In my survey of the year’s scholarship on Christopher Marlowe, I found that three trends dominated critical output. First, interest in the representations of physical bodies on the early modern stage were prominent in a number of pieces as scholars considered Marlowe’s decision to elide Timur’s lameness in his Tamburlaine plays, explored amputation in relation to Doctor Faustus, and examined the links between cartography and Marlowe’s fragmented bodies. Second, a significant number of works focused on Marlowe’s engagements with matters of religious faith. Diverse in scope, these pieces looked not only at Marlowe’s religious scepticism, but also at his use of biblical literary styles when creating prayers, and the links between contemporary religious feeling and understandings of race in his plays. Finally, many authors continued to look closely at Marlowe’s sources, suggesting that the playwright relied on a broader range of materials than previously noted by scholars. Marlowe not only relied on translations of historical works into English but read a number of works in other languages. Additionally, in his composition of plays, one author suggests that Marlowe considered the actors performing his plays and shaped the dialogue and action to suit the players. Scholarly studies of Tamburlaine dominated during 2022, although a number of scholars explored Doctor Faustus and Edward II and a few authors conducted multi-text studies.

**Tamburlaine**

The Tamburlaine plays generated a significant number of scholarly works in 2022. Andrew Bozio, in his article “Timur the Lame: Marlowe, Disability, and Form,” explores both the playwright’s descriptions of Tamburlaine and contemporary assessments of Edward Alleyn’s performance of the title character. Bozio notes that while Tamburlaine is based on the historical figure Timur the Lame, who was injured on his right side, Marlowe omits any mention of the character’s physical disability in his play. Marlowe’s choice to elide Tamburlaine’s historical impairment, Bozio argues, stems not from the sources that Marlowe consulted, but instead derives from his “theory of theatrical form.”¹ This theory, Bozio notes,
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allowed Marlowe to structure the play with the actor’s ability to embody the character in mind. In short, Bozio believes that Edward Alleyn’s able body shaped the play and contemporary conceptions of Tamburlaine. Indeed, many sixteenth century accounts of Alleyn’s performance stress his “predatory stride” and rhetorical power.\(^2\) For Bozio, the possibility that Marlowe composed *Tamburlaine* not just as a reflection of historical events but also in response to the performative abilities of the actor, offers scholars a new way to think about early modern plays. Thus, when considering the form of a dramatic work, critics need to examine the ways that performance may have shaped the play’s reception and composition.

In his consideration of the *Tamburlaine* plays, Michael Lind Menna also offers scholars a correction in how they think about authorial intent. Noting a recent return to source study, Menna aims to “articulate a broader theory of influence capable of accommodating many different source-to-play relationships.”\(^3\) To evaluate his theory, Menna turns to the *Tamburlaine* plays and examines Pedro Mexía’s *Silva de varia leccion*, a work frequently mentioned as a source in criticism of the play. Menna notes, though, that some scholars find Mexía’s text a problematic source and believe that Marlowe read an English translation of a French abridgment of Mexía’s narrative. Such an assessment, according to Menna, fails to account for source influence and use in the sixteenth century. Modern scholarship on sources tends to “favor source-to-play relationships,” privilege “linguistic consistency,” and assume that influential sources were typically those with “geographic, temporal, and linguistic proximity” to the writer.\(^4\) Rather than viewing Mexía’s text as the starting point for Marlowe’s readings about Timur, Menna argues for a broader approach to how Marlowe might have encountered and used his source materials. Menna contends that possibly Marlowe read more than one source about Timur and perhaps sources in many different languages. Additionally, Mexía’s work, rather than serving as “a fountainhead of all this content,” was actually based on Italian accounts of Timur that were abridged and reorganized by the Spanish translator.\(^5\) In surveying the section of Tamburlaine that focuses on the colours of his tents and comparing that text to those of Mexía and translations of Mexía’s work, Menna finds that all share similarities and no version clearly stands out as Marlowe’s
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main source. In conclusion, Menna encourages scholars to “consider the entire spectrum of possibilities consistent with what was ‘taken from other texts’.”

In addition to looking at the ways sources and actors influenced Marlowe’s writing, one scholar claims that the printer might have omitted key scenes of the original text of *Tamburlaine Part Two*. Lukas Christian Erne, in a brief piece published in *Note and Queries*, argues that a probable side plot involving Almeda is left out of the play. Noting that Richard Jones’s introduction to the plays suggests an abridgement to Marlowe’s original text and that the first published version includes scenes missing and out of order, Erne interprets the publication as “a seriously truncated text.” Erne also points to the importance placed on Almeda throughout the first three acts, in which Almeda is presented as the object of Tamburlaine’s rage. Indeed, Tamburlaine mentions his desire to punish Almeda for his betrayal multiple times, thereby creating the expectation of a confrontation between the two men. Yet, Almeda disappears after Act 3, scene 5. For Erne, this disappearance differs significantly from other plot strands in which “the violence planned by Tamburlaine is announced and infallibly carried out.” Erne concludes that Jones’s cuts to the work eliminated the end of the Almeda plot strand, thus significantly altering Marlowe’s text.

In her piece, “Against Nostalgia: Looking Forward to the Future in the Queen’s Men’s Plays and Marlowe’s *Tamburlaine*,” Kristine Johanson examines a number of “future-oriented, past-less” history plays performed prior to the staging of Shakespeare’s histories. For Johanson, plays like *Tamburlaine* and the Queen’s Men’s *Selimus* (1594) do not present nostalgic renditions of the past and are unconcerned with “political inheritance.” Instead, these dramatic works looked towards the future and represent the past as undesirable—themes that Johanson interprets as upholding the Elizabethan political agenda by foretelling that the play’s future (or the Elizabethan present) would be a time of progress and peace. Marlowe depicts Tamburlaine, for instance, as “without remorse or memory”; the ruler constantly projects himself into the future via his concern with memorialization. Although Shakespeare developed his style and use of history from earlier historical plays, Johanson argues that he altered the ways that history plays dealt with the past. Shakespeare, she
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contends, rather than focusing on the future, used nostalgic rhetoric to reclaim the past and point towards a future informed by an idealized past.

Jennifer Feather also considers Tambrlaine in her chapter from the edited collection, England’s Asian Renaissance, arguing that the play’s engagements with religious feeling helped audience members understand themselves “as racialized subject[s].” According to Feather, Marlowe’s depictions of Christians and Muslims in terms of their religious sincerity would have disoriented viewers. Religion within the play, she notes, was presented either “as an instrument of strategy to manipulate the superstitious” or as a true identity displayed through emotion. Tamburlaine not only explores religious belief, but the play also explores the links between religious emotion and understandings of race. For Feather, racialization, or the process of categorizing an individual’s race, relies on location—the closer someone is to another person or place the more they will understand their identity as connected to that person and geographic space. Religious affiliation, likewise, functions as a type of racial belonging but can be destabilized when sympathetic feelings bring an individual closer to someone of another ethnicity or religious belief. Moments of possible audience sympathy for characters of a different religion such as the Muslim Orcanes’s belief in Christ’s power and the “shared disgust for perjury” exhibited by both Christians and Muslims could make viewers question their own understandings of race and religion. According to Feather, in Tamburlaine Marlowe offers audience members a chance to think through their own beliefs by creating “shifting sympathies encoded by emotional norms, religious belief, and geographic location.”

Peter Herman’s essay, “The Circulation of Atheism in Early Modern England: Marlowe, Greene, and Shakespeare,” considers how King Lear, Robert Greene’s Selimus, and the Tamburlaine plays engage with early modern concepts of heresy and scepticism about divine providence. Noting that the term atheist “was often used as a synonym for ‘heretic’,” and frequently alluded not to unbelief but to the denial “that the universe is government by moral rules,” Herman argues for a broader understanding of early modern atheism. Use of the term atheism increased towards the end of the sixteenth century,
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reflected contemporary doubts of God’s providence in the wake of crop failures, poverty, starvation, and popular riots. Herman believes that the early modern stage functioned as a site to test the possibility of God’s lack of involvement in human affairs. Tamburlaine, staged during this period, stages characters who question the existence of God, but, according to Herman, the play “is geared more toward the question of providence than God’s non-existence.”\(^{16}\) Thus, in Tamburlaine, the conventional idea that God will punish sin is questioned as characters provide differing opinions about the rise of the titular ruler and the results of battles. Marlowe frames Tamburlaine’s authority, Herman argues, not as just the result of force, but also the will of the people, who “are quite capable of organizing themselves and maintaining order without any divine help or expectation of post-life reward or punishment.”\(^{17}\) Finally, Herman contends that the Tamburlaine plays influenced later works by Greene and Shakespeare, which allowed for the growth of atheistic literature that questioned not only the divine’s intervention in human affairs but ultimately the existence of God as well.

Marlowe’s Tamburlaine plays not only prompted religious scepticism, but they also indirectly influenced modern Arabic screenwriting. In their study comparing Marlowe’s plays and the recent Jordanian television series Rās Ghlais, or “The Head of Ghlais,” Hussein A. Alhawamdeh and Feras M. Alwaraydat found that both works contain similar elements that may find their basis in original Arabic writings about Timur. The series’ screenwriter, Salih, admits that Renaissance drama in general influenced his composition of Rās Ghlais, although he did not directly base his work on Marlowe’s plays. Alhawamdeh and Alwaraydat argue, however, that the television series is “one example of an implicit rendering and indirect appropriation” of the Tamburlaine plays.\(^{18}\) For them, three common attributes link the two works: depicting a shepherd character as a tyrant; including scenes depicting pastoral romance; and showing tribes banding together in an attempt to remove the shepherd despot character. Like Tamburlaine, Ghlais works as a shepherd prior to his decision to form a warrior band, loot other tribes, and degrade his captured enemies. Additionally, as Alhawamdeh and Alwaraydat note, Ghlais, in scenes similar to those of Tamburlaine teaching his sons how to inflict violence, instructs his sons in methods of cruelty. The two works also share parallels in their depictions of pastoral love. Just as Tamburlaine uses
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colourful rhetoric and poetic wording to woo Zenocrate, Ghlais tries to win his beloved, Hamdah, through a “poetic celebration of her beauty.” Finally, both Tamburlaine and Ghlais become threats to the political stability of their regions, leading their enemies to join together to fight these despotic shepherds. For Alhawamdeh and Alwaraydat, the similarities between these two works suggest a shared cultural heritage that is used by both authors to “warn against the colonial and imperial ambitions that lead to divisions and hegemonic control.”

**Edward II**

Sarah Crockarell examines Tamburlaine alongside Edward II, contending that both plays feature characters who exhibit early modern ideas of madness, which lead them to create “worlds full of queer, disordered, radical possibility.” Relying on Jack Halberstam’s theory of wildness, or that which “disorders desire and desires disorder,” Crockarell views both Edward and Tamburlaine as ruled by their desires and argues that both define their masculinity as their ability to control themselves and others. Edward’s desire could be defined as lovesickness, which centres on his erotic passion for Piers Gaveston. However, as Crockarell points out, Edward’s desire is deemed unacceptable not because it is sexual but because he wants to overturn the social hierarchy by placing Gaveston in a position of power. Tamburlaine’s desire, in contrast, centres on his need to control land and violently subjugate its inhabitants. Crockarell defines Tamburlaine as a sodomite as well, applying the term to not only a person with specific sexual proclivities but also to those who “threaten gender, class, religion, or race.” The worlds of both plays highlight the main characters’ fragile masculinity. In Tamburlaine sexually violent rhetoric permeates the text and sets up defeat as emasculation; in Edward II, the king’s lovesickness threatens his masculinity and kingship and ultimately results in his death as a type of rape. Crockarell concludes that the madness Marlowe depicts in these two plays provides audiences with examples of “radically subversive madness” that find power in nonnormative desires.
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In his essay on *Edward II*, Christopher Ivic examines how the play critiques Edward’s style of kinship, arguing that Marlowe’s play “stages a republican drama of a beleaguered political nation.” Although rarely mentioned by critics, commoners populate the play and frequently criticize the king’s authoritarian rule, which Ivic contends offers audiences “a profoundly republican reimagining of the political nation.” Marlowe depicts Edward as caring more for himself than the nation, which reflects the king’s inability to effectively care for his people. The use of the phrase “my country’s case,” provided by multiple characters throughout the play also attests to a collective idea of nationhood, which was gaining traction in Elizabeth’s England. Ivic cites two other aspects of the play as proof of its focus on republicanism—continual references to Gaveston’s foreignness and lack of connection to England and Marlowe’s decision to situate the play not only in England but also in Wales, Ireland, and Scotland. The latter, for Ivic, reflects contemporary events in England rather than historical occurrences. Indeed, discussions of the nation as composed of four distinct places points to sixteenth century attempts to unify Great Britain while Edward’s inability to assert his power over the Scots highlights concerns about James’ succession to the English throne. For Ivic, the play may reflect not just philosophical musings about authoritarian rule; instead, *Edward II*, by highlighting Edward’s relationship with the unworthy Gaveston, foreshadows later fears about James’ style of kingship and his promotion of favourites. In short, Ivic argues that the play endorses a republican and elective monarchy in which the king places the needs of his people above his own desires.

**Doctor Faustus**

The essays on *Doctor Faustus* appearing in 2022, rather than focusing primarily on religious belief and scepticism within the play, tackled other issues, including early modern understandings of dismemberment and twentieth-century performances of the work. Only Nathan Pensky’s article, “Divine Thoughts and the Corruption of the Will in *Doctor Faustus*,” engages with the more traditional critical issue of Marlowe’s theological understanding. Pensky examines Faustus’s claim that “hell is a fable,” questioning why the title character doesn’t believe in hell even when he has just signed his soul over to the devil. Mephistopheles responds to Faustus by explaining that experience will eventually cause
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Faustus to believe in hell. For Pensky, this discussion between the title character and Mephistopheles reflects an early modern theological debate between Ockhamist and Thomist theories about the divine’s relationship with human beings and the role of intellectual thought in salvation. The Thomist theory of Thomas Aquinas, Pensky explains, “conceived of human causality as linked inextricably to the teleological underpinnings of natural law, where mind bends toward the immanent goodness of God.” Ockhamist theory, in contrast, held that humans, rather than being drawn to God, were susceptible to doubt and corruption; for William of Ockham, belief was unconnected to human intellect and experience and could only be obtained through God’s grace.

Throughout the play, Faustus’s thoughts—which are often prompted by the Good and Bad angels—veer between a hope for heaven and forgiveness, a desire for material goods and worldly honor, and a focus on hell. According to Pensky, the Bad Angel and Mephistopheles appeal to Faustus “according to an Ockhamist approach to will, leading Faustus to believe he would become subject to the authoritative will of God,” while the other demons use a Thomist approach, tempting Faustus “into an intellectual state most amenable to hell.”

Mephistopheles, in particular, seems interested in Faustus’ thoughts, believing that what the main character thinks could determine the fate of his eternal soul. Pensky notes that whenever Faustus begins to think on God and repentance, Mephistopheles tries to draw him away from these ideas. The Bad Angel, likewise, continually tells Faustus he is unable to repent, causing Faustus to agree with this assessment and quit thinking about heavenly matters. Therefore, the devils in the play continually uphold the Ockhamist view of the universe, suggesting that faith cannot be gained intellectually, and that Faustus’s thoughts can never draw him back to God. The Good Angel, however, repeatedly advises Faustus to think about God, creation, grace, and repentance. For Pensky, these exhortations of the devils and angels “suggest that the world of the play exists within a universe of Thomist inclination, where intellect figures as the first moment of human action” and faith. Marlowe’s familiarity with these two theological theories, which were common points of debate at Cambridge University during his attendance, Pensky believes, influenced his composition of Doctor Faustus. Ultimately, Faustus’ scepticism about the power of inward thought to produce his salvation or damnation

demonstrates not only his theological dilemma, but also those of many of Marlowe’s original audience members.

In her article, ‘‘It Is No Small Presumption to Dismember the Image of God’’: Early Modern Leg Amputation on the Barber-Surgeon’s Table and the Dramatist’s Page,” Giulia Mari explores limb removal and bodily fragmentation in Doctor Faustus. The amputation of limbs in the early modern period, Mari explains, offered a range of cultural interpretations, including marks of punishment, signs of war-time sacrifice, the ravages of disease, and a loss of spiritual wholeness due to the lack of “corporeal integrity in the afterlife.”31 Expected to display stoicism despite the lack of anaesthetics, patients undergoing amputation were viewed as cowardly if they expressed a fear of physical pain. Faustus, who at the end of the B-text, is dismembered by devils, demonstrates both this dread and the fragile nature of the human body. Yet, as Mari notes, pranks involving limb removal occur earlier in the play and in Marlowe’s primary source, The English Faust Book, a 1592 translation of the German original. In both narratives, Faustus plays a trick on a horse-courser by pretending to remove his leg. Mari interprets this prank as evoking “early modern anxieties of bodily fragmentation” and foreshadowing “the ending of text B . . . where Faustus’ body is completely torn apart by devils.”32 These episodes also point to the ethical issues faced by surgeons when cutting off limbs; not only were surgeons wary of amputating appendages due to the violence and pain of the procedure, but they also feared killing their patients and mutilating the image of God. In the play, Marlowe considers both the physical and spiritual risks of the medical procedure and reminds his audience of these concerns. In the final scene of the B-text, Faustus’ “mangled limbs,” Mari argues “represent the ultimate dismemberment of the image of God, not only a way to reclaim Faustus’s body and soul to Hell, but also a triumph of fragility and fragmentation over integrity, both physical and spiritual.”33

Julie Vatain-Corfdir’s essay on Doctor Faustus focuses more fully on Orson Welles’ 1937 staging of the play than Marlowe’s text(s). In his Federal Theatre Project production, Welles, who played the title role, sought to “rekindle the intense connection between the play and audience that characterized” older theatrical traditions from the early modern period and nineteenth century.34 While Welles avoided making a political statement in his production, he
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The Journal of Marlowe Studies

did make the dramatization of Marlowe’s play inclusive and memorable through its democratic nature as “popular theatre” and its elaborate use of stage magic. In her examination of the performance, Vatain-Corfdir argues that the pull of researching and visualizing past unseen theatrical productions becomes a type of imaginary staging, inviting scholars to conjure the scenes just as Welles attempted to conjure Marlowe’s vision for a modern audience. Welles’ aims for the production involved introducing a classic to a modern audience and making it accessible and enjoyable for all viewers. In order to appeal to elite and popular spectators, Welles used a reorganized and abridged version of Marlowe’s A-text and omitted Latin phrasing throughout, which Vatain-Corfdir notes was “in defiance of more academic approaches.”

To engage his viewers, Welles’s Faustus also featured extravagant costumes, innovative lighting, spectacular illusions, and magic tricks. Additionally, Welles “placed great emphasis on the soundscape” and energy of Faustus, incorporating music, explosions, comic vaudevillian scenes, and a puppet show presentation of the Seven Deadly Sins into his production. The play was a success and ran for four months to packed houses. Vatain-Corfdir, lamenting her inability to watch the 1937 play, notes that the study of past performances like Welles’ Faustus still involve “layers of personal engagement, opinion, and emotion” and often invoke memories of Welles’s other performances and productions of early modern drama.

Marlowe as Playwright: Sources and Influence

Published posthumously, Roy Eriksen’s article, “Marlowe and Prayer: The Forgotten Sources of the Mighty Line,” examines the connections between Marlowe’s poetic and dramatic works and contemporary debates about and understandings of prayer. As Eriksen notes, the sincerity of prayer was a pressing issue in early modern England and one that Marlowe would have encountered during his studies at Cambridge. While not didactic nor meant to instil spiritual serenity, Marlowe’s lines frequently reveal the influence of not only classical works, but also the Hebrew Old Testament, the Sermon on the Mount, and the Lord’s Prayer. Many of Faustus’ prayers and incantations also share formal properties “with scriptural style in general and the Pater Noster and the other New Testament prayers in particular.” Numerous characters in Marlowe’s plays offer prayers, including Faustus, whose final soliloquy echoes
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one of Saint Augustine’s prayers; unable, though, to confess his sins like the saint, Faustus’s prayer fails. Eriksen also lists a number of characters who pray directly to God or offer prayer-like speeches, including one of the Damascus virgins from Tamburlaine Part One, Iarbas from Dido, Queen of Carthage, and Barabas in The Jew of Malta. Eriksen specifically points to Abigail’s confession and conversion in The Jew of Malta as similar to the Old Testament style of antitheses and parallelism. He also argues that Orcanes’s prayer requesting God’s punishment of the Christian traitors in Tamburlaine, Part Two alludes to “orthodox images of God both as an ever-vigilant judge and as a sphere whose circumference is nowhere and whose centre is everywhere.”

Noting that few scholars have focused on “Marlowe’s grounding in biblical style,” Eriksen concludes by suggesting that critics reconsider how the genre of prayer helped shape Marlowe’s poetic verse.

Marlowe’s influence on Shakespeare, an oft discussed theme, is the subject of Ian McAdam’s brief piece in Notes and Queries. McAdam contends that Shakespeare’s Comedy of Errors contains allusions to both Edward II and Doctor Faustus, which are “ultimately relatable to issues of masculine control in post-Reformation culture.”

Edward’s question asked of Matrevis and Gurney before they forcibly shave him and dunk him in channel water—“What, will you murder me?”—is echoed by Antipholus in a comedic scene that ends with Antipholus and Dromio dumping puddle water on Pinch. Additionally, McAdam notes that the phrase “brands of fire,” which is used to describe Antipholus’s removal of Pinch’s beard alludes to the red-hot poker Lightborne used to kill Edward. Additionally, McAdam identifies two allusions to Doctor Faustus: the depiction of Pinch as a scholar and magician who cannot control the devil he conjures and the links between Luce and Faustus’ Helen of Troy. Finally, Antipholus alludes to Gaveston’s description of a masque featuring Acteon in Edward II. This allusion, McAdam notes, positions Antipholus as an effeminate male who, like Gaveston, lacks masculine self-control. In sum, McAdam suggests that Shakespeare’s allusions to Marlowe’s work in The Comedy of Errors explore gender roles and could provide scholars with new critical insights about both works.

Richard Dutton, in a chapter from his study of theatrical licensing and censorship during the early modern era, explores how Edmund Tilney, in his role as Master of the Revels, oversaw Marlowe’s dramatic works. Dutton notes that although scholars have often
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viewed Marlowe as “a counter-cultural hero, and Elizabethan free-thinker” frequently censored for his work, Tilney was actually “permissive” in his dealings with Marlowe.\(^{42}\) The playwright’s works, admittedly, often included dubious elements such as black magic, Machiavellian politics, homosexual desire, and graphic depictions of violence. Yet, as Dutton points out “all of this found its way onto the stage and eventually into print,” leading him to surmise that the Master of Revels rarely objected to plays on the basis of attitudes or opinions.\(^{43}\) One of Marlowe’s plays, however, may have been censored—Doctor Faustus—due to the significant differences in the A- and B-texts. Although Janet Clare believed Tilney suppressed a particular scene dealing with the Pope’s excommunication of a Protestant ruler due to the changes made to the scene in its second and subsequent printings, Dutton disagrees. He instead suggests that the scene in question might have been written later by other playwrights following Marlowe’s death, and questions Tilney’s suppression of part of the work. Dutton also finds unconvincing Roy Eriksen’s suggestion that the B-text was censored due to its political and theological stance and the A-text replaced the work during the end of the 1590s. Dutton contends that more likely the older play stopped generating as much revenue and became less popular due to the retirement of Edward Alleyn. Dutton concludes that the A-text is predominantly Marlowe’s work while the B-text includes additions by William Bird and Samuel Rowley and that “censorship, self-imposed or otherwise, is a convoluted and unnecessary speculation about the relationship between the A- and B-texts.”\(^{44}\) The 1616 B-text of Doctor Faustus, though, does contain marks of censorship, which Dutton argues stemmed from the application of the 1606 Act to Restrain Abuses of Players, which sought to curtail profane uses of God’s name. Tracing the alterations to the B-text, Dutton notes that a number of oaths referencing God, Christ, or the Trinity were removed or rewritten. As these removals are the only evidence of censorship of Marlowe’s plays, Dutton concludes that the playwright’s personal opinions were not of interest to the censors and that the Masters of Revels tended to interpose “in a spirit of trying to make the play acceptable, not to rendering it unplayable.”\(^{45}\)


\(^{44}\) Dutton, “1586–1592: Decrees for Orders in Printing,” 94.

Marlowe, Cartography, and Architecture

Recent scholarship on early modern literature and culture has often turned to the ways that maps, borders like walls and hedges, and the construction of new monuments and public places shaped human understandings of place. Two essays from 2022 consider Marlowe’s work in light of human-made geographies. Lisa Hopkins, in her piece, “Roman Walls in English Renaissance Writing,” examines how walls operated in the early modern imagination. Hadrian’s Wall, for example, inspired a variety of literary depictions including connecting the English to the Picts and providing security from threats beyond the English border. Marlowe, Hopkins argues, represented walls as dangerous. For example, the Persian King Cosroe in Tamburlaine failed to construct walls at strategic places, which allowed his empire to be invaded. Within the same play, the title character uses walls to display dead bodies. Doctor Faustus also contains references to the ruined walls of Trier and to a number of Roman gates, walls, and pyramids. The latter, Hopkins argues, symbolized “the inseparability of Rome’s classical past from its Catholic present,” and served to remind audiences “that not only is Christianity divided, but it is not even the only faith.”

Marlowe, therefore, like many of his contemporaries, viewed Roman walls as places dangerous both because they threatened the individual and because they signified ideologies and theologies at odds with Protestant England.

Klaudia Łączyńska, in her book chapter from the edited collection Literary Invention and the Cartographic Imagination, explores how Marlowe connects cartography and anatomic study within Doctor Faustus and the Tamburlaine plays. With regret, I was unable to read Łączyńska’s piece, although it promises to present scholars with exciting new insights into the ways that Marlowe uses maps to suggest the fragmentation or wholeness of the early modern body. This chapter will be covered more fully in next year’s overview of Marlowe scholarship, which will include discussions of not only a number of articles and book chapters, but also thorough summaries of two new important books—The Revels Plays edition of Dido, Queen of Carthage (edited by Ruth Lunney) and Arata Ide’s Localizing Christopher Marlowe: His Life, Plays and Mythology, 1575–1593.
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