THE TRAGEDY OF THE INDOMITABLE SOUL
IN ENGLISH RENAISSANCE DRAMA
FROM 1587 TO 1633

By

AIKO MATSUMOTO

Bachelor of Arts

Northwestern Oklahoma State University

Alva, Oklahoma

1980

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS
December, 1982

OKLAHOMA STATE
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

THE TRAGEDY OF THE INDOMITABLE SOUL
IN ENGLISH RENAISSANCE DRAMA
FROM 1587 TO 1633

Thesis Approved:

Paul J. Klemp
Thesis Adviser

Janemarie Luecke

David S. Berkeley

Norman N Durham
Dean of Graduate College

1143262

PREFACE

The Renaissance culture believed that man through free will strives for the infinite discerned by divinely given reason or for the finite desired by his bodily senses; in short, he is free to choose and strives for his goal, whatever it may be. This concept is well known, and it is, I think, a significant undercurrent in English Renaissance literature. But to my knowledge few critics have studied this undercurrent or traced its changes while referring to particular works except those of Spenser, Shakespeare, and Milton. My thesis will focus on five early and late Renaissance tragedies.

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. Paul Klemp, my thesis adviser, for his guidance, helpful comments, and patience in preparing this thesis. I am specially indebted to Dr. Berkeley, my former adviser, who has taught me to appreciate Renaissance literature and who has continuously given me encouragement and support during my academic years. I thank Dr. Luecke for her valuable time spent giving me her comments and for her earlier encouragement about my improving my writing skill. I also thank

Mrs. Cynthia McDonald for her typing my final draft. Finally, I am grateful to my parents, Yoshimitsu and Ise Matsumoto, to whom my thesis is dedicated, for their encouragement and continued support of my entire education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

THE TRAGEDY OF THE INDOMITABLE SOUL IN ENGLISH RENAISSANCE DRAMA FROM 1587 TO 1633. 1

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 57

The revival of the classics, particularly those of Neoplatonism, changed the Renaissance man's view of himself and the world around him: the Neoplatonic approach to holiness of spirit through matter "enabled man to take a legitimate delight in the world and the flesh" while he still conformed to Christian teaching.[1] Inevitably, such a liberation prompted the development of the secular arts. To the man of the Renaissance, his love of nature's beauty became a necessary step in perceiving an ideal beauty in the realm of spiritual perfection. In literature the traditional allegorical conception of art gave way to a more imaginative one; the medieval theological didacticism, in the exemplum and the morality, was replaced by delightful teaching through more sensuous poetry and drama.

The unprecedented development in the English literature of the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods was made possible by rigorous experiments by writers who were stimulated by these Renaissance critical attitudes and conceptions. For them, literature, in short, was a renewed medium to reach the ultimate truth, which man had strived to attain. The position of the poet was also elevated, as Philip Sidney, a representative of English Renaissance men, spoke in An Apology for Poetry: "Only the poet . . . doth grow in effect another nature, forms such as never were in nature."[2] In other words, by showing another nature ("the golden world") which is beyond nature ("the brazen world") the poet enables man to "lift up the mind from the dungeon of the body to the enjoying his own divine essence."[3]

Although dramatists were not regarded as highly as poets at that time, some dramatists seemed to share the poet's mission. Otherwise there would not have been such a remarkable development, from crude moralities and rather awkward imitations of Italian dramas to much more refined ones, in such a short period. Drama also became a means to glimpse the universal truth when the dramatist used the faculty of imagination, which only when controlled by reason could be "like a mirror to give a true reflection of externals."[4] The role of the dramatist was then to represent a microcosm of life and give a true reflection of reality. A young ambitious dramatist, Christopher Marlowe expressed such a new awareness of the dramatist in the prologue of Part I of Tamburlaine:

> From jigging veins of rhyming mother wits,
> And such conceits as clownage keeps in pay,
> We'll led you to the stately tent of war,
> Where you shall hear the Scythian Tamburlaine

> Threatening the world with high astounding terms,
> And scourging kingdoms with his conquering sword.
> View but his picture in this tragic glass,
> And then applaud his fortunes as you please.[5]

Probably, the most significant, lasting Renaissance influence on English dramatists of this time is the idea of man, especially the greatness of man. Most early English Renaissance dramatists imitated dramatic techniques of Italian dramas: some typical ones may be, for example, Sackville and Norton's Gorboduc, Kyd's The Spanish Tragedy and Shakespeare's Titus Andronicus. As they matured, however, they abandoned mere imitation and set up their own style, which retained some of their unique native tradition, such as their preference for spectacular elements. But they did seem to retain the Renaissance belief in the greatness of man at least until the beginning of the seventeenth century.

The Renaissance man believed that man was the glory of the universe and that the universe was the manifestation of God, which derived from both humanistic pagan antiquity and rational theology of the late Middle Ages. Renaissance humanism added a dynamic aspect to the medieval rational but rather static view of man: not only is man given a special position--only beneath angels and God--in the universe, but he is free to ordain his own limits; he does not have to obey God's law.[6] A learned scholar in fifteenth-century

Italy, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, asserted such a new conception:

> He [God] therefore took man as a creature of indeterminate nature and, assigning him a place in the middle of the world, addressed him thus: ". . .The nature of all other beings is limited and constrained within the bounds of laws prescribed by Us. Thou, constrained by no limits, in accordance with thine own free will. . . shalt ordain for thyself the limits of thy nature. . . thou mayest fashion thyself in whatever shape thou shalt prefer. Thou shalt have the power to degenerate into the lower forms of life, which are brutish. Thou shalt have the power, out of thy soul's judgment, to be reborn into the higher forms, which are divine."[7]

This conception of man's freedom and infinite possibility, of man's greatness, is the very force of the Renaissance which enabled man to explore and enlarge his knowledge of himself and the world, and it seems to have persisted, regardless of the increasingly pessimistic views of life during the Stuarts' reigns, in the mind of the late Renaissance man.

The Renaissance man is said to have had "a sense of security, the felt existence of order, pattern, and sequence," a philosophy of order, which was based on the syncretism of the two great traditions of paganism and Christianity.[8] And "to aspire to change the pattern, to question the equilibrium of nature, or even to rise in the world" was considered sinful, and the sinner was believed to be justly "tortured by his own remorseful passions" or "punished by tyrants" (scourges of God).[9] But the principle of order was soon threatened when the Copernican theory shook the Ptolemaic orthodoxy, "when the king lost his throne and the peasant tired of his hut"[10] and when "such diverse explorers as Vesalius and Machiavelli inaugurated behavioristic views of man."[11] Although Renaissance men tried to compromise somehow--for example, the rise of capitalism and Protestantism came to rationalize the rise of a common man in the society as religious rather than ambitious--such sceptical, naturalistic views were gradually overwhelming the traditional Christian humanism, completely stripping man of the sense of dignity in the seventeenth century.[12]

English tragedy of this period reflects its time. The early dramatist Marlowe first set out the tragedy of an extraordinary individual, intensifying and secularizing the concept expressed by Pico. However, even with the opportunities and relatively optimistic atmosphere of his time, Marlowe seems to be aware of man's ultimate limitation; even more aware are later dramatists, such as Webster and Ford. In Webster's _The Duchess of Malfi_ and Ford's _'Tis Pity She's a Whore_, the protagonists live in much more chaotic and limited worlds than those of Marlowe's protagonists in Parts

I and II of _Tamburlaine_ and in _Doctor Faustus_: Tamburlaine, who self-consciously tries to be a conqueror of the world, or even the whole universe, controls the fate of others, whereas the Duchess, who tries to be a ruler of only a small realm, Malfi, is unaware that she is actually manipulated by others; Faustus, an extraordinarily learned scholar, is damned as the result of his enormous passion for forbidden knowledge, whereas Giovanni, a mere stripling, inexperienced scholar, is killed as the result of an ignoble, incestuous love affair. In all these works, nonetheless, persists the undercurrent of the dignity of man, though with considerably different tones, and these dramatists, even in their increasingly poignant atmosphere, assert the indomitable soul of man: no matter what man does or becomes, he is still limited by the worlds he lives in, but if he lives to the utmost of his will, whatever the end might be, there seems to remain at least a sense of sublimity. This thesis will focus on the five early and late English Renaissance tragedies, _Tamburlaine_, _Part I_ and _Part II_, _Doctor Faustus_, _The Duchess of Malfi_, and _'Tis Pity She's a Whore_, and examine the dramatists' treatments of the theme of the indomitable soul of man through their protagonists, tracing changes in their attitudes and scope.

The nature of Marlowe's Tamburlaine--once stereotyped as a shocking but rather flat, bombastic hero--has never been examined so vigorously as in recent years. Some critics regard Tamburlaine as Marlowe's approximation of an "aspiring" Machiavellian hero: according to Irving Ribner, "Tamburlaine is exalted as the man of destiny, the conqueror who, by his own unique abilities, can master fortune long enough to revitalize corrupt government and create empires," but he will be eventually cut off at the height of his glory by Fortune, as Machiavelli explains in *The Prince*, "for as long as he lives he can control Fortune and avoid adversity."[13] However, this approach may not be applicable to Part II of Tamburlaine, where Tamburlaine faces increasing distresses, such as his son's frivolity, his beloved wife's death, and incessant rebellions. Tamburlaine may have some of the burlesque tradition of "Machiavelli" in Elizabethan literature, such as betrayal of Cosroe--who trusts him and appreciates his help--and his ruthless treatment of his victims. However, Tamburlaine also has some heroic qualities, such as valor, sensitivity, and imagination, which are quite distinguishable from Machiavellian traits. Tamburlaine, after all, is quite different from other so-called Machiavellian figures in English Renaissance dramas, such as Kyd's Lorenzo, Shakespeare's Aaron and Iago, and Webster's Bosola, who scheme to do evil deeds without clear motives.

There is another interpretation using Marlowe's contemporary background, which links Tamburlaine with the concept of "fortunati," particularly that of the early sixteenth-century scholar Pontano: according to D. C. Allen, the "fortunati" are fortunate men, who are agitated by a divine power, and they, unlike the virtuous men, do not need a code of conduct for success but need only to follow their impulses for their goals: in short, "they violate all the dictates of reason and prudence, and yet they never fail."[14] Indeed, Tamburlaine is a very lucky man to rise from being a humble shepherd to a "thundering" conqueror without any failure, and his career seems to be destined by heaven as Tamburlaine and his followers frequently refer to his prophesied career: "Nature doth strive with fortune and his stars / To make him [Tamburlaine] famous in an accomplished worth; / And well his merits show him to be made / His fortune's master and the king of men" (Part I:II.i.33-6). But then why did Marlowe afflict Tamburlaine's later life with these distresses and let him die in mental anguish while the original Timur the Lame was said to have died quietly on the expedition to conquer China?

Some critics have turned to the classical and biblical accounts to explore the nature of Tamburlaine, linking him with the concept of the scourge of God, the Herculean myth, and Phaethon. Tamburlaine, who takes the lives of kings and emperors while proclaiming himself as the scourge of God (indeed, the subtitle of The Tamburlaine is The Scourge of God), is traditionally regarded as God's agent to punish the wicked, whose concept derived from present-world punishment of paganism and "Old Testament doctrines regarding God's providential management of history and His certain wrath upon despisers of His law."[15] However, it may be more likely that Marlowe happened to use the well known concept of the scourge of God to let Tamburlaine justify his action in a rather megalomaniac way as a divinely sanctioned destruction of the corrupt world. Also it might be taken into account that Marlowe's classical allusions are sometimes regarded, not as developments of the theme, but only as rhetorical ornaments: Mycetes calls for the martial valor by analogy between Theridamas' expedition and the journey of Paris, although the former results in a peaceful collision and the latter in the terrible wars.[16] Furthermore, Tamburlaine was not originally intended to be defeated, according to Marlowe's prologue in Part II, while the scourge of God was usually destined to be destroyed or defeated after his mission was completed.

Tamburlaine's valor and eloquence of speech are further linked to the Herculean myth: Waith thinks Tamburlaine has "the assurance of a demi-god rather than the piety of a good man," and although he is "not [the] son of a god, his facile references to the gods, sometimes friendly, sometimes hostile, may be interpreted as part of the heroic character of which Hercules is a prototype."[17] Both Tamburlaine and Hercules have great intellect as well as physical strength and receive admiration from their fellow men, but they are also quite different: after all, Tamburlaine is a man, whereas Hercules is a quasi-god, a son of Zeus and human Alcmena, and moreover Tamburlaine desperately tries to avoid his own death, whereas Hercules even welcomes his death, placing himself in flames. And finally the last moment of Tamburlaine's life is closely connected to another classical figure, Phaethon and his fiery chariot: Phaethon's and Tamburlaine's chariot prefigures "the delusion of grandeur," Levin states, "the *hubris* that goes before a meteoric fall."[18] Any triumphant moment, as the Elizabethans were painfully aware, is dazzling but only temporary.

Marlowe probably had these notions and concepts, elaborated by these critics, in mind when he composed the plays, since he was well educated in the classics and theology and moreover of an intellectually vigorous nature. But no matter what particular notion was dominant in his mind, there is no doubt that he was very self-consciously creating a new kind of hero, a new kind of tragedy, as he boasts in the prologue of Part I, where he denounces previous dramatic writing and manifests his new type of hero. He was neither moralizing nor advocating a new radical idea; he was asserting the Renaissance spirit and presenting what a man can do or be when he lives to the utmost of his will. And by using the actual historical figure, Marlowe conveys through his plays the indomitable soul of man with an unusual persuasion. The greater the soul of the protagonist, Marlowe seems to imply, the more terrible the effect of his conflict with an inevitable limitation.

Quite naturally, one may speculate on the coincidence of the ascendancy of Timur in the East and the rise of the Renaissance in the West.[19] The extraordinary life of Timur the Lame itself is a powerful actualization of the Renaissance dream. By disregarding some historical accounts of Timur which are not relevant to his concept of Tamburlaine, Marlowe crystallized the spirit of the Renaissance in the character of Tamburlaine.[20] A famous speech of

Tamburlaine's exactly expresses the spirit:

> Nature that framed 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 sphere,
> 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
> (Part I:II.vii.18-29).

His ever "moving," "climbing," and "aspiring" nature never lets him pause. The plot of Tamburlaine is itself a series of endless battles, and these incessant wars, in fact, are Tamburlaine's psychological reality. His mind never rests until he attains "that perfect bliss," and he has to keep fighting and shedding blood as long as he lives. His passion seems almost monstrous: all the sights of his enemies' corpses are simply "objects fit for Tamburlaine; / Wherein, as in a mirror, may be seen / His honor, that consists in shedding blood, / When men presume to manage arms with him" (Part I:V.i.477-80). His fiery passion consumes not only others, but also himself. In the final moment of his life, Tamburlaine is tormented by his almost uncontrollable passion: his infinite aspiration even compels him to go to the battle while he is almost dying from sickness and makes him utter in anguish on his death bed, "Give me a map; then let me see how much / Is left for me to conquer all the world, / That these, my boys, may finish my wants" (Part II:V.iii.124-26).

Tamburlaine's complete destruction of the world's political order may have repelled the audience of Marlowe's time, for most of the people at that time believed essentially in a definite order and degree of the universe, and moreover such an excessive ambition as Tamburlaine's was deeply felt by the Elizabethans as evil.[21] However, the power radiating from Tamburlaine cannot help but evoke an awesome admiration, if not in the audience, at least in some characters of the play with whom the audience is likely to sympathize. Tamburlaine has a magnetic charm to attract people. All of his followers and friends look up to him as "princely lions" and never fail to be loyal to him (Part I:I.i.52). Theridamas, a renowned captain in the Persian army, even deserts his weak king Mycetes for Tamburlaine. For not only is Tamburlaine endowed with outward qualities but he also possesses such inward qualities as eloquence of speech and sensibility for beauty. A lengthy description of Tamburlaine's appearance indicates his almost superhuman nature:

> Of stature tall, and straightly fashioned,

> Like his desire lift upwards and divine;
> So large of limbs, his joints so strongly knit,
> . . . .
> Pale of complexion, wrought in him with passion,
> Thirsting with sovereignty and love of arms;
> . . . .
> His arms and fingers, long, and snowy
> Betokening valor and excess of strength--
> In every part proportioned like the man
> Should make the world subdued to Tamburlaine
> (Part I:II.i.7-9,19-20,27-30).

Tamburlaine's nature is exactly reflected in his physical appearance. At Marlowe's time people believed that physical appearance mirrors inward quality. Even his enemy, Theridamas, when encountering Tamburlaine, cannot help being attracted to him: "A Scythian shepherd so embellished / With nature's pride and richest furniture! / His looks do menace heaven and dare the gods. / His fiery eyes are fixed upon the earth" (Part I:I.ii.155-58). More irresistable than his looks is his eloquence in speech.

Marlowe accomplished something new in his versification in Tamburlaine, particularly in Tamburlaine's speeches, such as the famous speeches of "Nature compound of four elements" and "What is beauty, saith my suffering." According to T. S. Eliot, Marlowe's versification in these speeches marks "the certain escape of blank verse from the rhymed couplet, and the elegiac or rather pastoral note of Surrey," and sets forth a new kind of blank verse: Marlovian blank verse with the melody of the great master Spenser and with a new driving power, which is reinforced by placing the sentence period against the line period and also by using resonant names and parallel structure.[22] When Tamburlaine persuades Theridamas to join him, he uses his intense yet imaginative language:

> I hold the fates bound fast in iron chains,
> And with my hand turn fortune's wheel about:
> And sooner shall the sun fall from his sphere
> Than Tamburlaine be slain or overcome
> . . . .
> when my name and honor shall be spread
> As far as Boreas claps his brazen wings,
> Or fair Bootes sends his cheerful light
> (Part I:I.ii.174-7,205-7).

And his speech creates such an effect that Theridamas utters, "Not Hermes, prolocutor to the gods, / Could use persuasions more pathetical" (Part I:I.ii.210-11).

Even Zenocrate, who is the only person to be somewhat detached and who plays a chorus-like role in the play, comes to admire and love Tamburlaine. Upon Zenocrate's offer to ransom herself, Tamburlaine delivers another excellent speech:

> Zenocrate, lovelier than the love of Jove,
> Brighter than is the silver Rhodope,
> Fairer than whitest snow on Scythian hills,
> Thy person is more worth to Tamburlaine
> . . . .
> With milk-white harts upon an ivory sled,
> Thou shalt be drawn amidst the frozen pools,
> And scale the icy mountains' lofty tops,

> Which with thy beauty will be soon resolved
> (Part I:I.ii.87-101).

Nobody seems to be able to resist Tamburlaine; Zenocrate, who is already betrothed to the king of Arabia, knows that she cannot refuse him too long: "I must be pleased perforce. Wretched Zenocrate!" (Part I:I.ii. 9-10). And she eventually comes to wish that she "may live and die with Tamburlaine" (Part I:III.ii.24). It must be Tamburlaine's magnetic power from his strength of soul that attracts her to him, for Zenocrate's feelings toward Tamburlaine do not seem to be the same as those of his valiant followers: she cares for valor less than for humanity. She must be deeply moved, not only by his physical strength and valor, but by his worthiness as a man.

Furthermore, those who admire and love Tamburlaine share a basically virtuous nature. Theridamas may not be so wise but has essentially a good nature, which is illustrated by his treatment of the widow Olympia, whose account Marlowe details in the second part. Also, Zenocrate is the only person who expresses pity and remorse for the death of Bajazeth and his wife and fears a possible retribution in Tamburlaine's future, while everyone else is ecstatic about the rising fortunes of Tamburlaine. She is the only one to understand what is happening. On the other hand, those who denounce and hate Tamburlaine seem to deserve their defeats by him: the Persian king Mycetes, a vain ineffective king; his brother Cosroe, an usurper of his own brother's crown; the Turkish emperor Bajazeth, a complete foil to Tamburlaine for his enormous pride without any real ability; and members of a Christian-Moslem league against Tamburlaine, insincere, opportunistic members whose truce is easily broken.

Despite all his outward and inward qualities and the almost superhuman strength of his will and soul, Tamburlaine is still limited by his very human nature. His infinite aspiration has a paradoxical counterpart. For example, his insatiable passion is centered on the acquisition of a crown; he does not care to be a good ruler but only to have the title. For him, to "ride in triumph through Persepolis" means to be a king (Part I:I.iv.54). It seems rather ironic that, while the power of his aspiration is such, the object of his aspiration is so flatly materialistic. But this paradoxical tendency is present from the very beginning of Tamburlaine's career to the very end. Tamburlaine, who enjoys stepping on the emperor of Turkey and torturing him daily, is far from the Tamburlaine who aspires to godhead. Such a trivial cruelty is not the cruelty which may be necessary for a conqueror and which is occasionally exhibited by even Tamburlaine himself; for example, he orders to hang the virgins of Damascus so as to keep his word. Furthermore, while Tamburlaine always regards his life as predestined by the stars and himself as the scourge of God or a demi-god, he often implies that such references to a divinity are empty rhetoric. Tamburlaine is quite earnest and sure when he says, "Jove masked in a shepherd weed, / And by those steps that he hath scaled the heaven / May become immortal like gods" (Part I:I.ii.119-201). But he often seems to consider such a reference as nothing more than rhetoric to him, for he accepts quite naturally such words as "a god is not so glorious as a king" (Part I:I.iv.57) and even comes to scorn gods as his pride grows with his continuous successes:

> Jove, viewing me in arms, looks pale and wan,
> Fearing my power should pull him from this throne.
> Where'er I come the Fatal Sisters sweat,
> And grisly Death, by running to and fro
> To do their careless homage to my sword
> (Part I:V.i.454-58).

Nonetheless, such a paradoxical tendency does not seem to disturb Tamburlaine as much as mortality does.

Tamburlaine's ultimate limitation is an inevitable death. As a mortal, Tamburlaine is destined to die eventually, but because of his nature--his endless aspiration to conquer--he will not accept death and leave some territories still unconquered. This defiance of death may be explained as his inward desire to conquer even death, the most irrevocable human limitation.[23] Tamburlaine occasionally seems to perceive human limitations--probably more and more in his later life, but his nature does not allow him to accept them until his death. Tamburlaine over-indulges himself in his soliloquy, when expressing his real feeling of Zenocrate, who is torn between Tamburlaine and her father, the Soldan of Egypt: Zenocrate's "sorrows lay more siege unto" him and even troubles his "senses with conceit of foil [conception of defeat]" (Part I:V.i.155,158). He even seems to forget himself when he contemplates beauty: "What is beauty, saith my sufferings, then? / . . . From their poet's immortal flowers of poesy, / Wherein, as in a mirror, we perceive / The highest reaches of a human wit. . . Which into words no virtue can digest" (Part I:V.i.160,166-8,173). However, Tamburlaine abruptly warns himself: "But how unseemly is it for my sex, / My discipline of arms and chivalry, / My nature, and the terror of my name / To harbor thoughts effeminate and faint!" (Part I:V.i. 174-77). Moreover, Tamburlaine would reject not only his but also others' human limitations and frailties.

It is totally unacceptable for him to have a petty, cowardly son; hence, he takes the life of his own son. Nor can he face the death of Zenocrate. Her death hits him so hard that in his furious grief he destroys the whole town where she has died. Tamburlaine is unable to comprehend that he will not be perfected in this world, where he, as a man, is limited. Thus, Zenocrate's final plea to her grief-stricken husband is of no avail: "Live still, my lord! Oh, let my sovereign live / And sooner let the fiery element / Dissolve and make your kingdom in the sky, / Than this base earth should shroud your majesty" (Part II:II.iv. 57-60).

Only when he faces his approaching death does Tamburlaine seem to reflect on his ultimate limitation: "What daring god torments my body thus, / And seeks to conquer mighty Tamburlaine? / Shall sickness prove me now to be a man, / That have been termed the terror of the world?" (Part II:V.iii.46-8). But soon he regains his posture, and he is as defiant as ever: "Come, let us march against the power of heaven, / And set black streamers in the firmament, / To signify the slaughter of the gods" (Part II:V.iii.48-50). Tamburlaine still cannot think of his mortality as his limitation as a man; he thinks of his approaching death as the revenge of envious gods, so he tries to fight in equal terms with gods:

> See, where my slave, the ugly monster, Death,
> Shaking and quivering, pale and wan for fear,
> Stands aiming at me with his murdering dart,
> Who flies away at every glance I give,
> And, when I look away, comes stealing on.
> Villain, away, and hie thee to the field!
> (Part II:V.iii.67-72).

Even while he feels that he is dying, he keeps fighting valiantly and wishing to go beyond human boundaries and reach the infinite. Tamburlaine wishes his immortality on his two sons: "My flesh, divided in your precious shapes, / Shall still retain my spirit, though I die, / And live in all your seeds immortally" (Part II:V.iii. 173-5). Even his last words, "For Tamburlaine, the scourge of God, must die," seem to imply that he refuses to be defeated by the ultimate human limitation, mortality, until the very end of his life: he would rather die as a doomed divine agent than a mortal man.

No matter how Marlowe was regarded at his time, I think that he was basically asserting human values but in an extravagant way. No matter how horrible Tamburlaine's deeds are, such an indomitable soul as Tamburlaine's cannot help raising a kind of admiration, or excitement, in one's heart, for such a soul is heaven's "choicest fire" (Part II:V.iii.252). And it is ironic and tragic that Tamburlaine, who is endowed with such a soul and aspiring mind for his infinite possibility, is limited by the earthly nature of man, which he has continually defied.

Marlowe's Faustus is another extravagant example of the Renaissance aspiring hero, whose desire is cosmic in scale. Both Tamburlaine and Faustus aspire for the unattainable: Tamburlaine strives to conquer the whole universe; Faustus longs to gain infinite knowledge. But they are also contrasted with each other: Tamburlaine is straightforward, he associates himself with gods, and most of his major actions take place outdoors; Faustus relies on black magic, he associates himself with demons, and his major actions take place in his study. The gallant tone in the prologues of _Tamburlaine_ disappears in _Doctor Faustus_; instead, there appears a morbid, more subdued tone: Faustus is "swoln with cunning," "falling to a devilish exercise," and he is destined to damnation (prologue, 21,23).

Marlowe's view of man seems to have somewhat darkened by the time of his composition of _Doctor Faustus_, five years after the composition of _Tamburlaine_: hope for human possibility decreased, and now painful despair has set in. While Marlowe seemed to be concerned with what man would and could be in _Tamburlaine_, he seemed to be concerned with what man is in _Doctor Faustus_. Indeed, Faustus is no longer conceived as a superhuman like Tamburlaine, but as only a man with exceptional intellect (in the end, Faustus becomes even subhuman). While Tamburlaine, a heavenly gifted young warrior, essentially tries to achieve his goal by his own power, Faustus, a middle-aged scholar who is impatient with previously acquired knowledge, chooses a deadly shortcut, black art. However despicable and terrible his choice is, Faustus has to and will follow his impulse, for he is a man of insatiable passion. His case is a tragedy of a man who is much more humanized than Tamburlaine but who still holds the same insatiable aspiration.

Although Faustus may appear to be another version of Tamburlaine with a different perspective, he is actually much more like an ordinary man. There is no mysterious account concerning his birth: he was born "of parents base of stock, / In Germany, within a town called Rhodes. / At riper years, to Wittenberg he went, / Whereas his kinsmen chiefly brought him up" (prologue, 11-14). Unlike Tamburlaine, Faustus is simply a common man who has earned his doctorate in theology and excelled in scholasticism. Even his passion for infinite knowledge is no longer as pure as Tamburlaine's. Faustus' passion is mixed with a desire for worldly pleasures. He seems to be attracted to magic not only because he wishes to attain infinite knowledge but because he is charmed by the worldly pleasures it brings, such as women, wealth like that of the king of Spain, and fame, which is beyond that of the Delphic oracle. Tamburlaine has such materialistic traits, but Faustus' desire often seems base, and moreover he sometimes values the worldly pleasures more than his pursuit of infinite knowledge. His speech listing his conditions for selling his soul to Lucifer illustrates this point:

> So he will spare him four-and-twenty years,
> Letting him live in all voluptuousness;
> Having thee ever to attend me,
> To give me whatsoever I shall ask,
> To tell me whatsoever I demand (I.iii.94-8).

Here Faustus demands materials ("give me whatsoever") before demanding knowledge ("tell me whatsoever").

Until the senses totally enclose his intellect, Faustus' preference for sensual pleasures increases after he makes the pact with demons.[24] Faustus' initial dispute over hell and damnation with Mephistophilis is immediately followed by a "wanton and lascivious" demand for a wife (II.i.142). When Faustus cries out for Christ, "my Savior, / Help to save distressed Faustus' soul!" he is soon easily won back by Lucifer and Belzebub's hellish entertainment with the Seven Deadly Sins. Then he gradually degenerates into lower degrees, as Lucifer ironically speaks to him: "And thou shalt turn thyself into what shape thou wilt"

(II.ii.188). And finally Faustus, "in making her [Helen] his paramour," even commits the sin of demoniality, that is, bodily intercourse with demons.[25] Faustus falls into idolatry as he gradually loses his intellect: around the end of his career, he murmurs, "Her lips suck forth my soul: see where it flies!-- / Come, Helen, come give me my soul again. / Here will I dwell, for heaven is in these lips" (V.i.111-3). The man who speaks of Helen, "More lovely than the monarch of the sky / In wanton Arethusa's azured arms; / And none but thou shalt be my paramour!" is a totally different man from the Faustus who in the opening scene questions the merits of all kinds of learning and aspires to attain infinite knowledge (V.i.125-7). This union with Helen signals an upset of the balance which has previously existed between possible salvation and damnation, and Faustus is doomed to damnation.[26]

Nonetheless, Faustus' sensual nature is his weakness; his ultimate limitation is that he, as man, cannot reach infinite knowledge he is so desperately striving to attain, for forbidden knowledge is only revealed at the Last Judgement. Being proud and confident of his intellect and knowledge, Faustus never realizes this. Faustus thinks of the will as the ultimate power within man, but he does not know that "it's a will which at the same time he morbidly suspects to be illusory and governed by something outside itself".[27] Thus, he makes such a decision to rely on an evil power rather than on his own power: "Divinity, adieu! / These metaphysics of magicians / And necromantic books are heavenly" (I.i.49-51). Faustus, being "glutted with a foretaste of what lies ahead" and not knowing his limitation, proceeds to the ominous contract with demons only to be disappointed by "little more than quiddities of Wittenburg."[28]

What Faustus gains from the contract is not what he expects to have. Mephistophilis never clearly answers Faustus' questions concerning cosmic issues. Even when Mephistophilis does answer vaguely, Faustus would not believe what he says: hearing Mephistophilis' words, "But I am an instance to prove the contrary; / For I tell thee I am damned, and now in hell," Faustus replies: "Nay, and this be hell, I'll willingly be damned; / What! sleeping, eating, walking, and disputing!" (II.i.136-9). Faustus listens only to himself. Faustus' further adventures are "less to fulfill his boundless ambition than to palliate his disappointment, to make the most of a bad bargain."[29] Instead of reaching godhead as he initially expects, Faustus gradually degenerates, deluding himself by regarding diabolical power as if it were the supreme power. Absurdities of the fools and clowns in the subplots symbolize the degree of Faustus' fall; his grand speech is quite incongruous with his real state of absurdity. Faustus, who teases the Pope by stealing his wine cup, is as ridiculous as the Pope himself, who is, like Faustus, extremely proud of his power--the Pope brags, "Is not all power on the earth bestowed on us?" (III.ii.152). Faustus, using his magic to tease his enemy by placing horns on him or to cheat a horse-courser and other fools by a horse trick, is as ludicrous as those men, and it shows Faustus' fall to the same level as that of those men.

Even though Faustus chooses Lucifer and hell to attain his goal, a sin which deserves eternal damnation, he still evokes pity for the energy of his soul. Despite Faustus' sin, Marlowe does not seem to condemn him severely. This might be explained by Marlowe's contemporary concept that "rightly to be great and wrongly to be great were awfully and dangerously close"; in other words, his contemporaries were repelled by ambitious men but also fascinated by their desire to "be upwards."[30] Marlowe's ambivalence is a development from the medieval theological didacticism in the morality play, from which Doctor Faustus is derived, and through such an ambivalence Marlowe probably tried to bring out the spirit of the Renaissance, the greatness of man, but with more cynical and ironical tone: while the morality teaches Christian faith and hope, Doctor Faustus--though Marlowe, in fact, conveys the indomitable soul of man through the play--seems to end with man's despair.

Faustus' ignorance of his limitation and consequent reliance on his intellectual power, manifested in his habit of quibbling, are certainly responsible for Faustus' fate, for they let him make the fatal pact and prevent him from repenting. But he can still evoke sympathy for his extraordinary soul. Faustus just cannot be satisfied with already acquired knowledge: "Philosophy is odious and obscure; / Both law and physics are for petty wits; / Divinity is basest of the three, / Unpleasant, harsh, contemptible, and vile" (I.i.107-110). His choice of evil is a natural course left for such an intellectual monster. Furthermore, he is not an absolutely bad man; he still has a conscience. When he deals with the devil, his inward struggle begins; the contention between good and bad angels is a psychological reality of Faustus' inner struggle. He also never does despicable crimes to others; he only seems to enjoy teasing them as if he were playing. He is even more willing to entertain people by his art. And Faustus' such worthy qualities are proved by the Old Man's plea for Faustus' repentance in the very last moment of his life, when his humanity is rapidly diminishing:

> O gentle Faustus, leave this damned art,
> . . . .
> Though thou hast now offended like a man,
> Do not persever in it like a devil,
> Yet, yet thou hast an amiable soul,
> . . . .
> For gentle son, I speak it not in wrath,
> Or envy of thee, but in tender love,
> And pity of thy future misery.
> And so have hope, that this my kind rebuke,
> Checking thy body, may amend thy soul (V.i.39-55).

Although medieval and Renaissance theology states that anyone can repent at any time, Faustus seems to be urged to do so because of his "amiable soul."

Regardless of his worthy quality, however, Faustus will not repent, for he cannot trust anything but his own intellect; consequently, he is damned eternally. Even when he comes close to repenting in the end, it is too late for him. His soul is possessed by a spirit, Helen, and he cannot perceive the imminent damnation. Nor can he cry any more: "On God, whom Faustus hath abjured! on God, whom Faustus hath blasphemed! Oh, God, I would weep! but the devil draws in my tears" (V.i.191-3). Now nothing can save Faustus. The Good Angel finally leaves Faustus: "Hadst thou affected sweet divinity, / Hell, or the devil, had had no power on thee. / . . . hast thou lost: / And now, poor soul, must thy good angel leave thee" (V.i.249-50,254-55).

When left by everyone and every hope, Faustus loses his sanity because of fear; he even begs for Christ, whom he will not accept: Faustus screams painfully, "Oh, I'll leap up to my God!--Who pulls me down?-- / See, see, where Christ's blood streams in the firmament! / One drop would save my soul, half a drop: oh, my Christ!--" (V.i.286-8). Faustus loses the dignity of man completely when he is being dragged into hell. His final struggle to escape from devils is almost bestial; his final words sound pitiful and petty, as if a child is trying to escape his punishment: "I'll burn my books!--Oh, Mephistophilis!" (V.i.331).

Faustus is endowed with a heavenly aspiring nature and its manifestation, his extraordinary intellect; however, he is limited by the fact that he is a man and thus cannot attain infinite knowledge in this world. His ignorance of the limitation and consequent over-reliance on intellect only drive him to his fate. Nevertheless, his strength of soul--to pursue whatever he believes in and dare to pass the boundary of man--makes him a Renaissance hero, although he is much more disgraced than Tamburlaine. After all, not every man has Tamburlaine's superhuman quality, and, if he aspires to godhead like Tamburlaine, he may have to choose an extreme means, as Faustus does.

The high spirit of the Elizabethan period faded as time passed; so did the scope of man's possibility and the Renaissance optimism, the concept of the greatness of man. While Tamburlaine strives to be a conqueror of the whole universe, John Webster's Duchess in *The Duchess of Malfi* is struggling to be a ruler of a small realm. The Duchess is surrounded by more powerful and skillful people and virtually thrown out of her position, whereas Tamburlaine is definitely the most dominant figure in the play. Nevertheless, there still remains a vein of human dignity in the Duchess--such a quality cannot be found after Webster's works and before the closing of the theaters in 1642. There is no significant tragedy after his, except that of John Ford, whose *'Tis Pity She's a Whore* is almost like the end of the tragedy of the indomitable soul initiated by Marlowe.

Concerning the nature of the Duchess, most critics have focused on her guilt or tragic flaw. Some accuse the Duchess of violating her society's code, the idea of order and degree. The Duchess' brothers, Ferdinando and the Cardinal, consider remarriage indecent and warn her not to remarry; however, it is said that "disapproval of widow marriage in the period was by no means unanimous."[31] But "to marry out of one's class," Bradbrook observes, "was definitely wrong, being contrary to the teaching of the Church, and to the whole conception of 'order' and 'degree' which was still so potent a force. To marry secretly and without the advice of kindred was also no light offense, however it may appear today."[32] However, she is also defended by others on various grounds: her genuine desire for love of life cannot be rejected by even Webster's contemporaries; furthermore, Selzer states, she does not seem to "violate degree out of weakness or passion or naivete" but rather tries to "promote in Malfi a new ethic, one rooted in the primacy of worth over degree."[33] Webster, indeed, does not seem to intend a moral lesson through the Duchess' doomed unconventional marriage, for he departs from his source--Painter's translation of Belleforest's tale, which disapproves of the marriage--and even seems to justify the match: Bosola, whom some critics regard as the protagonist of the play, speaks, "Can this ambitious age / Have so much goodness in't as to prefer / A man merely for worth, without these shadows / Of wealth, and painted honors?" (III.ii.277-80).[34] He is rather, I believe, trying to bring home to the audience a fading, nevertheless still persisting, spirit of the Renaissance--the noble strength of the Duchess' soul--in even such a corrupted society as Malfi, where its atmosphere is darkened by suspicion, mistrust, intrigue, and the wickedness of its inhabitants.

Compared with Tamburlaine, the Duchess is not particularly heroic, although she reveals herself as a noble ruler in the end, conveying what a person can become or do as Tamburlaine does throughout his career. While early dramatists gave rather exaggerated speech and acting styles to the stage, later ones used a more restrained and natural tone: Tamburlaine and Faustus can be rather easily understood, but the Duchess is noticeably more subtle.[35] The Duchess, unlike Marlowe's self-conscious heroes, is herself unaware of her inner aspiration to perfect herself as a noble ruler. At the beginning, she prefers her private role as a woman to her public role as a ruler of a state, even though she thinks she is taking care of the state. She is portrayed essentially as a woman whose interests are ordinary; her subject matters and her language are bawdy sometimes, but she has such a frankness, straightforwardness, and above all innocence that they in fact do not sound bawdy at all: "You [Antonio] are a lord of mis-rule (ruling only night)" (III.ii.6); "Alas, what pleasure can two lovers find in sleep?" (III.ii.10): "I'll assure you / You shall get no more children till . . . . " (III.ii.66-7). Also she is quite conscious of her appearance: noticing her hair turning gray, she says, "When I wax gray, I shall have all the court / Powder their hair with arras, to be like me"

(III.ii.59-60). And against Ferdinando, who accuses her of not keeping widowhood, she clearly declares her value, "Why should I, / Of all other princes of the world / Be cased up, like a holy relic? I have youth, / And a little beauty" (III.ii.136-39). In order to secure her happiness, or pleasure, as a woman, the Duchess defiantly ventures into the secret marriage; she ventures into a "wilderness, / Where I [she] shall find nor path, nor friendly clue / To be my guide" (I.i.366-68). Without knowing what she is, she boldly tries to deceive the public, particularly her two brothers, who are more skilled in scheming than she is.

Webster's bird imagery depicts the Duchess' behavior richly; she is a peaceful bird, which dares to contend with other birds of prey, but is soon hunted down and caged up. Against Ferdinando's accusation in her chamber, for instance, the Duchess replies in defiance: "Alas, your shears come untimely now / To clip the bird's wings, that's already flown" (III.ii.86-7). After the banishment, she speaks to Antonio: "The birds, that live i' th' field / On the wild benefit of nature, live / Happier than we; for they may choose their mates, / And carol their sweet pleasures to the spring" (III.v.17-20). Again, being imprisoned, she compares herself to pheasants and quails which are kept alive only to be fatted and eaten and describes her state: "The robin red-breast and nightingale / Never live long in cages" (IV.ii.15-6). The Duchess likens herself to a helpless bird which becomes the prey of her two brothers who are metaphorically predatory birds and beasts. The bird imagery is effective not only to symbolize her passion for pleasure and freedom but also to reinforce her helplessness and innocence, contributing to the conclusion that she is only a woman whose pursuit of a small happiness is cruelly ruined.

The Duchess' very human quality and seemingly helpless and innocent appearance make some critics regard her as a pathetic figure rather than a tragic heroine.[36] But they seem to miss an important point that the Duchess herself is unaware of her potentially great soul and her inner aspiration to be noble. For her potentially noble nature is evident throughout the play, although she does not understand herself at first. The very first repulsion of the Duchess for her two brothers' threats indicates her princely nature, which cannot be controlled unreasonably. Also, she seems to have married Antonio not only for love but also in her defiance of her brothers, for her decision of the marriage takes place immediately after her indignation against the two: "Shall this move me? If all my royal kindred / Lay in my way unto this marriage, / I'd make them my low foot-steps. . . / So I, through frights and threatenings, will assay / This dangerous venture" (I.i.348-55). Her frankness with an air of dignity is also another quality of her noble nature:

> You do tremble.
> Make not your heart so dead a piece of flesh
> To fear, more than to love me. Sir, be confident,
> What distracts you? This is flesh, and blood, sir,
> 'Tis not the figure cut in alabaster
> Kneels at my husband's tomb . . . (I.i.454-59).

Not only does the Duchess herself ask Antonio, her steward, to marry her, but she "put[s] off all vain ceremony" (I.i.460). Her disregard for ceremonial trifles is also a manifestation of her magnanimity.

The Duchess is apparently a born princess, and she retains her quality of nobleness throughout her life, though not with the same consistency and degree. She does not know that she is more a ruler than a woman. The Duchess' confusion is expressed in her confession to Cariola before the marriage: ". . . I have given up / More than my life, my fame" (I.i.355-57). The Duchess' such a state of mind is carefully observed by Cariola: "Whether the spirit of greatness, or of woman / Reigns most in her, I know not, but it shows / A fearful madness. I owe her much of pity" (I.i.455-57). Although the Duchess, in this intuitive moment, seems to feel that being noble is more essential and true to her nature than being happy as a woman through a secret marriage, she seems to try to ignore such a notion, as Tamburlaine refuses to accept human limitation. This inward aspiration of the Duchess explains why she readily accepts Cariola's advice to keep her marriage secret for the sake of saving her honor and fame.

From the moment she makes such a false compromise, however, she has to lie. She thinks that she can keep honor by doing so, but she is deluding herself; she is, in fact, debasing her noble nature. Her struggle probably begins somewhere inside of her, though it is not recognized, for she is actually doing what she despises--clinging to the superficiality of false fame. Her fear of losing her nature is shown in her description of her mind as wilderness. Antonio describes the Duchess' state of making herself less and less noble: "The great are like the base; nay, they are the same, / When they seek shameful ways to avoid shame" (II.ii.136-7). The Duchess' lies gradually worsen: she lies when offered another husband by Ferdinando, "When I choose / Another husband, I will marry for your honor" (III.i. 49-50). To Ferdinando, who already knows everything, she still dares to insist that her reputation is safe (III.ii.118-9). The climax of her degradation comes when she tries to escape--when she follows Antonio in the disguise of a pilgrim. Her attachment to her honor and fame, which comes from her inward aspiration, ironically brings about her defeat. Despite Cariola's warning "I do not like this jesting with religion, / This feigned pilgrimage," the Duchess at once accepts Bosola's devilish advice: "I would wish your grace to feign a pilgrimage . . . so may you depart / Your country with more honor, and your flight / Will seem a princely progress, retaining / Your usual train about you" (III.ii.307-12). The Duchess willingly listens to the two pieces of fatal advice; both of them seemingly concern her honor and fame.

Only when she is banished with Antonio from Ancona, where they try to take refuge, does she come to acknowledge her fault. Now she feels that she is justly punished and humbled by "heaven's scourge-stick" (III.v.78). In her misery and distress, she comes to realize her mistake and know her true nature. She admits that she has been playing "a part in't [in this world] 'gainst my [her] will" (IV.i.84). As Antonio predicts, "Man, like cassia, is proved best being bruised," the Duchess finds her true nature when she is placed in the worst condition of her life.

The Duchess' true nature, her aspiration to be noble, is more distorted than Tamburlaine's and suppressed in the world she lives in, where she is "forced to express our [her and others'] violent passions / In riddles and in dreams, and leave the path / Of simple virtue, which was never made / To seem the thing it is not" (I.i.449-52). In such a world it is difficult for her to be herself; she is even forced to falsify herself. Only when she is tried in an extreme way is she able to become herself: "Men oft are valued high, when th'are most wretched" (III.v.139).

After her realization of her nature, she grows in her nobility. Bosola notices her change:

> she seems
> Rather to welcome the end of misery
> Than shun it: a behavior so noble
> As gives a majesty to adversity:
> You [Ferdinando] may discern the shape of loveliness
> More perfect in her tears, than in her smiles
> (IV.i.3-8).

Being fully aware of herself, she even defies Ferdinando's base attempt to drive her mad and make her totally wretched through the devices of the madmen's show and the display of the wax figures of Antonio and her son. But being imprisoned and losing everything she loves, the world is too "tedious" for her to live in (IV.i.83); there is nothing she wishes but to "freeze to death" (IV.i.68). And even her expression of a death wish shows her growing inner strength: she demands, "Go, howl them this: and say I long to bleed. / It is some mercy when men kill with speed" (IV.i.110-11). Some critics think that the Duchess in the end attains a kind of stoic endurance and accepts death; indeed, she becomes stronger and longs to die. However, the Duchess is also denouncing the whole world which is indifferent, merciless to people. She does not merely endure; she even lays curses on nature:

> I could curse the stars.
> . . . .
> And those three smiling seasons of the year
> Into a Russian winter; nay the world
> To its first chaos (IV.i.96-100).

The Duchess' curse is, Bradbrook says, "the last weapon left to the helpless" and the power of such a curse was considered to be the "greatest in a great person, in whose outraged authority God saw an image of His own."[37]

The Duchess' affirmation of herself, her aspiration to be truly noble, is shown in her last speech: "I am Duchess of Malfi still" (IV.ii.142). And her defiance culminates in her facing her own execution: she boldly demands to be killed in a crude manner. Such self-assertion and bold defiance in the extreme condition are only possible for those who possess the great soul. And the indomitable soul of the Duchess is even to purify and convert villainous Bosola, who afterwards revenges her two brothers for the Duchess, for such a soul is probably the only value Bosola could find in the world where everybody pursues his interest relentlessly and whose atmosphere is symbolized by its bestial inhabitants. The Duchess' nature is considerably limited by the world she lives in rather than by her limitation as a human.

There is still a faint hope left for the spirit of greatness in man in Webster's _The Duchess of Malfi_; however, such a hope diminishes even further and almost disappears in Ford's _'Tis Pity She's a Whore_, which was written almost two decades after _The Duchess of Malfi_ and five decades after _Tamburlaine_. By Ford's time, a naturalistic, sceptical, and analytical tendency seems to have deprived man of the traditional religious and social values: man no longer accepts a universe and human conduct without questioning them; society is no longer "a microcosmic unit of God's larger order" but "a cluster of degree-vizarding individuals bent on material and emotional gratification."[38] Ford's play reflects this "decadent" period; it is the tragedy of a careless, meaningless, and corrupted society where man can no longer find any significant value. The young Giovanni, reputed for his academic achievements and admirable quality of youth, can find no value but female beauty: he can find neither any person who is worthy nor anything which is meaningful except Annabella and her beauty. Giovanni's willful defiance of a repentance for his sin of incest at first seems to resemble that of Faustus; however, well examined, he does not possess Faustus' dignity and greatness. His final destruction is thus no longer sublime but only unnatural. In my discussion of this play, I shall focus on Giovanni, who may be paralleled to Faustus and who, like Tamburlaine, Faustus, and the Duchess, essentially initiates the incidents of the play.

Giovanni's habit of quibbling resembles that of Dr. Faustus and seems to be the manifestation of his strong intellectual power but only on the surface. His subject matter is no longer lofty: it is incest. The play begins with a dispute over Giovanni's incestuous love for his sister Annabella. "Must I not do what all men else may, love?" Giovanni asks the friar, "Must I not praise / That beauty . . . ?" (I.i.18,20-1). He uses the concept of Platonic love to make his point, but he is soon to contradict himself, for his love later proves to be more sensual than spiritual. Indeed, Giovanni's concept of Neoplatonic love seems to reflect the affected Neoplatonic love of Charles' court. Not only does he misuse the concept of Platonic love, but he distorts logic:

> A customary form, from man to man,
> Of brother and of sister, be a bar
> 'Twixt my perpetual happiness and me?
> Say that we had one father, say one womb
> (Curse to my joy) gave both us life and birth,
> Are we not therefore each to other bound

So much the more by nature by the links
Of blood, or reason--nay, if you will have't,
Even of religion--to be ever one;
One soul, one flesh, one heart, one all?
(I.i.25-34).

Giovanni quibbles for his personal satisfaction, not for the sake of truth. For he uses the same argument to win Annabella: "A nearer nearness in affection" (I.ii.246). Annabella, unlike the friar who is more learned and matured than she, is easily won by his argument; she cannot discern Giovanni's distortion until much later.

Unlike Faustus, who is tormented at least occasionally by his conscience, Giovanni does not suffer and is consistently adamant to the friar's plea for repentance. His defiance is never shaken and even grows bolder. When he comes back to the university, he is more resolute than before: he defiantly declares to the friar, "What I have done I'll prove both fit and good. / It is a principle, which you have taught" (II.v.13-4). And again he employs the concept with his distortion:

the frame
And composition of the mind both follow
The frame and composition of the body;
So where the body's furniture is beauty,
The mind's must needs be virtue; which allowed,
Virtue itself is reason but refined,
And love the quintessence of that. This proves
My sister's beauty being rarely fair
Is rarely virtuous; chiefly in her love,

> And chiefly in that love, her love to me.
> If hers to me, then so is mine to her;
> Since in like causes are effects alike.
> (II.v.15-26).

To Giovanni no advice avails. Giovanni would not listen to the friar's warning of following nature blindly without faith (II.v.29-34), and he is now doomed: "I pity thee the more, / That one so excellent should give those parts / All to a second death [damnation]. . ." (II.v.59-61).

Just like Faustus, Giovanni indeed seems, as pointed out by Hoy, to be misusing the power of divinely given reason.[39] But he is probably not so much distorted by the powerful intellect of Faustus than perverted by the sickly obsession of his frustrated soul. For Giovanni falls short of Faustus in intellectual grandeur and quality of mind. As the friar declares, "Oh, ignorance in knowledge. / Long ago, how often have I warned thee this before?" Giovanni is still an inexperienced youth who only speaks like a scholar (II.v.27-8).

Despite Giovanni's perverted justification, his love is not purely spiritual, nor is it merely lustful, as is the case with Soranzo and Hippolita. As mentioned previously, it is rather sensual. Giovanni believes only in his love of Annabella, which is the only truth to him and which he calls celestial love. But his love is nothing like celestial. What he thinks is love is his desire for beauty. From the very beginning of the play, his sensuality predominates over his spiritual aspect: his utmost concern is female beauty. He speaks of Annabella:

> Such a pair of stars
> As are thine eyes would like Promethean fire,
> If gently glanced, give life to senseless stone.
> . . . .
> Such lips would tempt
> A saint, such hands as those
> Would make an anchorite lascivious
> (I.ii.200,206-7).

This sounds like a cult of beauty. Indeed he worships the beauty of Annabella, not of her person: "Must I not praise / That beauty," Giovanni speaks of Annabella, "and kneel to it, as I do kneel to them [the gods]?" (I.i.20-3). His love is also selfish. He easily becomes jealous about a trivial matter: for example, he does not even want her to wear a gift, a jewel given by their father's friend Donado. Later, his jealousy grows enormously and almost uncontrollably. Moreover, he tends to regard his love for Annabella as some debt she owes to him: the vow between Giovanni and Annabella is a contract which, for Giovanni, must be paid in blood when it is broken.

Giovanni's passion is so unnatural that it seems to be almost madness. It is quite different from that of Tamburlaine, Faustus, and the Duchess. He may have a possibility of greatness, for he at first seems to excel any other man: he is rendered as "a wonder of thine [his] age thoughout Bononia" (I.i.49) and "so angel-like, so glorious, that a woman / . . . would have kneeled to him and have begged for love" (IV.iii. 37-9). Nevertheless, his soul, which might have been capable of greatness, is perverted into unnatural passion for incestuous love. Kaufman says that the problem of Giovanni is "puzzling aspiration to be the architect of its own unhappiness."[40] It is not sure, however, whether Giovanni has such a self-destructive drive. It seems that Giovanni is merely obsessed with a desire for beauty.

Giovanni's soul is frustrated, and his mind aspiring to excell is violently transformed into an obsession for physical beauty in the society where everyone is far from human excellence. Their father is seemingly concerned with his children's happiness and morals, but nevertheless he is an inefficient father who never realizes what is happening. Even the friar, who persistently asks for Giovanni and Annabella to repent, cannot offer any alternative value to Giovanni. And the relationship between Soranzo and Hippolita is a complete foil to that of Giovanni and Annabella. Hippolita, a wife of Richardetto, betrays her husband for her lover Soranzo, who then ravishes and deserts her for Annabella but who, in turn, is outraged by the cuckoldry of Annabella. The Cardinal and Richardetto, who are most hypocritical in the play, remain triumphant to the end. Even servant-master relationships seem to be upset: Bergetto and Soranzo are far less intelligent than their servants Poggio and Vasques. Furthermore, their society is full of carelessness and distortion. Bergetto, for example, is killed mistakenly by Grimaldi. When Hippolita, intending to revenge Soranzo, is poisoned by Vasques,everyone applauds "Wonderful justice" (IV.i.89). Even the final words given to the Cardinal seem to be incongruous: "Of one so young, so rich in nature's store, / Who could not say, 'tis pity she's a whore?" (V.vi.163-4).

By depicting Giovanni and Annabella more worthy than the rest, Ford seems to justify incest and condemn the society, as one critic points out;[41] however, it is unlikely for Ford to advocate incest, but rather he asserts human wills which "capture our sympathy if motives are clarified."[42] Ford evokes pity through Giovanni: even a man with a soul which is capable of greatness is reduced to an unnatural, confused, and desperate man. Giovanni's desperate need for something certain is shown in his insistence of making a vow: "I charge you, / Do not betray me to your mirth or hate, / love me, or kill me . . . " (I.i.260-2). The vow between Giovanni and Annabella is somehow similar to the contract Faustus made with Lucifer: Giovanni and Annabella enter into the forbidden world where they are destined to damnation. While Faustus chooses his fate totally by his will, Giovanni and Annabella are rather forced into their fate by their situations. Annabella, too, has no choice but to accept Giovanni, for she is surrounded and disturbed by unworthy, vain, and ridiculous suitors, Soranzo, Grimaldi, and Bergetto. Naturally, Giovanni and Annabella somehow draw sympathy from the audience, for there is no choice left for the two.

Giovanni, nevertheless, grows so mad and bestial that he can draw little sympathy in the end. Although Annabella never loses faith and finally repents, Giovanni, like Faustus, will not repent and degenerates. Giovanni is even worse than Faustus, for he never hesitates or regrets even a moment. When Giovanni knows that Annabella has married Soranzo, the only thing he thinks of is revenge. Unlike Faustus, who sometimes listens to his conscience, the Good Angel, Giovanni would not listen to Annabella's account--she seems to be Giovanni's counterpart, a good part. His bestiality is demonstrated in his priding himself in killing Annabella: "to dispute / With thy (even in thy death) most lovely beauty, / Would make me stagger to perform this act, / Which I most glory in" (V.v. 87-91). Giovanni by this point seems to have lost his sanity: he speaks as if he were already in hell:

> Be dark, bright sun,
> And make this midday night, that thy gilt rays
> May not behold a deed will turn their splendor
> More sooty than the poets feign their Styx
> (V.v.79-82).

His unnatural, distorted nature is at last acknowledged by Annabella: she cries out, "Forgive him, heaven-- and me my sins; farewell. / Brother unkind, unkind!-- mercy, great heaven--Oh!--Oh!" (V.v.92-3). He even takes out her heart and shows it proudly to everyone in the banquet: "The glory of my deed / Darkened the midday sun, made noon as night" (V.vi.24-5).

Even Faustus glances at the blood of Christ when he is falling into hell, but Giovanni still confuses heavenly grace with the beauty of Annabella while he is dying: "Where'er I go, let me enjoy this grace, / Freely to view my Annabella's face" (V.vi.110-11). In Giovanni the diminishing spirit of the greatness of man disappears completely. There is only a faint suggestion of man's great soul but no substance in Giovanni.

In the five tragedies that I have discussed, there is a common undercurrent of the spirit of the Renaissance, the greatness of man, and each dramatist asserts the indomitable soul of man through the protagonist. Tamburlaine, Faustus, the Duchess, and, to a quite different degree, even Giovanni share the greatness of soul, energy of aspiration to be higher, perfect, and closer to God, but they also share human limitations, which they refuse to admit or fail to perceive. Tamburlaine, with all his superhuman qualities, is limited by mortality; Faustus, with his extraordinary power of intellect, is limited by his ironical ignorance of a fact that he as a man cannot attain infinite knowledge; the Duchess loses her own identity in the world of schemers until she realizes it in the end of her life; and Giovanni is completely lost in his world, and he, unlike the others, no longer evokes sympathy. The most notable change in the treatment of the theme is the scope of these protagonists' worlds: the cosmic scale and universal theme of the Elizabethan period gradually diminish into a more limited scale and domestic theme, such as family affairs, in the Jacobean period, and further into decadence, such as the matter of incest. This change exactly reflects the change in the spirit itself: the later Renaissance man, perceiving more and more limitations of man, no longer possesses the concept of the greatness of man to the same degree as those of their predecessors. While

Tamburlaine and Faustus are intensely aware of themselves and wish to control the whole universe by power and knowledge, the Duchess and Giovanni are no longer able to feel themselves quite different from others, gradually becoming parts of their worlds. Just like others, the Duchess falsifies herself, and Giovanni distorts his own soul. The tragedy of the indomitable soul initiated by Marlowe seems to have diminished completely by Ford's time: when the dramatist of this period could no longer conceive the indomitable soul of man, naturally he began to lose the lofty tragic vision of the Renaissance.

ENDNOTES

[1] Herschell Baker, *The Dignity of Man* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1947), pp. 248-9.

[2] Philip Sidney, "An Apology for Poetry," *Critical Theory Since Plato*, ed. Hazard Adams (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1971), p. 157.

[3] Sidney, p. 159.

[4] Baker, p. 285.

[5] Christopher Marlowe, *Tamburlaine*, *Part I* and *Part II*, in *Drama of the English Renaissance*, *Part One*: *The Tudor Period*, eds. Russell A. Fraser and Norman Rabkin (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1976). All references to *Tamburlaine* and *Doctor Faustus* are taken from this edition and are cited in parentheses in the text. References to *The Duchess of Malfi* and *'Tis Pity She's a Whore* are also taken from the same edition, *Part Two*: *The Stuart Period*.

[6] Paul Osker Kristeller, intro., *The Renaissance Philosophy of Man*, eds. Ernest Cassirer, Paul Osker Kristeller, and John Herman Randell, Jr. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975), p. 219.

[7] Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, "The Dignity of

Man," in The Renaissance Philosophy of Man, pp. 224-5.

[8] Baker, p. 223.

[9] Baker, pp. 229-230.

[10] Baker, p. 233.

[11] Douglas Bush, Preface to Renaissance Literature (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1965), p. 8.

[12] Baker, p. 229.

[13] Irving Ribner, "Marlowe and Machiavelli," Comparative Literature, 6 (1954), 354. Una M. Ellis-Fermor and Harry Levin also discuss possible Machiavellian influences on Marlowe; R. W. Battenhouse and P. H. Kocher contradict such notions.

[14] Don Cameron Allen, "Renaissance Remedies for Fortune: Marlowe and the 'Fortunati,'" Studies in Philology, 38 (1941), 192.

[15] Roy W. Battenhouse, "Tamburlaine, the 'Scourge of God,'" PMLA, 56 (1941), 337.

[16] Irving Ribner, "Marlowe and Shakespeare," Shakespeare Quarterly, 15 (1964), 52.

[17] Eugene M. Waith, "Tamburlaine," in Marlowe, ed. Clifford Leech (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964), p. 91.

[18] Harry Levin, The Overreacher (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957), p. 53.

[19] Levin, p. 35.

[20] U. M. Ellis-Fermor, ed., The Works and Life of

Christopher Marlowe (London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1930), pp. 39-40. According to Ellis-Fermor, Marlowe stripped all that could diminish or humanize Tamburlaine. Bajazeth was not so base as Marlowe described. His army was much smaller than Tamburlaine's. And Tamburlaine once turned back before the impassable Arabian Desert.

[21] Kristan Smidt, "Two Aspects of Ambition in Elizabethan Tragedy: *Doctor Faustus* and *Macbeth*," *English Studies*, 50 (1969), 235.

[22] T. S. Eliot, "Christopher Marlowe," in *Marlowe*, ed. Leech, p. 15.

[23] Suzan Richards, "Marlowe's *Tamburlaine II*: A Drama of Death," in *Christopher Marlowe's Tamburlaine Part One and Part Two*, ed. Irving Ribner (Indianapolis and New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1974), p. 311.

[24] Michael Hattaway, "The Theology of Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*," *Renaissance Drama*, 3 (1970), 69.

[25] W. W. Greg, "The Damnation of Faustus," in *Marlowe*, ed. Leech, pp. 105-6.

[26] Greg, p. 106.

[27] J. B. Steane, *Marlowe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964), p. 158.

[28] Levin, pp. 118-19.

[29] Levin, p. 119.

[30] Smidt, 236.

[31] P. F. Vernon, "The Duchess of Malfi's Guilt," *Notes and Queries*, 10 (1963), 335.

[32] M. C. Bradbrook, *Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy* (Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1969), p. 200.

[33] John L. Selzer, "Merit and Degree in Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi*," *English Literary Renaissance*, 11 (1981), 71.

[34] Bradbrook, p. 198.

[35] Clifford Leech, *John Webster* (New York: Haskell House Publishers, Ltd., 1970), p. 61.

[36] Susan Baker, "The Static Protagonist in *The Duchess of Malfi*," *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 22 (1980), 343. Jane Marie Luecke's "*The Duchess of Malfi*: Comic and Satiric Confusion in a Tragedy," *Studies in English*, 5 (1964), 275-6, also expresses such a view.

[37] M. C. Bradbrook, "Fate and Chance in *The Duchess of Malfi*," in *John Webster: A Critical Anthology*, eds. G. K. and S. K. Hunter (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1967), p. 133.

[38] Larry S. Champion, "Ford's *'Tis Pity She's a Whore* and the Jacobean Tragic Perspective," *PMLA*, 90 (1975), 86.

[39] Cyrus Hoy, "Ignorance in Knowledge," *Modern Philology*, 57 (1960), 146.

[40] H. J. Kaufmann, "Ford's Tragic Perspective," Texas Studies in Literature and Language, 1 (1959), 552.

[41] G. F. Sensabaugh, "John Ford and Elizabethan Tragedy," Philological Quarterly, 20 (1941), 450. Sensabaugh states, "For the play ends tolerant of incest, suggesting that because of Giovanni's disease [melancholy] and because of his celestial love he should stand as an heroic exception, more exalted than the wisdom of ages."

[42] Juliet McMaster, "Love, Lust, and Shame: Structural Pattern in the Plays of John Ford," Renaissance Drama, 2 (1969), 164.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Don Cameon. "Renaissance Remedies for Fortune: Marlowe and The 'Fortunati'." *Studies in Philology*, 38 (1941), 188-97.

Baker, Herschell. *The Dignity of Man*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947.

Baker, Susan. "The Static Protagonist in *The Duchess of Malfi*." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 22 (1980), 343-357.

Battenhouse, Roy W. *Marlowe's Tamburlaine: A Study in Renaissance Moral Philosophy*. Nashville, Tenn.: Vanderbilt University Press, 1941.

Battenhouse, Roy W. "Tamburlaine, the 'Scourge of God.'" *PMLA*, 56 (1941), 337-48.

Bradbrook, M.C. "Fate and Chance in *The Duchess of Malfi*." *John Webster: A Critical Anthology*. Eds. G. K. and S. K. Hunter. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1967, pp. 132-149.

Bradbrook, M. C. *Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy*. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Champion, Larry S. "Ford's *'Tis Pity She's A Whore* and the Jacobean Tragic Perspective." PMLA, 90 (1975), 78-87.

Eliot, T. S. "Christopher Marlowe." Marlowe. Ed. Clifford Leech. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964, pp. 12-17.

Ellis-Fermor, ed. The Works and Life of Christopher Marlowe. 2 vols. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1930.

Forbes, Elizabeth Livermore. "Of the Dignity of Man." Journal of the History of Ideas, 3 (1942), 347-54.

Fraser, Russel A. and Norman Rabkin, eds. Drama of the English Renaissance. 2 vols. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1976.

Greg, W. W. "The Damnation of Faustus." Marlowe. Ed. Clifford Leech, pp. 92-107.

Hattaway, Michael. "The Theology of Marlowe's Doctor Faustus." Renaissance Drama, 3 (1970), 51-78.

Herndell, George C. The High Design: English Renaissance Tragedy and the National Love. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1970.

Hoy, Cyrus. "Ignorance in Knowledge." Modern Philology, 57 (1960), 145-154.

Kaufman, H. J. "Ford's Tragic Perspective." Texas Studies in Literature and Language, 1 (1959), 523-37.

Levin, Harry. The Overreacher: A Study of Christopher Marlowe. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952.

Leech, Clifford. John Webster. New York: Haskell House Publishers, Ltd., 1970.

McMaster, Juliet. "Love, Lust, and Sham: Structural Pattern in the Plays of John Ford." Renaissance Drama, 2 (1969), 157-166.

Pico della Mirandola, Giovanni. "The Dignity of Man." The Renaissance Philosophy of Man. Ernest Cassirer, Paul Osker Kristeller, and John Herman Randell, Jr. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975, pp. 223-54.

Ribner, Irving. "Marlowe and Machiavelli." Comparative Literature, 6 (1954), 348-56.

Ribner, Irving. "Marlowe and Shakespeare." Shakespeare Quarterly, 15 (1964), 41-53.

Richards, Susan. "Marlowe's Tamburlaine II: A Drama of Death." Christopher Marlowe's Tamburlaine Part One and Part Two, Text and Major Criticism. Ed. Irving Ribner. Indianapolis and New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1974, pp. 298-311.

Selzer, John. "Merit and Degree in Webster's The Duchess of Malfi." English Literary Renaissance, 11 (1981), 70-80.

Sensabaugh, G. F. "John Ford and Elizabethan Tragedy." Philological Quarterly, 20 (1941), 442-453.

Sidney, Phillip. "An Apology for Poetry." Critical Theory Since Plato. Ed. Hazard Adams. New York:

Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1971, pp. 155-177.

Smidt, Kristan. "Two Aspects of Ambition in Elizabethan Tragedy: *Doctor Faustus* and *Macbeth*." *Renaissance Drama*, 3 (1970), 51-78.

Steane, J. B. *Marlowe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.

Vernon, P. F. "The Duchess of Malfi's Guilt." *Notes and Queries*, 10 (1963), 335-338.

Waith, Eugene M. "Tamburlaine." *Marlowe*. Ed. Clifford Leech. Englewood, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964, pp. 69-91.

VITA

Aiko Matsumoto

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Thesis: THE TRAGEDY OF THE INDOMITABLE SOUL IN ENGLISH RENAISSANCE DRAMA FROM 1587 TO 1633

Major Field: English

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Nagasaki, Japan, September 2, 1956, the daughter of Yoshimitsu and Ise Matsumoto.

Education: Graduated from Nagasaki Prefectural Women's Junior College, Nagasaki, Japan, with Associate degree in English Literature; received Bachelor of Arts degree in Economics and English from Northwestern Oklahoma State University, Alva, Oklahoma, in May, 1980; completed requirements for Master of Arts degree at Oklahoma State University in December, 1982.

Professional Experience: Graduate Teaching Assistant, Department of English, Oklahoma State University, from 1980 to 1982.