The Use of Necromancy in Renaissance Drama

1570-1620

Thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements of the University of Liverpool for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy by Christine Hughes

November 2000

THE USE OF NECROMANCY IN RENAISSANCE DRAMA 1570-1620

Christine Hughes

Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* unveiled an innovative and charismatic figure on to the London stage. In this thesis, I have commenced my study of the use of magic in Renaissance drama by identifying the type of magic demonstrated in the drama of the period before Faustus. Playwrights used the influence of romance protagonists such as Merlin, the magician in the legend of Arthur, and incorporated his characteristics with the qualities of the vernacular village wizard. Popular since the Middle Ages, this figure could perform such tasks as casting a horoscope to predict somebody's life path and identifying criminals. However, following on from a change of interest from the romance arts to some of the philosophical theories circulating around Europe and in English Universities (though I suggest that it was partly anticipated by the anonymous *Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune*), *Doctor Faustus* appeared on the London stage, and set a new precedent.

By following the pattern in the source narrative (the English / German Faust Book) of oscillating between 'romance' and 'philosophical' magic in a coherent pattern, Faustus presented an innovative figure for other playwrights to follow during the Elizabethan era. Indeed, from 1588 – 1595, magicians dominated several stage productions including Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, Munday's *John a Kent and John a Cumber* and the anonymous *John of Bordeaux*. All of these plays cast at least one magician in the role of the central protagonist, who performs magic which adheres to the practice established by Faustus of oscillating between the philosophical and romance genres, although with variations on Marlowe's structural model.

By the turn of the century, the witch was becoming a more popular protagonist than the male magician. However, Shakespeare's co-written play *Pericles* staged a mini revival in the use of the magician as a protagonist. Cerimon's revival of Pericles's dead wife through the practices of herbalism now signalled the return of a familiar character, although this time he had new techniques and skills. This was greatly elaborated on in *The Tempest*. In this play, the main magical practitioner is presented as the antithesis of Faustus, and yet he also displays several of the characteristics and qualities of his predecessor. Even his name – Prospero – represents a link with Faustus. However, although offered the choice of following the diabolical path prescribed by his predecessor through the paralleling of his own past with the wicked witch Sycorax, Prospero also manages to carry out his redemptive tasks. As an advocate of the arts of Neoplatonism and theories analogous to those of Francis Bacon, Prospero is able to achieve his ambitious plan and then reject his ability to perform magic in order to return to his former occupation as Duke of Milan.

This act of severance seems to signal an end for the trend of presenting magicians as central protagonists on the Elizabethan stage. Playwrights once again turned to the character of the witch, as she seemed to dominate public and courtly attention. Indeed, witchcraft was now upheld as the art responsible for several human frailties and this resulted in the numerous persecution campaigns against them during James's reign.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements

Introduction 1

Chapter One

An Innovative Role Model? 25

Chapter Two

Continuation or Innovation? 67

Chapter Three

Plays of the Commercial Theatre 101

Chapter Four

Commercial Theatre and the Introduction of New Motifs 133

Chapter Five

The End of an Era? 166

Conclusion 203

Appendix A

Appendix B

Appendix C

Appendix D

Bibliography

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Professor Jonathan Bate, without whose help, guidance and support this thesis would not have come to fruition. He has supported my ideas from the planning stage through to the realisation of a chapter, and eventually to this final presentation of thesis. I am also grateful to him for offering me tutorial times to fit around my work patterns, and encouraging me through the difficult moments.

Thanks and acknowledgement are offered to the support staff in the Department of English at the University of Liverpool, including Cathy Rees and Barbara Smith, Martin, Sabine, Clare, Simon and Tracy in Student and Examinations Division and the staff in the Sydney Jones Library. Thanks also to the staff at Avril and Aldham Robarts LRC, and to Tracy, Pat and Amanda in Technical Services who processed my many inter-library loan requests. This gratitude extends to all those who have answered my numerous I.T. questions over the last few years including David Cockram, Johnson, Stuart, Tracy and Jane. Acknowledgement is also due to Rayross printers who have printed this thesis.

On a personal note I would like to acknowledge the great love, support and encouragement from my parents John and Marylyn Hughes. Without their help and assistance, I would not have even attempted such a project. Gratitude is also expressed to my aunt Valerie Kelly, whose support has contributed to the completion of this project.

Acknowledgement is due to my employers both past and present, particularly Wayne and Dorothy who have accommodated my numerous leave requests over the last few weeks. Thanks also extends to my friends Joanne and James, Karin and Keith, Alex, Alan, Sharon, Tina, Derek, Ken, Jane, Jenny, Heather, Linda and everyone in my team group for their support. Special thanks are due as well to Diane Murphy and Daris whose help and advice over the final weeks proved invaluable.

INTRODUCTION

1576 – THE SETTING OF A NEW PRECEDENT?

> All the world's a stage,
> And all the men and women merely players.
> (II.7.138-139)[1].

Amidst the hustle and bustle of the area commonly known as the London Liberties, an area outside the city walls, and as such the jurisdiction of the Lord Mayor, a new phenomenon appeared in 1576. In this marginal setting famed for its leprosariums and bear-baiting rings the first theatre – the Red Lion – was erected by John Brayne, closely followed by The Theatre a few months later.

Since Henry VII's reign there had been a tradition of play-acting in England that had continued through to Elizabeth I's time. During this time a number of adult players and boy companies had been founded into groups under the patronage of a great lord to tour England. These players had generally performed at Court, in the halls of great houses, or in the public squares or yards of inns to celebrate either a special occasion, or as part of the festivities for a traditional celebration such as Christmas. However, frequently regarded by councils as a nuisance, and if unlicensed as rogues and vagabonds, they were generally perceived as causing disruption and leading people away from traditional religious pursuits on a Sunday. Now, with the construction of a permanent residence specifically designed for players to perform their plays in before a much larger audience, a new trend was established in England with its roots firmly embedded in the classical roots of the ancient world[2].

---

[1] William Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, ed. by Alan Brissenden (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).

[2] See Michael Hattaway, *Elizabethan Popular Theatre: Plays in Performance* (London, Boston, Melbourne & Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982), Chapter 1 for a comprehensive history of the London theatre.

By 1600 seven other playhouses had also been erected in London. With a stage in the main arena to focus the audience's attention and entrances, trap doors, facades, galleries and curtains, these theatres were now equipped to introduce plays to the London public. These early theatres were reasonably ornate in decoration, and the facades and platforms would generally be painted in rich vibrant colours and usually embellished with art designs. However, the Elizabethan stage was bare with regard to 'scenic illusion' and actors were expected to narrate the stage location to the audience and use different parts of the stage to suggest a variety of areas[3]. As the early theatres were open-air constructions, the audience were expected to accommodate themselves in cold, damp conditions. This was probably a deliberate ploy up to approximately 1600, as the early constructions were used for the dual purpose of animal baiting. Indeed, it was not until the seventeenth century that these buildings were solely regarded as for the express purpose of play-acting.

The construction of a permanent playhouse enabled the actors to introduce plays on to the stage that exploited old motifs, as well as exploring new themes. These new ideas were now used to provide spectacular illusions previously unseen in English drama. Indeed, the old medieval pursuits of tumbling and juggling were rejected, and the traditional morality motifs and 'romantic treatment of historical and classical legends' were used as a backdrop to offset new areas of interest and to introduce innovative protagonists on to the stage[4].

---

[3] R.A. Foakes, 'Playhouses and Players' in *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama*, ed. by A.R. Braunmuller & Michael Hattaway (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 1-52 (p.21)

[4] Hattaway, P.16

In this thesis I will be examining the presentation of a protagonist whose role changed considerably after the construction of the first theatres in 1576. The role of the magician had been a popular topic subject since the Middle Ages, and although condemned by the Church, the magician had continued to appear in a wide range of literary texts. The most famous example of a magical practitioner up to 1576 had been Merlin; a character derived from the legendary twelfth century *History of the Kings of Britain*, whose main feature was his ability to predict the future. After 1576 the magician continued to be an ever popular figure on the newly created London stage, and although at first he was loosely based on the qualities first exemplified by Merlin, he soon began to acquire his own distinctive characteristics. This set new precedents for the late Elizabethan and Jacobean playwrights to follow.

Indeed, the magician as a stage protagonist continued to thrive throughout the latter half of the Elizabethan era and early part of the Jacobean period. Elevated from a lowly role generally reserved for causing mischief in the play and thus providing some comic relief in a serious moment, by the late 1580s the magus had developed as a stage phenomenon. Frequently depicted as the central protagonist, the magician could now practise many of the traditional arts of the legendary Merlin and the highly regarded local figure of the village wizard, alongside the emerging philosophical theories purported by the University academics. This unique character enjoyed a starring role on the newly constructed London stages for almost a fifty - year period, before being outlawed by the frenzy of excitement about the art of witchcraft. Upstaged and redundant the magician was now replaced as a stage character by female witches whose powers, although not as powerful, led to them being more forcibly condemned and punished than their male counterparts.

Background to Magic

In his seminal work *Religion and the Decline of Magic*, Keith Thomas has regarded magic as a complex phenomenon that had its roots firmly embedded in the practice of religion[5]. In his book he demonstrates how the Church accounted for magical practices such as 'prophecy[ing] the future, control[ing] the weather, provid[ing] protection against fire and flood, magically transport[ing] heavy objects, and bring[ing] relief to the sick' by attributing 'miracles' to the saints[6]. Although the Church did not claim to work miracles, it did employ the saints to act as intermediaries between humans and God to answer any entreaties put to them. This led to the widespread worship of the saints and people began to make pilgrimages to various shrines throughout the country. Indeed, he claims that by the time of the Reformation 'The worship of saints was an integral part of the fabric of medieval society'[7].

However, Thomas also clarifies that whilst magical practices were scrutinised and determined by the Church before the Reformation, after Henry VIII's introduction of the Protestant religion there was a reduction in the power of Church magic. Yet, paradoxically the Protestant attitude to non-ecclesiastical magic retained the same hostile stance as the medieval church, and even things such as conjuring and juggling were viewed as invoking the devil. Heavy penalties such as the burning at the stake for heretics were introduced, however, in practice, only moderate punishments seem to have been carried out. Even though Elizabeth introduced the Tudor statutes against witchcraft, 'popular magic was treated by the Church courts as neither more nor less serious than such routine offences as sabbath-breaking, defamation and fornication'[8].

---

[5] Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1971), p.29

[6] Thomas, p.28.

[7] Thomas, p.27

However, writers such as Hans H. Penner have viewed Thomas's view as 'Malinowskian', because he has argued for the separation of magic from religion and science[9]. He believes that magic and science should be clearly separated as different entities, because magic relies on a ritual approach, which is frequently associated with the devil, whereas science has a rational and analytical method.

Flint in *The Rise of Magic in Early Medieval Europe* also agrees that magic and science should be separated from religion[10]. Indeed, she perceives magic as being at the opposite end to religion in practice, because religion requires

> Reverence, an inclination to trust, to be open and to please:
> and be pleased by, powers superior in every way to humankind;
> magic may wish to subordinate and command these powers.

However, despite this clear-cut definition, she realises that there is a blurring between religion and magic because of the development of the religious cults such as the Christian Church in western Europe. The Christian Church dominated medieval Europe, and as a result it was perceived as believing in 'certain sorts of magic'[11]. Flint also attributes other cults such as Zoroastrian, Neoplatonism and Gnostic beliefs to the rise of magic, as well as the constant references to magic in the works of great scholars such as Pliny, Augustine, Virgil and others. Instead, however, of attributing the increased interest in magic simply to religion as Thomas purports, she believes that it was the common link between all of these ideologies, which led to the popularity of the topic. The devil was the common factor in all of these beliefs, and as he was believed to have supernatural powers, by the time of the Middle Ages a magical practitioner worshipping the devil was someone to be condemned.

---

[8] Thomas, p.306

[9] Hans H. Penner 'Rationality, Ritual & Science' in *Religion, Science and Magic*, ed. by Neusner, Frerichs & Flesher (Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), pp.11-27, p.12

[10] Valerie I.J. Flint, *The Rise of Magic in Early Medieval Europe* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), p.8

[11] Flint, p.9

Literary Representations of Magicians

Although there had been paradoxical attitudes towards magic from the Middle Ages onwards, by the time of Elizabeth's reign - two popular types of magic had appeared - white and black. Practitioners who used magic as a means of producing a beneficial result, that is by using the art to help a sick person, or preventing some 'misfortune from occurring or warding off some evil spirit or witch' were usually classed as 'white magicians'[12]. Magicians who invoked the devil using some sort of secret knowledge were generally regarded as practising black magic or necromancy. However, whilst these two definitions existed as separate entities, there were frequent blurrings between the two distinctions. For example, a love charm could have been regarded as belonging to 'white magic' because it was beneficial for a person to fall in love, however, it may also have been viewed as 'harmful' because 'one person's' gain in love might easily be another's loss[13]. It was this 'grey area' between 'white' and 'black' magic which seemed to define the magicians of the early Elizabethan literature.

---

[12] Brian P. Levack, *The Witch-Hunt in Early Modern Europe* (London & New York: Longman, 1987, p.6.

[13] Levack, p.6

Up to the creation of the new theatres in 1576, the magician as a literary protagonist generally drew on two precedents for identifying himself on the stage. He would either adopt the characteristics of the village wizard and/or the traits associated with the traditional romance character Merlin, the legendary practitioner of magic from the Chronicles of Arthur. In both cases, the type of magic performed would be akin to 'white' magic, although the practitioners generally fell into the 'grey areas' between the two types of magic, as they would attempt to produce a benefit for one party at the risk of causing harm to another.

The 'village wizard' according to Keith Thomas rarely consulted books or theories to practise the art of prophecy, prediction and healing, and seemed oblivious to the philosophical theories that had been circulating in the intellectual movements that were gathering pace in Europe[14]. Indeed, Thomas insists that[15]

> In the sixteenth century the influence was as much the other way around. Instead of the village sorcerer putting into practice the doctrines of Agrippa or Paracelsus, it was the intellectual magician who was stimulated by the activities of the cunning man into a search for the occult influences which he believed must have underlain them. The period saw a serious attempt to study long-established folk procedures with a view to discovering the principles on which they rested. In the process the adherents of natural magic were led into attempting to rationalise magical recipes which had no intellectual basis at all... Here, as in so many other fields, existing technique was the stimulus to theoretical science, not a consequence of it.

Whilst some writers depicted their magical practitioners as following the route prescribed by the 'village wizard', others chose to adhere to the tradition made popular by Merlin in the Chronicles of Arthur. Indeed, the legend of Merlin proved to be a literary phenomenon which enjoyed several revisings and embellishments[16]. Based on the famous tale narrated by Geoffrey of Monmouth in the *History of Kings* and the Welsh writer Giraldus Cambrensis (circa 1190), the legend had been rewritten by Malory in 1485, and had proved so popular that it had run to five editions by the end of the sixteenth century[17].

---

[14] Thomas, p.229

[15] Thomas, p.229.

In the story, Merlin, who was the result of a liaison between a young woman and a devil, was born with supernatural powers. However, these supernatural powers had been tempered by the fact that his mother had been blessed after her liaison, and as a result, Merlin could use his abilities to make forecasts and prophecies, but could not destroy people.

There are several instances of Merlin using his career as a prophet in the Chronicles to advance the storyline. For example, at the age of seven Merlin was consulted by the soothsayers to see why a tower built to defend the country against the Saxon invaders collapsed every night. He correctly predicted that there was an underground stream that was affecting the foundations. Merlin was also used by the warrior Uther to interpret a dream that he had experienced whilst preparing for battle. Uther had witnessed the appearance of a star that exploded in the format of a dragon. Two beams were then projected from the dragon, one that stretched across to Gaul, and the other which was smaller splintered into different strands and veered towards the Irish Sea. Merlin interpreted this vision as

---

[16] From the 1560s to the 1580s, interest had also been revived in the old Arthurian legend by certain courtiers trying to woo Elizabeth. Contenders such as Leicester, who produced the famous Kenilworth entertainment, promoted these attempts in various dramatic forms.

[17] This reworking of the famous legend also encouraged other writers such as Sir John Price in 1573, Thomas Churchyard in 1587 and Richard, brother of Gabriel Harvey in 1593 to write books commending the story of Arthur.

> But the beam that is extended to the region of Gaul
> is the sign of the future son of yours who will be
> supremely powerful and whose might will control all
> the kingdoms…whose sons and grandsons in succession
> will have the kingship of Britain[18].

This oracle created for Merlin the reputation of a revered magician, and his reputation grew as each prophecy came true.

Merlin's other great ability which he used in conjunction with his powers of prophecy was his use of disguises to alter people's identities. For example, when Uther fell in love with his rival Gorlois's wife, Igerna, Merlin promised to help him achieve his heart's desire. Merlin used his magical knowledge of medicine and herbs to provide Uther with certain drugs that altered his appearance. Now disguised as Gorlois, Uther was able to satisfy his lust for Igerna, and 'This night also she conceived that most renowned of men, Arthur, who afterward won fame by his most extra-ordinary valor'[19].

Up to 1576, Merlin, with his special powers of prophecy and ability to disguise himself and other people, and the 'village wizard' appeared to set the defining characteristics for identifying what was known as a medieval romance magician. Indeed, Merlin's ability to use the art of prophecy was considered to be his greatest commodity, and this motif soon appeared in several pamphlets and manuscripts of the period. The art of prophecy appeared in many different forms of literature, from anti-government propaganda and rebellion literature, to justification for the Tudors assuming the throne of England. It was also used in Elizabethan England as a means of representing the iconography of the Queen. A. Hart in this tract *Olde Scottish Prophecies* quoted perhaps the most famous prophecy to have been in circulation during the period

---

[18] *The Romance of Arthur*, ed. by J. Wilhelm & Laila Zamuelis Gross (New York: Garland Publishing, 1984), p.60

[19] Wilhelm, p.60

When HEMPE is come, and also gone,
SCOTLAND and ENGLAND shalbe all one.

K	K	Q	K	Q
Henry	Edward	Mary	Philip	Elizabeth
H	E	M	P	E

Praised be God alone, for HEMPE is come and gone
And left us olde ALBION, by peace joyned in one.

This tract predicted the glorious past of the Tudor monarchy, and looked forward to a period when England would be united to form Great Britain.

However, by the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century writings about magical prophecies were beginning to dwindle in popularity. Writers were looking for a more sophisticated form of magic to depict in their literary representations. I would now like to argue that with the advent of the newly constructed London theatres and the influence of some University-educated writers depicting European philosophies, the traditional portrayals of the magician inhabiting ‘a remote or enchanted setting’, and practising simple tricks such as prophecy were redefined[20]. In order to demonstrate this change in attitude, I will be commencing this thesis by examining some of the early plays performed in the newly constructed theatres before moving on to the more famous extant plays such as Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus.*

---

[20] Chris Baldick, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* (Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), p.192

Clyomon and Clamydes

By the early 1570s the magician as a literary protagonist still seems to have been portrayed in drama as having the characteristics of Merlin and or the 'village wizard', and enjoyed relatively minor roles in popular plays. Although an extant number of plays featuring a magician in this period cannot be accurately recorded due to the limited number of extant plays available in print today, I believe that a clear example of this type of genre is the anonymous *Clyomon and Clamydes*[21]. This play has been viewed by critics such as Traister and Littleton as having been composed during the early 1570s, due to the fact that it demonstrates many of the popular themes and motifs of the romance tradition[22]. It is this composition date that I will be using for this play throughout the thesis.

With a composition date of circa 1570 – 1576, this play seems to adhere to the typical qualities of the romance genre. For example, some of the main motifs include a contest between two chivalric knights (Clyomon and Clamydes), adventures for the purpose of noble causes which ultimately end in achieving their heart's desire, that is marriage, and the identification of their lineage as belonging to royal or noble families. These adventures are also generally depicted as adhering to the genre of legend, as the story of Clamydes killing the dragon to win Juliana's hand in marriage is based to some extent on the story of the English hero, St. George.

---

[21] Although printed by Thomas Creede in 1599, it is thought to have a composition date of circa 1570 (Chambers & Harbage) and 1576 (Greg). Greg supported a 1576 dating because this was the recorded date for *Common Conditions* – a play written about the same time – in the Stationers' Register. There have been several suggested authors for this play including Peele, Wilson and Preston, although no confirmed authorship has been ascribed. It was also believed to be a popular play, as the front piece of the 1599 manuscript tells us that the play 'hath bene sundry times Acted by her Maiesties Players'.

[22] Anon. *Clyomon and Clamydes: A Critical Edition*, ed. by Betty J. Littleton (Netherlands: Mouton, 1968), p.53

However, in true romance or fairy tale tradition, the magician Bryan Sans Foy hinders one of the knights –Clamydes – in pursuit of his adventures. Described by the vice character Subtle Shift as 'The veryest cowardly villaine that ever was borne' (l.537), Bryan has a range of character traits which are generally associated with the traditional romance genre[23].

Bryan is presented in a minor role half way through the play. The main story line, that is the adventures of the two chivalric knights, has already been established. Bryan is only introduced to the audience as a foil for preventing Clamydes in 'easily' succeeding in his determination to kill the dragon living in the forest, and taking his head like a jewel to win the challenge of his chosen wife Juliana.

In his first stage presentation, Bryan is introduced as a true descendant of Merlin. He lives like a hermit in a castle in the 'Forrest of strange marvels' (l.540), and he is attended by servants who assist him in his magical skills. Bryan has the ability to perform two key magical tricks, one of which is to place people in an enchanted sleep, a trick which he informs the audience he has performed on a number of occasions. Desperately in love with Juliana himself, he is lacking the courage and/or magical ability to slay the dragon. So Bryan is forced to use his magical ability to prevent any other knight from succeeding in fulfilling Juliana's challenge, by placing them in an enchanted sleep 'So soone as I did looke on them, they straight were in a sleepe''(l.577).

---

[23] Anon. *Clyomon and Clamydes*, ed. by W.W. Greg (London: Thomas Creede, 1599 – reprinted by the Malone Society in 1913). This edition will be used for quotation purposes throughout this thesis.

This trick is once again repeated on Clamydes, although there is now a slight twist in the action. Clamydes has already killed the dragon and is taking its head as proof to win Juliana's hand in marriage. Desperate to achieve his own ambition, Bryan performs his magic on Clamydes and determines '…ten dayes in this sleepe I have charm'd him to remain'(l.699). This final act of enchantment (and the only one to have been seen on the stage) leads Bryan to adopt another character trait from Merlin: the use of disguise. Aware of Juliana's promise to Clamydes, Bryan steals Clamydes's clothes 'But here I have what I desired, his Sheeld, his coat and head,/ To Denmarke will I straight…' (ll.829-830), and makes his way to the court to reveal his courageous deed to Juliana. However, after the ten-day enchantment has lapsed, Clamydes is able to escape from the forest and pursue Bryan in his false claim.

Bryan's magical abilities are categorised in this play as simple tricks from the romance genre. He has deployed the art of enchantment to disrupt the smooth running of Clamydes's adventures and utilised the art of disguise to add intrigue to the culmination of the love motif. Indeed, he is simply presented as the villain of the play, in a similar role to the one of intrigue that was generally adopted by the vice. However, although this villainy is emphasised as having magical connotations, partly through Bryan's links with Merlin, it is also underlined by the fact that Bryan is a 'coward' who is terrified of the daylight, as he has to travel to court under the cover of darkness.

Having stolen Clamydes's identity, Bryan is only able to travel to Denmark at night, and this helps to underline to the audience the type of magic that he is performing. Night-time is the traditional witching hour and the time when villainous deeds are generally performed. By travelling to Denmark under the cover of darkness, Bryan is emphasising his culpability in meddling in the love contract between Juliana and Clamydes as well as emphasising his cowardly nature. It is therefore with no great sympathy that we witness Bryan being unmasked at the end of the play to reveal his true identity, and in typical fairy tale tradition being punished through imprisonment.

This magical performance adheres to the true romance tradition, as it ultimately permits the chivalrous knights to achieve their ambitions and punishes the main villain – Bryan Sans Foy – for interfering in the pursuits of one of these ambitions. However, this play also provides the audience with a clear definition of the role of magical protagonists in the early 1570s, either shortly before or immediately after the construction of the first theatres, and underlines the marginal role played by such figures in Elizabethan drama. Bryan's presentation as a magician in *Clyomon and Clamydes* depicts the range of magic able to be displayed in an Elizabethan performance. We see that he only able to perform simple tricks such as enchantments, which can be presented through words and the use of disguise, symbolised through a change of clothes, rather than elaborate actions or the use of complicated stage props to reveal a spectacular moment. Thus, *Clyomon and Clamydes* can be regarded as indicative of the type of play popular during the 1570s, a traditional romance that used the marginal role of the magician to cause disruption and villainy to the second half of the play. Although Bryan's magic affects the play, it never ultimately challenges the prescribed conclusion for the other characters (apart for him), that all go on to live happily ever after.

Black Magic

By the time of the Reformation great thinkers such as Martin Luther and Jean Calvin had revealed their thoughts about the devil to be 'essentially the same as those of late medieval Catholic demonologists'[24]. Although the reformers did not challenge the Catholic viewpoint about the devil, as Protestants, they re-emphasised his presence and the danger this could cause in the world. They believed that everybody was open and vulnerable to being deceived by the devil, and this led to many subsequent Protestant followers publishing works which displayed a very strong fear of the devil.

The art of necromancy was referred to as ceremonial magic and was more popular in the courts of European monarchs. Necromantic magicians were usually scholars learned in many philosophies who used their academic arts to invoke the devil. Continental philosophers who were believed to have followed these routes included Cornelius Agrippa, Bruno, Pico della Mirandola and Ficino, who were all producing great works about philosophies such as Neoplatonism which proposed the belief that the universe had a 'hierarchy of spirits' which could bring about occult happenings[25]. These philosophers all played a key role in the emergence of 'intellectual magic', and they generally adhered to the principle that

> By mystical regeneration it was possible for man to regain the domination over nature which he had lost at the Fall. Its astrological and alchemical lore helped to create an intellectual environment sympathetic to every kind of mystical and magical activity[26].

In England, these continental developments, particularly amongst the sixteenth - century philosophers such as Agrippa and Bruno, were restricted in influence to the elite few such as John Dee (1527 – 1608) and Walter Raleigh. Although the most advanced theorist to emerge during this period was Robert Fludd (1574 – 1637), he generally published his works in Europe rather than England. Indeed, this intellectual magic was rarely translated into English before the mid-seventeenth century and was usually reserved for University based graduates. Only the common traditions of magic that were explored in the popular genre would have been widely known to the English population.

---

[24] Levack, p.96
[25] Thomas, p.223
[26] Thomas, pp.224-225

However, by the late 1570s the main notion of using these philosophies to invoke the devil seems to have been regarded as a prototype for Renaissance 'magi'. Coupled with the strong Protestant ethos that condemned the art of using these philosophies to invoke the devil, this technique became very popular during the late 1580s. However, I would like to suggest that after the construction of the first playhouses in 1576, these two influences, that is the traditional romance genre and the intellectual movement became intertwined, and soon began to feature as popular topics on the Elizabethan stage.

Indeed, it is my hypothesis that plays of the late 1580s such as Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* and Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, both written by University graduates, actually referred to some of the intellectual philosophical arts. However, their roots were also in popular English traditions such as geomancy and pyromancy, and it is the mixing of these two topics which has led to the introduction of an innovative protagonist for the Elizabethan stage. I will also be exploring in this thesis how other plays of the commercial era of Elizabethan theatre in the 1590s continued this trend for mixing the two types of magic together. In the latter part of this thesis, I will move on to examine the developments for the magician in the Jacobean period which was dominated by the exploits of the witch. In order to commence this exploration of the intermingling of these two types of magic, however, I have concluded this introduction by presenting a brief overview of a play which appeared half way through the 1580s.

In the anonymous play *The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune*, the magician Bomelio started, I believe, to adopt some of the features more commonly associated with the philosophical arts such as adopting a more central role in the play and invoking the devil to practise magic. This innovative prototype previously unseen on the English stage was deliberately introduced in the midst of traits more commonly associated with the romance tradition for magicians.

The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune

Bryan cannot be conclusively identified as one of the first magicians to appear on the newly created London stage, due to the fact that not all the plays from the period are still in existence. However, I would like to suggest the hypothesis that he can from the extant material available today be classified as probably one of the last stage magicians to be portrayed as truly belonging to the romance genre. With the advent of new theatre constructions, plays such as the anonymous *The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune* (circa early 1580s) could now use popular themes from the romance genre as a backdrop for presenting a stage magician. These plays could also, in a departure from the patterns set by Bryan, present their necromancers as assuming a more central role, which would enable them to perform a more complex and perhaps diabolical form of magic. Although Doctor Faustus probably leads the way in presenting diabolical magic on the stage, his path seems to have been foreshadowed by earlier protagonists such as Bomelio, the magician in *The Rare Triumphs*, who appears to have entered into some sort of understanding / alliance with the devil.

Traister in *Heavenly Necromancers* observes that Bomelio has 'features that are interesting in so early a play', although she feels that the magic is not 'treated comprehensively or consistently'[27]. However, I believe that the 'interesting features' of *The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune*, although not 'consistently' presented, actually reflect the changing perceptions of the stage magician during the period.

Bomelio is introduced like his predecessor Bryan, as an exiled hermit living in a cave 'Then was I banished the Citie, Court and towne;.../ Heer have I liv'd almost five yeeres disguisde in secret wise' (III.2.603 & 607). He is attended by a servant and, like Bryan, he performs two simple magical tricks: striking the King's son, Armenio, dumb, and adopting a disguise. Bomelio strikes Armenio dumb for a typical romance reason. Bomelio's son Hermione, who is unaware of his true identity and noble blood (Bomelio had been banished from the court some five years previously), is in love with the King's daughter Fidelia. Considering Hermione an unworthy match for his sister, Armenio interferes in their courtship, and as a result is struck dumb by Bomelio. This act of magic leads into the second magical spectacle in the play, Bomelio's use of disguise. In order to carry out his plan of uniting his son with

---

[27] Traister, pp.38-39

Fidelia, Bomelio disguises himself as a physician, and goes to court to attend to Armenio. In this disguise, he recommends a cure that can be perceived as a type of spell. Armenio's tongue must be washed by the blood of his enemy, who is, at this moment in time, his sister Fidelia. This action is proposed by Bomelio in an attempt to unite the two siblings, and to bring the play to a traditional and happy conclusion

> If you no have your sonne be so dum still,
> You musse getta de grand enemy dat he now have,
> And in de tenderest part his deerest blood crave;
> Derwit musse you wash his tung a string.
> Noting but dat will his speech bring[28].
> (IV.1.1180-1185)

Although Bomelio has performed spectacles which are generally associated with the traditions of the romance convention as prescribed by Merlin, there is also an undertone to Bomelio's art which points to a change in the presentation of magic taking place even before the construction of the first London commercial theatre. Before the climactic conclusion, when Bomelio's magic achieves his true desire, the marriage of Hermione and Fidelia, his son Hermione burns the books that have helped him to perform his magical illusions. Deeply distressed at this turn of events, Bomelio suggests that his magic is linked with the devil, as he rants

> Gogs blood! Villins! The devil is in the bed
> straw! Wounds! I have been robd, robd, robd! Where
> be the theeves? My books, bookes!...
> (IV.4.1494-1496)

Unlike Bryan Sans Foy, Bomelio has derived his magical skills from the study of books and Traister suggests that this makes him a 'crude ancestor of such later love-assisting magicians as John a Kent, Peter Fabell and Prospero'[29]. However, I would also like to propose that Bomelio could be regarded as a 'crude ancestor' of great necromantic magicians such as Doctor Faustus, because he used some of the tools of the philosophical arts – books – to conjure the devil to carry out his ambitions. Although Bomelio does not go as far as Faustus, and indeed, he is afraid that the burning of his magical books will call up this diabolical force, the suggestion of necromantic magic is left to linger in the audience's thoughts.

---

[28] Anon. *The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune*, ed. by John Isaac Owen (New York & London: Garland Press, 1979). All quotations will be taken from this edition throughout this thesis.

Thus, although Bomelio has largely retained his status as a romance magician using the motifs generally associated with the genre such as castles, caves, use of disguise and the ability to strike his enemy dumb, he is also sowing the seed for a newer type of stage magician. For example, he seems to be appropriating the philosophical habit of studying necromantic books, which lead to an alliance with the devil. Indeed, Bomelio's paradoxical adherence of mixing romance magic with philosophical traits is limited in this play, and although he doesn't appear to take his alliance with the devil very far, his traits are later repeated and greatly developed in Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*.

---

[29] Traister, p.38

Structure of Thesis

In my first chapter, I will be examining the ongoing debate about the dating of *Doctor Faustus* and *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, and presenting my own conclusions as to which play appeared first, circa 1588. Having established this, I will then explore the links between this first play and the prose romance it is based upon, to see if there are any innovative elements which can be deemed as suitable for following the diabolical pattern initially suggested by Bomelio in *The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune.*

For chapter two, I will be identifying other plays that may have used this innovative stage protagonist as their main influence. I will be focusing on one play in particular which I feel has relied heavily on this earlier role model for the development of its magical practitioner, and I will be exploring how this equates with the widespread use of its prose source. In order to prove my theory about the relationship between the two plays, I will be examining some of the chief characteristics that I believe are shared between the two plays. This will include exploring the structures of the two plays, the presentation of magical spectacle and illusions on the stage, technical developments and shared characteristics between the two protagonists.

In chapters three and four, I will be arguing that, despite this culmination in the presentation of philosophical magicians in the late 1580s, the trend for magicians who performed the 'black' arts alongside the traditional ones seemed to dwindle in popularity during the 1590s. There was, however, an abundance of plays which featured magicians, and although their art can be defined as weak, they can be characterised as deploying some elements of the philosophical arts. I will be arguing that this can be seen through a detailed analysis of the extant plays *John a Kent and John a Cumber* and *John of Bordeaux*. I will also be exploring the possible hypothesis for the change in attitude from the necromantic magician who is keen to make an alliance with the devil, to the romance magician who is capable of performing some elements of the philosophical arts. One possible suggestion I will be developing is the fact that plays such as *John a Kent and John a Cumber* were performed in the provinces, and as such did not have access to the more sophisticated technical props available on the London stage.

Although plays about magicians increased in popularity during the late 1580s and early 1590s, by the end of Elizabeth's reign in 1603, there was a decline in interest in philosophical magicians, and in plays about magic in general. Indeed, this trend was almost moribund during the formative years of James's reign, despite his own interest in magic, as writers were now turning to other scientific novelties such as alchemy, which were beginning to attract attention. Plays featuring philosophical magicians now became a rarity rather than a convention.

However, in 1610 following on from the precedent he had set in *Pericles*, Shakespeare developed a new type of stage magician, Prospero[30]. In chapter five, I will be demonstrating my hypothesis that Shakespeare based his sophisticated protagonist Prospero on the role model originally defined in 1588, and built on these traits to develop a new model that would captivate and entice a Jacobean audience. I will be examining the new features attributed to this Jacobean prototype, and exploring how they continued to impress an audience now more favourably disposed to the newer stage protagonist of the witch.

---

[30] William Shakespeare, *Pericles* ed. by Doreen Del Vecchio & Anthony Hammond (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)

These newly constructed purpose-built theatres with advancing technical mechanisms now offered the Elizabethan and Jacobean dramatists scope for indulging in new and exciting subjects. By designing a magician who could provide a series of illusions and dramatic spectacles on the stage, the dramatists were cleverly engaging the audience in an act of fantasy, which also incorporated many of the topical issues popular during the period.

Recent Studies

There have been some recent influential studies of Elizabethan and Jacobean plays which feature magicians, and one of the most notable has been Barbara Traister's *Heavenly Necromancers.* Divided into two subsections, the book examines traditional perceptions about magic during the Elizabethan period and looks at the influences of three philosophical theorists – Agrippa, Bruno and Dee – on the stage drama from 1570 onwards. After providing brief details about the romance tradition and examining some of the plays featuring magicians from this popular form of genre, she then turns her attention to making a detailed analysis of the adventures and exploits of the 'ceremonial' or 'philosophical' magicians. Her selection includes the protagonists from Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, Chapman's *Bussy D'Ambois* and Shakespeare's *The Tempest.*

Traister attributes the popularity of these stage magicians during the period to the emergence of philosophical beliefs such as Neoplatonism. Whilst this is true to a limited extent, and Traister's work makes an influential contribution to the study of magic during the period 1570 – 1620, in reading her study, I believe that there are some other key areas to address.

As a result, I will be examining some of the following areas in this thesis. I will be making a detailed analysis of how the many different forms of magic such as romance / village wizard beliefs and the philosophical / academic subjects came to be encapsulated in plays during the period. Alongside this, I will be looking at the influence of certain dramatic styles and structures to see if they encouraged this phenomenon. Some autobiographical information about the playwrights will be considered to see if this encouraged an interest in writing about magic, and rivalry between well-known exponents of this dramatic form will also be reviewed. Whilst Traister has neatly attributed the phenomenon of the magician on the Elizabethan stage to the art of Neoplatonism, I believe that the spectacle also drew on other far-ranging influences, and it is these various elements that I will be examining in this thesis.

* * *

CHAPTER ONE

AN INNOVATIVE ROLE MODEL?

> I, John Faustus of Wittenberg, Doctor, by these presents,
> do give both body and soul to Lucifer, Prince of the East,
> and his minister Mephistopheles; and furthermore grant
> unto them that four-and-twenty years being expired, the
> articles above written inviolate, full power to fetch or
> carry the said John Faustus, body and soul, flesh, blood,
> or goods, unto their habitation wheresoever.
> (II.1.106-112).

This brave alliance with the devil sets a unique precedent in the presentation of magicians on the London stage between the late 1580s and early 1620s. Faustus in a solemn and dignified manner bypassed the fairy tale quality of the romance magician, and truly embraced the art of necromancy (as defined in the introduction), by selling his soul to the devil for twenty-four years of pleasure and magical abilities on the earth. In a visually spectacular and daring moment, Faustus pushed the boundaries of the traditional characterisation of a magician to its fullest limits, and introduced a new, exciting and dangerous element to the stock traits of this character appearing on the recently constructed London stage.

In order to ascertain how this fascinating development came to light, it is necessary, however, to explore some of the background controversies surrounding the play. These include the debate about the play's composition date, and whether it preceded Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, as well as the ongoing debate about whether the a or the b text should be viewed as the original. I would like to commence this chapter by exploring the theories dominating these debates in detail, before suggesting my own hypothesis. I would also like to explore my earlier assertion in the introduction, that Marlowe was introduced to the necromantic theories through his close circle of friends, before moving on to examine the influence of the prose narrative *The English Faust Book* on *Doctor Faustus.*

Dating of Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*

The editors of Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen have presented in their introduction the arguments for the dating of this play, 1588/89, and 1592[1]. Commencing with the 1592 dating, I have outlined the arguments for supporting this conjecture, before turning to the more popular theories supporting a 1588 /89 dating. This earlier date would support the belief that *Doctor Faustus* immediately followed *Tamburlaine* in the Marlovian canon[2].

Some scholars believe that *Doctor Faustus* was the last play to be written by Marlowe before his tragic and untimely death. This belief has been supported by the fact that Thomas Orwin printed 'the earliest extant edition' of the English Faust Book, the acknowledged source for Doctor Faustus, in 1592. Indeed, another edition printed by Abel Jeffes in May 1592 is also referred to in the Stationers' Register, although many believe that earlier editions were available.

As I believe that Marlowe in writing this play worked almost exclusively from *The English Faust Book*, its composition date is very important. Certainly the German version of the legend of Faust, the *Historia von D. Johann Fausten* was first published in 1587. Although there were several reprints of the story during the year, this only leaves a short period of time for the story to have been translated and rewritten by an English writer. From this evidence, it is difficult to support an argument for the composition date of Marlowe's play in 1588/89, and indeed critics such as Boas favour the 1592 date because

---

[1] Christopher Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus*, ed. by David Bevington & Eric Rasmussen (Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press, 1993). This edition will be used for quotation purposes throughout this thesis unless otherwise specified.

[2] Bevington & Rasmussen, p.1

> Unless, therefore, we make the purely arbitrary assumption that Marlowe had access to a manuscript of the translation, it seems that this play must be later than May 1592[3].

The Arguments for a 1588/89 Composition Date

However, there are a series of contemporary themes in the play which help to support a 1588/89 composition date. In I.i, Faustus is presented on the stage acknowledging the wonderful things that he can achieve by practising magic, and one of his ambitions is to 'chase the Prince of Parma from our land' (I.1.95). Bevington and Rasmussen in their footnote[4] state that Parma was the 'Spanish Governor-General of the Netherlands from 1579 to 1592'[5]. During this period, particularly after 1585, England began to face the prospect of war with Spain[6]. In order to avert this danger and prevent her dwindling finances from being further depleted; Elizabeth attempted to conduct a peace treaty with Parma in 1587. The English people were dismayed at this prospect, and believed that Elizabeth 'was being fooled'[7]. By the time the Spanish Armada set sail in 1588, Parma, one of the Catholic leaders, had become one of the most vilified people in English propaganda. Thus, it can be argued that Faustus's inclusion of such a topical and patriotic sentiment supports a 1588/89 dating of the play. Although Parma remained in his position of authority until 1592, as the Armada had been defeated and the Spanish no longer posed such a threat to England's safety, the name did not evoke such passionate feelings.

---

[3] Frederick S. Boas, *Christopher Marlowe* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940), p.204.

[4] Bevington & Rasmussen, p.117

[5] Alessandro Farnese – Duke of Parma and Piacenza, son of Margaret of Parma and Ottavio Farnese was a General in the services of Philip II of Spain. Appointed General to the rebellious Low Countries in 1578, he took control of 'Tournai, Maastricht, Breda, Bruges, Ghent and Antwerp'. He continued to pursue Catholic interests, and in 1590, two years after the disastrous Armada, he entered France to help the 'Catholic League' against Henry IV. Although reviled by the English, he was generally considered to be one of the world's greatest generals. (Taken from the *Concise Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia*, Columbia University Press, 1994, 3rd ed).Internet reference: www.enclyopedia.com/

[6] See J.E. Neale, Queen Elizabeth I (London: Penguin Books, 1933 reprinted 1988), p.295 for further details.

Nicholl in *The Reckoning* notes that Marlowe possibly knew Parma during his time at Cambridge, particularly during the year 1586[8]. Marlowe, according to twentieth-century research, was believed to have been recruited by the Elizabethan government as a spy and informer on certain Catholic activities operating at the University. Also operating in the same intelligence network was another spy Robert Poley. He was believed to be in close proximity to Marlowe during his time in the Netherlands, although he later returned to England to assume the role of government informer on the Babington plot[9]. Observations continued by this network of spies on the activities of Parma, hence this tentative link might have encouraged Marlowe to use a figure known either to himself or his fellow contemporaries in the course of this play [10].

---

[7] Neale, p.296

[8] See Nicholl, p.98 and 149 for further details.

[9] This was the proposed assassination attempt on the Queen in mid 1586, which would allow the 'Italian and Spanish [troops] under the Duke of Parma' to attack England.

[10] There were a lot of government agencies watching Parma during the 1580s, and Faustus's allusion to chasing him from 'our land' which is not specified as Germany suggests this link.

Alongside this contemporary textual reference to events occurring during the period 1586 to 1588, scholars have also examined external citings about the play. Bevington and Rasmussen acknowledge that writing in 1633, William Prynne noted that during a performance of the play a 'visable apparition of the devil [appeared] on the stage at the Belsavage, playhouse in Queen Elizabeth's days…'[11]. As the playhouse continued to be in use until 1589, Bevington and Rasmussen argue that a performance of *Doctor Faustus* in 1588 is a feasible possibility. They state that although the Queen's Men were the predominant acting company using the Belsavage theatre up to 1588, other companies 'more reliably associated with Marlowe…may also have acted there'[12].

Another contemporary indicator which tentatively supports an earlier dating as Bevington and Rasmussen observe, in their introduction is the 1589 entry onto the Stationers' Register for Richard Jones's 'A ballad of the life and deathe of Doctor Faustus the great Cunngerer'. This entry has been cited as a strong contender for the earlier dating of *Doctor Faustus*, because the ballad incorporated material from the play, as well as details from its 'acknowledged source', *The English Faust Book*. This was in keeping with a tradition during the late 1580s and early 1590s for ballads to be written based on popular plays of the era. Other stories, which were successfully rewritten as ballads during the 1590s, include *Titus Andronicus* and *Arden of Faversham*.

Whilst these contemporary references remain the strongest evidence for supporting a 1588/89 dating of the play, scholars such as Thomas and Tydeman, editors of

---

[11] Bevington & Rasmussen, p.2

[12] Bevington & Rasmussen, p.2

Christopher Marlowe have observed other factors which may contribute to the argument[13]. They state that 'morality plays and moral interludes were going out of fashion by the late 1580s...' and were probably moribund by the early 1590s. Yet Marlowe makes widespread use of this generic convention, as he incorporates such characters as the Good and Evil Angels, and the Old Man into the play. The very use of these protagonists from the traditional genre to demonstrate right and wrong in the play, helps the audience to identify Faustus with great characters such as Everyman and Mankind, and can thus be perceived as supporting to some degree, the case for a pre 1590 dating[14].

Bevington and Rasmussen conclude their argument for a 1588/89 composition date by citing Paul Kocher's discussion of *The English Faust Book* in *Christopher Marlowe: A Study of his Thought, Learning and Character*[15]. In this study, Kocher argues that the *English Faust Book* may have been available in Cambridge as early as 1588/89. Harold Jantz also argues that 'a lost Latin original of the *Faustbuch*' was available before the German version in 1587, and was used by German scholars [16]. Jantz supports this argument by citing a paragraph from the *Second Report of Doctor John Faustus*, which was published in London in 1594

> It is plaine that many thinges in the first book are meere lies, for proofe marke this: it is saide that it is translated, so it is, and where it is word for word: But I have talked with the man that first wrote them, having them from *Wagners* very friend, wherein he saith manie thinges are corrupted, some added *de nouo,* some canceld and taken awaie, and many were augmented.

---

[13] *Christopher Marlowe: the Plays and their Sources*, ed. by Vivien Thomas & William Tydeman (London: Routledge, 1994), p.177

[14] This argument can also be supported by the references to the anonymous *Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune*, which retained its connection with the romance genre, but also introduced the concept of a diabolical nature onto the London stage.

[15] See Bevington & Rasmussen, p.3

[16] Harold Jantz 'An Elizabethan Statement on the Origin of the German Faust Book', in *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, LI (1952), pp.137-153

Jantz assumes the 'first book' to refer to the Latin original, which was corrupted by the German scholars, and may well have been available in England before 1587.

Thus, I would like to argue that the reasons for dating *Doctor Faustus* in 1588, rather than in 1592 seem much stronger. The case for an earlier dating is especially supported by contemporary evidence such as the reference to the Duke of Parma, and the listing of the Ballad in the Stationers' Register in 1589.

* * *

Dating of Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*

Although Henslowe states in his *Diary* that *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* was printed for Edward White and entered onto the Stationers' Register on 14 May 1594, the play was not marked as new, and was therefore presumed to have been available before this date[17]. As a result, critics have adopted a paradoxical stance on the play. Whilst the general consensus of opinion supports a 1589 dating, there are still divisions about whether *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* preceded or followed *Doctor Faustus*[18].

'*Friar Bacon* was probably written in 1589, but because we lack definite evidence, its exact date must remain in doubt'[19]. Seltzer supports this date, because of the contemporary reference to St. James's Day in the play, and the veiled allusions to the patriotic fervour sweeping England after the attempted invasion by the Spanish Armada.

---

[17] Philip Henslowe, *Diary*, ed. by Walter W. Greg (London: A.H. Bullen, 1908), p.149

[18] Robert Greene, *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, ed. by Daniel Seltzer (London: Edward Arnold, 1964). This will be the edition referred to throughout this thesis.

[19] Seltzer, introduction, p.ix

In sc. 1 of *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, Edward in ordering Lacy to pursue Margaret on his behalf comments 'thou know'st next Friday is Saint James' (1.134). Both Kerstin Assarsson-Rizzi and Seltzer have verified this feast day (25 July) as occurring on a Friday in 1589[20]. This is the only reference to a specific date in the play, and has come to represent the most significant factor in supporting the 1589 argument.

Other contemporary references in the play that encourage a 1589 dating all adhere to a particular theme, patriotism. In the midst of the outpourings of 'sermons, psalm-singing, and bonfires' which followed the 1588 victory over the Spanish Armada, Elizabeth was busy preparing reserves to support England in case of any further Spanish adversity [21]. In 1589, Elizabeth began raising funds to support 'a great army and fleet, a veritable counter-Armada', and this notion of protecting England from foreign invasion may well have spilled over into the literature of the period [22].

The 'brazen-head' motif is one of the central images of the play, and contributes towards the argument for a 1589 dating. Bacon has constructed the 'head' using 'nigromantic charms' to achieve his main ambition and 'girt fair England with a wall of brass' (11.20)[23]. Although this notion is derived from the source narrative *The Famous Historie of Fryer Bacon* 'to make a head of brasse' to 'keepe it [England] hereafter from the like conquests', its usage may have been incorporated into the play because it represented some of Elizabeth's defence methods [24]. In an attempt to fortify England against the Spanish in 1588, the Elizabethans lit beacons to warn those guarding the shore of imminent enemy approach. Separate beacons were lit in fields to spread the message inland

---

[20] Kerstin Assarsson-Rizzi, *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay: A Structural and Thematic Analysis of Robert Greene's Play* (Lund: Berlingska Boktryckeriet, 1972), p.148.

[21] Neale, p.305

[22] Neale, p.308

> until by the morning not only London knew and Nottingham,
> but York and far-off Durham, that the Spaniards had come
> at last[25].

In effect these beacons represented a wall circling around England, in an attempt to protect her against the Spanish. Thus, Bacon's desire to create a wall of brass may well be linked to this tradition.

Bacon's choice of protection to guard England - a brass wall - may also suggest a military connection. During the campaign, the English ships relied heavily on 'gun-powder', which would be deployed through brass canons. Due to the popular use of this 'gun-powder' during the Armada, this image may provide a further clue to the composition date of this play.

By using his magical skills to provide a 'wall of brass' to protect 'fair England', Bacon seems to be referring to the bronze age ideology outlined in the first book of

---

[23] Bacon classes his art as necromantic, however, unlike Faustus, there is no reference to him ever having made an alliance with the devil in which he promised to give him his soul, in return for his magical abilities.

[24] Anon. *The Famous Historie of Fryer Bacon*, ed. by Henry Morley (London: Routledge & Sons, 1889), p.297

[25] Garrett Mattingly, *Defeat of the Spanish Armada* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1939), p.235

Ovid's *Metamorphoses*[26]. In the Act of Creation, Ovid describes the four ages of gold, silver, bronze and iron. Gold was supposed to represent a heavenly Utopia, and in this era, people 'Had never heard of war' and 'Springtime [was] the single / Season of the year'. However, gradually the 'golden age' was replaced by silver which introduced the season 'And it was then that Jove split up the year / In shifty Autumn, wild Winter, and short Spring'. These two eras were followed by the more violent bronze age

> Third came the age of bronze, less soft than silver,
> And men in bronze were quick with sword and spear,
> Yet all feared Jove. Then came the age of iron...
> (Bk I. 126-129).

The association of brass in the project suggests that England is living in the bronze age period, a time of labour and a period when men 'were quick with sword and spear'. This was possibly a veiled allusion to the attempted invasion by the Spanish Armada. By attempting to use his magical skills to protect England, Bacon could actually be voicing the popular belief that Elizabeth's political strategy during 1588 would now propel England back into the 'golden age', and her people would once again enjoy a Utopian existence. This theme of Elizabeth restoring the 'golden age' to England is suitable for 'post-war' celebrations in 1589, and certainly adds to the argument for this dating, especially as Elizabeth enjoyed frequent references to the 'golden age' ideology in the latter part of her reign.

The theme of patriotism and paying tribute to Queen Elizabeth as a ruler of the 'golden age' is a prevalent motif in the play, and surfaces again in Bacon's final speech

---

[26] Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, trans. by Horace Gregory (New York & Toronto: Mentor, 1958), Bk I, 102.

> That here where Brute did build his Troynovant,...
> Shall flourish out so rich and fair a bud...
> But then the stormy threats of wars shall cease.
> The horse shall stamp as careless of the pike;
> Drums shall be turn'd to timbrels of delight.
> (16.44, 46, 50-52)

Although this allusion does not refer specifically to the Armada, Bacon's euphoric tone is suggestive of post war celebrations.

Seltzer's final piece of contemporary evidence, which also provides a tentative argument for a 1589 dating, is the fact that in 1588 Greene was 'incorporated Master of Arts at Oxford'[27]. Having received his degree, Seltzer argues that Greene may have decided to write a play 'about his new alma mater's great natural philosopher'. Although this argument can be supported by Greene's frequent references to Oxford in the play, there is no conclusive proof to sustain this viewpoint.

As the critics seem to be in general agreement about a 1589 dating for *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, the only problem still to address is whether Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* preceded or 'actually borrowed here and there from Greene'[28]. Having examined the arguments for the two dates ascribed to *Doctor Faustus* of 1588/89 and 1592; I feel that 1588 seems a more logical date to apply to the play, because of the strong contemporary evidence. I believe that Marlowe would have been more inclined to use figures who were famous during 1588 in his play, and one whom he may actually have had some dealings with, rather than writing about him or others in retrospect. By 1592, Parma had turned his attentions to France, and as his moment of vilification in England had passed, it would seem more appropriate to place Faustus's ambitions in 1588. Other contemporary evidence such as the ballad and the sighting of the 'devil' at the Belsavage Theatre supports the argument for 1588. Thus, as a result of the stronger evidence for supporting an earlier dating of the play, I will for the purposes of this thesis be regarding Marlowe's protagonist as the innovative phenomenon who circa 1588 introduced the notion of a necromantic magician onto the London stage.

---

[27] Seltzer, p.ix
[28] Seltzer, p.ix

A Text or B Text?

Since 1616, there have been two versions of *Doctor Faustus*. These are more commonly known as the A or the B text. The A text is the first extant version, with a publication date of 1604. Modern day critics such as Bevington and Rasmussen, and Roma Gill have generally regarded this text as 'something more like the play that Marlowe wrote'[29]. For this reason I have used the A text in this thesis, to support my arguments that Faustus was an innovative stage magician, who was derived from his German predecessor, in an attempt to entice an Elizabethan audience. However, where appropriate, I have included references to the B text in some footnotes to the chapter.

---

[29] Christopher Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus*, ed. by Roma Gill (London: A.C. Black, 1989, reprinted 1997), preface.

Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*

Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* appeared at a time when the demand for stage plays, which provided spectacular displays and illusions was very high. By developing the previously minor role of a magical practitioner, and turning him into a central protagonist who had appropriated a type of magic previously unexplored on the English stage, Marlowe laid down the foundation stones for a new motif which could satisfy the audience's craving for stagecraft[30]. This protagonist was also used to develop other themes prevalent on the English stage at the time, such as the articulation of inner psychological dilemmas through the format of the soliloquy, and an exploration of Renaissance ideology and desire to be regarded as a 'demi-god'[31]. It is the combination of all of these roles which has led me to examine *Doctor Faustus* as an innovative figure for Elizabethan stage history.

As already outlined in the introduction to this thesis, I believe that Marlowe's diabolical character *Doctor Faustus* set a precedent for other stage magicians to emulate during the 1590s and early 1600s, for a number of reasons. There is circumstantial evidence to suggest that Marlowe had an association with great students of the philosophical theorists during the Renaissance. Thomas Kyd, who shared lodgings with Marlowe in 1591, cited both Thomas Hariot and Walter Warner as being close friends of Marlowe[32]. Thomas Hariot was employed by Henry Percy, 9th Earl of Northumberland as a 'mathematician, astronomer, philosopher, geographer', attributes which were regarded as the essential requirements of a Scientist or Renaissance occultist[33]. The Earl himself was a keen student of these subjects, as well as being extremely superstitious. For example, he even believed that a spirit directed him to the study of these theories, because on reaching for a copy of the *Arcadia* of his bookshelf, he accidentally knocked over Alhazen's book on atmospheric refraction[34]. The Earl described the moment in an essay

---

[30] This magic is a combination of the new philosophical and necromantic practices, which have been introduced alongside the traditional methods of the 'village wizard'.

[31] The dramatic device of the soliloquy had not previously been used in this sophisticated way to explain a character's personal dilemmas and problems.

[32] See Nicholl, p.195

> There lay an owld *Arabian* called *Alhazen*, which with some anger I angrylie removed, it flying open phapps by reason of a Stationers thred uncutt, yet superstitiouse in my religion that it was the spirit that directed me by hidden and unconceaveable means what was good for my purpose, with a discontented eye I beheld it where I pceaved a demonstration of the colours of the Raynebowe...

Walter Warner had written a book about the circulation of the blood, which also used some of the occult theories, and as Nicholl comments; these men became involved in a group nicknamed as "the Earl of Northumberland's 'three magi'". They were believed to be associated with the great English philosophical theorist, Dr. John Dee[35].

Although these friendships do not conclusively confirm that Marlowe had an association with students of such philosophical theories as occultism, mathematics and astronomy, he has circumstantial links with people who belonged to, or were associated with this group. He was also believed to have been an acquaintance of Ralegh, who became involved in the study of philosophical theories during this period, and this association has been noted in the poem *The Nymph's Reply*. Marlowe allegedly wrote this poem in response to an earlier poem by Ralegh, although once again, the evidence cannot be substantiated.

---

[33] Nicholl, p.194

[34] Essay by Henry Percy, 9th Earl of Northumberland, undated, published in Frances A. Yates, *A Study of Love's Labour's Lost* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936), pp.208-209.

[35] Nicholl, p.195

Another person who allegedly had links with Northumberland's 'three magi' and Marlowe was Lord Strange. His acting company, the Lord Strange's Men had performed *The Jew of Malta* and *The Massacre at Paris* at the Rose Theatre[36]. Again, this evidence is flimsy, merely based on a throwaway comment that Marlowe and 'Matthew Roydon speak of Strange and Northumberland together in the same sentence', and not surprisingly, this theory has many opponents. However, an association between the two men through the creation of the playhouses in London seems a viable option.

Gareth Roberts in his chapter entitled 'Necromantic Books', argues that at some stage, Marlowe must have been a student of Agrippa's works, because Faustus's necromantic chanting to raise the devil recall 'specific magical practices and theories which can be paralleled and therefore explained by Agrippa's books'[37]. Roberts cites Faustus's spell

> Within this circle is Jehovah's name,
> Forward and backward anagrammatised,
> The breviated names of holy saints,
> Figures of every adjunct to the heavens,
> And characters of signs and erring stars
> (A text, I.3.8-12)

as being derived from Agrippa's work. Jehovah's name was regarded as 'new names of power', and the saints' names can be 'glossed by one of Agrippa's methods of producing magical *characteres*, by contraction of words into a sort of magical monogram containing all the letters'. However, this evidence is again circumstantial, as there was also a text called the *Munich Manual,* which was widely believed to be available to clerics and scholars from the fifteenth century onwards[38]. This also narrated similar passages to the one highlighted by Roberts. What can be argued however, is the fact that due to his scholarly pursuits at University, and his alliances with other academics, Marlowe's background has brought him into contact with several of the philosophical theories prevalent during the era[39]. It is my belief that Marlowe has used these background interests to help him to depict his innovative stage protagonist.

---

[36] Nicholl, p.225 & 226

[37] Gareth Roberts, 'Necromantic Books: Christopher Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus* and Agrippa of Nettesheim' in *Christopher Marlowe and English Renaissance Culture*, ed. by D. Grantley and P. Roberts (Hants: Scolar Press, 1996), pp.148-171, p.155.

Cambridge

According to the rumours, which again cannot be substantiated, Marlowe was engaged by the Elizabethan government as a spy on his fellow students during his time at Cambridge University. Cambridge during the 1580s attracted students from staunch Catholic backgrounds. Poets such as John Donne were allowed to study at the University, but were not permitted to take their degrees. The University also attracted Protestant students, who enjoyed flirting with the Catholic ethos, as it represented an act of rebellion and defiance against the authorities[40].

---

[38] The *Munic Manual of Demonic Magic* was written in Latin during the fifteenth century and provided a detailed guide to necromancy. Indeed, it gave instructions on almost every page for conjuring demons with magical circles.

[39] These would probably be more widely known in Europe than in England.

[40] Nicholl, p.92

Although Marlowe's activities are not confirmed, the Privy Council had to intervene at the end of his course, to ensure that he received his degree, as the University authorities were refusing his candidature, on the grounds of his activities in Rheims. Nicholl notes a summary of the letter in the Council's Minutes

> their lordships thought good to certify that he had no such intent, but that in all his actions he had behaved himself orderly and discretely, whereby he had done Her Majesty good service, & deserved to be rewarded for his faithful dealing[41].

Whilst the world of spying and his own activities as an anti-Catholic informer may have influenced Marlowe, it is possible that a contemporary colleague such as Dr. John Dee, who was widely regarded as a 'black magician', may also have been regarded as a suitable subject for influence.

Linked to Marlowe through his association with Northumberland, Dee, along with his servant Kelly undertook several trips abroad on the pretext of 'lecturing'. William Sherman has confirmed that Dee went to the Bohemian courts in 1583 accompanied by his 'spirit medium Edward Kelley'[42]. During his trip he recorded the *Libri Mysteriorum*, in which he spoke about the angelic voices that had been transmitted through Kelley. Sherman acknowledges that Dee was most active in the court of Rudolph and wrote several tracts about stars and comets that had appeared between 1572 and 1577. By travelling around Europe extensively and visiting the court of the Emperor Rudolph in Prague (who was the brother of Charles V), and promising to show him his spirit Uriel, the 'Holy Vision', Dee may be regarded as suitable source material for Faustus[43]. A similar scene is depicted in the middle section of *Doctor Faustus*, where Faustus, with the help of Mephistopheles conjures the spirit of Alexander and his paramour for the Emperor of Germany, Charles V [44].

---

[41] Nicholl, p.92

[42] William Sherman, *John Dee: The Politics of Reading and Writing in the English Renaissance* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press), p.8

Richard Deacon acknowledged that Dee was an active spy in 1584, and 'had been instrumental in obtaining evidence which showed the Spanish ambassador in London was linked up in the Throckmorton plot, following which he was expelled'[45]. Dee continued to work for the British government, and, along with several other spies such as Thomas Walsingham, had a codename. This was 'Eyes', as he was considered to be the 'eyes' of the government, and was depicted on paper as two circles with a square root sign over them 007[46].

Although regarded as a spy, Dee was however, more widely believed to be a 'black magician'. He had been imprisoned by Mary for casting Elizabeth's horoscope, and predicting the correct date of her coronation. Although he had enjoyed a degree of protection from these 'slanderous accusations' during Elizabeth's reign, he was forced to petition the King on 5 June 1604, in an attempt to clear his name

> To be tryed and cleared of that horrible and damnable, and to him, most grievous and dammageable Sclaunder: generally, and for these many yeeres last past, in this kingdome raysed, and continued, by report, and Print, against him: Namely, That he is, or hath bin a *Conjurer*, or *Caller*, or *Invocator* of divels: Upon which most ungodly, and false report, so boldly, constantly, and impudently avouched: yea, and uncontrolled, and hitherto unpunished, for so many yeeres continuing…[47].

---

[43] See Charlotte Fell Smith, *John Dee* (London: Constable & Co. Ltd., 1909), p.150 for further details.

[44] This spelling of Mephistopheles will be used throughout this thesis, except when quoting from *The English Faust Book*.

[45] Richard Deacon, *John Dee* (London: Garden City Press, Ltd., 1968), p.7

[46] See Deacon p.3 for further information. Deacon also makes a comparison between this symbol and the 007 used for the famous British literary spy, James Bond. See also Appendix A for a copy of a letter signed by Dee using this symbol.

[47] See Appendix B for copy of letter.

As with the argument about Marlowe's associations with certain students of the philosophical theories, John Dee's activities may well have influenced him to create a necromantic protagonist for the London stage. However, I believe that the strongest and most viable explanation for the creation of such a role model, is the influence of the German Faust Legend. This was a narrative about the exploits of a famous German necromancer, Dr. Johann Fausten, and was first published in 1587 under the title of *Historia von D. Johann Fausten weitbeshreiten Zauberer und Schwartzkunsther*. It was reprinted several times during the year, due to its unexpected popularity, and as Roma Gill comments, certainly the

> Stories of witchcraft and enchantment, wandering loose in men's minds, attached themselves in the early sixteenth century to a real life Georg or Johannes Faustus, scholar and reputed magician of no fixed abode[48].

.

It was this fantastic story which attracted the attention of the anonymous English writer simply known as P.F. who translated the German narrative, either during or shortly after 1587. To an Elizabethan writer searching for a prose romance which offered great scope for theatrical and narrative development, as well as offering the possibility to mix new philosophical ideas with the traditional arts of popular magic, the *English Faust Book* must have provided a great source.

* * *

---

[48] Gill, intro, p.xvi

Structure

Certainly of the sixty-three chapters featured in the *English Faust Book*, twenty-six have reappeared to a greater or lesser extent in the A text of Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*. The play also retains from the source the notion of a three-part structure to divide up Faustus's twenty-four years on earth. In the *English Faust Book*, part one deals with Faustus's background and covenant with the devil (chapters 1 – 16). Part two chronicles 'His life and practises, until his end' (chapters 17 – 28), and part three concludes with an account of his 'Nicromancie' and 'lastly of his fearfull and pitiful end' (chapters 29 – 63).

Indeed, this three-part division in *The English Faust Book* reveals the oscillation in Faustus's art. The first part presents Faustus as a philosophical magician, the second part depicts him as a magician belonging to the romance genre, and the third part portrays Faustus as being involved in romance tricks before turning once again to his beloved necromancy.

Although the play is actually divided into five acts, the three-part division used in the source narrative seems to predominate. Acts I and II present Faustus as a philosophical magician making covenants with the devil. Acts III and IV reveal his magic as being more akin to the romance genre, and Act V once again depicts his philosophical links.

The play demonstrates these thematic divisions through the motif of using a chorus. Chorus number one derives its information from chapter one of the source narrative, and provides the audience with details of Faustus's background, and his current status as a scholar. However, the chorus also serves another dramatic purpose. Apart from confirming the stage setting in Faustus's study, it selects information from the source about Faustus giving 'himself secretly to study Necromancy' (p.2). It uses this information to characterise Faustus on the stage for the audience

> He surfeits upon cursed necromancy;
> Nothing so sweet as magic is to him,
> Which he prefers before his chiefest bliss.
> (Chorus I. L.25)

This characterisation of Faustus dominates the first two acts of the play, before the next chorus, which introduces the transitional nature of Faustus's art.

The next two chorus interludes introduce the beginnings of act III and act IV, and denote a subtle change in genre, from philosophical magic to romance. Again, this transition is present in the source narrative, which uses the first chapter of part two (21), to depict this change. Faustus is about to embark upon a journey around the world with his spirit Mephistopheles. However, instead of riding upon a devil's back, a characteristic more normally associated with a necromantic magician, Faustus is transported in the manner of a figure from classical myth, such as Medea, as he is sent in 'a Waggon, with two Dragons before it...' (p.47).

This notion of change is demonstrated in the second chorus of the play. Presented on stage as a soliloquy by Wagner, Faustus's servant, this chorus at the beginning of Act III draws on the same image as the source to signify the change. Wagner states that Faustus embarked upon his journey 'in a chariot burning bright / Drawn by the strength of yoky dragons' necks' (III. Chorus 5-6). This image of the dragon reminds the audience of the early romance genre which frequently linked magicians with dragons, such as Bryan Sans Foy in *Clyomon and Clamydes*, who stole the dragon's head from Clamydes to present to Juliana.

In a similar mode to Chorus II, Chorus number III at the beginning of Act IV is used to confirm the stage setting, and the fact that Faustus is now performing a mixture of romance and philosophical magic. This chorus is used to introduce the court of Carolus (Charles V), where Faustus performs necromantic magic by conjuring the ghost of Alexander. However, whilst at court, Faustus is involved in a display of romance magic, as he attaches a pair of horns to a knight for daring to question his abilities '...I see thou hast a wife, that not / only gives thee horns but makes thee wear them' (IV. 1. 78-79).

The final chorus of the play, which is again performed by Wagner, is drawn from chapter fifty-six of the source narrative. In the source, chapter fifty-six occurs after Faustus commits the sin of demoniality with Helen, and the chapter is merely used to demonstrate the futility of Faustus's actions in selling his soul to the devil. He may have amassed worldly possessions, but at the end of his twenty-four years he is forced to give 'this WAGNER his house and Garden...[give] him in ready money 1600. gilders' (p.116). Having distributed his wealth, Faustus is forced to spend the remainder of his time 'drinking and eating, with other jollitie' (p.116), rather than performing spectacular necromantic displays. This futile legacy underlines the dangers of necromancy and turning away from a Christian way of life, especially for an academic scholar like Faustus, who could have used his skill to achieve greater potential.

Although Wagner's soliloquy in the play draws on this material from the source narrative, it is placed in a different order. The chorus marks the commencement of Faustus's final time on earth, as Wagner comments 'I think my master means to die shortly, / For he hath given to me all his goods' (V. Chorus. 1-2), as well as demonstrating a change in generic emphasis. The chorus occurs before Faustus commits the sin of demoniality, and marks the transition from the predominantly romance / comic style that had occurred in the previous two acts, to the philosophical / tragical atmosphere for the denouement. As Wagner concludes in the chorus 'Belike the feast is ended' (V. Chorus. 7), so Faustus's travels and performances have ended, and he must face the stark reality of his choice: eternal damnation.

This presentation of different types of magic between the various divisions of the play presents an interesting phenomenon. The play seems to adhere to a pattern of philosophical magic, romance magic and finally philosophical magic, or perhaps, as in poetry, a structure of aba. This pattern can be construed as innovative because, assuming *Doctor Faustus* to be written circa 1588, other plays featuring magicians such as *Clyomon and Clamydes* presented their motifs as belonging strictly to the medieval romance tradition[49]. The majority of these magicians could alter their appearances through disguise and place people in an enchanted sleep, although there is no reference to them physically entering into an alliance with the devil.

---

[49] Although *The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune* is predominantly biased towards the romance genre, Bomelio appears to have some sort of alliance with the devil, which is not expanded upon in the play. However, he can be perceived in a different light to the traditional romance magicians. Indeed, he represents the crude foreshadowing of characters such as Doctor Faustus, who have used elements of the new academic philosophies on magic, and explored them alongside popular traditions of magic.

Themes

As already outlined, the play *Doctor Faustus* has almost faithfully copied the three-part structure deployed by the source to present its central protagonist on the stage. However, as well as appropriating this dramatic structure to enthral a London audience, *Doctor Faustus* has also adopted other themes and motifs from the prose romance which help to define the main character as a magician whose skills oscillate between the philosophical arts and romance magic. Although these devices do not adhere as rigidly to the prose romance as the dramatic structure, they have been used and developed in an exciting way to create an innovative protagonist who has set a precedent for other magical practitioners to follow.

The first novel theme to be appropriated and then expanded on from the prose romance to characterise Doctor Faustus as a nonconformist who engaged in 'dangerous activities' is the creation of his alliance with the devil. In the first part of the source, each chapter is exclusively devoted to demonstrating a particular aspect of the philosophical arts such as Faustus's rejection of traditional Christianity. Examples of this include, Faustus going into the wood to conjure a devil, and calling Mephistopheles to appear before him. Mephistopheles appears before him as 'mighty Dragon', before converting to the shape of a fiery man, and lastly attending 'in the manner of a gray Frier' (chapter two, p.5). By choosing to appear firstly as a 'mighty Dragon' and finally as a 'gray Frier', Mephistopheles is underlining the transition Faustus is making from romance to philosophical magic. Indeed, by conjuring a devil dressed as a friar who mocks Christianity, Faustus has called up a traditional emblem of the philosophical arts, and this deed now typecasts him as a necromancer.

The theme of defining Faustus as a necromancer through the conjuration of devils is appropriated and dramatically developed in the play from the prose romance. However, although Faustus eventually enters into a contract with Mephistopheles, Marlowe devotes the whole of I.i to another innovative development for stage protagonists, the dramatic device of the soliloquy. By debating which subject 'fitteth Faustus' wit' (I.1.11), the audience is able to establish Faustus's background as a distinguished academic and scholar, who has achieved eminent success in the traditional areas of medicine, logic and divinity. This background now qualifies Faustus, or so he believes, to pursue the new and more interesting area of necromancy

> And necromantic books are heavenly,
> Lines, circles, signs, letters and characters –
> Ay, these are those that Faustus most desires.
> (I.1.52-54).

By establishing his academic qualifications before turning to the area of necromancy, Faustus is laying the foundation rule for other magical practitioners to follow.

The use of soliloquy, which is not employed as a dramatic device in the source, is favoured in the play to portray a more three dimensional study of Faustus. Having decided to pursue the necromantic arts, Faustus is beleaguered with doubts, which take the forms of a Good and Bad Angel, and appear in the first and last parts of the play[50]. Appearing after his decision to practise necromancy, the Good Angel attempts to dissuade Faustus from his current course 'O Faustus, lay that damned book aside /

---

[50] See Bevington & Rasmussen, p.30 for further details

And gaze not on it, lest it tempt thy soul' (I.1.72-73). The Bad Angel, however, encourages him to go forward on his path of destruction 'Go forward, Faustus in that famous art… / Be thou on earth as Jove is in the sky' (I.1.76 & 78). These psychological manifestations of Faustus's inner dilemmas continue to appear at moments of dramatic tension throughout the play. Whilst enhancing the atmosphere of suspense for the audience, they serve to remind the audience of the moral tone of Christian ethos and the teachings of God. By following Lucifer, Faustus is walking along the path to eternal damnation. If he adheres to God's ways, then he will find his just reward of Heaven. This complex presentation of Faustus's innermost psychological thoughts has set a spectacular example for other plays to follow, and this can be seen most notably in the Jacobean emulation of Faustus, Shakespeare's Prospero.

There are three important necromantic acts in the play: the signing of the covenant with Lucifer: the conjuring of Alexander and his paramour: and the final act of demoniality with the succuba Helen of Troy. Although Faustus initially deviates from the first of these prescribed acts from the source narrative in the play, by dwelling on his academic abilities, his subsequent actions can once again be categorised as relying on the authoritative material. Having been given a book of magical spells, Faustus decides his first act as a necromancer in the play must be to conjure a devil. Hence, he speaks his spell in Latin to reinforce his characterisation as academically superior, and also to give more dramatic emphasis to his actions of conjuring Mephistopheles. Latin was the language of the Mass, and by using it to conjure a devil, Faustus is ensuring that the audience's first impression of him is as a necromantic magician. Although the play does not stipulate how Mephistopheles first appears before Faustus, his necromantic links are further highlighted when Faustus orders him to appear after he has sprinkled holy water and made the sign of the cross, as an 'old Franciscan friar; / That holy shape becomes a devil best' (I.3.26-27)[51]. As already outlined in the introduction, devils could only be conjured and agree to change their shape, if they believed that their end desire, that is the acquisition of a man's soul could be achieved. Mephistopheles's agreement to take on a Christian shape, ironically confirms Faustus's bitter ending, a fact he acknowledges when he answers Faustus's first summons

> For when we hear one rack the name of God,
> Abjure the Scriptures and his Saviour Christ,
> We fly in hope to get his glorious soul.
> (I.3.48-50).

Another religious image used in the source narrative, which confirms Faustus's status in the play as a philosophical magician, is his desire for sexual fulfilment through marriage. However, his desire to undertake such a ceremony horrifies Mephistopheles, who reminds Faustus of his vow with the devil 'thou canst not marry;...for wedlocke is a chiefe institution ordained of God, and that hast thou promised to defie...' (p.16). After this demonstration of Lucifer's powers, Faustus settles for Mephistopheles's necromantic substitution of marriage 'thou shalt have thy hearts desire of what woman soever thou wilt, bee shee alive or dead' (p.17).

Once again, this rejection of a Christian ceremony is utilised and developed in the play to highlight Faustus's status as a necromantic magician. Following the order of the source narrative, one of Faustus's requests to Mephistopheles after the signing of the covenant with Lucifer is for a wife. However, instead of reminding Faustus of his covenant with the devil and then punishing him for desiring to undertake a traditional Christian ceremony in the play, Mephistopheles punishes Faustus first by conjuring a 'Devil *dressed like a woman, with fireworks*' (II.1.after 151). Fireworks were used on the Elizabethan stage to signify the entrance of a devil (footnote for line 151-152), and they would certainly have resulted in a spectacular entrance. Having confirmed his power over Faustus, Mephistopheles warns him of the dangers of seeking a Christian way of life, and offers him the advantages of the devil

---

[51] In the A text we are merely told that Faustus conjures a devil who he defines as 'too ugly to attend on me' before charging him to return an 'old Franciscan friar' (I.3.25-26). This underlines Faustus's immediate characterisation as a philosophical magician, as he has inverted traditional Christian imagery. However, in the B text, Mephistopheles appears firstly '*in the shape of a dragon*' (I.3.after 23), before being told to return as a friar, thus adhering to the pattern prescribed in the source.

> Tut, Faustus, marriage is but a ceremonial
> toy...
> I'll cull thee out the fairest courtesans
> And bring them ev'ry morning to thy bed.
> (II.1.154-157).

As in the source narrative, this offer eventually leads to Faustus's final damnation.

The source narrative continues to define Faustus's status as a necromantic magician through his alliance with the devil. Faustus makes a covenant with the devil in which he gives 'both bodie and soule' to the devil in return for '24 yeares' on earth (p.11). This covenant is written in Faustus's blood, which is taken from him by a 'small penknife' being used to prick 'a vaine' (p.10). Blood is an essential ingredient of the human body, and it was Christ's life-giving blood, which was spilt when he died on the cross[52].

---

[52] In John's Gospel, we learn that on inspecting the crucified bodies, the soldiers discovered that Jesus was already dead. Therefore, instead of breaking Jesus's legs which was the custom to see if he was dead, the soldiers pierced his side and 'immediately there came out blood and water' (19:34-37). This fulfilled the prophecy that no bones in his body would ever be broken.

The notion of signing a covenant with the devil is appropriated in the play, because it confirms Faustus's status as a philosophical magician. However, the play also develops for the theatre audience some of the images briefly associated with the covenant in the source. For example, the source describes Faustus's signing of the covenant in blood, by briefly mentioning the fact that the blood is warmed in 'a saucer' set on 'ashes' (title of ch. 6, p.11). Yet the play develops this image to a greater dramatic effect. Faustus begins to write, and then notices that his blood congeals. Whilst Mephistopheles promises to bring fire to 'dissolve it straight' (II.1.63), fire being a symbol of the ever-burning flames of hell, Faustus is left alone on the stage to perform his soliloquy[53]. He uses this moment in the play to consider the implications of his act 'What might the staying of my blood portend? / Is it unwilling that I should write this bill?' (II.1.64-65), and after posing a series of questions to himself, he confirms his necromantic status, by concluding 'Is not thy soul thine own?' (II.1.68). This brief moment of reflection signifies to the audience the enormity of Faustus's act, and prepares them for his final sin at the end of the play, his act of demoniality with the succuba Helen of Troy.

Another image appropriated from the source and used for dramatic effect in the play is the appearance of the phrase 'O HOMO FUGE' (p.10) on Faustus's hand. This phrase is used in the source to introduce Faustus's determination to become a necromantic magician, as he proceeds to sign the covenant 'FAUSTUS continued in his damnable minde...'(p.11). This phrase is also incorporated in and elaborated on in the play, where it is used to signify Faustus's panic before fulfilling his necromantic ambitions. When the phrase appears, Faustus thinks of turning to God, however, he feels unable to do so because his previous action will make God 'throw thee down to hell' (II.2.78). Unable to focus his mind, Faustus believes himself to be hallucinating 'My senses are deceived...I see it plain' (II.2.79-80), and he is only able to control himself when Mephistopheles presents elaborate stagecraft in the show of devils dressed as the seven deadly sins. Delighted by this entertainment, Faustus dismisses his dubious thoughts and proceeds with the fulfilment of his necromantic ambition 'Here, Mephistopheles, receive this scroll, / A deed of gift of body and of soul' (II.2.88-89).

---

[53] This allows Faustus to shares his inner feelings with the audience at this moment in the play.

The final motif adapted from the source narrative to highlight Faustus's casting as a necromantic magician in the preliminary section of the play is the chronicle of Lucifer's fall from Heaven

> My Lord LUCIFER was a faire Angell, created of God as immortal,...hee would have presumed unto the Throne of God...
> (Ch. 10, p.18).

This story is adopted to point out that Lucifer fell for 'aspiring pride and insolence' (I.3.69), ironically, the very sin that Faustus is also guilty of, as it is the one thing that led him to study necromancy 'A greater subject fitteth Faustus' wit' (I.1.11).

Marlowe's play seems to have appropriated many of the examples from the *English Faust Book* which depict Faustus as a necromantic magician. Previously unrepresented on the Elizabethan stage, the necromancer is now easily identifiable through the dramatic establishment of a relationship with the devil, which is secured through the signing of a covenant. This covenant is generally responsible for generating the services of a particular devil, in this case, Mephistopheles. As Faustus's companion, Mephistopheles is now able to show him the delights of the world, as well as helping him to create spectacular tricks on the stage to impress other protagonists and the audience watching the unfolding action. This device enables Faustus to switch from practising necromantic magic to the more traditional and popular form of romance magic[54].

Romance Magic

In order to change the atmosphere to comic effect and utilise some of the new 'technical advances' present in the theatre, Marlowe identifies and adopts some of the source narrative's chronicles of Faustus's performance as a magician. Whilst the source generally continues to define Faustus in a necromantic manner, the play adapts some of the passages and defines him as a romance magician. This change in tone to the romance genre is effective for providing a comical interlude in the play, as well as developing a sentiment of futility, as Faustus gives his soul 'For / vain pleasure of four-and-twenty years' and as a result loses 'eternal joy and felicity' (V.2.39-41).

Having travelled with Mephistopheles all around the world, Faustus in the prose romance desires to 'see the Popes Pallace, and his manner of service at his table' (p.56). This episode is depicted in the source to demonstrate a strong Protestant ethos by propagating anti-Catholic sentiments; as Faustus notes that during his visit to the Vatican, there are people living in the Holy City who are guilty of similar sins to himself 'proud, stout, wilfull, gluttons, drunkards, whoremongers, breakers of wedlocke...' (p.57). As well as using this middle section to return to the more widely known area of popular magic, Marlowe's choice of appropriating this section of the source may well have stemmed from his involvement in the Government attempts to remove Catholicism from Cambridge. Indeed, during the Elizabethan period, there were many criticisms of the Catholic / Papist way of life, and Faustus's observations here highlight the (German) Protestant disapproval of the religion.

---

[54] This switch in genre is in keeping with Thomas's assertion that philosophical theories were not widely known in England, and in order to retain the audience's interest, Faustus would have to practise magical tricks which were derived from the popular tradition.

This episode is depicted in the play, and is hailed as Faustus's first public demonstration as a necromantic magician, although it is actually classified as belonging to the romance genre, due to its comic overtones and the types of tricks used to display Faustus's magic. Faustus attempts to sustain his necromantic image by ordering Mephistopheles to make him invisible whilst he visits the Vatican. Although Faustus believes that he is practising necromancy by attempting to affect the Christian way of life in the Holy City 'Then charm me that I may be invisible, to do what I / please unseen of any whilst I stay in Rome' (III.2.56-57), his only victory is a series of annoying tricks. Indeed, instead of being recognised as a necromantic magician aided by the devil and condemned to eternal hell, he is ironically characterised by the Cardinal of Lorraine as 'some ghost, newly crept out of / purgatory, come to beg a pardon of your Holiness' (III.1.73-74), whose tricks are simple and cause amusement rather than fear.

Whilst the source largely retains the notion of Faustus as a necromantic magician throughout his twenty-four year contract with the devil, the play highlights some of the episodes it uses and changes the overtones to develop a unique character for the

Elizabethan stage. In chapter twenty-nine of the source, at the court of Charles V, the Emperor openly characterises Faustus as 'excellent in the black Arte...' (p.79). This definition of Faustus's skill leads the Emperor to ask Faustus to grant his particular wish in order to prove his reputation 'to let me see that ALEXANDER, and his Paramour...as they used in their life time' (pp.79-80). Faustus is happy to grant this request by conjuring Alexander, thus proving his reputation as a necromancer.

This scene with its philosophical overtones is transcribed into the play, but its atmosphere is lifted by characters derived from the next chapter in the source narrative. Although the play retains Faustus's philosophical characterisation by the Emperor 'I have heard strange report / of thy knowledge in the black art' (IV.1.1-2), and the request to raise Alexander 'by cunning of thine art / Canst raise this man from hollow vaults below' (IV.1.35-36), there is a subtle change in genre. A knight present at Court mocks Faustus's ability to perform this conjuration, and is rewarded by Faustus attaching a pair of horns to his head. This trick derived from the myth of Diana in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (footnote 62-63, p.175) interrupts Faustus's presentation as a necromancer, and once again characterises him as a romance magician. Indeed, several of the early romances drew on classical allegories from writers such as Ovid to lend authority to their performances.

Although Faustus eventually performs his conjuration of Alexander, the dramatic pinnacle that the spectacle reached in the source is dismissed because Faustus is concentrating on the knight who mocked him. Faustus is determined to reveal the knight with the horns on his head to the Emperor and the rest of the court to maximise his humiliation. It is this obsession with the knight and the horns that diffuses the serious necromantic overtones of the conjuration, and reduces the spectacle once again to a simple romance performance.

Smaller episodes are also lifted from the source narrative such as Faustus's villainous trickery with the Horse Courser, and incorporated into the play, simply because they create a comic atmosphere for the audience and reveal the farcical level to which his skill has descended. Instead of conjuring great heroes from the past, Faustus's alliance with the devil has reduced him to preventing physical harm to his well-being, as he absurdly regrows the leg which the Horse Courser pulled off after their angry exchange. This is comically presented on the stage by Faustus's simple observation after the heated discussion 'Faustus has his leg / again' (IV.1.186-187). In other words, a human being can inflict physical harm on him, but the devil will be able to repair any damage, as long as it is within the timespan of the contract.

Despite this comic interval which has demonstrated the level of Faustus's skill as a necromantic magician, the audience now view the fulfilment of Faustus's twenty four-year contract with the devil with some trepidation. He has used his powers to play tricks such as the one on the Horse Courser to gain material wealth 'Well, this trick shall cost him forty dollars' (IV.1.188), rather than using his time on earth to contemplate his spiritual welfare.

It is only in the last scene of act IV, which again utilises a theme extracted from the source narrative (chapter 39), that Faustus's status as a magician begins to waver between the philosophical and the romance genre. This is to prepare the reader / audience for the final part of the story, which once again returns to the philosophical arts. In the source, Faustus demonstrates his necromantic arts at the Court of the Duke of Vanholt, by ordering Mephistopheles to bring a dish of grapes for the pregnant Duchess. Faustus executes this simple demand by displaying his great philosophical knowledge 'The yere is devided into two circles...when with us it is Winter, in the contrary circle it is notwithstanding Summer...' (p.93). Indeed, in the play, Faustus practically echoes his prototype by commenting 'the year is divided into two / circles over the whole world...' (IV.2.23-24). However, as the fruit is brought onto the stage by Mephistopheles rather than Faustus, this academic display of knowledge fails to impress the audience, as he is unable to perform the deed himself. Coupled with his previous simplistic tricks, the audience now characterises him as a romance rather than a necromantic magician.

Although the play has adopted various episodes from the middle section of the source, it has adapted them for the Elizabethan stage to create a comic effect, which lightens an otherwise tragical atmosphere. However, this middle section of the play also serves another purpose. By dramatising Faustus's tricks as belonging to the romance tradition, Marlowe is deriving his authority from past styles and conventions to present a new prototype on the stage. A magician who oscillates between the two arts is certainly a worthy subject to emulate and adopt for further dramatic presentation.

Philosophical Magic

In order for the audience to re-characterise Faustus as a philosophical magician to perform his final act against God, his descent into the romance tradition is abruptly halted after these last scenes. Although the source continues to describe Faustus's adventures with Mephistopheles, the play is mindful of time and presses onto the last part of the narrative, which witnesses Faustus's final performance as a necromantic magician, before being condemned to eternal hell. Again, this transition between these two forms of genre is evoked in the play through the chorus, which intimates to the audience Faustus's approaching death 'I think my master means to die shortly' (V. Chorus I).

This final act characterising Faustus as a philosophical magician who is offered the chance to repent or else face the consequences of his actions is very important for establishing a motif for other similarly themed plays to follow. Although Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* follows the course prescribed by the source narrative (chapters 45, 48, 49 & 55), whereby Faustus faces eternal damnation for his sins, his internal dilemmas (not mentioned in the source) are externalised on the stage through the Good and Bad Angel, and the Old Man. This dramatic device sets an innovative stance in the development of this prototype. Indeed, later magicians such as Friar Bacon face an agonising dilemma about the virtues of the philosophical arts, although, unlike Faustus, they choose to repent and follow the more acceptable paths of 'white magic'.

The character of the Old Man is directly imported from the source narrative, because his actions have serious implications for the nature of the play. It is the Old Man's speech to Faustus and the issues that it raises, which finally confirms the necromantic nature of his art. The Old Man tries to warn Faustus of the dangers he is placing his soul in 'Doctor FAUSTUS, let my rude Sermon be unto you a conversion, and forget the filthy life that you have led' (p.107). Faustus is almost convinced to repent, until the devil appears and threatens to beat him for attempting reconciliation with God. This seals Faustus's doom, and he once again agrees to renew his contract with the devil.

This chapter has great dramatic potential, and it is fully developed in the play. The use of the Old Man to tempt Faustus back to the Christian way of life is fully explored, especially in his speech which is developed to conjure vile images of hell 'The Stench whereof corrupts the inward soul / With such flagitious crimes of heinous sins' (V.1.42-44). These hellish images have a profound effect upon Faustus who immediately despairs of the life he has chosen, and almost confirms his necromantic status by accepting the dagger Mephistopheles offers him to end his life. This deed is classed as a necromantic act, because suicide is one of the mortal sins in the Christian faith. However, in order to comply with the source narrative and increase the dramatic potential of these scenes, the Old Man manages to dissuade Faustus from this course of action, by once again offering him the chance of redemption 'Ah, stay, good Faustus, stay thy desperate steps!' (V.1.53). The Old Man's calming words sooth Faustus, and permit him the opportunity to remind the audience of the dilemma troubling his conscience 'I do repent, and yet I do despair' (V.1.64).

Although an Elizabethan audience would be delighted with this exploration of Faustus's inner psyche, he has to remain true to his predecessor in the source narrative, and as a result, the calm atmosphere created by the Old Man is rudely disrupted by the devil. He threatens Faustus for not honouring his covenant 'Revolt, or I'll in piecemeal tear thy flesh' (V.1.69), and this horrific image shocks Faustus from his thoughts of Christian redemption. However, this image is later perceived by the audience to be ironic, as it proves to be an accurate description of his death, and pushes him into renewing his contract with the devil. This repeated dramatisation of the covenant 'My former vow I made to Lucifer' (V.1.73) again confirms Faustus's status as a philosophical magician whose destiny is for eternal damnation rather than Heaven.

This notion of rewriting the covenant has been appropriated from the source narrative and altered in the play to achieve a dramatic purpose. In the source, Faustus resigns his covenant after seventeen years; however, in the play, he remakes his alliance after his twenty four-year contract has expired. This emphasises to the audience that, despite his inner turmoil and debate, Faustus has resolved to pursue his necromantic course to the end, and reject any offer of reconciliation with God. By emphasising the necessary credentials for a philosophical magician, and setting a precedent for other magicians to follow or adapt to suit their own purposes, Faustus is now ready to commit his final sin and deed, which will confirm his status as a necromancer.

In chapter fifty-five of the prose romance, Faustus makes Helen his mistress, and together they have a child called 'Iustus Faustus' (p.115). This liaison between Helen and Faustus is retained in the play, although its dramatic potential is played out in a slightly different fashion. Faustus has renewed his contract with Lucifer, and as a result, he is now facing eternal damnation. In order to fulfil the terms of his contract and demonstrate the pinnacle of his career, Faustus commits the sin of demoniality

> Sweet Helen, make me immortal with a kiss
> [*They kiss*]
>
> Her lips sucks forth my soul. See where it flies!
> Come, Helen, come give me my soul again.
> (V.1.93-95)

Faustus's passion is highlighted by his confirmation that Helen is as beautiful and sexually appealing as depicted in the legend 'Was this the face that launched a thousand ships / And burnt the topless towers of Illium?' (V.1.91-92). This image helps the audience to understand why he has committed this act, even if the image has no substance. Faustus's emotions are running high after his final covenant with the devil, and he is attracted by the vision cunningly brought on to the stage by Mephistopheles to seal his fate. It is only after Faustus has committed the sin of demoniality, that he finally realises the full consequences of his deed.

Faustus's final miserable hour at the end of his life is dramatically chronicled on the stage by the interspersion of a clock chiming various parts of the hour. Although adapted from the source narrative, this final hour on earth is dramatically enhanced to portray Faustus's torment. Instead of merely lamenting his fears about a traditional ideal of hell 'sorrow, misery, payne, torment, griefe...' (p.121), Faustus commences his soliloquy at eleven o'clock. This act reinforces his necromantic status, as it is the hour before midnight, the traditional time for the appearance of the witches and devils. He must use this time to contemplate his sins and express his inner beliefs about his future torments in eternal damnation.

It is at this stage in the play that Faustus calls upon religious ideology in the vain hope of saving his soul from eternal damnation. This action seems to repeat the Protestant ethos of the source narrative, as Faustus yearns for time to repent, so that his soul may go to Heaven[55]. He begs

> let this hour be but
> A year, a month a week, a natural day;
> That Faustus may repent and save his soul!
> (V.2.71-73).

This great man who aspired to achieve the Elizabethan ambition to be a demi-god is now reduced to begging for time to seek God's forgiveness and mercy 'One drop [Christ's blood] would save my soul...' (V.2.79). The Faustus who scornfully rejected the advice of the Good Angel and the Old Man now seeks the very redemption they were trying to offer him, before his weakened mind was once again attracted by the transitory delights of the devil. These images of time, which were proving to be popular new themes for the Elizabethan stage, were constantly referred to in this final soliloquy, as the clock relentlessly chimes the last half hour of Faustus's time on earth. It mirrors his obsession with time, as he limited his contract with Lucifer to twenty four years, and he now tries to reduce his time in hell to 'A thousand years, / A hundred thousand' (V.2.102-103).

Faustus plays out his role as a necromancer, by introducing into this final soliloquy some topical Elizabethan themes. He refers to his horoscope, a popular task for a parent to complete after the birth of his / her child during the Elizabethan period. The local village wizard would cast a life prediction for the child's birthday, and this was believed to predetermine his path during life. Faustus now wishes that the 'stars that reigned at my nativity' (V.2.89) could now be influenced to try and change the path prescribed for him by destiny. Faustus even concludes his pathetic pleas by agreeing to forego his lifelong and truly Elizabethan ambition to be a demi-god, by offering to undertake a carnivalesque swap. His wishes to exchange his status as a scholar with free choice to study divinity or necromancy, with that of a beast whose soul is condemned to dissolve 'in elements' (V.2.111), rather than going to Heaven or hell.

---

[55] This idea of deathbed repentance in order for the individual to go to Heaven was traditionally associated with Protestantism. In Catholicism, a death bed repentance generally brought about in the presence of the priest and through the sacrament of extreme unction, would guarantee the individual a place in purgatory.

Stage directions indicating thunder and lightning are also used to signal God's displeasure at Faustus's selfish deed, and symbolise his future in hell, a place of fire and great noise. These dramatic motifs are employed in the play to signal the entry of Lucifer and his devils onto the stage to collect their due deserts. Later magicians such as Prospero in Shakespeare's *The Tempest* also adopt Faustus's final decision in his last soliloquy to reject philosophical magic, by burning 'my books' (V.2.123). However, whereas Prospero is able to turn to 'white' magic and return to a 'normal' way of life, this path is not open to Faustus, as he is the only magician to openly sign a contract with the devil. Thus, he must pay the price and suffer eternal damnation.

In studying the *English Faust Book* and examining Marlowe's appropriation of themes, structures, characters and images from it, I believe that this was the singular most influential object which encouraged him to produce his play. This assertion can be supported by the fact that the play also adhered to the structural presentation of magic in the prose narrative, as the magician is depicted making an alliance with the devil, conjuring spirits and committing the final act of demoniality. In using this narrative, Marlowe has explored issues which would appeal to an Elizabethan audience, and adapted them to fit in with the type of knowledge that they would have of magic during the period.

I also believe that Marlowe's background including his friendships with students of the philosophical arts and his unconfirmed activities as a spy during his time at Cambridge, suggests an influence in his choice of prose –something which would be topical – but would offer an alluring and dramatically spectacular piece of theatre. It is this legacy, I believe, which helped to establish the precedent for characterising magicians on the London stage, and encouraged other playwrights such as Greene to emulate with his famous play *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay.*

CHAPTER TWO

CONTINUATION OR INNOVATION?

How restless are the ghosts of hellish spirits
When every charmer with his magic spells
Calls us from nine-fold trenched Phlegiton,
To scud and over-scour the earth in post
Upon the speedy wings of swiftest winds.
Now Bacon hath rais'd me from the darkest deep...
(15.1-6)

The presentation of the case for a 1588 dating of *Doctor Faustus* raises the issue of the relationship between Marlowe and Greene. As Nicholl notes *Tamburlaine* had been a very successful debut for Marlowe and this provoked an attack by Robert Greene, who did not want to lose his place as a popular playwright for the Elizabethan stage [1]. As Bevington and Rasmussen acknowledge, he had already attempted 'to capitalise on Marlowe's success, as in *Alphonsus, King of Aragon* (1587 –8) and its nearly parodic depiction of the overreacher Tamburlaine'[2].

Although *Alphonsus* appears to be a 'parodic depiction' of *Tamburlaine*, it is however the line cited in *Perimedes,* which has led critics to believe that Greene used *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* to copy and perhaps rival Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* [3]. Indeed, in the preface to *Perimedes the Blacksmith,* which was registered on 31 March 1588, Greene again criticises Marlowe in an attempt to sully his name 'such mad and scoffing poets that have prophetical spirits, as bred of Merlin's race'[4]. This has been viewed as an attack on Marlowe due to a pun on the name Merlin, which was regarded as a variant on the correct spelling of Marlowe's name.

---

[1] Nicholl, p.202
[2] Bevington & Rasmussen, p.1
[3] S.R. 29 March 1588, Bevington & Rasmussen
[4] Nicholl, p.203

In following my hypothesis that Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* preceded Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay,* and that the outburst already outlined was a direct result of this, I would like to turn my attention to the relationship between the two plays. I will commence this study by looking at *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay's* reliance on its source, the prose romance *The Famous Historie of Fryer Bacon.* It is my belief that in following his previous example of responding to Marlowe's play *Tamburlaine* with *Alphonsus*, Greene looked for a prose romance which could be adapted as a suitable response to *Doctor Faustus.*

From the outset, Greene seems to be following Marlowe's precedent of searching for a popular prose romance about a stage magician with necromantic links. In his article 'Traditional Elements in the Character of Greene's Friar Bacon' Waldo F. McNeir cites the viewpoints of critics such as Alexander Dyce, A.W. Ward and J. Churton Collins, that 'the central figure' in Greene's play was 'The benevolent necromancer who appears in the Contemporary popularised romance, *The Famous Historie Of Fryer Bacon*'[5]. This assertion has been supported by Daniel Seltzer in his introduction to the play, although he clarifies the argument by stating that Greene also derived names from Holinshed's *Chronicles* (1264) and details from works by 'John Bale, John Foxe, Johannes Nauclerus and Giordano Bruno'[6].

However, as with the *English Faust Book,* these critics have acknowledged that there is a problem with this hypothesis. The earliest extant version of *The Famous Historie* was not published until 1623, and Greene's play was written circa 1589[7]. Despite this difference of approximately thirty five years, this assertion has always been upheld, because as Assarsson-Rizzi comments

---

[5] Waldo F. McNeir, 'Traditional Elements in the Character of Greene's Friar Bacon' in *Studies in Philology*, xlv (1948), 172-179 (p.172).
[6] Seltzer, introduction, p.xii.
[7] McNeir, p.172 (footnote on Arber's transcript of the Stationers' Register).

> the strong similarities that exist between Greene's play and the prose narrative have made scholars and critics abandon the problem, confident in the assertion that earlier editions, now lost, must have been published. No close investigation seems to have been made. Furthermore, such studies as have appeared are divided between scholars concerned with Roger Bacon and those concerned with *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*[8].

Relationship between *The Famous Historie, Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* and *Doctor Faustus*

In his play *Doctor Faustus*, Marlowe derives much of his information, structure and use of theme to define his central protagonist as a philosophical magician from the popular source narrative *The English Faust Book.* However, of the sixteen episodes narrated in *The Famous Historie of Fryer Bacon,* only five reappear in Greene's play *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay.* In this chapter, I will be arguing that these five episodes were specially selected, because they offered the best potential for presenting Bacon as a necromancer who performed popular romance tricks, in a similar manner to Doctor Faustus. They also offered the possibility for Bacon to deviate from the tragical overtones overshadowing Faustus's magical performance throughout the play, and create his own triumphant conclusion, by renouncing the practice of 'black' magical arts and turning once again to the more acceptable 'white' magic. By using white magic to hail the coming of the great monarch Queen Elizabeth, who would restore the golden age to England, this conclusion can be perceived as fitting for a play written circa 1589, a period of great rejoicing after the defeat of the Spanish Armada.

---

[8] K. Assarsson-Rizzi, p.24

The only episode from *The Famous Historie* to be almost directly replicated in the play, that is, by retaining the same characters, their actions, ambitions and behaviour is 'How Fryer Bacon made a Brasen head to speak'[9]. There are some small deviations in this episode's presentation in the play, such as Bacon's confirmation of his alliance with the devil and his condemnation of Miles to hell forever for his culpability, rather than being 'strucke ... dumbe for one whole months space' (p.301). However, the narrative structure of the source is predominantly adhered to. Whilst this episode may have been retained for a number of reasons, I would like to examine the use of this motif as evidence for the argument that Greene was attempting to follow the prototype example laid down by Marlowe in *Doctor Faustus.*

In the prose romance, the brasen head motif occurs fairly near the beginning of the narrative, after a series of presentations about Bacon's reputation as an academic 'he was sent for to the University of Oxford, ...and grew so excellent in the studies of art and nature...'(p.288). Bacon is depicted in these introductory episodes as a magician who could perform conjuring tricks. Indeed, he used his magical abilities to raise images of people for Kings and Queens, and he also appears to exercise a certain amount of power over the devil, as he saves a man's soul from Lucifer, in accordance with his vocational status.

---

[9] Due to the variations in spelling for Bungay / Bungey in *The Famous Historie*, I have used Greene's spelling of Bungay throughout this thesis, except if quoting from the source.

In *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, the brazen head motif is presented as the central spectacle of Bacon's magic, strategically placed after one performance with the 'glass prospective' and the philosophical debate. However, in keeping with the format of the prose romance, many of the scenes before this magical display are used to build a profile of Bacon as a magician.

Bacon is simultaneously introduced on stage by Rafe as a 'brave scholar' at Oxford University, who is also a 'brave nigromancer' (I.93-94). Indeed, Rafe's introduction seems to suggest that these two areas are inextricably linked, a point that is dramatically reinforced by Bacon's first appearance on the stage at Oxford University amongst other academics. In this scene, he uses Latin – the traditional language of scholars – to address Miles '*Attulisti nos libros meos de necromantia*?' (2.3). Bacon uses this scene with the scholars at Oxford to demonstrate his abilities as a magician, and like his predecessor in the source who conjures a 'kitchen-mayde', he conjures the Hostess at Henley (2.124) to prove that he is not the only academic engaged in studying the philosophical arts.

Bacon's introduction as a scholar at Oxford University studying necromantic books reminds the audience of Doctor Faustus, who dismissed the traditional academic pursuits to study the philosophical arts. As with Doctor Faustus, Bacon has reached the pinnacle of his academic career, as 'A friar newly stall'd in Brazen-nose?' (2.11), and it is this qualification which has offered him the possibility of pursuing alternative academic subjects such as necromancy [10]. Thus, it would seem necessary from the example of these two plays for an Elizabethan magus defining himself on the stage as a philosophical practitioner to list his academic qualifications before performing his magical spectacles.

---

[10] Brazen-nose referring to Brasenose College at Oxford University.

In a similar manner to his predecessor, and in close conjunction with the source narrative, Bacon lists these academic and magical qualities as necessary attributes for achieving his great ambition. Whilst Faustus engages in these practices to achieve his ambition to be a 'demi-god', Bacon clarifies his desire for fame by attaching a patriotic purpose to his project

> Fryer Bacon reading one day of the many conquests of England, bethought himselfe how he might keepe it hereafter from the like conquests, and so make himselfe famous hereafter to all posterities. (p.297)

> I have fram'd out a monstrous head of brass,
> That, by th'enchanting forces of the devil,
> Shall tell out strange and uncouth aphorisms,
> And girt fair England with a wall of brass...
> Wake me; for then by magic art I'll work
> To end my seven years' task with excellence.
> (11.17-20, 33-34).

Although Bacon's ambition is listed in the source narrative, it is generally perceived as being included as the main theme in the play due to its dating, circa 1589 (see chapter one). At this time, England was rejoicing in its famous defeat of the Spanish Armada, as well as taking steps to make sure its defences were secure from any other 'threatened' invasion.

Bacon continues to define himself in the play as a philosophical magician, by reminding Miles of his alliance with the devil

> Miles, thou knowest that I have dived into hell
> And sought the darkest palaces of fiends;
> That with my magic spells great Belcephon
> Hath left his lodge and kneeled at my cell.
> (11.7-10)

This reference can be construed as an attempt to copy *Doctor Faustus*, because in the source narrative there is only a limited reference to Bacon's dealings with the devil. In the source, Bacon conjures the spirit to 'tell to us the way and manner how to make this head to speake' (p.297). The devil is merely employed as a means to advise the friars how to achieve their objective; there is no reference to Bacon already having an alliance with him. In the play however, Bacon seems to have had an alliance with the devil for 'seven years' (11.15), a deed which has enabled him to enjoy devils visiting him in his cell, and helping him with his magical spectacles, such as the creation of the brazen head.

Bacon's light hearted and comical casting as a friar in league with the devil contradicts his Christian vocation of serving God and saving people from eternal damnation. Indeed, in the play, whenever Bacon practises necromancy and recalls his alliance with the devil he uses anti-Christian imagery to define the moment[11]. In the first display of his philosophical arts, (that is the glass prospective scene), Bacon welcomes Edward to his cell which he describes as a 'consistory court / Wherein the devils pleads homage to his words' (6.3-4). By welcoming devils into a cell designed as a Christian court, Bacon is mocking his own vocation, and following Faustus's example of inverting Christian imagery and ideology to achieve a necromantic career.

Although these two plays share this common motif, that is the fact that both protagonists have an alliance with the devil in order to perform their magical skills on the stage, Friar Bacon deviates slightly from the example prescribed by Doctor Faustus. Instead of physically entering into an alliance with the devil, and promising him his soul in return for eternal damnation, Friar Bacon's links with the devil are generally treated in a more light-hearted and comical manner. This is due to his final act of repentance and conversion to 'white magic' at the end of the play. However, despite this difference in their diabolical alliances, both magicians insist on using the devil motif coupled with anti-Christian ideology to define themselves as necromantic magicians on the London stage in Elizabethan England.

---

[11] This alliance is not specifically referred to until this scene, which is practically at the end of the play.

Another dramatic device used by Bacon for defining himself as a necromancer in this speech, which is not employed in the source, is his invoking of classical references such as 'And three-form'd Luna' (11.12). Daniel Seltzer in his footnotes cites this as a reference to the 'diva triformis' in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, or Luna, Diana and Hecate[12]. By aligning himself with Hecate, the goddess of the dark hours, Bacon is revealing the dark side of his nature [13]. This reminds the audience of his predecessor Faustus, who used classical references to lend authority to his magical displays, for example the instance with Benvolio.

The dramatic motifs deployed in Bacon's speech in order to characterise him as a philosophical magician are important for maintaining the distinction drawn between the two magicians Bacon and Bungay, in the prose romance

> To this purpose hee got one Fryer Bungey to assist him,
> who was a great scholler and a magician, (but not to bee
> compared to Fryer Bacon)...
> (p.297).

Bacon is portrayed in this episode in the prose romance as the leading magician capable of using his alliance with the devil to create the brazen head. One of the main reasons (probably), why this episode has been recreated almost faithfully in the play, is the patriotic nature of Bacon's ambition to create the head 'And girt fair England with a wall of brass' (11.20).

---

[12] Seltzer, footnote 12, p.72.

[13] Arthur Cotterell, *A Dictionary of World Mythology* (Oxford & Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1986), p.161.

Whilst this presents a slight distinction from *Doctor Faustus*, the two plays can be compared because only one of the magicians – Bacon – is allowed to adopt the central role. This is not the case in the prose narrative, as Bungay's magic later on equates with Bacon's, when he dabbles in necromantic deeds with Vandermast. However, in Greene's play he is reduced to the role of inferior magician, generally performing spectacles more closely associated with the romance genre. Indeed, Bungay retains the role of the supporting actor, by performing deeds such as attempting to marry Margaret and Lacy, so that Bacon can step in at the crucial dramatic moment and intervene in the spectacle. This gives credibility to Bacon's claim to practice the more superior philosophical arts, and to create a comparable role for him, alongside his predecessor Doctor Faustus.

In translating the episode of the brasen head motif from the source to the stage, Greene has utilised some of the notions in the prose, and added new overtones to them in their portrayal on stage. The idea of Bacon and Bungay watching the head for 'three weekes without any rest, so that they were so weary and sleepy, that they could not any longer refraine from rest' (p.298) has been retained, and converted in the play to reinforce Bacon's necromantic affiliations. In the play, Bacon records the shift as 'Bungay on the days and he [Bacon] on the / nights have watch'd just these ten-and-fifty days' (11.40-41). By specifically linking his shift to the nighttime, the traditional time for witches and devils to appear and perform their spells, Bacon is underlining his philosophical associations and superiority over Bungay.

Miles continues to follow the philosophical atmosphere prescribed by Bacon in the play, by arming himself with weapons so 'that if all your devils come I will not fear them an inch' (11.5-6). However, in keeping with the source, the whole project is undermined by Bacon falling asleep at the crucial moment, thus resulting in a change of tone for the performance. This signals to the audience a change in tone to the more familiar theme of popular magic. The head utters three rather nonsensical phrases which have been lifted directly from the source 'Time is', 'Time was' and 'Time is past' (11.53.65-75). Despite the climactic build up to the unveiling of Bacon's philosophical magic, these phrases actually remind the audience of the romance tradition, whereby magicians were consulted and asked to prophesy the return of stolen goods etc. Indeed, even in *The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune*, the magician Bomelio disguised as a physician was approached by the King to reassure him of the return of his son (Armenio's) voice.

The structuring of the three phrases helps to emphasise the development of Bacon's art. The first phrase 'Time is' suggests that the time is now ripe for Bacon to claim his status as a necromancer, studying the philosophical theories, making a contract with the devil and using it to his own advantage. The second phrase 'Time was' notes the actual potential of Bacon's art. However, by falling asleep, Bacon has missed his chance to achieve his ambition to be a necromancer, and created instead a device, which can perform 'romance' magic. This can be particularly seen in the last phrase 'Time is past', which acknowledges that although Bacon has the ability and devilish association to perform his necromantic ambition, he has missed his opportunity. As a result, the head self –destructs.

This portrayal of the highlight of Bacon's career can be viewed as light-heartedly following the precedent set by Faustus in the chronicle of his twenty-four year alliance with Lucifer, that is the aba or philosophical, romance, philosophical pattern. Before performing any magical illusions, Faustus describes himself as a necromancer by signing a covenant in blood with the devil. However, in performing his 'philosophical spectacles' during the pinnacle of his career, Faustus's art can only be defined as belonging to the romance genre. At the end of the play, Faustus renews his philosophical associations by committing the sin of demoniality.

Bacon attempts to follow the diabolical nature of Faustus's alliance with the devil at the end of this scene, rather than adhering to the story line in the prose romance. In the prose, Bacon merely strikes Miles dumb for the duration of the month. He is then allowed to continue serving Bacon, as well as practising some of his own magical deeds. However, in the play, Bacon continues his necromantic characterisation, by condemning Miles to hell as a punishment for not waking him 'Some fiend or ghost haunt on thy weary steps, / Until they do transport thee quick to hell' (11.128-129). However, his necromantic affiliations are undermined by Miles's comical response to this diabolical punishment. He finds the prospect of hell more appealing than his student days under Bacon, and in what could be viewed as a comical snipe at Faustus, who desired to see hell but on achieving his long held ambition found that it was not quite as he had envisaged it, Miles appreciates the advantages of his situation. Indeed, Miles even cheekily enquires of the devil 'Faith, 'tis a place I have desired long to see. Have you / not good tippling houses there?' (15.33-34). Although this attempt at a philosophical punishment for Miles prepares the audience for Bacon's final magical performance, the viewing of the scholars' fathers in the glass prospective scene, Miles's comical interlude also helps to set the atmosphere for Bacon's rejection of his art and conversion to 'white' magic.

The Glass Prospective

Alongside the brazen head motif, there are two other dramatic devices incorporated and altered from the source *The Famous Historie*, which depict Bacon as a philosophical magician in the same mould as his prototype predecessor, Doctor Faustus. These are the 'glass prospective' and the philosophical debate. The 'glass prospective' motif in the play adheres to its presentational structure in the source, as it encompasses two separate episodes, and intersperses them with other magical demonstrations. These episodes are 'How Fryer Bacon did helpe a young man to his Sweetheart, which Fryer Bungye would have married to another; and of the mirth that was at the wedding' and 'How two young Gentlemen that came to Fryer Bacon, to know how their fathers did, killed one another; and how Fryer Bacon for griefe, did breake his rare Glasse, wherein he could see any thing that was done within fifty miles about him'.

Although the 'glass prospective' motif is adopted from *The Famous Historie*, it is not completely replicated in the play like the brazen head episode. Whilst the basic story line of each episode remains, certain aspects have been dramatically altered to continue the theme dictated by the brazen head motif, that is of a superior philosophical magician performing spectacular illusions on the stage.

The play commences by converting some of the chivalrous characters from the source narrative to appear in its own love subplot. Although they do not overshadow the main characters, their roles are significantly developed to advance the story line. Indeed, the knight and the gentleman who appear in the love plot in the source, are replaced in the play by Prince Edward and members of his royal hunting party, and in a move away from the source they continuously feature in minor roles throughout the play [14]. These characters are responsible for the opening scenes of the play, when they are involved in hunting 'hart', although in reality they are pursuing Edward's heart's desire – Margaret – the Keeper's daughter. It is this love desire which leads the royal party to Friar Bacon's cell and innovatively introduces a philosophical magician into the play. In this first magical scene, the dramatic device employed by Bacon to perform his art, the 'glass prospective', also connects the later use of another episode from the source, the deaths of the two scholars. This ultimately brings about Bacon's recantation of necromancy and conversion to the more appropriate 'white' magic in the final scene.

Bacon and Bungay also perform a role reversal in the play from their original parts in the source. In the prose romance, it is Bungay who is depicted as the villainous magician for 'being covetous' and using 'his art' (p.318) to thwart the path of true love, by conspiring with the knight to help him marry in secret the lady engaged to the gentleman. In the play, it is Bacon, not Bungay who accepts money from Edward 'forty thousand crowns' (6.148), to use his art to prevent Margaret and Lacy from marrying

---

[14] In the *Famous Historie*, the knight and the gentleman who are involved in the love plot only feature in one episode.

> Fryer Bacon...shewed him a glasse, wherein any one might see any thing done (within fifty miles space) that they desired. (p.319)

and

> But come with me; we'll to my study straight,
> And in a glass prospective I will show
> What's done this day in merry Fressingfield
> (5.104-106).

To present the simultaneous proceedings in Oxford and Fressingfield, Bacon probably held up some sort of framing device to mark the boundaries of the stage (front and back). This division of the stage to depict two different events occurring simultaneously is effectively displayed through the 'glass prospective'; to continue the theme of superiority used in the brazen head episode. Friar Bacon as the superior magician engaging in philosophical arts is presented with Edward in his cell at Oxford, which has been comically described as the home of devils. Bungay, who is more generally depicted in the play as a romance magician, is portrayed as 'controlling' events in Fressingfield. However, the audience soon realise that, due to Bacon showing Edward the unfolding events in Fressingfield through the 'glasse', it is he, not Bungay who retains the status of the superior magician, and controls events for his own purposes.

In the prose romance, Bacon is responsible for permitting the course of true love to dominate, as he marries the couple to thwart Bungay's alternative plans. However, in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, it is Friar Bungay who attires himself in his religious vestments to fulfil his vocation as a friar to marry the two lovers, Margaret and Lacy

'I'll take my portace forth and wed you here; / Then go to bed and seal up your desires' (6.136-137). Indeed, Bacon has already received money from Edward to prevent this marriage from taking place. He proceeds to fulfil this promise by paradoxically mixing 'white' and 'black' magic together, thereby striking Bungay dumb at the crucial moment, and sending a devil to '*carry [off]* Bungay *on his back*' (stage directions 6.after 170). By striking Bungay dumb, Bacon is resorting to the traditional art of the romance magician, for example Bomelio striking Armenio dumb in *The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune*, although Bomelio's own alliance with the devil, like Bacon's art suggests an undertone of philosophical magic. This is indeed underlined in the play, by the fact that by silencing a friar in the middle of a Christian ceremony and sending a devil to bring him back to Oxford, Bacon is resorting to philosophical practices, and using blasphemous images to illustrate his art.

Bacon's deployment of an anti-Christian symbol – the devil - to disrupt a religious ceremony leads the audience to draw a closer comparison between him and Doctor Faustus, rather than his alter–ego in the prose romance. In *Doctor Faustus*, Mephistopheles refuses Faustus's plea for 'I am wanton and lascivious and / cannot live without a wife' (II.2.144-145), because marriage is a 'ceremonial toy' ordained by God. Indeed, Mephistopheles satisfies Faustus by providing him with 'fair courtesans' (II.1.157) and leading him to eternal damnation through his alliance with the succuba Helen of Troy. However, this comparison between the two magicians and their disruption of the marriage ceremony is limited, because of the comic overtones, which accompany Bacon's demonstration of his art

> I have struck him dumb, my lord; and if your honour please,
> I'll fetch this Bungay straightway from Fressingfield,
> And he shall dine with us in Oxford here.
> (6.162-164).

This comical way of inviting a person to dinner – on the back of a devil – lifts the diabolical potential of the play, an element which was an ever pervasive presence in *Doctor Faustus*, and helps to give credence to Bacon's final act of renunciation and conversion to 'white magic'.

* * *

Final Use of the 'Glass Prospective'

Bacon has used his 'glass prospective' to control events in Fressingfield and portray himself as a necromantic magician, although in the tradition established by Doctor Faustus, his magical displays have been undermined by an occasional return to the conventions of the romance genre. However, by concluding this first magical display on a comical, but philosophical note, that is Bungay riding on the back of a devil to Oxford, Bacon is preparing the audience for the final and most significant act of the 'glass', displaying the argument between Lambert and Serlsby.

Before the denouement of the play, and in a dramatic deviation from the source, Bacon prefigures this episode by narrating a prophecy about the forthcoming action to be depicted in the 'glass'. This dramatic device prepares the audience for a serious moment in the play, and introduces for the first time a sense of the diabolical potential of engaging in the philosophical arts. Previously, necromantic displays have always been underpinned by comic interludes. This scene, to highlight its difference, is prefigured by a prophecy full of foreboding[15]. Bacon is already despondent about the failure of his brazen head project, and in his apathetic state warns Bungay of his imminent downfall

> Bungay, sit down; for by prospective skill
> I find this day shall fall out ominous.
> Some deadly act shall 'tide me ere I sleep,
> But what and wherein little can I guess.
> (13.12-15).

This prophecy spoken by Bacon about his final downfall mirrors the introduction by the chorus in *Doctor Faustus,* who announces Faustus's fate as a result of dabbling in the diabolical arts. Although, however, it must be noted that in *Doctor Faustus* the audience are continually conscious of the chorus's opening characterisation, whereas in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay,* this sense of doom is confined to the final philosophical display.

The action depicted in this final 'glass prospective' scene in the play is largely defined from the episode in the source entitled 'How two young Gentlemen that came to Fryer Bacon...'. Bacon remains as the controlling magician offering his 'glass prospective', so that 'any man might behold any thing that he desired to see within the compasse of fifty miles round about him' (p.325), and he permits two young gentlemen to view the 'glasse' to witness an argument between their fathers. The only deviation from the source narrative in the play, is the fact that the two fathers have been given the names Lambert and Serlsby, and they are linked to the love subplot in the first demonstration performed in the 'glass prospective'. Also, at the end of this scene in the play, Vandermast and Bungay are alive, unlike their alter-egos in the source, who have used their philosophical arts to bring about their untimely deaths. It is necessary for Bungay to remain alive in the play, because he has played a supporting role to Bacon, by being defined as a romance magician and not a philosophical practitioner.

---

[15] This would be a familiar device to an Elizabethan audience reared on the art of the 'village wizard'.

This 'glass prospective' scene is incorporated into the play to symbolise Bacon's necromantic skills. In a similar manner to Faustus performing his last magical display with the succuba Helen of Troy, this diabolical spectacle has to be classified as philosophical, to give weight to the acts of renunciation spoken by both magicians at the end of the respective plays. Although Faustus's act is futile and Bacon's renunciation is successful, both concluding scenes provide the audience with an insight into the dangers of meddling with the necromantic arts.

Once again, the stage is divided in half to depict the action. Serlsby and Lambert quarrelling and killing one another are situated on one side, and on the other half, their sons – watched by Bacon and Bungay – re-enact the scene they have just witnessed. However, instead of depicting the time sequence of this scene as a dual action, which would correspond with the previous 'glass prospective' scene, this motif is presented with a slight time delay, so that the action is subsequent, not simultaneous

> *(They fight and kill each other)*
> LAMBERT. Oh, I am slain!
> SERLSBY. And I; Lord have mercy on me.
> 1st SCHOLAR. My father slain! Serlsby, ward that.
> *(The two* Scholars *stab one another)*
> 2nd SCHOLAR. And so is mine. Lambert, I'll quite thee well.
> (13.69-72)

This dramatic device serves to underline for the audience the extent of Bacon's necromantic skills and the evil mayhem he is responsible for creating. Bacon is now accountable for the deaths of four men, and this proves an emotive contrast to his true vocation as a friar supposedly saving lives from sin.

Indeed, the 'glass prospective' has now become an emblem for Bacon. In both the source and the play, it is used as a means to account for his deeds and reject his old way of life pursuing necromantic magic. In the source, at the end of the episode with the two gentlemen, he briefly acknowledges his responsibility for the four deaths

> Had I been busied in those holy things, the which mine order tyes me to, I had not had that time that made this wicked glasse: wicked I well may call it, that is the causer of so vile an act.
> (p.326).

However, the whole episode is overshadowed by the news 'of the deaths of Vandermast and Fryer Bungey' (p.326), who had used their magical abilities to conjure the devil, and in a similar manner to Doctor Faustus found that they had to pay the ultimate price. After a dramatic thunderstorm, the devil appeared to collect his dues

> for now the time was come, that the Devill would be paid for the knowledge that he had lent them, he would not tarry any longer, but then tooke them in the height of their wickednesse, and bereft them of their lives
> (pp.323-324)

In the play, Bacon is allowed to mournfully confess to Bungay (who has now adopted the role of a confessional mentor, thus befitting his vocation as a friar), the deadly potential of his philosophical arts

> See, friar, where the fathers both lie dead.
> Bacon, thy magic doth effect this massacre.
> This glass prospective worketh many woes;
> And therefore, seeing these brave, lusty brutes,
> These friendly youths did perish by thine art,
> End all thy magic and thine art at once.
> That poniard that did end the fatal lives

> Shall break the cause efficiat of their woes.
> So fade the glass, and end with it the shows
> That nigromancy did infuse the crystal with.
> *(He breaks the glass).*
> (13.74-83)

In this speech, Bacon uses more emotive language than in the source to underline the wickedness of his deed, and provide a dramatic confession for the audience. He describes the deaths as a 'massacre', and acknowledges his own responsibility in causing this slaughter, by repeating his culpability in phrases such as 'Bacon, thy magic doth effect...' and 'These friendly youths did perish by thine art'. This speech is significant because it presents images of death and destruction, and this now seems a more fitting way for Bacon to reject necromancy. Indeed, Bacon promises to destroy the necromantic instrument that effected the tragedy, and he performs this through an act of reflection. Instead of simply breaking his 'rare and wonderfull glasse'(p.326) as in the source, Bacon dramatically re-uses the same instrument 'the poniard' that caused the deaths of the four squires, to destroy his 'glass prospective'. Bacon concludes his confession to Bungay, by attributing the shows in the 'glass prospective' to the art of necromancy, and forecasts a new perspective on life, his return to his true vocation as a friar.

In the play, Bacon spends a great deal of time confessing his sins and acknowledging his sorrow over the harrowing deaths of the four squires. On the other hand, Bungay, who should at least play some part in this guilt, does not admit to any responsibility or shame in the appropriation of the blame. As the superior magician practising philosophical arts, it is Bacon who must take on the sole responsibility for his actions, whilst Bungay remains in his predefined role as a companion and helper, rather than as a moral observer.

In the play, Bacon's final confession and return to his true vocation, is a theme derived from the last episode of *The Famous Historie* entitled 'Howe Fryer Bacon burnt his books of Magick, and gave himselfe to the study of Divinity only; and how he turned Anchorite'. In the source, this is displayed as a mournful episode, with Bacon burdened by the dilemma of trying to balance philosophical studies with his religious vocation. He is able to acknowledge his successes in the philosophical arts, as well as admitting the ultimate failures it has caused him

> What hath all my knowledge of natures secrets gained me? Onely this, the losse of a better knowledge, the losse of divine studies, which makes the immortall part of man (his soule) blessed. I have found, that my knowledge has beene a heavy burden, and has kept down my good thoughts: but I will remove the cause, which are these bookes: which I doe purpose here before you all to burne.
> (p.327).

His misery at causing four deaths overshadows the remainder of his life, and after burning his books he retires to his cell to live the rest of his life as a recluse.

Whilst the themes of confession and destruction of magical books are retained in the play, they are treated in a very different manner to the source. Bacon's confessional speech provides a dramatic moment in the play, and in a similar manner to Faustus's confession in *Doctor Faustus*, it evokes sympathy for the protagonist. It is also greatly interspersed with religious imagery, in an attempt to reinforce a key Elizabethan theme. This audience would have experienced the religious turmoil created by the Reformation, and the more recent attempts by the Spanish Catholics to secure a conversion to their faith by the use of the Armada

> The hours I have spent in pyromantic spells,
> The fearful tossing in the latest night
> Of papers full on nigromantic charms,
> Conjuring and adjuring devils and fiends,
> With stole and albe and strange pentaganon,

The wrestling of the holy name of God,
As Sother, Eloim and Adonai,
Alpha, Manoth, and Tetragrammaton,
With praying to the five-fold powers of heaven,
Are instances that Bacon must be damn'd
For using devils to countervail his God.
(13.87-97)

The dramatic spectacle evoked by this speech underlines for the audience the key practices associated with necromancy. By conjuring devils, and wearing religious vestments (the stole and the albe) to emphasise his unorthodox views, as well as inverting the 'Hebrew word[s] for "Our Lord" (Tetragrammaton), Bacon is using standard images for defining a philosophical magician on the stage[16]. The only deviation between this play and *Doctor Faustus* being, the fact that through this confession, Bacon is able to seek God's reconciliation and forgiveness at the end of the play, a factor which is denied to Doctor Faustus

To wash the wrath of high Jehovah's ire,
And make thee as a new-born babe from sin.
Bungay, I'll spend the remnant of my life
In pure devotion, praying to my God
That he would save what Bacon vainly lost.
(13.104-108).

By appropriating the themes from the two extracts in *The Famous Historie*, the play is able to open with an image of purity, and by incorporating other examples of Bacon's art, able to change the tone and imagery of the scene to necromancy. By uniting these two images – marriage (new life), and death (the end), under one motif (the glass prospective), and separating them by other examples of Bacon's art, the play is able to maintain an aura of suspense, which reaches its conclusion in the destruction of the 'glass prospective'. These themes and images appropriated from *The Famous Historie* have been used in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* to help create a dramatic spectacle on the stage, before Bacon's final act of magic, the prophecy of the golden age.

Bacon now deviates from both the source and his prototype predecessor Doctor Faustus, by concluding the play on a magical note using traditions from the romance genre. He is able to prophesy a great future for England under Elizabeth

> I find by deep prescience of mine art,
> Which once I temper'd in my secret cell,
> That here where Brute did build his Troynovant,
> From forth the royal garden of a king
> Shall flourish out so rich and fair a bud
> Whose brightness shall deface proud Phoebus' flower.
> (16.42-47).

This conversion to 'white' magic to prophesy a golden future for England is an innovative technique, which is copied by later Jacobean plays such as *The Tempest.* Prospero, in a similar manner to Bacon is able to recant his magical powers at the end of the play, although instead of being punished like Faustus for deviating from the Christian way of life, he is able to return to Milan. He is also permitted to witness the 'golden future' of his daughter Miranda marrying Ferdinand, thus securing the safety of the dukedoms of Milan and Naples, and creating a new generation free from the corruption of the old one. Whilst *Doctor Faustus* sets the precedent for using a philosophical protagonist on the stage, *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* has utilised and developed this motif, to project greater spectacular displays in keeping with the golden age iconography dominating the Elizabethan era.

---

[16] Seltzer, footnote for (13.93-94)

The Philosophical Debate

Faustus only really deviated from his necromantic purpose during the twenty-four years of his contracted time on earth when he demonstrated his magical skills by touring round Europe with his devilish companion Mephistopheles. These demonstrations were mainly classified as belonging to the romance genre, and provided the audience with courtly spectacles and dramatic illusions as part of the entertainment. Bacon on the other hand remains true to his necromantic ambitions, and to the characterisation attributed to him in the episode entitled 'How Fryer Bacon over-came the German conjuror Vandermast, and made a spirit of his owne carry him into Germany'. He enters into the philosophical debate between Vandermast and Bungay in order to reveal his necromantic abilities, and to support his claim to be the superior magician.

The key theme derived from the episode in the source narrative is the motif of the contest between the two magicians Bacon and Vandermast. In this episode, Bacon outwits his German counterpart by conjuring Julius Caesar who then proceeds to kill Pompey the Great (the spirit raised by Vandermast). This contest provides an opportunity for Bungay to enter into the debate and display his inferior skills. Bacon's use of Bungay to deal with Vandermast reveals his contempt for his German counterpart, as he believes Bungay's inferior magician is sufficient for enabling him to win the contest

> I have here one that is my inferior (shewing hime Fryer Bungey) try thy art with him; and if thou doe put him to the worst, then will I deale with thee, and not till then.
> (p.306).

These themes are all re-used in the play, although the chronological order is frequently inverted. The play commences with the motif of the contest as 'the theme of contesting magicians was a popular one, and the English magicians would have the full sympathy of the audience'[17]. However, the theme is also enhanced by the new 'technicalities' that are introduced to demonstrate the Elizabethan academic influence on the motif. The contest begins in a previous scene when Harry, the English King promises Vandermast a reward if he can upstage Bacon, and achieve the title of the greatest philosophical magician in England

> In Oxford shalt thou find a jolly friar
> Called Friar Bacon, England's only flower.
> Set him but nonplus in his magic spells,
> And make him yield in mathematic rules,
> And for thy glory I will bind thy brows
> Not with a poet's garland made of brays,
> But with a coronet of choicest gold.
> (4.59-65).

The motif of a contest between two European scholars is further highlighted in the play by Vandermast and the Emperor mocking the traditions and privileges of Oxford, the University which has ordained Bacon as achieving his highest accolade 'as a friar newly stall'd...' in a place described as

> The towns gorgeous with high-built colleges,
> And scholars seemly in their grave attire,
> Learned in searching principles of art.
> (9.5-7).

As well as providing a motive for the contest, competition for the title of superior magician and a principle of jingoistic pride, this information is useful for providing the audience with a description of the scenery and a sense of setting for the play. By situating the philosophical debate in a University setting, these magicians are supporting Faustus's earlier claim that necromantic magic is only a suitable subject for academic scholars[18].

---

[17] Katharine M. Briggs, *Pale Hecate's Team: An Examination of the Beliefs on Witchcraft and Magic among Shakespeare's Contemporaries and His Immediate Successors* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962), p.59.

In order to introduce new 'technicalities' on to the Elizabethan stage, the notion of Bacon playing a 'game' with Vandermast is incorporated from the source to establish the scene in the play. However, some minor adjustments have been made to maintain the theme of superiority dictated by the brasen head motif in the source. For example, it is Bungay and not Bacon who introduces the theme of the contest 'Let it be this: whether the spirits of pyromancy or geomancy / be most predominant in magic?' (9.24-25). This is a surprising choice because up to this moment, Bacon has only performed traditional magical spectacles largely derived from the romance genre. However, this can be perceived as a cunning ploy by Bacon to win the 'game'. Bungay has a limited knowledge of the philosophical arts, which is enough to start the debate with Vandermast. This offers Bacon the chance to listen offstage and assess Vandermast's ability, before demonstrating his own skills.

These new 'technicalities', that is the subjects of 'pyromancy' and 'geomancy' are an advance on the philosophical arts demonstrated in *Doctor Faustus,* and a deviation from the source episode. In *Doctor Faustus*, Faustus in his first soliloquy chose to study the broad area of 'necromancy', a subject which makes widespread use of demons, calls 'up the dead with charms' and makes sacrifices using blood (frequently) from self-inflicted wounds[19]. However, in this debate, Bungay has gone one stage further by selecting two specific areas of the 'fourfold division of divinatory arts (geomancy, hydromancy, aeromancy, pyromancy, each calling upon one of the four elements: earth, water, air and fire)...'[20].

---

[18] This also seems to reinforce the notion that philosophical magic was reserved for academic life in Universities, whilst popular magic remained the preferred choice of the 'village wizard'.

[19] Valerie I.J. Flint, *The Rise of Magic: in Early Medieval Europe* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), p.52

Each contestant's knowledge of the new 'technicalities' is now displayed on stage, by each one selecting his preferred art form

> VANDERMAST. I say, of pyromancy.
> BUNGAY. And I, of geomancy.
> (9.26-27)

Vandermast believes that his choice of 'pyromancy' with its anti-Christian connotations demonstrates his superiority as a magician over Bungay. Pyromancy has traditionally been aligned in Christian countries with images of hell, due to the description of this devilish place in the Book of Revelation

> All those who worship the beast [Satan]...*in fire and brimstone* they will be tortured in the presence of the holy angels and the Lamb and *the smoke* of their torture *will go up for ever and ever.*[21]

This association with Christian imagery and its popular concept of hell is similar to, and possibly an allusion to Faustus, who set the conditions for gaining the status of a necromancer on the Elizabethan stage, by entering into a contract with the devil.

As already demonstrated in chapter one, Marlowe was probably the only Elizabethan playwright who had connections with students of Renaissance occultism. However, not to be outdone, Greene has offered his protagonists the chance to rival Faustus, by permitting Bungay and Vandermast the chance to engage in this philosophical debate[22]. Although Greene limits their knowledge to geomancy and pyromancy, he also satisfies his audience that other theories are known to them – at least to Vandermast – as he states 'The cabalists that write of magic spells, / As Hermes, Melchie and Pythagoras' (9.28-29), although he does not offer any advance on this statement.

---

[20] Flint, p.53

[21] Revelation 14.9-11

[22] Unlike Marlowe, Greene does not list students of the philosophical theories amongst his acquaintances. However, he may have derived a knowledge of these arts from his time at Oxford. As stated in chapter one, Greene had recently graduated from Oxford University, and may have decided to 'write a play about his new alma mater's great natural philosopher' (Seltzer, p.ix) hence the reference to specific necromantic arts.

Vandermast's magic can be classified as being a popular philosophical theory, and can thus be seen in the same context as Faustus's necromancy. In order to conjure the devil, Faustus had studied the texts of several philosophical theorists, and this study meant that he was able to understand and practise the magical spells from the book left for him by Wagner. Indeed, Vandermast's preferred choice of pyromancy was one of the specialities of the occultist Theophrastus Paracelsus (1493-1541). As Barbara Traister notes in *Heavenly Necromancers*, Paracelsus's theories had been translated and put into circulation in England during the 1580s[23]. Indeed, in keeping with his other contemporaries such as Agrippa, Paracelsus's works of over a hundred items were recorded as being catalogued in Dr. John Dee's library during the late sixteenth century. Divination theories appeared in some of the tracts written by the legendary Hermes Trismegistus, who was one of the popular ancient authorities consulted by contemporary philosophical theorists such as Agrippa and Ficino. By aligning his choice of pyromancy with the theories of Hermes

> If, then, as Hermes says, the fire be great'st,
> Purest, and only giveth shapes to spirits,
> Then must these demons that haunt that place
> Be every way superior to the rest.
> (9.37-40)

---

[23] Traister, footnote 25, p.12.

Vandermast is deriving his authority to be perceived as a superior magician practising philosophical magic on the stage from traditional contemporary practices[24].

Bungay's choice of geomancy, like Vandermast's decision to argue for pyromancy, reflects his stage status, as a more traditional romance magician. Indeed, Bungay engages in a philosophical practice that was paradoxically associated with the wizards and cunning men present in every village of England, rather than the academic designs of magicians and philosophical theorists debating the subject of magic in Universities. Geomancy was a divination technique used by a wizard as a means of detection (usually of stolen goods). According to Thomas a wizard in 'a state of semi-trance' would randomly draw a pattern of dots, and this would then be interpreted according to the astrological signs of the zodiac to provide the appropriate reading [25].

In a similar manner to pyromancy, this new technicality of geomancy appeared to have been a popular philosophical concept during the Elizabethan era. It was referred to as a philosophical art by Agrippa in *La Magic Celeste*

> Certaines figures ont été composées selon les nombrese des étoiles et leurs aspects. Elles ont été attribuées aux éléments, aux planètes et aux signes: elles sont appelées <géomantiques> parce que les géomanciens ramenent à ces figures les points qu'ils projettent au hasard une fois qu'ils les ont groupés entre eux par parité et imparité[26].

---

[24] It is worth noting at this stage Antoine Faiver's argument in 'The Children of Hermes and the Science of Man' in *Hermeticism and the Renaissance*, ed. by Ingrid Merkel & Allen G. Debus (Washington, London & Toronto: Folger Books, 1998), p.428, that the 'Germans had little part in the golden age of European hermeticism, which lasted from Ficino to Kircher'. If Vandermast was a German magician supporting his argument by references to an ancient authority, then according to this viewpoint, he should have cited another philosophical work. If on the other hand, Vandermast is a veiled allusion to Marlowe's protagonist Doctor Faustus, then this English tradition of referring to Hermes as an authority would have been quite acceptable.

[25] Thomas, p.215

[26] See Appendix C for further details.

The *OED* also states that in 1569, J. Sandford referred to the practice in his translation of Arippa's *van Artes*, and in 1590 Francis Sparry translated Christophe de Cattan's *Geomancie* from French into English. Although this cannot be an indicator of how popular the theory was during the late 1580s, the fact that it narrated the geomancical practices of 'maister Chrisopher Cattan', and was described as a 'booke, to knowe all thinges, past, present and to come' suggests that there was a demand for material of this nature [27].

Although the contemporary evidence suggests that these philosophical arts were at least known to privileged academics and some 'village wizards', it is hard to gauge an Elizabethan audience's response to the debate. Possibly, they were included by Greene as a running gag, simply to impress the audience with subjects on which there was very little information, or simply, as already suggested, they were included to rival Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus.*

The two magicians engage in a heated debate about their chosen philosophies, although Vandermast attempts to gain the upper hand by undermining Bungay, who, as a practising friar has chosen to study a necromantic art. Vandermast concentrates on the geomantic spirits' link with Lucifer, as they dwell in the centre of the earth, the place where Lucifer who 'fell from the heavens' also inhabited (9.58). He associates them with 'jugglers, witches, and vild sorcerers' (9.69), magical practitioners who were linked with the devil and the night. In order to conclude his attack on Bungay's art, and in the hopes of securing the title of 'superior magician', Vandermast challenges him to a demonstration of his art

---

[27] As described in the Short Titles Catalogue, entry 4864.

> But grant that geomancy hath most force;
> Bungay, to please these mighty potentates,
> Prove by some instance what thy art can do.
> (9.72-74).

This challenge now returns the demonstration of a 'new' device in the play to its centre of authority – the source narrative. In keeping with the episode in *The Famous Historie of Fryer Bacon* whereby

> Fryer Bungey then began to shew his art: and after some turning and looking in his booke, he brought up among them the Hesperian Tree, which did beare golden apples: these apples were kept by a waking dragon that lay under the tree.
> (p.306)

In an attempt to retain a comical element after the serious philosophical discussion, Bungay in the play conjures a similar dumb show for the audience

> Shew thee the tree leav'd with refined gold,
> Whereon the fearful dragon held his seat,
> That watch'd the garden call'd Hesperides,
> Subdued and won by conquering Hercules.
> (9.79-82).

The stage directions narrate Bungay's magical performance (*'Here* Bungay *conjures, and the tree appears with the dragon shooting fire'*) (stage directions 9. between 82 & 83). By depicting this myth based on the story of Juno protecting her wedding present (apples) from the Goddess of the Earth 'which she had entrusted to the keeping of the daughters of Hersperus, assisted by a watchful dragon', Bungay is aligning his demonstration with the romance tradition[28]. In earlier Elizabethan romances such as *The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune*, classical references were frequently deployed to lend authority to the text. Indeed, in *The Rare Triumphs* four dumb shows were performed, which were based on great tragical stories such as 'Troilus and Cressida' and 'Dido and Aeneas' to reveal the power of the gods, who were orchestrating the presentation of magic in the play.

---

[28] Thomas Bulfinch, *Myth and Legend* (Ware: Wordsworth, 1993), p.179.

This play-within-a-play technique was a popular theme during the Elizabethan period, and it has been used in this play to present the next part of the game on the stage. Determined not to be upstaged by Bungay, Vandermast re-enters the stage, and vows to outperform him to raise his own profile as a philosophical magician. He believes that he can achieve this by raising a devil in the shape of Hercules

> Then Vandermast did raise the ghost of Hercules
> in his habit that he wore when he was living...
> (p.306)

and

> But as Alcmena's bastard raz'd this tree,
> So will I raise him up as when he lived.
> (9.88-89).

Vandermast's challenge to 'charm' Hercules(9.98) and thus prove his worth as a philosophical magician, is again in keeping with the source narrative, although it is overshadowed by Bacon's appearance on the stage.

Notions of competition were prevalent on the Elizabethan stage; for example, there was the wrestling scene in *As You Like It* and the sparring scene in *Romeo and Juliet*. The audience who have already been intrigued by the philosophical debate, are now fascinated by this magical spectacle unfolding on the stage. This entrancing performance helps to build up the atmosphere to the final theatrical coup – Bacon's reappearance on the stage. Aware that Bungay's magic is insufficient to gain victory over Vandermast, and in accordance with patriotic pride (a German magician cannot be allowed to win the contest), Bacon's cue is signalled by Bungay attempting to control Vandermast's dragon Hercules.

Vandermast mockingly describes Bacon's reappearance on the stage after Bungay's defeat

> Lordly thou lookest, as if that thou wert learn'd;
> Thy countenance, as if science held her seat
> Between the circled arches of thy brows.
> (9.122-124).

However, this comic but derogatory description, cleverly indicates the change once again to philosophical magic. Bacon has the appearance of an academic, and although Vandermast's speech serves to undermine his authority, it actually reminds the audience of Bacon's seven years study of 'nigromancy', which will ultimately defeat Vandermast.

Tired of the game, Bacon refuses to rise to Vandermast's challenge and satisfy the audience's expectations of a dramatic climax. Indeed, Bacon's very presence is sufficient to prevent Vandermast's own devil Hercules from obeying him, and in a final philosophical act which is in keeping with the episodes in *The Famous Historie*, Bacon sends Vandermast back to Germany on Hercules's back and declares himself the superior magician 'Thou, Hercules, whom Vandermast did raise, / Transport the German unto Hapsburg straight' (9.157-158). This final necromantic image concludes the aba pattern for presenting magic, as originally observed in Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, and secures a victory for Bacon as the most superior practitioner of philosophical arts in Europe. This earns him a respected place in society.

Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay has appropriated to a greater or lesser extent five of the episodes from *The Famous Historie of Fryer Bacon*. Selected for their potential to display dramatic spectacles on the stage, they offer the ability to be adapted to include key Elizabethan theatrical themes such as challenging other protagonists to a debate. However, I believe that these extracts have also been deployed as a response to Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, because of the appropriation of episodes that display a superior magician performing philosophical acts, such as communicating with the devil. Frequent reference is made in this play to the aba structure used in *Doctor Faustus*, which was deployed for presenting magical spectacles on the stage. This heavy reliance on Marlowe's work for portraying a similarly themed motif on the Elizabethan stage adds substance, I believe, to the argument that *Doctor Faustus* was the innovative play introduced in 1588, which was used by other playwrights as a prototype model. Although Greene deploys new 'technicalities' such as the debate between pyromancy and geomancy to demonstrate the advancement of the philosophical arts, his usage of the Faustian model indicates his reliance on Marlowe's work.

CHAPTER THREE

PLAYS OF THE COMMERCIAL THEATRE

> Lady, in youth I studyed hidden artes,
> and proffited in Chiromancye much,
> If sight be not obscurde through natures weaknesse,...
> and rules of palmestrie ensuing chaunces.
> (I.2.237-239 & 241).

After the appearance of Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* in 1588, there appeared to be a surge in the number of plays that featured stage magicians as central protagonists. From this date onwards, until 1595, playwrights produced a flurry of commercial plays including Anthony Munday's *John a Kent and John a Cumber*, the anonymous *John of Bordeaux*, George Peele's *The Old Wives Tale* and several Shakespearean plays such as *Henry VI* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream.*

However, one of the precedential characterisations that had dominated the presentation of Doctor Faustus and Friar Bacon's magic on the stage - that is the oscillation between philosophical and romance magic through an aba pattern – now began to change. Whilst some plays, such as *John a Kent and John a Cumber* and *John of Bordeaux* continued to present their magicians using the two genres to depict their art on the stage, they now displayed their magical demonstrations in a haphazard and paradoxical manner. For example, *John a Kent and John a Cumber* depicts Kent at the beginning of the play as a necromancer who practises 'chiromancy', and studies the 'hidden artes', yet this identification is made whilst John a Kent is attired in the disguise of a hermit. It was a reasonably common tradition for a magician from the romance genre to disguise himself before performing a magical trick on the stage. A clear example of this can be seen in *The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune*, when

Bomelio dressed himself as a physician to perform his art for the King to advise him how to destroy the magic charm that had made Armenio dumb

> My freend, I am infourm'd that by thy woorthy skill
> In Phisick thou art able to recover at thy will
> The strangest cures that be
> (IV.1.1138-1140).

By re-using a similar motif in this play, the magician John a Kent is demonstrating the newer approach to representing magicians on the Elizabethan stage during the early 1590s.

In order to assess this type of magic, I will be focusing on two plays in the next two chapters – Anthony Munday's *John a Kent and John a Cumber,* and the 'alleged' sequel to *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, the anonymous *John of Bordeaux*. I will be examining these plays to see if I can trace the influence of *Doctor Faustus* and *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* on them, especially *John a Kent and John a Cumber,* which was believed to have been initially composed for a provincial audience. I will also be assessing any innovative developments which may well have occurred during the period, before moving on to examine the plays which featured magicians in the early part of James I's reign. The period from 1595 onwards was a turbulent era in the history of magical theories, as practitioners were now moving away from the diabolical influences prevalent on the stage, and the popular anti-Catholic movement of the 1580s. Although traditional forms of magic practised by the 'village wizard' were still in vogue, they were now being updated with alternative theories such as alchemy and the fashionable European concept of Neoplatonism. These alternative theories were beginning to influence the inquisitive minds of the playwrights, and the diabolical links proposed by Doctor Faustus were now reserved for the presentation of witches.

Dating of Munday's *John a Kent and John a Cumber*

In his article 'The Significance of a Date' I.A. Shapiro outlines his research on the hand-written date, which appears at the bottom of the manuscript [1]. Although the date appears 'in different ink and in a different hand...', Shapiro regards it as important for establishing a '*terminus ad quem* for the writing of the manuscript'[2].

As Shapiro notes, unlike other plays of the era, there is 'no internal evidence' to suggest a composition date for *John a Kent and John a Cumber*, although the manuscript is generally believed to be in Munday's handwriting [3]. However, critics such as W.W. Greg and E.M. Thompson have interpreted the inscription at the bottom of the manuscript as reading either December 1595 or December 1596[4]. By making a photographic enlargement of this plate for his 1955 article, Shapiro was able to identify that the date should actually be read as December 1590. This confirms the last possible composition date for the play, and opens up the debate about when, during the preceding decade the play was actually written [5].

However, some critics believe that 1590 is too late a composition date for this play, and they cite a more suitable dating as fairly early in 1589. This earlier dating raises the question of whether *John a Kent and John a Cumber* preceded or succeeded Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*. Certainly Munday first started writing for the theatre in 1579 and, although his work was not favourably received at the time, he did return to writing again in 1582. Therefore, an early 1589 composition date for this play is a feasible option. However, it is my belief that as there is more evidence available to support a late 1589 or early 1590 composition date, Munday's *John a Kent and John a Cumber* should be viewed as the successor to Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay.* This viewpoint is supported by critics such as J.C. Turner, who states that

---

[1] I.A. Shapiro, 'The Significance of a Date' in *Shakespeare Survey*, vii (1955), 100-105.
[2] Shapiro, p.p100-1011
[3] Shapiro, p.100
[4] Anthony Munday, *John a Kent and John a Cumber*, ed. by Arthur E. Pennell (New York & London: Garland Publishing, 1980), p.43. All references to this play will be taken from this edition.
[5] Shapiro supports A.W. Pollard's suggestion that it was the date of the play's sale.

> Munday obviously drank deep of Greene's fountain in preparing his comedy. John a Kent, a sage long known to English folklore, outplays the Scottish wizard, John a Cumber, at his own game, and through a maze of disguises and tricks, compasses the final triumph of two Welsh princes over rivals in love and unwilling fathers-in-law[6].

Shapiro cites the 'favoured' composition date for this play as probably August / September 1589 due to the fact that the last Marprelate tract – *The Protestation* – appeared in circulation about this time [7]. In this tract, a 'Mar-Martin' was mentioned alongside a reference to John a Cant. These citings have been presumed by Dover Wilson to allude to Anthony Munday, and his 'activities as the Archbishop of Canterbury's pursuivant, and presumably, anti-Martinist playwright and pamphleteer'[8]. 'Mar-Martin was believed to be a reference to Munday and John a Cant was supposed to be referring to the Archbishop of Canterbury [9]. Another factor which may support a 1589 composition date is Turner's observation that at some point during 1589, Munday seemed to have been involved in writing about morris dances for the theatre[10]. As the dramatic device of the morris dance appears in *John a Kent and John a Cumber*, then late 1589 could be regarded as a suitable contender for the composition of this play.

---

[6] Julia Celeste Turner, *Anthony Munday: An Elizabethan Man of Letters* (Berkeley & California, University of California Press, 1928, p.106

[7] This date would probably follow on from Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay,* which seems to have been composed sometime during July / August of 1589.

[8] Shapiro, p.101

[9] As John of Canterbury's 'hobbie-horse' Munday was sent to arrest the clergyman Giles Wigginton, a fellow at Cambridge, whose appointment had been opposed by Whitgift. Munday arrested him on a December morning, and took him by boat to Lambeth Palace for questioning. During this trip, he engaged him in conversation. He later used the conversation which had concentrated on the 'spell goose' story in Martin's second tract to denounce Wigginton as a traitor. Whitgift was impressed by this and promoted Munday as the 'head' of Martin hunters, although he was unable to find the press that was printing the leaflets. See J.C. Turner, pp.83-84 for further details.

Other critics such as Vittorio Gabriel and Giorgio Melchiori who have made in-depth studies of Anthony Munday's *Sir Thomas More,* support a composition date of 1590 for *John a Kent and John a Cumber*[11]. They cite the research by Maunde Thompson, who established that 'the original parts of *More* were written shortly after *John a Kent* and considerably earlier than the other extant manuscript in Munday's hand…'. They argue that as only two years (approximately) separated the two plays, and as Greg has attributed a composition date of 1592 for *More,* this according places *John a Kent and John a Cumber* as being written circa 1590.

Whilst neither late 1589 or 1590 can be substantiated as the most likely time of composition for this play, there is another hypothesis that could be regarded as supporting a 1590 dating. As J.C. Turner notes Munday's family was completed in 1589 and, although he had been writing sporadically throughout the 1580s, it was circa this date that he decided to supplement his wages by translating more romances[12]. He started this practice in late 1588 with *Palmerin D'Oliva* and *Palladine of England,* which he dedicated to the reinstated Earl of Oxford. He continued to write plays similar to these romances throughout the 1590s. It would therefore be a feasible hypothesis to suggest that following on from the success of these writings, Munday may well have been encouraged to write about a legendary figure such as John a Kent, in or around 1590.

---

[10] Turner, p.84

[11] *Sir Thomas More: Anthony Munday & Others*, ed. by Vittorio Gabriel and Giorgio Melchiori (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990)

[12] J.C. Turner, p.48

Due to the lack of 'internal evidence', or reference to any contemporary events in the period which might suggest a dating for *John a Kent and John a Cumber*, I have presumed from the circumstantial evidence available, that Munday's play appeared shortly after Greene's play in 1589. I believe that this view can be sustained by the later arguments developed in the section of this thesis about Munday's play being written for a provincial audience, in the style of popular, contemporary London stage plays.

Influences Believed to Have Contributed to the Theme of *John a Kent and John a Cumber*

Marlowe and Greene followed the traditional convention of basing their respective plays *Doctor Faustus* and *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* on the well-known prose romances *The English Faust Book* and *The Famous Historie of Fryer Bacon*. It is now generally accepted that Munday chose to follow this example of using a magician with some diabolical features from an acknowledged source, to play the role of one of the central protagonists in *John a Kent and John a Cumber*. This search may have been influenced by the fact that like Marlowe, Munday was also employed by the Government as a spy against Catholic activities abroad. Munday was certainly known to have been resident in the English Roman Catholic seminary in Rome[13] during 1578 where he appeared 'nominally as a likely convert, but actually as a spy...'[14]. During this period, St. Clare Byrne states that Munday was ordered to leave the seminary by the Welsh head – Doctor Maurice Clenocke. However, the Jesuits persuaded Clenocke merely to imprison Munday in a room. Although he was only imprisoned for a fortnight, Munday believed that the room was haunted by a devil, as he acknowledged in his later writings about his time in prison

> I lay almost feared out of my wits, so that when I was layd
> in Bed I durst not stirre till it was fayre broad day, that
> I might perceive everye corner of my Chamber, whether
> the Devill were there or no[15].

Whilst this experience, and the nature of the work he was performing in Rome may well have influenced his choice to search for a magician with some diabolical features, there is another indication as to why he chose a tale about the exploits of a legendary Welsh magician.

One possible suggestion for this choice of source may be due to the fact that sometime after his move from Barbican to Cripplegate in 1585, possibly around 1588, Munday began travelling in line with his activities as a Government spy and journalist[16]. He certainly acknowledged his absences in his epistle to the readers of *Palladine of London* (publication date 1588), whereby he asked the readers to excuse the faults in the text 'for I beeying often absent' had not been able to correct '...in the imprinting, in some places words mistaken...'[17]. As part of these travels, he may well have visited Mostyn House in North Wales and used the local legend of John a Kent as the source for his play.

---

[13] See *English Romayne Life* for an account of his experiences.

[14] M. St. Clare Byrne, 'Anthony Munday and His Books' in *The Library*, 4 (1920-1921), 225-256, p.228.

[15] M. St. Clare Byrne, p.229

[16] Munday's eldest child was born in 1584 and christened in June of that year in St. Giles in Cripplegate. During the next five years, there were entries in the records for the christenings of four other children. See M. St. Clare Byrne for further details about his family, p.230-231.

[17] M. St. Clare Byrne, p.244

As M. St. Clare Byrne states[18], a copy of the manuscript for *John a Kent and John a Cumber* was found in Mostyn Hall in 1919[19]. This was discovered with another play – *Fedele and Fortunio* – which was dedicated to the houseowner, Roger Mostyn[20]. The Mostyns were an important family in Wales. Indeed, from the records kept at Bangor University, it would seem that the family was an 'amalgamation' of five different lines. These included Pengwern in the lordship of Chirkland, Mostyn in Tegeingl, Gloddaeth in Creuddyn and Trecastell and Tregarnedd in Anglesey. These lines were known locally as the five courts. Mostyn was made the principal seat after Richard ap Hywel inherited the five courts, and the family name of Mostyn was first ascribed to his son Thomas. Thomas's son – William – had served under the Earl of Pembroke in Wyatt's Rebellion, and was made M.P for Flintshire in 1553.

Munday's connection with this family remains a mystery. However, due to the finding of two of his manuscripts in the Mostyn family papers, it would seem a likely possibility that he stayed in Mostyn Hall some time after Roger Mostyn's matriculation from Brasenose College in Oxford in 1584, and subsequent study at Lincoln's Inn. My hypothesis is that if Munday stayed in Mostyn Hall, then it would probably have been some time after 1589, when Roger Mostyn became the sheriff for

---

[18] M. St. Clare Byrne, p.238

[19] This manuscript was believed to have come into the family's possession in 1690, and was thought to have belonged to the Hobart collection. See the introduction to Anthony Munday, *John a Kent and John a Cumber*, ed. by Muriel St. Clare Byrne (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1923) for further details.

[20] *Fedele and Fortunio* was actually dedicated to M.R. Although there was no precedent for Elizabethan authors to transpose initials, the play was initially presumed to be dedicated to either Richard Martin or Ralph Marshall, who had received acknowledgements in other plays. However, the initials M.R have now been presumed to refer to Roger Mostyn.

Anglesey. As a government agent and part-time journalist, Munday may well have found this connection useful.

Although the hypothesis about Munday residing in Mostyn Hall some time towards the end of the 1580s cannot be substantiated, the argument can be supported by the fact that *John a Kent and John a Cumber* depicts legendary figures closely associated with this family and the surrounding area. Roger Mostyn was believed to be a descendant of 'Adda ap Iorweth Dda of Pengwern, who married Isabel, a sister of Owen Glendower'[21]. According to local conjectures, John a Kent and Owen Glendower were believed to be one and the same person. Mostyn was also believed to have been related to Llewellyn, Prince of Wales, who was a dominant character in the play.

It is believed by critics such as M. St. Clare Byrne and J.C. Turner that there was a connection between *John a Kent and John a Cumber* and two other titles, *The Wise Men of West Chester* and *Randal, Earl of Chester*. The *Wise Men of Chester* was a very successful play, which was performed as a new play by the Admiral's Men in December 1594 at the Rose Theatre[22]. *Randal* was printed by Thomas Middleton in the autumn of 1602. M. St. Clare Byrne states that 'It is by no means impossible that the *Wise Men* may have been a revision of *John a Kent* and *Randal* a revision of the *Wise Men*, but there is no secure basis for this speculation'[23]. Turner agrees that a revision of *John a Kent and John a Cumber* was made in 1594, and presented at the Rose Theatre under the new title of *The Wise Men of West Chester*[24]. This revision may well have been made if the play was originally written for a provincial audience, and needed to be updated for a London audience. It is also believed that the play was again revised by Middleton and appeared under the later title of *Randal, Earl of Chester*[25].

---

[21] M. St. Clare Byrne, p.238

[22] See M. St. Clare Byrne's introduction to *John a Kent and John a Cumber*, p.x.

[23] M. St. Clare Byrne's introduction, p.x

[24] This play is lost and therefore a comparison between the two texts is impossible.

The Legend of John a Kent

There is unfortunately no extant version of the 'exploits of John a Kent or of his competitor' available, although as Collier observes

> We feel satisfied that a work of the kind must formerly have been current, and that the very circumstance of its extreme popularity has led to the destruction of every copy, so as to leave John a Kent and his performances merely a matter of vague tradition[26].

Despite this lack of an extant text, Collier quotes the 'accepted' version of the legend of John a Kent from Coxe's 'Historical Tour of Monmouthshire'. He embellishes the account by citing various articles and correspondences that supported the popularity of the legend. For example, he notes that Seleucus, in his article in *Notes and Queries* states that John a Kent was a Welsh bard at the beginning of the fifteenth century [27]. He is also aware that the Welsh manuscript society published a collection of poems about the legend in the IOLO manuscripts at the beginning of the fifteenth century, in which John a Kent was upheld by the local people as a 'powerful magician'. The IOLO manuscript contains an additional note stating that

> In 1415, Owen [probably John a Kent] disappeared, so that neither sight nor tidings of him could be obtained in the country. It was rumoured that he

---

[25] See Turner, p.107 for further details. This play is also lost.

[26] Anthony Munday, *John a Kent and John a Cumber*, ed. by J. Payne Collier (London: Shakespeare Society, 1851), introduction, p.xix.

[27] Seleucus, 'John a Kent' in *Notes and Queries*, VI (1851), 119-120, p.119

> escaped in the guise of a reaper;... after which little or no information transpired respecting him, nor of the place or manner of his concealment. The prevalent opinion was, that he died in a wood in Glamorgan; but occult chroniclers assert that he and his men still live, and are asleep on their arms, in a cave called Govog y ddinas, in the Vale of Gwent, where they will continue, until England becomes self-debased...

John a Kent was believed like Doctor Faustus to have derived his skill by making a pact with the devil. Collier notes the appearance of an article about the protagonist in *The Athenaeum*[28] . The anonymous correspondent of this article states that John a Kent had sold his soul to the 'Evil Spirit', and only managed – unlike Faustus - to escape from his covenant, by insisting that he was 'buried under the church wall, half inside and half outside of the building'. He confirms that there were several tales in circulation about the exploits of John a Kent, but no written evidence to support the story. Collier's friend expressed the outline of the theory in a memorandum, an excerpt of which reads as

> His fame as a wizard, though not so extensive, is somewhat like that of Doctor Faustus. There is hardly any one in this southern part of Herefordshire, particularly among the peasantry, who has not some marvellous traditionary story to relate concerning him. Most of the tales, however, are resolvable into one or two exploits in travelling for or with his master, in something like the railway speed of a single night, from Grosmont or Kentchurch to London, and of his outwitting in some way or other the arch-enemy of mankind. But with regard to time they are so confused – as traditions are apt to be – that there is no arriving at any point from which a conjecture may be formed as to the period of his, or of his prototype's existence.

There can be no definite confirmation of the usage of a source narrative for *John a Kent and John a Cumber*, although it would seem a likely probability that the play was based on a legend which was perhaps local to Chester and North Wales. I feel that this supposition can also be supported by the belief that Munday was resident at the house of the Mostyn family for a period of time. This family had a distant connection with Owen Glendower who was believed to be John a Kent, and Lord Llewellyn who also featured in the play.

---

[28] Collier, p.xxiv

The determining of a composition date for this play has caused problems. Some critics have given the play an early dating of circa 1584, and therefore regarded it as a precursor to Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay.* However, due to my belief that Munday was resident at the Mostyn House after Roger Mostyn's matriculation from Brasenose and employment as a sheriff in 1589, I feel that the hypothesis for a later date, sometime towards the end of 1589, would be the most suitable for this play. This would support the suggestion that *John a Kent and John a Cumber* followed Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* in the repertoire of magical plays, and was either composed at roughly the same time or a little later than Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay.* Due to a lack of 'internal evidence' to offer any alternative explanation, and the unexplained edition of the date December 1590, I have chosen for the purpose of this thesis, to regard *John a Kent and John a Cumber* as succeeding Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay.* I have therefore examined the play to see if there are any techniques which may have been appropriated from the plays of Marlowe and Greene, to help to re-create on the provincial stage the spectacular and innovative figures displayed in the London theatres during the late 1580s.

* * *

Theme of Rivalry

Perhaps the most dominant motif to emerge in *John a Kent and John a Cumber* is the theme of rivalry. Featured through the dramatic device of naming the two protagonists in the title of the play – John a Kent versus John a Cumber – the motif continues to dominate the remaining action. Again, as in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, the format of the title is used to place the superior magician in the leading position, so that the audience is aware from the outset of the eventual winner of the 'casts'. This superiority is further demonstrated by John a Kent in the opening preamble of the play, where he uses his magical abilities to unite Marian and Sidanen with Powesse and Griffin[29].

However, as the director of the action of the play, John a Kent moves away from using technical devices such as the 'glass prospective' which was employed by Bacon in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* to introduce his counterpart on the stage. This stage prop had a dual purpose in the play, as it could be used by Bacon to interfere in the love plot and achieve monetary reward from Edward[30]. In this play Kent feels that the path of true love should not be allowed to run smoothly - 'the loove is sweetest, that moste tryes the wit' (II.1.534) - and decides to introduce his counterpart to fulfil his plan. In a role reversal to Greene's play, John a Cumber (Kent's counterpart) is presented as a magician in contact with the devil, and therefore a suitable contender for carrying out his plan of disrupting the lover partnership that John a Kent has so neatly united

---

[29] The theme of a magician being a superior protagonist was originally derived from Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*.

[30] Although in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* the overt hostility is directed towards Vandermast in the philosophical debate, Bacon and Bungay also enjoy a friendly rivalry between them. This can be clearly seen in the 'glass prospective' scene when Bungay tries to marry the lovers and Bacon uses his magical abilities to prevent the ceremony.

> O that I had some other lyke my selfe,
> to drive me to sound pollicyes indeed.
> Thers one in Scotland, tearmed John a Cumber,
> that overreachte the devill by his skill,
> had Moorton brought him to have sped his loove,
> I would have tryde which should the maister proove.
> (II.1.541-546).

Further rivalry is also depicted in *John a Kent and John a Cumber* between countries. Powesse and Griffin as Welsh Lords have selected a Welsh magician – Kent from Kentchurch near Hereford, to represent their interests. Meanwhile the Scottish Earls, who actually have the approval of the two girls' guardian – the Earl of Chester – have chosen a Scottish magician to win their claims. This rivalry between magicians representing two different countries can be perceived as following the example of the philosophical debate in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*. In this scene, Vandermast represents the academic excellence of Germany, whilst Bacon is determined to prove that England is a country which has greater academic achievements than its nearest rival.

However, this choice of a magician to represent a country – either Scotland or Wales – can be perceived as depicting the traditional legend of John a Kent. According to ancient folklore, John a Kent or Owen Glendower was supposed to have incited the local people to fight against a Scottish invasion. His use of magic to secure a victory for the Welsh side in the legend suggests to the audience of this play, that Kent will emerge from the 'casts' as the superior magician. This adherence to using a local Welsh legend – with its allusions to divisions and rivalry – not only offered Munday an excellent basis for writing a play which echoed a main theme in *Friar Bacon and*

Friar Bungay, but also praised the owner of Mostyn Hall – Roger Mostyn. By re-using a tale about the owner's famous relative Owen Glendower, and adapting it to fit in with the conventions of the London stage, through its reliance on necromantic and romance magic, Munday would have been providing a spectacular performance for a local audience, as well as honouring his host.

Although *John a Kent and John a Cumber* is divided into five acts, the narrative actually revolves around three plots or 'casts' as they are called in the play. These depict the two magicians Kent and Cumber using the mechanism of the love motif to play out the rivalry between them. This use of three motifs to present a necromancer on the stage has already been observed in Marlowe's biography of Faustus's life. This in turn also influenced the presentation of *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, which used three dramatic devices – the 'glass prospective', the philosophical debate and the brazen head - to depict the main necromancer: Friar Bacon.

Pennell describes this use of 'casts' as a "two-out-of-three-falls" contest', especially as it adheres to the following format[31]. Cast number one (acts I, II, III.1) is a very involved 'cast', as it encompasses three acts and two different outcomes. At the beginning of the 'cast', Kent is depicted advertising his services to Powesse and Griffin. He then fulfils their desires and establishes his own reputation, by re-uniting them with their brides-to-be Marian and Sidanen. Kent views this as a victory over Cumber. However, in the second part of the 'cast' the tables are turned, as Cumber keen to affirm his position as a superior rival to Kent advertises his services to the 'legitimate bridegrooms'. He manages to outwit Kent and re-unites the brides with

---

[31] Pennell, p.25

Pembroke and Moorton. Cumber then declares his victory over Kent, who is humiliated by the turn of events, and by the fact that Cumber has disguised himself as Kent. This leads Kent to challenge Cumber to the next 'cast'

> Perhaps my shape makes thee thus boldly vaunte,
> and armes thee with this ablenes of skill,
> whereas thine owne beeing insufficient,
> may make thee feare to deale with John a Kent.
> (III.1.967-970).

Cumber's adoption of a disguise to look like Kent spurs the real Kent to resort to his more advanced philosophical skills to outwit Cumber in the second 'cast' (acts III.2 and IV). Kent employs his assistant Shrimp to find out Cumber's plans so that he can reverse the outcome of the second 'cast'. This is the first introduction of Shrimp as the magician's assistant on the stage, and his role is now devoted to proving that Kent is the superior magician. With Shrimp's assistance, Kent secures a victory at the end of the second 'cast', and even enjoys the spectacle of watching Cumber being humiliated in the clown's jig 'Lordes, sit ye still, Ile come agayne anon, / I am prettily revengde on Cumbring John' (III.2.1391-1392).

Although Cumber is defeated in the second 'cast' by Kent's superior magical skills, he begs for the rivalry to continue and be settled in one final 'cast'. As always with these two magicians, the stake is the happiness of the brides, the legitimate bridegrooms and the true lovers. The magicians are happy to maintain this status quo, as long as one or the other proves to be the superior magician. Kent believes that he will assume this coveted title

> Ffayne would ye that your daughters were combinde,
> in sacred wedlock with these noble Lordes.
> ...Ile deliver them,
> to John a Cumber, so he will bestowe,
> his very deepest skill to make it sure.

> But if he fayle, and be my luck to speed,
> to ceasse contention, and confess him foyld,
> As I will doo the lyke, if he prevayle.
> (III.2.1468-1469, 1471-1476).

Once again, however, Cumber is outwitted by Kent's magical abilities. This time Kent does not resort to philosophical magic, he merely performs the simple trick of conjuring a mist to confuse Cumber so that he can sneak Powesse and Griffin into the Abbey where they are married to Marian and Sidanen. As a result, Kent is regarded as the superior magician, even though the end of the play is incomplete, and the audience's expectations are fulfilled as he successfully unites the two couples in matrimony. This happy ending justifies Kent's positioning as the lead name in the title, because his superior skills have brought about a true 'romance', that is a happy ending.

Sense of Magic in the Play

In *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, the theme of magic is demonstrated through three motifs, each of which adhere to the tripartite pattern prescribed by *Doctor Faustus* of displaying philosophical, then romance and finally philosophical theories. In *John a Kent and John a Cumber*, the presentation of magic is more haphazard, although the characters still seem to follow the examples of their earlier prototypes, as they oscillate between the two types of magic prevalent during the period, rather than following a precise and orderly format. As a result of this ambiguity in the presentation of magic, that is a philosophical performance may be followed by two romance demonstrations before reverting to philosophical magic again; I will discuss all of the philosophical displays of magic, before moving onto the romance motifs.

Philosophical

At the beginning of the play, Kent is introduced to Powesse and Griffin by Gosselen who states that the magician has knowledge of the 'secret artes' (I.1.107). This necromantic link is further emphasised by Griffin asking Kent if he has the ability of a typical philosophical magician 'to call up the ghostes of those long since deceast?' (I.1.109). Faustus first established this trick as an example of the philosophical arts when he conjured the vision of Alexander the Great and his Paramour. By questioning Kent's links with the underworld and the deceased, Griffin is establishing Kent as a necromantic magician who can use his knowledge and skills to bring Marian and Sidanen back to them.

However, having established himself as a necromantic magician in the mode of Doctor Faustus, Kent only sustains his magical reputation by occasional dalliances with the philosophical arts throughout the remainder of the play. Indeed, he defines himself as a philosophical magician in much the same way as Bungay in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, by stating his preferred school of thought at the beginning of the first 'cast', when he visits the brides-to-be disguised as a hermit. Kent professes to employ the art of 'chiromancy' or 'palmestry' 'Lady, in youth I studyed hidden artes, / and proffited in Chiromancye much...' (I.1.237-238). Chiromancy, or palmistry as it is more commonly referred to today, had during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries been condemned by the Catholic Church, who branded it as being akin to 'devil-worshipping'. However, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, notable philosophical theorists such as Agrippa (1486-1535), Paracelsus (1493-1541) and Robert Fludd (1574-1637) had started to investigate the art of chiromancy, and this gave it a more respectable air.

Chiromancy had been defined by Seligmann as the art of gathering two types of 'heavenly imprints' from the hand – that of character and destiny – to provide a prophetic reading for the individual[32]. This information was, he notes, more generally derived from the left hand rather than the right one, because it was an accepted fact that the signs were preserved more clearly on this hand. The right hand was usually regarded as the predominant one for working, and as such, the readings would not be as clearly derived.

During the sixteenth century, chiromancers generally produced their divinatory readings by studying the length of the line on the palm of the hand, rather than the more common modern approach of using the fingers to provide a reading. The palm was then divided into four 'humps' or 'grooves' – a technique suggested by Tricasso de Cerasari (d. 1550) – and these were interpreted as the heart line, the middle line, the life line and the liver line. These lines or groves could then be used to

> Regulate and command the whole art of palmistry, and all the others depend on them. The lifeline must be divided into three parts – youth, maturity and old age. From its length, we can recognise how long its owner had to live. When the heart line is short, without ramifications, it denotes mortal danger, conjured up by negligence. When the head line is stopped below the middle finger, this means that the individual will wound himself dangerously. When the liver line is very distant

---

[32] Seligmann, pp.266 and 268

> from the one of life, it denotes a vain or an insane being...[33]

These basic divisions were used by later sixteenth century theorists such as Agrippa, who used De Cerasari's diagram of the 'chiromantic hand' to show the location of the planets. Indeed, the art was taken very seriously during the sixteenth century, and an inspection of the hand was regarded as being equivalent to a full medical check up performed by doctors today.

By identifying himself as a chiromancer – in a similar manner to Bungay who defined himself to Vandermast and the Elizabethan stage audience as a geomancer – Kent is able to demonstrate a clever magical trick on the stage. He aligns himself with the scientific art of chiromancy which was studied by several of the philosophical theorists during the period, to lend an aura of necromancy to his characterisation. Although he pretends to divine Marian and Sidanen's futures in the play by studying their hands '...Ladyes, shewe me bothe your handes' (I.1.244), in reality, he is merely deceiving both of them because he already knows that they art 'both betrothde, / to two great Lordes, without your parents knowledge?' (I.1.247-248).

However, this deployment of his art is useful for moving the action of the play on, as Kent is able to continue his philosophical alliances in this part of the 'cast', by issuing his instructions for the Ladies to visit 'St. Winifred's Well' at midnight. This was the hour traditionally associated with witchcraft and devilry, and was frequently referred to by both Doctor Faustus and Friar Bacon to symbolise a necromantic display

> When twise two houres the daughters of the night,
> have driven their Eban chariot thorow the ayre,
> and with their duskie winges breathde calmie rest,

---

[33] Tricasso de Cerasari, *Enumeratio Pulcherrima Principium Chiromantiae* (Nuremberg, 1560) in Seligmann, p.268

> uppon the eyeliddes of eche living thing.
> (I.2.287-290).

Despite this necromantic overtone, Kent does not sustain this atmosphere, as he reverts to the type of behaviour more generally associated with the romance genre. Immediately after this speech, he pulls off his disguise as a hermit 'he pulles his beard' (stage directions I.2.299-300), to introduce the brides-to-be to their true lovers, Powesse and Griffin.

In the first 'cast' Cumber is introduced on the stage as a magician with necromantic links by Kent, who describes him to the audience as 'Thers one in Scotland, tearmed John a Cumber, / that overreachte the devill by his skill' (II.1.543-544). Although Kent does not specify Cumber's exact relationship with the devil, the fact that he, like his famous predecessors Faustus and Bacon has had contact with the devil, qualifies him to be stereotyped as a philosophical magician. This necromantic affiliation is further emphasised by Cumber's first magical performance – consulting a 'glasse' to see Kent's magical manipulation of the love motif - 'what <a>rt thou dooing? very seriously, / plotting downes pastimes to delight the Ladyes' (III.1.736-737). Again, this dramatic device echoes the presentation of magic in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, as Bacon uses his necromantic skills to consult his 'glass prospective' to observe Margaret and Lacy. However, despite this early introduction to Cumber as a philosophical magician, he is presented like Greene's portrayal of Bungay, as a potential necromancer who had a working knowledge of the art of geomancy, but who actually preferred to perform the type of magic more generally associated with the romance tradition. This portrays him on the stage as the inferior counterpart to John a Kent.

Advances on the Philosophical Model

John a Kent like Friar Bacon and Doctor Faustus makes the strongest overtures in the play to the philosophical arts. In order to outwit Cumber in the second 'cast', Kent demonstrates his necromantic status by ordering his assistant Shrimp to go and observe Cumber's plans go 'through the key hole quickly.../ marke well, and bring me woord what stratageme...' (III.1.984-985), so that he can successfully counter them.

The use of an assistant as a necromantic aide was an innovative development first mooted in the 1570s. Early 'romance' magicians such as Bryan Sans Foy in *Clyomon and Clamydes* had employed assistants merely as helpers, that is, once Bryan had charmed his victims asleep, his assistants would carry him/her off to a prison inside his castle. However, this strategy changed when Marlowe presented *Doctor Faustus.* In this play Faustus's assistant was the devil Mephistopheles, who was actively involved in the presentation of magic. This theme of using an assistant in a necromantic manner was continued in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay,* as Bacon employed Miles to look after his necromantic books and watch over the brazen head.

However, although Kent has followed the stereotypical path of using an assistant to characterise himself as a philosophical magician, the audience soon realises that Shrimp is not cast in the same mould as either Mephistopheles, who was a devil, or Miles who enjoyed a comical relationship with the devil. Although Shrimp has derived his authority to be viewed as an assistant to Kent, a magician who mixes both philosophical and romance arts, he is also introduced in this play as an innovative character who can be regarded as a template for later magical assistants such as Ariel to follow. Shrimp is a spirit who, like his descendant Ariel, possesses the ability to render himself invisible and pass through keyholes or walls. This attribute allows him to observe Cumber in his preparations for his next 'cast', and report his findings to Kent, so that he (Kent) can manipulate the situation to his own advantage, and win the contest for the coveted title of superior magician.

In a novel twist on Mephistopheles and Miles, who were deployed to enhance the magician's alliances with the devil, Shrimp now adopts a role more typical of the romance genre, as he is used exclusively in the play to interfere in the love plot. In a similar mode to his contemporary Puck, Shrimp agrees to fulfil Kent's command to 'bring the Ladyes back agayne' (III.2.1026), to thwart Cumber and re-unite them with Powesse and Griffin. This sets a precedent in the performance of tricks for later characters such as Ariel to follow, especially when he agrees to perform Prospero's orders to bring Ferdinand and Miranda together. Shrimp, like Puck with his magical potion, and Ariel who sings in Gonzalo's ear to warn him of imminent danger, charms the guards Oswen and Amery into an enchanted sleep, by singing a magical spell over them 'sleep sweetly, sweetly take rest' (IV.1.1150). Indeed, this simple magical trick proves to be very effective, as Oswen and Amery fall asleep, thus permitting the two lords – Powesse and Griffin – to rescue the ladies and take them to a place of safety.

Shrimp continues to perform 'romance' magic in his dealings with the two guards Oswen and Amery, as he deceives them into believing that he is Cumber and offers to help them find their charges 'followe me, / to fetche them back ere they have got too farre' (IV.1.1180-1181). This cruel trick derived from the romance genre – where disguises, time scales and delaying tactics were part of the stock trade for the magician - succeeds in allowing Kent to continue uninterrupted with his magical plan.

Again, this classification can be asserted for Shrimp's final act of magic at the end of the second 'cast'. Although the notion can be perceived as worthy of a necromantic magician, the reality of the deed suggests that Shrimp's magic is derived from the romance genre. Shrimp leads the two guards 'in a ring to daunce about this tree' (IV.2.1400), so that Kent can re-unite the ladies with their true bridegrooms. This comic effect of making the two guards dance around a tree is reminiscent of the earlier jig, which was used to humiliate Cumber, and entertain the audience.

This deviation in the presentation of a magical assistant from the characterisations of Mephistopheles and Miles, suggests that a new pattern / development was beginning to emerge in the presentation of magicians on the stage. Faustus had been preoccupied with making an alliance with the devil (Lucifer) to secure the services of Mephistopheles. This allowed him to attempt to secure his ambition to become a demi-god. In a similar manner, Bacon had also used the devil to help him create the 'brazen –head' in an attempt to achieve a great status for himself. This creation was to be watched over by Miles, however, when he failed to wake Bacon at the appropriate time, the Friar resorted to the philosophical arts he had practised at various stages in the play, and condemned Miles to eternal hell. Although this atmosphere is not retained, as Bacon eventually rejects 'black magic', his treatment of Miles suggests that he is following Faustus's example of using an assistant who is returned to hell by the end of the play.

This ending in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* may well have influenced the portrayal of Shrimp in *John a Kent and John a Cumber*. Established in the accepted role of an assistant to the philosophical magician John a Kent, Shrimp fails to embrace the necromantic affiliations / associations of either Mephistopheles or Miles in the play. Indeed, his magic veers towards the type of magic more generally associated with the romance arts. This new type of role – of deviating from the stock examples of a philosophical magician – is later echoed by Ariel in *The Tempest.* Ariel performs Prospero's Neoplatonic art, a theory that refuses to employ diabolical associations, but uses instead, planetary influences to help the magical protagonist to achieve his ultimate aims and ambitions. Indeed, this hypothesis can be confirmed by the fact that Ariel copies Shrimp's idea of using magic to make the two guards dance around the tree. Ariel leads Prospero's last remaining enemies – Caliban, Stephano and Trinculo – bedraggled, and in their fancy 'regal' costumes through muddy, watery circles to his cell, so that he can exact revenge on all his enemies.

Romance

Despite the early presentation of John a Kent and John a Cumber on the stage as philosophical magicians, neither protagonist is able to successfully sustain this characterisation. Almost immediately after his presentation to Powesse and Griffin as a necromancer, Kent is depicted as a romance magician. In order to gain entry into the Earl of Chester's house without arousing suspicion, Kent assumes the disguise of an aged hermit. This disguise is a device more commonly associated with the medieval romance genre, as the early magicians frequently assumed different appearances to perform their magical tricks. Indeed, this was Bomelio's purpose in *The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune*, when he donned the disguise of a physician to trick the King into believing that he was attending to Armenio, whom he had previously struck dumb. This magical deed enabled Bomelio's son Hermione to pursue his love for Fidelia without any further interference.

Kent's recourse to magic to depict the most important aspects of his art – the uniting of the two sets of couples after a turbulent series of adventures – follows the paths of some of his famous predecessors[34]. In a similar manner to the romance *The Rare Triumphs*, where the two gods agree before the Synod to use the love plot between Fidelia and Hermione to settle their argument, Bacon and Bungay also use the love subplot between Margaret and Lacy to demonstrate their magical affiliations. Indeed, Bacon even fulfils his necromantic pledge to Edward, who has paid him to prevent this marriage from taking place, by using a motif derived from romance plays such as *The Rare Triumphs*, as he strikes Bungay dumb. By following these famous examples, Kent is lending authority to the purpose of his 'casts', as well as copying a tried and tested formula for entertaining a theatre-going audience.

Although Kent has instigated the 'casts' for his own amusement, he promises to use his skills to ultimately unite the lovers, thus fulfilling the criteria of a 'romance' magician, and achieving a 'traditional happy ending'. Kent continues this theme when he advises the Ladies to 'washe not at Saint winifredes fayre spring' (I.2.260). Frequently in medieval romances, saints' names were linked to a special tradition that had magical implications. A common example was St. Agnes. If a woman prayed to

---

[34] This is due to his belief that the course of true love shouldn't be allowed to run smoothly.

St. Agnes on 21 January, after fasting for the day, she was supposed to dream of her future husband. By sending the Ladies to St. Winifred's well to fulfil the tradition of washing before a marriage ceremony, Kent is maintaining his magical links with the romance genre[35]. He is also securing a place for Powesse and Griffin to rescue their prospective brides from, before their marriage to Pembroke and Moorton.

Kent's links with the romance genre also occur in the final climactic stage of the second 'cast'. This is his ultimate victory, his chance to decide on a final punishment for Cumber. By employing a traditional pastime such as the morris dance, Kent is able to make Cumber appear as a fool, who is unable to use his skill to combat Kent's victory. Indeed, the atmosphere of fun and merriment is increased by the clowns entering the dance to continue their torment of Cumber, by dressing him in a fool's coat and dancing around him in a mocking style.

Kent's magical display in the third 'cast' is reminiscent of the medieval romance traditions. In order to win the 'cast', Kent conjures a 'mist' to bewilder Cumber and the legitimate bridegrooms. This enables him to smuggle the true lovers – Powesse and Griffin into the cathedral to marry Marian and Sidanen. In declaring his final victory over Cumber, Kent even pays tribute to the simple skills that have allowed him to succeed, as well as Cumber's inability to use his necromantic affiliations

> O rare Magitian that hast not the power,
> to beat asyde a sillie dazeling mist,
> which a mere abce scholler in the arte,
> can doo it with least facillitie.
> (V.3.1612-1616).

---

[35] Please see Appendix D for information.

Cumber

Following the structural presentation of the role of the second magician (Bungay) in Greene's play, Cumber is depicted as a rival to Kent, although his art never quite reaches the same level of achievement. Cumber is defined in a similar manner to Bungay, who is described in the play as following the art of geomancy. Although this art had been deemed as a suitable subject for religious practitioners to study, Vandermast suggests in the play that it also has a philosophical aspect, by describing the geomantic spirits as performing devilish deeds. Although Cumber's association with the devil is never clearly defined '...John a Cumber, / that overreachte the devil by his skill' (II.1.543-544), he does, like Bungay appear to have some sort of connection with this diabolical being. However, this necromantic casting seems to be merely confined to the introduction, as Cumber manages to win the first 'cast' by resorting to the type of magic more commonly practised by the magicians of the medieval romances.

Indeed, every magical demonstration performed by Cumber can be classified as belonging to the romance genre. Cumber secures his victory at the end of the first 'cast', by assuming Kent's identity and presenting a show of 'Antiques' to the true bridegrooms Powesse and Griffin[36]. These dramatic devices of using a disguise, and presenting a spectacle in the manner of the traditional dumb show motifs, were tried and tested formulas for displaying magical abilities in the medieval romances. Indeed, in keeping with the tradition of the dumb show motif, this display of

---

[36] Each 'Antique' represented a character from the legitimate wedding party.

'Antiques' also foretold the action about to be depicted on the stage, as the second 'Antique', the Earl of Chester comments

> Then like a father will I, come to check my filly,
> for her gadding foorth without me leave:
> And if she repent it, I am well contented,
> home agayne my darling to receive.
> (III.1.807-810).

Having concluded his display - Cumber still attired as Kent – follows the 'Antiques' into the Castle and shuts the door. It is only after this action, and when Powesse and Griffin see Kent approaching the Castle that they realise how they have been duped. By presenting a typical romance style magical trick, Cumber is able to secure an easy victory for Kent, and declare himself the victor at the end of the first 'cast'.

This display of the 'Antiques' is the only magical spectacle performed by Cumber in the play. His plan for victory in the second 'cast' is overshadowed by Kent's manipulation of the action. By attiring the unwitting Cumber as himself, Kent makes him a model of ridicule for the other characters on the stage, and helps Powesse and Griffin to secure Sidanen and Marian as their brides. Cumber's inferiority as a magician is then further highlighted by Kent involving him in the morris dance as a punishment for securing victory in the first 'cast'. Although Cumber attempts to overcome this humiliation by challenging Kent to a third 'cast', his magic now appears to be very weak. Kent underlines Cumber's inferiority by permitting him the position of guarding Chester Abbey, to make sure that the rightful wedding party are allowed in. However, Cumber is outwitted by Kent conjuring a simple 'mist', which creates confusion and allows the true lovers Powesse and Griffin to be united in matrimony with Sidanen and Marian. As the rest of the play is incomplete, it is hard to judge Cumber's reaction to this simple trick. However, for the audience, he now appears as the inferior magician whose skill has been reduced to the same level as the magicians in the early romances. Indeed, the limitations placed upon Cumber's magic makes him almost akin to Bomelio in *The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune*.

Although both Kent and Cumber are depicted at the beginning of the play as having the potential to be philosophical magicians through knowledge of the 'secret arts' and the use of necromantic implements such as the 'glass', their characterisation is not sustained throughout the play. In the 'casts' where they could have demonstrated the potential of their art, their skills are largely defined as being derived from the early romance genres. There are occasional glimmers of necromantic deeds in the 'romance' spectacles' such as the Boy reminding the audience in the middle of the morris dance of Kent's habit of 'sending thy devilles to / tell lyes and tales of me...'(IV.2.1371-1372). Yet, the general atmosphere of the play suggests that the magic is derived from the romance genre or popular magic practised by the village wizard, particularly at the end of the play, where Cumber's magic declines almost to the point of weakness.

Sense of Magic

Although it is my belief that Munday had tried to emulate Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, by adopting the theme of rivalry in the play, his presentation of the magicians during the 'casts' seems more akin to the middle section of *Doctor Faustus*. In *Doctor Faustus*, the middle section of the tripartite structure portrays

Faustus as a central protagonist who derived his tricks and devices from the romance genre, even though he is supposed to be using a devil to help him to perform his magical demonstrations. This adherence in style to the format prescribed by Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* may be due to a connection with Munday and Marlowe's spying activities. Indeed, Munday was still an active spy during the 1580s when Marlowe was involved in acting as an informer against the Catholic League for the Government[37].

Another suggestion for this reference to the medieval tradition may be the fact that the play was written for a performance in Mostyn Hall, rather than for the London stage. This suggestion can be supported by the fact that Munday himself acknowledged his habit of writing part of his plays during visits to provincial houses. This can be seen in an apology published to his patron Master Ralph Marshall of Carleton in Nottingham, in *Gerileon of England*, which started 'At your house I wrote a sheete or two...'[38].

If this hypothesis is correct, then as Traister observes, acting troupes touring the country would be limited in presenting 'spectacular effects of magic' due to a lack of portable 'staging techniques'[39]. Indeed, away from the London playhouses, the actors would only have the ability to perform simple tricks such as conjuring a mist or placing people in an enchanted sleep, as this would not involve complex stage effects. Philosophical spectacles such as flying on devils and creating special effects for thunder and lightning would be too complicated to perform in a private house.

---

[37] See previous reference to Munday's epistle to the *Palladine of England.*

[38] M. St. Clare Byrne, p.244

[39] Traister, p.40

However, by suggesting that his magicians are necromancers, but limiting their performances to the type of magic performed in the early romances, Munday is following the London trend implemented by Marlowe and Greene, and using these to present a spectacular play in a regional location.

CHAPTER FOUR

COMMERCIAL THEATRE AND THE INTRODUCTION OF NEW MOTIFS

> …we found
> theas Cristians setted in a thicket this poring on a booke
> wher in was draune formes and Carracters that seme
> most strange…
> (ll.129-132)

The theme of presenting philosophical and romance magic in a haphazard manner, as already depicted in chapter three on *John a Kent and John a Cumber,* continued in the anonymous play *John of Bordeaux*. Viewed by many as the sequel to Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, and indeed sometimes referred to as *Friar Bacon,* this play represents many of the themes that were popular in the commercial Elizabethan theatre between 1590 and 1594[1]. Although there is no title page on the original manuscript which was found in the Duke of Northumberland's library, the play was commonly believed to have been referred to during the Elizabethan period as *Friar Bacon*. Today, it has been preserved under the title of *John of Bordeaux.*

Composition Date

William Lindsay Renwick, editor of the 1936 edition of *John of Bordeaux* notes that several of the main characters in this play appear to have been derived from other famous stage plays during the era[2]. Most notably he concludes Lodge's *Rosalynde*

---

[1] The exact title of the play has not been determined. However, it is commonly referred to by modern critics as *John of Bordeaux*. This title will be used to refer to the play throughout this thesis.

[2] Robert Greene, *John of Bordeaux or the Second Part of Friar Bacon*, ed. by William Lindsay Renwick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1936), p.ix. This edition will be referred to throughout this thesis.

(1590), the anonymous *Selimus* (1591-1594), Peele's *The Old Wives Tale* (1591-1594) and anonymous *A Knack to Know an Honest Man* (1594) have all lent names to characters in this play. Renwick believes that this offers a composition date of between 1590 and 1594, although for a number of reasons which I will now outline, he believes that 1592 would be the most appropriate.

Renwick cites 1592 as an appropriate composition date for the play due to several references in the main text to John Holland (ll. 466, 678-679 and 1159)[3]. Holland was a member of Lord Strange's acting company between 1590 and 1593, and as such, his appearance in this play seems a feasible possibility. In his introduction to the play, Renwick cites the entries in Henslowe's diary to support this theory. In the diary there are two entries referring to Friar Bacon, 'as an old play acted by Strange's men, 19 February 1592, and again by the Queen's and Sussex's in April 1594'[4]. It is his belief that this should be read as references to two plays about Friar Bacon – one to Greene's play which was performed by the Queen's, and the other to *John of Bordeaux* by Lord Strange's players.

This later contention that Strange promoted this play under its 'supposed' original title of *Friar Bacon* can be assumed due to the fact that Lord Strange was believed to be interested in several of the philosophical and occultist arts made popular by the Elizabethan theorists during the period. However, given the fact that the title cannot definitely be confirmed as either *Friar Bacon* or *John of Bordeaux*, I believe that Henslowe's reference to *Friar Bacon* must still be regarded as referring to Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*.

---

[3] Renwick, p.viii
[4] Renwick, p.viii

A more likely explanation to support a 1592 composition date can be derived from some of the arguments proposed to confirm Greene's authorship of this play. It has long been suggested that *John of Bordeaux* was a sequel written by Greene to *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay.* Possibly keen to emulate his success with a tried and tested formula, and encouraged by the fact that plays such as *John a Kent and John a Cumber* derived their theatrical conventions, for example the theme of rivalry, from his original play, Greene may well have been encouraged to recreate a similar dramatic device. This hypothesis has been supported by the fact that the play *John of Bordeaux* re-uses two of Greene's most famous protagonists – Friar Bacon and Vandermast – and in the same roles as previously described in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay.* If Greene's authorship of this play can be confirmed, then 1592 would be the very last date for its composition, due to the fact that Greene died in September of that year. An earlier dating than 1589 – the composition date ascribed to *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* – has already been ruled out, by the reference to John Holland in the manuscript. This is also supported by Renwick's theory about several of the leading protagonists deriving their names from other popular plays during the early 1590s.

Is Greene the Author of *John of Bordeaux?*

Greene's authorship of this play has generally been accepted, although, it has been presumed that the copy of the play available today is a shortened version of a now lost original. This shorter version of the play has some speeches towards the end of the extant material that can be attributed to Chettle, although once again, this conjecture cannot be proved [5]. One possible hypothesis for this collaboration is the fact that the play may not have been completed before Greene died, and so it was necessary for other dramatists such as Chettle to take over the composition. Another suggestion favoured by Renwick is the possibility that Chettle may have owned the manuscript of the play, and in his capacity as a bookseller adapted it before publication.

Greene's authorship has generally been presumed due to the fact that two of the magicians from *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* – Friar Bacon and Jacques Vandermast – appear again as central protagonists. Indeed, the old theme of rivalry which was first mooted in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* is continued in this play, as the two magicians attempt to outwit one another in a bid to be regarded as the superior magician. Vandermast determines to aid Ferdinand, the German Emperor's son in his bid to win the love of Rossalin[6]. However, Bacon has the ability through his art to know Vandermast's intentions, and in an echo of his behaviour during the philosophical motif in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, he interferes in Vandermast's plan, by conjuring his devil and trying to reason with him

> ...was magicke
> therfor ment to mayntayne wronge, to force
> Chast Ladies yeld to folish lust, ha vandermast
> thow crakest a scoller fane but I will crose the
> to thy on disgrace Astrough wilt thow do what
> I command the...
> (ll.662-667).

---

[5] Renwick (p.xiii) has only cited one passage in the play, which he believes to have been written by Chettle (ll.1090-1101).

[6] Due to a variation in the spelling of character's names in the text, I have taken the spellings in the *dramatis personae* as the correct version.

This scene also echoes Bacon's attempt to help Edward win the love of Margaret at the beginning of Greene's play, especially as he (Edward), like Ferdinand simply desires to take Margaret as his lover and not as his wife[7].

There are two other references in the play which again point to Greene's authorship. In the introduction to the play, Vandermast recalls his treatment by Friar Bacon on their last meeting – during the philosophical debate in Oxford – when Bacon conjured a spirit to send Vandermast home to Germany. However, instead of telling the German Emperor that he was sent on a devil, he describes his retrospective action as thus 'he sett me on a [stead] **Iade** that posted me in hast from Albion / a vengance and a wherlwind brought me home' (ll.34-35). The other scene which is referred to in this play is Bacon's final act of 'black' magic, when he breaks his famous 'glass prospective' at Oxford after the deaths of the two scholars, Lambert and Serlsby. This is actually recalled fairly early on in the play 'ha Bacon had thy glass bin holl which thou didest breake, / at Oxford in a splene…'(ll.425-426). It is adapted in the play, so that Bacon can effectively achieve the same result as his previous experiment. However, this time he uses his art to create prophetic visions for the Emperor through the format of a dream 'you in a dreme whate ther pformd' (l.430), rather than a visual display on the stage.

Alongside these references to themes and motifs that have appeared in Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, there are some scenes that could be construed as an attempt to emulate performances in Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*. Given Greene's previous attempts to imitate his contemporary, as already outlined in chapter two, if he was the author of this play, then these scenes could be regarded as evidence to support the argument. They may also have been viewed by him (Greene) as suitable material for inclusion in a sequel. An example of this is the scene where Rossalin tries to persuade Bacon to conjure the spirit of John of Bordeaux 'good Docter plesur me and let me se him' (l.1007), which he agrees to perform. This echoes, to some degree, the scene in *Doctor Faustus* at the court of the Emperor Charles V, when Faustus promises to conjure the spirit of Alexander and his paramour[8] 'But such spirits as can lively resemble Alexander and / his paramour shall appear before your Grace...' (IV.1.53-54). However, it must be noted that Faustus conjures the spirit of a dead person, whereas Bacon in this play only raises the 'ghost' of a living person.

---

[7] Rossalin is already married to John of Bordeaux, and Edward is betrothed to Eleanor of Castile.

Renwick also supports the argument for Greene's authorship of *John of Bordeaux*, by noting the fact that at line 669, the word *Belce* has been 'struck out and *Lucifer* substituted, *belce* being (I take it) the beginning of the devil's name *Belcephon*, as in *Friar Bacon*'.[9] He believes that this supporting argument is strengthened by the fact that, as Churton Collins acknowledges, Belcephon was a name that had been specifically invented by Greene for the purposes of the play.

However, whilst all these arguments can be sustained by evidence in the text, I feel that there are certain important issues which have yet to be addressed. Although *John of Bordeaux* employs two of the most central protagonists from *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, as a sequel to the original, I feel that this would be the standard practice on the part of any writer attempting to write a follow on play. Also, it must be noted that only two of the protagonists from *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* – Friar Bacon and Vandermast – re-appear in this play. Friar Bungay who was deemed to be an important enough character to share the title of the play with Friar Bacon (a factor which is not derived from the source narrative *The Famous Historie of Fryer Bacon),* does not appear at all in this play. If this play was a sequel written by Greene, then I would have expected all three magicians to have re-appeared, even if only for a brief moment in this play.

---

[8] In *John of Bordeaux*, Bacon reminds Rossalin that he will only conjure the spirit of her exiled husband on the proviso that she will 'vow forberance lest she touch' (l.1008). This notion appears in the B text only of *Doctor Faustus*, where after having conjured the spirits, Faustus has to restrain the Emperor from embracing the spirits 'My gracious lord, you do forget yourself. / These are but shadows, not substantial' (IV.1.103-104).

[9] Renwick, p.vii

As already outlined as a supporting argument for Greene's authorship of the play, I have problems with the reference to Friar Bacon breaking his glass prospective in Oxford, only to perform similar prophecy magic in this play. By charming people into a sleep, Bacon uses the guise of the dream sequence to display his prophetic message. In *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, Bacon was deeply affected by the killing of the two scholars Lambert and Serlsby, and it was his own responsibility for this action, which moved him to break the 'glass prospective'

> Bacon, thy magic doth effect this massacre.
> This glass prospective worketh many woes;
> And therefore, seeing these brave, lusty brutes,
> These friendly youths did perish by thine art,
> End all thy magic and thine art at once.
> (13.75-79).

It is hard to believe that this character who dramatically broke his connections with his necromantic past in favour of practising 'white' magic in the future, would once again return to an art form so savagely rejected.

However, the most compelling evidence, I believe, for refuting Greene's authorship of this sequel is the fact that *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* was based to a large extent on five extracts from the prose romance *The Famous Historie of Fryer Bacon.* None of the other extracts from the source, which were dismissed from use in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* have been replicated in any way in this play. Indeed, as a sequel written allegedly by the same author, I would expect the previous source used for creating a successful stage presentation to be used again, especially as there were other extracts in the prose narrative, which could have been dramatically enhanced to offer an exciting performance. Such examples would include 'How Vandermast, for the disgrace that he had received by Fryer Bacon sent a souldier to kill him; and how Fryer Bacon escaped killing, and turned the souldier from an Atheist to be a good Christian' and 'How Vandermast and Fryer Bungye met, and how they strived who should excel one another in their conjurations: and of their deaths'.

Although the play is incomplete, and some extracts from *The Famous Historie* may well have appeared at the end of this missing section, I believe that, on balance, there is no further evidence to support this supposition. Thus, I feel that this total disregard for the primary source for *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* in the sequel is indicative of another playwright composing this play. This anonymous writer could have determined to follow the trend prevalent during the 1590s, of using magical protagonists as leading performers in a play, who derived their characteristics from previous role models, such as Greene's Friar Bacon. By adding a few veiled allusions to these characters' past activities in a former play, and adopting certain character traits from other innovative stage models such as Doctor Faustus, this anonymous playwright has – what he believes to be – a successful formula for enticing a London theatre-going audience.

John of Bordeaux

Once again, in a similar manner to many of its Elizabethan contemporaries, the theme of magic is presented as a central motif in *John of Bordeaux*. Although the presentation does not adhere to the tripartite structure of magic initiated in *Doctor Faustus* and almost faithfully reproduced in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, the play like Munday's *John a Kent and John a Cumber* bears certain similarities with these innovative Elizabethan role models. Indeed, although the magic is presented in a rather haphazard manner, the play still retains the fashion prescribed by these innovative plays of oscillating between the two generic conventions of philosophical and romance magic.

John of Bordeaux commences by adhering to the popular concept of characterising its two central protagonists Friar Bacon and Vandermast, in the traditional style of necromantic / philosophical magicians. This strategy of typecasting the magical character as a necromancer from the opening moment was first presented as a precedent by Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, and continued as a theme in both Greene and Munday's plays. However, it must be noted at this stage, that this play deviates from the format prescribed by Marlowe and Greene in the arrangement of the title. In the other plays of the period, the leading 'English' magicians who had the potential to be necromantic magicians all featured in the title of the play. In this play, there is no conclusive proof to ascertain the true title of the play – it may have been *Friar Bacon* or *John of Bordeaux* – thus, the play can only be presumed to be relating to the post 1590 pattern of not relating its title to the central motif. This pattern was seen in Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and Peele's *The Old Wives Tale*. In order to examine the pattern of magic presented in *John of Bordeaux,* and ascertain the influence of Marlowe and Greene's innovative protagonists, I will commence my study by examining the magical presentation of Friar Bacon followed by Jacques Vandermast.

Friar Bacon

In a strong parallel with *Doctor Faustus*, Friar Bacon first reveals the necromantic aspect of his art in *John of Bordeaux*, by allowing the play's namesake to narrate to the audience his (Bacon's) academic background 'wert thow at / oxford in thi howse of brassenos' (ll.23-24). By linking Bacon with his predecessor in Greene's play, who resided at Brasenose College in Oxford, and used his cell which was designed as a 'consistory court' to entertain devils in, John of Bordeaux is projecting a necromantic characterisation onto Bacon. During the Elizabethan era, it was a common characteristic for a magical stage protagonist to have studied academic subjects relating to magic at a University such as Oxford. These academic skills gave him the ability to dabble in the 'black' arts.

This notion is also played on when Bacon is arrested by the Turks for reading philosophical books

> … poring on a booke
> wher in was draune formes and Carrectors that seme
> most strange this other whom we hould to be his man sat just
> derect him with anenstrewment by all conjecturs seminge
> maggecall as yf he ment by art to draw the perfitt Citti.
> (ll.130-134).

Again, this confirms to the audience that Friar Bacon is a philosophical magician, as the study of magical books was a prerequisite for this type of art. It also reinforces for the audience the notion that Friar Bacon's conversion to 'white' magic at the end of Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* is now redundant, as Friar Bacon has once again embraced the arts, which led him to 'emotional' ruin in the previous play.

By identifying himself as a Christian, yet studying the type of books commonly associated with the 'black' arts, Bacon reveals himself in the same light as Faustus, who fell from God's grace for his sins of 'pride'. Bacon narrates the wonderful things that his study of books can achieve 'daunt thy Iannsaries with a froune, making thy Basshawes / bow when I Commaund...' (ll.151-152). Indeed, Bacon continues to follow this example suggested by his stage ancestor Doctor Faustus, of confirming his identity as a necromantic magician, by performing another characteristic commonly used to define such a protagonist on the stage. He displays a similar show to Faustus's conjuration of the spirits of Alexander and his paramour, which takes place almost at the end of his twenty-four years contract with Lucifer.

Faustus exemplified his necromantic art by conjuring the 'ghosts' of dead heroes. However, Bacon in this play deviated from this pattern, as he paradoxically conjures the 'ghost' of a living not a dead being. Although this action can be predominantly defined as philosophical, the fact that the ghost is of a living and not a dead person suggests that an element of the type of magic presented by the romance magicians is creeping into Bacon's spectacle. The 'ghost' is used in this play to act in a scene similar to the dumb show motif used in romance drama, although in this episode the characters are allowed to speak to ensure that the audience are fully aware of the harrowing emotions being displayed on the stage. Indeed, a similar device was used to portray Cumber's show of 'Antiques', which was employed to outwit Kent and the legitimate bridegrooms in *John a Kent and John a Cumber*[10]. Thus, although the tone of the show enacted for the Turkish Emperor is of a philosophical nature, the reliance on romance magic to support Bacon's demonstration remains, as in the magical displays by Kent and Cumber in Munday's play, an underlying feature of his art.

However, this mixing of philosophical and romance magic together to characterise Bacon as a necromantic magician is sustained throughout this episode, seemingly to remind the audience of his predecessor Doctor Faustus, who also mixed the two genres together. Bacon imprisons the Turkish Emperor into his chair, and, in a 'necromantic' spell which again seems to have its roots in the romance genre, he charms the Emperor from moving throughout the spectacle to prevent him from aiding the 'ghost' of his son. In front of this shocked protagonist, Bacon then enacts the horrific scene of a soldier chasing and eventually killing his son Selimus 'this souldier gave me chase so at thy feett thy / son must ether die…' (ll.196-197). Greatly traumatised and shocked by the cold hearted and murderous scene that he has just witnessed, the Turkish Emperor agrees to concede victory to Bacon and hands over the external embellishments of his regal status 'my Croune / my robe my semeter and what elce I hav…' (l.208).

Overjoyed by the victory of his magical spectacle, Bacon reveals the deception that he has practised on the Emperor in order to achieve his own ambitions and purposes. In the style of a true necromantic philosopher, such as Faustus, who can make recourse to the romance traditions to aid his magic, Bacon has the ability to conjure spirits and persuade them to perform in spectacles, which portray a fantasy, rather than a reality. Whilst Faustus raised the spirit of the dead Alexander, and displayed it on the stage in its true likeness for Carolus, so Bacon has used a spirit to enact this scene to help him achieve his true motive 'Bacon by majeck spells raysde up some spright in likenes of yor son / and by that menes and by that meanes hath gott yor robes awaye' (ll.242-243).

---

[10] The earlier romance – the anonymous *Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune* – also used this motif. Four classical tales such as the tragedy of Dido and Aeneas were enacted on the stage to suggest possible avenues for the final outcome of the love motif between Fidelia and Hermione.

Bacon completes his necromantic characterisation at the beginning of the play, by carrying out the last defining trait proposed by Faustus for typecasting this type of magician on the stage. In charming the Turkish Emperor to remain motionless during the 'killing of Selimus', Bacon is portrayed on the stage, by a noble, as collaborating with the devil to achieve his magical effect 'the devell I thinnck or elce som worsser hath so in chaunted ous we can not mov' (l.201). To be a true necromantic magician like Doctor Faustus, and to a lesser extent the original Friar Bacon, the principal protagonist has to enter into some sort of diabolical alliance to achieve his spectacles. Whilst this alliance is explicitly demonstrated on stage in *Doctor Faustus*, by Faustus physically signing a contract in his own blood with the devil, in other plays such alliances are only hinted at. However, magicians like Greene's Friar Bacon and this Friar Bacon, although not physically involved in signing a contract with the devil, seem to have made an alliance with him at some point. They certainly seem to have the same powers as Faustus to command the devil to perform their every whim and desire, as Bacon then commands his own personal devil Asteroth to 'go shroud thy selfe and him strayte in the depe' (l.219)[11].

This opening characterisation of Bacon as a necromantic magician, with strong links to Doctor Faustus, seems a far cry from the 'white' magician depicted on the stage at the end of Greene's play. He also seems far removed from the 'broken' man locking himself into solitary exile at the end of the prose romance *The Famous Historie of Fryer Bacon.* In these two preceding story lines, Bacon was full of remorse for his part in allowing the two scholars Lambert and Serlsby to consult the 'glass prospective', which led to their untimely deaths. Now he is in full characterisation as a necromantic magician displaying characteristics commonly found in Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus.*

Yet in this sequel, although there is a hint of comedy suggested by Perce mocking the Turkish Emperor 'ah Bacon what hast thow don / taken thy robes and sent thy sone to hell thus Inglish Bacon bede the Turk farw' (ll.220-221), the overriding tone is of a diabolical nature. Bacon has ruthlessly allowed the Turkish Emperor to believe that one of his devils dressed as a soldier has been responsible for committing the sin of murder. Totally against his prescribed Christian vocation which viewed murder as a cardinal sin, Bacon has mockingly displayed this spectacle with the help of his devil Asteroth. This helps to characterise him from the very outset of the play as a necromantic magician, although this image is of a paradoxical nature. Indeed, by the very portrayal of his art on the stage, his definition as a necromancer has been undermined by his reliance on traditions frequently associated with the romance genre to depict his skill.

---

[11] Again this Friar Bacon seems to be following in the footsteps of Doctor Faustus. Faustus, after signing his contract with Lucifer ordered Mephistopheles to serve him during the course of his twenty-four years on earth. Friar Bacon, in all but one episode in this play, also has Asteroth to serve him.

Vandermast

The other main magical character in *John of Bordeaux*, Jacques Vandermast is also cast as a philosophical magician in the play. His magical art, although not of quite the same diabolical potential as Bacon's skills, suggests that he is still a suitable rival and foil to this protagonist. However, at the beginning of the play, this image is underpinned by the fact that Vandermast can be perceived as adopting some of the magical attributes used by dramatists during the later 1590s to portray their magical motifs on the stage. Ferdinand describes Vandermast's magic as using the art of herbalism, a subject that was believed to have medical qualities, and absolutely no links with the devil. Ferdinand believes that this art will be particularly suitable for healing his heartache, which has been caused by his 'love' for Rossalin, even though she is married to John of Bordeaux, hence he visits Vandermast because he believes

> ...but yf that
> erbes or spells may cure the mynd I mervell why empatien...
> [erbes] yet will I tri the art of vandermast...
> (ll.106-107 & 109).

Herbalism had been a popular concept in the practice of medicine since medieval times, and this trend continued during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, although it was only now beginning to make an appearance on the stage, (this is seen in more detail in chapter five). Indeed, due to a lack of 'licensed practitioners'[12], many people, particularly amongst the poor would seek the advice of a 'herbalist' or 'wise woman' for common complaints such as burns, sores, earache etc. These people would often apply herbs and roots to the affected areas to effect a cure. Indeed, herbs such as St. John's Wort were thought to have 'special protective qualities', although many of the 'cures' suggested by these practitioners were for things which would eventually cure themselves without any outside help, for example warts and fevers[13]. In fact, due to the practitioners' lack of medical knowledge and proper training, these 'cures' frequently did more harm than good.

---

[12] Thomas, p.12

However, Vandermast's presentation as a herbalist with potential abilities to cure is not sustained in the play, as he seems to revert back to playing the same role as his 'predecessor' in Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay.* Indeed, he reminds the audience of his previous role in Greene's play, in the philosophical debating scene. In this scene he was depicted as presenting his magical abilities which were typecast as philosophical due to his study of pryomancy. This left him subjected to Bacon's greater art, which as he now remembers '...sett me on a [stead] **Iade** that posted me in hast from Albion / a vengance and a wherlwinnd brought me home' (ll.34-36)[14]. This reminder of Vandermast's previous ability to perform philosophical deeds such as the conjuring of Hercules, although eventually turned against him by Bacon gives credence to his later display of 'black' magical art in *John of Bordeaux*[15].

Vandermast promises Ferdinand that he will 'rayes a sperit in som turkish shape / like to a messinger from Ameroth...' (ll.321-322), in order to secure John's exile from the German court. He believes that this action will persuade Rossalin that her husband had deceived the German Emperor, and thus, in a weakened and humble state lead her to love Ferdinand, she will 'chaung her / thoughte and smill in tyme' (ll.331-332).

---

[13] See Thomas, p.181 & 208 for more information.

[14] In Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, it was a devil in the shape of Hercules which transported Vandermast to Germany in accordance with Bacon's wishes.

[15] This theme is also repeated in this play, but with a slightly different twist, as Vandermast tries to turn Ameroth against Bacon, as seen in his dealings with the welfare of Rossalin.

Vandermast expands on his philosophical characterisation by confirming with Ferdinand that if his ambitious plan did not work, then he would use one of his devils to conjure the lady 'in her night goune unto yow, yf then yow win not / your worthie loss' (ll.336-337). By promising to use his magical abilities to satisfy Ferdinand's sexual cravings, Vandermast is emulating the scene in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, where Edward pays Friar Bacon to use his philosophical art to secure the love of Margaret.

However, there is a slight difference in this later presentation of philosophical magic for sexual pleasure. Edward paid Bacon for his services, and Faustus signed his alliance with Lucifer using his own blood to secure his desires. Vandermast on the other hand does not profit by helping Ferdinand. Although he does not believe that Rossalin will succumb to Ferdinand's advances, for the sake of Ferdinand's mental status, he is prepared to enact his magic. This lack of material gain in exchange for the fulfilment of Ferdinand's desires reminds the audience instead of another type of magician – Merlin – from the romance genre. Merlin promised to fulfil Uther Pengragon's wish to deceive Igerna by disguising himself through Merlin's magic as her husband Gorlois. This liaison resulted in the birth of King Arthur, and although it satisfied Merlin's ambition to create a suitable King for England, his gain can be perceived as attempting to help a lustful man, rather than making a material profit from the transaction.

By presenting his art in such a mode, that is by pertaining to the philosophical theories and practices of his Elizabethan heritage, before combining his skill with the more traditional elements of the romance genre, Vandermast is following the example set by stage magicians such as Doctor Faustus. However, by adding in other skills to his art, such as the powers of producing herbal remedies and performing actions which do not profit the magician, Vandermast is also beginning to signal some of the newer innovations creeping into the presentation of stage magicians towards the end of Elizabeth's reign.

Perce

Bacon in the traditional style of a necromantic magician has an assistant Perce to help him perform his magical skills[16]. Perce is introduced to the audience in this role, when he is arrested with Bacon, by the Turks for 'poring on a booke' which is described as magical. Bacon uses him immediately after this episode, as an aid in his philosophical demonstration, whereby he removes the crown, robe and semeter from the Turkish emperor.

However, despite his role as a servant to Bacon which involves him performing the traditional requests made by such protagonists on the Elizabethan stage, Perce also seems to have magical abilities of his own. He now seems quite happy to display these skills in a comical interlude for the audience. In a later scene, away from the influence of both Vandermast and his master, Perce is persuaded by the scholars to demonstrate the abilities he has learnt whilst serving Friar Bacon. In a style that is reminiscent of the comical scene in Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* between Wagner, Faustus's servant, and Robin, Perce follows Wagner's example of performing examples from his master's repertoire of necromantic motifs. In *Doctor Faustus*, Wagner tries to emulate his master by persuading Robin to bind himself to him in a seven year contract, in return for food 'I know he would give his soul to the devil for / a shoulder of mutton…'(I.4.9-10). Perce further attempts to impress the scholars by imitating his master, as he speaks in Latin. This subject was considered to be the traditional language for an academic, as well as the required mode of communication for a practitioner of the philosophical arts. (Faustus first established the use of Latin on the stage as a means of communication for philosophical theorists, and other magicians then continued this trend). Indeed, mindful of this precedent, Perce quotes small phrases such as 'nesuter ultra crepedam' (1.360) to make his art sound impressive, although it does not actually contribute anything to the making of the magical spell.

---

[16] Again, this is different to Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, because Bacon was aided during his time as a philosophical magician by Miles who he eventually condemned to hell for failing to wake him at the moment of triumph. As this is supposed to be a sequel, and Bacon is believed to have reverted back to the role of a 'black' magician, it would seem reasonable to expect some sort of introduction to Perce, and an explanation as to how he obtained Miles's previous role. Indeed, I would have expected references to Miles and the punishment that he received to have been made in the play, even if only used by Bacon as a form of threat for keeping Perce in check.

However, undeterred by this, Perce continues to try and impress both the audience and the scholars with his knowledge, by trying to outwit his companions in the academic debate. Again, this motif seems to be a traditional representation for inclusion in a magical presentation. Perce is able to 'distinguish a noune / adgative from a none substantive' (ll.365-366), a fact which delights and impresses the scholars, and leads them to beg him to actively display some magical arts on the stage

> ...but perce hath he tought
> the no poynt of magick we ar so dri with talking
> we know not what to do now yf thow coldst cunger
> us to bottell of alle hether we wold honor for ever.
> (ll.378-381)

Appearing to ignore this request for a magical display, which pertains to the romance tradition, Perce continues to debate a philosophical theme. He sets the two scholars up in a similar manner to Bungay and Vandermast choosing their preferred philosophical theories in the debate motif, by asking them which doctrine they prefer to study. However, instead of arguing the merits for either 'phelosophe and her / is plato' or 'Lodgick and her is Arestotell' (ll.386 & 388), Perce cleverly uses these viewpoints to demonstrate his own magic

> to turne yor to booke in to toe bottells of all...
> ...her is plato for you and here is
> haristotell for you now drincke to me and Ill be
> moderater in this controvercie, wel sayd plato ho
> well don haristotell thow gost to the ground of the matter
> nayles yor dri scollers in ded drincke of plato and haristotell.
> (ll.391, 392-396).

Wagner gave his 'romance' display of conjuring mutton a philosophical air by raising the two devils Balliol and Belcher. By turning the two books into bottles of beer, Perce is performing the motif of cleverly demonstrating a 'romance' trick with a philosophical undertone. This categorises his art as belonging to the same league of magical traditions as Wagner's performance in *Doctor Faustus*. However, in this scene, Perce performs a role reversal to Wagner's technique, as he converts the essential tools of this art – the books (the trademarks of a philosophical magician) –

into beer (a prerequisite for the romance genre). He then comically points out to the scholars that their investments of a 'croune', are now only worth 'thre pence' (ll.404-405).

Perce's final demonstration of magic for the scholars revolves around the theme of food. The scholars do not have any money to buy food, and Perce tells them how to dupe the hostess of an inn to give them the food that they want. This trick is again derived from the romance traditions, as trickery and the art of deception were the essential tools for the magicians in this genre. In *Clyomon and Clamydes*, the magician Bryan Sans Foy deceives the Court, the King and Juliana into believing that he is Clamydes, in order to achieve his ambition of marrying the King's daughter

> Bearing knight **Clamydes** name, yet **Bryan Sance foy** am I.
> But though I do usurpe his name, his sheeld or ensigne here,...
> ...and **Bryan** as I am,
> I will unto the Court, whereas I shall enjoy that dame.
> (1670-1671, 1673-1674).

Having established his ability to perform magic in his own right on the stage, Perce promptly disappears, only to return again at the end of the extant text, in his traditional role once again, as an aid to Bacon. Bacon's magic has also resorted to its original necromantic nature, after his brief return to his true Christian vocation.

Presentation of Magic

As only approximately 1348 lines of this play are extant, it is hard to ascertain whether any particular system, such as the tripartite structure of presenting magic, which was innovatively introduced in *Doctor Faustus* has been employed. What is clear from the opening presentation of these protagonists in this play is that whilst the magical characters attempt to imitate great Elizabethan role models by adopting similar character traits to cast them as either philosophical or romance magicians, their actual portrayal of magic is very poor and haphazard. However, they have attempted to imitate the attraction of these protagonists involved in complex spectacular and ritualistic performances, by performing 'black' magical acts such as conjuring the 'ghost' of Selimus to offer comparisons with diabolical forces in other plays. This has been interposed with comical scenes such as Perce's conversion of the philosophical books into two bottles of beer, to provide light relief, and remind the audience of the fact that they are watching a spectacular performance of some technical advance. This adherence to the type of magic previously demonstrated in the late 1580s seems to have been almost faithfully attempted by several of the playwrights of the 1590s, as demonstrated through an analysis of this play. However, as seen in this play, it now seemed to be a common practice for the magician to present the magic in a haphazard way, that is, not to adhere to the clear-cut aba structure of its earlier predecessors.

Indeed, Perce's demonstration of magic seems to cut the play in half. Prior to this, Bacon had been presented as a necromantic magician with little regard for his religious vocation. Although he still practises philosophical magic in the second half of the play, his alliances with the devil are now called into question, and there are occasions when he almost seems to revert back to preaching the qualities of a Christian man. No explanation is offered in the play for this change in behaviour, although one supposition may be that different authors were now involved in presenting the spectacle on the stage. Certainly Chettle is believed to have rewritten extracts towards the end of this extant edition[17].

* * *

Magical Spectacle

After the magical trick performed by Perce, Bacon is ready to resume his role as director of the magical spectacles. His return to the stage as the superior magician is signalled by the German Emperor reminding the audience of Bacon's previous characterisation as a philosophical performer, by talking about the necromantic instruments that he used to keep in his cell at Oxford, in the original *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*

> ha Bacon had thy glass bin holl which thow didest breake
> at Oxford in a splene I myght in that have clerlie sene
> my wish for thow art mar of all siences.
> (ll.424-426).

Bacon is determined to sustain this characterisation as a philosophical magician, and although he no longer has his original necromantic instrument available to him, he promises the Emperor that he has other abilities which he can utilise to fulfil the Emperor's desires. The Emperor wishes to see how John of Bordeaux has handled the battle in 'Revena', and so, Bacon promises to use his art to show him (the Emperor) 'in a dreme what ther pformd as livlie as yor selfe were present ther' (ll.430).

---

[17] See introduction to this chapter for details about Chettle's involvement with this play. There may also have been other authors involved in the conclusion, if Greene was the author, and he died before the play was completed.

The magical spectacles in the second part of the play seem to be largely controlled by Bacon, although Vandermast puts in an occasional appearance, in a similar manner to John a Cumber in Anthony Munday's *John a Kent and John a Cumber*. Indeed, there are some key extracts in the play where Vandermast momentarily assumes control of the action of the play, and Bacon is left to flounder hopelessly. However, this spurs Bacon to dive into the dark recesses of his skills and abilities to overcome the magic performed by the German magician who is his greatest rival, and maintain his position as the superior magician. As a result, I will be examining the presentation of magic by the two magicians simultaneously, rather than attempting to separate their spectacles.

The 'glass prospective' had been spectacularly employed in Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* as an innovative and philosophical stage motif to demonstrate simultaneous events in another part of the country. However, in this play, Bacon, although reminded of the glories of his past (in Greene's play) is now forced to abandon his strong necromantic casting and resort to practising the type of magic more commonly associated with the romance genre. By casting a spell to make the Emperor sleep, Bacon is able to work his magical influence upon him through the motif of a dream sequence. Again, this technique had been used by an earlier 'romance' play, the anonymous *Clyomon and Clamydes*. In this play, the magician Bryan Sans Foy was able to charm his victims into an enchanted sleep. Bacon's only advance on this skill is the fact that he is able to conjure a dumb show as part of the dream sequence for the Emperor, although as it stands, a dumb show was also a ritualistic part of the romance genre. Plays such as *The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune*, which depicted the classical stories of great tragedies such as Dido and

Aeneas, employed this motif as an integral part for displaying its magical protagonist's abilities on the stage.

Although Bacon appears to be utilising his art to control the magical spectacle unfolding in the Emperor's dream 'in thy war like frounes...John of Burdiox / and his soulders forth show him the Combat...'(ll.443-444), Vandermast manages to conjure sufficient magical authority to interrupt Bacon's grand presentation. Vandermast had promised Ferdinand that he would dishonour John of Bordeaux, so that along with his wife and child, he would also be exiled, although he would rather conveniently be in a different location. Unbelievably, Vandermast then assures Ferdinand that in this sorry state, Rossalin would fall in love with him and agree to satisfy his sexual urges. In order to achieve this promise, Vandermast manages to intercept the Emperor's dream, and charms him to wake up with the lasting image that '...for veri grefe to se Lord Burdiox / flye I star up and waking from my dremes' (ll.465-466). At this stage in the play, Bacon's magical abilities have been momentarily overshadowed by Vandermast taking control of the situation.

This change in superiority is seen when Vandermast attempts to raise Asteroth. This is Bacon's own devil, and his command to fetch Rossalin to fulfil his promise to Ferdinand, fills Vandermast with a great sense of satisfaction. It also undermines the necromantic achievements of Bacon's art. Indeed, it is only when Bacon later questions Asteroth about Vandermast's intentions, that the audience begin to truly sense the strength of his philosophical demonstrations, especially as Asteroth responds to Bacon request for information in part Latin and part English to sustain the image

> quid moraris great vandermast hath raysd me from the
> and exorcising with a strict commaund to fetch the wif
> of John of Burdiox clad in her nightgoune unto fredricke
> and I must hast to fullfill his will.
> (ll.657-660)

However, incensed by Vandermast's attempts to assume control of the situation, topple his title as a superior magician capable of putting on spectacular performances for the audience to enjoy and raise his devil Asteroth, Bacon resolves to trick his rival to sustain his reputation in Oxford as the superior magician. He immediately raises Asteroth and reminds him of his status as the superior magician, by stretching out his wand over the devil to persuade him back to his point of view [18]. This use of the wand to control a diabolical situation is once again reminiscent of Bacon's actions in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, where he uses a wand to draw back the curtain covering the brazen head. However, in this play, it also has another symbolic effect. By stretching his wand out over the devil, Bacon seems to be momentarily returning to his true vocation as a Christian friar. In Christian religion Jesus is frequently portrayed as stretching out his hands over sick people to cure them of their illnesses or possession by a devil. Bacon has used this dramatic device to cure Asteroth of Vandermast's influence over him, and to make him return to his true mode of behaviour, of serving him (Bacon) in diabolical escapades.

Bacon reminds Asteroth of his powers over devils by boasting that 'Lucifer nor all / the devells in hell shall once resece the from my magicke spells' (ll.669-670). This action is a necessary conclusion to his actions with the wand, and also prepares the audience for his next stage of attack. Bacon plots with Asteroth to carry out suitable revenge against Vandermast, as this will enhance his own reputation as the superior magician in the play, and reduce Vandermast's powers to a very limited role. He leads him off the stage, promising 'com on thy wayes Ill tell the what to do' (l.674).

---

[18] This action is carried out in a rather paradoxical manner, perhaps due to limited stage resources.

Bacon tricks Vandermast by performing a romance trick on him with Asteroth's help. Instead of permitting Vandermast's art to conjure Rossalin and satisfy Ferdinand, Bacon manages to interfere in the display and conjures Vandermast's own wife [19]. This acquisition of a wife is a deviation from the stereotypical pattern of philosophical traits used to define a necromantic magician on the Elizabethan stage. Although Faustus craved marriage to satisfy his sexual desires, Mephistopheles would not grant his wish, because marriage was merely a 'ceremonial toy' performed in a Church. In Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, none of the magicians are romantically linked, and again this pattern is repeated in Munday's *John a Kent and John a Cumber*. However, in both of these plays, the magicians seem to devote large amounts of their time to either assisting or hindering the path of true love, and their recantations of magic at the end of each play ultimately allows true love to win.

In this play, Bacon's calling up of Vandermast's wife not only undermines his (Vandermast's) magical performance, it also reasserts Bacon's philosophical aura, which he had been trying to recover since discovering Asteroth's agreement with Vandermast. Indeed, by meddling in the affairs of the heart, Bacon even manages to confirm his status as the superior magician, in much the same way as Friar Bacon in Greene's play, when he tried to interfere in the love plot between Margaret and Lacy.

---

[19] This action of interference is not explained on the stage.

Bacon proceeds to go one stage further to confirm his necromantic characteristics, by engaging in a discussion with one of the scholars. Impressed by Bacon's magical spectacles, the scholar had queried

> ...may this yor magicke
> doctrine stand with art or doth a pover beyonnd all human sence
> govern the order of yor Actions.
> (ll.724-726).

Keen to assure the scholar that his art was derived from the study of philosophical theories, and not a magical ability that he had been born with like the romance magician Merlin, Bacon impresses the value of study on the scholar 'and more a man doth / studdie more his skill...' (ll.732-733)[20]. He encourages him to continue his study of Aristotle, so that he, like Bacon will be able to practise the philosophical arts. Indeed, Bacon even emphasises the importance of an academic background for practising such magic, as he spends part of the discussion time using the preferred scholarly language – Latin – for small phrases, which he interjects into the conversation. A typical example is his choice of the phrase 'Sapience dominabeter' (l.742) to reinforce his point.

Bacon demonstrates the value of an academic background for achieving necromantic spectacles, by promising to re-use a trick made famous by his predecessor, the original Friar Bacon. He determines to use his magic to send the scholar to Hapsburg. However, it must be noted that whilst Bacon offers to 'fytt the with a stead that like / a wherlwind shall convay the hence' (ll.791-792), in the original *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, Vandermast was actually conveyed to Germany on the back of a devil.

---

[20] There were several clear distinguishing traits between philosophical and romance magicians. However some of the most important were the facts that philosophical magicians usually derived their skills and art from the study of books. Romance magicians generally followed in the footsteps of the famous prototype Merlin, who had been born with the ability to prophesy future events.

This devil was not distinguished as a horse, but was clearly represented on the stage as a devil. However, despite this attempt to characterise himself as a necromantic magician in the style of his 'original' predecessor, this protagonist now begins to adopt a very different approach to presenting himself on the stage. Although not signalled by any dramatic device in the play, Bacon's characterisation innovatively oscillates between potential necromantic features and Christian virtues and teachings. Perhaps fuelled by the developing theories of magic circulating during the period, and the fact that the witch was now being characterised by the traits more commonly used to define a necromancer, such as making an alliance with the devil, this character now began to move in a new direction. This can be clearly seen in plays such as Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, which coherently mixes Christian ideals with developing magical practices and witchcraft.

One possible hypothesis for this new approach to representing magic on the stage in the 1590s may be the fact that at the end of Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, Friar Bacon was depicted on the stage as a repentant Christian. This re-conversion to his Christian vocation permitted him to engage in the practice of 'white' magic, such as his prophesy of the return of the golden era for England under the rule of Queen Elizabeth I. In *John of Bordeaux*, after his necromantic performance for the scholars, Bacon momentarily forgets his dramatic characterisation, as he offers Rossalin some comfort for her predicament, by reminding her of the will of God

> Ladie be patien in yowr meseries the hand of god is hevie
> for a tyme to tri yor sufference in affliction, but when
> he sees you humbled to his mynd this bitter stormes will
> have a quiet calme and he will temper fortunes teraine.
> (ll.981-984)

It is against this suddenly Christian background that Rossalin asks him to perform another trick which has philosophical potential 'but in shadow once behould / my husband John of Burdiox' (ll. 1005-1006). This action can again be compared with Doctor Faustus, when he raised the ghosts of Alexander and his paramour, and Mephistopheles, when he conjured the succuba Helen of Troy for Faustus's diabolical denouement. However, despite this potential philosophical characterisation, the scene rather paradoxically also has a religious feel to it. This underlying tone has not previously been used as a main feature in a necromantic magician's catalogue of displays, but rather kept to the end of the play, generally after a recantation of 'black' magic. However, aware of Rossalin's distress and sense of helplessness, Bacon agrees to return to his vocational values, and perform the request as an act of charity and comfort.

Having acted out of Christian kindness towards Rossalin in an attempt to help her through her period of distress, Bacon's magic now becomes even more complicated to define. Imprisoned by the Emperor as a result of Vandermast's charms, Bacon determines to escape by again contradicting the atmosphere created by the conjuring of John of Bordeaux for Rossalin. He resorts once again to philosophical magic by commanding his own devil to appear before him, using typical images of his art 'lord of the night emperiall sperite of hell / Rent up the bowells of the yearth I saye apere' (ll.1131-1132). This use of necromantic images such as night-time, which represented the traditional time for 'black' magical arts to be conducted, and the reference to hell, creates on the stage a diabolical atmosphere, which is then sustained by the stage directions to introduce the devils. Asteroth and Rabsacke appear amidst a background of '*thunder and lyghtnyng*' (stage directions after l.1132), traditional dramatic devices which had come to represent the entry of devils on to the Elizabethan stage, after the necromantic magician had performed his act of conjuration. Indeed, past necromancers such as Faustus who had also engaged in the act of conjuring the devil, usually witnessed the success of their actions on the stage, by a similar dramatic device.

However, in an ironical twist not seen in a philosophical performance before, Bacon finds that these devils at first refuse to perform his commands[21]. Indeed, not only do these devils refuse to obey him, but like Lucifer at the end of Faustus's twenty-four years contract, they come to collect what they view as rightfully belonging to them 'thy tyme prefickst thy pour hath a nend / and thow art ours both bodie and soull ho ho ho' (ll.1142-1143). However, unlike his predecessor Doctor Faustus, and in accordance with his temporary reconversion to his true vocation, which does not appear to have been explained on the stage, Bacon demonstrates that as a Christian, the devil cannot secure his soul 'thow hast no / pouer over a Cristian fayth...' (ll.1144-1145)[22]. This sudden reconversion to his Christian vocation is however used sparingly, because in the very next line of his speech, Bacon reasserts his necromantic authority and orders the devil to perform his wishes.

Bacon reasserts this expectation after the devil's refusal to obey his commands, by once again resorting to the typical traits of a philosophical magician. He commands the devil to perform his wishes by using Latin, the traditional language of such practitioners of magic. Despite this wavering between the philosophical arts and his Christian vocation, Bacon's powers seem to regain their previous strengths, at least on this occasion, as the devil now becomes pliant and willing to perform his commands. Having reinforced for both the audience and his collection of devils his position of authority and superiority, by the rather unusual means of adhering to his Christian vocation, Bacon determines to bring about the denouement of the play in the manner he considers to be the most appropriate.

---

[21] Unlike Doctor Faustus, Bacon does not appear to have made a contract with the devil limiting his time on earth to practise magic. Bearing this lack of contract in mind, the audience are still surprised to see Asteroth refusing to serve Bacon's commands, as it was generally understood, if not depicted in the action, that an alliance with the devil was a prerequisite for practising philosophical magic.

[22] It is merely demonstrated through Bacon's attempts to comfort Rossalin.

Bacon, who had been imprisoned by the Emperor at Vandermast's request, once again seems to resort to his Christian vocation, and uses 'white' magic to free himself and the other prisoners. However, as in the scene that depicted him using his religion to regain control over the devil, Bacon also has an ulterior motive. Having performed his 'good' deed, Bacon is now free to enter into the contest to claim victory for Rossalin's honour. This notion of a challenge – whereby gallant knights were called upon to come and defend the lady's honour – can be perceived as a throwback to the romance genre, as the theme featured in plays such as the anonymous *Clyomon and Clamydes*. In this romance, the two central protagonists go to defend the honour of the Queen of the Strange Marshes. By entering the contest, they are hoping to keep her, like Rossalin, out of prison. As the extant version of *John of Bordeaux* ends on this note, it would seem that the presentation of magic has reached a complex point.

The two magicians have ended their careers by retaining their powers as philosophical magicians, although their art frequently oscillates between these diabolical powers and the use of traits and characteristics from the romance tradition. Interspersed in the middle of these demonstrations are the innovative strategies of advocating some of the emerging trends from the period such as the study of natural magic, and the use of magic that denotes some sort of Christian values. This is a new moment on the Elizabethan stage, and can be perceived as an introduction to the later magical art practised by Prospero in *The Tempest*. In this play, Prospero as the central magical protagonist, mixes Neoplatonic art (a philosophical theory which was popular in Europe and beginning to court attention in England at the end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth centuries) with theurgical magic to influence his spectacular performances. He then demonstrates these magical motifs against the diabolical atmosphere created by the witch – Sycorax – whose presence seems to pervade the play.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE END OF AN ERA?

> Our revels now are ended. These our actors,
> As I foretold you, were all spirits, and
> Are melted into air, into thin air:
> And, like the baseless fabric of this vision,
> The cloud-capp'd towers, the gorgeous palaces,
> The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
> Yea, all of which it inherit, shall dissolve,
> And, like this insubstantial pageant faded,
> Leave not a rack behind. We are such stuff
> As dreams are made on; and our life
> Is rounded with a sleep...
> (IV.1.148-158)

The theme of the magician invoking the devil and performing other spectacular performances on the stage began to wane in popularity towards the end of Elizabeth's reign. Indeed, magical practitioners were now reduced to their original role, that is pre-1580, of playing relatively minor roles and using tricks more commonly associated with the romance traditions. Although magicians such as John a Kent resorted to some of the traits and characteristics associated with the philosophical arts, in general, their skills predominantly belonged to the romance tradition. They can thus be charged with the return of the magician to his original role of using magic to interfere in a love motif, rather than indulging in necromantic actions. This trend for adopting the traditions of the romance genre to define the magician on the stage can be detected in late Elizabethan plays such as *The Merry Devil of Edmonton.*

This moribund attitude towards the practice of necromancy in the immediate period leading up to the death of Queen Elizabeth was possibly due to the increasing interest in witchcraft during the 1580s and 1590s. Witchcraft prosecutions, according to Diane Purkiss, reached their peak during Elizabeth's reign, yet they did not regularly feature as popular topics in plays 'until the 1597 boom'[1]. There was a second boom in 1611 during James I's reign and a similar revival in 1633, although this last episode did not command the same celebrity status as the earlier phenomenon.

In this chapter I propose to examine the development of witchcraft as a popular topic for featuring on the late Elizabethan stage, and to ascertain how the evolution of this theatrical protagonist had an effect on the depiction of the magus during the Jacobean era.

As Gareth Roberts in his essay "'An Art Lawful As Eating?' Magic in *The Tempest* and *The Winter's Tale*" notes, there had been a long-standing assumption that magic 'as opposed to witchcraft, is a male art'[2]. Traditionally, theological opinion has claimed that there is no difference 'between magic and witchcraft' because 'both were ultimately diabolical and utterly unlawful'. However, in terms of gender, a distinction has always been drawn. Magic which uses 'supernatural power' has persistently been regarded as a 'male art', whilst witchcraft has been upheld as a 'female practice which supplicates it'[3]. Indeed, under these definitions 'male magical art' has traditionally been viewed as an 'art' which is 'allowable', whilst witchcraft has always been condemned as 'bad'[4].

---

[1] Diane Purkiss, *The Witch in History: Early Modern and Twentieth-Century Representations* (London: Routledge, 1996, reprinted 1997), p.181

[2] Gareth Roberts "'An Art Lawful as Eating?' Magic in *The Tempest* and *The Winter's Tale*', in *Shakespeare's Late Plays: New Readings*, ed. by Jennifer Richards & James Knowles (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999), p.128

[3] Roberts, p.129

[4] Roberts, p.133

This viewpoint has developed according to Gareth Roberts due to the practices of magic during the period[5]. Many of the Renaissance magi attempted to practise some form of 'high magic', that is they distinguished themselves from the traditional arts of witchcraft by insisting on 'learning, purity and male ideals of sacerdotal purity and chastity'. Roberts notes that the magician featured in Agrippa's *De Occulta Philosophia* (1533) is modelled on the Catholic priest, as he observes the conditions of purity and the use of the sacraments. Indeed, Roberts even declares that Protestant propaganda and pamphlets underlined this theory because they were full of tales about the necromantic deeds of popes such as Sylvester II and Gregory VI who were generally portrayed as magicians.

However, witchcraft has been portrayed in a different light. Diane Purkiss has traced the development of the witch as a protagonist on the stage, and she notes that the Elizabethan witch emerged from a history of supernatural figures such as 'sorcerers, sorceresses, classical witches, wise women, prophetesses and fairies'[6]. Far from drawing on the general areas dominating society such as law, medicine and religion, a belief that other critics such as Keith Thomas and Alan MacFarlane have been keen to establish, the witches of the late Elizabethan period

> do not reflect any single discourse of witchcraft, but instead manufacture not one but many literary witches of their own that have only a tangential relation to the figures in other people's texts, much less the figures on the scaffold at Tyburn[7].

Both Thomas and MacFarlane have studied the development of witchcraft in relation to the various statutes passed during the period. The first witchcraft act was passed by Elizabeth in 1563 and stated that anybody caught invoking evil spirits using 'Witchcrafte, Enchantment, Charme or Sorcerie...' was punished by death[8]. James I after succeeding to the English throne issued a revised version of the Elizabethan witchcraft act in 1604. This was more severe than the first one, and elaborated on such terminology as 'invocation of spirits' by stating that no-body was allowed to 'consult covenant with entertaine employ feede or rewarde any evill and wicked Spirit'[9]. As a result, critics like Thomas, MacFarlane and Corbin believe that pamphleteers and ballad-makers became interested in reporting about witchcraft trials, which resulted in dramatists during the early part of James's reign wanting to 'exploit the dramatic potential of witchcraft belief'[10].

---

[5] Roberts, p.134
[6] Purkiss, p.183
[7] Purkiss, p.182

Whilst Thomas and MacFarlane have studied the laws passed against practising witchcraft, and the rise in interest of journalistic reports from various trials as factors for explaining the development of this female protagonist, Purkiss has considered other external options. In August 1578 'three female wax figures...[were] found buried in a London dunghill, with bristles stuck through the heart'[11]. This was assumed to represent an attempt on the queen's life. As a result, witches became important because if they were acting on behalf of the devil, that is the pope or Spain, then it would appear that the devil wanted to remove her from the throne of England[12].

---

[8] Alan MacFarlane, *Witchcraft in Tudor and Stuart England: A Regional and Comparative Study* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970), p.14

[9] MacFarlane, p.15

[10] *Three Jacobean Witchcraft Plays*, ed. by Peter Corbin & Douglas Sedge (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1986), introduction, p.3

[11] Purkiss, p.185

[12] Purkiss has also clarified that although the English did not regard Elizabeth as a witch, other Catholic countries such as Spain presented her as being in league with the devil. Her mother Anne Boleyn had been accused of practising witchcraft, and as the character trait was supposed to pass down through the female line, Catholic countries perceived Elizabeth as being in league with the devil. This was particularly emphasised after she signed the execution warrant for Mary, Queen of Scots.

Another factor, which caused problems, was the queen's last marriage attempt to the Duc d'Alencon. This alliance had been greatly feared in England because a Catholic prince would produce a Catholic heir. Several pamphlets had appeared at the time condemning the negotiations including John Stubb's notorious condemnation *The Discovery of a Gaping Gulf*, which portrayed the Catholic ruler Catherine de Medici as a witch. This was used to emphasise the fact that if Elizabeth married d'Alencon then she would become a witch like Catherine, and as such would have the power of a devil[13].

Despite this interest in witchcraft, playwrights did not portray witches as stage protagonists until nearly the end of Elizabeth's reign. This was due to the fact that writing about a witch could, as Purkiss acknowledged, be perceived as citing Catholic propaganda[14]. Writers may also have been afraid that they would have received a severe punishment for depicting female characters as witches. This would partly have been due to the fact that Elizabeth had presented herself through classical iconography. Her genealogy acknowledged her links with the Arthurian legend (Henry VII had traced his family history and discovered a connection with the mythical figure of Arthur). If a dramatist tried to present a witch as the central figure in a play, then she may have been perceived as posing a threat to the queen.

Whilst Purkiss feels that all of these factors contributed to the development of the character of the witch on the London stage, she believes that the major influences responsible for the emergence of the witch as a stage type who was distinct from other magical figures was Reginald Scot's *Discoverie of Witchcraft* (1584). Indeed, she regards this book as the 'dramatist's principal source'[15]. In *Discoverie* Scot advocated the viewpoint that witches were either 'mad' or 'tricksters' or both[16]. This definition was particularly useful to dramatists as they could portray their protagonists as engaging in a variety of spectacles and illusions that would entertain the audience and generally fulfil the criteria of a theatrical presentation. Dramatists could now use Scot's work as a prototype for deriving witch characteristics, and Purkiss comments, the first play to feature a witch as the central protagonist appeared shortly after the publication of Scot's work and 'some three years after the beginning of the witch-panic at court'[17].

---

[13] Purkiss, p.185
[14] Purkiss, p.186

Some playwrights were afraid of engaging Elizabeth's wrath by employing such a protagonist on the stage, and so they adopted classical figures such as Medea to appear in their plays. However, in general, as Purkiss acknowledges, the 'surviving stage witch is almost purely Shakespearean'[18]. As a stage protagonist, the witch featured in practically all of his plays as a topic, a joke or a piece of the plot. She notes that from 'the Lapland sorcerers imagined in *Comedy of Errors* to the 'witchcraft' which brings Hermione to 'life' in *The Winter's Tale*, the idea of magical intervention or bewitchment is crucial'. Shakespeare was responsible for presenting a traditional image of rural England, for example 'thatched cottages' and 'maypoles' and setting against this background the figure of the witch. A powerless figure generally presented as an old hag, the witch could conjure, make a discovery, mask or unmask herself on stage and meddle in a plot. She could also narrate prophecies as seen in *Macbeth* whereby the witches were used to incite Macbeth to murder Duncan and predict Banquo's heritage[19].

---

[15] Purkiss, p.183
[16] Purkiss, p.188
[17] Purkiss, p.188
[18] Purkiss, p.189

By the time James I had succeeded to the throne of England, several plays had been produced featuring witches as important protagonists. Between 1604 and 1606 John Marston produced *The Tragedy of Sophonisba* which continued the theme of presenting the witch as a trickster[20]. The witch Erictho enticed Syphax who was in love with Sophonisba to have intercourse with her. By disguising herself as Sophonisba (the stage directions indicate that Erictho entered on to the stage '*in the shape of Sophonisba*') Erictho manages to dupe Syphax through the dramatic device of the bed trick, a motif made popular in Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure,* and conceives a child.

Other plays such as Middleton's *The Witch* were allegedly based on real life cases. For example, this play was supposed to depict the divorce hearing of the Earl of Essex in 1615 – 1616, in which he claimed that he was unable to consummate the marriage due to 'impotence induced by bewitchment'[21]. Another topical play was Dekker's 1621 production of *The Witch of Edmonton,* which was supposed to be centred on the life of the celebrated witch Elizabeth Sawyer. Indeed, the majority of plays during the period presented witches as tricksters who meddled in the course of the plot to introduce further theatrical spectacles.

---

[19] The witches in *Macbeth* embodied another popular conception about witches at the time. Purkiss notes that they are presented as 'bearded women' thereby 'figuring the ambivalence of the witch's gender', as well as reminding the audience of the 'witch's theatricality'. On stage, the witch is little more than a costume – simply – a 'hat and a cloak' (Purkiss, p.190).

[20] Edition edited by Corbin & Sedge

[21] Corbin & Sedge, pp.14 & 21

As well as an increasing number of plays featuring the witch as a central or important protagonist, the Court also seemed to be interested in copying this theatrical phenomenon and incorporating her into its celebrations for specific events.

In 1608 Ben Jonson produced the *Masque of Queens* which featured through a traditional formal structure an anti-masque followed by a masque. The anti-masque is devoted to the activities of eleven hags or witches who appear on the stage to await the arrival of their leader. In true theatrical terms they characterise themselves as creatures of the night 'And come we, fraught with spite, / To overthrow the glory of this night?' (ll.96-97), as night-time was traditionally the period for performing mischief[22]. Their main aim is to create disorder and misrule, and to appear as the antithesis of the queens who are appearing in the masque.

By including the theatrical image of the witch into this courtly entertainment, which had been ordered by Queen Anne, Jonson is showing how much influence this theatrical spectacle had generated. This can be set against the traditional courtly view derived from intellectual and legal movements, and embodied by James I in his book *Daemonologie*, which upheld the notion that people should be sceptical about the actual practice of witchcraft. By concentrating on the theatrical nature of the witches and their ability to perform a dance, which reversed the traditional steps, the witches delight the audience before vanishing to leave room for the queens. This dispels their evil and negative presence, and symbolically permits the 'good' 'straightforward' world to continue.

---

[22] Ben Jonson, *The Masque of Queens* in *Court Masques*, ed. by David Lindley (Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 1995)

Magicians

Despite this increase in the number of plays featuring the motif of the witch during the early part of James's reign, from the early 1600s the stage magician was once again enjoying a mini revival in popularity. Although his role as an enthusiast for making an alliance with the devil which had proved so popular during the reign of Elizabeth was not now recreated, some of his other traits and characteristics were retained and revamped. This helped to portray him as a remodelled protagonist co-existing alongside his female counterpart, the witch. It also permitted the magician to use his traits to move his art into the more popular theories of medicine, alchemy and herbalism. A play that embodied both the traditional concepts of the character of the witch and featured a magician exploring these alternative theories from the traditional necromantic viewpoint of invoking the devil was Shakespeare's *The Tempest.*

By the late 1590s, the stage magician was still involved in meddling in a love plot, but his magic was now beginning to embrace some of the newer and more recognisable 'scientific' qualities such as alchemy and astronomy. Some stage magicians continued to follow the practices of magicians previously associated with the philosophical arts such as Dr. John Dee, who used his necromantic abilities to turn his attention to the profitable art of alchemy. This magical practice was described by Dee's assistant – Edward Kelley – in a letter to his son. In this letter he talked about one of their key experiments – the attempt to create the 'Philosopher's Stone'. Kelley describes how to make this precipitation using natural elements, and he advises his son to 'reade yr phious bookes' to 'understand' how to heat the 'said matter, for y spate of a daye & night & after y you must it out of y glas & grinde it upon a marble stone so salt (most strongly) preparate (in nature) to dissolve the salt'[23]. However, other magical practitioners such as Friar Lawrence in *Romeo and Juliet* and the later Cerimon in *Pericles* were now resorting to herbalism, a more established art commonly associated with the apothecaries. It is this older art which seemed to dominate the stage presentations of the later Elizabethan theatre and early Jacobean period, and as a result, I would like to examine some of the plays which featured this natural form of magic, before turning my attention to *The Tempest.*

* * *

Romeo and Juliet

The basic storyline for *Romeo and Juliet* can be traced back to an early Greek romance, the love adventures of Abrocomas and Anthia in the *Ephesiaca*[24]. In this tale, and the stories which followed such as 'Le Cinquante Novelle' in a collection of tales by Massuccio of Salerno, the tragical story of Romeo and Juliet is more or less played out in accordance with the story used by Shakespeare[25]. In these stories the Friar is responsible for marrying the two lovers and ultimately bringing about their downfall, by supplying Juliet with a sleeping draught to help her to feign death[26]. Although she wakes from her sleep in the tomb, the letters sent by the friar to alert Romeo of his plan are tragically destroyed, and the timing device brings about the deaths of these two tragical protagonists. However, it is not until Arthur Brooke's poem in 1562 that the role of the friar changed slightly from its previous characterisation. Based on the 1559 version of the tale published by Pierre Boisteau Launay in *Histoires Tragicques extraictes des Oeuvres de Bandel,* Brooke uses some innovative devices alongside some new variations on the theme to create the storyline used by Shakespeare. Indeed, as the editor of the source P.A. Daniels states this poem 'contains whole scenes, and many details and forms of expression, adopted by Shakespeare, not found in any other known version...'[27]. Brooke develops the character of the nurse and her role of advising Juliet to marry Romeo, and he retains Boisteau's account of the apothecary from whom Romeo gains the poison to commit suicide.

---

[23] Extract of a letter from Edward Kelley to his son 'A treatise of the Philosopher's Stone' M.S. Sloane 83

[24] For further details see the introduction to Arthur Brooke, *Romeus and Juliet*, ed. by P.A. Daniel (London: N. Trubner & Co, 1875), p.iii

[25] These stories can be found in Dunlop's *History of Fiction*, see introduction to Brooke's poem for further details

[26] In Massuccio's story the friar performs this religious ceremony in the hope of eventually uniting the two families.

However, it is Friar Lawrence in Brooke's poem who sets the precedent for his Shakespearean descendant to follow. Friar Lawrence describes his art in the poem as

> One private frute more have I pluckd, / which thou shalt shortly know:
> What force the stones, the plants, / and metals have to woorke,
> And divers other thinges that in / the bowels of the earth do loorke,
> With care I have sought out, / with payne I did them prove.
> (II.2108-2112).

This passage is more or less repeated in Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet,* although it is depicted on the stage in such a way as to show an advance on the art of Doctor Faustus and Friar Bacon. Whilst these necromantic magicians happily associated their art with images of the night and the traditional hour for witches and devils, Friar Lawrence presents his art through images more commonly associated with natural magic. He introduces his art on the stage by using images of the dawn 'The grey-ey'd morn smiles on the frowning night, / Chequering the eastern clouds with streaks of light' (II.3.1.2)[28]. This suggests that Friar Lawrence is now performing an art previously undemonstrated on the Elizabethan stage although it had been popular for some time. This art or natural magic draws heavily on the theories of herbalism used by the apothecaries for medicinal purposes during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and indeed in *Romeo and Juliet* and *The Tempest* such philosophies appear to be the order of the day. Friar Lawrence now performs his art using the 'powerful grace that lies / In plants, herbs, stones and their true qualities' (II.3.11-12), and although it has tragical consequences in this play, it is a form of magic that seems to survive as a dramatic device until the beginning of James's reign.

---

[27] Daniels also cites Malone's statement in *Shakespeare's Works* (1821), in which he accepts this source as the basis for the play (p.xii).

* * *

Pericles

Shakespeare again experimented with this form of natural magic in the much later play *Pericles*. Cerimon, the magical protagonist, is now cast in a minor role. Indeed, whilst Cerimon is depicted on the stage using herbalism, the very art which resulted in the tragical deaths of Romeo and Juliet, in this play, the art is portrayed as a reversal of the friar's, because it is responsible for bring Thaisa back to life.

Cerimon, like the friar and his Elizabethan predecessors, is portrayed on the stage as a man of learning who has devoted his time to the study of 'physic' (III.2.31-32).

---

[28] William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*, ed. by Brian Gibbons (London & New York: Routledge, 1980, reprinted 1983, 1988, 1989, 1991, 1992, 1993). In some editions these lines are spoken by Romeo (based on Q.1) at the end of II.2.188-189. Others place them (Q.2) at the beginning of scene III and attribute them to Friar Lawrence. I have used the edition which attributes these lines to Friar Lawrence because this is the pattern used in Brooke's poem.

However, in an advance on the skills of the notorious necromancers Faustus and Friar Bacon, he desires to use magic as a means of gaining mastery over nature. This leads him to employ his skills for 'good' deeds, rather than making an alliance with the devil for self-fulfilment

> I have
> ...made familiar
> To me and to my aid the blest infusions that dwells
> In vegetives, in metals, stones; and can speak of the
> Disturbances that nature works; and of her cures,
> Which doth give me a more content in course of true delight...
> (III.2.31-35)[29]

Indeed, Shakespeare seems to continue this tried and tested technique when he presented *The Tempest*. In portraying his famous protagonist – Prospero – he seemed to emulate certain key characteristics from the Marlovian model, and added to these the developments in the presentation of magic and witchcraft circulating during the period. In this chapter, I will be examining the role of Prospero in light of these developments to see how influential he was in enticing the audience. I will also be questioning whether the revival of an old precedential formula, which used a mix of popular magic with academic theories to demonstrate the re-characterisation of the Jacobean magus could be responsible for ruthlessly ending the career of the magician. Indeed, by abjuring his magical skills at the end of the play, Prospero seems to be making way for the newer protagonist of the witch, and allowing her to adopt some of the characteristics previously reserved for the necromantic magician.

---

[29] William Shakespeare, *Pericles*, ed. by Doreen Del Vecchio & Anthony Hammand (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)

The Tempest

The Tempest is an innovative play because it combines the mini revival of portraying a magician engaging in some of the redefined theories about magic on the stage with some of the new theories circulating about witchcraft during the Jacobean period. This is cleverly presented through two sections of the play, the prehistory and the present history. The prehistory examines the role of the wicked witch Sycorax and considers the heritage she left behind on the un-named island for Prospero to practise his magic on some twelve years later. The present history looks at the magic presented by Prospero, which seems to have been largely based on the theories advocated by Francis Bacon and the European notion of Neoplatonism. This dramatic device can be viewed as providing Prospero with a link to his Elizabethan predecessors, as well as enabling him to establish himself as a truly Jacobean magus engaging in the types of magic more commonly studied during this era.

Indeed, Harold Bloom has identified Prospero as having an alliance with Faustus, through the definition of his name

> Prospero, Shakespeare's magus, carries a name that is the Italian translation of Faustus, which is the Latin cognomen ("the favoured one") that Simon Magus the Gnostic took when he went to Rome[30].

Bloom suggests that this is a deliberate ploy by Shakespeare to make Prospero appear as the anti-Faust, and is cleverly portrayed on the stage through a series of dramatic devices. In order to establish Prospero as the anti-Faust, Shakespeare derives certain character traits from Faustus to establish his protagonist's status as a magician. Prospero's removal of his 'magical garment' in act I, scene 1, line 23, before talking to Miranda reminds the audience not only of the philosophical magicians from the Elizabethan period, but also the legendary figure – Merlin – an incubus with devilish abilities[31]. Prospero's casting in the traditional role of a magician, particularly an Elizabethan necromancer, is also accentuated in the play by the numerous references to his dependence on books in the play. Indeed, it is this fascination with books that robbed him of his dukedom in Milan 'Me, poor man, my library / Was dukedom large enough' (I.2.109-110), and gave his brother the opportunity to exile him to the island. Even on the island Prospero is surrounded by the 'recognised' tools of his profession, as Gonzalo 'furnsh'd me / From mine own library with volumes…' (I.2.166-167), and it is these 'tools' which will offer him the chance to use his magic to avenge his enemies.

---

[30] Harold Bloom, *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human* (London: Fourth Estate Ltd., 1999), p.663

Other character traits previously identified / associated with the innovative Elizabethan model Doctor Faustus seem to have been adopted for establishing Prospero as a magician. For example, Prospero requires a servant to perform his magical illusions on the stage, and this character, like his predecessor Mephistopheles takes the form of a spirit. Prospero, like Faustus with the Good and the Bad Angels, externalises the dramatic dilemma burdening his conscience throughout the play, through the physical manifestations of the good and the bad spirits, Ariel and Caliban. By appearing to appropriate these character traits for his central protagonist, Shakespeare is generally presenting Prospero as a recognisable descendant of Faustus, as well as developing him as an innovative character specifically designed for the Jacobean stage. This characterisation helps to classify Prospero as the anti-Faust.

---

[31] William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, ed. by Frank Kermode (Surrey: Arden Shakespeare, reprinted 1998). All quotations from *The Tempest* will be taken from this edition.

Although Prospero begins his career by seeming to emulate certain character traits from Faustus to define himself on the stage as a magician, he also adopts other novel approaches that establish him as an anti-Faust protagonist. This is clearly demonstrated by his choice of magic. Whilst Faustus and Friar Bacon devoted their time and energy to making an alliance with the devil and blaspheming against the Christian way of life, Prospero is defined on the stage in a similar manner to Cerimon, as a magician who achieves control through the forces of nature. Miranda comments 'If by your Art, my dearest father, you have / Put the wild waters in this roar, allay them' (I.1.1-2). Stephen Orgel in his introduction to *The Tempest* has classified this art as being largely derived from 'Baconian science' and 'Neoplatonic philosophy' or 'the empirical study of nature leading to the understanding and control of all its forces', although other forces come into play. (This will be examined in greater detail later in this chapter).

* * *

Prehistory

The main protagonist of the prehistory is the wicked witch Sycorax. Sycorax is presented as a mixture of classical witch and theatrical spectacle, although interestingly for the audience she has been dead for twelve years by the time we learn of her existence, and her character analysis is conveyed to us from Prospero's perspective rather than an independent character. Her characterisation is established through Prospero's discussions after the tempest with Ariel, the spirit who Sycorax imprisoned by a magical spell on the island, and who remained a prisoner there until Prospero overturned her magical incantations.

In order to maintain her theatrical image Sycorax is described as a goetist practitioner. 'Goety' or 'black magic' has been defined by Walter Clyde Curry as an art which attempts to control 'material things', by the 'lowest order of spirits called irrational daemons'[32]. This art is different to Prospero's as he studies his philosophical books to produce his art, which is ultimately regarded as 'good' rather than 'devilish' magic. Sycorax had entered into a sexual alliance with the devil and other low spirits, and this liaison has produced her only child Caliban[33]. Exiled to the island for her 'sorceries terrible' (I.2.264) and this mating with the devil – Setebos – her magic is only allowed to live on in the present part of the play through her son. Indeed, Caliban frequently invokes his mother throughout the performance to call upon the devil Setebos to bring down on Prospero dramatic and spectacular punishments which would traditionally be associated with witches 'All the charms / Of Sycorax, toads, beetles, bats…' (I.2.341-342).

Alongside this traditional dramatic presentation of a theatrical witch, Prospero establishes Sycorax (according to certain conventions of the time), as a descendant of the classical protagonist Medea who featured in Book 7 of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*[34]. This characterisation is reinforced according to Orgel by her very name. Sycorax or 'Korax' meaning raven, the bird traditionally associated with witchcraft was viewed by many as 'an epithet for Ovid's witch', Medea. Medea was an evil protagonist who devoted herself to worshipping Hecate, the goddess of witchcraft, and it was Hecate's special powers that she invoked when making magical potions 'O Hecate, who answered my last prayer / …now I need more'[35]. By copying Medea's incantation to her devilish goddess (her 'potent ministers'), Sycorax is defining herself as a witch who derives her authority from the literature of the 'Old World' such as Ovid, Virgil and Horace[36]. This portrayal helps to establish her not only as a goetist practitioner of magic, but also as a suitable antithesis to Prospero's magic which sought to achieve harmony 'over the natural world'[37].

---

[32] Walter Clyde Curry, *Shakespeare's Philosophical Patterns* (Louisiana State: Baton Rouge, 1937), p.19

[33] Indeed, by conceiving a child Sycorax has managed to evade the traditional punishment for being a witch.

[34] William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, ed. by Stephen Orgel (Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 1987). p.19

However, despite Sycorax's portrayal at the beginning of the play as the antithesis of Prospero, a strange phenomenon creeps into his narrative about her arrival and subsequent life on the island. As Orgel notes her 'history is curiously parallel with his'[38]. Both of these characters have been banished into exile on the island with their children for studying / performing magical deeds. Both figures arrive on this deserted island to start a new life, and in their new capacity as rulers, they force Ariel through repeated threats into their employment 'Thou, my slave, /As thou report'st thyself, was then her servant' (I.2.270-271), and

> If thou more murmur'st, I will rend an oak,
> And peg thee in his knotty entrails, till
> Thou hast howl'd away twelve winters.
> (I.2.294-296).

By sharing his background experiences and control over Ariel with Sycorax, who has been linked with Medea and the devil, Prospero is acknowledging that he can be perceived in the same light as this goetist practitioner. This admission reminds the audience of the history of the stage magi, whereby protagonists such as Doctor Faustus and Friar Bacon, as part of their engagement with the philosophical arts entered into alliances with the devil to help them perform their spectacular stagecraft for the audience. By adopting their character traits such as studying magical books and nurturing Caliban, Prospero is permitting himself the opportunity to imitate these famous Elizabethan characters. However, by ultimately rejecting this opportunity to undertake goetist magic in favour of his own art of Baconian science and Neoplatonism, Prospero is establishing himself as an anti-Faust character, as well as a representative of the theories now currently in vogue for the Jacobean stage.

---

[35] Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, trans. by Horace Gregory (New York & Toronto: Mentor / Viking Press, 1958), Bk 7, p.193
[36] Kermode, p.xl
[37] Kermode, p.xl
[38] Orgel, p.19

Prospero's portrayal as an innovative anti-Faust protagonist suitable for the Jacobean stage is further enhanced by his agreement with Ariel shortly after the tempest. Prospero promises that he will free him, if he agrees to continue serving him for the remainder of his project 'Do so; and after two days / I will discharge thee' (I.2.298-299). Doctor Faustus, Prospero's famous predecessor, also made a covenant with his servant (although it was dedicated to Lucifer), which allowed him twenty-four years of pleasure and magical abilities in return for eternal damnation. However, Prospero ultimately rejects this path through his treatment of Ariel. By releasing Ariel from Sycorax's spell, and forcing him into his employment, Prospero is moving forward into the present history of the play, thus dismissing the past and its rich heritage

> It was mine Art,
> When I arriv'd and heard thee, that made gape
> The pine, and let thee out.
> (I.2.291-293).

Prospero's final linkage to, and indeed ultimate rejection of, Sycorax's goetist magic can be seen, as Jonathan Bate in *Shakespeare and Ovid* states, at the very end of the play when he abjures his magic[39]. Prospero commences this important speech by mirroring Sycorax's role model – Medea – and her incantation to Hecate in Book 7 of the *Metamorphoses* 'Ye Ayres and windes: ye Elves of Hilles, or Brookes, of Woods alone...'

> Ye elves of hills, brooks, standing lakes, and groves;
> And ye that on the sands with printless foot...
> (V.1.33-34)

As Jonathan Bate comments, this is a very significant moment in the play. Prospero's speech which for the first time refers to his capacity to raise the dead 'is the final mark of the potency' of his art. Indeed,

> It is also a sign of its roughness and a reason for its abjuration. Like Medea, Prospero has achieved renewals through his magic – the spiritual rejuvenation of Alonso substitutes for the physical rejuvenation of Aeson – but, also like Medea, he has used his magic to exercise power, to control other people. Prompted by Ariel's pity for the penitent mortals, and in particular Gonzalo, Prospero recognizes that 'The rarer action is / In virtue than in vengeance' (V.i.27-28). Whereas Medea goes on using her magic to act out revenge plots, Prospero renounces his and in so doing marks a movement away from the pagan world towards Christian 'kindness'. Medea's powers are summoned up not so that they can be exorcised, but so they can be rejected[40].

This mirroring of Sycorax through references to Medea, and the ultimate rejection of her goetist art enables Prospero to remind the audience that he has the potential to act like Doctor Faustus as well as perform the type of magic more commonly displayed on the Jacobean stage such as herbalism.

* * *

---

[39] Jonathan Bate, *Shakespeare and Ovid* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), p.8
[40] Bate, p.252

Present History of the Play

As director of the present history of the play, Prospero is able to demonstrate to the audience his role as a Jacobean stage magus. Regarded as an anti-Faust protagonist who has rejected the goetist magic of his predecessor Sycorax, Prospero performs four magical spectacles in the play, the raising of the tempest and the harpy and the creation of the masque and the anti-masque.

On the island, Prospero has used his 'books' to study forms of magic that were popular during the Jacobean era. Frances Yates and Frank Kermode have defined Prospero as a theurgical magician that is he used an art form that exercised control over nature through the use of 'planetary influences'[41]. Popular during the late Elizabethan era, theurgical magic was referenced and defined by Reginald Scot in *Discoverie*

> There is yet another art professed by these cousening conjurors, which some fond divines affirme to be more lawfull than necromancie, which is called Theurgie, wherein they worke by good angels. Howbeit, their ceremonies are altogether papistaicall and superstitious, consisting in cleanlines partlie of the mind, partlie of the bodie, and partlie of things about and belonging to the bodie, as in the skinne in the apparell, in the house, in the vessell and household stuff, in oblations and sacrifices; the cleanlines whereof, they saie, dooth dipose men to the contemplations of heavenlie things. They cite these words of esaie for their authority; to wit: Wash yourselves and be cleane, &c. In so much as I have known diverse superstitious persons of good account, which usuallie washed all their apparell upon conceits ridiculouslie. For uncleanlinesse (they say) corrupteth the aire, infecteth man, and chaseth awaie cleane spirits[42].

Orgel argues that Prospero's theurgical displays were also influenced by sources such as the *Magnalia Naturae*, a section in the third volume of Bacon's philosophical book entitled *Works*[43]. In this section, Bacon describes how a practitioner of this non-Christian, but supernatural art could achieve dominance over nature by employing an agent, in this case, Ariel to perform such tricks as unleashing the 'force of the imagination, either upon another body or upon the body itself'. It could also create 'impressions of the air and raising of tempests'. By employing an agent to transmit these influences, the magician could draw upon the arts of 'astrology, alchemy and ceremonial magic' to perform spectacular magical displays[44].

---

[41] Karol Berger, 'Prospero's Art' in *Shakespeare's Studies*, 10 (1977), 211-239, p.212. For information on Yates and Kermode's point of view, please see Orgel, p.21 for further details.

[42] Reginald Scot, *Discoverie of Witchcraft*, Chapter XLII entitled 'Of Theurgie, with a confutation thereof, a letter sent to me concerning these matters'.

As well as being associated with theurgical magic, Prospero has been identified as using Neoplatonic philosophy. Developed in Greece by Plotinus, who used Plato's theories in his treatise *On the Three Hypostases*, this was a theory that had gained momentum and influence from the works of Platonists such as Pico and Ficino in Europe, particularly in Florence during the latter part of the fifteenth century[45]. More generally, it was assumed that by using the outward representations of magic such as symbols and incantations to work upon the 'invisible spirits', the operator could use his imagination to 'transform either himself or his victim'.

It is through the deployment of Ariel and the type of magic that he orders him to perform that Prospero begins to be established as an anti-Faust protagonist. As a natural inhabitant of the island with no links to the devil, Ariel is deemed a suitable employee for Prospero's ambitious plan. Probably derived from Francis Bacon's concept of a 'lifeless spirit', this being is specifically upheld for its 'aerial nature' and possession of a 'flammeous component'[46]. Indeed, Ariel even emphasises these qualities during his first appearance on the stage

---

[43] F. Bacon, *Magnalia Naturae* in *Works*, ed. by James Spedding (London: Longmans & CO., n.d), vol III, pp. 167 & 168
[44] Kermode, p.xli
[45] R.T. Wallis, *Neoplatonism* (London: Duckworth & Co., 1972, 2nd ed., 1995), p.2

> ...I came
> To answer thy best pleasure, be't to fly,
> To swim, to dive into the fire, to ride
> On the curl'd cloud, to thy strong bidding task
> Ariel and all his quality.
> (I.2.190-194).

Prospero now determines to use his magical abilities to achieve his ambitious plan, and this is presented in a complex manner in the play. Prospero wants revenge on the nobles who wronged him in Milan, and has the opportunity to use the 'black' magical arts favoured by his Elizabethan predecessors to accomplish his desire. However, rather than revert to the Marlovian model, Prospero seems to use Neoplatonic and theurgical arts to achieve a 'good' or 'beneficial' ending. In order to increase the dramatic tension, these magical displays are presented in a paradoxical manner throughout the play. Prospero's magic exacts revenge on the nobles, a process that is started by the tempest and concluded through the motif of the harpy. Yet Prospero is able to use his magic to achieve reconciliation with his enemies as well as restoring natural order (through kingship and noble descent) with harmony.

Indeed, Prospero commences this process in the opening scene of the play by creating the tempest. This spectacular performance with its flashes of lightning and rolls of thunder suggests to the audience that the natural world has been upset by discord and upheaval, and that an unnatural act has been performed. This is confirmed on the stage by the fearful nobles, who believe that this terrifying and potentially dangerous act of nature could lead to their untimely deaths[47]. Prospero reminds the audience about the potential of the tempest when questioning his aerial servant, who invoked the elements of fire, air and water to bring about the magical spectacle

---

[46] Karl R. Wallace, *Francis Bacon on the Nature of Man* (Urbana, Chicago & London: University of Illinois Press, 1967), p.24

> I flam'd amazement: sometime I'd divide,
> And burn in many place;...
> O'th'dreadful thunder claps,...
> (I.2.198-199 & 202).

The tempest has achieved Prospero's main purpose of bringing the nobles to the island for them to undertake a period of reflection on their past misdemeanours, in order for them to emerge as changed individuals. Prospero has initiated this metamorphic process by having raised the tempest, which caused the nobles, as Ariel notes and Gonzalo later echoes, to dive into the sea. The sea-water commences the cleansing process (a condition necessary for fulfilling theurgical magic, as Scot notes in *Discoverie*), and disperses the nobles about the island under Prospero's watchful eye

> On their sustaining garments not a blemish,
> But fresher than before: and as thou bad'st me.
> In troops I have dispers'd them 'bout the isle.
> The King's son have I landed by himself.
> (I.2.218-221).

Prospero has also raised the tempest for another specific purpose - to separate Ferdinand from his father and the other nobles – to allow his daughter Miranda to meet and fall in love with him. By marrying Ferdinand, Miranda would be uniting two families and their children would be regarded as heirs to the dukedoms of Naples and Milan. By using magic to fulfil this personal ambition, Prospero is moving away from the trend established by Doctor Faustus and Greene's Friar Bacon of making an alliance with the devil for the purpose of achieving power. Indeed, it echoes instead the intentions of the 'love assisting magicians' of the 1590s. By permitting the two heirs to fall in love and marry, Prospero is fulfilling his dynastic ambitions.

---

[47] By presenting the tempest in the opening scene, Prospero is echoing a dramatic ploy used in Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*. In this play, the opening chorus predicted Faustus's fortunes and his ultimate descent into eternal damnation. In a similar manner Gonzalo, the innocent noble predicts the final outcome for the nobles. Although they do not face the same fate as Doctor Faustus, because the Captain's destiny is to hang, not drown '...no drowning mark upon him; his complexion / is perfect gallows' (I.1.29-30), Gonzalo is presenting the final outcome of the play for the audience. This dispels the atmospheric tension that the main protagonists will die in the opening scene.

Prospero deploys another dramatic device, which belongs to the Neoplatonic arts, when he uses music to achieve his ambition for Ferdinand. Cruelly isolating him from the other nobles and allowing him to believe that his father is dead, Ferdinand is encouraged to continue his journey on the island by Ariel's song 'This music crept by me upon the waters / Allaying both their fury and my passion' (I.2.394-395). Ariel's musical interlude is another 'powerful method of magical operation' in the play, and a far cry from the romance magic performed by Faustus and Mephistopheles during their tour around Europe[48]. Music was deployed by the Neoplatonic practitioner as a means of transmitting the 'moral attitudes' derived from the planets to the listener. This motif affects the mind, soul and nature of the individual to bring about a change, and in Ferdinand, it allows him to reach a new level of maturity away from the influence of his father. Thus, Prospero is using his art to prepare Ferdinand for the new challenge ahead of him, as a married man and heir apparent to a united kingdom.

Prospero's banishment into exile on the island can be perceived as being akin to a 'Quasi magical act by which a ruler purges the country of enemies, sending them away...as diseases were extracted from the body by medicine and exorcism'[49]. It is this personal experience of exile, which led Prospero to orchestrate his ambitious plan, to create the tempest, which brings the nobles to the island, into 'exile' and under his power and control to extract their diseases

---

[48] Berger, p.213

> By accident most strange, bountiful Fortune,
> ...hath mine enemies
> Brought to this shore; and by my prescience
> I find my zenith doth depend upon
> A most auspicious star, whose influence
> If now I court not, but omit, my fortunes
> Will ever after droop.
> (I.2.178-184).

It is also this ambition which leads him to present his second magical spectacle on the stage, the raising of the harpy. This theatrical presentation confirms Prospero's status as a magician. By drawing on the influence of his predecessor Doctor Faustus, Prospero metes out a punishment on those who have wronged him. Whilst Faustus used his alliance with Mephistopheles to punish Benvolio (by casting a pair of horns on his head for questioning his skill as a magician), Prospero employs Ariel dressed as a harpy to hunt down the nobles who condemned him to exile. However, in a move away from his predecessor, Prospero has used his skills (classified as belonging to the Neoplatonic arts and Baconian science) through Ariel to achieve his magical aim of securing repentance and reconciliation amongst these protagonists.

The spectacle of the harpy is cleverly placed in Prospero's structure of events. The nobles have already experienced an external 'purging' through the tempest, which caused them to plunge into the sea and emerge on the island with clothes 'being rather new-dyed than stained / with salt-water' (II.1.61-62). This event instigated the process of reconciliation, and was continued by the harpy purging them of their sins. It prepares them for their final reconciliation with Prospero and acceptance of him in his rightful role as Duke of Milan. The spectacle of the harpy also occurs after Miranda and Ferdinand have agreed to marry, thus ensuring the completion of Prospero's plan for dynastic survival.

---

[49] Linda Woodbridge, *The Scythe of Saturn: Shakespeare and Magical Thinking* (Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1994), p.104

As a form of punishment, the spectacle of the harpy is introduced on the stage by '*Thunder and lightning*' (stage directions III.3. between 52 & 53). This reminds the audience that Prospero will be using his novel and innovative form of magic to introduce the 'planetary influences' on the minds and imaginations of the nobles to make them susceptible to change. It signifies the natural world's intolerance of the nobles' deeds, of expelling the rightful Duke of Milan, and exposing him and his child to the mercy of the sea. Indeed, this opening dramatic device of thunder and lightning is important for creating the right atmosphere for the presentation of the harpy. It serves as a fanfare for introducing Ariel's condemnatory opening speech for the nobles 'You are three men of sin' who 'Being most unfit to live' (III.3.53 & 58) can only be 'belched up' by the sea on this uninhabitable island away from civilised society, and at the mercy of nature.

Although Ariel's portrayal of the harpy reflects Prospero in the same light as his Elizabethan predecessor – Doctor Faustus – who used his magical assistant to perform his ambitious plan, Prospero's magical skills far surpass his devilish predecessor's ability. Whilst Mephistopheles performed simple magical tricks such as placing the horns on Benvolio, Prospero controls Ariel to effect his Neoplatonic objective, that is, to work on the imaginations of the nobles and induce amongst them a temporary form of madness. He performs this by rendering the nobles into a position of helplessness and impotence, by making their swords immovable and inducing a form of paralysis in them. This makes them still, and enables them to listen to his words and receive the planetary influences on their natures 'Your swords are now too massy for your strengths, / And will not be uplifted' (III.3.67-68). Having paralysed the nobles both mentally with fright and physically, Ariel continues his punishment of them by narrating their crime 'that you three / From Milan did supplant good Prospero…' (III.3.69-70).

As if in a court of law, Ariel having charged the guilty nobles with their crimes, proceeds to pass punishment on them, by once again invoking the forces of nature

> The powers, delaying, not forgetting, have
> Incens'd the seas and shores, yea all the creatures,
> Against your peace
> (III.3.73-75).

This again reinforces the hypothesis that Shakespeare was attempting to create an anti-Faust protagonist. By permitting Ariel to use the image of water to wash away the sins of the guilty nobles, Prospero is turning around Faustus's alliance with the devil. Faustus commanded his devil to place horns on Benvolio so that he could be ridiculed in court. Prospero however, employs the Christian notions of repentance and reconciliation in his meting out of a punishment on the nobles. The water, like the sea which cleansed their garments, acts on all the nobles apart from Gonzalo who was already innocent, and Antonio who refused to be reconciled with Prospero, in a similar manner to a Baptism ceremony. Baptism was regarded as a symbol for washing away sin and welcoming the new believer into Christ's family. As Philip Edgcumbe Hughes notes, after the Reformation, the sacrament 'was retained by the

Reformers', as children could only 'become spiritual…by this new birth of water and the Spirit'[50]. By subjecting the nobles to the tempest, the sea is used in a similar manner to the Holy Water, as an agent for removing the stain of their old sins and transforming them into new beings. In this new guise, they are capable of returning in harmony with Prospero to Milan, to be ruled once again by him.

However, Prospero has employed Ariel in a similar manner to his predecessor Doctor Faustus who used Mephistopheles to carry out his magical wishes, as he represents the harpy and punishes the nobles for their misdeeds. This goes beyond Faustus's purposes and demonstrates Prospero's Neoplatonic and in some ways Christian ideology. Although Prospero employs the Neoplatonic arts to work upon the mind, his magic cannot be neatly categorised as truly Christian, because he deploys his art for the purpose of revenge, and to fulfil his personal ambition. However, his desire to achieve repentance and reconciliation amongst the nobles can be perceived as pertaining to the Christian ideology of forgiveness, and the desire to create a harmonious society.

Prospero's characterisation is also taken one stage further from Faustus's description at this point in the play, through his regard for family politics. Whilst Faustus used Mephistopheles to perform his magic and help him to achieve the status of a 'demi-god' to be revered throughout Germany, Prospero has deployed his art in order to secure a husband for his daughter Miranda. Faustus, unlike the romance magicians of the 1570s and 1580s, such as Bryan Sans Foy who wished to marry Juliana, and Bomelio who secured the marriage of his son to the King's daughter Fidelia, had no interest in generating offspring. This was in direct contradiction to the German source book *The English Faust Book*, in which Faustus had a child with the succuba Helen of Troy. Again, this trend was repeated by Greene in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, as neither magician enters into a sexual relationship, although Bungay plays an active part in uniting Margaret and Lacy in marriage. Prospero, on the other hand, has placed a high importance on family virtues, and as such, these values have become an integral part of his Neoplatonic plan.

---

[50] Philip Edgcumbe Hughes, *Theology of the English Reformers* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1965), p.203

In order to punish Alonso and help him to understand the sentiments that Prospero experienced upon his exile from Milan, Prospero uses other theories proposed by Francis Bacon, such as 'deception of the senses'[51]. This has the benefit of making Alonso believe the Harpy's statement 'Thee of they son, Alonso, / They have bereft…' (III.3.75-76). By allowing Alonso to think that his son has died, Prospero is denying him the chance of an heir to succeed his position to the throne, as well as to re-create the next generation. This is especially emphasised for Alonso, because he has just married his daughter Claribel to the King of Tunis, a country that is too far away from Italy to provide an heir apparent. Prospero is also making Alonso experience the mental trauma of losing a child, as well as using the opportunity to exact his revenge and final part of his magical plan.

Having employed Ariel to perform the harpy to punish the nobles, Prospero now desires him to retire from the scene and leave the nobles to contemplate their sins. Again, Ariel performs this in a truly dramatic way, by vanishing in a peal of thunder. This signifies the sense of disaster that had been present in the natural world, and the fact that the nobles are now subjected to the forces of nature. It is left to Gonzalo, who is unaffected by the harpy because of his innocence, to reflect on the true implications of Prospero's magical spectacular for the audience in his concluding remarks

---

[51] Francis Bacon, p.168

> All three of them are desperate: their great guilt,
> Like poison given to work a great time after,
> Now 'gins to bite the spirits.
> (III.3.104-106).

Prospero has raised the tempest and the harpy using magical theories closely associated with theurgical and Neoplatonic theories. These spectacles have helped him to achieve the beginning part of his ambitious plan. However, in a move away from his complex ideology about using magic to exact revenge and achieve reconciliation with his enemies, Prospero has another objective to accomplish. Although the demonstration of the harpy will punish the nobles sufficiently to force them to welcome him once again in his former position as Duke of Milan, Prospero's plan will only succeed if he is able to secure a suitable heir. Thus, as part of his dual purpose in raising the tempest, Prospero separated Ferdinand from his father and the other nobles and placed him in a different location on the island, before introducing him to his daughter Miranda. This cleverly orchestrated introduction enabled the two young heirs to fall in love and, in accordance with Prospero's scheme, agree to marry.

To celebrate these forthcoming nuptials, Prospero deploys his magic to create the spectacle of the masque. As Chris Baldick states, a masque was

> A spectacular kind of indoor performance combining poetic drama, music, dance, song, lavish costume, and costly stage effects, which was favoured by European royalty in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Members of the court would enter disguised, taking the part of mythological persons, and enact

> a simple allegorical plot, concluding with the removal of masks and a dance joined by members of the audience[52].

Critics examining the masque in *The Tempest* have generally been divided between two camps. In his 1953 edition Frank Kermode argued that the masque was incorporated into *The Tempest* as a 'topical compliment' to celebrate the marriage of Princess Elizabeth to Elector Palatine[53]. The sentimental school of criticism has also endorsed Glynne Wickham's view that Shakespeare was merely re-using the Jonsonian structure of the masque and anti-masque to celebrate this forthcoming royal marriage.

However, as James Knowles states, scholarship no longer regards this performance as a 'hollow spectacle', but views the masque as representing Prospero's 'underlying political ideology' that has shaped the play[54]. Knowles even defines this spectacle as being more akin to a country house entertainment such as Marston's *Entertainment at Ashby* which celebrates a dynastic betrothal 'and the consolidation of familial position and power', rather than a masque in the style advocated by Jonson[55].

As a spectacular pre-wedding present, Prospero creates the motif of the masque as part of his detailed plan to safeguard the future. Worried by the corruption present in the old generation that rejected its ruler and upset the natural order of 'kingship'

---

[52] Baldick, p.130

[53] Kermode, p.xx - xxiv

[54] James Knowles, 'Insubstantial Pageants: *The Tempest* and Masquing Culture' in *Shakespeare's Late Plays*, p.108

[55] Knowles, p.114. Knowles has identified some key differences between this entertainment and traditional masques. For example, it was traditional for a masque to be performed before a monarch and to use courtiers as actors so that political references could be attributed to specific individuals. By creating this presentation for Miranda and Ferdinand, and serving as the director of the spirit actors, Knowles believes that Prospero is situating his dramatic device within the conventions of the public theatre rather than courtly entertainments.

(although Prospero was not technically a king), Prospero now commands the two lovers to take a vow of chastity before their marriage to safeguard the future. He promises them that by observing his command, their reward will be a long and bountiful life in the manner of the 'golden age ideology'. Failure to obey his wishes will leave them open to corruption and hate

> If thou dost break her virgin-knot before
> All sanctimonious ceremonies may
> With full and holy rite be minister'd,
> No sweet aspersion shall the heavens let fall
> To make this contract grow; but barren hate,
> Sour-ey'd disdain, and discord shall bestrew
> The union of your bed with weeds so loathly
> That you shall hate it both...
> (IV.1.15-22).

Prospero's intentions in creating the spectacle of the masque appear honourable, yet in imitation of his other dramatic spectacles, his methodology suggests a more paradoxical ambition. For example, Prospero's demonstration of the masque can be interpreted as drawing on the example first mooted by Doctor Faustus in the final part of his twenty-four year contract with the devil. Having reinforced his alliance with Lucifer, Faustus determines to adhere to his side of the bargain – to commit his soul to eternal damnation – by enacting a formal presentation to take Helen as his paramour. Mephistopheles, now acting in accordance with Lucifer's wishes, helps to organise the performance of Faustus's downfall, by bringing on to the stage the classical figure of Helen of Troy, although it must be noted that it is Faustus himself who commits the sin of demoniality with the succuba 'Sweet Helen, make me immortal with a kiss / ...Her lips sucks forth my soul. See where it flies...' (V.1.93-94), which condemns himself to eternal damnation.

In a similar mode to Faustus, Prospero echoes this scene in the masque by once again calling upon his spirit Ariel to organise the celebrations for this 'contract of true love' (IV.1.84). Ariel calls on the classical goddesses Iris, Juno and Ceres, all traditionally associated with images of fertility, abundance and plenty, to perform the Christian ceremony of bestowing marriage blessings. This is very important for Prospero because he wants Ferdinand and Miranda to have an heir apparent for the two united dukedoms. Again, this motive can be perceived as an advance on Mephistopheles's conjuring of the succuba Helen, especially for Faustus. Paris's abduction of Helen because of her beauty and sexuality had been one of the main contributory factors for causing the Trojan War. However, in Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, the conjuring of the succuba Helen at the end of the play is an ironical twist on Faustus's previous desire to marry, as she attracts him to eternal damnation, and as such leaves him infertile on the earth. Indeed, this barren sexual fantasy created for Faustus by Mephistopheles was an innovative advance on the *English Faust Book*, which paired Helen with Faustus for a period of time and eventually led to the birth of the child 'Iustus Faustus'.

Although Prospero assimilates Faustus's dramatic device of using a spirit to organise this magical fertility rite in the play, he develops this notion by employing his Neoplatonic ideologies and 'natural' magic to transform the devilish overtones of Mephistopheles. According to the theories outlined by Francis Bacon in the *Magnalia Naturae*, magic could be used for encouraging 'germination'[56]. This is a notion that Prospero wanted to bestow on the marriage of Ferdinand and Miranda, and he emphasises this by commanding Iris the figure of restoration, and Ceres the goddess of agriculture and fertility to offer benevolent images to the couple 'Barns and garners never empty; / Vines with clust'ring bunches growing' (IV.1.111-112). This is a far cry from the succuba presented to Faustus, who even in mythology was associated with the destruction of Troy.

---

[56] Francis Bacon, p.168

By employing Ceres as part of the masque, Prospero is dramatically presenting a traditional fertility rite on the stage to complete the second phase of his ambitious plan. Ceres was the daughter of Saturn, a god who represented complex mythological images. Saturn was predominantly a fertility god who presided over the seeds and harvest to provide sustenance for the coming year. Yet in human terms, according to Linda Woodbridge, the scythe which was generally used for harvesting crops is also a representation of the 'Grim Reaper's' scythe[57]. In other words, as a provider of fertility, Saturn was safeguarding the 'continuance of the race', by helping the younger generation to win the war over the parent generation, in order to procreate and produce the next generation 'it is the terrible logic of life itself'[58].

By invoking Ceres and her association with Saturn, Prospero is reminding the audience, Ferdinand and Miranda that the masque, which was based on the Saturnalia, is a 'fertility festival whose founding myths had to do both with a golden age of plenty, and with murderous competition between the generations'[59]. In the harpy, Prospero punished the old generation who had attempted to alter the 'continuance of the race' by exiling Prospero and Miranda to the island. In the masque, he (Prospero) demands a vow of chastity from the two young lovers before their marriage ceremony in order to preserve the 'promise of civilization and fecundity' in the new generation[60]. If his terms and conditions are met, then Ferdinand and Miranda will enjoy a 'Golden Age' existence, and will not be troubled by the strife and murderous ambitions that governed Prospero's time as Duke of Milan. Thus, by calling upon Ceres to celebrate the masque with her association with fertility, Prospero is hoping to achieve his ambitions and use his abilities to shape the generation of the future.

---

[57] Woodbridge, p.22
[58] Woodbridge, p.22
[59] Woodbridge, p.22

Prospero's final magical presentation is the anti-masque. Jonson in his masques, for example *The Masque of Queens,* had established a dramatic structure whereby the masque was preceded by an anti-masque. Both spectacles were 'mutually exclusive' and the anti-masque is generally regarded as portraying characters that are the antithesis to the protagonists of the main masque[61]. This is spectacularly demonstrated in *Queens* as eleven witches gather on the stage to call up their leader. When she finally enters on to the stage, they start to perform a dance which is performed as a reversal of conventional dance steps, in an attempt to destroy the world of the impending masque. However, as the queens are now ready to perform their own dance, and the negative world of the witches contradicts their own ideology, the witches are forced to disappear after a fanfare of music. As disorder has been banished, the masque featuring the queens is allowed to proceed.

However, Prospero inverts this tradition. He presented the masque as a celebration of Ferdinand and Miranda's vow of chastity, before suddenly disrupting it because he remembered the 'foul conspiracy / Of the beast Caliban and his confederates' (IV.1.139-140). In a similar manner to the nobles who had wronged Prospero,

---

[60] Orgel, p.49

Caliban and his confederates must now face punishment through the deployment of hunting dogs 'Let them be hunted soundly' (IV.3.362), to make them conform to Prospero's wishes.

James Knowles has viewed the protagonists of this spectacle as going 'beyond' the roles of the traditional figures featured in the anti-masque such as witches, satyrs or Robin Goodfellow[62]. Rather than acting as an antithesis to the figures in the masque, these characters represent the very thing that Prospero is trying to prevent the two lovers from encountering through their vow of chastity, corruption, greed and usurpation of kingship. Although Caliban and his confederates are represented in true masque style as the 'bad' force, they are now through the spectacle of adopting '*glistering apparel*' (IV.1. stage directions between 193 & 194), set up on the clothes line by Ariel, brought before Prospero to receive the same treatment as the nobles, revenge and repentance.

In a similar mode to their masters, these conspirators are subjected to Prospero's Neoplatonic art, as he orders Ariel to make them suffer 'With dry convulsions' and 'With aged cramps' (IV.1.259 & 260) whilst they are being hunted. This spectacle reinforces Prospero's position as director of all the magical spectacles in the play and forces the conspirators, like their noble masters to repent their actions. These conspirators are now in a similar position to Alonso, who Prospero allowed to believe that he had lost his son during the tempest in order to endure punishment for denying Prospero his true right to rule the dukedom. However, unlike the nobles, all three conspirators are repentant for their misdeeds, and subserviently agree to return to their

---

[61] Stephen Orgel, *The Jonsonian Masque*, (New York & Guildford: Colombia University Press, 1981), p.137

masters as servants, or, as in Caliban's case, to live in peace and harmony on the island with Ariel. This final punishment through the anti-masque has enabled Prospero to conclude his magical spectacles and prepare for the final denouement of the play, his presentation to the nobles, resumption of his rightful role in society and the promise of a royal marriage to secure the future.

This mini revival of an old trend, enlivened by new additions such as Neoplatonism, offers an enticing picture for a Jacobean audience. However, by rejecting his magic and leaving Caliban and Ariel in charge of the island, Prospero is also signalling the end of the career of the stage magician. Sycorax's ever-pervading presence in the play, enacted through Caliban's continual references to her, signals the approach of a new trend for playwrights, the motif of witchcraft. However, Prospero's earlier identification with Sycorax, which was based on the formulaic presentation of Faustus, indicates the value of this protagonist for creating a new stereotype to entertain a Jacobean audience. These new theatrical protagonists could use spells to conjure spirits and create 'chaos and disorder' in the world[63]. Witchcraft material could also be exploited to demonstrate advances in stage-machinery, dance and costumes, and the motif could be deployed to offer the audience 'grotesque rituals, with their gruesome ingredients [which] add immensely to the aura of superhuman wickedness that surrounds the witches'[64]. Indeed, this soon proved to be a popular formula for guaranteeing success on the London stage.

---

[62] Knowles, p.112

[63] Corbin, p.3

[64] Harris, *Night's Black Agents: Witchcraft and Magic in Seventeenth Century English Drama*, 1980), p.88, referenced in Corbin, p.4

CONCLUSION

Throughout the course of this thesis I have studied the role of the magician on the stage in the newly constructed Elizabethan and Jacobean theatres. Prior to the development of the permanent theatres, the magician as a stage protagonist generally derived his characteristics from Merlin, the magical practitioner in the legend of Arthur and, from the local 'village wizard' who used his skills of prophecy to impress people with his magical abilities.

However, as demonstrated at the beginning of this thesis, after the development of the newly constructed theatres in London this stereotypical romance character seemed to undertake a change in representation. With the advent of a permanent stage which could house technical machinery for stage props, playwrights now had the opportunity to present a protagonist who could employ some of the philosophical arts circulating in Europe to present new and exciting dramatic spectacles.

From the extant material available today, I have signalled the magical practitioner Bomelio in *The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune* as the first protagonist to perform this new type of magic. Bomelio's necromantic qualities are only fleetingly seen at the end of the play, when Hermione burns his books. He does not actually perform any philosophical displays of magic, but rather performs his spectacles by drawing on the arts traditionally associated with the romance genre.

In chapter one I have suggested that by the late 1580s another play had appeared on the London stage which featured a magician who had acquired the necromantic qualities advocated by Bomelio during the earlier parts of the decade. It is my belief that Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* built on the qualities initially suggested by Bomelio and developed them alongside displays of magic more traditionally associated with the romance genre to establish himself as an innovative character for the newly constructed playhouses in London. It has also been my hypothesis that this play preceded Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* in 1588, and can therefore be regarded as the first play in the repertoire of magical performances during the 1580s which offered a role model with innovative traits and characteristics for other magical performers to follow.

Having established Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* as the first play in this category of magical performances, I examined the debate about the main influences of the period, which led Marlowe to depict a necromantic protagonist on the stage. However, I believe that the most likely contender for supporting Marlowe's choice of character is the publication of the prose narrative *The English Faust Book.* This is due to the fact that several of the themes and spectacles from this prose narrative reappear almost completely in Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus.*

By following this hypothesis, I have established that Doctor Faustus appeared to become a role model for other stage magicians to follow. For example, the presentation of magic in the source narrative has been identified as adhering to a tripartite structure which conforms to an aba pattern of philosophical magic, romance magic and then philosophical magic again. This structure appears to have been fairly rigidly adhered to in Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, the only real deviation from the source narrative being his performance of demoniality with the succuba Helen of

Troy. This dramatic motif then reappears in Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*. Although the play adopts five key episodes from its source *The Famous Historie*, it re-uses them in accordance with the tripartite structure advocated in Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*.

During the late 1580s to 1595, many of the plays performed on both the London and the provincial stages appeared to replicate some of the necromantic qualities which were derived from *The English Faust Book* to define Doctor Faustus in the first trimester of the play. Indeed, many magical protagonists such as Greene's Friar Bacon and the Friar Bacon from the anonymous *John of Bordeaux* characterised themselves as philosophical magicians by adopting Faustus's advocacy of academia. Doctor Faustus expressed his own viewpoint about the merits of academia in the opening sequence of the play, before using Latin (the traditional language of scholars) and philosophical books to help him to conjure magical spectacles and demonstrations. Greene's Friar Bacon continues this theme by characterising himself as 'A friar newly stall'd in Brazen-nose?' (2.11), who has 'read upon his magic book' (11.14). At the beginning of the anonymous *John of Bordeaux*, Bacon is also discovered by a Turkish soldier 'poring on a booke' (I.l.30).

Another characteristic which was used to define a philosophical magician on the stage, and which can be perceived as having been derived from Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus,* was the use of a magical assistant. In the *English Faust Book*, Faustus conjured the 'spirite Mephostophiles in the name of the Prince of Divells…' (pp.4-5), to help him perform his magical deeds. This action is again repeated in Marlowe's play, when Faustus speaks in Latin to raise Mephistopheles for the purpose of serving him during his time on earth 'I charge thee wait upon me *whilst I live, / To do* whatever Faustus shall command...' (I.3.37-38).

Mephistopheles's role in the play is to aid Faustus in his demonstration of magical spectacles. These mostly take place in the middle trimester of the play, and can generally be categorised (rather paradoxically) as belonging to the romance genre or the 'popular magic' of the village wizard. It is only at the end of the play that Mephistopheles brings about certain philosophical displays such as the conjuring of Alexander the Great to prepare the audience for Faustus's final necromantic deed. Indeed, the resigning of the covenant with Lucifer and the act of committing the sin of demoniality with the succuba Helen of Troy condemn Faustus to eternal damnation.

This role is imitated by Miles in Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, where, from the outset of the play, Miles imitates his predecessor by serving a magician with diabolical connections who also practises popular magic derived from the romance genre. Indeed, Miles even shares the same fate as Mephistopheles as he is carried off stage by a devil to face Bacon's final punishment of eternal damnation.

Again this role is adhered to in the anonymous *John of Kent and John a Cumber*, whereby Shrimp aids the superior magician who has 'proffited' in the philosophical art of 'Chiromancye' (I.2.238), yet practises romance magic as seen in his dealings with the two sets of lovers. Similarly the assistant Perce in *John of Bordeaux* serves Bacon in some of his schematic and diabolical plans such as the acquisition of the Turkish Emperor's robe and crown, before moving on to present his own demonstrations of romance magic, as seen in the debate with the scholars.

As well as presenting a series of traits and characteristics which could be adopted by other magicians to define themselves as philosophical magicians, Faustus also performs magical displays which have their roots firmly embedded in the romance genre. Whilst these tricks were not generally replicated by his successors, many of the magicians who followed Doctor Faustus performed similar displays which can be classified as belonging to this genre. Examples of this art include Faustus placing a set of horns on Benvolio's head and turning a horse into a bale of hay. Bungay in Greene's play conjured the Hesperian tree, Cumber in *John a Kent* displayed the 'antiques' in a series more akin to the dumb shows of the romance genre, and Kent attempted to punish Cumber by embroiling him in the morris dance.

During the course of this thesis I have identified many of the qualities used to define a necromantic / philosophical magician on the Elizabethan stage as being derived from the first trimester of *Doctor Faustus*. However, some stage magicians assimilated their character traits from the qualities used to characterise Faustus in the middle and final sections of the play. Perhaps the most famous of these traits is the conjuring of the spirits of dead people.

At the end of his twenty-four year tour around Europe with Mephistopheles, Faustus, like his predecessor in the *English Faust Book*, agrees to perform the Emperor Carolus V's request to display 'such spirits as can lively resemble Alexander and / his paramour' (IV.1.53-54). This is classed as a philosophical deed because only those believed to be in league with the devil could raise the spirits of dead people. It sets a precedent for later Elizabethan stage magicians to follow.

Although Bacon (in Greene's play) does not actively conjure any spirits, he does imitate Faustus by using his 'glass prospective' to depict images of people performing certain key events in a simultaneous time sequence to the protagonists visiting his cell in Oxford. However, both John a Kent and Friar Bacon in *John of Bordeaux* re-use this characteristic to help the audience to view them as philosophical magicians. Sir Griffin questions Kent about his abilities as a necromantic magician

> Canst thou, my freend, from foorth the vaultes beneathe
> call up the ghostes of those long since deceast?
> or from the upper region of the ayre:
> fetch swift wingde spirits to effect thy will?
> (I.1.108-111).

John a Kent's reply is ambiguous and his lack of clarity suggests that this trait was regarded as one of the most important qualities for a magician to be able to display on the stage, if he wanted to be perceived as a necromancer.

Friar Bacon in *John of Bordeaux* presents a similar characterisation of himself, although this time he conjures up the spirits of living rather than dead beings. Bacon presents two conjuring spectacles, and each one reveals him in a different manner. In the first display at the beginning of the play he conjures the spirit of Selimus and allows it to take place in a violent dramatic presentation to frighten his father. However, in the second display Bacon seems to have undertaken a change of heart as he uses this presentation to fulfil his Christian vocation of helping people. He conjures the spirit of John of Bordeaux to show Rossalin that her husband is fit and well.

Friar Bacon's performance in *John of Bordeaux* now signals a change in the presentation of stage magicians. He has used his magical abilities to punish his enemy the Turkish Emperor, and to reassert his Christian vocation of helping Rossalin. Thus he can be viewed as an early forerunner of Prospero who used his Neoplatonic and theurgical arts to achieve repentance and reconciliation with the nobles in order to secure his personal ambition of a dynastic union between Miranda and Ferdinand.

I have argued in this thesis that towards the end of the 1580s and up to approximately 1595, stage magicians derived their characteristics and traits from the qualities advocated by Faustus in Marlowe's play. However, by the end of the 1590s this type of stage protagonist became moribund, and the character of the witch now enjoyed the attention previously reserved for magicians. I have attributed this decline in interest, in the magician as a central stage protagonist to a number of reasons.

From 1588 to 1595 the magician was portrayed on the stage as having dual abilities. As an academic who had studied the philosophical arts, he was able to use his skills to conjure the devil. However, having performed this necromantic action he was frequently limited (perhaps through lack of stage resources and props) to performing magical displays more generally associated with the romance genre. However, by 1595 this attitude towards necromancy was being replaced by an interest in other philosophical theories, which were already extolled in Europe. For example, the Renaissance revival in Europe of the ancient Greek philosophy of Neoplatonism was beginning to exert an influence in England. This philosophy used the notion of a 'spiritual being' to exert 'planetary influences' on the minds of individuals to help them experience a change of viewpoint, and seemed to enjoy an increasing following amongst academics in the sixteenth century in England. Other medieval practices of herbalism, alchemy and astrology were also regarded as suitable subjects for academic pursuit and so the interest in making a contract with the devil began to wane.

Another hypothesis for explaining the fact that this type of protagonist seemed to vanish from the stage in the late 1590s may be gleaned from an analysis of historical events during the late 1580s. In 1588, Elizabeth was able to avoid the threatened invasion by the Spanish through the historic defeat of the Armada. This event was presented as a great victory in England, and Catholics, including the Spanish and the pope were then regarded as being in league with the devil.

This viewpoint may have encouraged certain playwrights such as Marlowe and Greene writing their respective plays in 1588 and 1589 (see chapter one) to search for a dramatic protagonist who could be used as a pawn to represent the political ideology of the time. Indeed, both playwrights seemed to use protagonists from their prose sources that had links with the devil to perform various dramatic spectacles before reaching a final climactic event, which determines the final outcome of the play. Faustus rejects his opportunity for repentance and commits the sin of demoniality to enjoy eternal damnation, thus underlining the moral tone of the chorus. Friar Bacon adopts the opportunity offered to him by the killing of the scholars to repent, and he even agrees to practise 'white' magic. This agreement enables him to utter the prophecy at the end of the play, which praises Elizabeth and establishes her claim to be the monarch who restored the 'golden age'.

By experiencing this final climactic event in the play, the magician, like the Spanish Armada, is made to endure defeat by a 'good' force, that is the English. Protestants have succeeded against the Spanish Catholics. With this moral point of view established, the play is permitted to close, safe in the knowledge that a traditional Elizabethan theme – natural order – has been restored at the end of the play. In other words, the devil has been defeated and the good forces have prevailed.

I have argued that by the early 1590s these innovative stage protagonists who performed necromantic spectacles alongside displays more generally associated with the romance genre were copied by other playwrights. However, Faustus's devilish links were overshadowed in these later representations by some of his other qualities such as the use of academic language and the study of books to define the magician as a necromancer. This later depiction of the magician who oscillated between the two genres of philosophical and romance magic may have been due to the fact that the celebrations for the victory over the Armada had subsided, along with the threatened invasion by the Spanish. Therefore, playwrights may well have rejected the dramatic ideology of having an alliance with the devil, which characterised the magician during the late 1580s. Also, as already outlined in Chapter III, the reason why magicians such as Kent may have omitted to enter into a contract with the devil was the alleged fact that this play was performed in the provinces, and as such, would have had limited access to stage props. By the time of the staging of *John or Bordeaux* between 1590 and 1594, the figure of the magician may only have been retained because the play was perceived as a sequel to Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*.

Thus it would appear that by 1595 interest in magic had reverted to the more traditional pursuits such as the philosophies of Neoplatonism and the study of alchemy. The patriotic feelings which had dominated Elizabethan England at the end of the 1580s, and led to the concept that Catholics should be represented as devils, had subsided and people were now focusing their attention on the question of succession. Although Elizabeth did not effectively name James VI of Scotland as her heir, he seemed to be the most likely contender.

Another reason for the decline in interest in the figure of the magician as a central stage protagonist was the creation of the witch as a theatrical spectacle. As outlined in Chapter V, dramatists had developed particular notions about the figure of the witch from Scot's *Discoverie of Witchcraft*, and she soon began to feature as a popular stage protagonist. She appeared in several plays during the 1590s and early 1600s, and even dominated the presentation of the anti-masque in Ben Jonson's *Masque of Queens* in 1608, which was written at the request of Queen Anne. However, it was, as Purkiss acknowledges, Shakespeare who adopted the witch as a popular motif, and she appeared metaphorically at least, in almost every one of his thirty-seven plays[1].

During the formative years of James's reign, the magician as a stage protagonist enjoyed a mini revival in some of Shakespeare's plays such as Friar Lawrence in *Romeo and Juliet* and Cerimon in *Pericles.* However, these magicians were presented in a very different role to their Elizabethan predecessors, as they performed natural magic. All references to the devil had now disappeared, although once again some of the traits used to define Faustus as a philosophical magician such as academic pursuits were retained, as Cerimon has devoted his time to the study of 'physic' (III.2.32).

---

[1] Please see Chapter V.

However, in *The Tempest* the presentation of magic is once again changed to depict current ideologies and vogues in the Jacobean society. The play is divided (as demonstrated in Chapter V) into two different eras, the past history of the island which occurred twelve years before the present history of the play, and the action that is now being performed on the stage before the audience. In the past history, the island has been ruled by the wicked witch Sycorax who imprisoned the good force Ariel through her use of goetist magic, and gave birth to her only child, Caliban. Twelve years after her death, the island is ruled by the Neoplatonic and theurgical magician Prospero. However, despite this clear-cut distinction between the two characters, as a goetist practitioner, Sycorax's art is allowed to live on in the play through Caliban (who frequently invokes her and the devil that she served), and by the fact that Prospero's history is curiously paralleled with her own background. Indeed, both protagonists have been exiled to the island, and both have shared responsibility for the ruling of Ariel and Caliban.

Sycorax's influence on Prospero allows him to be perceived as a character who has the potential to derive his authority from his Elizabethan predecessor Doctor Faustus. This is clearly seen through his adoption of certain character traits such as the study of books and the use of a magical assistant to perform his spectacular presentations. Indeed, the staging of the tempest and the harpy can be viewed as Prospero's attempts to seek revenge on his enemies. In a style moulded from Faustus, who punished those who disagreed with him, for example the placing of the horns on Benvolio after he mocked Faustus's magic, Prospero's art can be acknowledged as a form of punishment for the guilty nobles.

However, through the presentation of his magical spectacles, Prospero can be classified as an anti-Faust protagonist. This is due to the fact that his values as a theurgical magician who deploys Neoplatonic philosophy through the use of his spirit Ariel effect a change on the nobles and brings about their repentance and reconciliation with Prospero. In a move away from Faustus's desire to use magic to achieve his own ends, Prospero creates spectacles such as the masque for important dynastic reasons, and the harpy and the anti-masque to help to substantiate these ambitions. It is only after Prospero has successfully staged all of these magical demonstrations that he is able to unveil himself as the director of the play, and the rightful heir to Milan. Unlike Faustus or Friar Bacon, Prospero does not reject his magical art because it has achieved a diabolical effect, but rather because he has been able to use it to secure his political ambitions. With Miranda and Ferdinand united through matrimony, the future of his kingdom has been settled, and he can now retire from the scene, as he effectively promises at the end of the play with his statement 'And thence retire me to my Milan, where / Every third thought shall be my grave' (V.1.310-311). This can perhaps be seen as reflective of the ideologies that had dominated the last years of Elizabeth's reign, when the succession question was foremost in people's minds.

Having renounced his magic by destroying his book and magical implements and dressing himself in his former robes, Prospero has rejected all types of magic. This is perhaps significant in itself because by asking the audience for their approval at the end of the play '*Let your indulgence set me free*' (Epilogue, 20), Prospero appears to be signalling the end of the trend for displaying philosophical magicians on the stage. Although minor roles were still available, the diabolical character of the witch had replaced the magician as a fantastic central protagonist who could perform spectacular and wonderful displays of magic.

Perhaps fuelled by royal interest – James I had written *Daemonologie* about the art of witchcraft – witches as theatrical protagonists adopted the role previously filled by the magician during the Elizabethan era[2]. Indeed, witches such as Erictho in Marston's *The Tragedy of Sophonisba* committed propagation with a devil and then deceived Syphax through the bed trick, which had been made popular in *Measure for Measure*, were generally perceived as simply theatrical inventions for interfering in the course of the action. Many plays such as *Macbeth* featured witches as stage protagonists to direct the tragical hero to his untimely demise through the use of prophecy, or were allegedly based on real life dramas such as the Earl of Essex's divorce which featured in Middleton's play simply entitled *The Witch.*

In a similar manner to their predecessor the magician, these witches continued to use some of the qualities, which have been described in this thesis as the innovative characteristics employed by Faustus to classify himself as a necromancer. For example, the witch used Latin for chanting spells and invoked religious images to create a dramatic effect. However, the traditional necromantic qualities of studying particular forms of magic such as Neoplatonism seemed to die with the magician.

---

[2] As Purkiss notes the concept of the witch as a theatrical performer mostly seems to have come into effect during the reign of James I. She comments 'A protocol has been established: one must always begin on witchcraft and drama with James I, the king who argued for the reality of witches' compacts with the devil, and believed that he had himself been the target of witches' machinations' (p.221).

As a familiar figure the witch continued to feature in Jacobean culture through the motifs of drama, trials of law and pamphlet literature. She continued to represent the 'unpleasant truth that in the Jacobean public sphere, the only way for a woman's power to be visible was through her reduction to a signifier of disorder'[3]. However, despite this concept of her power as a figure of disorder rather than an academic scholar who could use his art to raise the devil, the witch continued to be a celebrated figure on the Jacobean stage long after the magician's demise.

Thus, it can be seen that the use of necromantic features to characterise Faustus in Marlowe's innovative stage play in 1588 set a precedent for other Elizabethan and later Jacobean plays to follow. Many key Elizabethan plays such as the ones studied in this thesis deployed the character traits used to define Faustus in the opening trimester of the play. These characteristics included the alliance with the devil, the use of academia, employment of a magical assistant and the later characteristic of conjuring up the spirits of dead people. Indeed, not only were these traits employed to characterise each stage magician as having necromantic potential at the beginning of every play, they also spilled over into the later presentation of witches on to the Jacobean stage. These traits have all been used by the stage magician to create a spectacular, dramatic and wondrous performance on the stage, and only seemed to finish when Prospero rejected his art and left the stage to continue his previous existence as Duke of Milan

Now my charms are all o'erthrown,
And what strength I have's mine own.
(Epilogue, 1-2)

---

[3] Purkiss, p.224

Appendix A

Copy of folio 45 from the Harleian Manuscript 6986

Most Gratious Soveraine Lady, The God of heaven and earth, (Who hath mightilie, and evidently, given unto your most excellent Royall Majestie, this Wunderfull Triumphant Victorie, against your mortall enemies) be allwaies, thanked, praysed and glorified; And the same God Almightie, evermore direct and defend your most Royall Highnes from all evill and encumbrance: and finish and confirme in your most excellent Majestie Royall, the blessings, long since, both decreed and offred: yea even into your most gratious Royall bosom and Lap. Happy are they, that can perceyve, so obey the pleasant call, of the mightie Ladie, Opportunitie. And, Therefore, finding our duetie concurrent With a most secret beck, of the said Gratious Princess. Ladie Opportunitie, Now to embrace, and enjoye, your most excellent Royall Majesties high favor, and gratious great Clemencie, of CALLING me, M^r^ Kelley, and our families, hoame, into your Brytish Earthly Paradise, and Monarchie incomparable: (and, that about an yere since by Master Customer Yong, his letters,) I, and myne, (by God his favor and help, and after the most convenient manner, we can,) Will from hencefurth endevour our selves, faithfully, loyally, carefully, warily, and diligently, to ryd and untangle our selves from hence: And, so, very devoutely, and Sowndlie, at your Sacred Majesties feet, to offer our selves, and all, Wherein, we are, or may be hable, to serve God, and your most Excellent Royall Majestie – The Lord of Hoasts, be our Help, and Gwyde there'n: and graunt unto your most excellent Royall Majestie, the Incomparablest Triumphant Raigne, and Monarchie, That ever was, since mans creation.

Amen

Trebo, in the kingdom of Boemia
the 10th of Novebre: A. Dui: 1588 stylo verses.

Your Sacred and most excellent
Royall Majesties
most humble and dutifull
subject and Servant
John Dee

Appendix B

Copy of Folio 178 from the Lansdown manuscript 161

To The Kings Most Excellent Majestie

In most humble and lamentable manner beseecheth your Royall Majestie, your Highnesse most distressed Servant, *John Dee*: That, as by the grace and providance of the Almightie, you are our King, our earthly Supreame Head, and Judge: So it may please your sacred Majestie: eyther in your owne royall presence and hearing; Or, of the Lordes of your Majesties most honorable privie Counsell: Or, of the present assembled Parlament States, to cause your Highnesse sayd Servant, to be tryed and cleared of that horrible and damnable, and to him, most grievous and dammageable Sclaunder: generally, and for these many yeeres last past, in this kingdome raysed, and continued, by report, and Print, against him: Namely, That he is, or hath bin a *Conjurer*, or *Caller*, or *Invocator* of divels: Upon which most ungodly, and false report, so boldly, constantly, and impudently avouched: yea, and uncontrolled, and hitherto unpunished, for so many yeeres continuing: (Albeit, your Majestie said Suppliant, hath published in Print, divers his earnest Apologies, against it) yet some impudent and malicious forraine enemie, or English traytor to the florishing State and Honor of this kingdome, hath in Print (Anno 1592. 7 January) affirmed your Majesties said Suppliant, to be the *Conjurer* belonging to the most Honorable Privie Counsell, of your Majesties most famous last Predecessor, (Queene Elizabeth) So that, seeing the said abnominable Sclaunder, is become so highly haynous, and disgracefull, that it pretendeth great discredit, and disliking to be had, also of the said most Honorable Lordes, of your Majesties privie Counsell (as to use any *conjurers* advise: and your said Suppliant to be the man). It, therefore, seemeth, (upon divers respects,) to be very needefull, due any speedy Order, to be taken herein: by your Majesties wisedom, and Supreme Authoritie (by one, of the three foresaid meanes, or any other,) to have your Highnesse said Suppliant, to be tryed, in the premisses: Who offereth himselfe willingly, to the punishment of Death: (yea eyther to be stoned to death or to be buried quicke: or to be burned unmercifully). If by any due, true, and just meanes, the said name of *Conjurer*, or *Caller*, or *Invocator* of Divels, or damned Spirites, can be proved to have beene, or to be duely or justly reported of him, or attributed unto him: Yea, (good, and gratious king) If any one, of all the great number of the very strange and frivolous fables, or histories reported and told of him (as to have beene of his doing), were True: as they have beene told, or reasonably caused any wondring among, or to, the many headed Multitude, or to any other, whosoever els. And the, your Highnesse said Suppliant (upon his said Justification, and Clearing, made herein,) will conceyve great and undoubted hope, that your Majestie will, soone after, more willingly, have Princely regard of his redressing of your Highness said suppliant his farder griefes, and hinderances; no longer, of him, possibly to be endured. So long, hath his utter undoing, by little and little, beene most unjustly compassed. The Almightie and most mercifull God, alwayes direct, your Majesties royall heart, in his wayes of Justice and Mercy, as is to him, most acceptable: and make your Majestie to be the most blessed and Triumphant Monarch, that ever this *Brytish* Empire enjoyed.
Amen.

Appendix C

Chapter XLVIII

Henri Corneille Agrippa, *La Magie Celeste*, trans. By Jean Servier (Paris: Berg International, 1981)

"Tableau des figures géomantiques qui sont a mi-chemin entre les symboles et les caractères".

Certaines figures ont été composées selon les nombres des étoiles et leurs aspects. Elles ont été attribuées aux éléments, aux planètes et aux signes: elles sont appelées ,<géomantiques> parce que les géomanciens ramènent à ces figures les points qu'ils projettent au hasard une fois qu'ils les ont groupés entre eux par parité et imparité.

Ces figures gravées ou dessinées sous l'influence de leurs signes et de leurs planètes en reçoivent vertues et pouvoirs.

Celui qui voudra connaître avec exactitude la nature, les qualités, les propriétés, les correspondances, la signification de ces figures ainsi que leur influence sur la destinée, doit aller chercher tout cela dans les ouvrages des géomanciens.

Le nombre des figures geomantiques est de seize. Le tableau suivant donne-leurs noms et leur trace.

Appendix D

Local Traditions

There are a number of local references and traditions listed in *John a Kent and John a Cumber*, which also support the hypothesis that the play was written for a private performance at a local house, rather than on the London stage. The names of some of the characters used in the play can be found in the legends of Wales, where they are upheld for their valour in fighting to retain Wales's independence. For example, Griffin may[1] have been named after the Welsh lord – Griffin Merriddock, who married a member of the Pembroke family in 1189. The Pembrokes were renown for fighting the notorious English Lord – Lllewellen to retain their independence. Powesse appears to have been called after Gwenwynwyn, Lord of Powys who fought against the English King, John and his powerful ally Llewellen in 1207. Gwenwynwyn later made a treaty with John , as they both feared Llewellen's growing power. Thus, by using characters who were renown for protecting Wales's independence in his play, Munday could have been employing political allegiances to appease the Welsh family who allegedly supported the production of the play.

Munday also makes extensive reference to Welsh locality and traditions in the play. There are several references to Chester, the River Dee and Plessye (`my house at Plessye'), which Pennell assumes is another name for Saltney, an area on the outskirts of Chester. However, the most clearcut reference to Welsh traditions is Kent's order to Marian and Sidanen to `washe not at Saint winifredes fayre spring' (I.2.260). According to Matthew Breeze[2], St. Winifred was a popular Welsh saint beheaded by Caradoc ap Alauc for resisting his advances. She was restored to life by her uncle St. Beuno, and has been upheld as a patron saint ever since. Her shrine is in Holywell,in north-east Wales, and is a place of pilgrimage for the sick, and for brides on the evening before their wedding[3]. A visit to the well was supposed to ensure a life of luck and fertility.

The last reference to local tradition which supports the argument for the play being staged in a private house rather than in London, is Kent's surprised allusion to the strength of Cumber's magic `I hope the learned Owen Glenderwellin, / is not come hither in the Lordes behalfe' (III.1.895-896). Kent is hereby attributing Cumber's magic to the famous Welsh magician Owen Glendower. Glendower has been hailed by the Welsh as a `national hero'[4], who was also an expert in the `black artes' (p.6). It was certainly this aspect of his nature which appealed to Shakespeare in his play *1 Henry IV*. By aligning Cumber with such a powerful magician, Kent is acknowledging his superiority in winning the first cast.

Thus, it would seem likely that due to the references to Welsh legendary figures, locality and traditions, the play has been written for a private performance at a house in the vicinity. This hypothesis can in some ways also be confirmed by the absence of spectacular philosophical tricks in the magician's casts, despite the growing trend for such displays on the London stage. As Pennell comments (p.53) these `pieces of circumstantial evidence present a tantalizing picture…' of a play which has tried to emulate the innovative dramas in the magic repertory, whilst also retaining a special significance for the people in the Welsh area.

---

[1] See Pennell, p.174

[2] Matthew Breeze, `St. Winifred of Wales and *The Duchess of Malfi*' in *Notes and Queries*, 45, 1 (March 1998), p.33

[3] Francis Jones, *The Holy Wells of Wales* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1954),p.49.

[4] John Edward Lloyd, *Owen Glendower* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931), p.146

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Agrippa, Henri Cornelius	*La Magie Celeste*, trans. by Jean Senner (Paris: Berg International, 1981)
Anon.	*Clyomon and Clamydes* (London: Thomas Creede, 1599, reprinted by the Malone Society, 1913)
Anon.	*Clyomon and Clamydes: A Critical Edition*, ed. by Betty J. Littleton (Netherlands: Mouton, 1968)
Anon.	*The English Faust Book*, ed. by H. Logeman (Nederland: University de Gand, n.d)
Anon.	*The Famous Historie of Fryer Bacon*, ed. by Henry Morley (London: Routledge & Sons, 1889)
Bacon, Francis	*Magnalia Naturae* in *Works*, ed. by James Spedding (London: Longmans & Co., n.d. vol III)
Brooke, Arthur	*Romeus and Juliet*, ed. by P.A. Daniels (London: N. Trubner & Co, 1875)
Corbin, Peter & Douglas Sedge (eds)	*Three Jacobean Witchcraft Plays* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1986)
Dee, John	Letter (Harleian MSS, folio 45)
Dee, John	Letter to James I (Lansdown 161, folio 178)
Gabriel, Vittorio & Giorgio Melchiori (eds)	*Sir Thomas More: Anthony Munday and Others* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990)
Greene, Robert	*Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, ed. by Daniel Seltzer (London: Edward Arnold, 1964)
?Greene, Robert	*John of Bordeaux or the Second Part of Friar Bacon*, ed. by William Lindsay Renwick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1936)
Henslowe, Philip	*Diary*, ed. by Walter W. Greg (London: A. H. Bullen, 1908)
Jonson, Ben	*The Masque of Queens*, ed. by David Lindley (Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 1995)
Kelley, Edward	*A Treatise of the Philosopher's Stone* Letter, M.S. Sloane 83
Marlowe, Christopher	*Doctor Faustus*, ed. by David Bevington & Eric Rasmussen (Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press, 1993)
Marlowe, Christopher	*Doctor Faustus*, ed. by Roma Gill (London: A.C. Black, 1989, reprinted 1997)

Munday, Anthony	*John a Kent and John a Cumber*, ed. by J. Payne Collier (London: Shakespeare Society, 1851)
Munday, Anthony	*John a Kent and John a Cumber*, ed. by Arthur E. Pennell (New York & London: Garland Publishing, 1980)
Munday, Anthony	*John a Kent and John a Cumber*, ed. by Muriel St. Clare Byrne (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1923)
Ovid	*Metamorphoses*, trans. by Horace Gregory (New York & Toronto: Mentor Classic, 1958)
Percy, Henry	Essay by Henry Percy, 9th Earl of Northumberland (undated) In Frances A. Yates, *A Study of Love's Labour's Lost* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936)
Shakespeare, William	*All's Well That Ends Well*, ed. by Russell Fraser (Cambridge, London, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985)
Shakespeare, William	*As You Like It*, ed. by Alan Brissenden (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993)
Shakespeare, William	*Pericles*, ed. by Doreen Del Vecchio & Anthony Hammond (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)
Shakespeare, William	*Romeo and Juliet*, ed. by Brian Gibbons (London & New York: Routledge, 1980)
Shakespeare, William	*The Tempest*, ed. by Frank Kermode (Surrey: Arden Shakespeare, reprinted 1998)
Shakespeare, William	*The Tempest*, ed. by Stephen Orgel (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987)

Secondary Sources

Assarsson-Rizzi, Kerstin	*Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay: A Structural and Thematic Analysis of Robert Greene's Play* (Lund: Berlingska Boktryckeriet, 1972)
Baldick, Chris	*The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* (Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 1991)
Bate, Jonathan	*Shakespeare and Ovid* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993)
Berger, Karol	‘Prospero's Art’ in *Shakespeare's Studies*, 10 (1977)
Bloom, Harold	*Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human* (London: Fourth Estate Ltd., 1999)
Boas, Frederick S.	*Christopher Marlowe* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940)
Braunmuller, A.R. & Hattaway, Michael (eds)	*The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989)
Breeze, Matthew	‘St. Winifred's Well and *The Duchess of Malfi* in *Notes and Queries* 45, 1 (March 1998), p.33
Briggs, Katherine M.	*Pale Hecate's Team: An Examination of the Beliefs on Witchcraft and Magic among Shakespeare's Contemporaries and His Immediate Successors* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962)
Bulfinch, Thomas	*Myth and Legend* (Ware: Wordsworth, 1993)
Cotterell, Arthur	*A Dictionary of World Mythology* (Oxford & Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1986)
Curry, Walter Clyde	*Shakespeare's Philosophical Patterns* (Louisiana State: Baton Rouge, 1937)
Deacon, Richard	*John Dee* (London: Garden City Press Ltd., 1968)
Fell Smith, Charlotte	*John Dee* (London: Constable & Co. Ltd., 1909)
Ferichs, N. & Flesher (eds).	*Religion, Science And Magic* ((Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 1989)
Flint, Valerie I.J	*The Rise of Magic in Early Medieval Europe* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991)
Grantley, D. & P. Roberts (eds)	*Christopher Marlowe and English Renaissance Culture* (Hants: Scoler Press, 1996)
Hattaway, Michael	*Elizabethan Popular Theatre: Plays in Performance* (London, Boston, Melbourne & Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982)

Jantz, Harold	'An Elizabethan Statement on the Origin of the German Faust Book' in *Journal of English & Germanic Philology*, LI (1952), pp.137-153
Jones, Alexander (ed)	*The Jerusalem Bible* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1968)
Jones, Francis	*The Holy Wells of Wales* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1954)
Hughes, Philip E.	*Theology of the English Reformers* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1965)
Levack, Brian	*The Witch-Hunt in Early Modern Europe* (London & New York: Longman, 1987)
Lindley, David (ed)	*The Court Masque* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984)
Lloyd, John Edward	*Owen Glendower* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931)
McConica, James (ed)	*The History of the University of Oxford: The Collegiate University* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986, vol III).
McNeir, Waldo, F.	'Traditional Elements in the Character of Greene's Friar Bacon' in *Studies in Philology*, xlv (1948), pp.172-179
MacFarlane, Alan	*Witchcraft in Tudor and Stuart England: A Regional and Comparative Study* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970)
Mattingly, Garrett	*Defeat of the Spanish Armada* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1939)
Merkel, Ingrid & Allen G. Debus (eds)	*Hermeticism and the Renaissance* (Washington, London & Toronto: Folger Books, 1998)
Neale, J. E.	*Queen Elizabeth I* (London: Penguin Books, 1933, reprinted 1988)
Nicholl, Charles	*The Reckoning* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1992)
Opie, I & M. Tatem	*A Dictionary of Superstition* (Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 1989)
Purkiss, Diane	*The Witch in History: Early Modern and Twentieth Century Representations* (London: Routledge, 1996, reprinted 1997)
Richards, Jennifer & Knowles, James (eds)	*Shakespeare's Late Plays: New Readings* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999)
Seligmann, Kurt	*Magic, Supernaturalism and Religion* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1992)
Seleucus [sic]	'John a Kent' in *Notes & Queries*, vi (1851), pp.119-120
Shapiro, I.A.	'The Significance of a Date'

in *Shakespeare Survey*, viii (1955), pp.100-105

Sherman, William — *John Dee: The Politics of Reading & Writing in the English Renaissance*
(Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1995)

St. Clare Byrne, M. — 'Anthony Munday and His Books'
In *The Library*, 4 (1920-1921), pp.225-256

Thomas, Keith — *Religion and the Decline of Magic*
(Middlesex: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1971)

Thomas, Vivien & William Tydeman (eds) — *Christopher Marlowe: the Plays and their Sources*
(London: Routledge, 1994)

Traister, Barbara — *Heavenly Necromancers*
(Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1984)

Turner, Julia Celeste — *Anthony Munday: An Elizabethan Man of Letters*
(Berkeley & California: University of California Press, 1928)

Wallace, Karl R. — *Francis Bacon on the Nature of Man*
(Urbana, Chicago & London: University of Illinois Press, 1967)

Wallis, R.T. — *Neoplatonism*
(London: Duckworth & Co., 1972, 2nd ed. 1995)

Wilhelm, J. & Laila Zamualis Gross (eds) — *The Romance of Arthur*
(New York: Garland Publishing, 1984)

Woodbridge, Linda — *The Scythe of Saturn: Shakespeare and Magical Thinking*
(Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1994)

www.encyclopedia.com/ — *Concise Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia*
(Columbia University Press, 1994, 3rd ed)

Yates, F.A. — *Astraea: the Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century*
(London, Boston, Melbourne & Henley: Ark Paperbacks, 1975)

Yates, F.A. — *A Study of Love's Labour's Lost*
(Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1936)

LIVERPOOL
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY