

Locating the Earliest “Critics”

If presentism suggests we can only know the past by its relation to the present,¹ it is worth pointing out that the earliest “critics” of Marlowe and Shakespeare may have more in common with the academic community today than most of the “rival” critics we will meet from the last 400 years. Located initially in the public theatres, the wide swath of amateur audience members who hoped to be entertained bumped up against overeducated and underemployed university graduates who hoped to find work in the newly emerging profession of playwriting; instead, many of these so-called “alienated intellectuals” fell into huge debt. While a great deal of caution must be used in any alchemistic attempt to transform base speculation into golden fact when describing early modern public audiences in the late 1500s, most of the spectators did have at least one thing in common: they committed time and money to see the performances.

As early as the premiere productions of Marlowe’s and Shakespeare’s plays in the late 1580s and 1590s, it became clear that these two writers were favored fare by theatregoers.² While I might disagree with David Bevington that the two playwrights were “perceived as rivals in the new art of writing plays about English history” (I’m not sure the audiences saw them necessarily as “rivals,” as was noted in my introduction),³ I certainly concur that both playwrights produced inventive and less didactic versions of English legendary tales than earlier works such as *Gorbuduc* (1562) or the anonymously penned *The Famous Victories of Henry V* (late 1580s). Perhaps these two writers, more than others of the time,

accepted and embraced this malleable opportunity to speak about history in an innovative way, employing a blank-verse voice which not only astonished but also appealed to a wider variety of playgoers than the dull and predictable stories offered up by other contemporary playwrights. The dramatic connection between past and present, both England's past on display in the 1590s, and our own location looking back at the Elizabethan era, is a destination point we will circle back to after journeying through select performance and print venues located in London at the time.

In any event, the "critical rivalry" certainly accelerated as it spread publicly when playgoers were granted the option to support, by way of their admission fees, one or both of the duopoly theatrical troupes commissioned in 1594.⁴ These two groups were granted sole power by the Queen's Privy Council to perform in the public sphere. The first was the Admiral's Men, who were granted control over the south side of the Thames and fortified with Marlowe's plays (and to a lesser extent, Thomas Kyd's). They featured Edward Alleyn's portrayal of overreaching protagonists at the Rose for most of the 1590s. The competing troupe, featuring Shakespeare's plays and employing Richard Burbage's less histrionic, but more lifelike acting skills, was initially dubbed the Lord Chamberlain's Men (renamed, of course, The King's Men in 1603). They first performed at The Theatre (built in 1576), before moving to the first Globe in 1599.⁵ Marlowe's and Shakespeare's plays were by any measure the most profitable, the most well known, and the most cited of the dramas staged between 1594 and 1600, when, as Andrew Gurr points out, the two companies "ran in parallel" as the most "dominant force in English theatre,"⁶ setting in place "a *pair* of durable traditions."⁷

In the book from which I just quoted, a monograph focusing on the history of the Lord Admiral's men (with the suspiciously biased, but decidedly more marketable main title, *Shakespeare's Opposites*),⁸ Gurr goes on to note a number of distinctions between the two companies in their desire to expand their playing spaces as well as in their day-to-day operations, performance choices, acting styles, and managerial structure. At least in the early years before the second Blackfriars was purchased in 1596, however, Gurr finds little difference between the two public crowds,⁹ which is not surprising as the first Globe was located on Bankside a mere 500 yards from the Rose. Gurr also admits that the "reception by such self-renewing audiences of the plays," as they crowded into the two sanctioned playhouses in London, "invited

cross-reference, both implicit and explicit,” referring to the interrelational dialogue, echoes, jabs, jokes, and storylines tossed back and forth at the time.¹⁰ I would add that these paying spectators still invite cross-reference today, particularly in my analysis of the “social spaces” where the earliest participants in the critical rivalry between Marlowe and Shakespeare gathered.¹¹

These audience members, to whom I will refer as “spectator critics,” were an obviously important ingredient in the success of the two companies, and, by extension, their leading dramatists, whose plays were sometimes produced on the very same stage before the duopoly took effect. As Stanley Wells documents via Henslowe’s *Diary*, on back-to-back days in January 1593, only sixteen months before the edict of May 1594, playgoers at the Rose could see “Harry the Sixth (presumably the first part of *Henry VI* by Shakespeare)” as well as *Titus Andronicus* sandwiched between Marlowe’s *The Jew of Malta* and *The Tragedy of the Guise* (Marlowe’s *Massacre at Paris*). In addition, Robert Greene’s magician play, *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, was performed during the two-day period, as was the blood-drenched blockbuster *Jeronimo*, obviously Kyd’s *The Spanish Tragedy*. The two “highest receipts,” however, as Wells reports, “were for the two plays by Marlowe,”¹² whose works, as we noted earlier, were already known as audience pleasers. As J. T. Parnell points out, “the regular performances of [Marlowe’s] plays at the Rose attest to their popularity, if not to the playwright’s fame.”¹³ In other words, even if many audience members did not know the author of each play, they certainly knew the titles, or versions of the titles, such as *The Tragedy of the Guise* or *Jeronimo* cited above.

Until quite recently, with the notable exception of Alfred Harbage and Ann Jennalie Cook,¹⁴ these audience members have been mostly disparaged as not literate or savvy enough to articulate aesthetic assessments of the plays, and they have often been chastised for their more boisterous attendees, with scholars tracing at least “thirty-four complaints” about audience behavior by almost all the dramatists of the time “other than Shakespeare,” according to Gurr¹⁵; Gurr fails to mention, however, that Marlowe never used a “Prologue” to complain about the audience either, and, in fact, in the Prologues to both parts of *Tamburlaine*, Marlowe makes clear the power of the spectators. Why Gurr purposely omits Marlowe from his list will be considered later; for now we need to focus on these early spectator-critics who paid and repaid to see the plays before we turn to the earliest written critiques of the two writers. It may

even be possible to suggest that the initial audiences were more porous as a group, and only later, as they began to write down their opinions as individuals, did their pronouncements take on an air of “authority.”

Even though these early audiences have often been dismissed, specifically the “much-abused groundlings” in Thomas Cartelli’s terms,¹⁶ Charles Whitney, building on Cartelli’s and Gurr’s more recent work (2004), argues that these “audience members become agents in the shaping and realizing of meaning.”¹⁷ Whitney contends, correctly I think, that audiences’ responses were “productive, purposeful, and performative, linking the world of the play to the world beyond and to the life of the playgoers,” although I do not wholly support his assertion (reversing the normal binary) that “[a]udience response rather than the plays themselves was the central element in the early modern theatre.”¹⁸ Still, by looking selectively at performance records, crowd responses, and literary allusions,¹⁹ and using these spectator critics as a starting point, I look briefly at the “response patterns” Whitney proposes to show how critical distinctions between Marlowe and Shakespeare took root in the soggy but fertile soil of the Elizabethan playhouses, those liminal spaces both ancient and modern, memorial and festive, sacred and profane.²⁰

Once these early critics are characterized, I turn to an examination of the language used by them and about them, specifically rhetorical devices, before locating the origin of the first printed reference to the two playwrights in *Greene’s Groats-worth of Wit*, allegedly written by Robert Greene but printed by Henry Chettle. We will also consider Chettle’s apology (affixed to *Kind-Heart’s Dream*) for publishing it, before turning in my final section to locate the playwrights’ emerging canonization in the pages of Francis Meres’s *Palladis Tamia*.

Even before Marlowe and Shakespeare were compared in print as the two leading playwrights of this new generation of writers, anyone familiar with the public playhouses must have sensed their ascent to the upper echelon of the scribes writing for the popular theatre based on financial records and audience responses to their productions. In September of 1594, for instance, the Admiral’s Men had four plays by Marlowe in performance: *The Jew of Malta*, *Massacre at Paris*, *Doctor Faustus*, and Part One of *Tamburlaine*.²¹ For this acting company, in other words, Marlowe’s work constituted almost a quarter of the repertory in the first year of the duopoly.

While we must approach such statistical figures with some caution, there is little doubt that of the four Marlowe plays mentioned above, *The*

Jew of Malta and *Tamburlaine* continued to be extremely popular by any accounting. Henslowe’s *Diary* notes a total of thirty-six productions of *The Jew of Malta* between 26 February 1592 and 21 June 1596, more than any other drama at the time, most performed at the Rose, a number perhaps enhanced due to the execution of Dr. Roderigo Lopez, the Queen’s Jewish Portuguese physician.²² In 1592 alone, there were ten performances between 26 February and June of that year, all at “intervals of less than a fortnight, [and] all earning good sums of money.”²³ As Clifford Leach succinctly summarizes, “the extraordinary frequency of these performances indicates that the play was one of the most popular of its time.”²⁴

Tamburlaine’s popularity is even more remarkable; even though it was already an “old” play in 1594, it continued to draw sizable crowds.²⁵ Just in the years of the duopoly, “Part one of *Tamburlaine* was in its ninth performance (17 December 1594) when the second part was revived on 19 December to accompany it. Thereafter the plays were scheduled consecutively five times before their mutual retirement on 12 and 13 November 1595,”²⁶ and these fifteen performances between 1592 and 1595 in London alone suggest at least 20,000 spectators witnessed it.²⁷ But the play set trends in other ways as well, as the two parts of *Tamburlaine* functioned as “reportorial partners, each drawing playgoers into the playhouse for the other.”²⁸ “Sometimes the two-part plays were performed on successive days,” according to McMillin, “but not always. The sequel to a successful play would draw spectators back to the playhouse whether or not the performance days were successive.”²⁹ While Knutson concedes that Marlowe “might not have invented the two-part play ... his *Tamburlaines* certainly popularized the design,” and she cites three additional two-part plays produced by the Admiral’s Men in the season of 1594–1595 alone: *Godfrey of Boulogne*, *Caesar and Pompey*, and *Hercules*.³⁰ The fact that most people have never heard of these other two-part plays only adds weight to Knutson’s suggestion that Marlowe was the innovating force pushing the genre forward³¹; in any case, these early modern versions marketing successful sequels and pre-quels provided a format which Shakespeare also embraced.

References and allusions to *Tamburlaine* suggest an even wider impact. Richard Levin noted decades ago that “a great many responses” to the play “have come down to us,” in fact, “more than for any other of the period,” and these responses flowed from the pens of the well known as well as the relatively unknown.³² In the former group, Levin

quotes from Robert Greene, Ben Jonson, George Peele, Thomas Dekker, Michael Drayton, Thomas Nashe, and many more. While some of these, such as Jonson's later comment referring to the admirers of the play as "ignorant," at least one contemporary writer, the anonymous author who penned Part One of the *Troublesome Reign of King John*, addressed his verses, not to "ignorant" groundlings but instead to literate "gentleman," as did Richard Jones who first published a version of the play.³³ Even though some of these, such as Jonson, comment on the outdated vogue such as the "strutting" and "furious vociferation" of *Tamburlaine's* protagonist, his character remained the one against which all others were measured (*Timber; or Discoveries* ll. 776–779). In any case, these allusions support Whitney's notion that the "development of a liberated pattern of reception ... first becomes visible in the record with response" to the *Tamburlaine* plays. It also "challeng[ed] players" and, I would add, playwrights as well, "with more substantial consumer demands."³⁴ I think it is fair to include Shakespeare's seemingly dramatic responses to the play as an attempt to meet similar marketplace demands.

While Shakespeare's popularity as a playwright may seem too obvious to rehearse again here, two of his earliest plays have only recently been canonized, even though both appealed immediately to contemporary audiences of the time. *Titus Andronicus* (probably with additions by George Peele) is usually dated as first performed in late 1593 when Henslowe made a notation next to it as "ne" on December of that year.³⁵ The play's success is evidenced by a number of performances in 1594, first on 28 January and then again in 4 February.³⁶ In the warmer summer months of the same year, Henslowe wrote in his diary that "begininge at newington my Lord Admerall men & my Lorde chamberlen men" performed the play "andronicous" on 5 June and 12 June.³⁷ Using Henslowe's *Diary*, Jonathan Bate makes a similar point that "the play earned some of the highest receipts of any play that season, taking three pounds and eight shillings on opening night and earning between eighteen and forty shillings at each subsequent performance."³⁸ The quarto edition of the play published in 1594 also marked the first time any of Shakespeare's plays were actually printed, and its success was followed by two more editions in 1600 and 1611.

In addition to its propitious opening season and three successful print runs, *Titus* seems to have remained a "company showpiece," for it was performed in other venues besides the public playhouses. For example, in 1596, the Chamberlain's Men, or at least some of the troupe, performed

it for over 200 guests at the home of Sir John Harington at Burley-on-the-Hill, Rutland, as part of that year’s Christmas festivities.³⁹ How the upper-class spectators ate spicy mince pie as they watched Tamora ingest her sons we do not know; however, we do know that Shakespeare’s bloody spectacle was a smash hit with the patrons of the public theatres, a point agreed on by scholars and biographers alike. The recent editor of the Cambridge edition, for example, concludes that the revenge tragedy was a clear “playhouse success,” adding that the second and third quarto editions in 1600 and 1611 “indicate that the play was still popular enough on the stage to attract readers.”⁴⁰ Peter Ackroyd reaches a similar conclusion: *Titus* was “a hugely popular play, still praised and performed thirty years after its first production” and “it conferred upon the young Shakespeare reputation and prestige.”⁴¹

The hugely successful *Henry VI* trilogy was in heavy rotation at the Rose in 1592, but was almost certainly performed earlier, or at least some parts of it were. Although Greenblatt speculates that “[c]rowds flocked in the late 1580s to see the *Henry VI* plays,”⁴² we have the more factual evidence of eyewitness testimony from Thomas Nashe (who may have had a hand in writing it) when he praised Part One in print in 1592 in his *Pierce Penilesse*:

How would it have joyed brave Talbot (the terror of the French) to think that after he had lien two hundred years in his tomb, he should triumph again on the stage, and have his bones new embalmed with the tears of ten thousand spectators at least (at several times), who, in the tragedian that represents his person, imagine they behold him fresh bleeding.⁴³

In fact, as Lois Potter suggests, the “substantial changes” Henslowe made to the Rose in 1592 by “raising and extending the stage area” may have been to “enable [a] more effective presentation of battle scenes,” such as those in both the *Henry VI* plays, as well as in a play such as *Tamburlaine*,” trendy dramas “filled with action.”⁴⁴ The following year, on 6 May 1593, the Privy Council “authorize[d] a company of players to tour until such time as the restraints against playing in London during an epidemic of plague are lifted,” and both 2 *Henry VI*, what in the First Folio is entitled *1 Contention*, and 3 *Henry VI* were included in the list.⁴⁵ Part Three of this historical pageant was famous enough for Robert Greene (or someone ventriloquizing Greene) to transform a purposely misquoted line into an insult before hurling it back toward Shakespeare in 1592.

2.1 LOCATING THE AUDIENCE: THE SPACE OF THE STAGE

While much inky analysis has been devoted to the printed reference by Greene, I want to pause first to reflect on the critics who as spectators have not been considered as carefully. After remarking on the location of the public theatres of the duopoly themselves by building on Gurr's research as well as Steven Mullaney's work, I turn to the space inside the theatre to peer at the audience, focusing part of my attention on the so-called "alienated intellectuals" of the time, a group of overeducated and underemployed writers, who both penned plays and attended performances, and a group which produced both Robert Greene and even Marlowe. While making comparisons between past and present "academics" is tenuous, one cannot help but feel some affinity for a group which shares many similarities to some scholars today, perhaps more than any other time in the 400-year history I am tracing.⁴⁶

While Mullaney highlights the binary between the laws of the city proper and the license allowed in the "place of the stage" in the Liberties, recent scholarship has shown that the two spaces also shared many similarities. As Lloyd Edward Kermode argues, "[c]oming from the city proper," theatregoers "left behind them a place which displayed certain fixed features (infrastructure, Protestant Christian ideology), and a place where the lawmakers and law-followers were affected by the political machinations of international relations and historical placement."⁴⁷ When the public did venture to the Rose or the Theatre or the Globe, as they often did, instead of completely escaping such order they found spaces which had "fixed features," such as "the walls, the stage [and] the galleries," a place where actors, the characters they "portrayed, and those who watched" were also affected by the same "political and religious machinations."⁴⁸ Kermode perceptively declares this space to be curiously liminal, for it "paradoxically both intensified ... and also cushioned the city of London from the influential power of the drama."⁴⁹

This same paradoxical notion seems equally important when viewing the passageway into the theatre, a boundary consisting of a continual "system of opening and closing that both isolates" such sites, and also "makes them penetrable,"⁵⁰ a feature which Marlowe and Shakespeare highlighted repeatedly.⁵¹ In his discussion of social space, Foucault argues that some sites resist categorization, remaining "governed by a certain number of oppositions that remain inviolable," places where "our institutions and practices have yet dared to break down: between public

and private, between family space and social space, between cultural space and useful space.”⁵² One of the clearest examples of this hybrid space is that of the theatre, where “incompatible” images are particularly emphasized, as Foucault himself recognizes: the “theatre brings onto the rectangle of the stage, one after the other, a whole series of places that are foreign to one another.”⁵³ In other words, while a “historical play” such as *Tamburlaine* or the trilogy of *Henry VI* seem staged in order to function as a moveable historical museum, and so become a space “orientated to the eternal,” a seemingly opposing current may have flowed in the spaces surrounding the stage, for it was linked to “time in its most fleeting, transitory, precarious aspect, to time in the mode of festival.”⁵⁴ Michael Bristol notes a similar contradiction as these plays’ “[n]arrative time contradicts the authority of the calendar and brings the past into immediate juxtaposition with the present.”⁵⁵ The space of the stage, then, encompassed an almost dizzying celebration of contradictory impulses.⁵⁶

In the public playhouses during the time of the first references to Marlowe and Shakespeare, this idea seems particularly prominent. But this space swirling about does not mean chaos or even perhaps disorder, for as Paul Yachnin has recently posited, we “understand now that spatiality is both an almost invisible instrument of power (invisible of course because it envelops those it subjects) and also a changeable, contested, and creative property of social life broadly considered.”⁵⁷ As Marjorie Garber points out when referring to *Tamburlaine*, “the territory to be conquered” in the play is “not Egypt or Damascus but the Elizabethan stage and the imaginative space of drama.”⁵⁸ I would add that the “territory” around the stage, the area occupied by the spectator-critics, was an equally contested domain.

After categorizing the audience members who occupied this location in a general way, I move to a consideration of their capabilities as judges of drama—in other words, their aesthetic responses to public theatre offerings in general—all the while keeping in mind Cartelli’s warning that “the division of the Elizabethan playgoing public into discreet classes” may have “the effect of channeling playgoer responses into predetermined, socially constructed categories.”⁵⁹ I’m specifically detailing audience diversity, however, only in order to suggest that the appeal of Marlowe’s and Shakespeare’s plays cut across numerous class lines.

Broadly speaking, once playgoers paid their admission, “participation did not depend on social rank,”⁶⁰ for the audience was composed of a

wide swathe of London society as any number of books by Andrew Gurr or Rosalyn Knutson delineate more specifically.⁶¹ Walter Cohen seems to hit the mark by noting that any “insistence on a heterogeneous audience with a plurality of artisans and shopkeepers, and a majority consisting of these groups and the ones below them,” including “servants, prostitutes, transients, soldiers, and criminals,” is “compatible with the existing evidence.”⁶² While some of the audience members may have “been shocked to find [themselves] lumped in with many of the others,” the complete social range spread across the interior, ranging all “the way from earls and even a queen to penniless rogues . . . , families of beggars, and the unemployed.”⁶³ Of course, this space was demarcated (somewhat) by the varying prices for admission, another factor suggesting the varied social status of the audience.

Contemporary accounts also testify to this diverse and often cramped collective, such as Henry Chettle’s report of “gentlemen,” and “citizens,” some trailed by their servants, who jostled alongside the “numerous apprentices” for a better vantage point from which to view and hear the performance.⁶⁴ Other first-hand descriptions were penned by poets. Sir John Davies, writing only a year after Chettle, detailed a throng crowding the exit at the end of a play: “For, as we see at all the play-house doors,/ When ended is the play, the dance and song,/ A thousand townes-men, gentleman and whores,/ Porters and serving-men, together throng, —”⁶⁵ And in one of Greene’s pamphlets called *Thirde and Last Part of Connycatching* (1592), he also notes the presence of women, even though it too is clearly meant to be derogatory. When a cutpurse accomplice tries to “convey the purse to her,” the female spectator was so engrossed in the “merriment” on stage, that she “gave no regard.”⁶⁶ Although Davies’s take on the critical rivalry is not known, Chettle and Greene become central figures in the printed origins of the comparison between Marlowe and Shakespeare, specifically in an “apology” Chettle attached to *Kind-Heart’s Dream*, from which I just quoted.

While Davies’s and Greene’s depictions only include women of the lower classes, we know females across the social spectrum attended the plays in spite of the fact that their attendance was “most open to question and most subject to attack.”⁶⁷ Perhaps the numbers of women who attended plays were also related to the literacy rates of the time. If we think about a theatre performance and how little of it usually requires reading of some kind, and once we also remind ourselves that illiteracy

among women at the time was close to 90%,⁶⁸ we can understand the appeal of the playhouses to the illiterate of both genders. For the male members of the audience, the adjective “illiterate” was often paired with the adjective “idle,” even though this lack of employment may have been a consequence of the lack of reading knowledge. However, before we fall into the stereotype of the “uneducated groundlings” highlighted by earlier critics, it is worth recalling that a number of the patrons, players, and playwrights had college educations, or at the very least some training in rhetorical skills.

Numerous writers in this chapter were affected by the newly instituted educational training begun in England in the mid-1500s, and even though Lawrence Stone’s account has been challenged recently, in general he’s probably correct to refer to an “Educational Revolution” between 1560 and 1590. Yet even Stone makes sure that his tidy summation that “facilities for higher education expanded very rapidly” during these years is ameliorated by his assertion that the new educational opportunities did not result “from a demand by the landed classes for a training” which would make them better civil servants; instead Stone suggests that the increased interest originated from the “bourgeoisie, professional classes, and clergy,” who wanted “vocational training”⁶⁹ for their sons.⁷⁰ David Cressy goes even further by challenging Stone’s simplified view of any evolutionary educational progress. While admitting to a rise in instructional options at the time, Cressy claims that any pretense to widespread, popular education was a myth. Instead, a “pyramid of privilege” remained intact; this rigid hierarchy shows that “the gentry made progress at the expense of their inferiors, [while] the middling classes gained educational opportunities at the expense of the poor, while any schooling available to ‘the poor’ went to the respectable, employed and even skilled artisans or peasants and not to the indigent, unskilled and barely employed masses of the ‘very poor.’”⁷¹

However, in spite of this inequitable educational hierarchy, recent work has highlighted the critical judgment of many in the playhouse audience, some of whom Marlowe and Shakespeare seemingly played to in their prologues and epilogues. Whether Marlowe, to take just one example, was complimenting the audiences’ critical skills, or more likely, hoping to claim some of their clinking coins, or maybe both, *Tamburlaine* opens with a direct address to the audience in the Prologue to Part One. After first encouraging them to “View ... his picture in this tragic glass,” he then grants them the option to “applaud his fortunes

as [they] please,” an interesting way of appealing for a favorable verdict for both protagonist and playwright (7–8).⁷² In Part II, the Prologue clearly states that this sequel to the first play resulted from the playgoers pent-up demand: “The general welcome Tamburlaine received/When he arrived last upon our stage/Hath made our poet pen his second part” (1–3).⁷³ In other words, in this passage, Marlowe (and Shakespeare soon enough) considered his audience to be, at the very least, a “deliberating public” who paid for the right to “express pleasure or dissatisfaction” at the close of the play.⁷⁴

If we grant that the audience was “deliberating,” we must assume they possessed some agency in making judgmental decisions about the dramas.⁷⁵ But how and when do sometimes passive spectators become active critics? While Knutson is right to claim that “audience taste is hard to verify,”⁷⁶ and the critical powers of the audience may also be difficult to define, within the theatre some spectators surely became critics, even if that meant, in its most simple terms, that they would pay the admission price a second or third time to see the play performed again. But I propose that the space of the theatre also provided them with a contradictory self-reflexive impulse which seems to have been generated and reflected by the paradoxical space inside the theatre. Jerzy Limon explains the doubleness in this manner: “The newly created fictional figure lives in a different time and a different space, appearing to us in a fictional stream of time whose ‘historical’ present overlaps with the real present time of the audience and the performers.”⁷⁷ More simply, theatricality itself, particularly metafiction, highlights the fictive world onstage even while rubbing up against the empirical world in the audience.⁷⁸ But both worlds share one important trait, according to Kermode: “The double level of identity that each audience member possesses” enables an observer to “create the critical act,” just as the actors on stage attempt “a ‘re-semblance’ of the personal character whom they are portraying.”⁷⁹ I would also suggest that it is at this moment of “self-reflexivity during spectatorship” which answers our question above, for it seems to signal “the adoption of an active rather than passive stance.”⁸⁰

If there is any doubt that some of the spectators possessed quite developed critical capabilities, one very specific example should dispel such a biased notion. During an early performance of *I Henry IV* in the mid-1590s, we know for certain that a playgoer carried a notebook into the theatre where he copied “sixty-three lines from six different scenes,” which he seems to have heard spoken during the play,

including fragments and phrases he considered suitable for saving in his commonplace book.⁸¹ These copied lines not only repeated poignant similes, such as King Henry’s line that “The edge of war like an Ill sheathed [k]nyff / no more shall cut his master,”⁸² but also propositions about personal conduct, including the King’s suggestion of deploying dual, if not multiple identities in order to achieve the crown: one should “steale Curtesy / from Heavn, & dress hymself in such humility, as he may pluck / allegiance from mens harts.”⁸³ This carefully transcribed passage jotted down on the back flyleaves demonstrates that some members of the audience could critically judge even fictive behavior on stage, choosing which passages they felt worthy of noting, and in some cases those lines which may have offered an opportunity for “self-and collective fashioning.”⁸⁴ Moreover, the notion of dual identity in the fictional King on the wooden planks of the stage, a character who plays a role by turns unassuming and courteous, and later aggressive and forceful, may also mirror the passive and humble spectator in the cramped audience being self-transformed into the actively discriminating critic.

2.2 LOCATING THE DISCOURSE: RHETORICAL DEVICES

While we might concur that such extremely learned practices were not the norm in the public theatres, most scholars do agree that a “majority of most amphitheater audiences would have had some grammar-school education, not just the privileged.”⁸⁵ Of course, this same early training occurred for the playwrights as well, including Marlowe and Shakespeare of course, but also their first critic/playwright, Greene, as well as for Henry Chettle and Francis Meres. But what happens when an alienated intellectual, and I’m counting only Marlowe and Greene in this category for now, has been granted the tools of rhetorical persuasion, but finds he has no way to employ them to make a living? As we will see in the case of *Greene’s Groats-worth of Wit*, it led to the first, and perhaps most infamous, notice ever printed about Shakespeare and Marlowe.⁸⁶

By the time Marlowe had graduated from King’s New School in Canterbury, and even before he entered Cambridge, according to Riggs, the playwright had already “internalized the basic principles of Latin prosody (figures of speech, metrical resolution rules, relative stress) that underlaid his great contributions to the art of English poetry: the heroic couplet and the blank verse line.”⁸⁷ We can also say, despite Greene’s reputation for exaggeration, he too would have been exposed

to rhetorical textbooks early. In his pamphlet called “The Repentance of Robert Greene Master of Arts (1592),” for instance, he claims that his “father had care to have” him “brought up at school, that [he] might through the study of good letters grow to be a friend to my self, a profitable member to the common-wealth, and a comfort to him in his age.” Growing up in a family of limited means, Greene worked hard and studied well enough to earn a scholarship as a “sizar” to Cambridge in 1575.⁸⁸ For such “scholarship boys,” that is for students such as Greene or Marlowe, the “upward path toward political participation,” according to Bryan Lowrance, “would have involved an ideal of political action through rhetorical skill.”⁸⁹ Beginning with their grammar school training, and continuing all the way to Oxbridge colleges, rhetoric, poetics, and politics would have merged into a common, broadly Ciceronian concept of *vita active* – of a life led appropriately ‘in action;’” although as we have already noted, this “ideal” was not always the end result of such education, particularly for the “alienated intellectuals” without noble parents or wealthy patronage.⁹⁰

In any event, the earliest written references to Marlowe and Shakespeare as peer playwrights occurred while both were still writing for the stage, Marlowe at the close of his career, Shakespeare near the outset. Focusing first on the ways that the rhetorical training in England during the mid- to late 1500s highlighted language devices, this section considers the earliest print portrayals of the relationship. These rhetorical constructs were born not only out of an attempt to contrast the pair, but were equally enabled by the emerging tension between print and performance. As we will see, however, these first documents referring to the two in tandem sometimes cross that porous line between text and stage. As Kirk Melnikoff and Edward Gieskes explain, professional writers at the time were located in three specific spaces: the printing house, the theatre, [and] the court—and these spaces often overlapped and, at times, conflicted with each other.”⁹¹ More specifically, I show how three rhetorically charged publications contributed to the developing notion of Shakespeare and Marlowe as “mighty opposites.”

Employing Foucault’s suggestion that classical rhetorical modes dominated investigations of life and literature of this historical era, I examine the use of *convenientia* and *aemulato* as well as other rhetorical devices such as *exemplum* and similitude to show how writers borrowed from a philosophical and rhetorical context that focused on differences in order to categorize and evaluate the two playwrights. By also highlighting the

way in which the material conditions of the day enabled the writings of these three to circulate so widely and quickly, an often overlooked aspect of the first references to the playwrights, I show how the role of printers and publishers contributed to the initial, nearly indelible, portrayals of Marlowe and Shakespeare. Both types of ornamentation, one rhetorical and philosophical, the other material and marketable, should further our understanding of these original character constructions which remained in place for hundreds of years.⁹²

Sixteenth-century writers constantly considered similarities and differences in order to make sense of their world. Using analogies such as macrocosms and microcosms, as well as images such as the Great Chain of Being, the idea of ordering things often dominated the thinking and influenced the terminology of those who lived at the time. While E. M. W. Tillyard’s notion of a monolithic worldview has been correctly challenged, there is little doubt that the use of “resemblances” was often the foundation for constructing edifices of education in the early modern period. As Foucault explains, such investigations “applie[d] the interplay of duplicated resemblances to all realms of nature” in order to show “an assurance that everything will find its mirror and its microcosmic justification on another and larger scale.”⁹³ This pervasive search for similarities and parallels, as well as a desire to distinguish differences and opposites, shaped the initial printed accounts of the playwrights.

Trying to distinguish any original from a duplicate is not an easy task, but I use the general idea of replication vis-a-vis similitude, to specifically characterize the earliest mentions of the relationship.⁹⁴ This vexed connection, like a magnet that both attracts and repels, may suggest the alleged “rivalry” for some critics, but I would add that it certainly captures the relationship between numerous commentators writing about the pair; perhaps some (and I include myself in this group) would feel an affinity or sympathy for those engaged in the same pursuit, even when they held opposing views, a not uncommon occurrence in my 400-year critical history. These widely varying interpretations concerning the Marlowe and Shakespeare relationship run the critical gamut, from charges of plagiarism to suggestions of collaboration, from sibling rivalry to collusive enterprise.

It requires, of course, acute observation and detailed explication to make such connections visible; some figure, in this case a writer or critic, is needed to “draw it out from its profound invisibility.”⁹⁵ In other words, these “buried similitudes must be indicated” by someone

or something in order “to transform [their] uncertain glimmer into bright certainty.”⁹⁶ These earliest accounts by “Greene,”⁹⁷ Chettle, and Meres accomplish just that: their writings transform the mere “glimmer” of Marlowe’s and Shakespeare’s innovations in blank verse and comprehensive character portrayal into a brighter light casting a greater glow over the London theatrical scene, both in print and in performance.⁹⁸ Not unlike the sixteenth-century stargazers searching for glittering parallel patterns in the dark sky, contemporaries of the two playwrights were the first to observe and document connections between Shakespeare and Marlowe. According to the first three writers comparing the playwrights, although the two authors may have inhabited the same sphere, they often moved in almost opposite “moral” orbits, but not necessarily opposite aesthetic orbits.

Although we will define the rhetorical devices employed in more detail as we pair them with our three critics, it is worth pausing now to explain the role of rhetoric in shaping the earliest descriptions. But to provide this context, we must look at rhetoric in Elizabethan education and how that affected Elizabethan society in general. Rhetoric, simply defined, is the “training in writing and delivering speeches which originated in the Greek city-states and which became the principal form of higher education throughout the ancient world.”⁹⁹ While limiting our scope to the rhetorical writing of the first three critics, we must not lose sight that rhetoric remains, in G. K. Hunter’s terms, a “science ... of persuasion,”¹⁰⁰ the same manner of powerfully persuasive speech Marlowe voiced through Tamburlaine, the former dominating the Elizabethan theatre, the latter conquering kingdoms and devastating empires, both wielding “words” as dangerous as “swords” (*Part One*, 1.1.74–75).¹⁰¹ The important thing to remember for the rivalry among critics, however, is that the first comments about the association between Marlowe and Shakespeare were regularized by rhetorical patterns which helped them to explain to their audience the connection between the two, so my brief focus on rhetoric allows us to understand why the initial critics first constructed the playwrights in relation to one another using such devices.

Most scholars now agree that rhetoric was one of the key components of Renaissance humanism. As Peter Mack explains, an education in rhetoric “appealed to the humanists because it trained pupils to use the full resources of the ancient languages, and because it offered a genuinely classical view of the nature of language and its effective use in

the world.”¹⁰² The timing was also right, for the printing press enabled such training to be widely disseminated. While the rediscovery of Greek notions of rhetoric was first felt midway through the fifteenth century, it would take another century and a half—about the time Marlowe and Shakespeare made their mark on the literary scene—to come to some mutual understanding concerning the ways rhetoric should be taught and employed.

The pervasiveness of the grammar school experience of these writers cannot be overestimated; for example, William Lily’s grammar text, *A Short Introduction of Grammar*,¹⁰³ published in 1512, remained in print for at least 150 years, and, unlike most books of the time, which ran to about 1,250 copies, his book had a print run of 10,000 copies.¹⁰⁴ As Mack points out: “[F]rom their training in the analysis of classical texts, pupils learned how to read and how they in turn might expect to be read.”¹⁰⁵ While perusing these texts, students were also encouraged to focus on a number of elements, including the rhetorical devices.

To pick one specific example, Ovid’s poems were included in almost all grammar school curriculums, not only for their moral lessons but also because his work, according to one textbook commentary, “teaches those who wish to learn eloquence with all the rhetorical doctrine of words and *figures of speech*, and it teaches how the different things invented should be organised and some subject matter explained clearly, copiously and pleasingly.”¹⁰⁶ The “copiousness” of words and their uses became a standard part of the educational project of the country, so it should come as no surprise that one of the most reprinted of grammar school texts was Erasmus’s *De Copia*. This work was used particularly for style because it offered a way of “supercharging texts” by employing various figures and methods of rhetoric.¹⁰⁷

The use of rhetoric became encoded in every grammar school student, and it is good to be reminded by Mack that the “same people who wrote the school exercises, letters, notebooks” speeches and so forth, “were also the audience of the texts we now recognize as canonical,” whether those texts were printed, performed, or both.¹⁰⁸ Rhetoric became a part of the educational atmosphere inhaled by Elizabethans of every rank, and its intoxicating power was not limited to members of the gentry (as Francis Meres was), for it could also be employed by the son of a saddler (Robert Greene), check spacing after (Robert Greene), Looks like an extra space is there of a glover/whittawer (Chettle and Shakespeare),

or of a shoemaker (Marlowe). In other words, rhetorical training pervaded not just the stolid grammar schools and highly regarded universities, but also the public arena, including the energetic print shops and the dynamic playhouses. While Mack, of course, seems to be referring to plays and poems of the leading writers of the time, including, but not limited to, Marlowe and Shakespeare, he does not consider how this rhetorical impetus affected critical writing of the period, and that is what we will pursue now in *Greene's A Groats-worth of Wit*, Chettle's "Introduction" to *Kind-Heart's Dream*, and Meres's *Palladis Tamia*.

Although many accounts of the connection between Marlowe and Shakespeare accept some given facts we noted in Chap. 1, most single out similarities in manner and methods, while none, so far as I can find, highlight Foucault's idea of *convenientia*, which focuses on adjacent locales. As Foucault explains, *convenientia* "really denotes the adjacency of places more strongly than it does similitude."¹⁰⁹ In other words, things, or in this case, writers, become somehow related when they reside "sufficiently close to one another to be in juxtaposition," more explicitly, "their edges touch, [and] their fringes intermingle."¹¹⁰ And it is clear that as we just noted in the first section of this chapter, the two playwrights worked in the same circles, as did at least two of their earliest critics.

The relatively small numbers of players, playwrights, and printers surely produced an intermingling intimacy among them. John Astington, for example, suggests that the total number of workers in the London theatre was not more than 200 or so;¹¹¹ Sandra Clark, writing about the print authors of the time, makes a similar claim: the "milieu in which the pamphleteers loved and wrote was a small and intimate one,"¹¹² about a "hundred or so printers and booksellers in the Stationers' Company," according to Riggs.¹¹³ Clark concludes that "[w]riters of all kinds congregated in London, then a city of about 160,000–180,000 people, and their own world formed an integrated community within the larger one."¹¹⁴ Although each profession employed their own specific rules and regulations for granting "success in terms defined by the field,"¹¹⁵ not only did the "fringes" or edges of these newly professionalized writing circles touch, but these "social spaces" overlapped with one another,¹¹⁶ and any boundary between print and performance continued to collapse.¹¹⁷ In short, the first critics of Marlowe and Shakespeare shared the same proximate area, particularly the worn paths and river crossings connecting the dusty playhouses in the liberties to the crowded booksellers' shops in St. Paul's Cross Churchyard.¹¹⁸

2.3 LOCATING THE FIRST CRITICAL COMPARISONS IN PRINT: ROBERT GREENE AND HENRY CHETTLE

Rhetorical devices embellished numerous theatrical productions of the day including comedies, tragedies, and histories; print runs of sermons, pamphlets, and plays were also ornamented with rhetorical flourishes. Yet in most cases it was easy to discern the difference between the two physical entities, one malleable and moving on the stage, the other stable and inert on the page. Although the division between these two was sometimes permeable, the boundary between performance and print in personal lives was much more blurred, particularly when a dramatist gained near-legendary status. While we will trace this notion concerning Marlowe and Shakespeare more carefully when we turn to Francis Meres's work, it is important to recall that Robert Greene, the first person who seems to have ever mentioned both writers in print, lived his life as if he were playing a role, and acted out an equally dramatic death. Even today it is hard to separate the wheat from the chaff when considering Robert Greene's career, specifically his alleged composition of *Greene's Groats-worth of Wit*. What we do know with more certainty is the role that rhetoric played in his personal and professional life.

He became even larger in death, for in a cruel turn of events for Greene, the red-haired, boisterous leader of the University Wits, the vindictive comments he allegedly penned about Marlowe and Shakespeare would live on for hundreds of years. With the theatres closed since June due to plague, Greene may have felt that a semi-autobiographical tale of a dying writer, ignored in his time of need by his theatrical colleagues, might produce some ready cash. The motivation for fast money seems to me much more likely than the alleged purpose noted in the subtitle of the tract, *Greene's Groats-worth of Wit, bought with a million of repentance*, which included a warning to other university-trained playwrights not to follow his immoral example, even though that is the way the work itself is rhetorically situated. I would suggest the document, vacillating like Greene's own life between pious repentance and irate resentment, resembles Greene's persona even if it was not entirely penned by his hand.

The only thing we know for certain is that after his supposed berating of both Marlowe and Shakespeare in the pamphlet, Greene's tract was printed by his associate Henry Chettle in less than three weeks. Perhaps in trying to explain such haste, Thomas Nashe noted that publishers

were eager to get almost anything written by Greene. “Glad was the printer,” Nashe claimed, “to pay him dear for the very dregs of his wit,” as he stated in the Preface to his *Strange News* published in January 1593.¹¹⁹ In any case, Greene’s depiction of Shakespeare as an “upstart crow,” as well as his characterization of Marlowe as a Machiavelli-influenced atheist, spread quickly through the London theatrical and bookselling community, for in less than three months, Chettle, whose role almost certainly included more than just printing Greene’s works, felt compelled to apologize in print to at least one of the playwrights whom Greene seems to have slandered.

When analyzing Greene’s writing, it is worth remembering that, in addition to similitudes and their variants, Greene would have learned another form of rhetorical device while in grammar school: the *exemplum*.¹²⁰ In one of Erasmus’s texts on *Copia*, for instance, we find the following advice:

Richness of expression involves synonyms ... metaphor, variation in word form, equivalence, and other similar methods of diversifying diction. Richness of subject-matter involves the assembling, explaining, and amplifying of arguments by the use of examples, comparisons, similarities, dissimilarities, opposites, and other like procedures.¹²¹

It is this type of “richness of expression,” inflated and exaggerated, sometimes real, often not, as well as the highlighting of “similarities,” that not only seems to characterize Greene’s comments on Marlowe and Shakespeare, but also colours a great deal of his other writings, including his first published work, *Mamillia*.¹²² Chettle, on the other hand, resorts to the “dissimilarities” and “opposites” between Marlowe and Shakespeare in his so-called apology.

Greene’s work in the theatre and as a writer of poems and pamphlets was as prolific as it was popular, including early prose works, his later somewhat successful poems and plays, and his final, often-bitter repentance pieces. Our focus, however, will only be on the works where Greene refers to or borrows from Marlowe, Shakespeare, or both. Greene’s notoriety, in part, allowed him to make a living through his writing, and to become a kind of “patronless, proto-bohemian,” according to the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, and one of the first London-based authors to survive by his pen alone. Writing in a number of genres, and providing the public with whatever the changing tastes of literary

London demanded, Greene’s most popular works included such dramas as *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* (1589) and *Orlando Furioso* (1594).¹²³ But Greene could never achieve the status he desired. Like a player king with a cardboard crown, Greene attempted to perform a role just outside his range, and the performance was as transparent as it was tragic; it was also clear he was borrowing from more successful playwrights.

One of Greene’s often-cited dramas remains *The Comical History of Alphonsus, King of Aragon*, which, according to most critics, borrowed heavily from *Tamburlaine*, resulting in its “nearly parodic depiction of the overreacher” in Marlowe’s play,¹²⁴ and, for some, a “Marlovian imitation from beginning to end”¹²⁵. But Greene’s work, while it featured an overreacher not unlike Marlowe’s tyrant, failed to measure up to its predecessor’s work, in part because his protagonist becomes a moral example, an extended *exemplum*. Its conclusion rings more like a “chivalric romance”¹²⁶ than a tragedy of epic proportions, as the play ends with a marriage which overshadows any notion of the conquering hero. Not unlike Greene’s other works, the moral implications of such a tidy ending are evident. Even though Alphonsus has strayed from the correct course of conduct for a ruler, in the end he converts to better behaviour both to women and in war. We also discover, conveniently enough, that unlike *Tamburlaine*, Alphonsus is royal by birth and blood, although like *Tamburlaine, Part One*, both plays also promise a sequel. While Marlowe’s success demanded a second play, there is certainly no account of any contemporaries clamouring for a follow-up from Greene.

In Greene’s play, political order is ultimately restored, the hero gets the girl, and viewers leave the theatre feeling that good has triumphed over evil. While Irving Ribner posits that Greene “must have [been] repelled” by Marlowe’s play,¹²⁷ I believe Greene was attracted to aspects of it, obviously borrowing stylistically more than philosophically. If Ribner is right to claim that Greene’s play responds to “Marlowe’s irreverence” in matters theological and political,¹²⁸ he concludes, too simplistically, that Greene’s conservative portrayal of events paralleled “the orthodox views dear to most Elizabethans.”¹²⁹

Greene was obviously offended by the critical comparisons that denigrated his version, and he seems to have never quite forgiven Marlowe for being the better playwright; *Tamburlaine* became, as we already know, one of the most successful of all Elizabethan plays, while *Alphonsus* sunk into near oblivion, weighted down by a bombast that could not match *Tamburlaine*’s brilliant boasting. Following the failure

of this play, Greene turned to more romantic comedies, in which he achieved some success. He did not, however, go gently into this new genre, for in the preface to *Perimedes the Blacke-Smith*, published the following year (1588), Greene explained that he had abandoned tragedy, in part, because of the criticism of other writers who used Greene's own words against him, claiming that Greene "could not make [his] verses jet upon the stage in tragical buskins ... daring God out of heaven with that atheist Tamburlaine" (7:7–8). This compressed reference to Marlowe's character, both literary and personal, ushered in a critical commonplace connecting the poet with his creations, a practice still in place today.

Four years later, Greene was lying on his death bed supposedly completing his infamous *Groats-worth of Wit*, a rhetorical work which "needs slow digestion,"¹³⁰ according to Anthony Burgess,¹³¹ and it is to this document we will now turn our attention, specifically to the debate over the authorship of the work. Following John Jowett's convincing essay in 1993 positing Chettle as the "main" author of *Groats-worth*, recent critics, including Katherine Duncan-Jones in 2011, refer to the work as authored by "'Greene'/Chettle."¹³² Borrowing from Foucault's and Barthes' notion of the "death of the author," Steve Mentz demonstrates how the "lack of precise knowledge" of the specific author of *Groats-worth* may be used as "an analytical opportunity" in this collaboration "between a living author who claims to be merely an editor (Chettle) and a dead author whose role cannot be firmly fixed."¹³³ I would agree that the narrative sounds like Greene, even if it is not completely penned by him, so I will use his name in quotation marks when referring to the author of *Groats-Worth* specifically.

The work begins with a semi-autobiographical tale of Roberto, clearly Greene himself, who seems to personify the "alienated intellectual"¹³⁴ of the time, a university-trained scholar who now must depend on the kindness of a passing stranger, who turns out to be a very successful actor-shareholder. Sound familiar? Roberto's tale fits the Prodigal exemplum perfectly. After taking up the Player's offer to write for his troupe in the city, Roberto quickly rises to prominence as an "Arch-playmaking-poet,"¹³⁵ however, the tale fast-forwards and he is now dying of "dropsy, and the loathsome scourge of lust," with "but one groat left."¹³⁶ "Greene" then interrupts the tale to admit to his readers, "Hereafter suppose me the said Roberto," and then proceeds to send the other playwrights "his groats-worth of wit," the four-penny piece being all he has left to his name, and so "by his repentance endeavor to do all men good."¹³⁷

But "Greene" breaks off this story to insert an epistle directed toward other playwrights. He begins by addressing, "those Gentlemen, his Quondam [former] acquaintance, that spend their wits in making plays," claiming he, the author, desires "a better exercise, and wisdom" for the three, most likely Marlowe, Thomas Nashe, and George Peele,¹³⁸ "to prevent [his own] extremities."¹³⁹ "If woeful experience may move you (gentlemen) to beware, or unheard-of wretchedness entreat you to take heed," he continues, he does "not doubt that they will look back with sorrow on [their] time past, and endeavor with repentance to spend that which is to come."¹⁴⁰ In other words, "Greene" may be suggesting that the other university-educated playwrights abandon the stage and turn to more moral and cultural pursuits, but he is surely saying they have been humiliated by writing for the stage and been used by players, the former now reduced to poverty, the latter now wealthy and well known.

Turning his attention to the writers individually, "Greene" begins with Marlowe, to whom he devotes over a quarter of the letter (37 out of 129 lines), and whom he grudgingly calls the "famous gracer of Tragedians."¹⁴¹ Admitting that he too, like Marlowe, "hath said" that "[t]here is no God," the writer asks Marlowe, "Why should thy excellent wit, His gift, be so blinded, that thou shouldst give no glory to the Giver," and wonders whether it is "pestilent Machiavellian policy that thou hast studied," before proclaiming "O peevish folly!"¹⁴² As David Riggs explains, "this thinly disguised" reference to Marlowe, whether penned by Robert Greene or not, clearly put the former "in harm's way" for its accusation of atheism.¹⁴³

Yet, this particular warning, which quickly swerves into insult, seems as much a psychological projection as a serious claim, for Greene himself was often accused of the same irreverent, if not blasphemous, behavior. Witness, for instance, Gabriel Harvey's elaborate denunciation of Greene. Who "in London hath not heard," Harvey begins, of Greene's "dissolute, and licentious liuing; his fonde disguisinge of a Master of Arte with ruffianly hair, vnseemly apparel, and more vnseemly Company; ... his monstrous swearinge [... and] his impious profaning of sacred Textes" as well as "his infamous resorting to the Banckside, Shorditch, Southwarke, and other filthy haunts?"¹⁴⁴ The most important point here, of course, is that "Greene's" supposed interpretation of Marlowe's actions is clearly shaped by Greene's personal manners as well as his professional milieu.

The writer of *Groats-worth* continues, “Base minded men all three of you, if by my misery ye be not warned,” regarding “those puppets, (I mean) that speak from our mouths, those Anticks garnished in our colours.”¹⁴⁵ In other words, these opening lines of the work insult performers as mere “Puppets” and “Anticks” who gain their signification only when “garnisht” with the “colours” of the playwrights. Since “antics” were the buffoon clown actors, the insult suggests that the University Wits are the real artists by filling up the actors’ empty forms with substance, including, in Allen Carroll’s description, “figures,” “ornaments” or “rhetorical modes” they had learned during their education. In other words, these lowly actors have been gussied up, not only in “make-up or costumes,” but also in speech, by the direction of the playwrights in charge.¹⁴⁶ He then moves into the most famous lines in the text: “Yes, trust them not: for there is an upstart Crow, beautified with our feathers, that with his *Tyger’s heart wrapt in a Player’s hyde*, supposes he is as well able to bombast out a blank verse as the best of you: and being an absolute *Johannes factotum*,¹⁴⁷ is in his own conceit the only *Shake-scene* in a country,” and he concludes by pleading that the three employ their “rare wits to be imploied [sic] in more profitable courses.”¹⁴⁸

So the relationship here is couched in an “us” (the University Wits) versus “them” (actors and provincial playwrights) attitude, with Greene aligning himself with the underpaid and underemployed “fellow scholars about this city” rather than jack-of-all-trades such as Shakespeare.¹⁴⁹ But as James Shapiro has noted, though the tract was “intended as invective,” the very mention of Shakespeare shows just “how great a threat the young actor was becoming to the leading dramatists of the day,” including Marlowe. Indeed, as Shapiro concludes, the work “nicely illustrates the way in which parodic attempts [Greene’s single line adaptation of Queen Margaret’s speech in *3 HVT*] to contain a rival can boomerang, serving instead to confirm and legitimate the target of parody.”¹⁵⁰ Greene was obviously no Shakespeare, but the idea of parody, imitation, and even emulation would color many contemporaries’ comparisons when surveying the significant playwrights of the day.

The final two lines twist and transform Shakespeare’s name into “Shake-scene” but not before the attack paints this upstart player/playwright as a *Johannes factotum*, most often glossed as a “jack-of-all trades”; according to the *OED*; however, at the time Greene was writing, the phrase also meant “a would-be universal genius.”¹⁵¹ Equally significant, but less discussed, is that “a factotum is and was a printing term for

an ornamental surround that will take any capital letter in its middle,” according to John Jowett. If we apply this notion to “Greene’s” attack, he seems to call Shakespeare a person who is “impressively ornamental and very versatile, but empty within and incapable of textual signification.”¹⁵² But it also suggests a printer’s knowledge of such tools of the trade, and so may point away from Greene and towards Chettle as the composer. In any event, we will now focus on the printing and compositing of the work vis-a-vis the message, authorship, and rhetorical design of the insult in order to illuminate our understanding of its widespread impact, if not of its specific intent, which may never be perfectly clear.

Although the details of Greene’s legendary mention of Shakespeare and Marlowe seem too entrenched in Shakespeare lore to be widely dismissed, we need to carefully consider the printing process of this work. As noted earlier, following Greene’s death, publication fell to Henry Chettle, who prepared a fair copy of the pamphlet for printing. Chettle, a “real *Johannes factotum* of the book trade, ready to write, print, play-make or do anything else with words to make money,”¹⁵³ was born into a family of dyers, and he was apprenticed to the trade in 1577.

In 1591, however, he entered into a business relationship with William Hoskins and John Danter, both stationers. The emergence of the stationers and their trade is crucial in considering this mystery, for their occupation was exploding on par with that of the theatrical world. For instance, in 1564, the year of Shakespeare’s birth, ninety-three printed titles are listed in the Stationers’ Register; by 1592, the year of *Groats-worth*, the number had more than tripled to 294.¹⁵⁴ The group employed by Danter published a number of ballads, a few dramas, including an error-riddled version of the first quarto of *Romeo and Juliet*, as well as other tracts and pamphlets. We also know that Chettle was paid by Philip Henslowe for working on at least three dozen plays between 1598 and 1603, all but a dozen with collaborators, and only one actually published. As we shall see, the symbiotic relationship between playwriting and publishing was enhanced by rhetorical flourishes on both sides.

Danter’s background and negative reputation is also important here, for it adds to the possibility of mischief, or, perhaps, malpractice, in the printing of “Greene’s” work. Although numerous critics have denounced Danter, including A. W. Pollard and W. W. Greg,¹⁵⁵ we may have Danter to thank for publishing *Titus Andronicus* on 6 February 1594,¹⁵⁶ and he seems to have printed works by Lodge, Robert Wilson, and George Peele among others. His notoriety lies with his printing of the so-called

bad quarto (Q1) of *Romeo and Juliet*, most likely a memorial reconstruction. Yet, Greg seems to go too far when he claims “Danter’s short career is nothing but a record of piracy and secret printing,” for it is worth remembering, as Leo Kirschbaum points out, that Danter’s “piracies were against the constantly hated and violated monopolies of the time.”¹⁵⁷ Danter was also the publisher of choice for more popular, if less highbrow, forms of writing, including pamphlets, ballads, and other sensationalist literature; he also “proved very useful to certain needy struggling writers,” including Greene, when they were forced by circumstances to churn out short pieces for quick money.¹⁵⁸ But in spite of Danter’s negative reputation which has come down to us, he does not seem “to have been more unscrupulous than other publishers” of the time.¹⁵⁹

The partnership of Chettle, Danter, and Hoskins probably ended in 1597, when Danter’s shop was raided by the authorities and his presses destroyed, although their association was strained long before that time. In April of that year, his printing machines and pica letters were ordered to be defaced after being seized by government officials.¹⁶⁰ However, the raid was not due to piracy of any sort, but instead resulted from Danter’s printing of an unauthorized Catholic tract, the *Jesus Psalter*. Yet, because this is the same year as the printing of the “bad” quarto of *Romeo and Juliet*, some critics equate the closure of his press with some so-called piracy. It seems that both he and Chettle have suffered from many false accusations, and, like the notion that Robert Greene solely, and resentfully, penned *Groats-worth*, such legends need to be examined for accuracy and then modified if necessary. Like hearing a familiar tune sung with new words, these interpretations may at first sound discordant; yet a careful listening of the entire score may reveal novel notes of interest and importance.

Until the later twentieth century, most critics simply assumed that Greene was the sole author of this important work. And many critics still follow that party line, usually with some mild qualifications. The chorus of dissenters, however, has grown more vocal, so much so that most scholars now fall into one of three camps: the first believe it was Greene’s work in essence and purport, even if Chettle did edit it; the second camp, led by Warren B. Austin, and then supported by John Jowett, think that Chettle is the sole author, and they detect only minor residual utterances from Greene’s pen; others, such as David Bevington, take a position somewhere in between.¹⁶¹

Austin's 1969 work, entitled *A Computer-Aided Technique for Stylistic Distinction: The Authorship of "Greene's Groats-worth of Wit,"* was not widely published and was also challenged immediately by the old guard. R. L. Widmann, writing in *Shakespeare Quarterly* in 1972, for example, concluded that Austin's study was "ultimately unconvincing."¹⁶² As early as 1973, however, Richard Proudfoot partly sided with Austin in his piece in *Shakespeare Survey* 26: "The linguistic facts revealed by Austin's study are open to more than one construction," Proudfoot concluded, and so "Chettle's revision may virtually have constituted authorship (or at least co-authorship) without carrying the implications of fraud or imposture alleged by Austin."¹⁶³

In 1993, Jowett defended and extended Austin's analysis, his essay becoming the foundation for those who follow this argument, including Duncan-Jones, who had argued that Nashe was the author in 2001, but was later so convinced by Jowett's evidence that she reversed her opinion, claiming that Jowett had "conclusively demonstrated that Chettle was the true author of the epistle."¹⁶⁴ While I do not wholeheartedly agree with her assessment, I do agree with her recent characterization of Greene as being "posthumously ventriloquised by Chettle."¹⁶⁵ My stance is that some sort of collaboration between playwright and printer occurred, even if Chettle was just voicing Robert Greene's supposed feelings and "seething resentments," as Greenblatt suggests.¹⁶⁶ Yet many biographers of Shakespeare and Marlowe hardly grant even that possibility.¹⁶⁷ In any case, a fact that almost all critics fail to consider is that the very stylistic similarities that cause such confusion over the authorship point to a larger contextual connection in the use of rhetorical devices employed by Greene, Chettle, and almost all other writers of the day.

In the years just preceding its publication, Chettle seems to have turned most of his attention to literary pursuits, and since Danter had set up another print shop in Duck Lane in late 1591, it would make sense that Chettle was now working as a kind of free agent or journeyman printer, particularly considering a legal dispute between Danter and Chettle in 1592–1593.¹⁶⁸ While we have no other details of the quarrel, we do know that shortly after, in the fall of 1593, Chettle published *Groats-worth*, inscribed with the following: "Entered for his copie, under master watkins hande vppon the perill of Henrye Chettle."¹⁶⁹ As Harold Jenkins has pointed out, because "it was entered at Chettle's risk, it seems more likely that he prepared it for the press out of friendship for Greene than as a commission for the publisher."¹⁷⁰ But it is probably

worth recalling that Jenkins was making this claim in the first third of the twentieth century, when giving one's subject the benefit of the doubt was considered the most mannerly way to write a biography. I would suspect, instead, that Chettle was seeking money as well as attention, and he now possessed a "book in Greene's name," which already made it very marketable, but the content and timing made it even more scandalous: "piping hot stuff, straight from the grave in Bedlam churchyard."¹⁷¹ While he may not have ever received much in the way of payment for the project, he garnered quite a bit of interest in the publication, as notice seems to have turned into notoriety.

Whatever the motivation for publishing the work, *Groats-worth* seems to have circulated quickly and widely, moving with mercurial speed through the London public theatrical scene. Soon after, Shakespeare, and perhaps Marlowe as well, must have complained in some way about the attack in a manner which compelled Chettle to affix a note to his next drama clarifying his intent when publishing the pamphlet. Before we get to his note, however, it is worth considering briefly the timing of the publication along with its material production. As noted earlier, the playhouses had been closed due to plague, so the normal commotion of the printing houses may also have been somewhat stilled. This symbiotic connection between the two institutions, particularly the way in which it affects the printing and circulation of the *Groats-worth* manuscript (whoever actually authored it), remains a critical component of the work, so we will use a wider contextual lens before narrowing the focus to details of the text itself.

The desire for monetary rewards prompted the publication of pamphlets, particularly when a bookseller hoped to produce "journalistic capital" on a piece such as *Groats-worth*, which depended in part on its connection with the theatres.¹⁷² The Stationers' Company, which controlled all this traffic, had been granted a royal charter in 1557, and these "bookmen of the city banded together" in such a fashion that by 1559, they were granted the right to wear "their own distinctive livery" as their profession expanded.¹⁷³ But this institutionalization was just the culminating moment for a trade which had been in place for a number of decades. Also highlighting the connection between print and performance spaces, Jowett explains that professional theatrical activity and printing activity cross-fertilized one another, giving "rise to opportunities in the field of publication," particularly for the "intellectual underemployment in London," the same group I have been referring to as the "alienated

intellectuals.”¹⁷⁴ Since the printing of plays, or even related documents, “had the potential to lift the dramatist out of anonymity,” whether for better or worse, it soon became apparent that the “market conditions dictated by the theatre might be resisted by the common interests of dramatists and stationers.”¹⁷⁵ Poets, players, and printers, as well as their motivations, manners, and methods, can hardly be cordoned off from one another despite the historical attempts to separate those working on wooden stages from those printing paper pages.

But how does all this background bear on *Groats-worth*? While it may be nearly impossible to imagine how marketable this document must have seemed, when we recall that Danter had been offered a sensationalist tract, allegedly written on the deathbed by a notorious playwright, which chastises a relative newcomer to the London scene, we sense its blockbuster potential. As if the deathbed confession were not enough, the pamphlet goes on to smear one of the most well-known playwrights of the last decade, one whose protagonist Tamburlaine was imitated, quoted, revised, and continually reenacted, as Richard Levin has shown (1984). One can only speculate on the demand to buy, then to read (or hear it read aloud) this salacious document, before passing it along. Even more fortuitous for Danter, the alleged author was dead, so libel charges were also not an issue.

While the cost of the pamphlet is hard to gauge, it must have been affordable for many, so it was probably priced somewhere between the one-sheet ballads that sold for a penny and the “single plays published in quarto or octavo format” which sold for six times that amount.¹⁷⁶ Using figures for other first printings of the time, we can also assume that about 500 copies of the tract were first published, a number that Park Honan also posits.¹⁷⁷ In any case, people seem to have crowded into shops to purchase it, for it had to be reprinted in 1596 to keep up with demand. I think it is safe to speculate that almost all of them were at least aware of this “deathbed” document. In fact, with these figures in hand, we can understand why it took Chettle nearly three months to compose a response to attach to his next publication, which may also explain why it took so long before the apology was printed.

One other overlooked aspect of *Groats-worth*'s appeal lay in its sensational matter and hearsay reports. While we may think of bookshops as literary and intellectual, Gary Taylor concludes that in actuality “men went to bookshops to gossip with other men.”¹⁷⁸ In many cases, these men must have been employees of the theatres, as they would

be interested in what was being printed for and about their colleagues. Moreover, as Astington points out, “Gossip [was] one leading off stage activity of actors and their circle.”¹⁷⁹ If there is one early modern document chock full of gossip, it is *Groats-worth*, and like the other fetishized, exotic commodities stocked on the booksellers’ shelves, this one created desire as much as it sated it, once again articulating the connection between print and performance.

In the “Preface” to *Kind-Heart’s Dream* (1592), Chettle not only identifies the aggrieved parties, but he also characterizes the playwrights who may have been offended, specifically Marlowe and Shakespeare, offering an apology (although a muted one in Marlowe’s case) for printing the work. Feebly explaining the circumstances for how the document came into his hands, Chettle declares that Greene had left “many papers in sundry Booke sellers hands,” including his *Groats-worth*. Chettle then details his role in the work:

To be brief, I writ it over, and, as neare as I could, followed the copy [of Greene’s handwritten version], only in that letter I put something out, but in the whole booke not a word in, for I protest it was all Greene’s, not mine nor Master Nashes [Thomas Nashe] as some unjustly have affirmed.¹⁸⁰

What this seems to suggest is that while Chettle admits to having a hand in censoring part of the attached letter, he protests that he did not compose or alter a single word of the pamphlet itself. Harold Jenkins interprets this passage as meaning that the “offensive pamphlet is none of his work” and Chettle “contributed nothing to it.” In fact, all he did was “to provide a fair copy for the press, because Greene’s hand was often illegible,” and so it could not be printed if it could not be read.¹⁸¹ For centuries, this alleged admission that Greene’s handwriting was so poor that Chettle copied it over before setting it in type, hardened into truth (although the fact that it took over two weeks for a mere word-for-word transcription of *Groats-worth* before it was registered should have raised some suspicion). But just as cold-case murders are now solved with emerging DNA testing, the computer-enhanced work done by Austin and Jowett disputed such a simplistic conclusion.

The rest of the affixed apology needs to be repeated in detail, not only to hear its rhetorical emphasis, but also to see the way in which the “character” of Marlowe and Shakespeare is initially constructed:

About three months since died M. Robert Greene, leaving many papers in sundry Booke sellers hands, among other his Groats-worth of wit, in which, a letter written to divers play-makers, is offensively by one or two of them taken, and because on the dead they can-not be avenged, they wilfully forge in their conceits a living author: and after tossing it to and fro no remedy, but it must light on me. How I have, all the time of my conu-ersing in printing, hindered the bitter inveighing against scholars, it hath been very well known, and how in that I dealt I can sufficiently prove.¹⁸²

So at this point we hear Chettle protesting too much, one might think, but it is also important that he calls the two “play-makers” and not writers, poets, and certainly not “players.” This then suggests to most that by the time of *Kind-Heart*, not only Marlowe but also Shakespeare had been writing for the stage long enough for readers to catch the allusion to them. Chettle then continues with his complex response, but this time, Shakespeare and Marlowe are set in opposition to one another:

With neither of them that take offence was I acquainted, and with one of them I care not if I never be: the other, whom at that time I did not so much spare, as since I wish I had, for that as I have moderated the heate of living writers, and might have used my own discretion (especially in such a case) as the author being dead, that I did not, I am as sorry, as if the original fault had been my fault, because myself have seen his demeanor no less civil than he excellent in the quality he possesses: besides, divers of worship have reported his uprightness of dealing, which argues his honesty, and his facetious grace in writing, that approves his art.¹⁸³

Chettle goes on to note that he has modified his own earlier opinion of the still-living playwright. He is not only “sorry,” as “if the original fault” had been his own (which we now agree is a distinct possibility), but he adds, it is “very well known” and Chettle “can sufficiently prove” that he has always respected writers. More specifically, he proclaims that during “all the time of [his] conversing in printing,” he has “hindered the bitter inveighing against scholars,” that others in his trade have continued to do.¹⁸⁴ Hiding behind the ornamental skills he knew so well, this “oily, self-righteous, and side-stepping apology”¹⁸⁵ seems to clarify little, raising more questions than it answers.

The relation between these two pieces of prose, *Groats-worth* and the Preface to *Kind-Heart’s Dream* remains unstable, although some scholars, such as James Shapiro, have tried to simplify the divergent views:

“Greene’s and Chettle’s veiled remarks offer strikingly alternative views,” claims Shapiro, as “Marlowe is described by Greene as a leading and influential dramatist” yet “Chettle would prefer not to associate with his kind.”¹⁸⁶ Moreover, Greene’s Shakespeare “is a rapacious imitator, whereas Chettle’s is ‘upright’ and ‘honest.’”¹⁸⁷ I would argue, however, that both works, scripted by the same person or not, share one important similarity overlooked in every account of the two pieces: that of employing the rhetorical device of similitude to extend and expand the debate over the two emergent playwrights, in an attempt to classify and begin to solidify their public reputation. I would also claim that since there were at least two other playwrights alluded to in the letter in *Groats-worth*, it seems apparent that Chettle’s mention of only two who take “offense” does not mean that Nashe and Peele were not offended; what it does signal is the fact that our Marlowe and Shakespeare have risen above the other writers in prominence constituting a class of their own, for only they need to be addressed by Chettle. His praise of Shakespeare’s character and his dismissal of Marlowe’s also introduces elements that would come to be part of the critical distinction between the two, not only the civil Shakespeare set in opposition to the ill-mannered Marlowe, but also the high astounding rhetorical terms that critics would continue to use in comparing the two.

Chettle’s “apology” also seems self-serving, for I believe he was shoring up his own precarious position as printer cum playwright¹⁸⁸ by complimenting the rising star of Shakespeare, and also by appealing, perhaps, to one of the many theatrical employers at the time, Philip Henslowe. In fact, since Chettle is retained by Henslowe about 6 years later (and is mentioned in Henslowe’s *Diary* in connection with some forty-nine plays), it may be that one of the “divers of worship” was employing Henslowe himself, a possibility that seems more likely with recent research that shows that Henslowe’s “active court service began around 1592 and extended to 1611.”¹⁸⁹

The take-away from these details proves that Chettle’s mention of the connection between Marlowe and Shakespeare says as much about Chettle as it does the playwrights. Moreover, the self-promotion for his personal writing venture via his construction of the two playwrights seems to have caught someone’s attention in the theatrical world, for he began to compose plays as well. Perhaps Chettle’s ability to imitate another’s writing suggested to Henslowe how well he might serve as a “play-patcher,” so in that sense *Groats-worth* may have served as his

audition piece. Chettle went on to compose a dozen or so plays by himself (although only *The Tragedy of Hoffman* was ever actually printed). Toward the close of the century, however, his work must have been well known by his contemporaries, for he is singled out in 1598 as “one of the best” English writers “for Comedy” in the next work we shall examine.

2.4 LOCATING THE ENGLISH CANON: MERES, STOW, AND THE MAPPING OF LITERARY LONDON

The document that praises Chettle also contains the next significant mention of Shakespeare and Marlowe. The Stationers’ Register must have been a busy place in 1598, for not only did Francis Meres publish his important work entitled *Palladis Tamia, Wits Treasury*, a culminating work on the relationship between the two dramatists both because of its date at the close of the century, and its use of rhetorical devices, but in the same year, John Stow, “the fee’d chronicler,” produced his topographical work, *The Survey of London*. Even though much critical work has focused on the two publications,¹⁹⁰ no one has set them in relief as parallel works mapping out the cultural contours of Elizabethan London.

Before focusing solely on Meres’s comments on the playwrights, I show how Meres and Stow both employ similar rhetoric—particularly comparative discourse—analysis, and evaluative summaries, in order to produce an emerging portrait of literary, dramatic, and geographical space in Elizabethan London. While only Meres mentions our two playwrights by name (although almost every edition of Stow since at least 1842 mentions Shakespeare on the first page of any “Preface,” as do most subsequent editions of Meres),¹⁹¹ Stow obliquely mentions them by referencing the Curtain and The Theatre in Shoreditch where their first plays were produced.¹⁹² Moreover, we are almost certain that Marlowe consulted Stow’s earlier work, *The Annales of England ... until 1592*, when composing *Edward II*,¹⁹³ so this quartet of writers, two creative and two critical, seem instrumental in mapping a new English identity toward the end of the century, one built literarily on Roman remains, the other rhetorically on classical authors. What they both eventually demonstrate is a bifurcated notion of authority, which also impacts personal space and public identity: for Stow, the newly empowered citizens chafe against the residual monarchical powers; for Meres, ancient

precepts and examples of literary convention challenge modern ideas and current practitioners. By employing a kind of cross-fertilization between old and new ideologies and topographies,¹⁹⁴ both works contribute to a new literary landscape where writers for the public playhouse, particularly Marlowe and Shakespeare, could flourish by transforming historical accounts into performances designed to please a variegated audience, some seeking to find an identity rooted in their common ancestry.

The backgrounds of Meres and Stow, however, were less similar than the effects their works produced, but even this difference suggests the collapsing notions of hierarchy and privilege. Both a writer and translator, Meres came from a family which seems to have been quite influential in the local region of Lincolnshire. After being granted a BA from Pembroke College, Cambridge, in 1587, he completed his MA in 1591. In 1593 he received an MA from Oxford, and he often referred to himself as “Maister of Arts in both Universities” on the title pages of numerous books. Stow, on the other hand, although originally admitted to the Merchant Taylors’ Company in 1547, in a stint of serious self-education on London’s history, became close associates with William Camden and other important “antiquarians” of the era sometime before 1561 when he published his first work, *The Woorkes of Geffry Chaucer*.¹⁹⁵ One of his other associates was William Fleetwood, the City Recorder of London, and Stow “likely gained access to the London records through his association” with him, an admittance absolutely necessary for the compilation of his book.¹⁹⁶ In both cases, the works clearly respond to the transformation of time and space in the land and in the letters of contemporary London, and both move away from any chronicle tradition of great men.¹⁹⁷

The rhetorical emphasis we have been tracing throughout the Chapter is also employed by both writers, and we will return to Meres’s more specific use of it with Marlowe and Shakespeare shortly. In general terms, he used numerous similitudes, and even in the dedication of *Palladis Tamia* to Thomas Eliot, he highlights his rhetorical devices, declaring “all the force of wit flows within three channels,” those of “A Sentence, a Similitude, and an Example.” Stow’s dedication to the Lord Mayor of London, someone with a provisional title instead of an inherited one, also employed “various textual framing devices, such as a title page, dedicatory letter, marginalia, and appendices” to “serve as demarcations of representational space depicting a map-like layout.”¹⁹⁸ Stow’s *Survey* also borrows from a classical topographical source, the “Aphthonian rhetorical scheme,” an ancient method of transferring praise from nobles to a

praise of a city itself, so that the “city’s physical features were like those of a person’s body, worthy citizens were a city’s equivalent to the worthy offspring of noble parents.”¹⁹⁹

The central rhetorical connection between the two works is the use of “comparative discourse,” mainly in measuring the ancients against the early modern inhabitants of London, but also in the medieval practice of “heaping up authorities”²⁰⁰ in order to support some weighty point. Meres’s work, subtitled *Wit’s Treasury*, first lists alphabetically on its opening pages “The Authors both sacred and profane, out of which the similitudes are for the most part gathered,”²⁰¹ and the comparisons rarely let up: “As *Homer* is reputed the Prince of Greek Poets; and *Petrarch* of Italian Poets; so *Chaucer* is accounted the God of English Poets,”²⁰² and so forth. Stow calls a final section which he appended to his book “A Discourse of the Names and First Causes of the Institution of Cities and Peopled Towns,” and the work goes on to connect such cityscapes in Rome and Greece with his Elizabethan London.²⁰³ The writer also quotes from “one or two ancient foreign writers” in this section, including Tacitus and Herodian.²⁰⁴

Interestingly and understandably, recent critics have also resorted to a type of “comparative discourse” when considering the two writers and their work. Greenblatt, for example, refers to Meres as “[s]urveying the theatre;”²⁰⁵ Stow’s “survey,” on the other hand, has been deemed “an extensive memory theatre,” and his portrait of the city, “a dramaturgical creation,”²⁰⁶ while his overarching aversion focuses on the “manipulative theatricality” of public practices and daily life.²⁰⁷

For the moment, however, we must focus our attention only on Meres’s work. After graduation, he moved to London and began to associate with the students at the Middle Temple, one of the city’s most famous law schools (as well as the site for the first documented performance of *Twelfth Night*). During this time, he published his first work, “God’s Arithmetick,” a thirty-six page didactic prose piece. Two years later, Meres began to translate religious tracts by Luis de Granada from their Spanish originals, including “The Sinner’s Guyde” and “Granados Devotion.” In both of these works, we see his use of rhetorical devices such as metaphor and similitude which he would have learned, of course, both in grammar school and at the university, to such a degree that Schoenbaum describes him simply as a “writer of euphuistic tendencies,” learned in part from John Lyly.²⁰⁸ Even more significant, at this same time Meres became an inveterate playgoer, critiquing and commenting on plays.

Meres's work achieves a new level of rhetorical ornament, however, when he uses hyperbole to praise and compare Shakespeare and Marlowe (who he also censures) in *Palladis Tamia*. The book begins by using similes to compare the spiritual world with the natural one, but he also incorporates chapters on "The Soul" (48), "The Mind" (50), "Conscience" (55), "Good Men" (38), "Wicked and Ungodly Men" (40), and "Women" (55). As Foucault reminds us, until "the end of the sixteenth century, resemblance played a constructive role in the knowledge of Western culture [, and it] was resemblance that largely guided exegesis and the interpretation of texts."²⁰⁹ It makes sense, then, that Meres turns to "resemblance" as a prominent pattern for this book.

Meres's writing was praised by other writers of note in his day, including Thomas Heywood who refers to Meres in his "Apology for Actors" as "an approved good scholar" and also judges his "account of authors" to be "learnedly done,"²¹⁰ even though some twentieth-century scholarship has challenged Mere's erudition.²¹¹ Although on the surface it would seem Meres had a great deal of classical knowledge, and we would assume from his education that he would know a great deal about ancient as well as modern authors, recent critics have pointed out how much he relied on other authors to produce his book. Erasmus via John Lyly, for instance, is copied nearly word-for-word, albeit in an English translation of Erasmus's Latin versions. Even this criticism, however, does not diminish my argument, for Meres's pronouncements on Marlowe and Shakespeare remain important, more for their subsequent import than for their alleged originality, the latter not necessarily valorized at the time.

The most significant section comes close to the end of the work and is entitled "A comparative discourse of our English poets, with the Greek, Latin, and Italian Poets," where Meres uses analogous pairings throughout this section. MacDonald P. Jackson elaborates on the method and the overall effect of the "comparative discourse" segment. While Jackson also notes that Meres's comparisons are "organized as a series of 'similitudes' between the writers of antiquity and those of contemporary England," his more important claim is that the listings also became one of the "first 'evaluative survey[s]' of Elizabethan literature,"²¹² a forerunner of the type of survey I focus on in Chap. 4. Beginning with Chaucer, Meres pairs the English poets with their ancient counterparts in numerous genres, including elegy, poetry, and play writing.

While admitting that the project borrows from works such as George Puttenham’s *The Art of English Poetrie* (1589) and Sir Philip Sidney’s *Apologie for Poetrie* (1595), I would side with those critics who suggest it goes beyond these earlier works. For instance, both Andrew Gurr and Katherine Duncan-Jones also single out Meres as an important observer of theatrical productions. Gurr cites Meres in his list of documented playgoers, mainly due to his mention of a number of Shakespeare’s plays that were not in print when *Palladis Tamia* was published, including, most “notably,” according to Gurr, “*The Two Gentleman of Verona*, *The Comedy of Errors*, *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* and *King John*.”²¹³

Duncan-Jones goes even further, claiming Meres was “a particularly attentive playgoer,” who may have even “made notes while in the theatre.”²¹⁴ She then turns her attention to a section from Meres’s earlier discussion of “Women” in *Palladis Tamia* which seems to borrow from Meres’s personal observations in the theatre. For example, he writes the following in his similitude on female suicide: “As trusty *Thisby* did gore her gorgeous body with the same sword, wherewith princely *Pyramus* had pricked himself to the heart: so true hearted *Juliet* did die upon the corpse of her dearest *Romeo*.”²¹⁵ The language of the first observation leaves “no doubt,” according to Duncan-Jones, that Meres is referring to Shakespeare’s play-within-a-play in a *Midsummer Night’s Dream*, not only because the phrase “trusty Thisbe” (5.1.139) is spoken by Peter Quince in the burlesque’s Prologue, but also because this wording is never mentioned in any ancient sources that Meres may have consulted. Moreover, Meres’s alliteration, including “gore” and “gorgeous,” as well as his line “Princely Pyramus had pricked,” should be viewed, according to Duncan-Jones, as a “creative response” to the “old-fashioned alliterative style” of the parody.²¹⁶ While I agree with Duncan-Jones in principle about his playgoing, I would hasten to add that Meres’s use of alliteration was a device also learned during his traditional rhetorical training in ornamental devices.

Even though most literary scholars are aware of the Shakespearean pronouncements in this work, it is worth reiterating them in order to see if they may enhance our vision of any distinctions between Marlowe and Shakespeare (although it would be the spirit of Marlowe’s works since he died 5 years before Meres’s publication). More significantly, Meres’s account of Marlowe’s death at the conclusion of this section of his work accelerates the emerging construction of contrasting identities,

as the Gentle Will Shakespeare is set in opposition to the controversial Kit Marlowe.

Early in the comparisons, Meres claims that just as the “Greek Tongue is made famous” by Homer, Sophocles, Pindarus, and others, and the “Latin tongue” by Virgil, Ovid, Horace, and more, so “the English tongue is mightily enriched, and gorgeously infused in rare ornaments and resplendent habiliments” by poets such as Sidney, Spenser, Drayton, Shakespeare, Marlowe, and Chapman.²¹⁷ Meres also uses similitudes to make a connection between the cultural climate of the ancients and the moderns, particularly the relationship between patrons and poets, rulers and writers. Just as “noble *Mecenas*” not only “graced Poets by his bounty, but also by being a Poet himself so *James the 6*, now king of Scotland is not only a favorer of Poets, but a Poet” as well.²¹⁸

In perhaps the most excerpted passage, Meres refers to both Shakespeare’s poetry and his play writing. As Jonathan Bate reminds us, no “other poet, either English or classical, was praised by Meres in so many different categories of writing.”²¹⁹ In poetry, Meres claims, the “sweet witty soul of Ovid lives in mellifluous & honey-tongued Shakespeare,”²²⁰ and he cites *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece* as examples.²²¹ In the same paragraph, he points out that “As Plautus and Seneca are accounted the best for Comedy and Tragedy among the Latins, so Shakespeare among the English is the most excellent in both kinds for the stage,”²²² and goes on to mention almost a dozen of Shakespeare’s plays.²²³

So Meres seems to show farsightedness in his focus on Shakespeare, and his record is invaluable for dating these dozen plays. Yet, we must remember that Meres mentions on numerous occasions other so-called lesser lights of the period, such as Michael Drayton, and Meres’s praise of Chettle is certainly suspect. This leads Schoenbaum to conclude that while Meres “has been accused of intelligence, the inclusiveness of the listings does not inspire confidence in Meres’s powers of critical discrimination.”²²⁴ As Bate points out, however, this notion can also be viewed positively, even if Meres was getting some of his information second-hand (from, say, Anthony Munday, who was a friend and collaborator, and who also published an “enlarged edition” of Stow’s *Survey* in 1618). While Meres’s “opinions were nearly all Elizabethan commonplaces,” according to Bate, it is “precisely because they are unoriginal” that they serve as “evidence of the general view of Shakespeare” and his literary

achievements by 1598. In short, only 6 years after the attack bearing Robert Greene's name, "the upstart crow had made it to the top."²²⁵

Turning his attention to Marlowe, Meres lists him as among "the best for Tragedy" in England and compares him to poets such as "Sophocles among the Greeks and Seneca among the Latins."²²⁶ But at the close of this section, Meres turns more morally judgmental and less astutely critical, particularly regarding the details surrounding Marlowe's untimely death: "As Jodelle, a French tragical poet being an Epicure, and an Atheist, made a pitiful end: for our tragical poet Marlowe for his Epicurism and Atheism had a tragical death," and he directs those who want to read more about the death to Thomas Beard's *Theatre of God's Judgments*.²²⁷ He proceeds with one final comparison regarding Marlowe's murder: "As the poet Lycophron was shot to death by a certain rival of his, so Christopher Marlowe was stabbed to death by a bawdy serving man, a rival of his lewd love."²²⁸ Meres's slandering of Marlowe, as well as his incorrect account, would be one of the first, but certainly not the last, to present Marlowe's death as a consequence of the poet's allegedly immoral behavior. His account also accords with his inclination to provide order in the world according to his moral and classical principles. Although a number of works immediately following Marlowe's death praised him, Dutton has shown how Gabriel Harvey's and then Thomas Beard's characterization of Marlowe's death as "'poetic justice' of the ungodly"²²⁹ became the norm.²³⁰

But Meres's account also brings Shakespeare and Marlowe, along with George Chapman, into the "closest possible conjunction" when he lists them as three of the seven best English writers in all genres, for Chapman is another of the usual suspects for the alleged rival poet role.²³¹ Moreover, two pages later Chapman and Marlowe are mentioned immediately after Meres refers to Shakespeare's "fine-filed phrase," and he adds that in England, Chapman and Marlowe are "excellent poets" who have written of "the love of Hero and Leander."²³² This leads Jackson to conclude, correctly I think, that Meres advanced "the notion of poetic influence ... or possession by a forerunner's spirit."²³³ In other words, Ovid's spirit guided Shakespeare to write *Venus and Adonis*, and that same muse allowed Shakespeare and his poem to surpass his rival Marlowe's *Hero and Leander* in popularity.²³⁴

In short, Meres's work accelerated the nascent critical construction of Marlowe and Shakespeare, but more importantly, his rhetorical flourishes demonstrate how similitude and examples were one of the

primary means available for the Elizabethans to organize and understand both the natural world and their critical discourse on literature. For the remainder of his life, Meres participated in such teaching and learning by being ordained a priest in 1599, and then serving as both the rector and grammar school headmaster in Wing, Rutland, for the next 45 years. It seems appropriate, then, that *Palladis Tamia* was reissued as a textbook in 1634, 13 years before his death at age eighty-one.

Returning to Stow and Meres for a moment, we might also ask how their respective writings map out a national identity, literary or otherwise. While Hugh Grady reminds us of the obvious point that *Palladis Tamia* “attempt[ed] to establish a canon of literary poets to compare with those of ancient Greece and Rome,”²³⁵ Lois Potter bluntly concludes, correctly, that “Meres’s project was essentially a patriotic one.”²³⁶ Yet in spite of their nationalistic impulse, both writers challenged traditional authority, even as they referred to ancient authors to buttress their arguments; nor did either shy away from the negative aspects of the new metropolis and its inhabitants. We have already seen how Meres did not avoid a mention of the supposed sinful end of Marlowe’s life, nor did he elide Greene’s gruesome death mentioned earlier in this chapter. “As Achilles tortured the dead body of Hector,” he writes toward the close of *Palladis Tamia*, “so Gabriel Harvey hath shewed the same inhumanity to Greene, that lies full low in his grave.”²³⁷ Stow also shows the multiple personages both good and bad from London’s history, mentioning rebel types, such as Jack Cade and “the bastard Fawconbridge,” but also highlighting Thomas a Beckett and Erkenwald, the Bishop of London for the Anglo-Saxon Christian church, the former who “had violated” the sacred space, the latter, who had “hallowed it,” according to Lawrence Manley.²³⁸

Although much thought has recently been devoted to the nascent English national identity vis-à-vis maps and topographical space,²³⁹ theoretical critics of space began such investigations decades ago. The vanguard work of Henri Lefebvre proves helpful here when plotting the two primary “movements or conditions” for nationhood. The first is an “existence of a *market* built up” over time, which develops into a “complex ensemble of commercial relations and communication networks,” even as it “subordinates the local or regional markets to the national one.”²⁴⁰ The second condition is that a “political power controlling and exploiting the resources of the market” must be in place “in order to maintain and further its rule.”²⁴¹ But the new science of cartography also

contributed to this notion, because a “map anticipated a spatial reality, not vice versa,” so that “a map was a model for, rather than a model of, what it purported to represent.”²⁴² So the combination of cartography (which virtually did not exist until 1500), on the one hand, and market forces on the other, both existed at the time we are considering in London. I would add that such notions produced a new critical space as well, one dominated by the figures of Marlowe and Shakespeare, whose alleged personal lives and literary output marked the seemingly, if not stereotypically, opposite boundaries of Elizabethan dramatic literature: one witty, intellectual, and multi-faceted, the other fevered, emotive, and singularly bombastic.

2.5 CONCLUSION: “DISLOCATION, THEN AND NOW”

While we have focused on attempts to “locate” certain aspects of the earliest critical discourses about Marlowe and Shakespeare, any attempt to arrive at a fixed conclusion must remain provisional, for any allegedly firm notions are always being dislocated even as we try to stabilize them. The same holds true for the earliest critical audiences and players. As Susan Cerasano has noted, dislocation grew to be a prominent and practical feature for the acting companies. “When we take into account elements of scheduling,” she argues, “the sense of location and (dis)location embedded within the *Diary*’s playlists reminds us that acting companies moved from the city to the court and back again,”²⁴³ in Henslowe’s own words “goinge vp & downe to the corte to grenwiche.”²⁴⁴ Claiming that by 1590 “such movement would have been part of the normal” scheduling process, Cerasano concludes that “during the period between Christmas and the celebration of Twelfth Night, the public playhouses in London simply went dark.”²⁴⁵ I would also note that even as the troupes were changing spaces, the earliest audience critics of Marlowe and Shakespeare would have likewise been dislocated from the viewing and reviewing space of the theatre during certain times of the year.

The other early critics in this chapter surely suffered from a sense of dislocation as well. Greene’s comments come as a gurgling last gasp of a dissipated and dispossessed University Wit, who rose above his so-called station as a poor sizar, but then fell back into a perilous position of debt followed by a fatal disease. In his account, the first pairing of the two in print, Shakespeare had just burst on the scene, and Greene (aided and

abetted by Chettle), appears to be siding with Marlowe against this new upstart who is rising above his betters. But the text of *Groats-worth* is also a warning to Marlowe and the other university-educated writers not to err as Greene had done. While his piece certainly seems to participate in psychological projection, his plea is ornamented, elaborated, and presented with an array of rhetorical skill, even if these flourishes were carried out by Chettle in the final published copy. And Greene's own demise at the age of thirty-four provided for his associates a living (and dying) exemplum, one of the central rhetorical devices of the age, as did his final resting place, a pauper's grave in the New Churchyard, also known as the Bedlam burial ground, far away from any sanctified ground.²⁴⁶

Chettle, who apprenticed to a trade but attempted to distance himself from this origin by rising to the level of author, initiates the process, without naming names, of contrasting "civil" Shakespeare with the unworthy (even of Chettle's friendship) Marlowe. His contribution seems mainly to be aimed at one of the "divers of worship" that could help to further his own career, although apologizing to Shakespeare, whose star was in ascendancy, would not have hurt that goal either. And there is no doubt that Philip Henslowe, who, as I have argued, was part of Chettle's main audience for the "Preface" of *Kind-Heart*, often advanced money to Chettle for his writing over a seven-year period, in an attempt to keep him out of debtors' prison,²⁴⁷ a (dis)location he constantly feared.

Meres's pronouncements, coming from a university-educated writer who seems to have spent more time at theatrical locations than at the Court,²⁴⁸ are the most well known of course (absent Greene's one-line "upstart crow" insult), and it seems safe to say that his work canonized the reading of the relationship that has come down to us today. As an educated man with a special interest in spiritual matters, his version includes a large dollop of moral instruction, most specifically in his portrayal of Marlowe's death. Inaccurate though it was, it stood as he pictured it—Marlowe as sinner in the hands of an angry god; Shakespeare as premier English poet—for some 300 years. Stow's allusions to the theatrical world of London are literally and textually dis-located. As many critics have noted, the first edition of Stow's *Survey* mentions the Curtain and The Theatre but only in passing when describing the area where they were located. This near omission seems so jarring to some that they believe it demonstrates that for Stow "the professional theatre has

virtually no part in his scenario of communal activities,”²⁴⁹ which seems to square with his nostalgic viewpoint.²⁵⁰ In any case, by the time he published the second edition in 1603, the two theatres are relegated to a marginalia-type footnote at the bottom of the page: “And neare thereunto are builded two publique houses for the acting and shew of comedies, tragedies, and histories,” and “one is called the Courtein, the other the Theatre” (377). As William Slights has suggested about Renaissance writing in general, “While marginalia sometimes help to locate text, at other times they may dislocate it.”²⁵¹

Greene’s insult followed by a warning, Chettle’s plea and dismissal disguised as an apology, Meres’s comparison followed by a critical and moral evaluation—each of our three writers shaped the relationship for personal means. In addition, the fact that these three sprang from different classes demonstrates not only the porousness of Elizabethan society, but also shows the effect of rhetorical education on the Elizabethan theatrical world more broadly. Most importantly, the three comparisons highlight just how much the names of Marlowe and Shakespeare, often ornamented with rhetorical devices, began to dominate multiple discourses on actors and playing in London in the late sixteenth century.

By juxtaposing the prolifically infamous Greene, the somewhat obscure Chettle, and the allegedly erudite Meres, I realize I am participating in a rhetorical similitude as well. Greene had nothing to lose at this point in his life, so his account (by way of Chettle) seems the most personal. Chettle, on the other hand, was in the midst of his literary career, so he remains much more judicious in his references to the two writers. Meres, standing close to but still outside the world of the players and writers, seems to provide us with an objective, up-to-the-minute view of Marlowe and Shakespeare. Still, as current as his similitudes may seem, Meres’s accounts are shaped by historical precedent combined with literary legend, one borrowed from his learning, the other taken from local hearsay.²⁵²

Even from my vantage point today, as not wholly an “alienated intellectual,” nor solely a card-carrying Presentist creating my own similitudes in this chapter, I still suspect a similar sympathy for Shakespeare and an antipathy towards Marlowe, not only in the current space of critical discourse on the two, but also in the economic space of scholarly works. As we noted briefly in the Introduction to this chapter, the spine of Gurr’s book on The Lord Admiral’s Company is confusingly, or deceptively, called *Shakespeare’s Opposites*, and even on the inside title

page, this title is set in large, bold letters, while below it, in type half the size, the subtitle in italics reads: “The Admiral’s Company 1594–1625.” Equally telling is that in Gurr’s first chapter, Shakespeare’s name is mentioned seven times before we first come across Marlowe’s name on page four.²⁵³

In conclusion, we can turn again to Foucault to show how resemblances, if too close, can lead to pronounced differences, and how this paradigm may help us to visualize the earliest depictions in the critical rivalry between Marlowe and Shakespeare. In Foucault’s words: “Sympathy is an instance of the *Same* so strong and so insistent that it will not rest content to be merely one of the forms of likeness; it has the dangerous power of *assimilating*, of rendering things identical to one another, of mingling them, of causing their individuality to disappear.”²⁵⁴ That is why, Foucault warns, that “sympathy is compensated for by its twin, antipathy,” which “maintains the isolation of things and prevents their assimilation.”²⁵⁵

The critical distinction between honesty, soon to be seen in references to “gentle” Will Shakespeare, and transgression, evidenced in charges against the “blasphemous” Kit Marlowe, begin almost immediately following Meres’s document, heightened, of course, by the controversial death of Marlowe just 5 years earlier, a murder that may have also “paradoxically” cemented his “status as canonical poet and tragedian.”²⁵⁶ But this very distinction, so often seen in the sympathy exhibited for Shakespeare and the antipathy toward Marlowe, at least the man, may be an essential aspect of any theoretical understanding of the similitude between the playwrights.

At the outset of his splendid biography of Marlowe (2004), David Riggs suggests that the “first question to ask about” any supposed “underworld connections” or alleged blasphemy by the playwright is not “Did he or Didn’t he?” but rather “Why Marlowe?”²⁵⁷ I would suggest that one possible answer may lie in Foucault’s notion of opposites. In other words, if the transgressive Marlowe did not exist, it seems it was necessary to invent him, not only as a foil to the kinder, gentler Shakespeare, but also in order to keep the two separate in the public and critical eye.

But perhaps equally important on a more practical and less theoretical level, the references to Shakespeare as a possible plagiarizer may have also led him to swerve mostly away from the creative space of collaborative writing so central to dramatic production of the time. While this fact

cannot be proven, the evidence of collaboration and co-authorship of the day can be readily demonstrated, as we will see in Chap. 3.

NOTES

1. While I employ presentism in a number of places in my work, as will become apparent, I also depend deeply on the work of theatre historians, drawing from both the new and the older varieties of “historicism.” For a recent debate about Shakespeare, Presentism, and textual editions, see Gabriel Egan, “The Presentist Threat to Editions of Shakespeare,” in *Shakespeare and the Urgency of Now: Criticism and Theory in the 21st Century* edited by C. DiPietro and H. Grady (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 38–59.
2. Scott McMillen, “Sussex’s Men in 1594: The Evidence of *Titus Andronicus* and the *Jew of Malta*,” *Theatre Survey* 32 (1991): 216. Even in the season at the Rose Theatre prior to the duopoly (created in 1594 and on which I will be focusing), Henslowe’s accounts show that from 27 December 1593 to 6 February 1594, the two most popular plays based on receipts were *Titus Andronicus* (“six performances, averaging 49s”) and the *Jew of Malta*, (one performance, “which drew 50s”).
3. David Bevington, “Christopher Marlowe: The Late Years,” in *Placing the Plays of Christopher Marlowe*, ed. Sara Munson Deats and Robert Logan (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 210–211.
4. W. R. Streitberger, “Chambers on the Revels Office and Elizabethan Theatre History,” *SQ* 59.2 (2008): 205 n. 65. As Streitberger points out, the term “monopoly” has been used most often to describe the Queen’s Men between 1583 and 1594, and “duopoly” applied to the division in 1594, although he suggests the word “favored” instead since the stricture was not as exclusive as it was, say, in the Restoration.
5. Susan Cerasano, “Philip Henslowe, Simon Forman, and the Theatrical Company of the 1590s,” *SQ* 44.2 (1993): 154. Cerasano observes that Richard Burbage would have been either 32 or 33 when the first Globe opened, approximately the same age as Alleyn, and both had family backgrounds with enterprising businessmen.
6. Streitberger, “Chambers,” 205. Both companies continued to entertain the Queen during her private Revels, however. Of the fifty-nine nights of entertainment between 1594 and 1603, all “but ten featured appearances by one of the two companies.”

7. Emphasis mine; Andrew Gurr, *Shakespeare's Opposites* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 197.
8. On the inside title page, *Shakespeare's Opposites* is set in large, bold letters (and it is the only title on the spine), while below it in type half the size, the subtitle in italics reads: "The Admiral's Company 1594–1625." Equally telling is that in Gurr's first chapter, Shakespeare's name is mentioned seven times before we first come across Marlowe's name on page four, an issue considered more fully in the conclusion of this chapter.
9. Andrew Gurr, *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 1.
In Gurr's *Playgoing* he distinguishes between "audience" and "spectator," using audience to designate a "collective group of listeners," while "spectator" refers to an "individual, seeing for him or herself."
10. Gurr, *Shakespeare's Opposites*, 32.
11. Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1991), 190.
For the distinction between a "social space" and a *socialized* space, see Lefebvre's *The Production of Space*. As he notes, "it would be more accurate to say [space] played a socializing role (by means of a multiplicity of networks) than that it was itself socialized," a distinction we will consider shortly.
12. Stanley Wells, *Shakespeare and Co.* (New York: Pantheon Books, 2006), 22–23.
13. J. A. Downie and J.T. Parnell, eds., *Constructing Christopher Marlowe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 3.
14. Alfred Harbage, *Shakespeare's Audience* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1941); Alfred Harbage, *Shakespeare and the Rival Tradition* (New York: Macmillan, 1956), 90; 88.
Harbage's two works categorized the audiences of the public playhouses as citizens and artisans, with "predominately working class" backgrounds, reserving the term "genteel" to describe the audiences for the indoor playhouses. Cook argues for a higher percentage of the "upper class" at the public playhouses, and she also posits, contra Harbage, that after the opening of the indoor playhouses, "gentlemen continued to attend both kinds of troupes and playhouses." (See Ann Jennalie Cook, *The Privileged Playgoers of Shakespeare's London, 1576–642* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982], 129).
15. Gurr, *Shakespearean Stage*, 280.
16. Thomas Cartelli, *Marlowe, Shakespeare, and the Economy of Theatrical Experience* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991), 16.
17. Charles Whitney, *Early Responses to Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge, University Press. 2006), 2.

18. Charles Whitney, “Ante-aesthetics: Towards a Theory of Early Modern Response,” in *Shakespeare and Modernity: Early Modern to Millennium* (London: Routledge, 2000), 42.
19. Whitney, *Early Responses*, 7.
I also think Whitney is correct to claim that “while a good allusion can seldom reveal how the writer actually responded to a specific piece of dramatic material during the performance or the reading, it can reveal what the writer would have considered a reasonable or at least a possible response.” In other words, allusions “may bring us closer to understanding the audience’s role.”
20. Michel Foucault, “Of Other Spaces,” *Diacritics* 16.1 (1986): 22.
These terms are borrowed from Foucault who argues that “in the Middle Ages there was a hierarchic ensemble of places: sacred places and profane places; protected places and open, exposed places; urban places and rural places,” a distinction which collapses in the public playhouses, a point to which we will return in the next section of this chapter.
21. Roslyn Knutson, “Marlowe Reruns,” in *Marlowe’s Empery: Expanding His Critical Contexts*, eds. Sara Munson Deats and Robert A. Logan (London: Associated University Press, 2002), 25–42.
For a more detailed accounting of the performances of the *Jew of Malta*, see Knutson (28–30), and for the *Tamburlaines* (32–35).
22. Christopher Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus, A- and B- texts (1604, 1616.)*, eds. David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993), 180, n. 146.
Lopez was accused by Essex in January, tried in February, and executed on 7 June 1594. However, he had been in the public eye, according to Bevington and Rasmussen, “from the time of his appointment in 1586” as Elizabeth’s physician. Lopez is also referred to in the horse courser scene in *Doctor Faustus*, although the allusion may not have been penned by Marlowe himself.
23. N. W. Bawcutt, ed., *The Jew of Malta. The Revels Plays* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1978), 1.
24. Clifford Leach, *Christopher Marlowe: Poet for the Stage* (New York: AMS, 1986), 21.
25. Christopher Marlowe, *Tamburlaine the Great Part One and Two. The Revels Plays*, ed. J. S. Cunningham (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981), 23; 98, n.65.
The play’s initial performance seems to have been in 1587. Cunningham also speculates that “[p]erhaps Marlowe wrote Part One before leaving Cambridge in 1587, and composed the sequel in time for production later the same year or early in 1588,” but it is equally possible, Cunningham contends, that “Marlowe composed the sequel between 1587 and the first octavo text.”

26. Roslyn Knutson, *Playing Companies and Commerce in Shakespeare's Time* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 59.
27. Whitney, *Early Responses*, 274, n.10.
28. Roslyn Knutson, "Marlowe Reruns," *Marlowe's Empery: Expanding his Critical Contexts*, ed. Sara Munson Deats and Robert A. Logan (London: Associated University Presses, 2002), 33.
29. Scott McMillin, "Shakespeare and the Chamberlain's Men," *Medieval & Renaissance Drama in England* 17 (2005): 209.
30. Knutson, "Marlowe Reruns," 34.
31. Scott McMillin, "Shakespeare," 210.
As Scott McMillin adds, the Admiral's Men were not only "doing a number of two-part plays in the later 1590s," but in the year "1598 they were even planning three parts of a venture called The Civil Wars of France."
32. Richard Levin, "The Contemporary Perception of Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*," *Medieval and Renaissance Drama* 1 (1984): 51.
33. Quoted in Levin, "Contemporary," 35.
Although *Troublesome Reign*, which may have been written by Peele, was produced in 1588, the verses may have been added as late as 1591, according to Levin (67, n. 9). Richard Jones, the printer of the 1590 quarto version of *Tamburlaine*, also addressed his work to "The Gentleman Readers."
34. Whitney, *Early Responses*, 2–3.
35. Brian Vickers, *Shakespeare, Co-Author* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 149.
Vickers notes, however, "any ground for concluding" that the play was "indeed a new play in January 1594 is debatable, and so he concludes "the question of its date is wide open," even though the recent editors of the play, Bate and Hughes, cite the 1594 date as the first production.
36. Alan C. Dessen, *Shakespeare in Performance: Titus Andronicus* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989), 6.
Dessen suggests that "the very features that have proved problematic for subsequent editors, directors, actors, and readers (e.g., the mythological allusions, the long, rhetorical passages, the on-stage violence) may have appealed to playgoers still under the spell of *Tamburlaine*."
37. R.A. Foakes, *Henslowe's Diary*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 21–22.
38. Jonathan Bate, ed., *Titus Andronicus* (London: Arden Shakespeare, 1995), 69–70.
39. Lois Potter, *The Life of William Shakespeare: A Critical Biography* (West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 202.

40. Alan Hughes, ed., *The New Cambridge Titus Andronicus*. 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 9; 14.
41. Peter Ackroyd, *Shakespeare: The Biography* (New York: Doubleday, 2005), 168.
 Bate, among many others, also considers the Peachem drawing of the play to be further evidence of the play’s popularity, one which may constitute the only visual representation of Shakespeare remaining from his own time. (See Bate, *Titus*, 38–39). However, even the drawing has now been challenged as a visual response to *Titus*. (See Vickers, *Shakespeare, Co-Author*, 149, following June Schlueter, “Rereading the Peacham Drawing,” *SQ* 50 (1994): 171–184.)
42. Greenblatt, *Will in the World*, 195–196. While Greenblatt claims these plays were “still crude” compared to Shakespeare’s later history plays, “they convey a striking picture of the playwright pouring over Holinshed’s *Chronicles* in search of materials that would enable him to imitate *Tamburlaine*, but it results not in an “homage” so much as a “skeptical reply,” as Shakespeare’s trilogy is full of “Tamburlaine-like grotesques.”
43. Anthony B. Dawson and Paul Yachnin, *The Culture of Playgoing in Shakespeare’s England: A Collaborative Debate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001). Quote from Nashe’s *Pierce Penniless*, 14. For an articulate assessment of Nashe’s comment, see Dawson’s remarks on the double role of the actor, “presumably” Burbage playing Talbot: “The person of Burbage ... not only represents ‘Talbot,’ he is also identified with Talbot—since it is his person, as identified with the character’s, that generates emotions,” and the audience “who believe in Talbot and weep at his (or is it the actor’s) ‘triumph,’” 15.
44. Lois Potter, *The Life of William Shakespeare: A Critical Biography*. (West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 93. Julian M. C. Bowsher, “Marlowe and the Rose,” in *Constructing Christopher Marlowe*, ed. J. A. Downie and J.T. Parnell (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000), 37, 40. In his essay entitled “Marlowe and the Rose,” Julian M. C. Bowsher, a senior archeologist at the Museum of London, explains that the “new stage was not much larger” than the first one, but “with the new extension of the yard on either side, it produced a greater ‘thrust’ and thus more contact with the groundlings in the yard”; it also allowed for “an increase in audience capacity.”
45. See Knutson, *Playing Companies*, 24; E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, vol. 2 (Oxford: The Clarendon P, 1923), 123.
46. M.H. Curtis, “The Alienated Intellectuals of Early Stuart England,” *Past and Present* 32 (1962): 28. Writing about the “alienated intellectuals” of early Stuart England, only a decade after the time I’m considering,

M. H. Curtis claims, "Frustration rather than exploitation or absolute isolation was the common experience of these men," particularly "in the pursuit of their professions or careers," "opportunities to use their training and talents to the full were not available to them ..." even though some "positions gave them employment and livelihood." Ultimately, it left them restless and critical because [the posts] did not offer sufficient challenge to their sense of duty or did not appease their self-esteem and desire for recognition."

47. Lloyd Edward Kermode, "'Marlowe's Second City': The Jew as Critic at the Rose in 1592," *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 35.2 (Spring 1995): 215.

Kermode is referring to the disputes between London and Spain as well as the close "proximity to the economically and ideologically important Netherlands."

48. Kermode, "Marlowe's," 215.
 49. *Ibid.*, 215.
 50. Foucault, "Of Other Spaces," 26.
 51. Kermode, "Marlowe's," 19–22.

The theatre, as Kermode notes, is a "walled, organized location of life-stories," so we should not be surprised to find "walls" as prominent features in the plays we are considering, specifically in *The Jew of Malta*, but also in *I H VI*, as well as the obviously meta-theatrical prologue to *Henry V*: "Suppose within the girdle of these walls/Are now confined two mighty monarchies."

52. Foucault, "Of Other Spaces," 23.
 53. *Ibid.*, 25.
 54. *Ibid.*, 26.
 55. Michael Bristol, *Carnival and Theatre: Plebian Culture and the Structure of Authority in Renaissance England*. (London: Routledge, 1989), 112. Michel Foucault, "Questions on Geography," in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*, trans. and ed. Colin Gordon (New York: Pantheon, 1980), 178. It is worth remembering that the "time" vs. "space" dichotomy has usually privileged "time," so that if "one started to talk in terms of space that meant one was hostile to time," a binary that has been challenged in the recent critical discussions of space which I am considering.
 56. David Scott Kastan and Peter Stallybrass, "Introduction," in *Staging the Renaissance: Reinterpretations of Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama*, eds. Kastan and Stallybrass (New York and London: Routledge, 1991), 7. Other interesting contradictions regarding the players themselves are noted by Kastan and Stallybrass: "the commercial acting company ... was dependent and not dependent upon its aristocratic patrons; and the

- actors themselves, deemed rouges, vagabonds, and beggars” in 1572 decree, were by 1590, at least on paper, “members of aristocratic households.”
57. Paul Yachnin, “Theatre and the Reformation of Space in Early Modern Europe,” *Early Theatre* 15.2 (2012): 148.
 58. Marjorie Garber, “‘Here’s Nothing Writ’: Scribe, Script, and Circumspection in Marlowe’s Plays,” *Theatre Journal, Renaissance Re-Visions* 36:3 (Oct. 1984): 302.
 59. Thomas Cartelli, *Marlowe, Shakespeare, and the Economy of Theatrical Experience* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991), 47.
 60. Jeffrey S. Doty, “Shakespeare’s *Richard II*, ‘Popularity,’ and the Early Modern Public Sphere,” *SQ* 61 (Summer 2010): 187.
 61. See Gurr, *Playgoing*; Gurr, *The Shakespearean Stage*; and Knutson, *Playing Companies*.
 62. Walter Cohen, *Drama of a Nation: Public Theatre in Renaissance England and Spain* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University P, 1985), 168.
 63. Gurr, *Playgoing*, 58.
 64. Henry Chettle, *Kind-Heart’s Dream*, ed. Edward F. Rimbault (London: The Percy Society, 1841), 39.
 65. Sir John Davies, “In Cosum,” ed. Alexander B. Grosart (Blackburn, Lancashire: St. George’s, 1869), 323.
Bowsher, “Marlowe and the Rose,” 35.
In his description of the Rose following its excavation in 1989, Bowsher notes only one “entrance at the southern end,” opposite the “stage projecting into the yard at the northern end;” he also notes that the “mortar surface of the original yard was rather eroded near the stage front,” seemingly suggesting “the crush of groundlings towards the stage.”
 66. Quoted in Arthur V. Judges, ed., *The Elizabethan Underworld* (London: G. Rutledge and Sons, 1930), 195.
 67. Gurr, *Playgoing*, 67.
Gurr even claims that in one way, female “playgoers provide the hardest evidence for the social composition” of the audiences, because it shocked some observers as an anomaly, leading him to conclude that “women from every section of society” attended plays, “from Queen Henrietta Maria to the most harlotry of vagrants.”
 68. Gurr, *Playgoing*, 65.
 69. Lawrence Stone, “The Educational Revolution in England, 1560-1640,” *Past and Present* (1964): 72.
 70. M. H. Curtis, “The Alienated Intellectuals of Early Stuart England,” *Past and Present* 32 (1962): 29. Of course, part of the need for an educated clergy arose in response to the rapid changes in the twenty-five years before Elizabeth’s

accession to the throne in 1558, a time which had “decimated the clergy,” so much so that “at least 10–15 percent of the parish churches were without incumbents,” and in Marlowe’s hometown of Canterbury, for example, “some populous archdioceses had vacancies in one-third of the parishes.”

71. David Cressy, “Educational Opportunity in Tudor and Stuart England,” *History of Education Quarterly* 16.3 (Autumn 1976): 303.
72. Ruth Lunney, “Speaking to the Audience: Direct Address in the Plays of Marlowe and His Contemporaries,” in *Christopher Marlowe the Craftsman: Lives, Stage, and Page*, eds. Sarah K. Scott and M. L. Stapleton (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010), 109.
See Ruth Lunney for more on Marlowe’s ability to speak in a “Direct Address” to his audiences, in part because “[s]ixteenth-century audiences expected to be spoken to.”
73. All quotes from *Tamburlaine the Great Part One and Two. The Revels Plays*. Ed. J. S. Cunningham. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981. Marjorie Garber, “‘Here’s Nothing Writ’: Scribe, Script, and Circumspection in Marlowe’s Plays,” *Theatre Journal, Renaissance Re-Visions* 36:3 (Oct. 1984): 304. While Garber agrees with most critics that “Tamburlaine’s reappearance on the stage is explicitly attributed to the audience’s enthusiastic reception of Part One, she perceptively adds that “in the Prologue to Part II, the poet’s ‘pen’ has now become a powerful curative and creative verb governing the actions and the fate of the play’s protagonist.”
74. Doty, “Shakespeare’s *Richard II*,” 191–192.
75. Gurr, *Shakespearean Stage*, 280.
As Gurr notes, “the successes among the better plays were made by the consistent judgements of a long series of audiences,” so they “could hardly be called bad judges.”
76. Knutson, *Playing Companies*, 19.
77. Jerzy Limon, “From Liturgy to the Globe: The Changing Concept of Space,” *Shakespeare Survey* 52 (1999): 552.
78. Doty, “Shakespeare’s *Richard II*,” 198–199; 205. While I believe Doty could be correct in arguing that “public opinion” in the theatre could result in “popular discontent,” and that “playgoers might recognize themselves as a public and their own thoughts as political,” my aim is only to show how “popular opinion” was an element in the creation of “spectator-critics.”
79. Kermode, “Marlowe’s,” 220.
80. Doty, “Shakespeare’s *Richard II*,” 202.
81. Thomas Kohonen, “Commonplace–book Communication,” in *Communicating Early English Manuscripts*, eds. Andreas H. Jucker and Päivi Pahta

- (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 13–24. In general terms, commonplace books were a collection of texts compiled in one notebook and used for future reference, and they include items as wide ranging as proverbs to medical recipes to letters to poems to play fragments. For a good overview see Thomas Kohnen.
82. Hilton Kelliher, “Contemporary Manuscript Extracts from Shakespeare’s *Henry IV, Part One*,” *English Manuscript Studies* 1 (1989): 155.
 83. Kelliher, “Contemporary Manuscript,” 157.
 84. Doty, “Shakespeare’s *Richard II*,” 188.
 85. Whitney, “Ante-aesthetics,” 52.
 86. Park Honan, *Shakespeare: A Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 159. Honan refers to it as the “bitterest and nearly the most famous lines ever written of Shakespeare.”
 87. David Riggs, “Marlowe’s Life,” in *Cambridge Companion to Christopher Marlowe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 27.
 88. *Repentance* quote from *Complete Works*, ed. Grosart 12: 172. Johnston Parr, “Robert Greene and His Classmates at Cambridge,” *PMLA* 77.5 (1962): 536. “Sizars” were “usually poor students who performed menial tasks in return for their education and keep,” as Johnston Parr notes in his detailed essay on Greene’s education. According to university records, Greene received a B.A. in 1580, and an M.A. in 1583. He also was granted an M.A. from Oxford in 1588.
 89. Bryan Lowrance, “Marlowe’s Wit: Power, Language, and the Literary in *Tamburlaine* and *Doctor Faustus*,” *Modern Philology* (2014): 717.
 90. *Ibid.*, 717.
 91. Kirk Melnikoff and Edward Gieskes, eds., *Writing Robert Greene: Essays on England’s First Notorious Professional Writer* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 16.
 92. Robert Sawyer, “Re-Reading Greene’s *Groatsworth of Wit*,” *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses (Alicante Journal of English Studies)* 25 (December 2012): 67–79. For more on the physical ornamentation used by John Danter’s press, see Sawyer, 2012.
 93. Michel Foucault, “The Prose of the World,” in *The Order of Things* (New York: Random House, 1970), 31.
 94. Michel Foucault, “The Order of Things,” 19–20; 28.
 “It is not often possible to say” which is the original, as Foucault points out, “for emulation is a sort of natural twinship existing in things; it arises from a fold in being, the two sides of which stand immediately opposite to one another” (19–20). Yet, if this image sounds somewhat antagonistic, we must also remember, as Foucault reminds us, that two things are rarely “linked” unless “they have a mutual attraction for each other, as do the sun and the sunflower.” That is, there must be an

- “affinity,” a kind of “sympathy between them” (28). For more on *emulation*, see Vernon Guy Dickson, “A Pattern, precedent and lively warrant”: Emulation, Rhetoric, and Cruel Propriety in *Titus Andronicus*,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 62 (2009), 378. He articulately explains that “*emulation* also suggests the way Renaissance writers often vied with the original model, following it yet finding ways to personalize the text, often besting the original.”
95. Foucault, “The Order of Things,” 26.
 96. *Ibid.*, 26.
 97. Katherine Duncan-Jones, *Upstart Crow to Sweet Swan, 1592–1623* (Arden, 2011), 31. Numerous attempts have been made to distinguish in typeset that the actual person Robert Greene was not the same as the author or authors of *Groats-worth*, some using quote marks as I do above, and some, such as Duncan-Jones deploying “‘Greene/Chettle” as the author(s)’.
 98. Walter Benjamin, “Doctrine of the Similar,” in *Selected Writings, Volume 2, Part 2 1931–1934*, trans. Rodney Livingstone and Others, ed. Michael W. Jennings, Howard Eiland, and Gary Smith (Cambridge and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1999), 696. Using a comparable astrological analogy, Walter Benjamin explains that any observer of corresponding elements must also have near-perfect timing: “The perception of similarities,” he points out, also requires “the addition of a third element—the astrologer—to the conjunction of two stars.” Similarly someone such as the literary critic must capture the connection and record the observation, “for without honed skills and propitious circumstances, the astrologer is cheated of his reward, despite the sharpness of his observational tools.”
 99. Peter Mack, *A History of Renaissance Rhetoric, 1380–1620* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 1.
 100. G. K. Hunter, “Rhetoric and Renaissance Drama,” in *Renaissance Rhetoric*, ed. Peter Mack (Palgrave Macmillan, 1994), 103.
 101. All quotes from *Tamburlaine the Great Part One and Two. The Revels Plays*. Ed. J. S. Cunningham. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981.
As McDonald notes, the “yoking of language and action” characterizes much of Tamburlaine’s speeches; he concludes that “emotional power of controlled language is never far from the consciousness of Marlowe’s principal speakers.” (See Russ McDonald, “Marlowe and Style,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Christopher Marlowe*, ed. Patrick Cheney [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004], 58.) In an essay showing Shakespeare’s debt to Marlowe’s language, Maurice Charney characterizes the “Marlovian manner” as one of an “ascending magnitude

- of eloquence,” each line “capable” of “overtopping” the “previous thought.” (See Maurice Charney, “The Voice of Marlowe’s Tamburlaine in Early Shakespeare,” *Comparative Drama* 31.2 [Summer 1997]: 215).
102. Peter Mack, *A History of Renaissance Rhetoric, 1380–1620* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 1.
 103. Full title: *A Short Introduction of Grammar, Compiled and set forth for the bringing up of all those that intend to attain the knowledge of the Latin Tongue*.
 104. Brown cited in Lynn Enterline, “Rhetoric, Discipline, and the Theatricality of Everyday Life in Elizabethan Grammar Schools,” in *From Performance to Print in Shakespeare’s England*, eds. Peter Holland and Stephen Orgel (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 187, n. 9.
 105. Peter Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric: Theory and Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 2.
 106. *Ibid.*, 17.
Enterline, “Rhetoric,” 182–187.
For the problems with using Ovid as a model, see Enterline.
 107. Quoted in Mack, 2002, italics mine, 31.
Desiderius Erasmus, “On Copia of Words and Ideas,” in *Literary and Educational Writings*, ed. C. R. Thompson (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1974), 580.
In Marlowe’s sixth-form textbook *On the Abundance of Words and Ideas*, Erasmus points out that “when the whole business has no purpose but pleasure, as is usually the case with poetry, and with [display pieces] which are handled precisely for the purpose of exercising and demonstrating one’s ingenuity, one may indulge rather more freely in graphic descriptions of this sort.”
 108. Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric*, 2.
 109. Foucault, “Prose,” 18.
 110. *Ibid.*, 21.
 111. John H. Astington, *Actors and Playing in Shakespeare’s Time: The Art of Stage Playing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 8. Astington speculates that the actors alone “in London in the first decades of the seventeenth century must have stood between a hundred and fifty and two hundred people”; when adding those actors in the provinces and on the continent, the number rises to “around five hundred people” by the time the theatres closed.
 112. Sandra Clark, *The Elizabethan Pamphleteers: Popular Moralistic Literature 1580–1640* (London: Athelton, 2000), 31.
 113. David Riggs, *The World of Christopher Marlowe* (London: Faber and Faber, 2004), 78.

114. Clark, *Elizabethan*, 31.
115. Melnikoff and Gieskes, *Writing*, 15.
116. Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production* (Cambridge and Oxford: Polity Press, 1993), 30.
As Bourdieu notes, “the field as a field of possible forces, presents itself to each agent as a *space of possibilities*,” particularly present in the “space of literary or artistic positions.”
117. Gary Taylor, “Making Meaning Marketing Shakespeare in 1623,” in *From Performance to Print in Shakespeare’s England*, eds. Peter Holland and Stephen Orgel (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 59.
Some booksellers even carried their printed products to the playhouses, where they were “sold, alongside apples.”
118. Peter Blayney, “The Bookshops in Paul’s Cross Churchyard,” in *Occasional Papers of the Bibliographic Society*, vol. 5. (London: London Bibliographic Society, 1990), 10, n. 5.
The walking distance between the two would have been less than 30 minutes. As Blayney cautions, however, the word “print shop,” used in many accounts of the book trade, is erroneous. The word “shop” designated only a place where “commodities were sold by retail.” A “factory where a printer manufactured” books was “called a “printing house” instead.
119. Thomas Nashe, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, ed. R. B. McKerrow, 5 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1904–10. Rpt 1966), 1:287.
120. Heinrich Lausberg, David E. Orton, R. Dean Anderson, eds. *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study* (Brill Academic Publishers, 1997), Quint. Inst. 5.11.5–6.
An “exemplum is in actuality simply a special case of the broader similitudes.”
121. Erasmus, *On Copia*, 301.
122. Peter Mack, ed, *Renaissance Rhetoric* (Palgrave Macmillan, 1994), 121,122.
For a rhetorical reading of *Mamillia* (1580; 1583), Greene’s first work, see Mack’s “Rhetoric in Use: Three Romances by Greene and Lodge,” where he argues that the work’s “Similes and historical parallels provide a treasure house, or *copia*, of material,” resulting in a large amount of ornament” together “with a very clear line of argument.”
123. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, “Robert Greene,” online www.oxforddnb.com.
Lawrence Manley, “From Strange’s Men to Pembroke’s Men: 2 ‘Henry VI’ and the First Part of the Contention.” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 54.3 (Autumn 2003), 276.

Since *Orlando Furioso* was also in the “repertory of Strange’s Men,” it may have been this connection where Greene first encountered Shakespeare, although it is likely he knew Marlowe earlier from their common association with the University Wits. See Logan’s introduction to all six volumes of his edited volumes of the University Wits (especially the one on Marlowe).

124. Marlowe, Christopher. *Doctor Faustus, A- and B- texts (1604, 1616)*. David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen, eds. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993, 1.
Charles Crupi, *Robert Greene* (Boston: Twayne P, 1986), 101.
Crupi summarizes the standard reading of the play, alleging the work suffers from “general awkwardness and heavy-handed imitation of Marlowe’s *Tamburlaine*.”
125. Bart Van Es, “Johannes fac Totum?': Shakespeare’s First Contact with the Acting Companies.” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 61.4 (Winter 2010), 571.
Es shows, for instance, the verbal echoes throughout the two plays. When Alphonsus proclaims he will capture “Fortune in a cage of gold, /To make her turn her wheel as I think best” (4:122), Es finds this passage to be “a transparent reworking” of Tamburlaine’s claim that “I hold the Fates bound fast in iron chains, /And with my hand turn Fortune’s wheel about” (*Tamburlaine, Part One*, 1.2.173–174).
126. Crupi, *Robert Greene*, 102.
127. Irving Ribner, “Greene’s attack on Marlowe: Some Light on ‘Alphonsus’ and ‘Selimus,’” *Studies in Philology* 52.2 (1955): 164.
128. *Ibid.*, 165.
129. Robert Sawyer, “Shakespeare and Marlowe: Re-Writing the Relationship,” *Critical Survey* 21.3 (December 2009): 41–58.
I also take exception in Chap. 6 to Ribner’s comparison of Marlowe and Shakespeare. See Sawyer, 2009 for a similar challenge to Ribner.
130. Anthony Burgess, *Shakespeare* (New York: Knopf, 1970), 108.
131. *Ibid.*
Besides Burgess’s fictional accounts of Marlowe’s and Shakespeare’s lives (which we consider in detail in Chap. 5), he also published a scholarly, coffee-table type biography simply called *Shakespeare* in 1974.
132. Duncan-Jones, *Upstart Crow*, 31.
133. Steve Mentz, “Forming Greene: Theorizing the Early Modern Author in the *Groatsworth of Wit*,” in *Writing Robert Greene: Essays on England’s First Notorious Professional Writer*, eds. Kirk Melnikoff and Edward Gieskes (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 118.
134. Riggs, *World*, 196–197. In addition to the familiar names of the University Wits, including Nashe, some anti-theatrical writers such

as Stephen Gosson would also fit into the group of overeducated and underemployed university graduates of the 1580s. He too was “cut adrift after receiving his B.A. at Oxford,” notes Riggs. “Unable to find gainful employment,” he wrote poems in English and Latin, and also “tried his fortunes with the players” as an actor and as writer for Leicester’s Men, “but this too went poorly.”

135. Quoted in Allen D. Carroll, ed., *Greene’s Groatworth of Wit* (Binghamton, NY: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1994), 71.

136. *Ibid.*, 75.

137. *Ibid.*, 75.

138. Lukas Erne, “Biography and Mythography: Rereading Chettle’s Alleged Apology to Shakespeare,” *English Studies* 79 (1998): 431.

See Lukas Erne for a solid summary of the identities of the three addressees. I disagree, however, with his conclusions.

139. Carroll, *Greene’s*, 80.

140. *Ibid.*, 80.

141. *Ibid.*, 117.

Carroll explains, “the curious word *gracer*, which has no earlier recorded history, may have sounded like a slurred or hurried *Christopher* (*grace* = *Chris*),” and he also notes that the word “grace” may be ironically related to Greene’s accusations regarding Marlowe’s “atheism.” But the use of “graced” in the Chorus of *Doctor Faustus* (A-text) is glossed by Bevington and Rasmussen, borrowing from Boas (1940) to refer to the “Cambridge official ‘grace’ permitting a candidate to proceed to his degree” and Marlowe’s name appears in the Grace Book in 1584 for the B.A. and in the M.A. record in 1587 (107, n. 17). I suspect Greene was hoping to evoke by a single adjective all of these possibilities.

142. *Ibid.*, 80.

143. David Riggs, *The World of Christopher Marlowe* (London: Faber and Faber, 2004), 293.

144. Gabriel Harvey, *Gabriel Harvey: Four Letters and Certain Sonnets, especially touching Robert Greene, 1592*, ed. G. B. Harrison (London: John Lane, 1922), 19. Such rhetorical bombast is not surprising to hear from Harvey who became a reader in rhetoric in about 1576, and in 1583 was employed as a junior proctor at Cambridge University. While he was elected master of Trinity Hall in 1585, the appointment was never completed. In that same year, Oxford granted him a Doctor of Civil Law so he could practice law in London, where his disputes with Nashe and Greene soon became legendary. In fact, the satirical writing between the

- two was one of the key reasons a restraining order was put in effect in 1 June 1599 by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London.
145. Carroll, *Greene's*, 83–84.
 146. *Ibid.*, 84.
 147. D. Allen Carroll, “Greene’s ‘Upstart Crow’ Passage: A Survey of Commentary,” *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1985), 114.
According to Carroll’s reading of the *OED*, at the time Greene was writing, the phrase meant not merely a jack-of-all trades, but also “a would-be universal genius.”
 148. Carroll, *Greene's*, 85.
Anthony Burgess, *Shakespeare*, 112. In Anthony Burgess’s innovative vernacular, the term meant a “Johnny do-all,” referring to the “play-mending, speech-vamping, walking on Will,” while the phrase “Shake-scene” was a “shameful deformation” of his “noble name,” something Will’s “father would not [have] wish[ed]” to happen.
 149. Carroll, “Greene’s ‘Upstart,’” 141.
 150. James Shapiro, *Rival Playwrights: Marlowe, Jonson, Shakespeare* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), 5.
 151. Carroll, “Greene’s ‘Upstart,’” 114.
 152. John Jowett, “Johannes Factotum: Henry Chettle and *Green's Groatsworth of Wit*,” *Bibliographical Society of America* 87.4 (1993): 453–486.
 153. Burgess, *Shakespeare*, 109.
 154. Helen Smith, “The Publishing Trade in Shakespeare’s Time,” in *A Concise Companion to Shakespeare and the Text*, ed. Andrew Murphy, (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2007), 18–19.
 155. Cited in Jowett, “Johannes,” 468.
 156. Alan Hughes, ed., *The New Cambridge Titus Andronicus*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 1.
As Hughes notes, we “may accept January 1594 as a pretty reliable *terminus ante quem*” for the composition of the play. On the same day that Danter entered “a booke intituled a Noble Roman Historye of Tytus Andronicus” in the 1594 quarto form, he also entered “the ballad thereof” in the Stationers’ register.
 157. Leo Kirschbaum, *Shakespeare and the Stationers* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1955.), 298.
 158. Phoebe Sheavyn, *The Literary Profession in the Elizabethan Age* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1909), 68.
 159. *Ibid.*, 69.
 160. J. A. Lavin, “John Danter’s Ornamental Stock.” *Studies in Bibliography* 23 (1970): 24.

161. David Bevington, *Shakespeare and Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 16.
Bevington characterizes Chettle's role in the *Groats-worth* authorship controversy as "speculative," and he retreats to firmer ground, concluding that "the whole episode does at least suggest that Shakespeare's genius as a young dramatist provoked an envious response" in 1592, even if we cannot pin down the writer. Wells claims the tract "may actually have been written by Henry Chettle." See Wells, *Shakespeare and Co.*, 66.
162. R. L. Widmann, "Review of Austin (1969)," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 23 (1972): 214
163. Richard Proudfoot, "The Year in Review," *Shakespeare Survey* 26 (1973): 182.
164. Duncan-Jones, *Upstart Crow*, 37. In *Ungentle Shakespeare* (2002), she argued that there was "good reason" to think Nashe "already experienced in writing satirical and controversial pamphlets carefully concealed under pseudonyms" was the stronger suspect (44). Her work in 2011 expressed her revised view.
165. *Ibid.*, 37.
166. Stephen Greenblatt, *Will in the World: How Shakespeare Became Shakespeare* (New York: Norton, 2004), 212.
167. *The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare* (2001) still attributes the quote to Greene (173), as do most of Marlowe's biographers, including Honan (2005). (See Michael Dobson and Stanley Wells, eds., *Oxford Companion to Shakespeare* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001) and Park Honan, *Christopher Marlowe: Poet & Spy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
Constance Kuriyama's biography *Christopher Marlowe: A Renaissance Life* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2002), however, notes the possibility of Chettle being the driving force behind *Groats-worth*, which she claims was "ostensibly" written by Greene (113). The most recent edition of *The Norton Shakespeare* (3rd, 2016) still stubbornly refers to the piece in an appendix as "Robert Greene on Shakespeare (1592)," (2006: A13).
168. Harold Jenkins, *The Life and Work of Henry Chettle* (London: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1934), 8.
169. Quoted in *Ibid.*, 8.
170. *Ibid.*, 8.
171. Burgess, *Shakespeare*, 109.
172. John Jowett, *Shakespeare and Text* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 8.
173. Helen Smith, "The Publishing," 18.

174. Jowett, *Shakespeare*, 8.
175. *Ibid.*, 8.
176. Lukas Erne, *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 120.
177. Park Honan, *Christopher Marlowe: Poet & Spy* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2005), 309.
178. Gary Taylor, “Making Meaning,” 57.
179. Astington, *Actors*, 8.
180. Chettle, *Kind-Heart’s*, v.; Nashe, *The Works*, 1: 153–154. Nashe called the tract “a scald, trivial, lying pamphlet,” and went on to protest, too much some think, in the following declaration: “God never care of my soule, but utterly renounce me if the least word or syllable in it proceeded from my pen, or if I were any way privy to the writing or printing of it.”
181. Jenkins, *The Life*, 9.
182. Chettle, *Kind-Heart’s*, iv.
183. *Ibid.*, iv.
184. *Ibid.*, iv.
185. Honan, *Shakespeare*, 310.
186. Shapiro, *Rival Playwrights*, 77.
187. *Ibid.*, 77.
188. Quoted in Harold Jenkins, *The Life and Work of Henry Chettle* (London: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1934), 17.
In a letter dated 1596, Chettle is still straddling the two worlds of printing and play-writing, for he refers to his skill as an “Artificer,” meaning he can rearrange words on the page to cause a more pleasing effect (a kind of visual rhetorical device), and he signs the letter, “Your old Composer [sic].” For more on the visual effects of printing during Chettle’s employment as a printer, see J.A. Lavin, “John Danter’s Ornamental Stock,” *Studies in Bibliography* 23 (1970): 21–44.
189. Cerasano, 2005: 335.
Jenkins, *The Life*, 19.
Most of Chettle’s literary work occurred during his association with the Admiral’s Company between 1598 and 1603; Henslowe’s *Diary* often mentions Chettle’s constant debt which may have led to his willingness to collaborate, adapt, revise or rewrite numerous dramas for acting companies.
190. For Stow see Edward T. Bonahue, Jr., “Citizen History: Stow’s Survey of London,” *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 38.1 (Winter 1998): 61–85; Lawrence Manley, “Of Sites and Rites,” in *The Theatrical City: Culture, Theatre and Politics in London, 1576–1649*, eds. David Smith, Richard Strier, and David Bevington (Cambridge: Cambridge

- University Press, 1995); and Steven Mullaney, *The Place of the Stage* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1988), specifically pgs 14–19. For Meres, see MacDonald P. Jackson, “Francis Meres and the Cultural Context of Shakespeare’s Rival Poet Sonnets,” *The Review of English Studies, New Series* 56.234 (2005): 224–246; Dutton, “Shakespeare and Marlowe”; and Don Cameron Allen, “The Classical Scholarship of Francis Meres,” *PMLA* 48.2 (June 1933): 418–425.
191. Stow, John. *A Survey of London*. Edited by William J. Thoms. London: Whittaker and Co., 1842. In this edition of Stow I’m using, the second paragraph of the very first page of the Introduction by Henry B. Wheatley references Shakespeare: “What the reader of to-day wants, is the original work as it left the hands of the veteran antiquary” Stowe, in order to give the reader “a vivid picture of Elizabethan London—the city in which Shakespeare lived and worked” (1842: vii).
192. Lois Potter, *The Life of William Shakespeare: A Critical Biography* (West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 53.
Standing “almost side by side” but under separate management, the two theatres, as Lois Potter points out, “operated jointly and were frequently referred to together, as if they represented the London theatre scene,” a point to which we will return.
193. Christopher D. Foley, “Marlowe’s *Edward II*,” 15.
Recent critical work suggests that when writing *Edward II*, Marlowe consulted both Holinshed and Stow, the first supplying the playwright with the “anally-fixated torture and murder” of the king, the latter providing the account of the insulting shaving of Edward “with sewer or ‘channel-water.’”
194. Lefebvre, *Production*, 35; 220.
As Lefebvre points out, such spaces as the theatrical liberties can trace their origins to ancient “ludic spaces, devoted for their part to religious dances, music” and so on, even as they were separated from other spaces intended for “magic and sorcery,” the latter locations “cursed rather than blessed,” the former more “beneficent than baleful.” I would suggest the space of the public theatres collapsed such distinctions. Later in his book, Lefebvre terms these areas, such as the Greek theatre, “monumental spaces,” places which “offered each member of a society an image of that membership, [and] an image of his or her social visage,” so they “constituted a collective mirror more faithful than any personal one.” He concludes that “[s]uch a ‘recognition effect’ has a far greater import than the ‘mirror effect’ of the psychoanalysts.”
195. In 1565, Stow published his *Summarie of Engllsye Chronicles*, which went through a number of editions. For Stow and his relationship to other Chronicle writers such as Holinshed and William Harrison, see

Bonahue, Jr., "Citizen History," 69ff. As Richard Helgerson summarizes in "The Land Speaks: Cartography, Chorography, and Subversion in Renaissance England," *Representations* 16 (Autumn 1986), whether called "choreography," "survey," or "description", the mode defines itself by opposition to chronicle; in other words, it is "the genre devoted to place, as chronicle is the genre devoted to time" (71–72).

196. Manley, "Of Sites and Rites," 39.
197. Arthur B. Ferguson, *Clio Unbound: Perception of the Social and Cultural Past of Renaissance England*. (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1979), 79.
This challenge to received antiquarian history "involved an ability to think of people in terms of their collective relationships," one "not as represented in the traditional and essentially static analogies of the "body politic" or the "chain of being" as they are considered more active with a sense of more agency.
198. William Keith Hall, "A Topography of Time: Historical Narration in John Stow's *Survey of London*," *Studies in Philology* 88.1 (1991): 1.
199. Manley, "Of Sites and Rites," 36.
200. Don Cameron Allen, "The Classical Scholarship of Francis Meres," *PMLA* 48.2 (June 1933), 19.
201. Francis Meres, *Palladis Tamia: Wits Treasury*, ed. Arthur Freeman (New York: Garland, 1973), Preface.
Page numbers refer to the Garland edition of Meres's book, edited by Arthur Freeman, 1973, but I have modernized the spelling and punctuation of Meres's work.
202. Meres, *Palladis*, 279.
203. Thoms, ed., 482.
204. Thoms, ed., 487.
R. H. Bowers, "The Similitude as Essay: The Case of Robert Cawdrey," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 20.2 (Feb. 1957): 178. Bowers refers to such gathering of similitudes as a "favorite Renaissance bookworm's activity," a "profitable venture for publishers," and a "[s]ibling to the numerous collections of sentences and proverbs from equally honored profane and sacred writers of antiquity and modern times."
205. Stephen Greenblatt, *Will*, 201.
206. Mullaney, *Place*, 15–16
207. Manley, "Of Sites and Rites," 51.
208. Samuel Schoenbaum, *Shakespeare's Lives* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), 53.
209. Foucault, "The Order of Things," 17.
210. Thomas Heywood, *An Apology for Actors* (Rpt. London: The Shakespeare Society, 1841), 44.

211. Allen, "Classical Scholarship," 418. Don Cameron Allen sourly suggests that the "shallowness of [Meres's] knowledge" vis-a-vis his classical allusions should "stand as a caveat regarding his evidence in general." Still Meres's mention of Shakespeare and Marlowe should not be ignored, even if his work on classical authors is derivative. The version I'm quoting from is a facsimile reprint of the Shakespeare Society edition published in London in 1841.
212. MacDonald P. Jackson, "Francis Meres and the Cultural Context of Shakespeare's Rival Poet Sonnets," *The Review of English Studies, New Series* 56.234 (2005): 233.
213. Gurr, *Playgoing*, 205.
214. Katherine Duncan-Jones, "Francis Meres, Playgoer," *Notes & Queries* 56.4 (2009): 579.
215. Meres, *Palladis*, 47–48.
216. Duncan-Jones, "Francis Meres," 579.
217. Meres, *Palladis*, 280.
218. *Ibid.*, 284.
219. Jonathan Bate, *The Genius of Shakespeare*, 10th Anniversary Edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 21.
220. Meres, *Palladis*, 281.
221. William R. Jones, "'Say They Are Saints Although That Saints They Show Not': John Weever's 1599 Epigrams to Marston, Jonson, and Shakespeare," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 73.1 (March 2010): 93. William R. Jones has recently challenged the alleged "laudatory intention" of this phrase, reminding us that "honeyed" can also "characterize persuasion that is deceptive and dangerous," such as Lady Anne's use of it in *Richard III* (4.1.79), as well as its use in *Love's Labours Lost* (5.2.334), and in *The Winter's Tale* (2.2.31).
222. Meres, *Palladis*, 282.
223. The plays he refers to are the following in comedy: *The Two Gentleman of Verona*, *Love's Labours Lost*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and *The Merchant of Venice*; for tragedy: *Richard 2*, *Richard 3*, *1 H 4*, *King John*, *Titus Andronicus* and *Romeo and Juliet*.
224. Schoenbaum, *Shakespeare's*, 54–55.
225. Bate, *Genius*, 21.
226. Meres, *Palladis*, 283.
227. Meres, *Palladis*, 287.
- The French writer Étienne Jodelle (1532–1573) applied aesthetic principles to French drama in an attempt to move away from mere morality plays, preparing the way for Corneille and Racine. Meres seems to be referring to a feast that was the occasion of Jodelle's first successful drama in 1552 on Cleopatra. Apparently a goat was brought in

garlanded with flowers; his detractors claimed it was a pagan rite of bacchanalian proportions. He died in poverty twenty-one years later.

228. Meres, *Palladis*, 287.
Lycophron was a Greek poet, grammarian, and playwright who lived at Alexandria. Accusations of adultery have been connected with his name. In Ovid’s *Ibis*, where Meres surely got his version of Lycophron, the Greek writer is killed by an “arrow pierce[ing] his body” and clinging to his “entrails.”
229. Richard Dutton, “Shakespeare and Marlowe: Censorship and Construction,” *The Yearbook of English Studies* 23 (1993): 2.
230. Lisa Hopkins, “Marlowe’s Reception and Influence,” in *Cambridge Companion to Christopher Marlowe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 284.
Lisa Hopkins argues that “Meres is determined to make meaning(s) out of Marlowe’s death,” including the idea that Marlowe died in such a way as to provide “suitable punishment” for his overreaching lifestyle.
231. MacDonald P. Jackson “Francis Meres and the Cultural Context of Shakespeare’s Rival Poet Sonnets.” *The Review of English Studies, New Series* 56.234 (2005), 234; Meres 1841, 280.
Dympna Callaghan, *Shakespeare’s Sonnets* (Oxford: Blackwell P, 2007), 131. The debate over the identity of the rival poet has been ongoing (besides Jackson, see Vendler 1997, and others mentioned in the “Introduction,” for representative accounts). I would, however, side with Dympna Callaghan, who argues in her excellent work on the sonnets that it is “far more important to ascertain the qualities Shakespeare ascribes to the poet’s rivals ... rather than to determine their identities.”
232. Meres, *Palladis*, 282.
233. Jackson, “Francis Meres,” 234.
234. Jonathan Bate, *Shakespeare and Ovid* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 25.
Jonathan Bate calls attention to the fact that the “ways of reading Ovid underwent radical transformation, as a newly unapologetic delight in the poetic and erotic qualities of the *Metamorphoses* came to compete with the predominant medieval practice of moralizing and even Christianizing them.”
235. Hugh Grady, “Shakespeare Criticism, 1600–1900,” in *Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare*, eds. Margaret de Grazia and Stanly Wells (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 265.
236. Lois Potter, *The Life of William Shakespeare: A Critical Biography* (West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 259.
237. Meres, *Palladis*, 287.
238. Manley, “Of Sites and Rites,” 41.

239. For one recent collection, see *Literature, Mapping and the Politics of Space in Early Modern London*, eds. Gordon and Klein, 2001, and other works by Sullivan (1998) and Helgerson (1986, 2001). National identity was certainly developing in relation to the new cartography. As Richard Helgerson points out in “The Land Speaks,” the “cartographic representation of England did have an ideological effect,” by “strengthen[ing] the sense of both local and national identity at the expense of an identity based on dynastic loyalty” (56). Moreover, “[m]aps let them see in a way never before possible the country—both county and nation—to which they belonged and at the same time showed royal authority—or at least its insignia—to be a merely an ornamental adjunct to that country” (56). More recently, Helgerson asserts that in “such moments of unexpected self-recognition, maps helped transform subjects into citizens, dynasts into nationalists” (2001: 253).
240. Lefebvre 1991, 112.
241. *Ibid.*, 112.
242. Thongchai Winichakul, 1997, 130.
As Winichakul concludes: “A map was not a transparent medium between human beings and space,” but instead served as “an active mediator.”
243. Susan Cerasano, “The Geography of Henslowe’s Diary.” *SQ* 56.3 (Autumn 2005): 343.
244. R. A. Foakes, *Henslowe’s Diary*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 74.
245. Susan Cerasano, “Geography,” 344–345.
246. While the cemetery was called “New Churchyard,” it was built in 1569 by walling in the former vegetable garden next to Bedlam hospital.
247. To be fair, Henslowe loaned many playwrights money (See R.A. Foakes, *Henslowe’s Diary*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), but it seems, according to Harold Jenkins, “The Life and Works,” that Chettle was “probably the most penurious” of the writers in his employ for the Admiral’s Men (20).
248. Although Meres hoped to gain a postgraduate position at Cambridge, and later attempted to achieve a place in the Queen’s Counsel, neither effort was successful in spite of well-connected relatives such as Lawrence Meres.
249. Angela Stock, “Stow’s *Survey* and the London Playwrights,” in *John Stow (1525–1605) and the Making of the English Past*, eds. Ian Gadd & Alexandra Gillespie (London: British Library, 2004), 91.
250. One possibility for the change is that The Theatre had been torn down by 1603, but this seems to me to be less likely than his dislike in general for the public theatres, particularly when we consider his interest in so many other London sites which had ceased to exist.

251. William Slights, *Managing Readers: Printed Marginalia in English Renaissance Books* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001), 8.
252. Honan, *Christopher Marlowe*, 358.
In his recent biography of Marlowe, Park Honan makes a similar point, referring to him as “the conventional Francis Meres.”
253. It is also worth noting that Gurr has a history of downplaying the company managed by Henslowe, always at the expense of Shakespeare’s troupe. For example in the 3rd edition of his best-selling *The Shakespearean Stage* (1992), Gurr claims Henslowe “kept in close touch with several hack-writers,” often “employ[ing] them to patch on additions or alterations to plays he had bought for his companies, or to old plays that needed freshening up” (20). In the 4th edition (2009), however, the section is revised, toned down, and credits Henslowe’s authors with being more than mere “hack-writers”: “Henslowe kept in touch with at least eight different writers, assorted groups of them teaming up for each new play. He would additionally employ individual writers from the group such as Dekker to patch on additions or alterations to plays he had bought for his companies, or to old plays that needed freshening up” (30). We will return to possible reasons for the change at the conclusion of the book.
254. Foucault, “Prose,” 23–24.
255. Richard Helgerson, “The Land Speaks: Cartography, Chorography, and Subversion in Renaissance England,” *Representations* 16 (Autumn 1986): 76.
Helgerson traces a similar pattern in the connection between poetry and choreography, suggesting that both elements “begin in close alliance with the court, which provides not only patronage and protection but also an image of power,” even as “both types of symbolic gestures emulate the authority of the court; however, eventually and dangerously, from “emulation springs difference, alienation, finally even opposition, until both representational modes emerge as sources of cultural authority that, in a period of political tension, will rival the authority of the crown.”
256. Hopkins, “Marlowe’s Reception,” 284.
257. Riggs, *World*, 4–5.



<http://www.springer.com/978-1-349-95226-7>

Marlowe and Shakespeare

The Critical Rivalry

Sawyer, R.

2017, XI, 382 p. 4 illus., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-1-349-95226-7