

Apocalypse Then: TAMBURLAINE and the Pleasures of Religious Fear

Richard F. Hardin
University of Kansas

But I see you have some religion in you, that you feare.
-Iachimo in *Cymbeline* 1.4.127

Well before the rise of the public playhouses religion provided an irresistible current of imaginative material for the ordinary person in sixteenth-century England. It is worthwhile to inquire into the ways in which this reservoir of imagery and emotional experience influenced the stage in its formative years, particularly at the hands of an innovative artist like Christopher Marlowe, who knew and used religion in this dimension—as opposed to religious ideas—to great advantage in his plays. Marlowe came to London not only with considerable religious learning, but also a creative rhetorical talent that helped him to use language and performance to manipulate audiences' feelings. How he applied this knowledge and talent in *Tamburlaine* will be the focus of this article.

In the past two decades historians like Kevin Sharpe have begun to investigate early modern Christianity for its “visual, sensual, and emotional experience” (12), not just its various doctrines. Although the sacred art of the past survived in many Elizabethan churches, the iconoclasm and anti-ritualism of official religion suggests that sensual experience came chiefly through the word, hence the enormous value placed on pulpit rhetoric in that system. The sensory side of religion, conveyed in the imagery of sin and suffering vs. reward and punishment, readily adapted itself to the stage during this era, and the exchange holds implications for theatrical history. John Russell Brown has described the style of acting that Marlowe envisioned as “strong, clear, galvanic,” a style not only fit for Aeschylus, Seneca, Artaud, and Genet, but also “for highly developed rituals” (157). This style would embrace the many moments of spectacle, pageantry, and ceremony in the plays (Stroup 92-94). At an elemental level, the imagery of damnation—with fireworks, devils, a dragon, and a sinner dragged off to hellfire—kept *Doctor Faustus* on stage for decades after Marlowe's death. As it is with *Faustus*, so with *Edward II*. Some still conceive of Edward in his last suffering as a kind of Christ figure (Sirluck 19). In a 1985 performance, a reviewer notes, “Edward broke and dispersed bread to Spencer and Baldock; later, abased and tortured by Matrevis and Gurney, he stumbled under the weight

of a heavy plank down his own *via dolorosa*" (Deats 7). Others, however, have detached the king from the realm of the sacred and believe Marlowe borrows from religion in order to provoke sympathy for a secular character (see Ryan). A similar effect occurs in the *pietà* scene of Lear holding the body of Cordelia. Ruth Lunney has recently shown how Marlowe leads audiences to see in new ways. In *Edward II* their anticipations of conventional moral lessons regarding profligate kings collapse in the cruelty of Edward's last hours. Marlowe's plays, she contends, initiate on the English stage a shift "from the didactic and informative to the persuasive and affective" (66). Marlowe similarly appropriates doomsday terrors in *Tamburlaine*, not to support the widespread Tudor sense of an approaching end, but to lend precisely that feeling to a drama of cataclysmic though not literally apocalyptic events.

The Second Coming, in fact, ties into one of the earliest allusions to *Tamburlaine*, the preface to the 1590 *Works* of the Puritan Edward Dering, in which the unnamed writer, urging the need to reform the church at once, declares,

It will be to late the third day to intreate for mercie. Tamerlan, Gods vengeance, when his black tentes are once uppe, though wee come out never so humbly with Laurell in our hands becladd in white garmentes, yet will hee not be intreated, but by the selfe same sinnes wherby we have offended, with the same wee shall be punished. (quoted in Wormersley, also Levin, "Early")

Such religious rhetoric of fear, with a long history, was ready for satire when Stella Gibbons composed Amos Starkadder's sermon to the Church of the Quivering Brethren in her novel *Cold Comfort Farm*: "Ye miserable, crawling worms, are ye here again, then? Have ye come like Nimshi, son of Rehoboam, secretly out of yer doomed houses to hear what's comin' to ye?" (98). As Amos warmed up, "An expression of lively interest and satisfaction passed over the faces of the Brethren, and there was a general rearranging of arms and legs, as though they wanted to sit as comfortably as possible while listening to the bad news." It seems paradoxical that fiery tirades on the torments of Hell, or God's vengeance on sinful nations, or the coming terrors of doomsday would bring "satisfaction" to the hearers, though such "lively interest" has persisted in some faiths. If sixteenth-century religious anti-theatricalism in effect sought to eliminate theatrical competition (a variant war of theatres), it was Marlowe's genius to realize the possibilities of exporting the language and imagery of religious terror to the popular stage, whether the fear of damnation in *Doctor Faustus*, Christ-like agonies in *Edward II*, mass martyrdom of Protestants in *Massacre at Paris*, or, the focus of this article, anxieties about the coming apocalypse in *Tamburlaine*. This is particularly so in Part Two of the play when Tamburlaine, having conquered the Turks and vast stretches of Asia and Africa, undergoes a heightened rage for power.

Scholarship has discovered how deeply rooted apocalyptic thinking was in the age (see Emerson, Hill). While scholars like Erasmus might question the canonical status of Revelation, Luther's followers championed its authenticity, often claiming that the prophecies were being fulfilled in their own time (see Backus). Both Luther and Thomas More have been called "apocalyptic souls," perhaps owing to a widely shared belief that "Somehow the entire society had become corrupt, and no one could tell where the corruptions would end short of the horrible advent of Antichrist and the spilling out

of the wrath of God upon the earth” (Marius 69, 269). While More’s *Dialogue of Comfort* associated the Turks, besieging Budapest’s Christians, with the Antichrist’s ravaging armies of the last days, Protestant England allowed both the Pope and Turks a share in the role, as in John Fox’s 1556 apocalyptic play *Christus Truimphans*, which centers on the battle between the woman Ecclesia and the dragon Satan, who uses the Turks as his instrument. The year of Fox’s death—and the probable year of *Tamburlaine*’s first performance—saw the printing of his *Eicasmī seu meditationes in sacram apocalypsin* (1587), a massive commentary on Revelation, following in the vein of William Fulke’s *Praelections upon the Sacred and Holy Revelation of S. John* (separate publications in Latin and English, 1573), Heinrich Bullinger’s *A Hundred Sermons upon the Apocalypse* (1573), and two sermons on the topic published separately in 1580: Bartholomew Traheron’s *An Exposition of the Fourth Chapter of S Johns Revelation* (1577), and Sir William Herbert’s commentary, *A Letter Written by a True Christian Catholike* (1586). The Geneva Bible’s marginal notes in Revelation also nourished Elizabethan millenarianism or belief in the coming end of the world and Christ’s victory over Satan. The Geneva scholars gloss the four angels of Revelation 9:13-15 as “Meaning the enemies of the East country, which shulde afflict the Church of God, as did the Arabians, Sarasines, Turkes & Tartarians” (*Geneva*). The preoccupation with end-time continued to surface at various points on the literary horizon, most famously in the first book of *The Faerie Queene* (see Bauckham, Wittreich). Marlowe’s contemporary John Napier, inventor of logarithms, is less widely recognized for his 1594 book on the Pope as Antichrist, employing his new math to calculate the numerology of the Beast in Revelation. Napier predicted that the beginning of Antichrist’s end would come in 1639, followed by Judgment Day in either 1688 or 1700 (Hill 25-26). Apocalypse then as now also inflamed minds that dwelt at the extremes of religion. In 1586 an Essex minister, Ralph Durden, claimed to be the king of kings ready to “lead the saints to Jerusalem.” The notorious London fanatic William Hacket, an ex-servant, claimed to be the Messiah and persuaded his followers that he was “King of Europe” and the angel of the Last Judgment. Charged with treason, he was executed in 1592 (Thomas 133-34).

Although *Tamburlaine* appears in a decade of apocalyptic ferment, scholars have not seriously investigated the connection. Several, beginning with Roy Battenhouse and his “scourge of God” thesis, have mentioned an apocalyptic element in the play, but Battenhouse is more interested in linking the Scythian hero to Machiavelli and to paganism. David Riggs touches on echoes of Revelation in both parts of the play as belonging to the cultural moment (212, 218), and Ian Gaskell, mentions in passing that *Tamburlaine*’s death cuts short “the climactic build to Armageddon” (188). In a comment that begs for elaboration, Troni Y. Grande attends to the eschatological symbolism behind the conquest of Babylon in Part Two: *Tamburlaine*’s “feat suggests a typological parallel with Christ’s apocalyptic victory over the world of sin and death, symbolized in Revelation as Babylon in the figure of a whore”(72). From another perspective, in an article that finds Marlowe a critic of the Gnostic impulses behind contemporary religious radicalism, Roger E. Moore proposes that “Marlowe’s plays depict the violent, apocalyptic consequences that follow logically from the Gnostic flight from the world” (135). If so, Marlowe may well be asking a question posed by James Berger, a modern theorist of apocalypse: “What degree of hatred for the world—for world as world: the

site of procreation and mortality and economics, and the site of language as well as representation—is necessary to generate the wish to end it entirely?” (Berger, para. 4).

Studies of Marlowe’s use of the Bible by Sims and Cornelius, especially the latter, have detected numerous allusions to the Book of Revelation but neither considers this play’s overall assimilation of millenarian thinking beyond the figure of Antichrist. Cornelius’s study, grounded on the belief that Marlowe is “a champion of Biblical truth, and a critic of secular Renaissance humanism” (ix), should be valued for the author’s intimate knowledge of both Marlowe’s and the biblical texts, but it approaches them without considering popular reception of biblical stories, and takes the unsustainable view that the plays are moral exempla. Almost three hundred biblical references are found in the two *Tamburlaine* plays (about evenly divided), many of which create Tamburlaine as a parody-figure of Christ. These allusions

begin with the birth of Tamburlaine, who rose “in the east with mild aspect” but was given indication of his kingly reign by prophecies, movements of the stars, and heavenly oracles. As Techelles sums it up, “his birth, life, health, and majesty / Were strongly blessed and governèd by heaven.” (67)

Although Cornelius is reluctant to see Tamburlaine as an Antichrist figure, parodic or ironic parallels similar to this birth comparison are made in fabulous Antichrist texts like *The Byrthe and Lyfe of the Moost False and Deceytfull Antechryst*, printed about 1528 by Wynkyn de Worde. These reflect popular legends: strong, longstanding influences, whatever the religious establishment may have thought of them. Cornelius finds a relatively high number of references to Revelation in Part Two of the play (27 are listed on 165-90). Some of these are intended to arouse the apocalyptic sensibility, especially in the latter half of the play. The King of Jerusalem predicts “That shortly heaven, filled with meteors / Of blood and fire thy tyrannies have made, / Will pour down blood and fire on thy head” (4.1.143-45). A likely source is Revelation 8:7: “So the first Angel blew the trumpet, and there was hail and fire, mingled with blood, and they were cast into the earth” (see Cornelius 181). In addition, “meteors” are easily identified with the “signs in the heavens” of the Gospel apocalyptic prophecies, so that, with the repeated “blood and fire” of Revelation, these three lines bring inescapably to the audience’s mind thoughts of the end of the world.

Tamburlaine’s apocalyptic imagery draws on the demonized Turks, conventional Antichrists, who in the sixteenth century inherited the ancient role of the Islamic enemy. These fearsome “Oriental hordes,” conquered by Tamburlaine’s even more fearsome horde from even further east, would stir atavistic anxieties in any European audience. When the Turkish Emperor Bajazeth, “the great commander of the world,” falls in Part One to Tamburlaine, the Scythian becomes a still more awful figure whose strangeness (Cosroe calls him and his henchmen “the strangest men that ever nature made” 2.7.40) endows Tamburlaine with a mythic aura. In a 1992 production at Stratford, the strangeness was exaggerated by creating a monstrous Bajazeth on stilts, toppled by Anthony Sher’s Tamburlaine in a Tarzan-like swing from above (see Hopkins, “Tamburlaine”). Terry Hands, the director, included additional emblematic moments to an already emblem-saturated play. But the eschatological Tamburlaine, apparently not featured in modern productions, fully materializes in the text only in Part Two. Source studies have revealed

that this second part mostly abandons the histories followed in the first, and as Douglas Cole writes in his 1995 book on the playwright, “The infinite longings and high aspirations invoked in Part I have turned into a nightmarish megalomania” (73).

Part Two, which offers such unhistorical major scenes as Tamburlaine’s murder of his son and his own death by internal combustion, belongs as much to myth as Part One does to history.¹ The last half of the play, particularly act five, featuring the unhistorical final conquest in Babylon, shows Marlowe busily evoking the imagery of end-time. This process begins with the episode of Tamburlaine’s receiving the crowns of tributary kings (1.3), then recrowning them in a ceremony whose length suggests that in performance this was a moment of prolonged spectacle, a grander version of the crowning of Antichrist in the Chester mystery play. Also like the Chester Antichrist, Tamburlaine then commissions his tributary kings with their special powers of rule. Hyperbolic language reinforces this sense of eminence (Orcanes calls Tamburlaine “Emperor of the world” in 3.5.22), supported by the hyperbolic emblem of captive kings drawing the world-ruler across the terrain. This striking icon of power redoubles that of Bajazeth as a footstool in Part One. But in the earlier part, there is nothing to match the astonishing use of theatrical space in the last scene of act four in Part Two. Here, the stage of the Rose Theatre, at the time twenty-five feet across the front and fifteen feet deep (Foakes 11), is crammed with the following remarkable assemblage of humanity: “Tamburlaine drawn in his chariot by [the kings of] Trebizon and Soria[...]Techelles, Theridamas, Usumcasane, Amyras, Celebinus, [the kings of] Natolia and Jerusalem led by five or six common soldiers” (4.3. s.d.). Add the concubines “brought in” at line 66 (at least five or six for the soldiers?) and Marlowe has perhaps twenty-one actors and one chariot crowding the scene. For almost a century, scholarship on Marlowe has been preoccupied with references to geographic place-names in the plays, but a scene such as this one, resonant with the tradition of the stage itself as a mirror of the world, directs attention to his imaginative sense of theatrical space.

Various images of Tamburlaine perversely liken him to the Christian God, employing the traditionally parodic features of Antichrist. A study of pastoral imagery in *Tamburlaine* has explored the “bad shepherd” element in his composition (Hopkins, “Dead Shepherd” 8). Tamburlaine also mimics Christ when he tells his sons, “Come boys, and with your fingers search my wound,/ And in my blood wash all your hands at once” (3.2.127-28). The audience would recall Jesus’s invitation to Thomas to put his hand into the wounds from his crucifixion (Greenblatt 210); some might also think of Revelation’s image of being washed in the blood of the Lamb. Understanding the scene in this way, we can perhaps come to terms with the problematic and unhistorical scene of Tamburlaine’s killing his son, Calyphas. This puzzling episode, which could make sense as a parody of Abraham and Isaac or of God the Father’s sacrifice of his Son, surely resonates with the religious imagery of sacrifice. In fact, Tamburlaine is speaking to Jove in a kind of prayer just at the moment when he cuts Calyphas’s throat as one would dispatch a sacrificial animal. Scriptural travesties continue into the last scenes of the play when Tamburlaine speaks to his remaining two sons—now a parodic trinity?—as if instituting a eucharistic self-continuity in them: “My flesh, divided in your precious shapes,/ Shall still retain my spirit, though I die,/ And live in all your seeds immortally” (5.3.173-75).

The conquest of Babylon in act five caps the Antichrist parallels in this play. Histories of the Scythian mention Babylon as one among many conquests, but none puts it

in the climactic place that Marlowe does. He evokes the mythic site— what the governor calls “this eternised city Babylon” (5.1.35). Supposed location of the Tower of Babel, Babylon symbolizes human power and arrogance, suggested in Tamburlaine’s image of “stately buildings” and “lofty pillars, higher than the clouds” (5.1.63-64). Babel/Babylon was also the beginning of tyranny under Nimrod, as described in the beginning of book twelve of *Paradise Lost*. Tamburlaine, by invoking “Belus, Ninus, and great Alexander,” and “fair Semiramis,/ Courted by kings and peers of Asia” (ll.69, 73-74), draws us into his fascination with the power and luxury proverbial in ancient tyranny, now resurrected in his own regime. “Slave,” “tyrant,” and forms of these words appear far more often in *Tamburlaine* than all the other works of Marlowe combined, and these words become especially frequent in the last two acts of Part Two. The slave-tyrant theme finds support in the climactic image of Tamburlaine’s entrance into the city drawn by his yoke of kings. In act five the ultimate world ruler completes his victory over all the hordes and lords of the East, all the sites of tyranny and slavery, by reducing the archetypal empire to rubble. Mythic Babylon is built in Genesis and destroyed in Revelation.

These evocations do not mean that Marlowe actually thought of his hero as Antichrist or the Beast or the Man of Sin or the Emperor of the Last Days. The events of *Tamburlaine* occurred two centuries before his audience witnessed them onstage. Instead, it is likely that Marlowe used the imagery of the Apocalypse to arouse the requisite feelings of woe and wonder in his audience.² Apocalypse is, of course, only one of several allusive patterns operating in the play. Eugene Waith has explored the Hercules pattern, and we might also include that of history’s prototypical world conqueror, Alexander, as well as, in the epic that Marlowe partly translated, Lucan’s Caesar. Theatrically, Tamburlaine originates not in Hercules or Caesar, but in a traditional English stage type, more instantly recognizable to an Elizabethan audience than the classical types mentioned. This is the “anagogic” figure of the world-king who boasts of his power over “cities, towers, and towns,” a type that includes not only the Chester Antichrist, but also other mystery play incarnations of demonic power. Pharaoh, Herod, Satan, and the Emperor of Rome all project the same vast power and unquenchable power-thirst, and on stage they display the same (sometimes darkly comic) appetite for both annihilation and total control. Herod raging on a scaffold was a great crowd pleaser, as was Tamburlaine, to judge from the number of his admirers, starting with Shakespeare’s fictive (though probably a familiar type) Pistol, or the real-life rabble-rouser of the Dutch libel, who signed his name Tamburlaine.³ Still in 1629 his image permeated the popular imagination when workhouse prisoners pulling trash carts through London met with jeers of “Holla, ye pampered Jades of Asia” (Levin, “Contemporary” 60).

Especially in Part Two, Tamburlaine “appears to be passing through a demonic incarnation on this earth” (Proser 94) and begins to assume the unhistorical, mythic contours of this figure of Satanic power, who will finally manifest traits of Antichrist in the last days. Viewed more narrowly, this transition foreshadows the final tyranny so often anticipated by religious enthusiasts of the sixteenth century, a type that had a long tradition on the popular English stage. The association of apocalypse and tyranny, in fact, has continued into our own century, with Josef Pieper, for example, declaring that Nazism, like any tyranny, was a “milder preliminary form of the state of Antichrist” (quoted in Kermode 25).

Endings in Marlowe have a concrete finality. Is there not something astonishing in the uncannily modernist savagery of Marlowe's last scenes? Faustus is torn by demons; Barabas is boiled alive; Edward undergoes appalling torture and murder; Tamburlaine, a defiant, glorious death? Frank Kermode has written of Shakespeare that *Macbeth*, *Hamlet*, and *King Lear* especially offer us "imagery of crisis, of futures equivocally offered ... as actualities" (88). In this regard,

The world may, as Gloucester supposes [in *Lear*, another play harboring apocalypse], exhibit all the symptoms of decay and change, all the terrors of an approaching end, but when the end comes it is not an end, and both suffering and the need for patience are perpetual. (82)

Marlowe's plays, augmented by a mastery of spectacle and pageantry, leave the audience with no nuance, no Shakespearean hedging or equivocating, but with a sensational finality, a day of wrath with all its violence and upheaval.

The collective body of legend, popular traditions, and learned or sensational commentary on doomsday furnished Marlowe with dozens of ideas and images conducive to emotional peaks unavailable in the bare chronicle material about Tamburlaine. To exploit this material, however, he employed the rhetorical skill that a university education had provided him, for there can be little doubt that Marlowe came to the public theatre viewing his foremost talent as rhetorical. Mighty declamations enhance the spectacles of power and violence. Marlowe's game, the "play" of the plays, sought above all to move audiences—an idea he culled, no doubt, from a close reading of Aristotle. Indeed, the second book of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, a familiar text in both Oxford and Cambridge, constitutes a study of audience psychology—of what kinds of arguments move audiences of the young, the old, the rich, and so forth. It speaks of ways to arouse and manipulate anger, compassion, and shame. Particularly relevant here are the comments in chapter five on arousing fear, and the ways in which that emotion is tied to power. Fear, says Aristotle, can be aroused simply by indicating things that are terrible, such as "the enmity and anger of people who have power to do something to us" (104). The greater the power people feel over them the greater will be their fear. We also fear "injustice in possession of power; for it is the unjust man's will to do evil that makes him unjust" (105). In what follows, as elsewhere, one could easily substitute "playwright" for "orator":

And since most men tend to be bad—slaves to greed, and cowards in danger—it is as a rule a terrible thing to be at another man's mercy[. . .] [W]hen it is advisable that the audience should be frightened, the orator must make them feel that they really are in danger of something, pointing out that it has happened to others who were stronger than they are, and is happening, or has happened, to people like themselves, at the hands of unexpected people, in an unexpected form, and at an unexpected time. (106)

A teacher could do worse than require so suggestive a text in a class on play writing. Here, Marlowe, working from a premise about human depravity ("most men tend to be bad") that every current creed supported, would have learned that audiences could be swung from one extreme to the other: from impugning Faustus's blasphemy to pitying him in the Devil's clutches; from loathing Edward II and his minions to compassion over his terrible suffering; from admiring Tamburlaine in his annihilation of the mighty to horror at his

murder of “people like themselves” —the Damascus virgins and citizens.

Whether *Tamburlaine* expresses its author’s beliefs about divine scourges and the illusoriness of power remains uncertain. We have only the play and its impressive contemporary reception. The precise nature of the playwright’s religious or anti-religious convictions also escapes us, despite that subject’s prominence in scholarship (e.g., Bevington, Greenblatt). Could the man who read the atheist’s lecture write *Doctor Faustus*? One recent biographer concludes in part that “the more biographers tailor Marlowe’s life to suit our current taste, the more likely they are to distort it” (Kuriyama 141). It is just possible that a poet as talented as Marlowe, with remarkably original insights about using the aesthetic potential of the stage, recognized himself that his own beliefs were irrelevant to the memorable *coups de théâtre* that Elizabethan religion made possible with his audience. It is surely dubious to maintain that “we no longer take seriously the discredited notion that Marlowe had no aim but to shock an audience and make it squirm” (Duane 58). Few would say, concerning any important artist, “no aim but.” Yet shocking has its pleasures as part of the play in play-making. Douglas Duncan argues convincingly that Marlowe was “a born mischief-maker, a precocious intellectual quite likely to make a game of a popular audience” (108). Pointing to Marlowe’s apparent lack of ideological commitment, which differentiated his irony from that of Jonson or Erasmus (111), he grants that “Just how much serious purpose lay behind Marlowe’s mischief is the most slippery problem posed by a notoriously elusive writer” (113) — whose elusiveness, one must add, continues to draw scholars to his book, and audiences to his plays.⁴

The twenty-first century, with its doomsday cults and violence in biblical lands, cries out for a large-scale, blood soaked production of *Tamburlaine*. Both parts of the play were staged uncut by the National Theatre in 1975-76 (with Albert Finney in the title role), making for a theatrical experience not unlike Edward Hall’s recent “Rose Rage” version of Shakespeare’s first Henriad. The question remains whether today’s audiences want the real thing. David Farr’s 2005 production at the Barbican and the Bristol Old Vic merged the two parts into a single three-hour play, quietly excising *Tamburlaine*’s orders to burn all copies of the Koran (Marlowe’s invention, in fact). The audience for this revival would not have been disposed to think apocalyptic thoughts, as did that of the Rose Theatre in the 1580s, but in a world that daily witnesses supposedly respectable governments out-tyrannizing the tyrants, the play has much to say about the contagion of unlimited power that could end in catastrophe. The challenge of the play on stage lies in its extremes of pity and fear, and especially in its unavoidable strains of global calamity that still move audiences in the modern West.

Notes

1. Scholars have often remarked upon the different intertextualities of Part Two. Braden writes: “By part 2 Marlowe, having outrun his sources, is apparently improvising further conquests according to no significant scheme” (190). In contrast, Trombly proposes: “As an alternative to approaching the play as merely an incompetent, ramshackle version of Part One, we should entertain the possibility that Marlowe was inventively playing

with unsettling an audience's assumptions through anticlimax and discontinuous form" (84-85). In my view, "unsettling audiences" was indeed Marlowe's game, and the means for doing so in Part Two are indirect references to the fearful speculations about the approaching end time.

2. The tactic has much in common with narrative devices in film, such as the suggestion of Nazi militarism in the "Empire" of the *Star Wars* movies, creating response through association.

3. On the Dutch libel, an anti-alien verse rant alluding, with admiration, to violence in Marlowe's plays, see Kuriyama 122-23. In *2 Henry IV* Pistol invokes "hollow pampered jades of Asia, / Which cannot go but thirty miles a day" (2.4.159-60).

4. Quite possibly my article was unconsciously shaped by Duncan's comment on Marlowe that "To stretch an audience accustomed to orthodoxy, he knowingly perverted the arts of discourse as taught in his time" (109).

Works Consulted

Aristotle. *Rhetoric and Poetics*. *Rhetoric* trans. W. Rhys Roberts. New York: Modern Library, 1954.

Backus, Irena. *Reformation Readings of the Apocalypse: Geneva, Zurich, and Wittenberg*. New York: Oxford UP, 2000.

Bauckham, Richard. *Tudor Apocalypse*. Oxford: Abingdon, 1978.

Berger, James. "Ends and Means: Theorizing Apocalypse in the 1990's." *Postmodern Culture* 6.3 (1996) (e-journal).

Bevington, David. "Marlowe and God." *Explorations in Renaissance Culture* 17 (1991): 1-38.

Braden, Gordon. *Renaissance Tragedy and the Senecan Tradition: Anger's Privilege*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1985.

Brown, John Russell. "Marlowe and the Actors." *Tulane Drama Review* 8.4 (1964): 155-73.

Cole, Douglas. *Christopher Marlowe and the Renaissance of Tragedy*. Contributions in Drama and Theatre Studies, 63. Westport CT: Greenwood, 1995.

Cornelius, Richard M. *Christopher Marlowe's Use of the Bible*. New York: Peter Lang, 1984.

- Deats, Sara. Rev. *Edward II*. American Shakespeare Repertory, New York. *Marlowe Society of America Newsletter* 5.1 (Spring 1985): 7.
- Duane, Carol Leventen. "Marlowe's Mixed Messages: A Model for Shakespeare?" *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 3 (1986): 51-67.
- Duncan, Douglas. *Ben Jonson and the Lucianic Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1979.
- Emmerson, Richard Kenneth. *Antichrist in the Middle Ages: A Study of Medieval Apocalypticism, Art, and Literature*. Seattle: U of Washington Press, 1981.
- Foakes, R. A. "Playhouses and Players." *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama*, eds. A. R. Braunmiller and Michael Hattaway. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990. 1-52.
- Gaskell, Ian. "2 *Tamburlaine*: Marlowe's 'War against the Gods.'" *English Studies in Canada* 11 (1985): 178-92.
- Geneva Bible: A Facsimile of the 1560 Edition*, intro. Lloyd Berry. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1969.
- Gibbons, Stella. *Cold Comfort Farm*. 1932; rpt. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986.
- Grande, Troni Y. *Marlovian Tragedy*. Lewisburg PA: Bucknell UP, 1999.
- Greenblatt, Stephen J. "Marlowe and the Will to Absolute Play." *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980. 193-221.
- Hill, Christopher. *Antichrist in Seventeenth-Century England*. London: Oxford UP, 1971.
- Hopkins, Lisa. Rev. *Tamburlaine the Great*. Royal Shakespeare Company. *Marlowe Society of America Newsletter* 13.1 (1993): 2-3.
- . "'Dead Shepherd, now I find thy saw of might': *Tamburlaine* and Pastoral." *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* 35 (1996): 1-16.
- Kermode, Frank. *The Sense of an Ending*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1966.
- Kuriyama, Constance Brown. *Christopher Marlowe: A Renaissance Life*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2002.

- Levin, Richard. "The Contemporary Perception of Marlowe's Tamburlaine." *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in English* 1 (1984): 51-70.
- . "Early Responses to Tamburlaine." *Notes and Queries* 40 (1993): 176-77.
- Lunney, Ruth. *Marlowe and the Popular Tradition: Innovation in the English Drama before 1595*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2002.
- Marius, Richard. *Thomas More: A Biography*. New York: Vintage, 1985.
- Marlowe, Christopher. *Christopher Marlowe: The Complete Plays*. Ed. Mark Thornton Burnett. London: Dent, 1999.
- Moore, Roger E. "The Spirit and the Letter: Marlowe's Tamburlaine and Elizabethan Religious Radicalism." *Studies in Philology* 99 (2002): 123-51.
- Proser, Matthew. *The Gift of Fire: Aggression and the Plays of Christopher Marlowe*. New York: Peter Lang, 1995.
- Riggs, David. *The World of Christopher Marlowe*. New York: Henry Holt, 2005.
- Ryan, Patrick. "Marlowe's 'Edward II' and the Medieval Passion Play." *Comparative Drama* (1998-99): 465-95.
- Sharpe, Kevin. *Remapping Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.
- Sims, James H. *Dramatic Uses of the Bible in Marlowe and Shakespeare*. Gainesville: U of Florida Monographs, Humanities 24, 1966.
- Sirluck, Katherine. "Marlowe's 'Edward II' and the Pleasures of Outrage." *Modern Language Studies* 22.2 (1992): 15-24.
- Stroup, Thomas B. *Microcosmos: The Shape of the Elizabethan Stage*. Lexington: U of Kentucky P, 1965.
- Thomas, Keith. *Religion and the Decline of Magic*. New York: Scribners, 1971.
- Trombly, Fred B. *Playing with Desire: Christopher Marlowe and the Art of Tantalization*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1998.
- Wittreich, Joseph. "Apocalypse." *The Spenser Encyclopedia*, gen. ed. A. C. Hamilton. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1990. 46-48.
- Wormersley, David. "An Early Response to Tamburlaine?" *Notes and Queries* 38 (1991): 471.

