marlowe's king ... is completely absolute. He holds his office not by divine appointment but by his own merits, and he is responsible to no one but himself. He has complete power over the lives of his subjects, and he rules outside of law, either human or divine ... it is Niccolò Machiavelli's concept of the lawgiver, the one great leader

who can restore a corrupt state to virtue by returning it to its original principles, but who, while effecting his reforms, may rule outside of law and with complete authority (355).

Tamburlaine is not governed by any divine means; he does not feel limited by any power above himself on earth. Thus, he does not hesitate to burn the Koran and to call Mohammed forth to put an end to his bad deeds:

Now, Mahomet, if thou have any power,
Come down thyself and work a miracle.
Thou art not worthy to be worshipped
That suffers flames of fire to burn the writ
Wherein the sum of thy religion rests (*Tam* 2.V.i.185-9).

Considering himself as the ultimate power and basing his faith only in himself, Tamburlaine fears nothing; hence, he easily establishes his own laws not refraining from anything divine or unethical. In this sense he echoes Machiavelli, who believes that a leader should not hesitate to put aside his morality and to hold all power in his hands when his country's well being is in question.

Several other unjustifiable instances of cruelty that reveal where Tamburlaine's fury and barbarism may lead are, when he kills one of his sons for not resembling him in terms of martial skills and when he burns down a town after Zenocrate's death. According to Williams, Calyphas is killed by Tamburlaine because "Tamburlaine was morally obliged to do whatever he could to save his country from the prospect of being ruled by an unworthy prince" (72). Therefore, he was actually doing "a service to the state" (72). In this sense, Bartels argues that whether Tamburlaine is "intrinsically barbaric or intrinsically noble is ... undecidable" (12). He is "capable of being both", and as a true Machiavellian, he can "[appropriate] nobility to mask barbarity" (Bartels 12). Moreover, Günsberg states that it is against the Machiavellian code to be "fickle, frivolous, effeminate, cowardly, or irresolute" (132). A prince must show his "grandeur, courage, sobriety and strength" (Günsberg 132). As Calyphas embodies none of the latter qualities, he deserves to be killed in the eyes of Tamburlaine. Even if they are for the nation's good, these unjust violent deeds are examples of

Tamburlaine's "destructive" (Kocis 123) cruelties which can by no means be attributed to the type of leader Machiavelli favours, for no one except for Tamburlaine benefits from them, satisfying his ego and reinforcing his power.

In Machiavellian terms opportunism is the quality which is attributed to a leader who is clever enough to perceive his chances and to make good use of them. By themselves chances are not of much use; however, seeing where the opportunity lies provides a starting point to reach power if one is clever enough during that process. Opportunity brings leaders "matter but they [give] its form; without opportunity their prowess would [be] extinguished, and without such prowess the opportunity would ... come in vain" (Machiavelli 50; ch. 6).

In *The Jew of Malta*, Barabas makes use of Machiavellian opportunity. He makes use of the love of two men to his daughter to kill them, he makes use of the friars' greed to get rid of them, and he makes use of Calymath to return back to the city after he has been thrown outside the walls of Malta. Yet, as Machiavelli said, making use of the opportunity is not enough if one does not have the intelligence to make that opportunity permanent. And, because Barabas makes several mistakes, he turns out to be unsuccessful in spite of employing Machiavellian terms. He trusts his servant Ithamore and loves him: "O trusty Ithamore! No servant, but my friend" (III.iv.42) and does all his bad deeds with him, who in return betrays Barabas for money. Just as Machiavelli says, love issues from obligation and is forgotten easily (96; ch. 17). However, if Ithamore had feared Barabas, he would never have betrayed him. Moreover, Barabas's deeds are always villainous and barbarous and only for his own good. Therefore, they arouse hatred towards him and cause his downfall. Furthermore, at the end of the play he trusts Ferneze's word that he will help him whereas he should never have trusted someone whom he had wronged before. As Machiavelli states, "whoever believes that with great men new services wipe out old

injuries deceives himself” (61; ch. 7). The same idea is also stated in the “Prologue” of the play:

Hence comes it that a strong built citadel
 Commands much more than letters can import:
 Which maxim had [but] Phalais observ'd
 It 'ad never bellow'd in a brazen bull
 Of great ones' envy (“Prologue”, 22-6).

A clear example of the governor's opportunism is seen when, in order to secure his own position, he breaks truce behind Turks' backs who have given him time to gather the money. When the vice-admiral of Spain forces Ferneze to help them sell their Turkish slaves in Malta and says that his King can help him against the Turks, Ferneze immediately agrees:

Martin Del Basco: My lord and king hath title to this isle,
 And he means quickly to expel you hence.
 Therefore be rul'd by me, and keep the gold:
 I'll write unto his majesty for aid,
 And not depart until I see you free.
 Ferneze: On this condition shall thy Turks be sold (II.ii.37-42).

Although the Turks aren't portrayed as honorable in the play for asking for that much money without good cause, Ferneze is similarly dishonorable for breaking the truce. Yet, here again Ferneze echoes Machiavelli, who says that as men are corrupt, in order not to be a fool, a leader should also be equally corrupt (100; ch. 18).

Ferneze's cunning, cruelty and opportunism become obvious towards the end of the play, where he once again tricks Barabas at the last moment by acting against the pact they had made in order to get rid of Calymath and his men. In the final acts of the play, Barabas helps Calymath to seize Malta who in return makes Barabas the new governor of the city. Ferneze becomes Barabas's captive, and on second thoughts, Barabas decides to use Ferneze's prominence to restore his money. They make a pact according to which Barabas will trick and kill Calymath and all his men, and Ferneze will collect the amount of money he had taken from Barabas

from the citizens of Malta. Thus, Ferneze will also regain his freedom. To capture Calymath, Barabas digs a pit in the ground, puts a boiling pot in it and covers it with wood. Once the wood is displaced by cutting the rope which holds it, Calymath is supposed to fall in the pot and burn to death. Moreover, as soon as a cannon is fired, all his men will be burned in the monastery, where they were invited to feast. Ferneze, who is aware of Barabas's plan, lets the monastery be burned down, but cuts down the rope when Barabas is standing on the wood and Barabas falls in the pot and dies. Barabas never suspects to be tricked by Ferneze, believing that "from whom [his] most advantage comes, shall be [his] friend" (V.ii.115-6). However, while Barabas considers Ferneze as a friend, Ferneze is cleverer in seeming like a friend but trusting only himself when his interests were at stake. David J. Palmer says that "Barabas' fatal mistake is that he fails to allow his enemies the same degree of suspicious mistrust towards him as he holds towards them" (63). Definitely, Barabas ought to have been clever enough to consider that Ferneze might betray him. His "guarded style" (Sales 94) helped him to conceal his real interests which were to capture Calymath and to restore the injury done to Malta as well as restoring his position as governor. He states this to Calymath as:

...here thou must stay,
 And live in Malta prisoner;
 ...
 ...till thy father hath made good
 The ruins done to Malta and to us,
 Thou canst not part; for Malta shall be freed,
 Or Selim ne'er return to Ottoman (V.v.125-6, 118-21).

During all the time that Barabas trusts Ferneze, Ferneze actually has in mind to ruin Barabas and to deprive Calymath of his men so as to gain back power in Malta and restore the city's freedom. Keeping his intentions as a secret, Ferneze sees the opportunity given to him by Barabas and makes good use of it both cunningly and cruelly; hence, he reaches his aim. Moreover, as his intentions are for a good cause, that is, for the well-being of Malta, he is rendered a hero rather than a Machiavellian.

Both Faustus and Mephostophilis see an opportunity when they meet each other. For Faustus, giving away his soul is the opportunity to have limitless power in life. Ornstein suggests that:

In *Dr. Faustus* man's primal disobedience is ... the questioning mind ... that threatens the divinely established order. For with knowledge enough man ... could become like the gods (1381-82).

Faustus falls into the oblivion of believing that his pact with Mephostophilis will give him the chance to possess as much power as God. With the help of Mephostophilis, he wants to reach the level of knowledge that God has denied mankind, and that is beyond human understanding, and thus to:

...be great emperor of the world,
And make a bridge through the air
To pass the ocean. With a band of men
I'll join the hills that bind the Africk shore,
And make that country continent to Spain,
And both contributory to my crown.
The Emperor shall not live but by my leave,
Nor any potentate of Germany (I.iii.104-11).

Hence, while Faustus fails to see the true opportunity for himself, which is repentance, Mephostophilis sees his opportunity of how to make use of Faustus's desire. Therefore, Duane argues that "Faustus's despair, damnation, and death are fully accounted for by his own actions" (62) because he fails to read the signs of his possible salvation correctly. He wavers in his belief of God's mightiness and fears Lucifer's wrath every time he is warned by angels to repent. Therefore, in the end, he "is destroyed by forces that have the upper hand" (Duane 62). Faustus's failure to see where the opportunity lies and to make good use of it, makes Mephostophilis the real Machiavellian who not only notices but also pursues an opportunity successfully to its end.

Rudowski defines Machiavellian opportunity as "the area of experience that lies entirely outside human control, an area that includes events for which no rational causes are detectable" (62). In this sense, Tamburlaine's fortune can be the fact that he has been endowed with both

physical and mental power that no other man on earth has been given. Being well aware of this luck, granted to him by powers beyond himself, he makes good use of them to reach the highest possible levels of his aspirations. In Ribner's words, "Tamburlaine is exalted as the man of destiny, the conqueror who, by his own unique abilities, can master fortune long enough to ... create empires" (354). Moreover, "the hero of history is he who can master Fortune and bend her to his will" (Ribner 355). This "hero" is Tamburlaine, who is always allowed to succeed no matter what cruelty he does and how high his aspirations are.

In all three Marlovian plays, *The Jew of Malta*, *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus* and *Tamburlaine, Parts I and 2*, characters reveal actions based on cunning, cruelty and opportunism. However, employing these Machiavellian qualities does not bring triumph to all of them as a normal consequence. When two Machiavellian figures meet in each play, the one who proves to be more intelligent and secretive than the other becomes the winner. The loser is never pitied, and just like Machiavelli states, glory shines through Ferneze's unjust means of reaching peace and freedom which makes him successful. However, wickedness shines through Barabas's deeds, so he fails. In this sense, Ferneze could be the true Machiavellian figure of the play that makes use of cunning, cruelty and opportunity; yet, as his ends are good, he is never unmasked. However, Barabas might be the farcical Machiavellian figure, who cannot disguise his deeds under a refined pretext, and whose behaviour clearly reveals that whatever he does is only for his own good. "He does not come to grief because he is a Machiavel, but because he is not Machiavellian enough" (Palmer 63). Therefore, although both characters have cunning minds, the one whose intelligence surpasses the other becomes successful and the weaker encounters catastrophe.

As a Machiavellian character, Mephostophilis proves to be successful, for till the last moment he struggles to have Faustus's soul to burn in Hell. It is only towards the moment of death that he allows Faustus

to realise the horror of this truth and reveals his hypocrisy saying that it was he who kept Faustus from repenting:

Faustus: Oh, thou bewitching fiend, 'twas thy temptation
 Hath robbed me of eternal happiness.
 Mephostophilis: I do confess it, Faustus, and rejoice.
 'Twas I that, when thou were't i' the way to heaven,
 Damned up thy passage; when thou took'st the book
 To view the scriptures, then I turned the leaves
 And led thine eye (V.ii.98-104).

Compared to Mephostophilis, Faustus is less successful as a Machiavellian figure, for at the end of the play he is condemned to eternal punishment. Moreover, he can only be a Machiavellian on earth as a result of the powers bestowed on him by Mephostophilis. However, once it is his moment of death and past his chances of repentance, he bargains with God in vain:

Oh God, if thou wilt not have mercy on my soul,
 (...)
 Let Faustus live in hell a thousand years,
 A hundred thousand, and at last be saved (V.ii.176, 179-80).

It is possible to realise how his worldly Machiavellian powers prove futile when faced with true Machiavellian figures of the otherworld, and he proves to have been a puppet Machiavellian in their hands.

Despite his cruelty and villainy, Tamburlaine gives high esteem to his friends and wife; yet, this does not save him from being a Machiavellian who gives the highest esteem to himself. Therefore, when interests clash, Tamburlaine's is always on the foreground. As Ribner states, "Tamburlaine is precisely the type of leader whom Machiavelli saw as capable of reforming a corrupt Italy, unifying it, and expelling its foreign invaders" (354).

¹ During the 15th and 16th centuries Italy had two unreconciling faces. On the one hand it was continuously developing in cultural, artistic and economic terms; on the other, it was struggling to strengthen its military power and wavering politics. As a man of state, Niccolò Machiavelli was preoccupied with the political inconsistency throughout the country. After his active role in politics was brought to an end by an exile, he wrote *The Prince* as a handbook where he gave advice to King Magnificent Lorenzo II on how to gain and maintain power throughout Italy so as to end the disputes in the country, to close doors on any foreign intervention and to unite the country under one leader who had firm relationships with the neighbour countries, nobles, the Church, the army and the people. Machiavelli divided his book into 26 chapters. In the first chapter he classified types of state; in chapters 2 to 11 he explained how these states could be gained, kept or lost; in chapters 12 to 14 he wrote about his opinions on a country's army; in chapters 15 to 23 he set down rules on how a leader should act towards his citizens and lastly in chapters 24 to 26 he explained how Italy could be saved and unified.

² Some critics regard Machiavelli's thought as an open invitation to fraud, self-interest and hypocrisy, whereas others believe his work was a satirical and ironical insight into contemporary politics. Quentin Skinner states that Machiavelli's name "lives on as a byword for cunning, duplicity and the exercise of bad faith in political affairs" (1). However, he also goes on to say that "the most original and creative aspects of his political vision are best understood as a series of polemical – and sometimes satirical – reactions against the body of humanist beliefs" (v). Kocis defines the author as "the cynical seeker of power for its own sake, the unscrupulous "teacher of evil", who freed from politics morality" (11). Yet, he adds that "the redeeming grace of his commitment to modernizing his nation by freeing his people and bringing them to civilizing glory should forestall a desire to condemn or damn him" (18). Similarly, Victor Anthony Rudowski states that "Machiavelli himself subscribed to a higher political goal that ... was beyond considerations of good and evil: namely, the establishment of a unified Italian state that would be strong enough to expel the French, Spanish, and German interlopers" (11).

CHAPTER 3

INDIVIDUALISM AND SELF-DETERMINATION

This chapter aims to explore the concepts of individuality and self-determination in Christopher Marlowe's three plays, *The Jew of Malta*, *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus* and *Tamburlaine, Parts 1 and 2*. In each play the focus will be on the major characters. It has been discussed in the previous chapter that these characters embody Machiavellian qualities. They employ immoral qualities as long as the qualities are a vehicle for them to reach their aims, and to establish their individuality. Therefore, it is within a depraved frame that they attempt to realise themselves. Finally, the chapter will conclude to what extent these Marlovian characters succeed in their self-realization and prove to belong to the Renaissance idea of man.

Renaissance gave a chance to individuals to explore the world within themselves as well as the world outside. The geographical and astrological discoveries led people to embrace a broader vision of the world in which they lived. They realised that as human beings they did not have to keep back from cultivating their souls with something other than religion. The more importance they gave to themselves, the more they focused on realising their wishes. Hence, the concepts of self-determination and individualism prevailed as long as the conflicting atmosphere of the era continued to be felt. The major characters of Marlowe's plays reveal how much the Elizabethans were influenced by these concepts. In all three plays that will be analysed, the major characters struggle to assert their individualism and firmly put forth their self-determination in order to triumph in their desires. Dr. Faustus, Barabas and Tamburlaine all experience crucial moments when they decide to take over the responsibility of their souls and fates. Dr. Faustus denies God and makes a pact with Satan in order to reach limitless knowledge, Tamburlaine decides not to be a soldier in the service of a King but to be the sole king of all kingdoms on earth, and Barabas puts aside all his moral and humane traits in order to get his money back. Therefore, all characters have aspirations which they never

waver in pursuing, and they are all brave enough to deny whatever is a hindrance to their aspirations. In this sense, the plays open up for an analysis of the concepts of individualism and self-determination.

Marlowe's plays coincide with a very chaotic period in British literary history. Renaissance which had initiated as a movement in arts, culture and literature was effective on the whole of Europe. Britain, which had so far been governed by the King hand in hand with the Church, was being forced to open up its gates to a new way of perceiving the world. The Church was being threatened in relation to imposing its established religious rules on individuals because people had started learning about the world in which they lived. This was a consequence of books that were easily published and circulated thanks to the printing press invented around the 1480's. As a result of the widespread circulation of books, people started changing their world view. As the view towards perceiving the world changed, so did the individual. He was no longer the stereotype man of the Middle Ages; he had a more open mind to acquire knowledge on different areas of interest and to reach conclusions based on facts. The individual learned and questioned, which led to his questioning the Church and to refusing belief based on superstition and fraud. Thus, religion started becoming more personal and subjective. People did not require the assistance of another to show them what was right and what was wrong from the point of view of religion. This new religious understanding was a consequence of the Renaissance and was regarded as enlightenment. People did not wait for the otherworld any longer; instead of trying merely not to sin in life, they broadened their vision and found out that there was more to the world and to themselves.

This new type of mind open to inner and external inquiry as well as to knowledge of the individuals living in the Elizabethan society was one of the sources for Marlowe's characters. Consequently, his characters are aspiring individuals with definite aims, and as long as they live, they do everything to fulfill them. At this point, these characters do not hesitate to

rely on immoral behaviour and action. Their basic desire to reach their aims urges them to disregard morality, virtue, humanism and religious devotion. They readily employ Machiavellian means because they yearn for self-fulfillment, and cannot stoop to self-negation. Instead of denying their wishes for fear of being stigmatized with an unethical etiquette, the characters choose to deny whatever ethical there is that will prevent their self-realisation. Therefore, all of them establish “a new morality” (Kocis 29) for themselves in which “moral obligations are created by humans rather than forces like God or nature” (84) so that the classical notions of virtue, faithfulness and truthfulness do not necessarily prevail. Kocis suggests that “for Machiavelli ... our moral obligations are created by us as a rational response to the needs of living together in society” (29). In this sense, in order to survive in a society and not to experience pressure on one’s personality traits, one has to formulate his morals and action in accordance with his benefits. Therefore, when it is necessary to do so, Marlowe’s characters mask their intentions behind a seeming goodness; and thus, become examples of the Machiavellian understanding. Moreover, they have no other choice than to rely on their cunning and hypocrisy because their urge for self-realisation depends on the fulfillment of an aspiration which is beyond the limits of an individual’s right and freedom to achievement. Machiavellian means open up a way and possibility for these characters to move a step closer to their aims. Machiavelli believed that “human choices can make a difference” (Kocis 23) and that everyone should “take charge of [their] own lives” (23). Therefore, by employing Machiavellian means, “Marlowe’s heroes struggle to invent themselves,” (*Absolute Play* 75) and they can only do this “not in loving submission to an absolute authority but in self-conscious opposition: Tamburlaine against hierarchy, Barabas against Christianity, Faustus against God” (66). Such a courageous and decisive denial enables them to:

freely proclaim their immense hunger for something which takes
on the status of a personal absolute, and they relentlessly pursue

this absolute. The more threatening an obstacle in their path, the more determined they are to obliterate or overreach (*Absolute Play* 80).

For Dr. Faustus, denying God as his first step to assert his individuality becomes a must, as he hungers for the kind of knowledge to which only God has a right. In his decisiveness, he easily denies religion although it will mean committing a sin;

Jerome's Bible! Faustus, view it well.
 (...)
 'If we say that we have no sin
 We deceive ourselves, and there is no truth in us.'
 Why then, belike, we must sin,
 And so consequently die.
 Ay, we must die, an everlasting death.
 What doctrine call you this? Che sera, sera.
 'What will be, shall be.' Divinity, adieu! (I.i.38,42-48).

Faustus reads in the Bible that all men are sinners. At this point, he decides to commit the sin that he wants knowingly if sinning is inevitable. Consequently, he takes the responsibility of himself as an individual. Rather than relying on religion to decide for his fate, he himself decides for it. This becomes his first step towards asserting his individuality. Therefore, he makes a pact with Mephostophilis, Satan's servant, in order to satisfy his hunger. As the play opens, Dr. Faustus is shown in his study brooding over his time spent on studying philosophy and physics as they have not satisfied him. He has been successful both as a philosopher and physician, but he believes that "a greater subject fitteth Faustus' wit" (I.i.11). Besides, in spite of philosophising well and having found cures to many illnesses, he is "still but Faustus and a man" (I.i.23). As he wants to be more than that, and as he believes he is fit for a more challenging kind of knowledge, he turns to black magic:

These necromantic books are heavenly,
 Lines, circles, scenes, letters and characters:
 Ay, these are those that Faustus most desires.
 Oh, what a world of profit and delight,
 Of power, of honour of, omnipotence (I.i.49-53).

Faustus's deviation from *accepted* areas of knowledge towards the exploration of the forbidden is a result of his realisation that:

“normative behaviour” in the world always demands a closing down of doubt and desire.... Faustus rejects this capitulation, aware both that it amounts to a falling short of human potential and that in so doing he renders his life incompatible with conventional earthly existence (Hamlin 257).

Faustus decides not to end his inquiries when he trespasses the human boundaries to knowledge. He knows that his self-realisation will only be possible if he acquires the amount of knowledge that God has. As an individual whose main aim is to satisfy his need of self-fulfilment, he turns his back on any limitation that will prevent his self-realisation. Therefore, while showing the first signs of the Renaissance understanding of the freedom of will, he also shows the signs of a Christian sinner.

Sanders says that “for Faustus... knowledge is power” (149) and similarly McAdam points out that “*Dr. Faustus*...is obviously about human aspiration to unlimited power” (113). It is clear enough that Faustus wants to possess unlimited knowledge. That is the one thing he aspires for because it will give him a chance to assert his individuality.

Faustus: Shall I make spirits fetch me what I please,
 Resolve me of all ambiguities,
 Perform what desperate enterprise I will?
 I'll have them fly to India for gold,
 Ransack the ocean for orient pearl,
 And search all corners of the new-found world
 For pleasant fruits and princely delicates.
 I'll have them read me strange philosophy,
 And tell the secrets of all foreign kings.
 I'll have them wall all Germany with brass,
 And make swift Rhine circle Wittenberg.
 I'll have them fill the public schools with silk,
 Wherewith the students shall be bravely clad.
 I'll levy soldiers with the coin they bring,
 And chase the Prince of Parma from our land,
 And reign sole king of all provinces (I.i.78-93).

Practicing magic will give Faustus the chance to reach his aim by which he will satisfy both his individualistic needs and the needs of other people.

Using the spirits whom he plans to command as his servants, he will have them make him wealthy, endow him with further knowledge on alternative subjects, improve the conditions of students at universities and free the country from invaders. Hilary Ghatti points out that the play:

in a time of violent religious and civil conflict, turns deliberately to magic in its traditional, forbidden, medieval form, but through that magic he searches for a new kind of knowledge of the universe, making his bid, in the face of the Devil, and the armies of hell, for the advancement of human learning about natural things (qtd. in Braunmuller and Hattaway 74).

Moreover, by the knowledge he gains, Faustus also plans to become the ruler of Germany and to hold all power in his hands. Therefore, in order to possess limitless power, he aspires for limitless knowledge. As a result, he gives away his soul to Satan, who in return gives Mephostophilis as a servant to Faustus during Faustus's 24 years on earth.

Faustus: Sweet, Mephostophilis, thou pleasest me.
 Whilst I am here on earth let me be cloyed
 With all things that delight the heart of man.
 My four and twenty years of liberty
 I'll spend in pleasure and in dalliance,
 That Faustus' name, whilst this bright frame doth stand,
 May be admired through the furthest land (III.ii.58-64).

Faustus aims to use Mephostophilis to satisfy his worldly desires as long as he continues to live. Instead of only working for the well being of his soul in the otherworld by neglecting what it yearns for in life, as a character showing traits of the Renaissance man, Faustus decides to satisfy his soul's worldly needs while on earth. Ghatti defines Faustus as:

a new image of man, unsuccoured by theological dogma, committed to enlarging the sphere of human knowledge and to acquiring an ever-increasing dominion over nature (qtd. in Braunmuller and Hattaway 75).

Moreover, in that way, Faustus aims to be looked up to by everybody else. For, not only Faustus but his two friends, Valdes and Cornelius also want

their names to live on after their deaths, which is another reason why they turn to practicing magic. Marlowe has Valdes say, “Faustus, these books, thy wit and our experience / Shall make all nations to canonize us” (I.i.118-9). The “validation” that Faustus gets from his friends is “a necessary precondition for feeling his own worth” (Matalene 512). Yet, the implication that the characters expect to reach immortality through the exercise of black magic is ironic as such an end is never reached.

According to Greenblatt, all of Marlowe’s characters are “obsessed” with the idea of “naming themselves” (*Absolute Play* 79), and they can only do this if they “pursue a goal” (*Absolute Play* 77). What Greenblatt states by “naming” (*Absolute Play* 79) is not being known and remembered but imposing a self-identity. Faustus aims at all three. His first aim is to assert his individuality by pursuing his worldly desires and eventually to leave a name by which he will be admired and remembered. In order to do this, the “goal” (*Absolute Play* 77) he goes after is reaching limitless knowledge. Ultimately, with the help of Mephostophilis, he acquires thorough knowledge on many subjects in a short period of time and reaches his aim as to the amount of knowledge which he has aspired all his life. He explores “the clouds, the planets, and the stars / The tropic, the zones, and quarters of the sky” (III.i.7-8) including the moon and the first sphere beyond the planets. Moreover, having satisfied his curiosity on astronomy, he travels round the world and learns everything about geography and cosmology;

Having now, my good Mephostophilis,
 Passed with delight the stately town of Trier,
 Environed round with airy mountain tops,
 With walls of flint, and deep entrenched lakes,
 Not to be won by any conquering prince,
 From Paris next coasting the realm of France
 We saw the river Main fall into Rhine,
 Whose banks are set with groves of fruitful vines;
 Then up to Naples, rich Campania,
 Whose buildings fair and gorgeous to the eye,
 The streets straight forth and paved with finest brick,
 Quarters the town in four equivolence.
 There saw we learned Maro’s golden tomb,
 The way he cut an English mile in length,

Thorough a rock of stone in one night's space.
 From thence to Venice, Padua and the rest,
 In midst of which a sumptuous temple stands,
 That threatens the stars with her aspiring top,
 Whose frame is paved with sundry coloured stones,
 And roofed aloft with curious work in gold.
 Thus hitherto hath Faustus spent his time (III.ii.1-21).

In the end, Faustus indeed becomes a learned scholar who people turn to in order to enhance their knowledge. He is invited to feast with the Emperor, whom he delights by showing the true images of Alexander the Great, his lover and Darius. As a reward for the amazing time they spend, the Emperor makes Faustus the ruler of Germany.

Emperor: Come Faustus, while the Emperor lives,
 In recompense of this thy high desert,
 Thou shalt command the state of Germany,
 And live beloved of mighty Carolus (IV.ii.121-4).

Throughout the twenty four years donated to Faustus, he seems to fulfill all his aims about possessing a wide knowledge on subjects such as astronomy, cosmology, philosophy, mythology, and so on. Moreover, he becomes the ruler of Germany as he wishes, and he is respected as a wise scholar. Therefore, Faustus succeeds in fulfilling all his worldly desires except for one. Although he had started off denying God and Christianity so as to be God's equal, that remains to be the only sphere of which he gets no hold. In that sense, he cannot reach limitless power and cannot realise himself to the highest level possible because what he aspires for is impossible to fulfil to its topmost extent. According to Sanders, the moment that Faustus's self contained identity begins to fail is when "he slips into an arrogant self-justifying fantasy of his invincibility" (150). He considers himself at least as powerful as God, and can only realise that his powers on earth are too feeble to compete with God when he comes close to death. "Faustus' black magic, then, is a tool with which Faustus strives to mimic God's creative power; but ... this magic is illusory in its achievements and short lived" (Proser 149). Either because of his arrogance, which shows itself more clearly

towards Faustus's last years on earth or because of Mephostophilis's deceit, which prevents Faustus from realising his mistake, he can only understand that there is no chance to escape torture and Hell at his last moments on earth. Breaking away from the restrictions that religion imposes on the intellectual mind remains futile when it is time for poetic justice. Therefore, the cruel end which awaits Faustus is the proof of his failure to assert his individuality. He remains torn between the desire to realise himself and the fear of infernal punishment. Nuttall states that:

Calvin notoriously denied human free will through his doctrine of predestination. At the same time he retained the notion that man, for all that he could do nothing but sin, was nevertheless responsible for that sin and justly damnable. The Platonico-Hermetical party on the other hand ascribed to man not just free will but also a kind of super-freedom, a liberty to determine one's own nature (25).

Faustus is the embodiment of the ideas of both poles. He is courageous enough to go after his "super-freedom" (25) and to achieve his aims in life, but in the end, he proves to have committed the "sin of daring" (Ornstein 1381), and is punished. The moment that he gives away his soul to Satan exposing his free will is, at the same time, the moment that he becomes predestined to be damned. Therefore, Marlowe puts forth the basic conflict of the time: "man's new faith in his own intellectual resources against a deeply rooted Christian concept of the vanity of human endeavour alone" (Nuttall 92). In this sense, it is natural that

Marlowe presents the supernatural as part of Faustus's culture – as a way of governing one's behaviour which can be selected, learned, and brought into "real" being by the very act of one's choosing ... to choose is to provide behavioral substance for the words "power" and "freedom", while simultaneously it is to limit one's potentiality by eliminating alternatives" (Matalene 517-518).

Marlowe allows Faustus to make his choice whether to deny God's power or to consent to it. Such a liberty shows that Faustus has a right to the freedom of will which strengthens his importance as an individual. However, making a choice is, at the same time, posited as a limitation

because it shuns other possibilities. Therefore, none of the choices that the individual makes can gain him unlimited freedom, and he is only allowed to function in an enclosed sphere. As a consequence of his choice, the need to repent and the fear of damnation occur to Faustus when his twenty four years have almost been completed:

Faustus: Where art thou, Faustus? Wretch, what hast
thou done?
Damned, art thou Faustus, damned: despair and die.
Hell claims his right, and with a roaring voice
Says 'Faustus, come, thine hour is almost come' (V.i.53-6).

Although he wishes to repent, he is kept back by Mephostophilis, who by all means is after Faustus's soul. Having fulfilled his wishes and satisfied most of his curiosity as to the areas of knowledge that were unknown to him before, Faustus realises "the futility of his bargain with the devil" (Ornstein 1379) as he nears death. Although he has wished to spend his twenty four years "in pleasure and in dalliance" (III.ii.62), as the years draw to an end, he comes to the understanding that "For vain pleasure of four and twenty years hath Faustus lost eternal joy and felicity" (V.ii.68). In his despair, he yearns to be spared:

Faustus: Fair nature's eye, rise, rise again, and make
Perpetual day. Or let this hour be but
A year, a month, a week, a natural day,
That Faustus may repent and save his soul (V.ii.148-51).

Faustus's final pleas and his being incapable of facing his end proudly reveal his failure in having established an identity for himself. McAdam believes that "as a man" (118), Faustus "failed in his own self-possession, self-confidence, self-cohesion" (118). In his last moments, Faustus becomes "overwhelmed by the intensity of his own passions and consumed by the power of God's wrath in him" (Proser 154). As a result, his courage turns into a frenzy like fear, and the only thing he cares for becomes the purification of his soul. His self-determination leaves its place to self-

negation and to the necessity to accept and be accepted by the more powerful eternal force. According to Ornstein:

The heroic choice is not between alternative paths of self-fulfillment but between the self-destructiveness of mighty strivings and the salvation that demands self-abnegation and the denial of heroic aspiration. For inevitably man's attempts at greatness must break against a universal order which is predicated on, and which demands human obedience and denial (1380).

Therefore, no matter how much Faustus denies the "universal order" (Ornstein 1380), he inevitably figures out that his self-realisation is only possible within its limits, and that he has to accept the smallness of his power and individualism for self-salvation.

Time also plays an important role as a force beyond Faustus's powers that limit him in his self-realisation. As Greenblatt states "time is alien, profoundly indifferent to human longing and anxiety" (*Absolute Play* 64). In his final moments on earth, Faustus addresses time and pleads for it to stop passing:

Stand still, you ever-moving spheres of heaven,
That time may cease and midnight never come (V.ii.146-7).

Yet, he knows that time functions beyond his powers; it is another dominion that he could not get hold of despite the amount of power given to him in life.

The stars move still, time runs, the clock will strike.
The devil will come, and Faustus must be damned (V.ii.153-4).

For Faustus, the struggle to assert one's identity becomes a sin that he was willing to commit at the beginning of the play. Although he is applauded throughout the play for pursuing his desire, his punishment is exercised in the end for having dared to be above God. Therefore, Faustus becomes "a Renaissance man who paid a medieval price" (Nuttall 24), and the play puts forth "the conflict between self-assertion and self-surrender" (McAdam 113). Then again, Faustus comes close to asserting his

individuality because without self-realisation, “self surrender” (113) would not have been possible; however, he does not reach the highest point of his aspirations and is defeated by a power greater than himself.

On the other hand, challenging and denying God for worldly power do not bring destruction to Tamburlaine, who struggles even harder than Faustus to become an individual by solely relying on his own physical and mental strength. As Una Ellis Fermor stated, the play “is set upon the attainment of something that lies at the uttermost bounds of possibility”(139). No matter how hard Tamburlaine has to struggle in order to attain his desire, it is his only way of establishing his identity. Therefore, he determinedly goes after it. Tamburlaine’s decision to assert his individualism shows itself when he refuses to fight for a King. On the contrary, he resolves to fight for himself and become *the* King;

I am strongly mov’d,
That if I should desire the Persian crown,
I could attain it with a wondrous ease:
(...)
I’ll first assay
To get the Persian kingdom to myself;
(...)
And, if I prosper, all shall be as sure
As if the Turk, the Pope, Afric, and Greece,
Came creeping to us with their crowns a-piece (*Tam* 1.II.v.75-7, 81-2, 84-6).

With this decision to first conquer Persia and then Asia, Africa and Europe, Tamburlaine reaches the highest point in his aspiration and makes up his mind to “triumph all over the world” (*Tam* 1.I.ii.173). McAdam has asserted that “*Tamburlaine* is about the fulfillment of will” (102), and consequently, rising to the level of a monarch from that of a shepherd he is definitely “a hero, a breaker of moulds, and a forger of new orders” (Sanders 149). The first part of the play “places great importance on Tamburlaine’s will to create his own role” (Braunmuller and Hattaway 219). That’s why, he is endowed “with limitless ability at once to create ... a world of his own desires and to conquer the very world he fashions” (Birringer 230). From the very first moment that he makes up his mind as to pursue his worldly

desire, he never falters in his purpose. Moreover, the will and determination remain within his soul until his moment of death. When Zenocrate asks him when he will leave “the dangerous chances of the wrathful war” (*Tam* 2.I.iv.11), his answer is decisive and direct:

When heaven shall cease to move on both the poles,
And when the ground, whereon my soldiers march,
Shall rise aloft and touch the horned moon,
And not before, my sweet Zenocrate (*Tam* 2.I.iv.13-6).

The ambition to conquer whatever is on his path to his becoming the Emperor of the world is the purpose of his being on earth, and he is determined never to stop his bloodshed. Therefore, not even the pleas of his wife, whom he relishes above his crown are effective in stopping his expansion:

Zenocrate: Yet would you have some pity for my sake,
(...)
Tamburlaine: Not for the world, Zenocrate, if I have
sworn (*Tam* 1.IV.iii.123-25).

Furthermore, his self-determination, self-confidence and high self-esteem are the key points that lead him to glory.

Tamburlaine: Nature, that fram'd us of four elements
Warring within our breasts for regiment,
Doth teach us all to have aspiring minds.
Our souls, whose faculties can comprehend
The wondrous architecture of the world,
And measure every wandering planet's course,
Still climbing after knowledge infinite,
And always moving as the restless spheres,
Wills us to wear ourselves and never rest,
Until we reach the ripest fruit of all,
That perfect bliss and sole felicity,
The sweet fruition of an earthly crown (*Tam* 1.II.vii.18-29).

Tamburlaine believes that it is within the nature of human beings to have “aspiring minds” (*Tam* 1.II.vii.20). He does not fear to listen to the urge in himself to go after what his soul yearns for. For him, the soul does not find

peace until it reaches “the ripest fruit of all” (*Tam* 1.II.vii.27) by which it encounters gratification as soon as the object of need is achieved. In *Tamburlaine*, the hero can reach gratification by power which “is pleasure” (Proser 83). Every individual has different aspirations and for Tamburlaine “the ripest fruit” (*Tam* 1.II.vii.27) is “an earthly crown” (*Tam* 1.II.vii.29); in other words, to get hold of the rule of all kingdoms in the world. By showing his courage in taking the responsibility to respond to the needs of his soul, Tamburlaine becomes the example of a Renaissance individual even at the beginning of the play. Moreover, aspiring to such extremes puts forth the potential of the individual who disregards all limitations as to his self-realisation. According to Braunmuller and Hattaway:

Marlowe’s *Tamburlaine* pursues a career of sustained expansion, enlarging our sense of what it means to be without limits; it is not only that he makes actual what he imagines, but that he dares to imagine on so grand a scale (223).

Portraying such a character in the turbulent era of Renaissance, Marlowe must have given the audience hope to cope with obstacles and provided them with a belief that they could also break free to pursue their goals.

In the pursuit of his aims, Tamburlaine dares to disregard religion, and by stationing himself as high as God on earth, he “suggests a materialist alternative to the transcendental authority” (*Absolute Play* 74).

fates and oracles [of] heaven have sworn
To royalise the deeds of Tamburlaine (*Tam* 1.II.iii.7-8).

I ... am term’d the Scourge and Wrath of God,
The only fear and terror of the world (*Tam* 1.III.iii.44-5).

His self-confidence due to his belief that God is on his side, and that his martial skills surpass those of anybody else, enable him to think that it is his right to voice his pride and arrogance:

Ye petty kings of Turkey, I am come,
 As Hector did into the Grecian camp,
 To overdare the pride of Graecia,
 And set his warlike person to the view
 Of fierce Achilles, rival of his fame.
 I do you honour in the simile;
 For, if I should, as Hector did Achilles,
 (The worthiest knight that ever brandish'd sword,)
 Challenge in combat any of you all,
 I see how fearfully ye would refuse,
 And fly my glove as from a scorpion (*Tam* 2.III.v.64-74).

Tamburlaine is bold enough to look down upon his enemies in his comparison of himself to Hector. He acts sarcastically by comparing the Turkish kings to Achilles. Finally, he is a rude and disrespectful rival in calling his enemies cowards. What's more, he is too proud of his merits and power to accept the death of his wife. In his rage and despair towards death and fate, he challenges them rather than showing respect to divine judgement:

What, is she dead? Techelles, draw thy sword,
 And wound the earth, that it may cleave in twain,
 And we descend into th' infernal vaults,
 To hale the Fatal Sisters by the hair,
 And throw them in the triple moat of hell,
 For taking hence my fair Zenocrate (*Tam* 2.II.iv.96-101).

Not only does he degrade all his adversaries and challenge powers beyond his reach, but he also dares to regard himself as God's equal and challenges religion in order to confirm that no power on earth can surpass his:

In vain, I see, men worship Mahomet.
 My sword hath sent millions of Turks to hell,
 Slew all his priests, his kinsmen, and his friends,
 And yet I live untouch'd by Mahomet.
 (...)
 Now, Mahomet, if thou have any power,
 Come down thyself and work a miracle.
 Thou art not worthy to be worshipped
 That suffers flames of fire to burn the writ
 Wherein the sum of thy religion rests
 Why send'st thou not a furious whirlwind down,

To blow thy Alcoran up to thy throne,
 Where men report thou sitt'st by God himself?
 Or vengeance on the head of Tamburlaine
 That shakes his sword against thy majesty,
 And spurns the abstracts of thy foolish laws? (*Tam* 2.V.i.177-80, 185-95).

Fearless as he is towards powers beyond the battlefield, he does not hesitate to burn the Koran. Besides his lack of respect for religion, his disappointment towards Mahomet, who remains silent to the conquest of Babylon activates his pride, arrogance and wrath which lead to his challenge and humiliation of the prophet and his religion. Greenblatt claims that the intention behind the challenge is actually “to challenge the habit of mind that looks to heaven for rewards and punishments, that imagines human evil as ‘the scourge of God’” (*Absolute Play* 66). Therefore, Tamburlaine is depicted as a Renaissance individual who is not kept back by a groundless fear created by religion, and who can venture to oppose and question divine rules when necessary. Greenblatt states that, “Tamburlaine is proud, arrogant, and blasphemous; he lusts for power, betrays his allies, overthrows legitimate authority, and threatens the gods” (*Absolute Play* 66). In other words, he commits every sin that deserves punishment; however, contrary to what he should get, “he rises to the top of the wheel of fortune and then steadfastly refuses to budge” (*Absolute Play* 66). According to Ribner, the reason why Tamburlaine is not punished in the same manner as Faustus is, is because he “is intended as a conquering hero” (353). Therefore, “all of the signals of the tragic are produced, but the play stubbornly, radically, refuses to become a tragedy” (*Absolute Play* 65).

Just like Faustus, Tamburlaine also feels the urge to “name” (*Absolute Play* 77) himself in order to assert his identity. While he still considers himself to be rising to absolute power, the way to assert his identity is to conquer both the dominions and the souls of his adversaries. His way of conquering a soul means sparing its existence on earth by limiting it to cherish him, which is the case of Theridamas, who abandons Mycetes, and starts to serve Tamburlaine:

If thou wilt stay with me, renowned man,
 And lead thy thousand horse with my conduct,
 Besides thy share of this Egyptian prize,
 Those thousand horse shall sweat with martial spoil
 Of conquer'd kingdoms and of cities sack'd.
 (...)

Both we will reign as consuls of the earth,
 And mighty kings shall be our senators.
 (...)

And when my name and honour will be spread
 (...)

Then shalt thou be competitor with me,
 And sit with Tamburlaine in all his majesty (*Tam* 1.I.ii.188-92, 197-98,
 205, 208-9).

Theridamas joins Tamburlaine, who keeps his word and crowns him the King of Argier after having conquered it. Bringing Theridamas under his service is a means for Tamburlaine to assert superiority over another skillful warrior like himself and thus to reinforce his identity. Another way of conquering the soul of an adversary means mentally destroying its owner. In the first part of the play, Tamburlaine diminishes the position of Bajazeth from that of an Emperor to that of a deprived animal. Bajazeth is put in a cage and fed with the remains of other people's meals. Similar to Bajazeth, in the second part of the play the states of the kings of Trebizon and Soria are reduced to those of the slaves who draw Tamburlaine's chariot. All ex-emperors die in miserable conditions, and their degradation asserts Tamburlaine's identity more firmly. As Tamburlaine's aspiration is to be the only ruler of all kingdoms in the world, he needs to destroy all other kings in order not to share the power of the throne with them. Only in this way can he ascertain his individuality. Therefore, it is natural and necessary for him to kill and destroy if he wishes to achieve self-realisation because he "can maintain his identity, his sense of masculine power, only by the wholesale destruction of everything and everybody around him" (McAdam 110).

Tamburlaine also names himself by renaming the places that he conquers after himself or Zenocrate:

I will confute those blind geographers
 That make a triple region in the world,

Excluding regions which I mean to trace,
 And with this pen reduce them to a map,
 After my name and thine, Zenocrate (*Tam* 1.IV.iv.81-6).

Therefore, he conquers people as well as places to ensure his self-realisation. A last way he employs to ascertain his individuality is to pass down all his skills to his sons so as to give shape to them as copies of himself. With this aim he does not hesitate to kill his son, Calyphas, for being reluctant to follow in his steps. He cannot forgive Calyphas and let him live because this will mean that he has allowed someone of his own blood to assert a totally contradicting identity to his own. The result of this would be the failure of establishing the kind of name that he wanted for himself. Because Calyphas “cannot contain the state of Tamburlaine” (*Tam* 2.IV.i.122), he should not live to present an image of “folly, sloth, and damned idleness” (*Tam* 2.IV.i.128). In the eyes of Tamburlaine, Calyphas is a “coward villain” and a “traitor to [Tamburlaine’s] name and majesty” (*Tam* 2.IV.i.91-2). Tamburlaine kills Calyphas “because his son does not fulfil his function as an extension of Tamburlaine’s ego” (Trudell 6). Therefore, Tamburlaine’s sons are spared as long as they show similar character traits and combat skills to those of their father. Behind this is Tamburlaine’s irresistible need to assert his individuality. In accordance with his aim, he teaches his two other sons all the skills of combat that he knows, and before his death wishes his name to live on in their behaviour and characters and to pass down to their heirs as well:

But, sons, this subject, not of force enough
 To hold the fiery spirit it contains,
 Must part, imparting into both your breasts;
 My flesh, divided in your precious shapes,
 Shall still retain my spirit, though I die,
 And live in all your seeds immortally (*Tam* 2.V.v.169-75).

Although Tamburlaine does not want to leave the world and boasts that “sickness and death can never conquer [him]” (*Tam* 2.V.ii.220), at the end

of the second part of the play, he lies in his bed too proud to accept that he may be dying after all:

What daring god torments my body thus,
And seeks to conquer mighty Tamburlaine?
Shall sickness prove me now to be a man,
That have been term'd the terror of the world? (*Tam* 2.V.iii.44-7).

Having reached the highest possible level in terms of his desire about absolute power on earth, Tamburlaine regards himself above other men and cannot accept to be simply “a man” (*Tam* 2.V.iii.46). However, when he faces death, he realises that it is a power which he cannot overcome. Thus, he understands that he is nothing more than “a man” (*Tam* 2.V.iii.46). Although this does not satisfy him, he is at the highest level of classification when his achievements are compared to those of other individuals who are far away from self-realisation. Referring to Tamburlaine, Birringer has mentioned that “he rises to total victory at the end of the play – reinforcing his identity as a proud, violent, arrogant, and blasphemous rebel” (236). Nonetheless, Sanders indicates that “although his aspiration is limitless, his ability to obtain fulfilment is shown as being restricted by forces beyond his control” (149). In this sense, Tamburlaine resembles Faustus. It can be argued whether Tamburlaine’s death at the end of the play means that he is punished in the same manner as Faustus is. However, it is for sure that just like Faustus, he is beaten by a more powerful force than himself. Consequently, his self-realisation is limited to the boundaries of the world and to the length of his lifetime. Therefore, time is another factor which is “inimical to ardent ambitions” (Tydeman and Thomas 34). Tamburlaine cannot accept death so easily because there are still places which he wishes to conquer in order to reach his aim of holding the kingship of all places in the world in his hands:

Look here, my boys; see, what a world of ground
Lies westward from the midst of Cancer’s line
Whereas the sun, declining from our sight,
Begins the day with our Antipodes!

And shall I die, and this unconquered?
 (...)

And from th' Antarctic Pole eastward behold
 As much more land, which never was descried,
 Wherein are rocks of pearl that shine as bright
 As all the lamps that beautify the sky!
 And shall I die, and this unconquered?
 Here, lovely boys; what death forbids my life,
 That let your lives command in spite of death (*Tam* 2.V.iii.146-51, 155-61).

His plans of conquest are ruined by his lifespan which has drawn to an end in spite of his eagerness to continue. With that in mind, he advises his sons to follow his footsteps and to carry on with the conquests. According to Helen Gardner "*Tamburlaine Part One* 'glorifies the human will', *Part Two* 'displays its inevitable limits'" (qtd. in Tydeman and Thomas 20). The limitation that time imposes makes the reader "find in Marlowe's plays a powerful feeling that time is something to be resisted and a related fear that fulfillment or fruition is impossible" (*Absolute Play* 64). Tamburlaine finds fulfillment to a degree, but similar to Faustus's case, it is below the degree that he has aimed at. Therefore, he does not reach the top point of his self-realisation. As Tydeman and Thomas point out, the play ends expressing "the infinite aspirations of the human imagination ... as defeated by the material world" (20).

In *The Jew of Malta*, Barabas is not defeated by "the material world" (Tydeman and Thomas 20) but rather by the materialistic world. Conforming to the typical perception of Jews at the time, Marlowe portrays Barabas as a merchant who is too fond of money. Therefore, Barabas's aspiration to earn as much money as possible is clarified at the beginning of the play. Moreover, having acquired a certain amount of wealth means that he is already some steps ahead in terms of his self-realisation. Greenblatt has stated that "Barabas is not primarily a usurer, set off by his hated occupation from the rest of the community, but a great merchant, sending his argosies around the world" (*Absolute Play* 67). Therefore, there is nothing negative in Marlowe's initial depiction of the Jew, except for his greed. However, the play revolves not around the achievements of the Jew in order

to become more prosperous and complete his self-realisation, but around his evil deeds in order to get back his possessions which have unjustly been taken away from him. In this sense, Barabas is actually robbed of his aspiration and is reduced to point zero. Throughout the play he struggles to regain his object of aspiration so as to restart his self-realisation. The intolerable feeling of having to abandon his purpose of living triggers in him the will to take revenge. This moment of decision is a turning point for Barabas which will enable him to assert his individuality. Eventhough the play centers around “Barabas’s evolution into an incarnation of the more spectacular aspects of evil” (Goldberg 241), he is nonetheless a Renaissance figure who determinedly pursues his goal. However, it should be made clear that self-realisation is not possible for Barabas because the play is based on a never ending quest for the object that would enable self-realisation. Therefore, despite the fact that “most dramatic characters ... accumulate identity in the course of their play; Barabas loses it. He is never a gain as distinct and unique an individual as he is in the first moments” (*Anti-Semitism* 301). As Barabas’s actions are progressions of his desire to get his money back, his character is transformed by his determination, and his individuality is shaped in accordance with his requirements to reach his aim.

In order to avoid the unfairness of the governor of Malta, Ferneze, Barabas tries appealing to his conscience. He questions Ferneze and his men with regard to their religion and tries to make them feel remorse for the injustice they decided to do. He attempts to remind them that they are men of faith and, in this way, hopes to change their minds:

Will you, then, steal my goods?
Is theft the ground of your religion? (I.ii.98-9).

However, they are not moved by the fear of committing a sin in spite of their belief in Christianity. On the contrary, Ferneze and his men act as if Barabas was guilty of his present condition. In fact, “Barabas is not responsible for the communal peril he is called upon to dispell” (Goldberg

234). However, Ferneze and his men pressurize him into believing in his sinfulness in order to supply the money they need:

If your first curse fall heavy on thy head,
And make thee poor and scorn'd of all the world,
'Tis not our fault, but thy inherent sin (I.ii.111-3).

As soon as Barabas understands that his efforts are in vain, he decides to avenge himself on Ferneze, who actually abuses his position as governor to straighten out his failure on international politics. Ferneze's solution is to supply the money that he owes to the Ottomans from the Jews on the island instead of dividing every Maltese an equal share in the payment of the money. Therefore, Barabas "suffers because of the political dereliction of the ruling class of Malta" (Goldberg 234). He believes that it is unjust to force only the Jews to provide the money, and realises that his Jewishness has provided Ferneze with a pretext. It is the despair that Barabas feels in realising Ferneze's hypocrisy that makes him take revenge. What triggers his hatred is "the disparity between the profession of Christianity and the practice of Christians" (Harbage 49). Hence, he revolts not only against Ferneze's identity but also against Ferneze's understanding of Christianity. He calls out to fate in his devastation:

My gold, my gold, and all my wealth is gone!
You partial heavens, have I deserved this plague?
What, will you thus oppose me, luckless stars,
To take me desperate in my poverty?
And, knowing me impatient in distress,
Think me so mad as I will hang myself,
That I may vanish o'er the earth in air,
And leave no memory that e'er I was? (I.ii.264-71)

Barabas puts the blame of his misfortunate state on his fate because he has no one to show him compassion. He is the only Jew who does not accept passivity; the others comply with Ferneze's decision because they fear a worse mischance. However, Barabas is too "self-protective" (Proser 117) to accept passivity. What's more, he is an aspiring individual with an urge to

feel his existence and not a forlorn soul given to religion. Therefore, he lapses into grievance and supposes that his existence on earth is unimportant, and that as a Jew it would even be better if he were dead. The reason why he falls into seeing himself as someone unwanted is because he realises that the majority have no respect for his religion. Moreover, they can be so insensitive and indiscreet when their benefits are at stake. Nevertheless, Barabas's pessimism does not lead him to shut himself out of social life. He resolves to take action in order to get back his possessions:

No, I will live! Nor loathe I this my life:
And since you leave me in the ocean thus
To sink or swim, and put me to my shifts,
I'll rouse my senses, and awake myself (I.ii.272-75).

When he rejects passivity and decides to "awake himself" (I.ii.275), he awakes his self-determination as well. However, in *The Jew of Malta*, self-determination serves merely malicious ends as opposed to the two plays that have previously been analysed in this chapter. At the bottom of Barabas's self-determination lies the hunger to take revenge; therefore, it leads to the exposition of evil character traits.

Moreover, exercising evil is the result of Barabas's need to *rename* himself in a society where he has been robbed of his identity. Therefore, his malice gives shape to an alternative identity which acts as a protection against another possible hypocritical threat. From this moment onwards, Barabas is seen in the act of committing evil deeds. He states that Ferneze's "extreme right does [him] exceeding wrong" (I.ii.157) and wills to cause him the same amount of suffering. Consequently, he has Ferneze's son killed by his friend. However, this does not satisfy him. He constantly causes trouble to add to Ferneze's grief:

As for myself, I walk abroad a-nights,
And kill sick people groaning under walls.
Sometimes I go about and poison wells;
And now and then, to cherish Christian thieves,
I am content to lose some of my crowns (II.iii.179-83).

Barabas acts as the “polluting element” (Goldberg 234) throughout Malta in order to make sure that Ferneze does not lead a peaceful rule. Moreover, he punishes the Maltese for not having supported him against the injustice of the governor. In this sense, the more he exercises cruelty, the more he asserts his individuality. Berek says, “the Jew who insists on preserving at all cost his identity as a Jew, does so by transforming identity into a succession of useful fictions” (134). Definitely, Barabas “transforms” into “fictions” but not all of them prove “useful” (134). The trick he plays on Ferneze’s son and his friend by which they kill each other leads to his losing his daughter. Then, every action he takes brings him closer to his destruction at the end of the play. Nonetheless, because Barabas’s identity is “transformed” based on “fictions” (134), it is fake and consciously constructed in order to avoid another injustice and degradation. Consequently, “his characteristic response to the world, and his self-presentation are very largely constructed out of the materials of the dominant Christian culture” (*Anti-Semitism* 300). He creates an identity in accordance with the requirements of the society in which he lives and by so doing he wishes to assert his individuality. However, without knowing, his actions lead him to form and present the type of character that the Christian society would expect of him. “He plots, plans, connives, disguises himself” (Proser 118), as a result of which he turns into an unwanted evil figure who is driven into an “alien status” (Proser 124) by the Maltese society. Therefore, although he does not refrain from the society, the society refrains from him because of the destruction he causes. At this point, he starts losing everybody around him. As it is necessary for a person who wants to assert his individuality to have people around him, Barabas cannot accept to be left alone. Therefore, he clings to his servant Ithamore, who is the only trustable and intimate person left with him after his daughter’s decision to convert to Christianity. For, he can only feel like an individual by his interaction with Ithamore, who will “do anything for [Barabas’s] sweet sake” (III.iv.41). After he has been betrayed by Ithamore and thrown out of the city’s walls

for having caused Lodowick's death, he helps Calymath and his men to seize the city. As a result, Calymath makes him the new governor of Malta. In his last attempt to restore his identity, he offers to help Ferneze get rid of the Ottomans on the island. He is clever enough to know that his governorship has no meaning in a city where he is hated. Therefore, he bargains with Ferneze for his wealth and social status in return of Ferneze's post as the governor:

Barabas: Governor, I enlarge thee. Live with me;
 Go walk about the city, see thy friends.
 Tush, send not letters to 'em; go thy self,
 And let me see what money thou canst make.
 Here is my hand that I'll set Malta free .

Ferneze: Here is my hand; believe me, Barabas,... (V.ii.91-5, 103).

However, trusting Ferneze leads to his downfall, and he boils in the cauldron that he had prepared for Calymath. The moment that he believes he has both Calymath and Ferneze in his hands is when he reaches the final point of self-destruction. Proser has suggested that "Barabas carries the seeds of his own destruction in him; but they were planted by society" (112). Clearly, Barabas should have known that trusting Ferneze would be a mistake. He should not have believed in the word of someone whose son he had killed. However, the murder he planned was to take his revenge on Ferneze, who had robbed him of his money. Therefore, the results of Barabas's actions do lead him to destruction, but the causes of those actions are rooted in the injustice of the society. Moreover, "destructive energies are ... tied into the way society deploys them in its hierarchies, stratifications, and distributions of power" (Proser 112). Therefore, as the person who held the greatest power in his hands, Ferneze did not hesitate to cause the destruction of a single individual. Barabas refused to be destroyed, but the evil that he was forced to exercise led him to his self-destruction. In other words, far from being able to assert his individualism he was "de-individualized" (*Absolute Play* 71) because of his exclusion from society.

All in all, it can be concluded that Barabas's evil actions stem from the necessity to stand up against injustice and in this way to resist passivity. The more he does evil to assert his identity, the more he fails to realise his individuality. Moreover, the type of individual he creates is one that would not be affected by the evil of the others. Therefore, it is a protected identity which prevents threats to get to the core identity. In this sense, among the three Machiavellian characters studied in this chapter, Barabas is the least fortunate in achieving individuality. Contrary to him, Tamburlaine and Faustus come closer to reaching their aims and even if they do not realise themselves fully, they have the chance to reveal their true identities. In *The Jew of Malta*, the achievement towards self-realisation is cut short because the individual belongs to the minority, and he is not even given the chance to be slightly successful.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

This thesis has analysed Christopher's Marlowe's plays *The Jew of Malta*, *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus* and *Tamburlaine, Parts 1 and 2* in terms of the Machiavellian concepts of cunning, cruelty and opportunism that the characters embody as well as their self-determination to assert their individuality. As a result, the thesis has aimed to conclude to what extent the characters that were dealt with are the examples of the Renaissance individual in terms of the above mentioned traits.

In Renaissance, man was for the first time more important than any other subject. Man and the world within and around him had become the center of interest and attention. Marlowe's plays focused on the human, his environment and himself. His passions, his thoughts, his fury, his fear, shortly, 'he' was in the foreground. Displaying characters who revealed conflicting emotions as to their desires and ethical or religious concerns, Marlowe must have influenced people because he offered them a world where it was at least possible to pursue worldly needs instead of showing a total devotion to the otherworld while still alive.

Having the individual as the focal point of attention, Chapter 2 has been devoted to the Machiavellian concepts of cunning, cruelty and opportunism. It is necessary to acknowledge that in order to bring solidarity to his country, Machiavelli was undermining ethics in his book, *The Prince*. Therefore, his ideas served to shatter the religious frame in which people were expected to be devoted individuals whose only purpose in the world was to make sure that their good deeds secured a comfortable place for them in the after life. With its emphasis on hyposricy and self-interest, Machiavelli's book was a deviation from the common characteristics that religious morality wanted to implement. It must have been very striking for people to realise that such a deviation was considered to be the only way to bring peace and uniformity to the country. In other words, Machiavelli was legalising the practice of immorality as long as it resulted in an elevated

cause. Such ideas must have provided a new perspective for Renaissance individuals. They no longer had to hesitate in showing immoral behaviour if it was for their own good. Machiavelli's logic was probably a popular topic at the time, so that Marlowe made it a subject for his plays. In the second chapter of this thesis, two characters have been chosen from each play, and their Machiavellian traits of cunning, cruelty and opportunism have been analysed. It has been seen that Marlowe has given shape to two major characters who can be considered exact onstage representations of the type of leader that Machiavelli wanted to create. These characters are namely Tamburlaine and Ferneze. Both are political figures who use their power for their own benefits and eagerly manipulate their subjects according to their own wills. At the end of *The Jew of Malta*, Ferneze regains control of his country; therefore, employing Machiavellian means leads him to glory. Similarly, at the end of *Tamburlaine, Part 2*, Tamburlaine leaves the biggest kingdom on earth to his sons, and dies. Thus, his Machiavellian traits result in a lift of his status from that of a shepherd to that of an emperor. On the other hand, Marlowe seems to have created Barabas in order to show how people without honorable intentions can encounter misfortune. Revealing his Machiavellian character openly, and eliminating everyone around him simply because of his personal hatred, causes the destruction of Barabas. As opposed to Tamburlaine, Calymath does not prove to be such a clever Machiavellian figure. Because he falters in realising that he is not the only political figure with intentions of conquest, he fails when he is confronted by Tamburlaine. Faustus's failure to beat God shows that Marlowe did not attribute higher status to Machiavelli's ideas when religion was in question. Therefore, no matter how cleverly Faustus employs Machiavellian traits, he cannot surpass religious restrictions. Moreover, Mephostophilis's success in sending Faustus's soul to hell as a result of his cunning and opportunism, could stand for Marlowe's association of Machiavellian characteristics with devilish properties. Eventually, the chapter has concluded stating that all the six characters that have been subjected to analysis embody the concepts of

cunning, cruelty and opportunism. However, when a comparison is made between the two characters in a play, one of the characters proves to be more Machiavellian than the other. In this sense, the character who is more cunning, cruel and opportunistic is more successful in reaching his aim, and the weaker Machiavellian is beaten when confronted by the other.

Chapter 3 has focused on the analysis of self-determination and individualism that the major characters of the plays display. In this sense, each character has been taken up starting from their moments of decision when they resolve to oppose a limiting force in order to reach their aims. Afterwards, scenes relevant to the concepts have been analysed in order to prove whether these characters could keep up with the self-determination that they show at the beginnings of the plays, and whether they achieve individuality or not. It was proved in Chapter 2 that Barabas, Tamburlaine and Faustus are, in one way or another, Machiavellian figures. Therefore, they easily oppose the force that they consider a hindrance to their individualism. Denying ethics does not weigh on their conscience because they give utmost importance to their aims. However, they are not given the chance to go as far as denying the authority of religion. Therefore, no matter how confident Tamburlaine is in believing himself to be as powerful as God on earth, his achievements inescapably come to an end when his time of death approaches. Similarly, when it is his hour of doom, Faustus's certainty that black magic will make him more powerful than God proves wrong. By doing every wicked deed to avenge himself of all Christians, Barabas actually ends up sinning against Christianity and defiling his Jewishness. Consequently, none of the characters escape punishment. Tamburlaine dies when his lifespan comes to an end, Faustus is taken to Hell at the end of his extra twenty four years on earth, and Barabas burns in the cauldron he had prepared for the Turkish prince. On the whole, Chapter 3 has concluded asserting that all of the characters have decisive moments in which they own the responsibility of their worldly existence. Nevertheless, their self-realisation is restricted by forces more powerful than themselves, as a result

of which none of them reach the highest possible level of asserting their individuality. In this sense, Marlowe does not endow his characters with limitless freedom as opponents of religion. In the plays, he makes a distinction between the way religion is practised and the concept of religion itself. Although he allows his characters to reveal the religious corruption, he does not allow them to defy religion. Therefore, individuals are given the right to criticise social, political or religious institutions; however, they need to know where to stop and respect the authority of such institutions. Shortly, Marlowe portrays characters who show progress in terms of individual achievement and worldliness; yet, who fail as challengers of the holy order.

On the whole, the conclusions reached in each chapter have emphasized the aim of the thesis which was to reveal to what extent the Marlovian characters that have been analysed come closer to being Renaissance individuals. As they all embody the concepts of cunning, cruelty and opportunism, and as they show self-determination in order to assert their individuality rather than accepting the oblivion of corrupt religious influences, they can be considered as revealing certain traits of a Renaissance individual through Marlowe's verse.

WORKS CITED

- Abrams, M. H. gen.ed. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature* 1. London:W.W.Norton Company, 1986.
- Bartels, Emily C. "The Double Vision of the East: Imperialist Self-Construction in Marlowe's *Tamburlaine Part One*." *Renaissance Drama* n.s. 23 (1992): 3-24. <<http://www.jstor.org>> (May 19, 2007).
- Babb, Howard S. "Policy in Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta*." *ELH* 24.1. (1957): 85-94. <<http://www.jstor.org>> (May 19, 2007).
- Berek, Peter. "The Jew as Renaissance Man." *Renaissance Quarterly* 51 (1998): 128-162. <<http://www.jstor.org>> (February 1, 2007).
- Birringer, Johannes H. "Marlowe's Violent Stage: "Mirrors" of Honor in *Tamburlaine*." *ELH* 51.2 (1984): 219-239. <<http://www.jstor.org>> (May 19, 2007).
- Braunmuller, A. R., and Michael Hattaway, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.
- Clare, Janet. "Marlowe's Theatre of Cruelty." *Constructing Christopher Marlowe*. Ed. J. A. Downie and J. T. Parnell. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.
- Cunningham, Karen. "Renaissance Execution and Marlovian Elocution: The Drama Of Death." *PMLA* 105.2 (1990): 209-222. <<http://www.jstor.org>> (May 19, 2007).
- Duane, Carol Leventen. "Marlowe's Mixed Messages: A Model for Shakespeare?" *Medieval and Renaissance Drama In England III*. Ed. Barroll Leeds. New York: AMS Press, 1986.
- Ellis-Fermor, Una M. "Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*." *Christopher Marlowe's Tamburlaine Part One Part Two*. Ed. Irving Ribner. Indianapolis: Odyssey Pres, 1974.
- Goldberg, Dena. "Sacrifice in Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta*." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 32.2 (1992): 233-245. <<http://www.jstor.org>> (February 1,2007).

- Greenblatt, Stephen. "Marlowe and the Will to Absolute Play." *New Historicism and Renaissance Drama*. Ed. Richard Wilson. London: Longman, 1992.
- _____. "Marlowe, Marx, and Anti-Semitism." *Critical Inquiry* 5.2 (1978): 297-307. <<http://www.jstor.org>> (February 1, 2007).
- Günsberg, Maggie. "The end justifies the means: end-orientation and the discourses of power." *Niccolò Machiavelli's The Prince New interdisciplinary essays*. Ed. Martin Coyle. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1995.
- Hamlin, William M. "Casting Doubt in Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 41.2 (2001): 257. available at <<http://ywes.oxfordjournals.org>>
- Harbage, Alfred. "Innocent Barabas." *The Tulane Drama Review* 8.4 (1964): 47-58. <<http://www.jstor.org>> (February 1, 2007).
- Hilton, Della. *Second Unto None Marlowe and Early Drama*. USA: Durham Academic Press, 1997.
- Hiscock, Andrew. "Enclosing 'Infinite Riches in a Little Room': The Question of Cultural Marginality in Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta*." *Modern Language Studies* 35.1 (1999): 1-22. <<http://www.jstor.org>> (May 19, 2007).
- Hopkins, Lisa. *Christopher Marlowe A Literary Life*. New York: Palgrave, 1997.
- Hutchings, Mark. "'And Almost to the Very Walles of Rome': 2 *Tam*, II.i.9." *Notes and Queries* (2005): 190-192. <<http://www.jstor.org>> (May 19, 2007).
- Ide, Arata. "The Jew of Malta and the diabolic power of theatrics in the 1580s." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 46.2 (2006): 257-280.
- Knoll, Robert E. "Christopher Marlowe." *Twayne's English Authors Series*. New York: G.K. Hall & Co., 1969.
- Kocis, Robert A. *Machiavelli Redeemed Retrieving Humanist Perspectives on Equality, Power, and Glory*. London: Associated Presses, 1998.
- Marlowe, Christopher. *Christopher Marlowe The Complete Plays*. Ed. J. B. Steane. England: Penguin Books, 1984 ed.

- III Matalene, H. W. "Marlowe's Faustus and the Comforts of Academicism." *ELH* 39.4 (1972): 495-519.
<<http://www.jstor.org>> (May 19, 2007).
- McAdam, Ian. *The Irony of Identity: Self and Imagination in the Drama of Christopher Marlowe*. Newark: Delaware UP, 1999.
- Niccolò, Machiavelli. *The Prince*. Trans. George Bull. England: Penguin Books, 1987.
- Nuttall, A. D. *The Alternative Trinity: Gnostic Heresy in Marlowe, Milton and Blake*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Ornstein, Robert. "Marlowe and God: The Tragic Theology of Dr. Faustus." *PMLA* 83.5 (1968): 1378-1385.
<<http://www.jstor.org>> (May 19, 2007).
- Proser, Matthew N. *The Gift of Fire: Aggression and the Plays of Christopher Marlowe*. New York: Peter Lang, 1995.
- Ramsay, Maureen. "Machiavelli's political philosophy in *The Prince*." *Niccolò Machiavelli's The Prince New interdisciplinary essays*. Ed. Martin Coyle. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1995.
- Ribner, Irving. "Marlowe and Machiavelli." *Comparative Literature* 6.4. (1954): 348-356. <<http://www.jstor.org>> (February 1, 2007).
- Rudowski, Victor Anthony. *The Prince: A Historical Critique*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1992.
- Sales, Roger. *Christopher Marlowe*. London: Macmillan, 1991.
- Sanders, Andrew. *The Short Oxford History of English Literature*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000.
- Skinner, Quentin. *Machiavelli*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1981.
- Trudell, Scott. "Critical Essay on *Tamburlaine, The Great*." *Drama for Students* 21 (2005). <<http://www.answers.com>>
- Tydeman, William., and Vivien Thomas. *State of the Art Christopher Marlowe*. Great Britain: The Bristol Press, 1989.

Williams, Carolyn. “‘This Effeminate Brat’: Tamburlaine’s Unmanly Son.” *Medieval And Renaissance Drama in England* 9 (1997): 56–80.

Wilson, Richard. “Marlowe and The New Historicists.” *Constructing Christopher Marlowe*. Ed. J. A. Downie and J. T. Parnell. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.