

**THE BOOK WAS
DRENCHED**

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_212328

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

Umanita University Library

Call No. **B22 32** Accession No. **29961**

Author **M34D**
Marlowe

Title **Doctor Faustus 1604-1616**

This book should be returned on or before the date
last marked below. **1950**

MARLOWE'S
DOCTOR *FAUSTUS*

PARALLEL TEXTS

Oxford University Press, Amen House, London E.C.4

GLASGOW NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE WELLINGTON

BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS CAPE TOWN

Geoffrey Cumberlege, Publisher to the University



WOODCUT OF FAUSTUS RAISING THE DEVIL

(from the title-page of *Q* 1620: B.M., C. 39. c. 26)

MARLOWE'S
"DOCTOR EAUSTUS"
1604-1616

PARALLEL TEXTS EDITED BY

W. W. GREG

Litt.D. (Cantab.), Hon. D.Litt. (Oxon.), Hon. LL.D. (Edin.), F.B.A.
Foreign Member of the American Philosophical Society
Honorary Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge



OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
1950

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

TO MY WIFE

who has made my work possible

PREFACE

WHILE, in the autumn of 1944, I was preparing parallel texts of *Doctor Faustus* for the present edition and had already reached certain tentative conclusions respecting their relationship, I chanced to have sight of the typescript of an article by Mr. Leo Kirschbaum, then assistant professor of English in the University of St. Louis, in which he argued that the edition of 1604 contained a reported text of the play. I welcomed this confirmation of an opinion to which I was myself being rather reluctantly driven. The article in question has since appeared and I have been able to make use of some points in its argument and to acknowledge my indebtedness. My own views, which are more elaborate and cover a wider field, have been worked out independently, but I take this opportunity of emphasizing that in conception and publication alike priority belongs to Professor Kirschbaum.

Complexity, I am well aware, is no recommendation for a theory. In a happy aphorism, 'seek simplicity and distrust it', no less a philosopher than A. N. Whitehead at once enjoined economy of hypothesis and warned against a specious appearance of the same. Facts are not always simple in themselves, and it is a bad theory that achieves simplicity by ignoring some of the data. I am afraid that the hypothesis by which I have sought to account for the features of the two versions in which *Faustus* has reached us falls short of the ideal of economy, and it might be objected that by it almost every conceivable variation could be explained. I can only plead that I have not developed the theory out of wanton love of elaboration, but have been led to it step by step in an honest endeavour to interpret the textual evidence.

It may be well that I should here state my theory in outline. I believe the play to have been originally written by Marlowe in the last year of his life and in collaboration with at least one other playwright, who may possibly have been Samuel Rowley. The text printed in 1604 I believe to represent a reconstruction from memory of the piece as originally performed, but shortened for provincial acting, occasionally interpolated, and progressively adapted to the capacities of a declining company and the taste of a vulgar audience. It preserves, however, almost all Marlowe's share in the composition, and presents it with substantial fidelity though far from verbal accuracy. The text of 1616 I believe to have been prepared for publication by an editor on the basis of a

Preface

manuscript containing the authors' drafts from which the prompt-book had in the first instance been transcribed. In the course, however, of preparing the prompt-book, the text underwent an appreciable amount of revision which, of course, found its way into the stage version that underlies the 1604 text. Moreover, the manuscript was incomplete and in parts damaged or illegible, so that the editor was sometimes forced to reproduce passages from the earlier version, either as they stood or with such corrections as could be deciphered in the manuscript. From the 1604 text he also took over some of the prompt-book revisions and even some of the interpolations of the report, besides some stage directions. Finally the editor made a number of cuts and alterations of his own, mostly on the score of profanity, but a few on literary grounds.

I naturally hold the several parts of this theory with varying degrees of confidence. Of the correctness of the main conclusions I feel as certain as a reasonable critic can be of anything of the sort. But my views respecting many details are by comparison lightly held, and were some miraculous revelation to prove all my guesses true nobody would be more surprised than myself.

In conclusion I wish to make it clear that this does not pretend to be a critical edition, either in the sense of attempting to reconstruct the original text or of supplying a complete exegetical commentary—though as regards the latter I have been led to greater fullness than I originally intended. My principal aim has been to inquire into the history of the text. I suppose that any investigation of the sort should logically proceed by a full analysis of the texts, taking all variants seriatim and considering the manner in which each is most likely to have arisen, whether by corruption on the one hand or by revision on the other, and then attempting a synthesis of the evidence so obtained. In practice, however, such a procedure would prove insufferably prolix and dull, and the eventual integration might easily defy critical ingenuity. What in fact I have done is to seek, in the introduction and on the basis of what appeared to be the most significant evidence, to formulate a theory respecting the relation of the texts, and then, in the notes, to show how this theory works out in detail. Such a procedure is admittedly open to the objection that it argues on a basis of selected evidence; but it is hoped that the analysis furnished in the notes will provide an adequate corrective. The check will, of course, only be effective if the analysis is free from conscious or unconscious bias; but

Preface

no method that does not fulfil this condition can expect to reach a valid conclusion. I can only hope that my own treatment will stand the test.

My indebtedness to earlier editors will be obvious. For Bullen's reaction to problems of style and composition I have a respect that has survived occasional disillusionment, and has even tempted me to base speculations of my own on certain of his suggestions. From Ward's erudite if sometimes wayward commentary I have learned much; not least on occasions when I have taken a different line. In Dr. Boas's championship of the 1616 version I found welcome support for my own views, however much we may disagree on points of detail, and I owe much to his kindness in correspondence. To several other friends who have helped me at particular points indicated I offer my thanks, and especially to Miss M. St. Clare Byrne, who looked up various matters for me in the British Museum when I was unable to do so myself. I should also like to acknowledge the courtesy of the Astronomer Royal who in reply to an inquiry sent me information that unfortunately proved too technical for use in a merely literary study.

References to and quotations from other plays are to and from the Malone Society's reprints where these are available, except in the case of Marlowe's, where for line-references (but not for quotations) Tucker Brooke's edition has been used.

W. W. G.

RIVER, PETWORTH

11 December 1949

CONTENTS

WOODCUT OF FAUSTUS RAISING THE DEVIL	<i>frontispiece</i>
REFERENCES	xiii
INTRODUCTION	
I. SOURCE, DATE, PERFORMANCE, PRINTING	1
Source, 1. Date, 5. Performance, 11. Printing, 12.	
II. GENERAL COMPARISON OF THE TEXTS	15
General considerations, 15. (Tabular analysis, 16-17.) Structural peculiarities of A, 20. The B-text and the additions of 1602, 22.	
III. NATURE OF THE A-TEXT	29
The A-text and the additions of 1602, 29. <i>Faustus</i> and <i>The Taming of aShretv</i> , 31. Late additions in A, 32. A is a shortened and simplified text, 33. A's knowledge of omitted matter, 34. Farcical elaboration in A, 35. Later adaptation in A, 37. Corruption of names in A, 39. Analysis of Prologue, 40. Evidence of reporting in A: Indifferent variants, 43. Quasi-indifferent variants, 44. Misunderstandings, 45. Grammatical and metrical corruptions, 48. Inversions, 49. Actors' insertions, 50. Assimilation, 53. Anticipations and recollections, 54. Loose phrasing, 56. Paraphrase, 56. Vulgarization, 57. Miscellaneous points, 58. History of the A-text, 60. The performing company, 60.	
IV. NATURE OF THE B-TEXT	63
Categories of text, 63. Portions printed from A, 65. Portions peculiar to B, 72. Common portions printed from MS, 73. Conflation of stage directions, 73. (Tabular analysis, 74.) MS defective, 79. Nature of MS, 80. Prompt-book revisions, 81. The editor of B: Censorship, 85. Literary editing, 86. Non-editorial peculiarities, 91. Possibility of revision in 1594, 92.	
V. AUTHORSHIP AND COMPOSITION	97
Attitude to authorship, 97. Prol. and I. i, 100. I. ii, 101. I. iii, 102. I. iv, 103. II. i, 103. Chor. 1, 108. II. ii, 108. II. iii, n 1. Chor. 2, i n . III. i, i n . III. ii, 114. Chor. 2(A), 115. III. iii, 115. IV. i, 116. IV. ii, 116. IV. iii-iv, 116. IV. v, 117. IV. vi, 118. IV. vii, 118. V. i, 120. V. ii, 125. V. iii, 128. Epil., 128. Possible recasting of Act V, 129. Marlowe's collaborator, 133. Analysis of authorship, 136. (Table, 138-9.)	
APPENDIX—THE VARIANTS OF B2 (1619)	140
NOTE ON THE PRESENT EDITION	151
DRAMATIS PERSONAE	158
PARALLEL TEXTS 1604 & 1616	159
NOTES	295
ADDITIONAL NOTES	+03
INDEX	406

REFERENCES

- ARBER. A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640. Edited by Edward Arber. 5 vols. London, privately printed, 1875-94.
- BAKELESS. The Tragical History of Christopher Marlowe. By John Bakeless. 2 vols. Harvard University Press, 1942.
- BENTLEY. The Jacobean and Caroline Stage. Dramatic Companies and Players. By G. E. Bentley. 2 vols. Clarendon Press, 1941.
- BOAS. The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus. Edited by F. S. Boas. London, Methuen & Co., 1932.
- BRAUNE. Das Volksbuch vom Doctor Faust. Abdruck der ersten Ausgabe (1587) [by W. Braune, with introduction by F. Zarncke]. Halle a. S., Max Niemeyer, 1878.
- BREYMANN. Marlowes Werke. II. 'Doctor Faustus'. Herausgegeben von Hermann Breymann [parallel texts]. Heilbronn, Gebr. Henniger, 1889.
- BULLEN. The Works of Christopher Marlowe. Edited by A. H. Bullen. 3 vols. [Introduction, i. xxxi-xxxiii.] London, J. C. Nimmo, 1885.
- CHAMBERS. The Elizabethan Stage. By E. K. Chambers. 4 vols. Clarendon Press, 1923.
- FLEAY. On the Date and Authorship of 'Doctor Faustus'. By F. G. Fleay. [Appendix A in Ward's edition, pp. clxvii-clxxi.]
- GREG. TWO Elizabethan Stage Abridgements: Alcazar and Orlando. By W. W. Greg. Clarendon Press, 1923.
- The Damnation of Faustus. By W. W. Greg. *The Modern Language Review*, April 1946, xli. 97-107.
- & BOSWELL. Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company, 1576 to 1602, from Register B. Edited by W. W. Greg and E. Boswell. The Bibliographical Society, 1930.
- HENSLOWE'S DIARY. Henslowe's Diary. Edited by W. W. Greg. 2 vols. London, A. H. Bullen, 1904-8.
- HENSLOWE PAPERS. Henslowe Papers, being documents supplementary to Henslowe's Diary. Edited by W. W. Greg. London, A. H. Bullen, 1907.
- HOUK. 'Doctor Faustus' and 'A Shrew'. By Raymond A. Houk. *PMLA*, December 1947, lxii. 950-7. (This article appeared after my introduction and commentary were in the printer's hands. But I can find no ground for the writer's belief in a version of *Faustus* earlier than that underlying the A and B texts. All the evidence can be otherwise explained.)
- KIRSCHBAUM. The Good and Bad Quartos of 'Doctor Faustus'. By Leo Kirschbaum. *The Library*, March 1946, xxvi. 272-94.
- KOCHER. The English 'Faust Book' and the Date of Marlowe's 'Faustus'.—Some Nashe Marginalia concerning Marlowe.—The Early Date for Marlowe's 'Faustus'.—By Paul H. Kocher. *Modern Language Notes*, February 1940, lv. 95-101; January 1942, lvii. 45-9; November 1943, lviii. 539-42.
- Nashe's Authorship of the Prose Scenes in 'Faustus'. By Paul H. Kocher. *The Modern Language Quarterly*, Seattle, March 1942, iii. 17-40.

References

- LOGEMAN. The English Faust-Book of 1592. Edited by H. Logeman. (University de Gand. Recueil de travaux publics par la faculté* de philosophic et lettres. Fasc. 24.) Ghent and Amsterdam, 1900.
- NOSWORTHY. Some Textual Anomalies in the 1604 'Doctor Faustus'. By J. M. Nosworthy. *The Modern Language Review*, January 1946, xli. 1-8.
- OLIVER. Rowley, Foxe, and the 'Faustus' Additions. By L. M. Oliver. *Modern Language Notes*, June 1945, lx. 391-4.
- RHODE. Das englische Faustbuch und Marlowes Tragodie. Von Richard Rhode. Halle a. S., Max Niemeyer, 1910.
- ROSE. The History of the Damnable Life and Deserved Death of Doctor John Faustus, 1592. Edited by William Rose. (Broadway Translations.) London, G. Routledge & Sons [1925].
- SIMPSON. The 1604 Text of Marlowe's 'Doctor Faustus'.—Marlowe's 'Tragical History of Doctor Faustus'.—By Percy Simpson. *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, vii. 143-55; xiv. 20-43. Clarendon Press, 1921, 1929.
- STATIONERS' REGISTER, *see* Arber. STATIONERS' COURT-BOOK, *see* Greg & Boswell. (In both cases reference to entries is by date only.)
- SYKES. The Authorship of 'The Taming of A Shrew', 'The Famous Victories of Henry V and the Additions to Marlowe's 'Faustus''. By H. Dugdale Sykes. The Shakespeare Association, 1920.
- TUCKER BROOKE. The Works of Christopher Marlowe. Edited by C. F. Tucker Brooke. Clarendon Press, 1910.
- WARD. Marlowe: Tragical History of Dr. Faustus. Greene: Honourable History of Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay. Edited by A. W. Ward. Fourth Edition. Clarendon Press, 1901.

CORRECTIONS

In the Text

Page 206, note on l. 773:

triflle'] read *trifle*
should be
triflle] read *trifle*

Page 273, l. 1778:

for hath read *has*

In the Notes

518. There is another false concord at A 1384-5. To remove it we should either have to treat both *smiles* and *laughs* as errors, and this seems unlikely, or else alter *heauens* to *heauen*, which is less usual after the article. The failure is therefore probably original. I doubt whether the lines are Marlowe's. The change of number at B 1377-8 is certainly a piece of original bad grammar.

630. But if *is* is interpreted as *et* it seems to imply that the fiery and crystalline spheres are one, whereas, as Mephostophilis' reply shows, they are in fact distinct. This would be made clearer if *is* were interpreted as *and*.

983. Not, of course, *sacred*, which occurs in the previous line: possibly *holy* as in 978. At 1050 the synod is *reuerend*.

1863-71. I think these lines must be Marlowe's: the table on pp. 138-9 should be altered accordingly.

INTRODUCTION

I. *Source, date, performance, printing*

THE Faustus legend was crystallized, if it was not in the main invented, during the last quarter of the sixteenth century, in the anonymous

Historia von D. Iohaii Fausten, dem weitbeschreyten Zauberer vnd Schwartzkünstler, Wie er sich gegen dem Teuffel auff eine benandte zeit verschrieben, Was er hiezwischen fur seltzame Abentheuwer gesehen, selbs angerichtet vnd getrieben, bisz er endtlich seinen wol verdienten Lohn empfangen. Mehrertheils ausz seinen eygenen hinderlassenen Schriffthen, alien hochtragenden, furwitzigen vnd Gottlosen Menschen zum schrecklichen Beyspiel, abscheuwlichen Exempel, vnd treuwhertziger Warnurig zusammen gezogen, vnd in den Druck verfertiget. [motto from JAS. iv. 7] Cum Gratia et Priuilegio. Gedruckt zu Franckfurt am Mayn, durch Iohann Spies. M. D. LXXXVII.¹

There were reprints the same year, and several enlargements also appeared, which, however, need not concern us, for it was the original version that was translated into English as

The historie of the damnable life, and deserued death of Doctor Iohn Faustus, newly imprinted, and in conuenient places imperfect matter amended: according to the true Copie printed at Franckfort, and translated into English by P. F. Gent. Seene and allowed, [printer's device] Imprinted at London by Thomas Orwin, and are to be solde by Edward White, dwelling at the little North doore of Paules, at the signe of the Gun. 1592.²

¹ Spies's preface is dated 4 Sept. 1587. In the title and in the headlines 'Fausten' is evidently the German dative of 'Faust', and the vernacular form of the name is found sporadically in the text beside the prevailing Latinized form 'Faustus' (regularly declined 'Faustum', 'Fausti', 'Fausto'). The 'Historia' is generally known as the *Faust-Buch* and referred to as *FB*. In modern times it was first reprinted, from what he believed to be the only extant copy, that in the former Imperial Library at Vienna, by August Kiihne (Zerbst, 1868). I have used the later reprint by W. Braune (Halle, 1878), which claims to be more accurate and has an excellent bibliographical introduction by F. Zarncke. According to this two reprints and an enlarged edition also appeared in 1587, and two further enlargements, a metrical rendering, and translations into Low German, Dutch, Flemish, French, Danish (?), and English followed between 1588 and 1592. Its popularity waned, however, with the appearance of the *Wagner-Buch* in 1593. Zarncke reports that of three copies of the original known, both that at Vienna and one in the library of the Academy of Sciences at Budapest are defective, the only perfect copy being in the hands of Heinrich Hirzel, a bookseller at Leipzig. There is, however, another copy of the first edition in the British Museum (C. 40. b. 37) acquired in March 1846. A manuscript of the work, believed to be some ten years earlier than the printed text, from which it differs in certain respects, was discovered in the library at Wolfenbiittel and edited by Gustav Milchsack (Wolfenbattel, 1892-7: see Rose, p. 25).

² I have used the careful reprint by H. Logeman, 1900, but have checked all quotations with photostats of the original.

Introduction

Of this edition a copy, apparently unique, is in the British Museum (C. 27. b. 43): it continued to be reprinted for over a century.² A 'Second Report of Doctor Iohn Faustus' of 1594 again does not concern us. Who 'P. F.' was is not known,³ but from the wording of the title it is clear that the earliest surviving edition of his translation was not the first. Moreover, the mention of 'imperfect matter' implies that the text previously printed had been defective in a way more serious than merely careless composition, and even suggests the possibility of its having come

¹ *S.T.C.* is in error in reporting a copy in the Bodleian. I refer to the 'Historie' as the *Damnable Life*, or for short as *EFB*, since it is often called the *English Faust Book*.

² So far as I have been able to discover the early reprints are as follows (cf. Esdaile, *English Tales and Romances*, pp. 46-7: for assignments see p. 14, note):

1608. John Windet for Edward White. B.M. (G. 1029).

1618. Edward All-de for Edward White. Bodleian.

1622. Mentioned in Hazlett's *Handbook* (from the Harleian Catalogue).

1626. Mentioned by Thorns (see 1704-7) as 'in the library of Mr. North'. Perhaps an error for 1636.

1636. For John Wright. Folger; Huntington.

1648. For Edward Wright. B.M. (C. 27. b. 44).

From Edward Wright the copy appears to have passed in 1655 to William Gilbertson (see p. 14), so that the following edition probably appeared after his death in 1665.

1642-84. Bodleian (wants title). Doubtless sold by Ralph Smith, whose advertisement of the *Second Report* appears at the end. Smith published an edition of this in 1680 (B.M., G. 1030). The order of this and the following editions is uncertain.

1674. For W. Whitwood. Pepys collection. A copy of an edition for Whitwood (1666-99) with the imprint defective is in B.M. (113. c. 26). Whitwood advertised an edition in *The Honour of the Taylors* as late as 1687.

1677. For T. Sawbridge. Advertised in the Term Catalogue (ed. Arber, i. 285).

1682. For T. Sawbridge. Huntington (formerly Huth).

1690. For W. Whitwood, sold by T. Sawbridge. Advertised in the Term Catalogue (ii. 326).

1696. W. Ofnley]. for J. Back. B.M. (C. 56. d. 30); Folger. Undated, but advertised in the Term Catalogue (ii. 607).

1704-7. C. Brown for M. Hotham. B.M. (G. 1031); Bodleian (two copies); Folger; Yale (University Library). A remainder of this edition appears to have been re-issued as late as 1742 in *Winter Evening Amusements*. This is the edition reprinted by W. J. Thorns in his *Early Prose Romances*, 1827-8.

Two abridgements were published as chapbooks, one in thirteen chapters called 'The History of the Wicked Life and Damnable Death of Dr. John Faustus', by Thomas Passinger between 1664 and 1688 (Bodleian), and one in seven chapters called 'The History of the Wicked Life & Miserable End of Dr. John Faustus', printed (like 1696) by W. Ofnley]. for J. Back, and therefore between 1682 and 1703 (B.M., G. 19126, imprint defective), and reprinted by John White at Newcastle-upon-Tyne between 1708 and 1769 (Bodleian). There is also a history of Doctor John Faustus 'compiled in verse', 1664 (B.M., 1621. a. 17), reprinted in 1696 (B.M., G. 18804).

³ The editions of 1592 to 1618 give the translator's initials as *P. F.', those of 1636 to 1704-7 as 'P. R.', no doubt by a printer's error. (Some of the later editions misprint 'imperfect matter* as impertinent matter!') According to Ward (p. lxxxv, note 2) at least one late edition gives the initials as 'P. K.', but I suspect that this is a slip.

Source, Date, Performance, Printing

from a different printing and publishing house.¹ The book was not entered in the Stationers' Register: however, the Court Book of the Company contains the following minute under the date of 18 December 1592:

Abell Jeffes Yt is ordered: that if the book of Doctor Faustus Tho. Orwin shall not be found in the hall book² entred to Richard Oliff before Abell Jeffes claymed the same which was about May last- That then the seid copie shall Remayne to the said Abell as his proper copie from the tyme of his first clayme which was about May Last as aforeseid

The names in the margin are, as is customary in these minutes, those of the stationers between whom the matter was in dispute, and since Orwin is known to have published an edition of the *Damnab!e Life* this very year, there can be no reasonable doubt that it was over this, and not over the play, that the dispute had arisen. Further, it is clear that Orwin's claim to the copyright was based on an alleged entrance by Richard Oliffe or Olive. The ground of Jeffes's claim is not stated, but, no entrance being alleged, it is difficult to see what it can have been if not an edition previous to Orwin's; and since Orwin's title-page implies the existence of an earlier edition possibly by a different publisher, it can hardly be risky to assume that the edition in question was Jeffes's. We are therefore entitled to suppose that the events that led up to the dispute were as follows. Early perhaps in 1592 Orwin acquired from Oliffe a manuscript of the *Damnab!e Life* in the belief that it had been duly entered in the Register, which in fact it had not.³ Whether this was a genuine misunderstanding, or whether it involved misrepresentation on Oliffe's part, we do not know.⁴ Meanwhile, however, Jeffes somehow acquired

¹ The printer and publisher of the extant edition of 1592 was, of course, Orwin: White was only the distributing bookseller. The inference of a change of publisher is no more than conjecture.

² The Hall Book was the Register in which the Clerk of the Company recorded the entrance of copies and other matters: the minutes of the Court were in fact at this date kept in the same volume.

³ At any rate no entrance can be traced. Collier in his edition of Henslowe's Diary (1845, P. 4²) stated that it was entered in 1588; and Fleay (*apud* Ward, p. lxxxvi, note 3) suggested that a leaf bearing the entry had since been abstracted. No leaf is missing from the part of the Register in question, and the subsequent history of the copy proves that no entrance could be found in 1592.

* I suspect the former. Orwin's edition claims to have been 'Seene and allowed', and there appears no reason to doubt that it had received the official licence of one of the Archbishop's correctors. If Oliffe assured Orwin that the copy had been 'licensed*' (and this would be borne out by its having the corrector's hand to it) the latter may have mistakenly assumed that this included 'entrance' (for which it may even have borne the warden's warrant, and only the formal act of registration have been omitted).

Introduction

another and inferior copy, and about May 1592 printed an edition (of which no copy has survived) also without entrance. Regarding this edition as defective and unauthorized, Orwin proceeded to print and publish (through Edward White as bookseller) his own superior copy (the extant edition). Against this action Jeffes complained to the Court of Assistants on 18 December. This, unfortunately, tells us little about the date of Orwin's edition; for as early as July Jeffes had got himself into trouble with the authorities for disorderly printing and resisting search, and had been committed to prison on 7 August (Court Book B). Though he may not have remained locked up for long, he could hardly have laid his case before the Court until he had submitted and made his peace with the Company's authorities, which he did on the same 18 December.¹ Orwin's edition must have followed Jeffes's, and it probably did not appear before July (for the first we hear of 'Jeffes disorder' is on the 22nd: Arber, i. 560), but it may have done so at any time during the next five months, and it was certainly out by mid-December. From the decision of the Court it appears that, in spite of the fact that Jeffes had never entered his copy, they were prepared to recognize his claim and grant him the copyright, provided that there had been no entrance of the copy in the Register to any other man, and even, it would seem, to override an entrance made subsequent to the appearance of Jeffes's edition. This, it must be allowed, seems a generous treatment of the claims of a not very reputable plaintiff, and rather hard on one who, probably in all good faith, had superseded a defective by a more authoritative edition. That the copyright did in fact 'Remayne' with Jeffes is shown by an entry in the Register on 5 April 1596:

Edward Entred for his copie (he havinge thinterest of abell Jeffes
white. thereto) The history of the Damnable Life and Deserued
Death of Doctor Iohn faustus

White, it will be remembered, had acted as bookseller for Orwin's edition of 1592, and he himself published reprints in 1608 and 1618.²

¹ It may be mentioned that a year earlier Orwin had himself been in trouble, though what his offence was we do not know. His press was seized by the Company (Arber, i. 555); but on his acknowledging his fault it was restored to him at the request of the Archbishop conveyed in a letter of 30 Aug. 1591 (Arber, v. li).

² I do not think that we can assume that the order of the Court would have authorized Jeffes to appropriate Orwin's superior text, though it would, of course, enable him to prevent Orwin from reprinting it. The form of White's entry is unusual: it is not a normal assignment of copyright. Probably White bargained for the rights of both parties, and was thus enabled to reprint Orwin's text under protection of Jeffes's copyright. Orwin had in fact died in 1593, but his rights passed to his widow.

Sourcey Date, Performance, Printing

While this interpretation of the evidence is not at all points susceptible of proof, it may, I think, be accepted with some confidence. In any case, if it is anywhere near the truth, it follows that P. F.'s translation of the German 'Historia' first appeared, in some version or other, about May 1592.¹ This date is important, for there is no doubt (Boas, pp. 13-14, and note on B 813-21)

¹ Dr. P. H. Kocher, a firm believer in the early date of Marlowe's play and therefore of the *Damnable Life*, has sought (1940) to counter the bibliographical evidence by pointing out that, by an agreement with the Stationers' Company, the printers to the University of Cambridge (a post held from 1588 by John Legatt) had the right, for one month after the return from the Frankfort book-fair, to choose and print any foreign work brought over, and that the German 'Historia', having been printed at Frankfort itself, may have been one of the books that arrived from the fair of Oct. 1587 or Apr. 1588. He suggests that Legatt may have availed himself of his right of choice to print P. F.'s translation of the 'Historia' and that it was as Legatt's assignee that Jeffes claimed the copy in 1592. The Cambridge agreement is indeed dated 6 Dec. 1591 (Court Book B), but it may have done no more than regularize existing custom. At the same time there is no evidence whatever that Legatt did print the *Damnable Life*, and some reason for doubting the plausibility of Kocher's theory. The agreement was presumably intended to give the University a priority in the reprinting of learned works in the classical languages, and a popular romance in German would hardly fall within its intended scope: it is unlikely that the right of reprinting would have been held to cover translation, and very doubtful whether a private assignment to another printer would have been recognized. For Kocher's quotation of the text of the agreement stops short at a crucial point. After laying down that if the University chooses a book it is 'to be allowed to the saide Printers of Cambridge and by them to be printed', the original adds the important provision, 'So alwayes that euerie suche booke within the said monnethe be orderlye allowed and therevpon entred in the Cumpanie of Stacioners for the said Printers of Cambridge or some of them*'. In the present instance no entrance of course was made, and if indeed Jeffes's claim in 1592 was based on so unusual a ground, we should have expected to find it mentioned in the minutes. It is, of course, impossible to prove that Legatt did not cause the German 'Historia' to be translated and printed in 1588-9; but that he in fact did so, and moreover that the Stationers' Court recognized his right in a copy printed previous to the agreement of 1591, and the validity of an assignment that, being unregistered, contravened the terms of that agreement, is a position that can hardly be maintained in the absence of positive proof.

All we are offered by way of proof are certain supposed allusions to the *Damnable Life* previous to 1592. A marginal note in Henry Holland's *Treatise against Witchcraft* (Cambridge, 1590) mentions 'Faustus' as one of 'many fabulous pamphlets . . . published': this, *pace* Kocher, need imply no more than a bare knowledge of the existence of the German 'Historia' (for the form 'Fausten' see p. 1, note 1; the hero's name is habitually 'Faustus' and the book would certainly be so called). In Gabriel Harvey's *Advertisement for Pap-hatchet* there is the incidental phrase 'like another Doctor Faustus*'. The *Advertisement* is dated 'At Trinitie hall: this fift of Nouember: 1589'; but it was first printed in *Pierce's Supererogation* in 1593, so that the evidence is in this instance a little equivocal. But once again the allusion may imply no more than a hearsay knowledge of the 'Historia*'. Moreover, the legend of Faustus appears in the writings of Melancthon, Luther, Conrad Gesner, Johann Weyer, and Ludwig Lavater (see Ward, pp. lxiv-lxvi), and again, *pace* Kocher, is likely to have been known in England even before the 'Historia' appeared. Indeed, Reginald Scot named him in his *Discovery of Witchcraft* as early as 1584. Much more significant is one of Harvey's marginalia in his copy of Richard Morysine's translation of the *Strategematica* of Frontinus ('The strategemes sleyghtes and policies of warre', London, 1539) now at Harvard, published in an article by Hale Moore ('Gabriel Harvey's

Introduction

that it was this translation that Marlowe used in writing his play, and the latter must therefore, it would seem, have been composed during the last year of his life.

It has, indeed, been customary to date both the translation and the play several years earlier. Of course the German 'Historia*' affords a fixed upper limit of 1587; but 1588 for the translation and 1588—9 for the play have been popular conjectural dates. Considering the *Damnabla Life* by itself, the only ground for suspecting that it was in existence before 1592 is the following entry in the Stationers' Register on 28 February 1589:

Ric Iones Allowed vnto him for his Copie, A ballad of the life and death of Doctor Faustus the great Cunngerer. / Allowed vnder the hand of the Bishop of london, and m^r warden Denhams hand beinge to the Copie

This has been assumed to refer to 'The Judgment of God shewed upon one John Faustus', a ballad, one copy of which 'Printed by and for A. M/' is in the Roxburghe collection, and another 'printed for W. O.' in the Bagford collection.¹ These, however, both belong to the latter part of the seventeenth century, and must be identified with the ballad entered under the specific title on 1 March 1675.² The extant ballad shows a knowledge of the *Damnabla Life* and possibly of the play as well, but there is no

References to Marlowe', *Studies in Philology*, July 1926, xxiii. 346-7). It runs: 'if Doctor Faustus cowlde reare Castles, & arme Diuels at pleasure: what wonderful, & monstrous exploits, might be acheuid by such terrible meanes' (cf. B 1641, 1485-8). Here we have allusion to two specific incidents in the Faustus story, and if, as Moore supposed, the note was written not later than 1591, we should be bound to believe either that Harvey was somehow acquainted with the contents of the German 'Historia', which is not very likely, or else that a translation, presumably P. F.'s, was already in some form current, if only in manuscript. (Moore took the allusions to be to the play, but I agree with Kocher that the *Damnabla Life* is the more likely source.) But the only reason for fixing c. 1590 as the *terminus ad quern* of the memoranda is that this is the date of the latest event to which definite allusion is made. Near the end of the book Harvey quotes 'Sir Roger Williams in his new Discourse of Warr'. Of *A brief Discourse of War* two editions appeared in 1590, but Harvey's 'new' need not imply that even this note was written till a year or two later; nor is there any reason to suppose that because the mention of Faustus occurs earlier in the volume it was also earlier in date. Harvey, according to an inscription on the title, bought the book in 1578, and he made his entries at various times: thus we still lack proof that he knew the *Damnabla Life* before the appearance of Orwin's print of 1592 (cf. Boas, p. 9).

¹ *Roxburghe Ballads*, ii. 235, reprinted by Boas, p. 208; *Bagford Ballads*, ii. 55. The initials A. M. cannot be certainly identified. Earlier Augustine Mathewes (1619-53) is not known to have printed ballads: later they might be those either of Anne widow of David Maxwell (1665-15) or of Alexander Milburn (1684-93). W. O. was doubtless William Onley (1696-1709), who also printed a chapbook of Faustus (see p. 2, note 2).

² Boas, p. 9: Register F, p. 470, 1 Mar. 1674/5. 'The judgment of God shewed upon one John Faustus' is the twentieth in a list of thirty-nine ballads entered that day to Francis Coles, Thomas Veere, John Wright, and John Clarke. Clearly none of these published the extant copies, but they probably made the entrance on behalf of a ballad syndicate.

Sourcey Date, Performance, Printing

reason to suppose that the earlier ballad did so—it may have been based directly on the German 'Historia'¹ or even on reports brought back from Germany by actors or others.

Nor are there any strong grounds for believing the play to be earlier than 1592. True, there are allusions in it that are consistent with, and have been thought to suggest, a date some three or four years before. Thus 'the fiery keele at *Anwerpe* bridge' (B 123) refers to the fire-ships used to destroy the bridge over the Scheldt on 4 April 1585: but this only gives us a *terminus a quo*, for memory of the exploit must have endured. Just before (B 120) Faustus proposes 'to chase the Prince of *Parma* from our Land'¹: though the Netherlands were technically part of the Empire, Parma was Spanish governor-general there from 1579 till his death in 1592. But from 1590 he was mainly occupied with affairs in France, and it has been held that the allusion would be less apt after that date. Such arguments, however, carry little weight: allusions to historical events are not always made at the moment when they would be most topical.

Further, it has been argued (by Ward) that *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* was written in emulation of *Doctor Faustus*. This would be conclusive if it were true. In fact, however, there is nothing to show that Greene's play, which was already an old piece when acted by Strange's men on 19 February 1592, may not have been the earlier. Bakeless, who accepts Ward's chronology, writes (i. 307): 'In detail the play borrows little from *Doctor Faustus*, and its episodes are taken with little change from the prose pamphlet on *The Famous History of Friar Bacon*. Such verbal echoes as exist are all from *Tamburlaine*' This would be remarkable in a play written to rival *Faustus*. Moreover, he proceeds (i. 308) to point out that 'Marlowe . . . even appropriated one of Bacon's miracles when he makes Faustus boast:

He have them wall all *lermany* with brass' (A 120)

for which he quotes as parallel in Greene's play (Sc. ii (203—4)):

Thou meanst ere many yeares or daies be past,
To compassc England with a wall of brasse.

If there is in fact any indebtedness here, it is surely more likely that Greene drew directly on his regular source and that Marlowe borrowed from Greene, than that Marlowe on this particular

¹ As is indeed suggested by the resemblance of 'the great Cunngerer' with 'dem weit-beschreyten Zauberer': that of 'the life and deathe' with 'the damnable life, and deserued death' is less significant.

Introduction

occasion went to a source of which he elsewhere shows no knowledge, but which later furnished Greene with material for a rival play.¹

An obvious objection to a late date for *Faustus* is that there are unquestionable pilferings from it in *The Taming of a Shrew*, and that the date of this 'has been placed in or before 1589, because certain lines of it appear to be parodied both in Greene's *Menaphon* of that year, and in the prefatory epistle to *Menaphon* by Nashe' (Chambers, iv. 48). But it seems risky to base any argument on the obscure banter about the beard of Boreas (*T. of a S.*, 1594, sig. C4, Sc. vii, 'Whiter then . . . icie haire that goes on Boreas chin'; cf. McKerrow's *Nashe*, iii. 311, 11. 23—4, and note), since in such a plagiaristic text as *A Shrew* any borrowing is likely to be on its side. Moreover, all we know of the borrowings from *Faustus* is that they appear in the quarto of 1594; whereas, if the Boreas passages in *Menaphon* really refer to lines in *A Shrew*, these lines may have been in the source-play that some critics believe to underlie both the memorial reconstruction of 1594 and Shakespeare's rehandling of the theme in *The Taming of the Shrew* (R. A. Houk in *PMLA*, 1942, lvii. 1009-38; G. I. Duthie in *R.E.S.*, 1943, xix. 337-56).²

Perhaps the most troublesome piece of evidence, because of the difficulty of interpreting it, is a reference in *The Black Book* by T. M., 1604: 'like one of my Diuells in Dr. Faustus when the old Theater crackt and frighted the audience' (Bullen's

¹ The best treatment of the supposed dependence of *Friar Bacon* on *Faustus* with which I am acquainted is that in Herford's *Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century* (1886), pp. 189-95, but it is not convincing, and he has to assume that Marlowe knew the *Famous History*. *Friar Bacon* was probably written in 1589.

² An extremely interesting item of evidence has recently come to light and been published by P. H. Kocher (1942). A copy of John Leland's *Principum ac illustrium aliquot et eruditorum in Anglia virorum encomia* (London, 1589) from the Harmsworth collection, now in the Folger Library, contains what Kocher believes to be the signature and autograph marginalia of Thomas Nashe. I have examined photostats of these. That the signature is his there appears to me little doubt, and that the notes in question are also in his hand is at least highly probable. One of these is 'Faust9: Che sara • sara deuinynitie adieu' /sic? but the 'y' looks more like a 'g' cf. B 74-5); in another the last two words appear to be repeated (but the writing is obscure and the spelling at least is different) together with what Kocher deciphers as 'Faust9: studie in indian silke' (cf. B 109, 117). That the writer was recalling Marlowe's play is obvious. Further, it would appear that Nashe was acquainted with Leland's work soon after its publication (preface to Greene's *Menaphon* (entered 23 Aug. 1589), ed. McKerrow, iii. 320, l. 28) and it is likely enough that he wrote his name in the volume the same year. But that the references to *Faustus*, supposing them to be his, were entered at the same time is admittedly a matter of doubtful inference. They have no relevance to anything in the text, and there is therefore no reason to suppose that they were written in the course of reading the book. Like some other scribbles in the volume they are evidently pen-trials.

Sourcey Date, Performance, Printing

Middleton, viii. 13). This certainly seems to imply that *Doctor Faustus* had been acted at the Theatre in Shoreditch, and it has been maintained (by Bakeless) that the Admiral's men, who owned the play, acted at the Theatre in 1590—1 but not later.¹ This, however, is not quite correct. According to Chambers the old Admiral's company was more or less broken up in 1589 or 1590, when its leader Edward Alleyn, possibly with some others, allied himself with Lord Strange's. It was this company that acted at the Theatre and left it in May 1591 after a quarrel with James Burbage. They probably moved at once to the Rose, where they are found the following spring, but *Faustus* does not appear in their repertory. It is clear then that it was not in 1590—1 that the play was acted at the Theatre. But if *Faustus* was written in 1592—3 it may still have been performed (and originally performed) at the Theatre by a remnant of the Admiral's company (or by some other) any time before the summer of 1594, during one of the brief intermissions of the plague. The Theatre was not closed till 1597. It was only after Alleyn had rejoined or re-formed the Admiral's company and started them on their successful career at the Rose in June 1594 that *Faustus* is found in their possession.²

It might be argued that while none of these fragments of evidence has much individual weight, yet collectively they constitute a plausible case for dating *Faustus* before rather than after 1590. To which I think the answer is that critics, having decided, for some not very apparent reason, that *Faustus* was Marlowe's second (or third) venture as a dramatist, have cast round for any indications of early date, and have not unnaturally discovered some specious confirmation of their views.³ I confess that the traditional dating seems to me intrinsically improbable, and I am at a loss to understand why critics should have been so ready to believe that the rant and youthful crudity of *Tamburlaine* should

¹ Chambers (iii. 423) writes: *The reference in *The Black Book* can hardly be taken as evidence that the original production was at the Theatre.' Nor, I may add, do we know that the Admiral's men were the original owners of the play, though they certainly acted it in 1594 and later, which sufficiently accounts for its being assigned to them in the quarto of 1604 (see below, pp. 12-13).

² They first acted *Faustus*, one of their most successful plays, in the autumn (see p. 11), which suggests that they only acquired it (from some other company) three months or so after their opening at the Rose—unless indeed the delay was due to revision: it is not marked as new. I do not understand why Chambers says (ii. 395, note 2) that *Dr. Faustus* seems to have been continuously in Henslowe's hands from the beginning of 1592. It is evidently a slip.

³ They might even have found further confirmation in B 284-6 (see note).

Introduction

have been immediately followed by anything so spiritually mature as *Faustus* a play moreover which, whatever its dramatic defects, admittedly contains Marlowe's finest dramatic writing. We need only consider how, besides the very effective opening, the tense vigour of the disputation about hell, and the splendour of incidental passages like 'Haue not I made blind *Homer* sing to me . . .', three scenes or episodes stand pre-eminent. The address to Helen is pure lyric inspiration, the final monologue spiritual drama keyed to its highest pitch; with these, and in its different mode little below them, I would place *Faustus** solemn farewell to his students which, in spite of its almost ritualistic stiffness, shows to my thinking that Marlowe, had he chosen, could have excelled in prose no less than he did in verse.¹

The conclusion therefore stands that the *Damnable Life* was almost certainly not in print before the spring of 1592, and that the play (if, as I shall show reason to believe (p. 81, note 3), it was completed in Marlowe's lifetime) was probably written in the course of the next twelve months. At the same time it must be admitted that the dependence of the play on the history cannot be held altogether conclusive in the matter of the date, since there remains the possibility of Marlowe having had access to the *Damnable Life* while it was still in manuscript. Such an hypothesis, indeed, savours always of special pleading, and the manuscript circulation of a work of this sort² should not be assumed without much stronger evidence than can be produced in the present case. It is true, however, that if P. F.'s work was frequently copied, it would help to account for the entrance of the ballad, and also to explain how an imperfect transcript found its way into the hands of Jeffes.

¹ The conditions under which not only *Faustus* but most of Marlowe's plays were produced or have been transmitted do not make critical comparison between them easy. Like *Faustus*, both *Dido* and *The Jew of Malta* are, or appear to be, only in part Marlowe's, and the text of *The Massacre of Paris* is too mutilated to afford much basis for criticism. Only the early *Tamburlaine* (1587) and the late *Edward II* (1592?) offer satisfactory grounding, and *Edward II* is not *in pari materia*. J. M. Robertson challenged received opinion by suggesting that *Faustus* was later than *Edward II* (*Marlowe: a Conspectus*, 1931, pp. 33-4) and though the grounds of his opinion cannot be accepted, it must be remembered that Tucker Brooke, who in 1910 dated *Faustus* in the winter of 1588-9, later came to the conclusion that it belonged to 1592 ('The Marlowe Canon', *PMLA*, 1922, xxxvii. 379-84). See Boas (p. 11), who is himself prepared to accept the later date. Though it is not of much importance as evidence, I may point out that *Faustus* opens with a possible allusion to *Edward II* (see note on lines 2-6, and cf. those on B 75 and 2039-47).

² Yet even a professional writer like Nashe had to complain, or affected to complain, that his *Terrors of the Night* 'progressed from one scrieuers shop to another, & at length grew so common, that it was readie to bee hung out for one of their signes, like a paire of indentures' (ed. McKerrow, i. 341).

Source, Date, Performance Printing

The earliest evidence of performance, apart from the uncertain allusion in *The Black Book*, belongs to the autumn of 1594. Under the date of 30 September (which should probably be 2 October)¹ Henslowe records, in his list of what it is generally agreed are the performances of the Admiral's men at the Rose, the receipt 'at docter Fostose' of £3. 12[^]., a considerable sum for a play that is not marked as new. The company gave in all two dozen performances of the piece between then and 5 January 1597 (a period of twenty-seven months);² and another performance when they were playing in conjunction with Pembroke's men the following October shows that it continued in their repertory. Further, an inventory of goods belonging to the Admiral's men, probably drawn up by Henslowe and dated 10 March 1598 (which with Henslowe might mean either 1598 or 1599, but most likely means the former, soon after the amalgamation with Pembroke's), includes 'j dragon in fostes', and also 'the sittie of Rome', which, it has been suggested, might be a back-cloth for the play (Act in); and another inventory, drawn up by Alleyn probably about the same time, includes 'faustus Ierkin [and] his clock'.³ By this time the play must have been getting stale (Henslowe's receipts from the performance in January 1597 were only 5s.) and it probably dropped out of the repertory. But five years later an attempt was made to revive it, and on 22 November 1602 Henslowe, on behalf of the Admiral's company, paid £4 to William Birde or Borne and Samuel Rowley 'for ther adicyones in doctor fostes'.⁴ We know, of course, that the part of Faustus was played by Edward Alleyn, the leader of the Admiral's company,⁵ and it is probable that they withdrew

¹ Not 1 Oct. as given in my table of corrections of the dates in *Henslowe's Diary*, ii. 325 (I have it right on pp. 168 and 339).

² The only other Admiral's plays that reached twenty performances during this period were *A Knack to Know an Honest Man* (printed 1596), 21; *The Seven Days of the Week* (part i), 22; *The Blind Beggar of Alexandria* (by Chapman, printed 1598), 22; and *The Wise Man of West Chester* (possibly Munday's *John a Kent and John a Cumber*), 32. These were all new pieces.

³ See *Henslowe Papers*, pp. 113, 118, 116, 52, 54. The company also possessed 'j poopees miter' (p. 118)—two are required for *Faustus*—and 'iij Imperial crownes' (p. 118)—of which one is required. It is not certain whether 'j Hell mought' (p. 116) was used in the play, but it is possible.

⁴ Henslowe's *Diary*, fol. 108^b. The entry dated 20 Dec. 1597 (fol. 19b) recording a payment to 'Thomas dickers' 'for adicyons to Fostus twentie shellinges and fyve shellinges more for a prolog to Marloes tamberlan' is one of Collier's forgeries.

⁵ The intrinsic probability is made certain by the well-known lines about the gull in a surplice 'Like Allen playing Faustus* in Samuel Rowlands's *Knave of Clubs*, 1609 (entered 2 Sept. 1600).

Introduction

the play when he retired towards the end of 1597 and did not consider reviving it till after he rejoined them on the opening of their new house, the Fortune, late in 1602.

Meanwhile the play had been entered for publication. The Stationers' Register contains the following record of 7 January 1601:

Tho. Busshell Entred for his cotype vnder the handes. of M^r Doctor Barlowe, and the Wardens. A booke called the plaie of Doctor Faustus

but no copy has survived of any edition earlier than that dated 1604.

The play has reached us in two different versions (at least there are only two with which textual criticism need concern itself) commonly and conveniently distinguished as the A-text and the B-text respectively. The known editions, to the end of the seventeenth century, are as follows:

A i, 1604. The Tragical History of D. Faustus. As it hath bene Acted by the Right Honorable the Earle of Nottingham his seruants. Written by Ch. Marl, [printer's device] London Printed by V[alentinej. S[immes]. for Thomas Bushell. 1604.

The first of the texts here reprinted, with a reproduction of the title-page. The only copy recorded is in the Bodleian Library (Malone 233 (3))-

A2, 1609. The Tragical History of the horrible Life and death of Doctor Faustus. Written by Ch. Marl, [ornament] Imprinted at London by G[eorge]. E[ld]. for Iohn Wright and are to be sold at Christ-church gate 1609.

One copy is in the Huntington Library, California, another at Petworth House; a third is or was in the State Library at Hamburg.¹

On 13 September 1610 'The tragical history of the horrible life and death of Doctor Faustus, written by C. M.' was assigned by Thomas Bushell to John Wright in the Stationers' Register. This was evidently the formal registration of an earlier private agreement in virtue of which Wright had published his edition the previous year.

A3, 1611. The title is the same as in 1609 except for the date. The only known copy is in the Huntington Library.

These are the only known editions of the A-text, but the fact that the five extant copies belong to three different editions, of which two are represented by single copies, makes it likely that

¹ It appears that the Staatsbibliothek was completely destroyed during the war. However, a report from the relevant department of the Military Government, received through my son, Major E. R. Greg, R.A.C., states that *Doctor Faustus* and other treasures of the library are safe.

Source, Date, Performance, Printing

one or more editions have been completely lost. We are therefore at liberty to assume that Bushell followed up his entrance at the beginning of 1601 with an edition the same year (cf. p. 40, note). That the edition of 1604 is a reprint is further suggested by its calling the acting company 'the Earle of Nottingham his servants' (i.e. the Lord Admiral's men), since the company had passed under the patronage of Prince Henry before the end of 1603. We do not, of course, know that the text of 1601 (if such an edition existed) agreed with that of 1604, but there is nothing to suggest that it did not (see pp. 30—1). We now come to the editions of the B-text, of which the earliest known is dated five years after the last of the A-text.

Bi, 1616. The *Tragicall History of the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus*. Written by Ch. Mar. [woodcut] London, Printed for Iohn Wright, and are to be sold at his shop without Newgate, at the signe of the Bible. 1616.

The second text here reprinted, with a reproduction of the title-page. Apart from the imprint, the wording of the title-page differs from those of 1609 and 1611 only in omitting the word 'horrible': it makes no mention of alterations (cf. B2). It is, however, the first edition to bear the well-known woodcut representing Faustus raising the devil—in a room instead of a grove as in the play. (Owing to the mutilated state of the original, the cut has been reproduced in the frontispiece from a later edition.) The only known copy is in the British Museum (C. 34. d. 26).

B2, 1619. The title-page, apart from the date, is the same as in 1616, except that between the title and the author's name it inserts the words 'With new Additions'. These were repeated in later quartos. The only known copy, formerly in the Rowfant library, is now in the possession of Mr. Robert Garrett of Baltimore.

B3, 1620. The title differs only in the date (and in the misprint 'Histoy'). There is a copy in the British Museum and another at Worcester College, Oxford: three others have appeared in the sale-room in the last thirty years.

B4, 1624. The title (without misprint) again differs only in the date. The only known copy is in the British Museum.

B4*, 1628. The title again differs only in the date. This recently discovered edition should properly be 'B5', but it is not worth while disturbing the traditional numbering. There is a copy at Lincoln College, Oxford, and another in the Royal Library at Stockholm.

B5, 1631. The title again differs only in the date. There are copies in the British Museum, the National Library of Scotland, the Bodleian, and in America.

Introduction

Note that out of six editions from 1616 to 1631 three survive in unique copies. Again it is possible that some editions have been lost.

On 27 June 1646 was registered an assignment (authorized by a Court held on 6 April) whereby John Wright made over to his brother Edward 'The tragecall history of the life and death of Doctor Faustus a play' and likewise 'The history of the life and death of Doctor Faustus', no doubt the *Damnabable Life*, of which John published an edition in 1636 and Edward one in 1648.¹ Two separate entries of 4 April 1655 record the assignment by Edward Wright to William Gilbertson of 'The Tragicall history of the horrible Life and death of Doctor Faustus. by C. M.' and of 'A Play called The Tragicall history of the Life and death of Doctor Faustus', respectively. Presumably the first of these is the *Damnabable Life*, to which the initials belonging to the second were inadvertently added.

1663. The Tragicall History of the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus. Printed with New Additions as it is now Acted. With several new Scenes, together with the Actors Names. Written by Ch. Mar. [woodcut] Printed for W. Gilbertson at ahe [*sic*] Bible without Newgate, 1663.

The woodcut is a rougher recutting. This edition contains a third different version of the play, debased and strangely bowdlerized, in which the Roman scenes are replaced by one at the court of the Soldan of Babylon, which contains echoes of Marlowe's *Jew of Malta* (Boas, p. 5). It has, of course, no textual value—nor, for that matter, have most of its later predecessors.

On 18 April 1666 Rachel Hayes, executrix (and presumably widow or daughter) of William Gilbertson, assigned to Robert White 'The Life and Death of Doctor Faustus'. This might, of course, be either of Gilbertson's copies (assuming that they were distinct), but Gilbertson is not known to have reprinted the prose history, nor apparently did White make any use of the assignment.

¹ See p. 2, note 2. Edward White assigned 'The history of Doctor Faustus' to Thomas Pavier and John Wright on 13 Dec. 1620. On 4 Aug. 1625 Pavier's interest was assigned by his widow to Edward Brewster and Robert Bird, and on 29 Apr. 1634 by Bird to John Wright.

II. *General comparison of the texts*

The A-text, in the quarto of 1604, runs to 1517 lines of print; the B-text, in the quarto of 1616, to 2121, thus approaching the average length of an Elizabethan play. The general relation of the two as regards contents is shown in the accompanying scheme, in which episodes common to both versions are printed in the middle, those peculiar to A on the left, and those peculiar to B on the right. Here then we already have a threefold classification. We may also distinguish three types of relation between the texts: in the first the two versions run parallel, in other words the texts are substantially the same, or at least possess a common basis, and differ only in minor omissions, additions, and variations: in the second the action is essentially the same, but the texts show only occasional verbal resemblance:¹ to the third belong those scenes and episodes present in only one of the two versions—nowhere do the versions introduce different action at the same point.² It is true that in the portions of the texts to be regarded as parallel the degree of variation itself varies considerably: for example in Sc. iv between Wagner and the Clown, and in the episodes of the Pope's banquet (in Sc. vii = in. ii), Wagner's news from Vanholt (in Sc. xi = iv. v), and the magic grapes (in Sc. xii = iv. vii), the texts though still in a manner parallel (and so treated in the present edition) agree less closely than they do at most other points. In the same manner some correspondent passages show more similarity than others. It will also be noticed that whereas some scenes are fully parallel throughout, or throughout only correspondent, others exhibit frequent alternation of the two types of relation. Nor will the distinction always bear pressing in detail. A curious instance (here treated as parallel) is Wagner's short speech while Faustus is at dinner with the Students (at the beginning of Sc. xiii = v. i), in which the first and last lines are almost identical in the two texts, while the half-dozen that intervene show for the most part only a general resemblance, with sometimes a word or phrase in common. Nevertheless the distinction between parallel and correspondent passages is on a broad view clear enough, and it anyhow has to be made in printing; and as printed here the proportions

¹ Passages exhibiting this type of relation I call 'correspondent': they are distinguished by italics in the tabular scheme.

² As does the version of 1663, which for the episodes at the papal court substitutes a scene at Babylon.

Introduction

Italic type distinguishes those episodes the text of which is only correspondent. A star () indicates a comic or marvellous incident^ a dagger (†) farce or clownage; those unmarked belong to the tragic action.*

A	(common)	B	
Prol.	Prologue-Chorus.		Prol.
Sc. i	Faustus reviews his studies and decides on magic. Wagner's mission. The Good and Bad Angels. Faustus dreams of power. Valdes and Cornelius visit him.		I. i
Sc. ii	Wagner and the Scholars.		I. ii
	(Lucifer in conclave. s.D.)		i. iii
Sc. iii	Faustus' evocation of Mephostophilis and their disputation.		
Sc. iv	fWagner and the Clown.		I. iv
Sc. v	Faustus faces damnation. The Good and Bad Angels. The infernal bond. The devil wife. The magic book.	II.	i
.....(continuous)-----			
		•Chorus (Wagner) [misplaced]	Ch. I
Sc. vi	Faustus and Mephostophilis dispute. The Good and Bad Angels. Disputation continued. The Good and Bad Angels. Lucifer intervenes. The Seven Deadly Sins. Another magic book.	II.	ii
[= Sc. viii, misplaced]	†The Clowns with Faustus* book.	II.	iii
Ch. I	*Chorus (Wagner in A)		Ch. 2
Sc. vii	*Faustus and Mephostophilis arrive in Rome.		in. i
		•Travel plans. *Pope and Antipope. •The mock Cardinals.	
	•Faustus is made invisible	III.	ii
		•Discomfiture of the Cardinals.	
	•The interrupted banquet. *The solemn cursing.		
Ch. 2	•Chorus.		

General Comparison of the Texts

A	(common)	B
<hr/>		
Sc. viii [= B, II. iii]		
<hr/>		
Sc. ix	† <i>The Clowns with the Vintner and the burlesque evocation.</i>	III. iii
	*The injurious Knights.	IV. i
<hr/>		
Sc. x	* <i>The Emperor and the show of Alexander.</i> * <i>The horned Knight.</i>	IV. ii
	*The Knights in ambush.	IV. iii
	*The Knights are shamed.	IV. iv
(continuous).....	
Sc. xi. Faustus thinks on the end.	† <i>The Horse-corser's bargain.</i> Faustus' end again. † <i>The Horse-corser cheated.</i> *Wagner brings news.	IV. v
	†The dupes conspire.	IV. vi
(continuous).....	
Sc. xii	* <i>Wonders of Vanholt.</i> *The magic grapes. †The dupes are fooled. * <i>Farewell to Vanholt.</i>	IV. vii
<hr/>		
Sc. xiii	Wagner's foreboding. The Students and the show of Helen. <i>The Old Man's exhortation.</i> Mephostophilis regains control and Faustus renews his bond. Evocation of Helen. The Old Man assailed by Devils.	(The demon servitors. s.D.) v. i
<hr/>		
Sc. xiv	Faustus takes leave of his Students. Faustus' last hour.	Lucifer and the fiends assemble. Faustus makes Wagner his heir. Mephostophilis triumphs over Faustus. The Good and Bad Angels, with heaven and hell discovered. v. ii
	The morning after.	v. iii
<hr/>		
Epil.	Epilogue-Chorus.	Epil.
<hr/>		

Introduction

are as follows. Of the 1517 lines of the A-text, parallel passages account for 1220, and correspondent passages for 261; while 36 lines are peculiar to that text. Similarly of the 2121 lines of the B-text, parallel passages account for 1159, correspondent for 286, and 676 are peculiar.

Another classification of the text, again threefold, is into the tragic or at least serious business, the comic or marvellous, and the farcical or clowning. For the most part Faustus himself keeps clear of the last: in A he only touches it in the Horse-corser episode (Sc. xi = iv. v); B adds the foiling of the dupes (in iv. vii). Both these scenes are anomalous in other ways: the Horse-corser episode contains two tragic passages (one found only in A) and ends with a few lines relating to the comic business; the episode of the foiling of the dupes, itself the culmination of the clownage, is inserted in a scene of the comic action, which thus also becomes (in B) of a mixed character. There are, indeed, some lighter passages in the serious scenes: for instance the talk between Wagner and the Scholars (Sc. ii) belongs essentially to the tragic action, yet Wagner is allowed to play the fool in it, and later the farcical incident of the Devil-wife (in Sc. v = 11. i) and the comic show of the Seven Deadly Sins (in Sc. vi = 11. ii) interrupt the serious business. But though these are more or less integral elements of the scenes in which they occur, they do not affect their essential character, which remains tragic. Similarly the comic action includes some incidents, like Faustus* interruption of the papal banquet (in Sc. vii = m. ii), that might be regarded as pure farce. However, in spite of all this, the three strands of action that for want of better names I have called the tragic, the comic, and the farcical remain easily discernible. The strictly clownage scenes and episodes are these: Wagner and the Clown (Sc. iv), the Clowns and Faustus' book (Sc. viii = 11. iii), the Clowns and the Vintner (Sc. ix = in. iii), the Horse-corser business (forming the bulk of Sc. xi = iv. v), the dupes' conspiracy (iv. vi), and their fooling (in iv. vii). These, it will be seen, are scattered through all but the last of the five acts into which the B-text is here divided. If we remove them the construction appears simplicity itself: the tragic action constitutes Acts, 1, 11, and v, and the comic business Acts m and iv, with the exception of the slight tragic infusion in the otherwise farcical Horse-corser episode in iv. v.¹

¹ In the tabular scheme incidents belonging to the comic action are distinguished by a star, those belonging to the farcical by a dagger. Those of the tragic action are unmarked.

General Comparison of the Texts

A more important classification would be that of authorship, for there is general agreement among critics that neither text can be credited to Marlowe in its entirety. This, however, is a very complex and difficult problem, which, with the allied problem of composition, must be left for later consideration (in Section V) after we have done our best to establish the nature of the material with which we have to deal. All that can be said at the moment, and in the most general terms, is that Marlowe seems to have been responsible for the tragic action, and another hand to have contributed the comic; neither can Marlowe be held responsible for the scenes of clownage, but whether these are the work of the comic writer or of yet another hand is an open question.

The most obvious structural difference between the two versions is, of course, the greater length and elaboration of B. This is least in evidence in the tragic sections: the first two acts are substantially the same in the two texts; it is only in the last that any marked differences appear. B opens this with a spectacular procession of devils, it inserts two considerable passages marked by supernatural elements, and it adds the scene of the discovery of Faustus' remains. The elaboration of the comic sections is on a greater scale. In the Roman scenes B supplies the whole of the Antipope business. At the imperial court the merely incidental theme of the Injurious Knight is expanded into a complete dramatic action involving three new scenes. In the Vanholt affair the anyhow rather exiguous romantic interest is eked out, not indeed by any further comic action, but by one complete scene and one long episode that belong to and form the climax of the clowning. Incidentally it may be remarked that, of the comic matter peculiar to B, the Knight's revenge is based on the *Damnable Life*, whereas the Antipope theme derives from Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*, a source not elsewhere used. In the clownage scenes some incidents are based on the usual source and some are not: of B's additions, the plotting in the tavern is original, while the final discomfiture of the conspirators makes use of an incident in the *Life*. Even in the tragic action, which in general follows the source fairly closely, the Valdes and Cornelius episode, common to the two versions, appears to have been invented by the dramatist.

This greater length and elaboration of the B-text may, of course, be attributed *a priori* either to additions in B or to omissions in A, and the question whether A or B offers, in its general structure,

Introduction

the more original version of the play is the main textual problem it poses to the critic and one that will occupy our attention through the rest of this section.

We may approach it first through the consideration of certain structural peculiarities of the A-text. The most striking of these is that on several occasions scenes that are structurally and dramatically distinct are treated as continuous from the theatrical and textual points of view. The most serious instance, in that it does most injury to the play, is where A makes one scene of the signing of the bond (Sc. v) and the show of the Seven Deadly Sins (Sc. vi),¹ although the break in continuity, and the abrupt change of tone from the more or less frivolous episodes of the Devil-wife and the wonder-book to the tragic despair of 'When I behold the heauens, then I repent', make division imperative.² Yet to make a break here involves the absurdity of closing one scene with two characters on the stage and immediately opening another with the same pair. It is quite clear that a whole intervening scene must have been lost (see p. 108). The B-text recognizes the necessity for a break, and transfers to this point a Chorus that A correctly inserts at a later; but the awkwardness of the expedient proves that here at any rate B cannot be a free and unfettered revision of A. An even cruder, if less disastrous, instance of scenic conflation occurs later on, where the scene at the Emperor's court (Sc. x) and that at the Duke of Vanholt's (Sc. xii), together with the intervening episode of the Horse-corser (Sc. xi), are made continuous.³ After the show of Alexander and the discomfiture of the mocking Knight we find the direction 'exit Emperour' (which must be interpreted to include his court) and the scene continues with a conversation between Faustus and Mephostophilis. To make a break would involve the exit and immediate re-entry of these two. (In B, iv. iii-iv intervene.) At the end of the Horse-corser episode Faustus and Mephostophilis are again left on the stage, and we are specifically told that the Duke and Duchess enter 'to them. A break would involve the same absurdity as before. (In B, iv. vi intervenes.) No doubt, there is in each case a change of locality: the Alexander show must be within the imperial palace at Innsbruck, whereas the

¹ The structural independence of these and other conflated scenes in A is recognized in the numbering here adopted from Breymann's edition.

² The suggestion that a transitional passage has been cut out of a continuous scene must be rejected for reasons explained in the head-note to Chorus i (in B).

³ The details of the evidence are discussed in the head-notes to the scenes in question.

General Comparison of the Texts

Horse-corser episode opens on a 'faire and pleasant greene';¹ the latter ends with an invitation to Vanholt, where the meeting with the Duke and Duchess presumably, takes place. Of course, on the Elizabethan stage the exit or entrance of important characters, in conjunction with the drawing of the traverse, may indicate a change of locality; and this, doubtless, is what we should imagine in the present instance, and what justifies the separate numbering of the scenes. But dramatic *enjambement*² used in this crude fashion indicates either a very primitive or a very degenerate technique, and it is in marked contrast to the orderly succession of scenes in B, which we may therefore suspect to be here the more original.

Another peculiarity in A is the misplacement of one of the farcical scenes. In B, Acts 11 and m each ends with a scene between the Clowns, and they are duly linked together: in the first (n. iii) Dick and Robin propose to visit the tavern, in the second (in. iii) they have just come thence.³ In A the two scenes are found together in the later position, and are even placed after the Chorus (peculiar to A) that should introduce the scene (x) at the Emperor's court. Simpson has commented on the absurdity of the Clowns going off only to enter again immediately: it is true that they have to steal a goblet from the tavern, but that being so, it is all the more necessary that we should be told that they are going there, and on that point A is silent. The only reasonable explanation is, as we shall see (p. 38), that in A the two scenes are intended as alternatives. Here there can be no doubt that B preserves the original arrangement.

These considerations suggest that there is no lack of material for criticism and that anyone who maintains that the A-text preserves substantially the original version of the play will have to do a lot of explaining. That this was till lately the prevailing opinion is true, and it was I think based mainly upon two grounds, neither of which can survive critical scrutiny. The first was that the proportion of evidently Marlowan writing is higher in A than in B. But from this it is unreasonable to draw any conclusion,

¹ Boas tacks A 1134-42, which localize Sc. xi, onto the end of Sc. x (iv. ii), supplying an exit and re-entrance. This is perhaps the least unsatisfactory way of inserting these A-lines into the B-text, but such conflation is hardly legitimate.

² That is, the carrying over, without exit, of characters from one scene to another. I proposed and explained the term as long ago as 1900 in an essay on Webster's *White Devil* (*The Modern Language Quarterly*, iii. 121), and I still find it convenient.

³ The scenes are also linked by the fact that in one we find Robin conning a book of magic and in the other he puts its spells into practice. This link is also in A.

Introduction

since, whatever the proportion, the actual amount is little if at all greater. The second was the belief, accepted without due examination, that the considerable amount of matter peculiar to B represented, in the main at least, the additions known to have been written for the play in 1602 (see p. 11). Whether, or how far, such a presumption is justified it will be our next task to inquire. The older view respecting the originality of the A-text was first challenged, so far as I am aware, by Simpson, who in 1921 pointed out the many incongruities of that version, though he refrained from drawing any specific conclusion. In 1932 appeared Boas's edition, which is based on the B-text and contains the first reasoned defence of that version.¹ Yet, while he argued that the matter peculiar to B was in part original, he still believed that it included passages belonging to the 1602 revision (see p. 138).²

Let us, therefore, now consider the action of the last three acts, which contain all the main additions of the B-text, and see how it differs in the two versions. And I propose to deal first with the tragic action of Act v, where the conditions are in rather marked contrast to what we find earlier. The A-text opens with the short speech by Wagner foreshadowing Faustus' end, after which the Doctor enters in conversation with his Scholars. They have been discussing what lady 'was the beutifulst in all the world' and beg that they may be favoured with the sight of Helen of Greece. Faustus agrees, and Helen 'passeth ouer the stage': the Scholars make appropriate comments and depart. Next there enters an Old Man, who reasons with Faustus and persuades him to consider his spiritual plight. No sooner, however, has he left than Mephostophilis asserts his domination, and Faustus, cowed by threats, not only renews his compact but begs vengeance on his would-be seducer. He also prays that he may have Helen for his paramour, which the Spirit grants. Helen reappears, and after Faustus has delivered his famous address they go out together. The Old Man re-enters lamenting the hero's fall: he is assailed by devils, over whom he triumphs. The next scene shows us Faustus again in company with his Scholars, of whom he takes a

¹ He did not, however, have the full courage of his conviction, for he foisted into the B-text many lines from A that are either manifest interpolations or that[^]ie himself condemned as such.

² To all but the youngest generation of students it is the A-text that is the more familiar, and we older readers have in consequence an unconscious bias in favour of its readings. For my own part I often find it difficult to judge objectively of the alternatives presented, but repeated cases in which I have become convinced that it was only prejudice that made me prefer **the** reading of A have led me to distrust my first reactions.

General Comparison of the Texts

touching farewell, and left alone on the stroke of eleven, plunges at once into his final speech, which ends as midnight chimes with devils bearing him off to hell. A brief chorus or epilogue closes the play.

To this simple and straightforward action B makes several additions. First, it prefixes a dumb show, in which a procession of devils led by Mephostophilis bear covered dishes into Faustus' study where he is entertaining the Scholars. At the beginning of v. ii it introduces Lucifer, Beelzebub, and Mephostophilis, evidently aloft, discussing the fate of Faustus. They announce their intention of remaining to witness its consummation. When Faustus enters it is not with the Scholars but with Wagner, to whom he briefly announces that he has made him his heir: the Scholars follow later. Their departure is followed by a colloquy between Faustus and Mephostophilis, after which the Good and Bad Angels appear with visions of heaven and hell, and it is only after their withdrawal that the clock strikes eleven. Lastly, after the devils have dragged Faustus from the stage, B adds a brief scene in which the Scholars re-enter to find the torn limbs of their master and bear them out to burial. On the other hand, whether by accident or design, B omits the conclusion of the Old-Man episode after the second appearance of Helen.

The passages peculiar to B are not in any way organic, and they have indeed been very generally held to detract from rather than to heighten the tragic force of the catastrophe. This is not, perhaps, quite the right way to look at the matter. Any tightening or slackening of the dramatic tension is at most incidental: what the additions do is rather to transpose the action into another mode. This, at least, is how it appears to me; and at the end of this introduction I have ventured to put forward an admittedly speculative, and it may be thought fanciful, theory of what occurred (see pp. 129—32). This, however, is beside the present purpose. It cannot be denied that in Act v the passages peculiar to B have somewhat the appearance of later additions, and the argument that they form part of the revision of 1602 has a certain plausibility. At the same time they appear to be all of a piece (structurally if not in authorship), and if there is anything in Bullen's view, who detected in them 'the ring of Marlowe', they must belong to the earliest and not the latest stratum of composition. This is, of course, a subjective ground on which to base any critical conclusions, but Bullen's opinion is entitled to respect, and for my own part I to some extent endorse it.

Introduction

The position in the comic action is entirely different. The third act of the B-text is wholly occupied by the Roman business. On their arrival Faustus and Mephostophilis make themselves at home in the Pope's private apartments, where they proceed to discuss their journey and the sights of the city. After a while there enters & procession of cardinals, bishops, monks, and friars, accompanying the Pope and the King of Hungary, with *'Bruno led in chains'*. The last, it appears, is a claimant to the papal throne, appointed by the Emperor, who has just been captured in a victory over the imperial forces, and who still wears the tiara. Ascending his state, with Bruno as footstool, the Pope directs two Cardinals to search the decretals and discover what should be done with the prisoner, and they accordingly depart to the consistory. At this point Faustus, who with Mephostophilis has been standing apart, decides to take a hand in the game, and the two follow the Cardinals out. After some talk between the Pope and Bruno they return disguised as the Cardinals, whom they have left asleep over the records. Faustus reports that the Emperor and his nominee should be declared heretics and the latter burned at the stake. Thereupon the Pope commits Bruno to their custody for incarceration in the castle of St. Angelo and his triple crown for deposit in the papal treasury. They depart, and the Pope orders a banquet in honour of his victory. In a fresh scene (in. ii) Faustus and Mephostophilis, having dispatched Bruno on his way to the Emperor's court, re-enter *'in their owne shapes'* while the banquet is preparing, and Mephostophilis by a charm renders Faustus invisible. Upon this the Pope and King with *'all the Lords'* return and are immediately followed by the Cardinals with their report. The consequent misunderstanding ends by their denying all knowledge of the crown entrusted to them and being sent off to prison. The party then settle down to the banquet, which is interrupted by Faustus, who first snatches away the dishes and goblet of which the Pope is about to partake, and then hits him over the head. The feast breaks up in confusion and there follows a solemn exorcism by the Friars, which the pair bring to an end by throwing fireworks among them.

The action of the A-text appears by comparison bare and disjointed. It begins in the same way, but before the entry of the Pope it breaks off in the middle of a sentence (which it completes with a couple of burlesque lines) and passes on to Faustus* horse-play at the banquet and the Friars' malediction, only pausing to pick out, as necessary to the action, some half-dozen lines of the

General Comparison of the Texts

B-text relating to Faustus' invisibility, though it omits the charm itself.

From Rome we pass to the imperial court at Innsbruck. B opens the fourth act with a scene in which two knights meet and discuss the arrival of Bruno followed by that of Faustus, who proposes to display his art before the Emperor. They call upon a third knight, Benvolio, who appears half-dressed at a window and mocks the pretensions of the magician. Thereupon (iv. ii) enter the Emperor and his court, with Bruno, Faustus, and Mephistophilis. There is more discussion of Bruno's affairs, after which Faustus undertakes to show the Emperor 'the royall shapes Of *Alexander* and his Paramour', while Benvolio at his window utters sarcastic asides till he presently falls asleep. An elaborate dumb show, which includes Darius as well as Alexander and his lady, appears and vanishes. Immediately afterwards Benvolio is seen to be wearing antlers that prevent his withdrawing his head from the window. After some 'sport', the Emperor begs Faustus to release the knight, which he does with a final injunction thereafter to 'speake well of Schollers', to which Benvolio replies with threats of vengeance. Faustus departs recompensed and 'belou'd of mightie *Carolus*'. In the next scene (iv. iii) the three knights plot to kill Faustus, and place soldiers in ambush for the purpose. Faustus enters, and Benvolio incontinently cuts off his head, only to find that he is still alive enough to summon Mephistophilis and others to his aid. Faustus commands the knights to be thrown from the rocks and dragged through bog and briar. No sooner have they been led away than the soldiers enter and attack Faustus, only to be themselves attacked by an army of devils. The last scene (iv. iv) shows us the three knights, wounded and bedruggled and wearing horns, who resolve, since they are manifestly powerless against their tormentor, to retire to a lonely castle, there to bide obscure and 'rather die with grief, then Hue with shame'.

Of all this elaborate plot little is found in A, which begins at the point where the Emperor makes his appearance, but contains, of course, no allusion to Bruno. An unnamed Knight of the court mocks Faustus and then goes out. There follows a much simplified version of the dumb show, after which Faustus asks that the Knight be sent for. He enters wearing horns, from which he is released at the Emperor's request; he is again enjoined to 'speake well of Schollers', but makes no reply, and there the matter ends.

From Innsbruck to Vanholt, by way of the Horse-corser

Introduction

episode (iv. v), of which the A-text offers the more elaborate but not therefore the more original version. B begins with a scene (iv. vi) in a tavern where the Horse-corser, a Carter, and the two Clowns foregather and recount the various ways in which they have suffered at the hands of Faustus and his servants, and plan to be even with him. The next scene (iv. vii) brings on the Duke and Duchess with Faustus and Mephostophilis. The Duke thanks 'Maister Doctor' for his pleasant entertainment 'in erecting that enchanted Castle in the Aire', and Faustus in return asks what he can do to pleasure the Duchess. She confesses that were it not now mid-winter she would desire above all things 'a dish of ripe grapes', which Mephostophilis at once produces. Faustus' extremely obscure explanation of how the seeming miracle has been performed is cut short by the riot of the Clowns who '*bounce at the gate, within*'. They are admitted and, encouraged by Faustus, behave boorishly, calling for drink, which is brought by the Hostess of the tavern. Finally, Faustus strikes them all dumb and drives them out, after which the Duke thanks him for 'His Artfull sport', and the scene and act come to an end.

Of this we find in A no more than the Duke's thanks for an unspecified 'merriment', the miracle of the grapes with Faustus' explanation, and the final promise of reward.

In these two acts there is a striking contrast between the orderly succession of incidents that build up a coherent plot in B and the merely disjointed episodes of A. It is, of course, theoretically possible that bare and isolated incidents of a comic, marvellous, or farcical nature should in the course of revision be expanded and developed into a duly articulated whole, though I rather doubt whether any relevant example of such a process could be adduced. But it seems, on *a priori* grounds, much more likely that an organic series of events should in process of time disintegrate into disconnected episodes, and of such structural degeneration it would not be hard to find examples in all forms of literature that have been subject to popular transmission or to rehandling, and more especially in a number of Elizabethan plays that, as we now believe, were reconstructed from memory without the control of a written text. If such degeneration has taken place in the A-version of *Faustus* we shall expect to find evidence of the fact in the details of the text as well as in the broad outlines of the structure: whether that evidence is forthcoming it will be the business of the next section of this introduction to inquire.

Meanwhile probabilities are a poor foundation for critical con-

General Comparison of the Texts

elusions, and it will be well to see whether we cannot get something more definite out of the evidence before us. In the Roman scenes we cannot help being struck by the way in which the A-text, after for a while agreeing closely with B, breaks abruptly off and passes to later business, only retaining just those fragments of the B-text needed to render the action intelligible. Here at any rate it is almost inevitable to conclude that the A-text has been cut down from some fuller representation of the action, rather than that a reviser, intent on making something more substantial and dramatic out of the material, should so slavishly have preserved every fragment of a feeble and disjointed original. It is no less difficult to account, on the hypothesis of revision, for the state of the Chorus before Act in. Of the 25 lines of the B-text, which have throughout their source in *EFB* and form a carefully articulated paragraph, only the first six, the last four, and one intermediate line appear in A, which is merely concerned to get Faustus to Rome, and is content with a series of loosely strung clauses, which in spite of some attempt at grammatical reconstruction possess little logical cohesion.

Of course it does not follow that the original form of Act in, from which A's version appears to be the mutilated remains, agreed in all respects with B; and it might be pointed out with some cogency that the texts cease to be parallel at the very point at which in B we find, in the mention of 'the Popes triumphant victory', the first hint of the Bruno theme, for which the B-version deserts its usual source in the *Damnably Life* to draw upon the *Book of Martyrs*. At the same time it must be remembered that the story of Saxon Bruno is carried over from the Roman scenes to those at the imperial court, where it is interwoven with that of the Injurious Knight. The two, therefore, clearly belong to the same stratum of composition (if I may be allowed to use the phrase without prejudice) and if one of the themes should prove to be original, the same must be conceded for the other.

Now the scenes in which B develops the theme of the Injurious Knight contain one or two phrases that may give a clue to their date. I have already mentioned (p. 8; cf. pp. 31—2) that several passages borrowed or imitated from *Faustus* appear in the text of *The Taming of a Shrew* as printed in 1594, and one of these has been found in the scene in which Benvolio cuts off Faustus* head (iv. iii). There lines 1449—50 run:

And had you cut my body with your swords,
And hew'd this flesh and bones as small as sand . . .

Introduction

A *Shrew* (sig. Fa, Sc. xvi) has the somewhat similar expression:

This angrie sword should rip thy hatefull chest,
And hewd thee smaller then the *Libian sandes* . . .

Since it is unquestionably *A Shrew* that is the debtor, indebtedness in this instance would prove that the scene in B, if not part of the original text of the play, at any rate belonged to a period before its earliest recorded performance in 1594. Unfortunately this passage is one of the least convincing of the parallels, and cannot be taken by itself to prove anything at all. It is, however, supported by a curious point relating to another of the scenes peculiar to B (iv. iv). In *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (iv. v. 67 ff.) Bardolf enters all bedraggled and explains:

so soone as I came beyond *Eaton*, they threw me off, from behinde one of them, in a slough of myre; and set spurres, and away; like three *German e-diuek*, three *Doctor Faust asses*.

It has been argued that we here have an allusion to the treatment suffered by the three knights, from which they emerge 'Halfe smother'd in a Lake of mud and durt' (1497), and indeed I do not see how the conclusion can well be avoided. Since, then, *The Merry Wives* was probably written in 1600 or 1601¹ it follows that the scene in question was at any rate no part of the Rowley-Birde additions of November 1602.

For the originality of the 'additional' matter in the Vanholt scenes the evidence is even stronger. Here, namely, we find the A-version of the Horse-corser episode (iv. v) amplifying the B-version by borrowings from the tavern scene (iv. vi) which is only preserved in B.² Since borrowing in the opposite direction, inherently improbable, is found to be virtually impossible on a detailed examination of the text (see p. 34), we have here conclusive proof that at least one of the scenes peculiar to B was already in existence at the time the A-text took shape.

Let me recapitulate and define the items of evidence that point to the scenes and episodes peculiar to the B-text being, not late additions, but part of the original, or at any rate of an early, version of the play. In the Roman scenes the disjointed nature of the A-text implies the pre-existence of at least a part of B's additions, say perhaps B 856-90 and 1023-4 (possibly not exactly

¹ It is true that the allusion to *Germane-diueW* and *'Doctor Faustasses'* does not appear in the 'bad' quarto of 1602 (entered 18 Jan. 1601/2), but that affords no ground for dismissing it as a later insertion. For another link between the plays see p. 40, note.

² Kirschbaum (pp. 285-6) was, I believe, the first to draw attention to this important piece of evidence.

General Comparison of the Texts

in their present form). There is no proof that the Bruno business, roughly B 891—1022 and 1042—72, was already present; but it will be observed that the transitions at 1022—3, 1041—2, and 1072-3 are perfectly smooth and natural and give no hint of rehandling. As regards the scenes at the Emperor's court, there is strong reason to suppose that iv. iv is early, and with this necessarily go iv. i and iv. iii. But iv. i contains allusions to the Bruno business, so that this cannot after all be a late accretion unless we suppose that these allusions (B 1187—90, 1201, 1217—20) and others in iv. ii (B 1232-53) are interpolations, which there is nothing to suggest. In the Vanholt portion the A-version of iv. ii (= Sc. xi) shows a knowledge of iv. vi (only found in B), which must therefore have been already in existence; and with iv. vi goes the clownage episode in iv. vii. In Act v the originality of the B-additions rests only on the supposition that portions of them, say B 1894—1903 and v. iii, are from Marlowe's pen, and the likelihood of this each reader must decide for himself.¹

It is therefore with some confidence that I advance the conclusion that none of the passages peculiar to B represent the additions paid for by Henslowe in 1602, and that structurally at any rate the B-text preserves the more original, and the A-text a maimed and debased, version of the play. How far this conclusion is borne out by the details of the text it will be the task of the next section to inquire.

III. Nature of the A-text

I shall argue that A is a reported text of the type we are familiar with in a number of editions commonly known as 'bad quartos'. But at the threshold of any inquiry into the subject we are faced with a perplexing uncertainty, which we must first endeavour to resolve.

¹ The survival of some fragments of late revision in B it would in any case be hardly possible to disprove; though why only fragments it would be equally difficult to explain. Since Henslowe paid Rowley and Birde £4. for their additions, as much as he sometimes paid for a whole play, these must have been fairly extensive, at least as extensive, one would suppose, as the matter peculiar to B (which amounts to no more than 676 lines) and portions of this we have now shown to antedate A. The argument that some of the matter peculiar to B was written by Samuel Rowley (which may be true) and that it must therefore belong to the 1602 revision, would only be valid if we knew that Rowley could not have been connected with the play at an earlier date. The question is discussed in the last section of this introduction (pp. 133-7). Rowley's hand has even been seen in the A-text. In fact the only point that might make me suspect that any part of the B-text was as late as 1602 is a possible echo of *Hamlet* in l. 1200.

Introduction

The earliest extant edition is dated 1604, and therefore presumably appeared at least one and possibly two years after Birde and Rowley wrote their additions for the play in November 1602, so that there is no chronological impossibility in these forming part of the A-text. Is this a contingency that we need seriously consider? We have seen that the edition of 1604 was probably not the first, and that it is reasonable to suppose that the play had already been printed in 1601. Now an edition of 1601 could not have contained the additions, and if that of 1604 was a mere reprint, neither can it.¹ On the face of it the earliest known edition is such a reprint: it makes no claim on the title-page to being enlarged or revised, and this, though not conclusive, is still significant. That it is not conclusive is shown by the later history of the play, for the additions first printed (so far as we know) in 1616 were not mentioned on the title before 1619: at the same time it seems very unlikely that such reticence should have marked two successive expansions of the same play. Of course it is not at all likely that the Admiral's company, having paid a considerable sum for giving the play fresh attractions on the stage, would willingly have released the additions to the press; but these might have been reported,² as I believe the original text to have been, or, if the quarto of 1604 does not represent the manuscript entered in 1601, the whole of it may be a report of a performance given, say, in 1603. I see no way of disproving this hypothesis if anyone likes to entertain it; only I would point out that, as we shall see in a moment (pp. 31—2), one of the farcical scenes (common to the two texts) is proved by *The Taming of a Shrew* to have been in existence in 1594, and, as we have already seen (p. 28), one belonging to the comic action (preserved, it is true, only in B) appears to have been familiar to Shakespeare about 1600; so that there can be no question of either the clowning or the comedy as a whole belonging to the additions of 1602. Moreover, though it may not be wise to rely much on Henslowe's choice of words, it is still worth remembering that what he paid for was not revision but additions, and that were we to cut out any large part of the

¹ Nor, if the edition of 1604 was after all the first, can it have contained the additions if it was printed throughout from the manuscript licensed and entered in 1601.

² There is reason to believe that the deposition scene in *Richard II*, as first printed in the quarto of 1608, is a report, and there is some suggestion that the same is true of the additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* in the quarto of 1602. The earlier texts of these plays are, however, sound and their origin respectable: there would have been more inducement for a publisher to supplement them by the inclusion of previously censored or newly added material than there would in the case of such an inferior text as that of *Faustus*, popular though the play may have been.

Nature of the A-text

apparently non-Marlowan scenes from the A-text, we should be left with a play having indeed a beginning and an end, but no middle, a play that it is impossible to imagine would have so successfully met the demands of the Elizabethan theatre.¹

For these reasons I think that it is fairly safe to ignore the possibility of the A-text's containing any part of the additions of 1602, and in what follows I shall assume the 1604 quarto to be a mere reprint of an edition of 1601 or at any rate to represent the manuscript entered in January that year. At the same time I ought to point out that if I am wrong in this conclusion, although my theory respecting the nature of the A-text would be unaffected and my theory respecting the B-text would need only minor modification,² the speculations regarding the history and composition of the play advanced in Section V would lose all substance.

We may now begin our examination of A, and ask whether the structural evidence, which we saw point to B as in general the more original, is borne out by an analysis of the text. Now, for the criticism of the rival texts we have one important document of control. It happens that *The Taming of a Shrew*, as printed in the quarto of 1594, quotes and imitates extensively from Marlowe's plays, and among others from *Faustus*. This gives us information respecting the textual form in which certain passages were current ten years before our earliest authority for the play as a whole. Five parallels to or quotations from *Faustus* have been detected.³ One, perhaps the least significant, we have already considered (pp. 27—8). In two there are no variants between our texts and they therefore do not help us.⁴ But in two other passages we find relevant evidence. The first four lines of 1. iii

¹ Could we regard the A-text as a report of the original performance supplemented by what could be picked up in the theatre of the additions of 1602, it would help to explain certain features of both texts that we shall consider later in relation to a possible revision in 1594 (pp. 94-7). Still, most of the objections that apply to the hypothesis of an early revision would apply to that of a later one as well.

² In particular I should have to argue that the foul papers of the additions were preserved along with those of the original play. This is not impossible (see p. 94).

³ All are collected by Boas (Appendix III). See also note on B 369.

⁴ *Faustus*, B 110-11: Ransacke the Ocean for Orient Pearle,

And search all corners of the new-found-world . . .

A Shrew, sig. C3, Sc. vi: To seeke for strange and new found pretious stones,

And diue into the sea to gather pearle . . .

Faustus, B 597-8: And hath not he that built the walles of *Thebes*,

With rauishing sound of his melodious Harpe . . .

A Shrew, sig. E3^v, Sc. xiv: As once did *Orpheus* with his harmony,

And rauishing sound of his melodious harpe . . .

Introduction

are reproduced verbatim in *A Shrew* (sig. A2, Introduction, i) and in one there is a variant, A reading

Now that the gloomy shadow of the earth,

where B substitutes 'night' for 'earth': and 'night' is the reading of *A Shrew*.¹ More striking is the opening of i. iv, where the texts run as follows:

A: *Wag*. Sirra boy, come hither.

Clo. How, boy? swowns boy, I hope you haue seene many boyes with such pickadevaunts as I haue. Boy quotha?

B: *Wag*. Come hither sirra boy.

Clo. Boy? O disgrace to my person: Zounds boy in your face, you haue seene many boyes with beards I am sure.

A Shrew, sig. C4^v, Sc. viii:

Boy. Come hither sirha boy.

San. Boy; oh disgrace to my person, souns boy
Of your face, you haue many boies with such
Pickadeuantes I am sure . . .

Here *A Shrew* supports B throughout except for the one reading 'Pickadeuantes', in which it agrees with A. There can be no doubt therefore that in this passage B preserves substantially the text current in 1594 or earlier, but that it has been edited by the alteration of a word that had probably lost entertainment value.

There are two other passages in A that must be condemned as unoriginal. One is in the episode of the Horse-corser, who enters after his ducking with the exclamation (A n76-7):

Alas, alas, Doctor Fustian quoth a, mas Doctor *Lopus* was neuer such a Doctor . . .

This allusion to the Jewish physician Roderigo Lopez must have been inserted after he had attained notoriety by his trial for treason in February 1594, and probably after his execution the following June. The other is in the scene in which Wagner hires the Clown, who says (A 394-5),

Mas but for the name of french crownes a man were as good haue as many english counters,

for it is maintained that French crowns did not become a drug in the English money-market before 1595, which would date the passage not only after Marlowe's death but after the earliest

¹ 'earth* is unlikely to be a compositor's error. In the next line both A and B read 'drisling looke': *A Shrew* has 'drisling lookes' which, as Boas observes, may be the correct reading.

Nature of the A-text

recorded performance (Ward, p. cxxxiv, note). Neither of these allusions is found in the B-text.

In the previous section we found reason to suppose that A had been shortened from the more original *text of B*, and the conditions in Act in and the preceding Chorus made it clear (p. 27) that the cutting was deliberate.¹ Another feature of the A-text is the marked simplicity of its staging. There is no reason to suppose that *Faustus* was not written as a normal play for a normal Elizabethan stage. But A avoids the use of the window for the horned Knight (Benvolio) in iv. ii and also the use of the balcony in 1. iii, where B introduces '*Lucifer and 4 devils*' evidently 'above', to preside over the conjuring up of Mephostophilis, and again in v. ii where in B Lucifer, Beelzebub, and Mephostophilis are apparently present at least when Faustus takes leave of his students. Later in the same scene the throne that descends from the 'heavens', and the 'discovery' of hell evidently on the inner stage, are found only in B. A also omits the final scene (v. iii) in which the Scholars 'discover' Faustus' remains. Thus the A-text calls, it seems, for nothing beyond a bare stage.² But even simpler theatrical effects appear to be avoided. There is no trace of the devils who in B enter as servitors to bring in the dishes when Faustus entertains his students (v. i);³ the piper disappears from the procession of the Deadly Sins in 11. ii (see p. 50); the dumb show of Alexander in iv. ii is cut to a bare minimum; and Faustus' conjuration in 1. iii takes place without the accompaniment of thunder and of the hovering dragon, though the latter is not only vouched for by the *Damnable Life* but was actually present among the Admiral's men's properties.

¹ Boas (p. 32, note) quotes from an unpublished dissertation by Miss M. J. Dickson to the effect that 'The 1604 text has the distinguishing features of an acting version that has been severely cut'. But her further inference that 'the cutting was not undertaken for the purpose of reducing the cast' since the stage directions 'nowhere appear to indicate the removal of a character' is hardly borne out by the evidence. Apart from the considerable number of characters involved in the omitted scenes, Beelzebub disappears, not indeed from the directions, but from the text of the show of the Seven Sins, the King of Hungary from the Pope's banquet, and the Duke of Saxony from the Emperor's court. Her final suggestion, that A was printed from a manuscript snatched from the hands of a reviser in the midst of his labours, is somewhat too imaginative for my taste.

² No doubt Faustus is meant to be discovered '*in his Study*'* in the first scene, but at a pinch he could take his seat at a table placed up-stage before the entrance of the Chorus.

³ This bit of spectacle would, one supposes, have had such a popular appeal that we can hardly avoid suspecting that it was absent from the performance upon which A was based. Indeed I personally suspect that all the instances of the use of the inner and upper stages mentioned above (with the exception of the window in iv. i-ii) were in fact eliminated before the original production of the play (see pp. 129-32).

Introduction

The deliberate omission in A of a scene in the current performance can in one instance be proved. Where in iv. v the Horse-corser comes in after his ducking he says in B (1554 ff.):

O what a cosening Doctor was this? I riding my horse into the water, thinking some hidden mystery had beene in the horse, I had nothing vnder me but a little straw, and had much ado to escape drowning . . .

The corresponding passage in A (1176 ff.) runs:

Alas, alas, Doctor Fustian quoth a, mas Doctor *Lopus* was neuer such a Doctor, has giuen me a purgation, has purg'd me of fortie Dollers, I shall neuer see them more: but yet like an asse as I was, I would not be ruled by him, for he bade me I should ride him into no water; now, I thinking my horse had had some rare qualitie that he would not haue had me knowne of, I like a ventrous youth, rid him into the deepe pond at the townes ende, I was no sooner in the middle of the pond, but my horse vanisht away, and I sat vpon a bottle of hey, neuer so neare drowning in my life . . .

Now, when in the next scene the Horse-corser meets his fellow dupes at the tavern, a scene peculiar to B, he narrates his adventure in these words (1615 ff.):

when I had my horse, Doctor *Fauster* bad me ride him night and day, and spare him no time; but, quoth he, in any case ride him not into the water. Now sir, I thinking the horse had had some quality that he would not haue me know of, what did I but rid him into a great riuer, and when I came iust in the midst my horse vanisht away, and I sate straddling vpon a bottle of Hay.

It will be noticed that A*s is a conflated account: 'was neuer such a Doctor*' comes from 'O what a cosening Doctor' in B, and the fear of drowning is common to both; Doctor Lopez, the purgation, and the adventurous youth are A's own embroideries; some of the rest might have been put together from the earlier part of the scene, in which, of course, Faustus delivers his warning; but the close verbal agreement from 'now, I thinking* down to 'bottle of hey' proves that A*s main source was the passage in iv. vi, though the changes made in it¹ point to memorial dependence only. Even such trifles as the perversion of Faustus* name and the expression 'quoth he*' are retained, though neither in its exact form. It is possible that the same speech of the Horse-corser contains a reminiscence of another episode in which he figures in B, but which is omitted in A. When he catches sight

^x Particularly the substitution of 'the deepe pond at the townes ende*' for '*a great riuer*'; see note on B 1537. Notice too that in A 'ride him*' has no antecedent.

Nature of the A-text

of Mephostophilis, who takes no part in the scene in B, he says (A 1187-9):

O yonder is his snipper snapper, do you heare? you, hey, passe, where's your master?

The phrase 'hey, passe' was current for conjuring or perhaps a conjurer, and it occurs in a fuller form in iv. vii, where the Carter says to Faustus (B 1763-4):

you thinke to carry it away with your *Hey-passe*[^] and *Re-passe* . . .*

Here then we have conclusive evidence that one at least of the scenes preserved only in B was known to the compiler of the A-text and must have formed part of the performance on which it was based.² The knowledge, as I have said, was apparently memorial and not based on any written text, and how far the borrowing was conscious it would be difficult perhaps to determine. But one thing is I think clear, that it was part of a deliberate attempt at elaboration. For although in general A is a much abridged text, and though the climax of the clownage (iv. vi and the latter part of iv. vii) is absent, those farcical scenes that are preserved tend to be expanded.

In the earliest of these, which closes the first act with Wagner's hiring the Clown, A introduces two passages depending for their humour on the Clown's misunderstanding of words (stavesacre: knave's acre, guilders: gridirons) and including the joke about French crowns, which we have already seen (p. 32) cannot be earlier than 1595; the Clown's boast of not fearing the devil is embroidered with a jest borrowed from a contemporary piece (see pp. 52—3); there is some additional play with the names of the devils Banio and Belcher, and the Clown is allowed a couple of passages of coarse humour (one suggested by an allusion later

¹ See also note on A 1204. There is another possible instance in IV. vii, which in A begins with the words of the Duke (1229-30):

Beleue me maister Doctor, this merriment hath much pleased me.

The corresponding passage in B mentions instead 'pleasant sights' that include an 'enchanted Castle in the Aire', derived from *EFB* but unknown to A. A's 'merriment' may, however, be derived from the later portion of the scene (not in A) in which Faustus describes the Clowns as 'good subiect for a merriment' (B 1696: see note on B 1639-43). A minor instance of proved omission in A is B 608 (see p. 54).

² Assuming, as I think we are by now entitled to do, that B is in the main the more original text. It has, of course, in the past been sought to account for such evidence on a theory of revision, fragments being moved by the reviser from one position to another, like pieces of a jigsaw puzzle. But, in the case in point, to assume that a reviser first rewrote the passage in conciser form, and then in a later scene reproduced the original almost verbatim, is not an hypothesis that commends itself to present-day criticism.

Introduction

in the play, B 682-6) of which B is innocent. In the next clowning scene, at the end of the second act (misplaced in A), the text is hardly parallel, though the outline is the same: some of the jokes are expanded in A in a manner not altogether seemly; Nan Spit the kitchen-maid is its own invention. The next is the scene with the Vintner that closes Act in. This has peculiar features to which I shall shortly return (p. 37). The texts are only corresponding and there is no vulgar elaboration; but it may be observed that whereas in B the Clown's mock-invocation in a way parodies that of Faustus, in A it is mere gibberish, and that on Mephostophilis* appearance A replaces one serious line in B by three lines of rather inapposite rant that read almost like a deliberate parody of Marlowe's bombastic style.¹ The last of the farcical scenes preserved in A is the Horse-courser episode (v. v). The texts are again only correspondent, with here and there a parallel speech, but A's is considerably the longer. It was A's use of v. vi in this scene that prompted our search for elaboration (p. 34), and we have also seen how the Lopez allusion dates A's expansion at any rate after the early months of 1594 (p. 32). A's most notable addition to the scene is the presence of Mephostophilis, who first acts as a bait for the dupe and ends by threatening him with the constable. In B he has no part, his name in the direction ¹ *Enter Faustus and the Horse-courser and Mephostophilis*' (B1523—4) is manifestly an editorial addition.

Elaboration of this sort is little in evidence in other parts of the play. The scene between Wagner and the Scholars (1. ii) properly belongs to the tragic plot, but it is mainly comic in treatment, and here we do indeed find evidence of expansion in some quibbling about 'witnesses' (A 215-18) that is out of keeping with the general tone. In the comic action proper there is practically nothing analogous. The incident of the Pope's crossing himself at the banquet (in in. ii) is emphasized in A (899-905); but here B's handling is so bare as to suggest that there must have been some elaboration for performance (see pp. 118-19). In the tragic action the same explanation may apply to the coda appended in A to the gift of the magic book at the end of 11. i (A 614-27), which is quite different in tone from the farcical elaborations (see pp. 81-2). On the other hand, the end of the Old-Man episode, found only in A (1377-86), may have been purposely omitted in B (see p. 125).

¹ However, the presence of these lines in A may have a different explanation (see pp. 83-4).

Nature of the A-text

There can be little doubt that the most natural explanation of the structural and textual differences we have so far examined is that A represents a version that has been first drastically curtailed for performance within a limited time, and then at some points elaborated to tickle the palate of a more vulgar audience. It might perhaps be suggested that these two processes were simultaneous, part of a single planned revision, and that there is no reason to suppose a progressive degeneration of the text. Any such suggestion is, however, disproved by the next feature we have to examine, namely, the presence in A of what seem to be alternative passages, where the text appears to have undergone alteration after it was first written down.

The clearest instance, and one which has indeed been long suspected or recognized, is in the mock conjuration by the Clowns at the end of in. iii, where according to A Mephostophilis enters twice over and twice changes the Clowns into beasts. In B we first have Robin's invocation: '*O per se 0, demogorgon[^] Belcher and Mephostophilis⁹*' whereupon '*Enter Mephostophilis*' with a verse speech, and to the accompaniment of some fooling, changes Dick into an ape and Robin to a dog, and then himself goes out. Originally A had much the same version, except that for the invocation is substituted the gibberish, '*Sanctobulorum Periphrastricon . . . Polypragmos Belseborams framanto pacostiphos tostu Mephostophilis, &c.*'—the '*&c.*' emphasizing the extempore element in this text—that what follows is much shortened, and that Mephostophilis goes out first, leaving the Clowns on the stage. But that is not how the text now stands. Immediately after the invocation, '*Enter Mephostophilis: sets squibs at their backs: they runne about*' the Vintner and the Clowns each in a couple of lines confessing his sins; after which again '*Enter to them Meph⁹*' also with a couple of prose lines:

Vanish vilaines, th'one like an Ape, an other like a Beare, the third
an Asse, for doing this enterprise.

He then proceeds with his verse speech, which, however, retains its original indentation, and the scene continues as already described. With a little imagination we can easily see what happened. Probably the direction '*Enter to them Meph*' originally stood at the top of a page, with a convenient space before and after it. At the foot of the previous page (below the invocation) the reviser wrote the new direction and the first of the new speeches, the Vintner's. At the top of the next page he wrote

Introduction

the new speeches for the two Clowns, and below the original direction he crowded in the new speech for Mephostophilis, 'Vanish vilaines, . . .'; if, as he should, he added an 'Exeunt', the compositor left it out.¹ The motive of the revision is not very clear, for the saving in length is negligible (8 lines against 15): perhaps the pretended metamorphosis (with the victims remaining on the stage) proved ineffective, and the fireworks presumably offered an attraction. But since no attempt was made, apparently, to cancel the original ending, we must suppose that the two were left as alternatives, either of which could be used according to the needs of the performance.

But that was not the end of the matter. We have already noticed (p. 21) that in A the scene of the stolen book (11. iii) immediately precedes that with the Vintner (in. iii) and that the absurdity of this arrangement is too great for us to regard it as intentional. What happened is again fairly obvious. In the first instance it was intended to omit 11. iii altogether (as earlier a scene between 11. i and n. ii had been omitted) and to retain only in. iii, which was probably thought the more amusing. But with the shrinking resources of the company, the juggling with the goblet proved beyond the skill of inferior actors, and it was decided to substitute something simpler. The omitted scene had called for no 'business', and a version of this was therefore inserted before the Vintner scene, not as an introduction, but as an alternative, though the Vintner scene was pathetically left standing in hope of better days.

With these instances in mind let us turn to the pageant of the Seven Deadly Sins. There is no very great divergence in the texts, but it will be noticed that whereas in B the show is introduced by a speech by Lucifer, in which he bids Faustus 'marke the shew*' and adds, 'go *Mephostoph.* fetch them in', what he says in A is 'marke this shew . . . come away'. Simpson has commented on the absurdity—'clumsiness*' is his word—of the order 'come away' when nobody leaves the stage. I suggest that 'come away*' is an insertion intended to replace B's 'fetch them in' and to close the scene at this point should the pageant prove beyond the capacity of the company or the time available be insufficient for its exhibition.

¹ Ward, who recognized the presence of 'double endings*', followed Dyce in vamping the text by supplying an exit for Mephostophilis at A 1012 and a re-entry at A 1020, and omitting his prose speech, A 1021-2. But obviously this cannot represent the intention at any point of A's varied history. Even Tucker Brooke regards Mephostophilis' prose speech as * wrongly* inserted and leaves it out.

Nature of the A-text

The picture that we now have is not simply that of a text curtailed for performance in a limited time by a company of limited resources, but of one that has been progressively adapted to the needs of a declining company and the palate of an uncultivated audience. The features are those we are familiar with in *Orlando Furioso* as printed in 1594. What distinguishes the two plays is that, whereas Greene's rather tawdry flights of poetic fancy were largely cut to make room for comic elaboration, the serious parts of Marlowe's *Faustus* were, so far as we can judge, preserved substantially intact. It might still, however, be possible to argue that the A-text started life as an orderly abridgement of an authorized prompt copy, such as we find, for instance, in the quarto of Peele's *Battle of Alcazar* (1594), and that the dislocations and textual corruptions we have observed are after all sporadic and may be accounted for by accidents in its later history. We must now therefore turn our attention to what may be called the constant or at least the prevailing texture of the A-version, in the hope of being able to discover whether this too shows signs of corruption.

Approaching this question, I may remark in the first place that critics have been curiously silent about two nominal perversions that run all through the A-text, '*Wertenberg*' and '*Mephastophilis*'. There is, of course, no doubt that Faustus' university, like Luther's and Hamlet's, was Wittenberg; it is Wittenberg in the German '*Historia*', in the *Damnable Life*, and in the B-text. Clearly then whoever prepared the A-text had only a vague notion of the sound of the name.¹ For the name of Faustus' attendant spirit we are dependent on the prose history. In the German it is '*Mephostophiles*', and the same in the English. In B it is regularly '*Mephostophilis*'[>] except on a few occasions when we find '*Mephastophi/is*' which is the usual form

¹ On its first occurrence the reprints attempted a correction: in 1. 14 Ai has **Wertenberg*| A2 '*Wirtenberg*', and A3 actually '*Wittenberg*'; but emendation was carried no farther. When Boas (ad loc.) speaks of 'the South German Duchy' of '*Wertenberg**, he assumes that '*Wertenberg*' is an anglicized form of *Witrtemberg*, and it is true that '*Wirtenberg*' is an early spelling of that name. It is also true that the two names were sometimes confused, for Peter Heylin in the first edition of his *Microcosmus* (1621, p. 154) has '*Wittenberg*' for *Wurttemberg*, and Ward (p. xcv, note 2) points out that Reginald Scot, quoting Johan Weyer in his *Discovery of Witchcraft*, speaks of 'the dukedom of *Witneberge*' I doubt, however, whether in A '*Wertenberg*' is anything but an oral or memorial blunder. Surely no one but an historian could have imagined, like Ward (p. xcv), that the error in A had anything to do with the fact that legend sometimes represented the historical Faustus as born at a town in *Wurttemberg*.

Introduction

in A, though alternating with '*Mephistophilus*'.¹ There can be no doubt that '*Mephistophilus*' was the form deliberately chosen by Marlowe and that A's '*Mephistophilus**' is nothing but an error of ear or memory. These are significant facts for the nature of the A-text.

I think the best way to *get* an insight into the character of the A-text will be to take a characteristic passage and consider the variants in detail. For this purpose I have chosen the prologue or opening chorus, not because it affords the most striking evidence, but because it is representative of many other passages, and because it raises at once certain considerations that will have to be borne in mind throughout.

The first line runs in A:

Not marching now in fields of *Thracimene*

and in B:

Not marching in the fields of *Thrasimen* . . .

The presence or absence of 'now' seems, so far as the line itself is concerned, to be a matter of indifference. The sentence certainly does not require it: It is neither of the wars of nations, nor

¹ The -z- form is found in B at 498, 1013, 1025, 1359, and abbreviated to '*MephastcS*' at 1025 and 1857. (Only the first of these is in a passage taken by B direct from A: see p. 72, but see also note on B 1352-61.) The -o- form is found in A only at 279 and 1012 (both stage directions). The by-form in -us is found in A consistently or almost consistently in two passages, namely at 464, 466, 468, 478, 488, and 493 (all corrected in A2) and again at 614, 629, 679, 696, 713, 821, and 822 (but not at 659 or 807: A2 corrected 679, 696, 713, and A3 added 821, 822). (For the vocative '*Mepha(p)stophile*' found in both texts at A 469 and B 417 (but corrected in B 2) see note ad loc.) These two passages are also distinguished by the use (though not consistent) of a colon instead of a full point after speakers' prefixes, and I am therefore inclined to believe that the spelling merely points to a different scribe or compositor. (It is curious, however, to find Pistol using the form '*Mephostopkilus*' in *The Merry Wives*, I. i. 132 (folio: it is not in the quarto of 1602). The -o- form would naturally be derived from the stage, but the -us seems to imply a knowledge of A. Chambers dates *The Merry Wives* 1600-1, and here we may perhaps see evidence that an edition of *Faustus* was printed soon after the entrance of 7 Jan. 1601. It is even more curious that, as Ward (p. 118) points out, Flavia, disguised as a witch, also uses the -us form in Shirley's *Young Admiral* (1637), which was not licensed till 3 July 1633, when one would suppose the A-text to have been long forgotten.) In A abbreviated forms are only found in stage directions, at 1243 and 1317*. In B they are much more frequent. There are not only eight instances in directions (including '*Mephosto*' without a stop at 1802) but also nearly a dozen in the text, and the question arises whether the name was ever meant to be shortened in speech. '*Mepho*' at 414 and '*Mephostoph.*' at 678 are obviously graphic. All the rest are '*Mephosto*' (or '*Mephastc*'), which is a possible verbal abbreviation; three have a full point, four a colon, one a comma, and one no stop at all. Metre proves the instances at 859 (point), 441, 1025, 1040, 1851 (colons), and 1006 (comma) to be graphic: '*Mephosto*' at 426 seems to be in prose and '*Mephosto*' at 1269 is extra-metrical, and no inference is possible: only '*Mephosto.**' at 972 appears to be a verbal shortening according to the verse, and since it stands alone it is more probable that the line was intended for an alexandrine.

Nature of the A-text

of love and policy contending at court, nor of deeds of heroism that our author writes. . . . At the same time it lends a not ineffective emphasis to the opening line that would, perhaps unconsciously, recommend it to a declamatory actor. But the variant cannot be considered in isolation, for in line 8,

A: Onely this (Gentlemen) we must performe

B: Onely this Gentles: we must now performe

it is A that omits and B that includes the 'now', and we have to decide to which line it properly belongs. I think the answer must be that its most natural position is clearly in connexion with what in fact is 'now' to be performed. Nor does there seem any reason why the address in line 8 should be confined to the male portion of the audience, and we may therefore conjecture that the reading 'Gentlemen' is due merely to the need to make up for the loss of a syllable later in the line. If we still hanker after the more emphatic opening of A, I suggest that this is due merely to its having long been for most of us the more familiar.

This consideration is again, I believe, operative in our choice between the readings of the second line, which in A runs,

Where *Mars* did mate the Carthaginians

and in B,

Where *Mars* did mate the warlicke *Carthagens* . . .

I frankly admit that I prefer the dignified simplicity of A; but it would be idle to pretend that adjectival elaboration is alien to Marlowe's style, or that 'warlike' is not a favourite word with him and his imitators.¹ Moreover, the unusual form '*Carthagens*'² is unlikely to have been introduced merely to make room for a conventional epithet: it seems much more likely that an actor or reporter unconsciously substituted the habitual 'Carthaginians', with inevitably the consequent loss of 'warlike'.

The next variant is in line 7, where A reads 'daunt' and B 'vaunt'. B is undoubtedly correct, but since A's reading is presumably a mere misprint, it is irrelevant for our purpose. There is a real difficulty in line 10:

A: To patient Iudgements we appeale our plaude

B: And now to patient iudgements we appeale . . .

O.E.D. cites A's reading (s.v. Appeal, sense 10) for the meaning 'To remove to a higher tribunal', but I doubt whether such an

¹ As in B 1196, 'The royall shapcs and warlike semblances'.

² Greene has 'port Carthagene*' for Carthage in *Orlando Furioso*, 1. 820.

Introduction

interpretation is here possible: you can appeal a matter or a case, but hardly applause; nor, I think, can 'plauide' mean the claim to applause.¹ In any case, why particularly appeal for applause when recording Faustus' infancy? The line affords just such semi-sense as an actor or reporter might produce at a pinch from imperfect recollection. On the other hand, B's line, though straightforward, is not wholly convincing: there is no reason for the 'now', and its repetition from line 8 is awkward.² I would suggest that Marlowe, with line 8 still in mind, inadvertently wrote 'And now' by mistake for 'And so'.

The slight variant in line 12,

A: Now is he borne, his parents base of stocke,
B: Now is he borne, of parents base of stocke,

is indifferent, but B's construction is perhaps the more natural; and the same is true in line 14,

A: Of riper yeeres to *Wertenberg* he went
B: At riper yeares to *Wittenberg* he went . . .

So again in line 16,

A: So soone hee profites in Diuinitie
B: So much he profits in Diuinitie

the variant is in itself indifferent, but A's reading may have been suggested by 'shortly' two lines below.

B omits line 17 of A,

The fruitfull plot of Scholerisme grac't. . .

It was certainly not the invention of an actor or reporter, and to me at least it seems thoroughly Marlowan (see note). But if B is an edited text (as in the next section we shall see that in some measure it certainly is) the slight obscurity may have led to the omission of the line.

One of the most disputed variants is that in line 19 of the A-text (B 18),

A: Excelling all, whose sweete delight disputes
B: Excelling all, and sweetly can dispute . . .

In fact A needs no emendation (see note) if we take 'disputes' to be a substantive and understand 'is' before it, though the con-

¹ Dyce proposed to read 'appeal for plaud\ but this is a mere makeshift, unless we were to suppose that the T was accidentally omitted or dropped out, and the remaining *or* was miscorrected to *our'

² Still more so its anticipation of line 12. If it really stood in the prompt-book, a desire to get rid of it may have started the muddle in A.

Nature of the A-text

struction is certainly harsh. B is perfectly smooth—suspiciously so—and my belief is that in this instance A is original, and that the editor of B attempted to smooth out the roughness (see p. 88). In the next line,

A: In heavenly matters of *Theologie*

B: In th'heavenly matters of *Theologie*

the variant is again indifferent; but given B, the natural tendency would be to reduce it to the simpler form, whereas given A, there would be no incentive to elaborate it.

In lines 21 (20) and 23 (22) there are differences of punctuation: in the former B is wrong, in the latter a difference of interpretation is implied; but both, since only commas are involved, may be due to the compositors. In line 25 A's 'glutted more' (B 24, 'glutted now') is generally allowed to be a corruption, since the notion of 'over-glutted' is tautological: but it may be no more than a graphic error.

This analysis of some thirty lines suggests the following considerations. We should be on our guard against letting a familiarity with the A-text close our eyes to what more objective criticism may detect as unoriginal features. Further, A appears to have some at least of the characteristics of a reported text. On the other hand, not all its variants are necessarily corruptions, and we must allow for the possibility that B may have undergone a certain amount of editing. In view therefore of earlier evidence of unoriginality in A we are justified in inquiring how far its text betrays the usual signs of memorial reconstruction.

A great many of the variants between the A and B texts are indifferent, that is to say there is no critical ground on which one can be preferred to the other.¹ A few examples will suffice. 'Why, dost not thou know?' one of the Scholars asks Wagner (A 208), and there seems neither gain nor loss in B's 'know then!' When the Clown is bidden to follow in Wagner's footsteps (A 432—3) it makes no difference whether he keeps his left eye on his master's right heel or his right eye on his left heel. At A 440,

what bootes it then to thinke of God or heauen ?

B has 'on God' (and cf. A 722); but the slight distinction we feel would probably not have been recognized by an Elizabethan.

¹ Such variants are therefore unlikely to arise through revision, unless the reviser is making a complete transcript, in which case no doubt he may more or less unconsciously substitute one word or phrase for another.

Introduction

Nor I think would any preference have been felt in the lines (A 603-4),

She whome thine eie shall like, thy heart shal haue,
Be she as chaste as was *Penelope*

where for 'Be' B substitutes 'Were'. Other instances are, A 575:

Why? thinkst thou then [B: dost thou think] that Faustus shall bee
damn'd?

A 769:

Away enuious rascal [B: Out enuious wretch]

A 1405-6:

though my heart pants and quiuers [B: pant & quiuer]

and A 1432-3:

threatned . . . to fetch both [B: fetch me] body and soule . . .

But it often happens that what at first sight look like indifferent variants yet on further consideration offer some valid ground of choice.¹ Thus at B 636,

Well, I am answer'd: now tell me who made the world?

A's apparently trivial omission of 'now' is really a distinct loss (see note). A's lines (662—3),

Come Mephistophilis, let vs dispute againe,
And argue of diuine *Astrologie*,

raise no suspicion; but B's 'reason' is slightly more dignified than A's 'argue'. Again Faustus* exclamation at sight of Lucifer (A 716),

O who art thou that lookst so terrible?

is well enough; but it misses the suggestion of a dimly apprehended form in B's 'O what art thou'. At A 810 ff.

Learned Faustus,
To know the secrets of *Astronomy* . . .
Did . . . scale *Olympus* top,

will pass; but B's 'to find the secrets' seems more appropriate.

¹ When one reading is preferable to another it may of course be due to revision. In every instance the reader should ask himself (1) whether the inferior reading is what an independent author would be likely to write, and (2) whether the superior reading is likely to have occurred to a reviser. There are no doubt cases in which the reading of A seems preferable. In course of performance some asperities of the original will naturally be smoothed away, and readings will be introduced that may be genuine improvements, or have at least a specious appearance of being so.

Nature of the A-text

Exactly the same applies at A 612—13:

And men in armour shal appeare to thee,
Ready to execute what thou desirst [B: commandst]

and even more strongly at A 721:

Thou talkst of [B: calst on] Christ, contrary to thy promise ..

In other passages the injury to the sense is greater, and this shows itself particularly, and perhaps significantly, in the case of auxiliaries. Notice, for example, *Mephostophilis** words when he demands the blood-bond (A 477):

If thou deny it, I wil [B: I must] backe to hel.

He is not his own master, but is merely executing the commands of Lucifer. So a little later, when *Mephostophilis* tells Faustus to draw the bond 'in manner of a deede of gift', he replies (A 501):

I so I will [B: so I do], but *Mephostophilis* my bloud conieales . . .

He is already writing when the blood stops flowing. At A 708 the Good Angel says:

Neuer too late, if Faustus can [B: will] repent.

It is not a question of the possibility of repentance—that is assumed—but of the will to repent. When Faustus has made his confession to the Scholars one of them exclaims (A 1435):

O what shall [B: may] we do to [B: to saue] Faustus?

As it stands A makes no sense, but the omission of 'saue' was doubtless accidental. However, it is not a question which of several courses the students will choose, but what possible course is open to them. Rather similar is a case that occurs just before, where Faustus says (A 1428):

I writ them a bill with mine owne bloud, the date is expired, the time wil come [B: this is the time], and he wil fetch mee.

Obviously, if the date was expired, the time had come. (A may have been affected by recollection of the later lines (A 1460-1):

the clocke wil strike,

The diuel wil come, and Faustus must be damnd.)

Sometimes the reading of A implies a definite misunderstanding of the text or situation, and it is not without interest that in

¹ In this line the change of preposition followed of course upon the change of verb. But the change here presumably determined that in the following line,

Thou shouldst not thinke of [B: on] God, thinke of [B: on] the deuil . . .

though the substitution is indeed characteristic of A: cf. A 440 cited above, p. 43.

Introduction

several cases the context is theological. Thus when in the scene of farewell to his students Faustus confesses to 'A surffet of deadly sinne that hath damnd both body and soule', one of them seeks to comfort him with the words (A 1400—1):

Yet Faustus looke vp to heauen, remember gods mercies are [B: and remember mercy is¹] infinite.

Here A misses the point: it is not a question of how abundant are the mercies that God bestows on mankind, but that His mercy extends even to the greatest sinner. Earlier, Faustus in one of his fits of repentance exclaims (A 711—12):

Ah Christ my Sauioir, seeke [B: Helpe] to saue distressed Faustus soule. To seek to do something implies a doubtful issue: but whereas it is heretical to question Christ's power to save, it is true belief that that power is only exercised in aid of the sinner's own endeavour.² There may be a further example when at the Pope's banquet an ecclesiastical guest, by way of explaining the disturbances, remarks in B (1095-6):

Please it your holinesse, I think it be some Ghost crept out of Purgatory, and now is come vnto your holinesse for his pardon.

The suggestion of course is that a soul in purgatory has, like Hamlet's father, escaped for a space from his prison house, and has come to crave the papal indulgence for the remission of his term of suffering. A (895—6) paraphrases:

My Lord, it may be some ghost newly crept out of Purgatory come to begge a pardon of your holinesse.

The thoughtless insertion of 'newly' (a muddled recollection of B's 'now') alters the whole meaning of the passage, for the point of time is here irrelevant unless to suggest a soul newly released, and such a soul would need no indulgence. But misunderstanding of a secular context is just as common. Faustus' wondrous cures avail him little (B 50-3):

Yet art thou still but *Faustus*, and a man.
Couldst thou make men to Hue eternally,
Or being dead, raise them to life againe,
Then this profession were to be esteem'd.

This is straightforward sense, whereas A's questions,

wouldst thou make man to Hue eternally?
Or being dead, raise them to life againe ?

¹ The timid censorship from which B suffers throughout (see pp. 85-6) has probably removed the word 'Gods^s'.
² See also note on B 408.

Nature of the A-text

make nonsense of the following line, besides containing a false concord. Later Faustus arrives in Rome (A 818-20)

To see the Pope, and manner of his court,
And take some part of holy *Peters* feast,
That to this day is highly solemnizd.

But the point is not that the feast of St. Peter is still celebrated in Rome, but that Faustus happens to arrive that day, as appears from B's

The which this day is highly solemnized.

Similarly in 1. iv the reporter reduces to nonsense Wagner's Latin tag, which he evidently did not understand, by altering the introductory phrase (B 286). In the same scene he misses the point of a joke: the Clown does not mean that his vermin behave as though they had fatted him up, but as if they were guests at an ordinary (B 363-4). The inappropriateness of A's reading is sometimes revealed by the context rather than in the phrase itself, as at A 244:

Now that the gloomy shadow of the earth [B: the night],
Longing to view *Orions* drisling looke,
Leapes from th'antartike world vnto the side,
And dimmes the welkin with her pitchy breath . . .

Night is the shadow of the earth, so that the two readings are strictly synonymous; but while it is all very well to personify night, or even the darkness of night, and to speak of 'her pitchy breath', it is hardly appropriate to treat a fact of astronomical optics after the same fashion. Of course, we already know from other evidence that B's reading is original (see p. 32). An example of sheer nonsense is found in A's lines (62—3),

Such is the subiect of the institute
And vniuersal body of the Church [B: the law]

which, however it originated, proves the depths of ineptitude to which A can descend. Mishearing, or the sort of memorial perversion that is indistinguishable from it, is manifest at A 251-2:

Within this circle is *lehouahs* name,
Forward and backward, and Agramithist,
[B: Forward, and backward, *AnagramatisV*:]

Lastly, Mephostophilis correctly reports Lucifer's decision in B(4i9),

That I shall waite on *Faustus* whilst he Hues,

Introduction

where A's 'whilst I Hue' has all the appearance of an actor's slip.

Where sense thus suffers it is natural that grammar should not escape abuse. A (1280) is content with:

Doctor, if you will do vs that favor, as to let vs see . . .

where B has the orthodox construction 'doe vs so much fauour'.¹
At A 212-13 we find:

That follows not necessary by force of argument, that you being licentiate should stand vpon't [B: vpon], therefore acknowledge . . .

Here 'necessary*' is probably a misprint, but the intrusive 'it' is slipshod, and we meet it again in the same scene (A 230—1):

as this wine if it could speake, it would [B: would] enforme your worships . . .

Unidiomatic too is A 586-7:

But leauing off this [B: leauing this], let me haue a wife . . .

Metre fares no better than grammar, for it is often disturbed by the small omissions that memory is apt to make and the small insertions to which actors are prone. The following lines in A are all rendered unmetrical by the loss of the bracketed words preserved in B,²

470: Now tel [me], what sayes *Lucifer* thy Lord?

481: Is that the reason [why] he tempts vs thus?

483: [Why,] Haue you any paine that tortures others?

489: Then [*Faustus*] stabbe thine arme courageously,

539: Then heare me reade them [*Mephostophi/is*]:

560: [So,] Now Faustus aske [me] what thou wilt.³

564: I, [so are all thing else;] but where about?

569: And where hell is, [there] must we euer be:

though in the last instance A's line is rather effective. At A 583—4 we find omission and intrusion combining to destroy the metre:

But Faustus I [B: But I] am an instance to proue the contrary

For [B: For I tell thee] I am damnd, and am now [B: and now] in hell.

More elaborate recasting appears at A 631-4:

why Faustus,

Thinkst thou heauen is such a glorious thing?

I tel thee tis not halfe so faire as thou,

Or any man that breathes on earth.

¹ This, however, may be an original slip corrected by the editor of B; see note on B 1791.

² For omissions in prose see note on B 341-3.

³ But see note on B 506,

Nature of the A-text

Here B reads:

'Twas thine owne seeking *Faustus* thanke thy selfe.
But think'st thou heauen is such a glorious thing?
I tell thee *Faustus* it is not halfe so faire
As thou, or any man that breathe[s] on earth.

One could hardly wish for a better illustration of the working of defective memory. An amusing example of the combination of imperfect recollection with connective embroidery may be seen where B's lines (530—1),

Nay, and this be hell, Fie willingly be damn'd.
What sleeping, eating, walking and disputing ?

are thus translated into prose by A,

How? now in hell? nay and this be hell, He willingly be damnd here:
what walking, disputing, &C¹

We have seen that insertion may be as destructive of metre as omission. In the following examples the bracketed words of A are not found in B,

443: Now go not backward: [no] *Faustus* be resolute,
669: And [*Faustus* all] iointly moue vpon one axletree,
719: O *Faustus*, they are come to fetch [away] thy soule.

Inversion again, often accompanied by verbal change, may produce the same disorder, as in

B 458: See *Faustus* here is fire, set it on.
A: Heres fier, come *Faustus*, set it on.

B 552: Brings Thunder, Whirle-winds, Storme and Lightning:
A: Brings whirlwindes, tempests, thunder and lightning.

Thunder and lightning are inseparable in the mind of the actor or reporter. Or the result may be indifferent, as in

B. 475: What meanes this shew? speake *Mephostophilis*.
A: Speake *Mephostophilis*, what meanes this shewe?

But inversion is not confined to verbal details; we see it operating on a larger scale in the displacement of the speeches of Envy and Wrath in the pageant of the Sins (A 755-69). In the absence of any internal evidence, A's order might as well be original as B's: equally there was nothing to guide the actor or reporter or to check a lapse of memory. At the end of the same show there

¹ The first four words echo the preceding speech by *Mephostophilis*: *I tell thee I am damn'd, and now in hell* (see below, p. 51).

Introduction

is a little variant that is an epitome of the character of A. In B Lucifer dismisses the Sins with the words (730):

Away to hell, away on piper.

Instead A has

Away, to hell, to hell

but the words, instead of being given to Lucifer, and although they retain their indentation, are tacked on to the speech of Lechery. The piper, who evidently led the procession, disappears in accordance with A's habit of pruning all theatrical display (see p. 32). What is left is substantially the same: the reporter remembered the sense, he even remembered that there was repetition, but he forgot which word to repeat.¹

I have already mentioned the insertion of connective phrases. These are found in A, as they are in all reported texts, though they are not very frequent, perhaps because many of the scenes in which one would expect to find them are so loosely paraphrased that the minor features of reporting are obscured. But already at A 93 we have

Heere *Faustus* trie thy braines to gaine a deitie

where the hypermetrical vocative is not in B; and again at A 599,

Tut *Faustus*, marriage is but a ceremoniall toy,

where the first two words are peculiar to A. Sometimes a connective replaces a longer phrase, as in the passage, A 631 ff., already quoted (pp. 48—9). Two instances are concealed in prose: A 364,

Tel me sirra, hast thou any commings in?

and A 673,

But tell me, haue they all one motion ?

in each of which the words 'Tel me' or 'tell me' are not found in B. The 'Tut*' in the second example given above, no less than 'Tush', is rather characteristic of A. Either may, of course, be original: in the middle of the clownage of the Horse-corser scene both texts have the line (A n 73 = B 1550),

Tush, Christ did call the thiefe vpon the Crosse,

and at A 798 we find,

Tut *Faustus*, in hel is al manner of delight

¹ Other good examples of the working of the reporter's or actor's mind will be found in the notes on B 341-3, 352, and 692-5.

Nature of the A-text

where B's 'But' is so inappropriate as to suggest a misprint; and we may recall that in *Tamburlaine* (pt. i, 1. 1101) Marlowe himself wrote,

See how he comes! Tush. Turkes are full of brags

and in *Edward II* (1. 2310),

The *Spencers* ghostes, where euer they remaine,
Wish well to mine, then tush for them ile die.

But the exclamation is intrusive and unmetrical at A 678,

Tush, these slender trifles *Wagner* can decide,

and it occurs again in A only at 684 (but see p. 108, note). At A 848 we find 'Tut, tis no matter man/ in loosely paraphrased prose, and at A 627 'Tut I warrant thee' in a passage peculiar to that text.

Sometimes we find larger insertions intended apparently to bridge what were felt to be the too abrupt transitions of the author. When Lucifer dismisses the pageant of the Sins Faustus exclaims in B (731),

O how this sight doth delight my soule.

A, feeling that this needed leading up to, substituted (A 796—7),

Lu. Now Faustus, how dost thou like this ?

Fau: O this feedes my soule.

So an actor may for emphasis repeat the last words of another's speech (p. 49, note), and he may do the same to raise a laugh, as at A 370—1. Other expansions are elucidatory. Faustus asks Mephostophilis to tell him who made the world, and the dialogue proceeds (B 637-40):

Meph. I will not.

Faust. Sweet *Mephostophilis* tell me.

Meph. Moue me not *Faustus*.

Faust. Villaine, haue not I bound thee to tell me any thing ?

Whether 'Moue*' is here used in the sense of to anger or to urge is not certain; but A took it to mean the latter, as is clear from its reading (A 697)

Moue me not, for I will not tell thee.

Any text reported from performance is likely to contain bits of actors' gag, and many of the additions of the A-text may have originated in this way. Passages of some impropriety, verbal misunderstandings, and the trick of repetition, have already been

Introduction

mentioned (pp. 36, 45-6, 51). At A 215-18 is a jest out of keeping with the academic style that Wagner maintains through the rest of the scene (cf. p. 36): it turns on the question of 'witnessed and curiously enough there is another humorous insertion in which characters appeal to the audience for 'witness' in Wagner's scene with the Clown (A 401-3); which suggests the same agency at work on two passages of possibly different authorship. Anti-papal ribaldry, such as inspired a printer's ornament familiar to Elizabethan students, appears in a couple of lines inserted before the Friars' *'Dirge'* In B (1109-10) Faustus exclaims,

Bell, Booke, and Candle Candle, Booke, and Bell,
Forward and backward, to curse *Faustus* to hell

and A continues,

Anon you shal heare a hogge grunt, a calfe bleate, and an asse braye,
because it is S. *Peters* holy day.

A particular form of gag sometimes found in reported texts is the introduction of phrases, lines, or even larger passages from other plays with which the actor or reporter happened to be familiar: *The Merry Wives*, 1602, borrows thus from *Hamlet*, and *Hamlet*, 1603, borrows from *The Spanish Tragedy*. And so we find that A 1117,

Bred in the concaue of some monstrous rocke

to which there is nothing corresponding in B, is lifted from 2 *Tamburlaine*, in. ii (1. 3279),

Fenc'd with the concaue of a monstrous rocke . . .

A more extensive borrowing has been pointed out by R. A. Law.² When Wagner threatens to call up the devils Banio and Belcher to carry away the recalcitrant Clown, the latter retorts in B (373~4)>

Belcher} and *Belcher* come here, I'le belch him: I am not afraid of a deuill.

A elaborates as follows (406-10):

Let your *Balio* and your *Belcher* come here, and He knocke them, they were neuer so knocht since they were diuels, say I should kill one of them, what would folkes say? do ye see yonder tall fellow in the round slop, hee has kild the diuell, so I should be cald kill diuell all the parish ouer.

¹ See also note on B 1857.

² *Modern Language Notes*, 1911, xxvi. 147: I owe the reference to Kirschbaum, p. 283.

Nature of the A-text

Most of this is borrowed from *A Looking-Glass for London and England* (1594, sig. Gy 11. 1732-5) in which the Clown boasts,

Then may I count my selfe I thinke a tall man, that am able to kill a diuell. Now who dare deale with me in the parish, or what wench in *Niniuie* will not loue me, when they say, there goes he that beate the diuell.

A persistent disease of reported texts is assimilation. When an author has to say something several times over he generally tries to vary the expression and avoids mechanical repetition. But an actor will not always burden his memory with such niceties, and a reporter is apt to get one form of expression fixed in his mind and to produce it whenever anything of the sort is called for. A notable example in *Faustus* is furnished by the Horse-corser scene. The transformation of his steed is mentioned several times, and B duly varies the expression—it is indeed rather inconsistent: the first time he finds himself astride 'a little straw' (1536), next 'a bottle of Hay' (1560-1), last 'a bundle of hay' (1567): when he recounts his adventure in the next scene (which is not found in A) it is again 'a bottle of Hay' (1621-2). A bottle of hay is a nice phrase and it stuck in the memory of the actor or reporter. The A-text does not follow B at all closely, but it also mentions the transformation three times, and on each occasion it has 'a bottle of hey' (1185, 1202, 1218). For B 477,

And let thee see what Magicke can performe

A has the rather lame substitute,

And to shewe thee what Magicke can performe_f

a borrowing from 'what means this shewe' a couple of lines before. In the next scene B reads (591—3),

Swords, poyson, halters, and inuenomb'd Steele,
Are laid before me to dispatch my selfe:
And long ere this, I should haue done the deed,

where in the last line A has the awkward repetition,

And long ere this I should have slaine my selfe « . . . ,

A minor but interesting example is to be found in 11. ii. At B 625 the phrase 'But tell me' is used, and duly appears in both texts. It evidently fixed itself in the mind of the actor or reporter, for he not only anticipated it at 604 by 'Tel me' in place of B's 'Speake', but also introduced 'tell me' in 614, where there is nothing corresponding in B (cf. p. 50; see also note on

Introduction

B 371). Or again an endeavour to retain the variation may lead to repeated shifting. Consider the following passage in B (604-9):

Speake, are there many Spheares about the Moone? . . .

Meph. As are the elements, such are the heauens,
Euen from the Moone vnto the Emperiall Orbe,
Mutually folded in each others Spheares . . .

In the first of these lines A substitutes 'heauens' for 'Spheares', and consequently in the next it has to substitute 'spheares' for 'heauens'; the next line it omits, but later, confronted again by 'Spheares', it borrows 'orbe' from it without even troubling to make it plural.

Perhaps the most characteristic mark of a reported text is the occurrence of what may be called recollections and anticipations, that is the borrowing at some particular point of a phrase that properly belongs to an earlier or later passage of similar import. It may be due either to an actor or to a reporter, provided the report is made from memory. Of the two, anticipation is the more significant, since it can only be due to an agent who is familiar with the play as a whole, and cannot occur in the work of one who, like a copyist, knows only what has gone before. We have already observed (pp. 34-5) how in the Horse-corser episode A borrows from a later scene that is only preserved in B. This may have been at least partly intentional. Some minor examples of anticipation may be noticed here. At A 385 Wagner says to the Clown,

but sirra, leaue your iesting, and binde your selfe presently vnto me

where 'leaue your iesting', which is not in B, implies a change of subject, whereas in fact Wagner himself carries on the jesting. The phrase has been borrowed from a somewhat later context in B (26§) where jesting is in fact dropped and the bargain completed. A little later in the same scene A has some more fooling of which there is no trace in B. The Clown says (A 424-7),

no, no sir, if you turne me into any thing, let it be in the likenesse of a
little pretie frisking flea, that I may be here and there and euery where,
O He tickle the pretie wenches plackets He be amongst them ifaith.

This characteristic bit of ribaldry is the invention of A, but it seems to have been suggested by the allusion to Ovid's flea in the speech of Pride, the first of the Seven Sins (A 741 ft.), which is in both texts, but from which A most uncharacteristically omits the delicate embroidery. In the same show of the Sins,

Nature of the A-text

Faustus' inquiry 'what art thou? the fift' gets the answer in A (770),

who I sir, I am *Gluttony*,

where B has merely 'I am Gluttony*. But when Faustus repeats the question to 'the seauenth and last', the texts agree in the answer (A 792),

Who I sir? I am one that loues . . .

It will be admitted, I think, that this is in the style of Mistress Minx.

Recollections, or repetitions from earlier passages, are a less marked feature of A, but note that 'talke of the diuel, and nothing else* (A 737) and 'thinke on the diueP (A 806), neither of which has anything corresponding in B, are borrowed from an earlier passage that runs in B (662-3),

Thou should'st not thinke on God.—Thinke on the deuill

though these are not of course unconscious repetitions but attempts to get an extra laugh. So too after the devil-dance that celebrates the signing of the bond A gives Faustus a line (532) that has no parallel in B:

Then theres inough for a thousand soules . . .

Again this is a conscious insertion, but it is suggested by the earlier exclamation (A 347-8 = B 327-8),

Had I as many soules as there be starres,
Ide giue them al for *Mephastophilis* . . .

There may be another trifling instance. In the course of the recasting and elaboration at the end of iv. v the Horse-corser says (A 1214) 'come to my Oastrie', that is, my hostelry. The unaspirated form is not very common, but it is found in B (756) where the Clown speaks of 'the Ostry' in a scene where A is widely divergent, and the Horse-corser himself uses the more normal form 'Hostry* (B 1629) in a scene that A certainly knew though it did not preserve.¹

¹ For a minor case of combined anticipation and recollection see note on B 352, and for one of recollection that on B 615.

Repetitions are not, of course, necessarily evidence of reporting, they may be deliberate. There are several in the B-text, notably the echo of 509-10 at 1708-9 and the anticipation of 1874 at 1422-7. Of quite another nature and origin are a number of duplications in B due to careless composition or interpolation: e.g. 173:175,470:476, 548:736, 558-6' 738-9, 800-1:855-6, 1792:1807. Twice such a duplication appears to have been removed on revision in the prompt-book and consequently does not appear in A: B 687-8:724 and 1830:1843 (that at B 800-1:855-6 was partly removed by cutting in A).

Introduction

A general slackening of expression is another mark of reported texts, since actors and reporters alike are liable to replace a terser by a looser phrase. A few examples will illustrate what I mean. The second scene opens with the Scholars wondering 'what's become of *Faustus*': one of them says in B (192),

That shall we presently know, here comes his boy
where A has

That shall we know, for see here comes his boy
dropping the significant 'presently' in favour of the merely connective 'for see'. At the drawing of the bond Mephostophilis bids *Faustus* (B 447)

Write it in manner of a Deed of Gift
which agrees with the verse context; A's expansion,
thou must write it in manner of a deede of gift

reduces the line to prose. A little later *Faustus*, in doubt whether the words '*Homo fuge*' are really visible on his arm, exclaims (B468),

O yes, I see it plaine, euen here is writ . . .
whereas A, accidentally omitting 'O yes', makes up for it metrically by the over-precise 'here in this place is writ'. Typical is Mephostophilis' remark concerning heaven (B 578),

'Twas made for man; then he's more excellent
which A renders,

It was made for man, therefore is man more excellent
in spite of the verse context. Such an explanatory insertion as that at A 697 (see p. 51) might have been treated under this head, and much the same may be seen a few lines later. When *Faustus* reminds the recalcitrant Spirit that he is bound *to* tell him anything, Mephostophilis replies (B 641-2),

I, that is not against our Kingdome.
This is: Thou art damn'd, think thou of hell.

This A renders,

I, that is not against our kingdome, but this is,
Thinke thou on hell *Faustus*, for thou art damnd.

The passage is prose, though both texts print it as verse.

Such slackening of style passes insensibly into paraphrase. Of course large portions of A are paraphrase, and very loose at

Nature of the A-text

that. Here are some examples that may be described as transitional. Asked whether he has brought Faustus to Rome, Mephistophilis answers (B 826-9):

I haue my *Faustus*, and for prooffe thereof,
This is the goodly Palace of the Pope:
And cause we are no common guests,
I chuse his priuy chamber for our vse.

In spite of the verse context A reads:

Faustus I haue, and because we wil not be vnprouided, I haue taken vp his holinesse priuy chamber for our vse.

Shortly afterwards we read of the Castle of St. Angelo (B 842-5):

Where thou shalt see such store of Ordinance,
As that the double Cannons forg'd of brasse,
Do match the number of the daies contain'd
Within the compasse of one compleat yeare . . .

In this instance A preserves the metre and is even the more concise:

Within whose walles such store of ordonance are,
And double Canons, fram'd of carued brasse,
As match the dayes within one compleate yeare,

but by altering the construction it has made nonsense of what follows, since 'Besides the gates' is apparently dependent, if somewhat illogically, on 'thou shalt see'. Metre is again preserved in recasting B 1841-2,

Faustus I leaue thee, but with grieffe of heart,
Fearing the enemy of thy haplesse soule

in the form

I goe sweete *Faustus*, but with heauy cheare,
fearing the ruine of thy hopelesse soule.

It is interesting to note that it was the form rather than the sense of the second line that impressed itself on the memory, though 'hopelesse*' is probably a mere misprint. In the first line 'sweete *Faustus*' may be a recollection of the Old Man's opening address 'O gentle *Faustus*' (B 1813, where A has 'Ah Doctor *Faustus*') confused with *Faustus*' 'Sweete *Mephistophilis**' (A 1336 = B 1851): 'heauy cheare' was a very common expression at the time, and is less individual than 'grieffe of heart'.

This substitution of the more commonplace for the more distinctive word or phrase is one element in the general degrading

Introduction

or vulgarization characteristic of reported texts. Another is the actor's urge to rub in a point, as where Wagner, having set his face 'like a Precisian', ends his speech with the words (A 231—3),

and so the Lord blesse you, preserue you, and keepe you my deare brethren, my deare brethren.

The unnecessary repetition of a phrase that has already been used earlier in the speech is confined to A. A sad want of perception is shown when a Scholar's respectful encouragement (B 1932),

Tis but a surfet sir, feare nothing

is converted into the familiar and hearty

tis but a surffet, neuer feare man.

Another recognized element is exaggeration; and so when Faustus in his first enthusiasm exclaims (B 88),

A sound Magitian is a Demi-god,

A is content with nothing less than 'a mighty god'; and when Wrath (B 705)

leapt out of a Lyons mouth when I was scarce an houre old,

A insists that it was 'scarce half an houre'.¹

I may close this analysis with a few miscellaneous observations. A link between A and stage representation is implied by the direction '*enter Wagner solus*'⁷ that stands at the head of the first Chorus (A 809). Doubtless this means that in a performance to which A is somehow related the actor who played Wagner also took the part of the Chorus. It might, however, be due either to the reporter, and refer to the performance on which A is based, or to the prompter, and refer to a performance for which A was intended. Perhaps the latter is the more likely, seeing that we have already found evidence, in the provision of alternative stagings (pp. 37-8), that A does represent a prompt-book of some sort. On the other hand, there is a possible link between A and the original prompt-book of the unabridged play, or at any rate with a document closely associated with it. Among the comic scenes the Friars' '*Dirge*' (A 915-27) stands out as unusually well reported. Now this would naturally be chanted from a service-book, and a script used in performance may possibly have been available to the compiler of the A-text. The suggestion is borne out to some extent by the appearance in A

¹ See further in the notes on B 49 and 152.

Nature of the A-text

of the direction '*Sing this**¹ and the final response '*Et omnes sancti Amen*\ which are not in B. There are also one or two directions that are inconsistent with the text of A, but consistent with the fuller version in B. Before the show of the Sins both texts have '*Enter Lucifer, Belsabub, and Mephistophilus*'⁷ (A 713): Beelzebub has a part in B, but not in A. He may of course have come on as a mute. In the middle of the Horse-corser scene B has the direction (1552) '*He [Faustus"] sits to sleepe*\ whereas A has '*Sleepe in his chaire.*' B does not tell us where the incident took place, but presumably it was in a house of some sort ('his Inne' according to *EFB*): in A the scene is a 'faire and pleasant greene' (1141), and there is no reason why Faustus should not sit down and fall asleep by the way-side. Thus A's direction implies B's setting. No doubt in the original performance Faustus did sit in a chair, and the reporter appears to have remembered this and retained the chair though it contradicted his own text. There are also a few cases in which the wording of directions in A is suspiciously like that of B, and it might be a help if we could suppose the reporter to have had some recollection of the original prompt-book. I do not know why we should not.² There is one other matter I ought to mention here. B has of course generally some basis in the *Damnable Life* (with the notable exceptions of the Valdes and Cornelius episode and the 'Saxon Bruno' affair) and A usually deviates more widely from that source. But in the scene at the Emperor's court (iv. ii) down to the entrance of the Alexander pageant, where B shows itself comparatively independent, the A-text is an unusually slavish paraphrase of the *Damnable Life*. Kirschbaum's explanation (pp. 288 ff.) is presumably correct. The reporter for some reason must have had only a vague recollection of the original, and he was moreover faced with the necessity of producing a text that omitted all mention of Bruno (who does not appear in A). He found it therefore less trouble to go direct to the source than to try to reconstruct a scene out of his very defective memory. This, however, raises the difficult question why the reporter remem-

¹ Imperative directions, which may with caution be accepted as pointing to prompt copy, appear in other parts of the A-text likewise: in the Horse-corser episode, for example, we not only have the direction '*Sleepe in his chaire*' mentioned below, but also '*Hallow in his eare*' (A 1204) and a couple of lines later '*Pull him by the legge, and pull it awafi*' corresponding directions in B are in the indicative.

² I have in mind, of course, the possibility that the reporter may have been the former prompter. But in the next section we shall find evidence in favour of a different explanation of these similarities (pp. 73 ff.).

Introduction

bered some scenes so much better than others, a subject on which I shall have some speculations to offer at the end of the next section (pp. 92-7).

The history of the A-text seems therefore to have been something like this. The play was written and produced (or at least prepared for production—of this we shall find evidence in the next section) during the last year of Marlowe's life. It was performed, presumably on the London stage, by some unidentified company, no doubt before the plague of 1592-4 reached its height and put a stop to all acting. But this was a time of great dislocation in the theatrical world, during which most companies were forced to travel and some came to grief. The text we have in A appears to be a version prepared for the less critical and exigent audiences of provincial towns, and prepared, not in an orderly manner by making cuts and alterations in the authorized prompt-book, but by memorial reconstruction from the London performance, and therefore either by the original company after they had lost or parted with their prompt-book, or by some other company that included actors, or at least one member, who had taken part in or been somehow intimately connected with the original production. This report or reconstruction served as a new prompt-book for provincial performance, and in the course of its use as such it suffered further degeneration, partly by the insertion of bits of gag, sometimes of a topical sometimes of an unseemly character, that had proved attractive to a vulgar audience, but also by provision for further shortening and simplification as time or the dwindling resources of the company demanded. Some insertions must have been made at least two years after the original production of the play.

All this is, I believe, fair deduction from the evidence gathered together in this section, and I hope that it will stand the test of examination. But now for a moment I propose to indulge in a little frank speculation. If my conjecture is wrong, or if the reader is disinclined to accept it, no harm will be done, for I build nothing upon it. 'A hypothesis ought to be a one-storied building only' was a wise saying of Henry Bradley's.

First let me recall some dates in theatrical affairs during the difficult times through which the companies passed between the summer of 1592 and that of 1594. On 23 June 1592 the Privy Council, in consequence of riots in Southwark, ordered the closing of all theatres till Michaelmas. There were petitions against the order during the long vacation, and it was in fact revoked,

Nature of the A-text

probably early in August; but by that time the plague, of which we first hear that month, intervened, and the houses necessarily remained closed. The death-rate fell towards the end of the year, and the Rose at any rate reopened in the last days of December; but a fresh outbreak closed it again at the beginning of February 1593, and soon one of the worst plagues of the century sent the companies into the provinces. By the end of December, however, it had abated again, and the Rose opened once more, probably on the 26th. But there was much disorganization, and it was not till the middle of June 1594 that occupation of the house settled down to normal.

Now, in 1590 or 1591 there had been some sort of an amalgamation between Lord Strange's men and those of the Lord Admiral. The joint company was led by Edward Alleyn, who remained the Admiral's servant, but it passed by the name of Strange's. It was this company that acted at the Theatre in 1591 and at Henslowe's house, the Rose, in 1592. Their petition against the restraint lays stress on their great numbers and the consequent charge of travelling, and Chambers (ii. 129) conjectures that it was as an offshoot of this organization that there arose a new company under the patronage of the Earl of Pembroke, of which we first hear about this time. That it was a company of some standing is proved by the fact that it was chosen along with Strange's to give performances in the winter of 1592—3 at court, where it acted on 26 December and 6 January. We know that it was Pembroke's men who acted Marlowe's *Edward 77*, and Chambers assumes that this was one of their court performances. I suggest that the other was *Doctor Faustus*¹ and that in January 1593, during the brief abatement of the plague, they gave the performance at the Theatre mentioned in *The Black Book* (see pp. 8-9). In that case they doubtless took it into the country with them when forced to leave London. But they did not prosper. They were back by the latter half of August, and on 28 September Henslowe wrote to his son-in-law Alleyn:

as for my lorde a penbrockes which you desier to knowe wheare they be they ar all at home and hausse ben this v or sixe weackes for they cane not saue ther carges with trauell as I heare and weare fayne to pane ther parell for ther carge²

That Alleyn should have specially inquired about Pembroke's men bears out the idea that there was some particular connexion

¹ See, however, note on lines 2-6.

² *Henslowe Papers*, p. 40.

Introduction

between them and the Admiral-Strange organization. If Pembroke's were constrained to pawn their wardrobe it is likely enough that they were forced to sell some of their plays as well. Four at least of their pieces came into the booksellers' hands about this time, namely *Edward II* (1593), *Titus Andronicus* (1594, perhaps through Sussex's men), *The Taming of a Shrew* (1594), 3 *Henry VI* (*The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York*, 1595), and therefore almost certainly 2 *Henry VI* (*The First Part of the Contention of York and Lancaster*, 1594). Some of their plays are later found in the hands of the Chamberlain's men, having been acquired in 1593 either by Sussex's men or personally by Henslowe and Alleyn (*Henslowe's Diary*, ii. 85-6; Chambers, ii. 130-1). The later history of the company is obscure. Some at least of its members may have continued to act in the provinces for a time at all events. A Pembroke's company entered into an agreement in February 1597 to play at the Swan, but the venture came to grief over *The Isle of Dogs* in July, and in October the company joined forces with the Admiral's, in which it became merged. Chambers (ii. 131-2) believes this to have been a different organization, but since he wrote evidence has been found of their presence at Oxford in 1595-6,¹ which makes some sort of continuity perhaps possible.

Now if Pembroke's company owned *Faustus*, which is found in the Admiral's repertory in the autumn of 1594, they doubtless sold the prompt-book to Henslowe and Alleyn in the autumn of the previous year, and if after that they carried on some sort of provincial existence, they would have been in exactly the position in which we have inferred the company that produced the A-text of *Faustus* to have been. Nor is it without significance that three out of the five plays mentioned above as having belonged to Pembroke's men, namely *The Taming of a Shrew* and 2 and 3 *Henry VI*, have come down to us in bad quartos. I submit, therefore, that the hypothesis that Marlowe originally wrote *Faustus* as well as *Edward II* for Pembroke's men is sufficiently plausible to merit consideration, though admittedly it rests largely on conjecture.

¹ In the accounts of the City Chamberlain appears the item: 'given to the earle of Pembrokes players . . . x^s' (F. S. Boas, *Shakespeare and the Universities*, 1923, p. 20). The accounts appear to run from Michaelmas to Michaelmas.

IV. Nature of the B-text

The B-text is of composite origin. That much of it was printed from manuscript is clear from the many scenes and passages not found elsewhere. But, though less obvious, its dependence on A is equally evident to inspection.¹ The most striking example is the Wagner-Chorus (A 809-20 = B 557-68).² This, in its proper place between the earlier Wittenberg and the Roman scenes, B replaced by a fuller and correcter version from manuscript; but it transferred A's mutilated text, including its misleading heading, to a position between the first and second scenes of Act 11, where something is clearly missing, but where the Chorus is in fact quite inappropriate. Further evidence of dependence is found in a number of misprints and errors it takes over from A. These are particularly common in Latin, for example, '*legatus** for '*legatur*' at B 55 and '*per accident*' for '*per accidens*' at 272, and especially in the invocation at 242—9. Both texts give the name of Faustus' birthplace as '*Rhodes*' (13), doubtless through familiarity of association: it is 'Rhode' in the *Damnable Life* and 'Rod*' in the German 'Historia', that is, no doubt, Roda in Saxe-Al ten burg (Ward, p. xciv: see also notes on 117 and 2061—2). There is identical line-division of prose printed as verse at B 69-72,

If we say that we haue no sinne
We deceiue our selues, and there is no truth in vs.
Why then belike we must sinne,
And so consequently die,

and identical misdivision of verse at B 2042—3,

Perpetuall day: or let this houre be but a yeare,
A month, a weeke, a naturall day,

(see also notes on B 390-1 and 2052). These might, of course, be errors of a common source; but that would imply transcriptional continuity, which is impossible if A is a reported text. But we can go further than this, and say that B is not only dependent on A, but on a particular edition of that text. The outstanding example is the famous '*Qncaymceori* of A i, which A2

¹ Bibliographically this is shown by the fact that while the head-title of A, 'The tragicall Historie of Doctor Faustus', was altered in B to 'The Tragedie of Doctor Faustus', in the headlines 'The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus*' was retained.

² Henceforth all line-references are to the B-text unless preceded by the letter 'A*.

Introduction

and all later editions replace by '*Oeconorny** (B 41). Unless we have the impiety to reject Bullen's interpretation, *ovok OX. fiiij 64*, we are bound to believe that **Oeconomf* is the guess of a learned or would-be learned emendator, which it would be extravagant to believe found its way into A2 and Bi independently. It is moreover supported by a number of other instances. Thus in A 106-7:

Go forward *Faustus* in that famous art,
Wherein all natures treasury is contained:

A2,3 and B have 'treasure', a much feebler reading. Or take A 314-15,

Fau. and what are you that Hue with *Lucifer*?
Me. Vnhappy spirits that fell with *Lucifer*,

in which A2, in place of 'fell', repeats 'liue' from the line above, and A3 and Bi follow it. At B 306-7,

O *Faustus* leaue these friuolous demandes,
Which strikes a terror to my fainting soule

the false concord would not necessarily condemn the reading as unoriginal; but when we observe that Ai reads 'strike', and that 'strikes' first appeared as a misprint of A2, any defence becomes impossible. (For further examples see the notes on B 76, 98, 121, 127, 152, 161, 175, 302, 321, 401, 411, 495, 507, 1115, 1795, 1796, 1882, 1941, 1970, 2087, 2090, 2121.) We may refine further and say that it is in fact upon A3 that B depends.¹ This conclusion rests in the main upon one remarkable reading. At line 145 of Ai we find the preposterous word 'Consissylogismes'. It stands, of course, for 'concise syllogisms', but the printer clearly took it for one word, since he spelt it with a long 'fT ligature in the middle. A2 reproduced the reading as it stood, but the compositor or press reader of A3 was determined to make sense of it, and failing to recognize the first element, substituted 'subtile sylogismes' whence 'subtle Sillogismes' in B 1. This will probably be admitted as conclusive, but it can be supported by two or three agreements of lesser importance. Thus at line 5 we have 'ouerturnd' in Ai, 2, 'ouer-turnd' in A3, and 'ouer-turn'd' in Bi; at A 23 we have 'ouerthrow' in A 1,2, and 'ouer-throw' in A3 and Bi. In *Faustus*' conjuration, at A 259-60, Ai reads '*ignei, aerij Aquatani spiritus*\ Whatever the exact form of words behind

¹ Or, of course, upon some lost edition subsequent to A2 that in the relevant readings agreed with A3.

Nature of the B-text

this nonsense (Boas emends it to '*Ignis, aeris, aqua, terra spiritus*') the comma after the first word is indispensable, but in A2 it is printed so faintly as to be almost invisible (at any rate in the two copies examined) and in A3, followed by B i, it was omitted altogether. (For further examples see the notes on B 88, 168, 835, 1660, 1975, 2075, 2083, 2116.)

It may therefore be accepted as certain that the B-text, besides being largely dependent on a manuscript source,¹ is also in part dependent on a copy of the quarto of 1611 (A3). Moreover, the transference of the Wagner-chorus, already mentioned, together with the persistent censoring of what was considered profanity, of which more later (pp. 85 ff.), proves that B is an edited text. We may say then that the B-text was compiled by an editor who used for the purpose both MS and A3.

But analysis enables us to make a further distinction. We find that of those parts of the B-text that are dependent on A, some passages follow A3 exactly without any indication of another source, whereas others contain corrections that can only have come from MS. Similarly, of those parts of the B-text that are dependent on MS, some passages contain additions from A, whereas others show no such conflation. Neither of these sub-distinctions is altogether clear-cut, but they are nevertheless certain. The analysis has been attempted in the notes at the head of each scene or section of the text, but the results may conveniently be gathered here.

I begin with those portions of B for which A3 actually served as copy. The Prologue probably belongs here:² the evidence is not very conclusive, but the conditions appear to be the same as in the first scene. That the whole of this scene was printed from A3 there can be no doubt: '*Oeconomf*' (B 41) and '*subtle Sillogismes*' (34), with common mislining at 69—72, are conclusive for their respective passages; these and other errors at 55 and 102 have already been considered (pp. 63—4). They are supported by a large number of scattered agreements between B and A3, which, of little individual weight, testify to the general dependence (see collations at A 36, 39, 52, 54, 59, 61, 61, 70, 79, 87, 92, 103, 120, 123, 126, 128, 134, 134, 163, 163, 172, 172, 179, 186, 190). On the other hand, a considerable number of corrections, some of A in general and some of A3 in particular, many of which

¹ I shall refer to this source throughout and specifically by the letters MS.

² If the Prologue was printed from A there must of course have been corrections from MS, as appears from the variants considered in the previous section (pp. 40-3).

Introduction

can hardly be conjectural, witness to the use of MS. Obvious examples are:

A 54: wouldst [B: Couldst] thou make man [A3, B:men] to liue eternally? [B:eternally,]

A 62-3: Such is the subiect of the institute
And vniuersall body of the Church: [B:the law.]

A 66: The deuill [B:Too seruile] and illiberall for me: [B:mee.]

At B 88 'mighty god' is corrected to 'Demi-god', and in the next line B's alteration of 'gaine' to 'get' may also have authority. The direction at 96 differs from A's and is clearly from MS. So too, probably, is the correction of A3's 'rod' to 'wrath' at 99 and certainly that of its 'hetherto' to 'heeretofore' at 165 (in both of these cases B returns to the reading of A_i). The correction at 144 of 'subiects' to 'spirits' might conceivably be conjectural, and I do not think that there are any other clear instances of the use of MS. In any case the use made of it was sporadic, as indicated by the surviving errors with which we began. Of course, even if at 41 the editor read "*Oncaymoeoti* or something like it in MS, he would not understand it, and might prefer to keep the more intelligible 'Oeconomy' of A3; and I am not convinced that he would have troubled to alter the improper line-division of A 72—5, even if MS did show it to be prose. But the breakdown at B 78, where the editor was content merely to omit the meaningless 'sceanes' of A, and his unconvincing tinkering at 151 point to the absence of adequate control. One of the most interesting variants is at 173. The line reads in A_i,

That I may coniure in some lustie groue,

where 'lustie' may mean pleasant, but was altered in A₂ to 'littie', which is merely silly. B emended it to 'bushy', perhaps following MS.¹ However, the 'lustie groue' looks like an anticipation of the 'solitary groue' two lines below, and the whole passage is suspect, as we shall find when we come to consider the composition in detail (p. 101). The general inference is that, at any rate in the later part of the scene, MS was only occasionally available, or was only occasionally consulted. It may have been mutilated or illegible.

Conditions are the same in 1. iii. The meek reproduction of the impossible Latin of the invocation (242—9) proves B's

¹ There is some graphic similarity between 'bushy' and 'lustie*' that suggests that they may be connected' If the original manuscript had 'bushy', this was probably misread 'lusty*' in preparing the prompt-book (hence A_i's 'lustie'); on the other hand, if MS had 'lusty', the editor misread it 'bushy*' when seeking to emend A3's 'littie'.

Nature of the B-text

dependence on A no less clearly than does the common mislining at 281, and the persistence of errors and variants of A3 at A 315 (see p. 64), 322, and 327. (For other instances see collations at A 256, 260, 262, 262, 263, 275, 301, 325, 329, 341.) But the use of MS is equally evident. From it must come the initial direction in B (225-6):

Thunder. Enter Lucifer and 4 deuils, Faustus to them with this speech.

A (343) merely has

Enter Faustus to coniure.

In B the incantation is again preceded by *'Thunder'** (242), and the *'Dragon'* embedded in it (246) is clearly a direction for its appearance in the air, as in the *Damnabie Life*. Neither is in A. We may wonder why, if MS was here available, it was not used to correct the Latin; but the editor of B was evidently no scholar, and if he noticed discrepancies he may have doubted whether there was any reason to suppose the manuscript more correct than the quarto. Corrections in the text that may reasonably be ascribed to MS are at 227 'night' for 'earth' (confirmed by *A Shrew*: see p. 32), 235 " *AnagramatisV* for 'and Agramithist', and possibly at 236 'Th'abreuiated' for 'The breuiated', and 241 'vttermost' for 'vtmost'. But the use of MS seems to peter out, and indeed after the incantation variants are relatively few. Three lines (A 276—8) are omitted, perhaps because the Latin of the third was unintelligible. The treatment of A 290 is particularly interesting. In A_i it runs,

Did not my coniuring speeches raise thee? speake.

But in A_{2,3} 'speeches' is misprinted 'spirits', and the editor, recognizing this to be nonsense and unable to emend it, omitted the word, so that in B (271) the line stands, reasonably but unmetrically:

Did not my coniuring raise thee? speake.

We may conclude with some confidence that here MS was not available. At 333 'Country', in place of A's 'land', makes the line metrical, but is as likely to be due to the editor as to MS (see p. 89); at 279 'all godlinesse' is one of his bowdlerizations (see p. 86); at 281—6 the pronouns are more consistent in A than in B, where the editor may have tired of the stilted third person; at A 332 'those' is probably a mere slip automatically corrected to 'these', and at B 337 'desir'd' seems inferior to A's 'desire' and may be a mere misprint; errors of

Introduction

A3 at A 335 (omission of Vp') and at A 339 (omission of 'me') may well have been conjecturally corrected. There is no compulsion to believe that in this scene MS was available from B 250 onward.

In 11. i conditions are more complicated and the evidence rather less clear. The first speech (389—401) stands apart from what follows, and shows signs of dependence on A, which also appear in the bond and a few succeeding lines (487—507). The initial direction, '*Enter Faustus in his Study**', is identical in the two texts. B retains the doubtful division of the first two lines, though it tinkers with the second, and what is more significant makes the same mistake of treating them as a question; in the last line of the speech there is a small but significant agreement between B (401) and A3. There is no sign of MS; the variants seem to be editorial. In 392 'think on God' (A 'of') is characteristic of B and probably due to the editor or compositor (like 'Oh*' for 'Ah', see pp. 91-2). The omission of 'no' in 395 (cf. p. 89) is a rather clumsy attempt to improve the verse. The omission of A 446 and the alteration of the following short line are due to the editor's dislike of the over-frequent mention of 'God*' (see p. 88). Readings in 390-1 and 395-6 are suspect and probably unoriginal. It looks as though MS was damaged or illegible at the beginning of this scene. But with 402 dependence on A ceases and close agreement does not reappear till 487. In the bond such variants as there are seem due either to editorial tinkering or more probably to mere errors of the compositor: they are certainly not corrections from MS. In A the second clause of the agreement (A 542-3),

that Mephistophilis shall be his seruant, and at his commaund

follows the wording of *EFB* (except for 'commandement'), which B's '*and be by him commanded**' (with its unnecessary repetition of 'be') does not. Later B's '*shape and forme*' (495) corresponds to A's '*forme or shape**' (again from *EFB*): the '*and**' is an error of A2,3, the inversion probably accidental. By the same article in A (553—4) Faustus grants Lucifer, the term of '24. yeares being expired' the articles about written inviolate, full power* to carry him off to hell (A3 prints '*foure and twenty**' in full). B (499-500) has '*foure and twentie yeares being expired, and these Articles about written being inviolate*' with a tautological '*these**' and another pointless repetition that slackens the construction. Just before, B (498) reproduces A's spelling of '*Mephistophilis*' and just

Nature of the B-text

after (501) it accidentally omits the words '*or goods*' from A and *EFB*. In the four lines that follow the reading of the bond, A's line (560),

Now Faustus aske what thou wilt

becomes by easy tinkering metrical in B (506),

So, now *Faustus* aske me what thou wilt.

On the other hand, the following line in B,

First, I will question thee about hell

is rendered unmetrical by the omission, following A2,3, of 'with' before 'thee'. After that, the reappearance of normal variation suggests that B is again using MS as copy, and it is significant that at 527 the omission of 'meere' by A2,3 has not affected B, any more than did A3's misprint of 'Come*' for 'Cast*' at 414 in the earlier part of the scene. There is then good reason to suspect that the bond and a few lines of dialogue following it were absent from MS. For the remainder of the scene B depends on MS, though, as we shall see later (pp. 73—7), it borrows a few directions from A.¹

11. i is followed in B by the misplaced Wagner-chorus (557—68). This is printed from A (809-20) without alteration of any kind in spite of the fact that the MS was available and that B printed the authentic version from it at 777—801.

The next passage in which B seems to be dependent on A is the opening speech of m. i, the first of the Roman scenes. MS was certainly not absent, for B must have taken from it two lines (820—1) that *EFB* proves to be original.² But it was most likely defective, since B was unable to clear up the muddle a few lines earlier (811-13). Here Ai reads,

Then vp to *Naples*, rich *Campania*,
Whose buildings faire and gorgeous to the eye,
The streetes straight forth, and pau'd with finest bricke,
Quarters the towne in foure equiuolence.

For the possible interpretation and emendation of the first three of these obviously corrupt lines the reader must be referred to the notes: B reproduces them unaltered. In the last line 'Quarters' should of course be 'Quarter' and 'equiuolence' should be 'equivalents', equal parts. This the editor might have guessed

¹ At 541 a misprint in Ai is corrected identically in A2,3 and in B, but this does not of course imply dependence.

² At 817 the impossible variant 'East' (for A's *rest') may possibly be due to a misreading of a partly illegible word in MS (see note ad loc).

Introduction

had not A3, in an unhappy attempt at emendation, printed 'forme equiuolent'; but faced with this manifest absurdity all he could do was to omit the line altogether. This he would surely not have done had MS been available with the correct version. But from 826 onwards the texts are normally variant, and the slight link between B and A3 at 835 may very well be accidental.¹

The fourth act affords no instance of the use of A as copy;² but we meet with another notable example in v. i, where the first speech by a Scholar and Faustus' reply (1785—1803) are certainly printed by B from A3. The directions at the beginning and end of this passage are A3's with the possibly editorial addition of Mephostophilis. It is true that Faustus* speech is printed as prose in A, like the Scholar's, and correctly as verse in B, but the latter's dependence is shown by a couple of readings from A3. After an exordial 'Gentlemen' the text in Ai runs (1284—7, correcting the lining),

for that I know your friendship is vnfained,
and Faustus custome is not to denie
the iust requests of those that wish him well,
you shall behold that pearelesse dame of *Greece* ...

In the third of these lines the certainly correct 'requests' of Ai became 'request' in A2,3, which were followed by B. Much more important is that A2, followed by A3, omitted the 'and' from the beginning of the second line, leaving both the construction and verse halting. B was content to accept the construction, though illogical, doing its best by placing a colon after 'well'; but it restored the metre by printing

It is not *Faustus* custome to deny . . .

The editor would hardly have tinkered thus had MS been available.³ The Scholar's speech I believe to have originated in A, and therefore never to have been in MS at all; but the reason for this belief must be reserved for discussion in the next section (pp. i79-80).⁴

We next find A used as copy in Faustus' farewell to his students

¹ There is one point in the Friars' "*Dirge*" (n 11-26) that suggests that it was printed from A3, but the weight of the evidence is in the other direction (see pp. 73-4).

² Unless B made some use of A to supply a defect in MS at 1353-61 (see note); but this is by no means certain.

³ Incidentally he or the compositor modernized 'otherwaies' to 'otherwise' in 1798.

⁴ Later in the scene Faustus* address to Helen may possibly have been printed from A, but on the whole the evidence is against it.

Nature of the B-text

in v. ii. The texts open divergently, but become very close with the long speech beginning 'But *Faustus* offence can nere be pardoned' (1937 ff.), and remain so till the exit of the Scholars (1982) brings the episode to a close. There is evidence of B's dependence on A3 at 1941, 1952 (?), 1969, and notably in the common omission of 'there' at 1975. But MS was available and was used for the correction of small errors of reporting in A 1405—6 (possibly), 1422, 1433, and more serious ones at A 1428 ('the date is expired') and 1435 ('what shall we do to *Faustus*?'), both of which were considered in the previous section (p. 45). It may, however, have been damaged or illegible in the latter part of the episode, for B abandoned it as copy at 1937.

After the intervention of *Mephostophilis* and the Angels, which is only found in B, we come to *Faustus*' final soliloquy, and for this again A served as copy. The variants are mostly due to the editor's censoring of profanity (see pp. 85 ff.): a few others are small alterations for the worse, for which see the notes on B 2057, 2064, and 2086. Dependence on A is proved by common false line-division at B 2042—3 (see p. 63) and a wrong attempt at division at 2076—7, which could hardly have occurred if MS had been consulted; and it is borne out by a number of agreements with A3, though these are of no great evidential value, the most important being at 2074, where Ai reads '*metem su cossis*' A2 '*metemsucossis*' A3 '*metemsyscossis*,' and Bi '*Metemsyscossis**' (for others see collations at A 1449, 1451, 1459, 1477, 1499, 1504). At A 1468 important evidence has been lost through B's censoring; and at A 1477 a misprint in A3, 'entrance' for Ai's 'intrailes', has been corrected in B to 'entrals', where the spelling rather points to conjectural emendation (see note on 2061). The hand of the editor is seen in the amalgamating of the directions at A 1502 and 1505 in a single one at B 2088. There is no clear evidence of the use of MS, and the probability is that it did not contain the soliloquy.¹

The brief scene of the finding of *Faustus*' body is only in the B-text, after which follows the Epilogue or final Chorus. In this there is very little variation of any kind, A being, as one might expect, well reported. But certain details point unequivocally to the use of A as copy. Since A is a reported text, the Latin motto at the end, '*Terminal: hora diem, Terminat Author opus*' is

¹ Certain speculations that will be found in the next section (pp. 131-2) suggest that it may possibly have contained a different speech.

Introduction

most likely an addition of the printer's, which it would be unreasonable to suppose was also found in MS. This at least B must have borrowed from A, and its dependence in the Epilogue itself is borne out by several small agreements with A3. The most significant is in the third line (2116). At the end of this A1 has a colon, which is the lightest stop that will satisfy the sense; but this A3 replaced by a comma, which is found again in B i. We may also note (2120) Ai 'intise', A2,3, Bi Entice', and more strikingly (2121) A1 'than', A2,3, Bi 'then': a "*FINIS*" in Bi replaces the device, and had already done so in A3. There is little doubt therefore that in the Epilogue A served as copy for B, and there is nothing to suggest that it stood in MS at all.

Our conclusion on the evidence must be that B was printed from A3 in the following passages: Prologue (1—28), 1. i (29—188), 1. iii (225-339), in 11. i lines 389-401 and 487-507, Chorus 1 (557-68), in in. i lines 802-25, in v. 1 lines 1785-1803, in v. ii lines 1937-82 and 2035-92, Epilogue (2113-21).¹ The respective lengths of these eleven passages are 28, 160, 115, 13, 21, 12, 24, 19, 46, 58, and 9 lines; in all 505 out of a total of 2121, or rather less than a quarter. Some of these passages were certainly present in MS, and use was made of it for correction in lines 1—28, 29—188 (sporadically), 225—339 (sporadically, and probably not after 250), 802-25 (sporadically), and 1937-82 (sporadically). Chorus 1 (557—68) was of course in MS (as is proved by the fuller version at B 778—801), but no use was made of it here. In lines 389-401, 487-507, 1785-1803, 2035-92, and 2113—22 there is nothing to show that MS was consulted. The question how far non-consultation of MS implies its absence will be discussed later (p. 79).

All the rest of the B-text was set up from MS. Much of it did not appear in A at all and therefore could not be influenced by it. Scenes and episodes and other substantial passages² peculiar to B are the following: in Chorus 2 lines 783-95, 797, in in. i lines 859-1011, in in. ii lines 1012-22, 1028-37, and 1040-72, iv. i (1181-1232), iv. iii (1371-1488), iv. iv (1489-1522), iv. vi (1577-1636), in iv. vii lines 1675-1768, in v. ii lines 1894-1921 and 1983-2034, v. iii (2093-112). The respective

¹ The limits of the passages must not be taken as necessarily exact. In a few cases it is not possible to say with certainty where the use of one copy ends and that of the other begins. Doubtful cases are discussed in the notes.

² B, of course, sometimes adds a few lines of its own, not only in passages parallel with A, but even, as we have seen, in some mainly printed from A.

Nature of the B-text

lengths of these thirteen passages are 14, 153, 11, 10, 33, 52, 118, 34, 60, 94, 285 52, and 20 lines: in all 679 out of a total of 2121, or rather less than a third. They include all types of text; serious in Chorus 2 and Act v, farcical in the clownage scene and episode of Act iv (vi, vii), and comic in the rest.

There remain therefore 937 lines of B that were printed from MS although they were present in some form in A. This is roughly four-ninths of the whole—somewhat less than half. All three types of text are represented and, what is more important, alike passages closely parallel and others only distantly corresponding. The passages in question are as follows: 1. ii (189—224), 1. iv (340-88), in 11. i lines 402-86 and 508-56, 11. ii (569-741), 11. iii (742-76), in Chorus 2 lines 777-82 and 796, 798-801, in in. i lines 826-58, in in. ii lines 1023-7, 1038-9, and 1073-1126, in in. iii lines 1127-80, iv. ii (1233-1370), iv. v (1523-76), in iv. vii lines 1637-74 and 1769-73, in v. i lines 1774—84 and 1804—93, and in v. ii lines 1922—36. These twenty passages run to 36, 49, 85, 49, 173, 35, 6, 5, 33, 5, 2, 54, 54, 138, 54, 38, 5, 11, 90, and 15 lines respectively. A table setting forth the figures for the three categories consecutively is appended.

But these passages printed from MS are not wholly independent of A. Examination shows that there is on occasions identity or close similarity of stage directions. Either, therefore, we shall have to assume that the reporter of A had some knowledge and recollection of the original prompt-book, a possibility that was suggested in the previous section (p. 59); or else we must conclude that the editor of B, even when using MS as copy, still kept an eye on A, and so occasionally conflated his text. That the editor did in fact do so is, I think, proved in one instance. We have already noticed that the Friars' *'Dirge'** (1111—26) agrees remarkably closely in the two versions, and I went so far as to suggest that in this instance the reporter of A was able to make use of written copy (p. 58). But I think that we are bound to conclude from the evidence that in B the *'Dirge'* was printed not from A but from MS, like the rest of the scene. This follows from the difference in the form of the responses, together with B's omission of the direction *'Sing this'* at the beginning and of *'Et omnes sancti Amen'* at the end of A's version.¹ But the clearest

¹ It is true that in 1115 B agrees with A2,3 in omitting the unnecessary word *'awaf'*; but since in 1117 B also omits the necessary word *'on'*, I think that the agreement should be regarded as accidental.

Introduction

Analysis of the B-text

Categories: A = printed from A; B = in B only; C = printed from MS

Acts and scenes	Passages—lines	Category	A no. of lines	B no. of lines	C no. of lines
Prol.	1-28	A	28		
I. i	29-188	A	160		
I. ii	189-224	C			36
I. iii	225-339	A	115		
I. iv	340-88	A			49
II. i	389-401	C			
	402-86	A			85
	487-507	C	21		
	508-56	A			49
Chor. I	557-68	C	12		
II. ii	569-741	A			I 173
II. iii	742-76	C			35
Chor. 2	777-82	C			6
	783-95, 797	B		14	
	796, 798-801	C			5
III. i	802-25	A	24		
	826-58	C			33
	859-1011	B		153	
III. ii	1012-22	B		11	
	1023-7	C			5
	1028-37	B		10	
	1038-9	C			2
	1040-72	B		33	
	1073-1126	C			54
III. iii	1127-80	C			54
iv. i	1181-1232	C		5 ²	
IV. ii	1233-1370	B			138
IV. iii	1371-1488	C		118	
IV. iv	1489-1522	B		34	
IV. V	1523-76	B			54
IV. vi	577-1636	C		60	
	1637-74	B			38
	1675-1768	C		94	
IV. vii	1769-73	B			5
	1774-84	C			11
	1785-1803	C	19		
V. i	1804-93	A			90
	1894-1921	C		28	
	1922-36	B			15
V. ii	1937-82	C	46		
	1983-2034	A		52	
	2035-92	B			
V. iii	2093-112	A		20	
Epil.	2113-21	B	38		
		A	!	505	937
	Total 2121 lines			679	

Nature of the B-text

indication is afforded by a curious duplication in the direction at the end. This stands in B:

Beate the Friers, fling fire worke[s] among them,
and *Exeunt*. *Exeunt*.

In A it is:

*Beate the Friers, and fling fir e-w or kes among
them, and so Exeunt.*

The only reasonable explanation is that MS had only the direction '*Exeunt*' and that the rest was written into it by the editor, copying from A; moreover, he wrote it in without distinction of script, so that the printer set it (except for '*Exeunt*') in black letter, and it remains the only black-letter direction in either text. And I should point out that the direction at the head of the same passage may also have been conflated. In B it reads,

*Enter the Friers with Bell, Booke, and Candle,
for the Dirge*

whereas in A we find,

Enter all the Friers to sing the Dirge.

'*Dirge*' of course, comes from the text (i 121, cf. 1099), but it is a sufficiently inept description of the solemn cursing to raise a doubt whether it can have been used independently in the two directions. It seems more likely that B's '*for the Dirge*' reflects A's '*to sing the Dirge*' and that in MS the direction read simply '*Enter the Friers*' (consonant with the bare '*Exeunt*' at the end), and that the editor borrowed the bell, book, and candle from the text.

Conflation once proved, another instance may be detected in iv. vii. Embedded in the text, and in consequence abbreviated, is A's direction (A 1243-4)

Enter Mephasto: | with the grapes

in place of which B has the fully displayed direction,

Enter Mepho. agen with the grapes.

Since this simply specifies the action, the agreement might well pass for accidental, were it not that A3 further abbreviated '*Mephasto:*' to '*Mepha.*' whence no doubt B's '*Mepho.*' MS, we may assume, had nothing but '*Enter agen.*'¹

¹ There is, I believe, another instance of conflation, in this case injudicious, at 1523-4. In A we have merely '*enter a Horse-courser*' since Faustus and Mephostophilis are already on the stage. B, however, begins a fresh scene here, and we find the direction,

*Enter Faustus and the Horse-courser, and
Mephostophilis.*

Now the repetition of '*and*' is itself suspicious (cf. 1785-6, see p. 77), and when we

Introduction

There are two scenes in which conflation, once recognized, is found to be recurrent: these are n. i and v. i. In the former the initial direction, *'Enter Faustus in his Study* is identical in the two texts, but here B is printing from A. The later part of the scene however (apart from the bond) is dependent on MS: nevertheless there is a suspicious similarity between the direction

Enter Mephistophilis with a chafer of coles

at A 510, and B's

Enter Mephostoph: with the Chafer of Fire.

The text speaks of fire, not of a chafer; and I conjecture that in MS the direction read *'Enter Mephostoph: with the Fire*. But the reporter, remembering what he had seen, explained that Mephostophilis carried a chafer of coals, and from this the editor of B borrowed the 'chafer' though not the 'coles'. After the signing of the bond comes the dance of devils. Both texts have an exit for Mephostophilis (A 524, B471). Then in A the direction runs,

*Enter with diuels, giuing crownes and rich apparell to
Faustus, and daunce, and then depart.*

For this B has

*Enter Deuils, giuing Crownes and rich apparell to
Faustus: they dance, and then depart.*

Enter Mephostophilis.

Evidently in A Mephostophilis introduces the devils, whereas in B he re-enters after their departure. The latter was presumably the arrangement in MS, but the bulk of the direction B must have taken over from A. At the same time it should be observed that two bare directions in B, *'Enter the two Angels** (402) and *'He fetches in a woman deuiW* (536), must derive directly from MS, and are uncontaminated by the fuller forms in A, *'Enter good Angel/, and EuilV* and *'Enter with a diuell drest like a woman, withfier workes'*.¹

further observe that Mephostophilis nowhere speaks in this scene in B, while he plays a conspicuous part in A, we can hardly avoid the inference that the editor added his name to the MS direction out of mistaken deference to A.

¹ The editor's efforts were certainly spasmodic. At 374 he left standing the MS direction **Enter 2 deuils* where A offered the more attractive

*Enter two diuells, and the clawne runnes vp
and dvuone crying.*

Nature of the B-text

The other scene is that containing the appearances of Helen. One passage of text near the beginning was printed by B from A, and introducing this is B's direction (1785-6),

Enter Faustus, and Mephostophilis, and two or three Schollers.

This, of course, is substantially from A, but Mephostophilis is an addition, and it is worth noting the repeated '*and*' in place of A's '*with**. There is no indication of Mephostophilis' appearance in A till 1317 where he is unaccountably present. At the end of the same passage (1802—3) we find in A the direction,

Musicke sounds, and Helen passeth ouer the stage

and in B,

Musicke sound, Mephosto brings in Hellen, she passeth our the stage.

Again B's direction is from A with the same addition as before: probably MS had '*Mephosto brings in Hellen*' (observe the formal inconsistency of '*brings*' and '*passeth**). Here then we have examples of directions borrowed from A but conflated with MS. There is nothing to show whether B's direction '*Enter an old Man*' (1812, centred) is from A's '*Enter an old man*' (1296-7, marginal) or independent; but at B 1831—3 the direction '*Meph. giues him a dagger*' is certainly from A's '*Mepha. giues him a dagger*', for both are marginal and '*Mepha*' had already been reduced to '*Meph*' in A2,3. For Helen's second appearance A has only the marginal direction '*enter Helen*'; B (1872—3) has

Enter Hellen againe, passing ouer betweene two Cupids.

There is here, of course, no direct conflation, but the words '*passing ouer*' are most likely a borrowing from the earlier appearance inserted into the MS direction. This seems all the more probable since there is a similar case elsewhere. At the head of 11. ii B has the direction (569),

Enter Faustus in his Study, and Mephostophilis.

There is no corresponding direction in A, since it makes no break in the text. What there was in MS we naturally do not know, but it is a fair guess that it had only '*Enter Faustus and Mephostophilis*' and that the editor amplified this by borrowing the words '*in his study*' from the direction at the head of 1. i (29), which he had taken over from A.

Introduction

I find no other examples of conflation. There are identical directions or resemblances between directions at 189, 340, 654, 677, 1127, 1553 (in passages where MS served as copy for B), but they are too closely descriptive of the action to imply direct dependence.

The impression we get from the evidence just reviewed is that the directions in MS were on the whole rather bare; but this impression is not borne out by an examination of those parts of the text that appear in B only, and are therefore necessarily derived from MS. These contain many elaborate directions, and the suspicion arises whether the editor, who conflated some MS directions with A, may not have amplified others out of his own head. Such a direction as that at B 1489-92:

*Enter at seuerall doers, Benuolio, Fredericke, and Martino,
their heads and faces hloudy, and besmeared with
mud and durt; all hauing homes on
their heads*

might easily contain amplifications derived from the text. At the same time we must suppose that the editor's object was to put together a text for publication and not for the stage, and even in this example we note the theatrical 'W *seuerall doves*' (which is also found at 1181 and 1995—6; cf. '*seuerall waies*\ 742). It is, moreover, noticeable that the embroideries in the directions cannot by any means always be inferred from the text. Thus the direction at 1205-6,

Enter Benuolio ahoue at a window, in his nightcap: buttoning

cannot be attributed to the editor, for though the '*ahoue*' is obvious and the '*window*'* is mentioned in the text (1223), there is nothing from which the '*nightcap*'* or the '*buttoning*' could be inferred. Nor could we hold him responsible for 1675 '*The Clowne[s] bounce at the gate, within* or 1679 '*They knocke againe, and call out to talke with Faustus**; while '*Enter Faustus with the false head*' at 1412 we shall not hesitate, having the famous ass-head of *A Midsummer-Night's Dream* in mind, to ascribe to someone in touch at least with the resources of the property-box.¹ We are therefore led to doubt whether, apart from the two instances mentioned above (1872-3 and 569; p. 77), the editor did any expansion of directions on his own account. If so, the great

* This might be thought to apply equally to '*Enter Mephostoph: wit, the Chafer of Fire*' discussed earlier (p. 76); but there, as we saw, it is not '*the Chafer*' b it '*the Fire*' that is significant.

Nature of the B-text

difference in the fullness of the directions exhibited by MS is most likely to be ascribed to differences of authorship.¹

The question we *next* have to consider is whether the editor of the B-text used A in part as copy merely for convenience of printing, or because MS was defective. It was certainly not to save himself trouble, since he took on occasion considerable pains to correct A by comparison with MS before handing it to the printer. But this raises the further question whether the very imperfect and spasmodic nature of his correction was due to carelessness or again to MS being damaged or illegible.

There can be no reasonable doubt that MS was in fact incomplete. It must, like A, have lacked something between the first and second scenes of Act n. That the editor was aware of the gap is proved by his borrowing A's Wagner-Chorus (A 809—20) to fill it, a clumsy expedient to which he would never have resorted had MS been available. What was missing must have been a whole scene, and doubtless a farcical one, into the probable action of which we shall inquire in the next section (p. 108). MS also presumably lacked the Chorus between Acts in and iv (A 930-47) and possibly the end of the Old-Man episode (A 1377—86): neither of these is in B, though why the editor did not supply them from A must remain matter for conjecture (see, however, for the Old-Man episode, p. 125). This being so, we shall naturally attribute B's use of A in other parts of the play mostly to defects in MS, and since these defects can hardly have been other than accidental, the probability is that MS was generally in a rather dilapidated condition. While therefore we may feel confident that the editor's failure to correct some errors of A was due to oversight, it will be charitable and reasonable to assume that in most instances damage to or illegibility of MS rendered correction impossible.

¹ If we could regard this as established it would, of course, provide a useful criterion for investigating the authorship of various parts of the text. For example, in the first two acts we find in B very bare directions for the appearances of the Angels; at 96 '*Enter the Angell and Spirit* 402 '*Enter the two Angels*' and the same at 581 and 648. On the other hand, in Act v, B (1995-6) reads, '*Enter the good Angell, and the bad Angell at seuerall doores*' and in the ensuing dialogue the free use of couplets points unmistakably to a different author. On the whole the MS directions in the tragical parts of the play appear to have been generally bare, in the comical parts much fuller. The farcical scenes show some inconsistency: as a rule they are bare, but in the latter part of iv. vii, which contains the climax of the clowning, they are rather markedly elaborate. In view of the possibility (to be discussed in the next section, pp. 133-6) that Samuel Rowley may have collaborated in the play, it may be worth mentioning that the directions in *When you See me you Know me* are fairly full, with some descriptive touches and including rather elaborate processions.

Introduction

What sort of a manuscript, then, are we to suppose it to have been that came into the editor's hands? Was it some much worn and tattered prompt-copy? We may fairly assume that if the Prince's men had wished to release the play for press, they could have provided an adequate text that would not have called for all this elaborate editing. On the other hand, if a new prompt-book was prepared at the time Birde and Rowley wrote their additions, which is likely enough, the old book that had served many performances during the last eight or ten years would have been discarded, and might, granted some carelessness or dishonesty, have found its way to the publisher's office. This is harmless speculation, but it is, I believe, definitely disproved by one passage, which shows that MS was not a prompt-book at all.

We have already seen that in v. i the beginning of the episode of Helen's appearance to the Scholars was almost certainly absent from MS (p. 70), and that this began with the direction '*Mephosto brings in Helli*' (p. 77). B continues with speeches by the Scholars (1804-9):

- 2 Was this faire *Hellen*, whose admired worth
Made *Greece* with ten yeares warres afflict poore *Troy*?
- 3 Too simple is my wit to tell her worth,
Whom all the world admires for maiesty.
- 1 Now we haue seene the pride of Natures worke,
Wee'l take our leaues . . .

In place of these speeches A has (1291-8):

2. *Sch.* Too simple is my wit to tell her praise,
Whom all the world admires for maiestie.
3. *Sch.* No maruel tho the angry Greekes pursude
With tenne yeares warre the rape of such a queene,
Whose heauenly beauty passeth all compare.
- I. Since we haue seene the pride of natures workes.
And onely Paragon of excellence,
Let vs depart. . .

The main differences are that A omits the first two-line speech of B, and inserts a three-line speech between the second and third and a new line in the third. Now, like Bullen, I take it as axiomatic that (apart from possible minor errors in A) both versions are Marlowe's, and that the common phrase 'ten(ne) yeares warre(s)' proves that the speeches peculiar to either version are alternatives and (in spite of Boas) should not be both included in

Nature of the B-text

a composite text. I think it must also be admitted that A's version is so superior, especially in its three-line addition, as to make revision by the author the only reasonable hypothesis.¹ Nor is the reason for Marlowe's dissatisfaction with the original draft difficult to conjecture. 'Was this faire *Hellen* . . .?' was all very well till he had written 'Was this the face . . .?' (1874), the impact of which it then weakened by anticipation. The repetition 'worth . . . worth', though perhaps Marlowesque, has a pedantic effect; and 'poore *Troy*'⁹ is feebly sentimental.² It appears therefore that what we have in B is Marlowe's first draft of the passage, and since A is based on performance the revision must have been carried out for, or perhaps in, the prompt-book.³ But the matter does not rest here. We have already seen (p. 70) that the previous speech by Faustus (1794-1801) was apparently absent from MS, and a natural reason for its absence would be that it was written as part of the same revision. The probable evolution of the text at this point is discussed in the next section (pp. 121-2), where it is suggested that, after the procession of devils and Wagner's speech, the scene originally began with the appearance of Helen and the Scholars' comments thereon, that when Marlowe revised these he also prefixed Faustus' speech, and that later on the speech of the first Scholar was again prefixed by the reporter.⁴

Once revision in the prompt-book is established it is possible to see other instances. The most probable perhaps is A 614-27, the coda appended to the brief and rather inconsequent episode of the first gift of a magic book. A has, of course, a habit of expanding the more farcical incidents, and evidently the appeal

¹ The minor variants between B and A, '*worth: praise', 'Now: Since', 'worker workes*', 'Wee'l take our leaues: Let vs depart', may be regarded either as revisions or corruptions in A according to taste. They need not, of course, be all of a kind.

² No similar objection is felt to the echo of 'pompe or Maiesty* (1798) in 'admires for maiesty' (1807). There would of course be every objection to the verbal repetition of 1807 from 1792; but, as already indicated (p. 70), the whole of the first Scholar's speech is a later invention of the reporter's (taken over by B from A) in which the line in question is simply filched from its later position.

³ Since the revision was obviously not made on the original draft (preserved in MS) it must have been made in the prompt-book unless there was an intermediate transcript, which so far there seems no reason to postulate. The importance of this lies in the implication that the play was prepared for production, if not actually produced, before Marlowe's death, and the fact that it excludes the possibility of another hand having completed a piece left unfinished by the author. (But see p. 132, note.)

• It will be noticed that Wagner's speech immediately preceding the Helen episode (1778-84) and the Old Man's speech immediately following it (1813-29) are widely different in the two texts. The possibility that there has been revision here too is discussed in the next section, pp. 121-3). In neither case does the work appear to be Marlowe's.

Introduction

here is to the sense of wonder. But it occurs at the end of a serious scene, and is in quite a different vein from A's characteristic embroideries: it may well have occurred to a reviser, on going through the prompt-book, that more should be made of the incident. The addition does not seem to be Marlowe's. Another addition likely to have been made in the prompt-book by a collaborator, and in this instance taken over from A by the editor of B, is the speech by Faustus that opens the second act (390—401; see pp. 103-4). There are a few other passages in which the B-text is so bare as to be suspicious and to invite amplification such as we find in A. The climax of the Pope's banquet stands thus in B (1100-6):

Pope. . . . To lay the fury of this same troublesome ghost.

Faust. How now? must every bit be spiced with a Crosse?

Nay then take that.

Pope. O I am slaine, help me my Lords:

O come and help to beare my body hence:

Damb'd be this soule for euer, for this deed.

Exeunt the Pope and his traine.

This is singularly abrupt. A has the following version:

Pope. . . . to lay the fury of this ghost, once againe my Lord fall too.

The Pope crosseth himselfe.

Fau. What, are you crossing of your selfe?

Well vse that tricke no more, I would aduise you.

Crosse againe.

Fau. Well, theres the second time, aware the third,

I giue you faire warning.

Crosse againe, and Faustus hits him a boxe of the eare,

and they all runne away.

The Pope's rather superfluous speech is omitted, and much of the wording of the rest may be due to the reporter, but it seems not unlikely that what he reported was a revised and expanded version of B. Or consider the earlier episode of the devil-wife. In B the text runs thus (532-9):

Faust. . . . But leauing this, let me haue a wife, the fairest Maid in Germany, for I am wanton and lasciuious, and cannot Hue without a wife.

Meph. Well *Faustus*, thou shalt haue a wife.

He fetches in a woman deuill

Faust. What sight is this?

Meph. Now *Faustus* wilt thou haue a wife?

Faust. Here's a hot whore indeed; no, Fie no wife.

Nature of the B-text

A's version is as follows:

Fan. . . . But leauing off this, let me haue a wife, the fairest maid in *Germany*', for I am wanton and lasciuious, and can not Hue without a wife.

Me. How, a wife? I prithee *Faustus* talke not of a wife.

Fau. Nay sweete *Mephostophilis* fetch me one, for I will haue one.

Me. We'll thou wilt haue one, sit there till I come, He fetch thee a wife in the diuels name.

Enter with a diuell drest like a woman, withfier workes.

Me: Tel Faustus, how dost thou like thy wife?

Fau: A plague on her for a hote whore.

The language is obviously the actor's or reporter's, but it is significant that Mephostophilis' reluctance and protest and also his question 'how dost thou like thy wife?' come straight from the *Damnable Life*¹ and may very likely therefore be amplifications by the author. Here, again, is the speech of Sloth in the pageant of the Sins according to B (724—5):

Hey ho; I am *Sloth*: I was begotten on a sunny-bank: hey ho: Fie not speak a word more for a kings ransome.

Sloth is evidently too lazy to say more, but this brevity appears to have been thought ineffective, for in A we read:

I am sloath, I was begotten on a sunny banke, where I haue laine euer since, and you haue done me great iniury to bring me from thence, let me be carried thither againe by Gluttony and Lechery, He not speake an other word for a Kings raunsome.

Here the style of the insertion does not in the least suggest the actor or reporter, and A does not as a rule amplify these speeches, which are generally well reported.¹ Lastly I would draw attention to a passage in one of the clowning scenes. Summoned from Constantinople by a stolen incantation, Mephostophilis enters in B with the words (1159-60),

You Princely Legions of infernall Rule,
How am I vexed by these villaines Charmes?

which A thus expands,

Monarch of hel, vnder whose blacke suruey
Great Potentates do kneele with awful feare,
Vpon whose altars thousand soules do lie,
How am I vexed with these villaines charmes?

I do not doubt that the reporter, seeking a more emphatic entrance, would have been capable of inventing extravagant

¹ For another possible and closely related revision, see p. no.

Introduction

bombast of this sort (cf. A 1116-19), but it resembles so closely the inapposite rant of Faustus' speech on his arrival in Rome (848-52) that I cannot help suspecting that it came from the same hand as

Now by the Kingdomes of Infernall Rule,¹
Of *Stix*, of *Jcheron*[^] and the fiery Lake,
Of euer-burning *Phlegeton*, I swear,
That I do long to see the Monuments
And situation of bright splendent Rome . . .

And if substantial additions were made in the prompt-book, doubtless there were minor revisions likewise. These must in the nature of the case be harder to detect, but I think one may be seen at 1843,

Accursed *Faustus*[^] wretch what hast thou done?

This is in part an exact repetition of 1830,

Where art thou *Faustus* ? wretch, what hast thou done ?

a repetition that cannot have been intentional. Moreover, on the earlier occasion 'what hast thou done?' refers reasonably to Faustus' practice of magic, the burden of the Old Man's exhortation (see 1813), whereas on the later occasion he has done nothing in particular except not commit suicide. In place of 1843, A has

Accursed Faustus, where is mercie now ?

which accords well with what follows, and seems to me to be much less likely due to emendation by the reporter than by the author revising the prompt-book (see further pp. 82-3). And if he touched up the text here he may have done so just before, where at 1839 the regular flow of verse is broken by the impossible line,

O friend, I feele thy words to cofort my distressed soule,

which A replaces by the two octosyllables,

Ah my sweete friend, I feele thy words
To comfort my distressed soule . . .

But here I am conscious of treading on dangerously speculative ground.²

^x Whoever wrote this had of course B 1159 in mind.

³ Other possible prompt-book revisions are discussed in the notes on A 43, B 347-8, 441-2, 483, A 777T8, B 772, 854-8, 1043-4, mi-26, 1161, 1787-90, 1855, 1894-1914 (end), 1914-21. For the suggestion of considerable cuts and alteration in the last act see pp. 129-32.

Nature of the B-text

It would therefore appear that the manuscript used in the preparation of the B-text was not only in all probability incomplete, mutilated, and illegible, but also contained a text that was at some points unrevised.¹ The only sort of dramatic manuscript likely to exhibit these features would be a bundle of what were known as 'foul papers', that is, the draft of the play in the hands of the authors, from which the prompt-copy was prepared. Such then, I suggest, was MS, the main source available to the compiler of B.

That the compiler played at the same time the part of an editor, modifying as well as combining his materials, I have throughout assumed, and it is indeed obvious. But it is time we looked rather more closely into his editorial activities. It was he, of course, who had the unhappy idea of inserting A's Wagner-Chorus (A 809-20) between 11. i and 11. ii (B 557-63), who supplied defects of MS from A, and who at times corrected A by what he could decipher of MS. No less evident is his activity as censor. Having, doubtless, in mind the Act of 1606 against profanity in plays (Chambers, iv. 338—9), he set out to delete or alter and tone down all expressions that he thought might excite the disapproval of authority. Such censorship has been commonly thought to be evidence that the manuscript on which it was carried out had been used for stage production. But I have elsewhere shown reason for believing that it was sometimes the work of an editor preparing the play for press (*The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare*, pp. 108, 129); and if our conclusions about the nature of MS are correct, any use of it on the stage is out of the question. A clear instance of censorship is the omission in B of A 141-2,

Diuinitie is basest of the three,
Vnpleasant, harsh, contemptible and vilde,

and a probable one that of A 726-8,

Neuer to name God, or to pray to him,
To burne his Scriptures, slay his Ministers,
And make my spirites pull his churches downe.

Omission sometimes involved altering the context, as at A 1463-4,

See see where Christs blood streames in the firmament,
One drop would saue my soule, halfe a drop, ah my Christ,

¹ Not only did the text of MS undergo revision at some points in the prompt-book, but, as we shall see in the next section, at other points, such as the opening of in. i, it badly needed a revision that it never received (pp. 111-14).

Introduction

for which B substitutes,

One drop of blood will saue me; oh my Christ,
which is hardly intelligible. A few lines later A has (1467-9)

Where is it now ? tis gone:
And see where God stretcheth out his arme,
And bends his irefull browes:

which B translates into

Where is it now? 'tis gone.
And see a threatning Arme, an angry Brow.

At 1483-5 A reads,

Oh God, if thou wilt not haue mercy on my soule,
Yet for Christs sake, whose blood hath ransomd me,
Impose some end to my incessant paine,

and B,

O, if my soule must suffer for my sinne,
Impose some end to my incessant paine . . .

In all these instances except the second B is printing from A, and the last three are in a section of the text that was probably not in MS at all. In another section for which A served as copy occur the lines (A 445—8),

Abiure this Magicke, turne to God againe,
I and Faustus wil turne to God againe.
To God? he loues thee not,
The god thou seruest is thine owne appetite,

in which the repetition of the name of God evidently perturbed the editor, for he omitted the second line and in the third altered 'To God?' to 'Why'. Alteration without omission appears in the following lines,

- A 298: Is stoutly to abiure the Trinitie [B: abiure all godlinessesj,
- A 519: If vnto God [B: vnto heauen,] hee'le throwe thee downe to hel,
- A 1462: O He leape vp to my God [B: to heauen]: who pulles me downe ?
- A 1471: And hide me from the heauy wrath of God [B: of heauen].
- A 1505: My God, my God [B: O mercy heauen], looke not so fierce on me . . .

It is unlikely that an editor prepared to deal thus high-handedly with the text where profanity could be detected would confine his activity to this particular sphere. And we know he did not. The quotation of 342—3 in *The Taming of a Shrew* (see p. 32) proves that it was B's text and not A's that was current

Nature of the B-text

in 1594, but it equally proves that A's 'pickadevaunts', and not B's 'beards', was the original reading. The latter must therefore have been substituted by the editor for a word which either he was unfamiliar with or else had ceased to have a fashionable point. And since there is no evidence that MS contained Faustus' final soliloquy, we are bound to assume that it was the editor who combined A's '*Thunder and lightning*' (1502) and '*Enter diuels*' (1505) into the single direction '*Thunder, and enter the deuils*' at B 2088. Several omissions near the beginning of the play may also be reasonably ascribed to him. Drunk with the prospect of magic power, Faustus exclaims (A 86—91),

All things that mooue betweene the quiet poles
Shalbe at my commaund, Emperours and Kings,
Are but obeyd in their seuerall prouinces:
Nor can they raise the winde, or rend the cloudes:
But his dominion that exceedes in this,
Stretcheth as farre as doth the minde of man.

The emphasis here is on the spatial extension of the magician's power, and this is to some extent obscured by the mention of particular manifestations of power in the fourth line, even though these do in fact imply extension to another element. There is (*pace* Boas) no reason to doubt that the line is Marlowe's; but at the same time it is quite possible to think that the editor improved the passage by cutting it out, as he appears to have done. This was perhaps his most judicious effort, but there are several other omissions in which we may suspect his hand.¹ He did not, it is true, usually interfere with the Latin of his copy, but we may note that the line (A 43),

Seeing, *vbi desinit philosophus, ibi incipit medicus*

which is absent from B, is unnecessary to the sense; and that, though he was no scholar, he may have been sufficiently disturbed by the disputable line,

Quin regis Mephistophilis fratris imagine

to cut out the whole passage (A 276-8) in which it occurs (so ridding himself also of the senseless 'No *Faustus*', presumably a misprint for 'Now *Faustus*'). Some lines may have been omitted on the ground of obscurity, for example A 17,

The fruitfull plot of Scholerisme grac't,

¹ For a possible addition by the editor see note on B 403.

Introduction

(which I cannot with Boas regard as an insertion of A's: cf. p. 43); and perhaps A 49,

Is not thy common talke sound Aphorismes ?

which is in any case not happy; and A 136-8,

Yet not your words onely, but mine owne fantasie,

That will receiue no obiect for my head,

But ruminates on Negromantique skill,

which is evidently intended to assert Faustus' independence, but is at best obscure as well as mispunctuated. But by far the most important instance of interference by the editor on literary or rather dramatic grounds—if it really was the editor who was responsible—is the omission of the end of the Old-Man episode (A 1377—86). This problem, however, had best be reserved for discussion later (see pp. 124—5).

Obscurity is the apparent reason for alteration as well as omission. It must have been unfamiliarity with the technical term 'suppositions' that led to the substitution of the commonplace 'questions' at 625. An instance in the Prologue I have already mentioned (p. 42). Faustus, we are told, showed such proficiency in his studies (A 18-20)

That shortly he was grac't with Doctors name,

Excelling all, whose sweete delight disputes

In heauenly matters of *Theologie*[^]

that is, Faustus surpassed all those who take delight in theological disputation. But the passage has troubled modern editors, as it evidently did the editor of B, who rewrote the second line as

Excelling all, and sweetly can dispute

regardless of the fact that sweetness, while appropriate to delight, is an unusual quality in theological controversy.¹ There is a curious alteration in the final soliloquy, which, since there is here no evidence of the use of MS, must be ascribed to the editor. Faustus thus invokes the stars (A 1476-80):

Now draw vp Faustus like a foggy mist,

Into the intrailles of yon labring cloude,

That when you vomite foorth into the ayre,

My limbes may issue from your smoaky mouthes,

So that my soule may but ascend to heauen . . .

¹ In the Prologue B was probably printed from A, but the text was carefully corrected by comparison with MS. Unless, therefore, we assume that B's reading was derived from MS, which I cannot believe, the latter must be taken to have agreed with A. In that case the editor was prepaid to alter conjecturally a reading that puzzled him in spite of the agreement of his two authorities.

Nature of the B-text

Of course, there is something wrong here; either there is corruption involving the pronouns 'you . . . your', or else Marlowe confused the stars with the cloud. But the general meaning is clear, and the editor made no attempt to straighten out the details. But he rewrote the last line in the form

But let my soule mount, and ascend to heauen.

This seems manifestly inferior: it is one thing to say, 'Let my body be destroyed if thereby my soule may be saved'; there is no point in wishing ill to the flesh if salvation noway depends on it: moreover 'mount, and ascend' is a feeble repetition. There must, one would suppose, have been some cogent reason for the alteration, but it is not easy to see what it can have been. Did the editor feel that A's text smacked too much of a bargain with heaven?

It is not, of course, always possible to tell whether the editor is making an emendation on his own account or correcting from MS. A case in point is at 61. Faustus, abandoning medicine, exclaims 'where is *Iustinian*?' but after dipping into the book he throws it aside in disgust with the words,

Such is the subiect of the institute,
And vniuersal body of the law.

The next line runs in A,

His study fittes a mercenary drudge,

and it is not clear whether 'His' refers to Justinian seven lines before, or whether it is the old neuter referring to the Institutes. B solves the ambiguity, and at the same time avoids the use of the possessive for the objective genitive, by changing 'His' to 'This'; but whether it was the editor's own doing, or whether he relied on MS, which was here available for correction, there is no means of telling.

That the editor sometimes interfered on behalf of the metre is also likely. As I mentioned before (p. 67) he may or may not have had the authority of MS for emending A 353,

And make that land continent to *Spaine*,

by substituting 'Country' for 'land'. But his tinkering was not always happy. In A's broken-backed line (443):

Now go not backward: no Faustus, be resolute,

he omitted the 'no', which was a palliative rather than a cure: it is legitimate to suspect that it was the self-vocative that should

Introduction

have been deleted. The final monologue was printed from A without reference to MS, and in it frequent extra syllables and such prosodic audacities as

See see where Christs blood streames in the firmament,
One drop would saue my soule, halfe a drop, ah my Christ,

are a challenge to the metrist and the editor. They naturally did not escape attention. Our editor, when he bowdlerizes, is generally careful to observe the scansion, as may be seen in the examples already recorded (pp. 85-6). For example, one regular line replaces the two just quoted, and the hypermetrical

Oh God, if thou wilt not haue mercy on my soule,

is rewritten in stricter form. But he did not always understand the metrical structure of the original. His recasting of A 1467—9 is metrical, but it preserves the short line of the copy, whereas the correct division is obviously

Where is it now? tis gone: and see where God
Stretcheth out his arme, and bends his irefull browes:

and he (or the compositor) bungled in dividing the imposthumped line (A 1493),

Vnto some brutish beast: al beasts are happy, for when they die,
after 'beast' instead of after 'happy'. One of his least fortunate alterations is at A 1503,

Oh soule, be changde into little [B: into small] water drops,

where by a metrical and apparently indifferent substitution he reduces the line to banality. Several times he renders a line metrical by the omission of a redundant exclamation (here shown in brackets),

A 1465: [Ah] rend not my heart for naming of my Christ,

A 1488: [O] no end is limited to damned soules,

A 1500: [O] it strikes, it strikes, now body turne to ayre . . .

These exclamations may perhaps be due to the actor (the last certainly is); but it is not so in the deliberately hypermetrical line (A 1472),

No no, then will I headlong runne into the earth:

which B's single 'No?' fails to make regular, while it raises a rather subtle question about the exact sense, or perhaps rather emphasis, of the exclamation. (For further possible cases of

Nature of the B-text

editorial tinkering see the notes on 104, 105-7, 390-1, 484, 542-3, 499-500, 665, 782, 817, -18.)

Attention should be called to a few features of B that do not seem attributable to the editor. Whatever the nature of MS, we may confidently assume that it contained occasional errors and that some of these found their way into the printed text. It must have been through carelessness that the author at 1630-2 let the Clown (= Robin) say that he had been turned into an ape, when we know from 1175 that he became a dog, and Dick an ape. I have already suggested (p. 42) that a small error may have found its way from MS into B 10. There are also a few cases of the omission of speakers' names. Thus the prefix *Meph.* is wanting at 419, so that two consecutive speeches are assigned to Faustus, though the passage is correct in A.¹ Again at 1855 and 1857 both lines lack their prefixes, so that Mephostophilis* two lines become merged in Faustus* speech. Since Mephostophilis' remark is in no way essential to the passage and can be removed without affecting its continuity, it may well have been an addition in MS written in the margin without proper indication of the speaker.²

The compositor too contributed his share of error. One small but noticeable characteristic of B is the use of the exclamation 'O' or 'Oh' where A has 'Ah'. A uses both expressions and generally distinguishes them in a plausible manner; B hardly uses 'Ah' at all. An early instance is where Faustus' blood refuses to flow that he may write the bond: here A reads (506—7),

Why streames it not, that I may write afresh?

Faustus giues to thee his soule: ah there it stayde,

which seems more effective than B's 'O there it staid*'. The variant is particularly frequent in the last act (for details see notes

¹ B was here printed from MS, but it is just possible that the editor was inadvertently responsible for the error. The passage stands thus (417-20):

Veni Veni Mephostophile.

Enter Mephosto.

Now tell me what saith *Lucifer* thy Lord.

7^hat I shall waite on *Faustus* whilst he liues,

So he will buy my seruice with his soule.

Now, the position of the direction, though logical and in agreement with A, may be due to the editor. In MS it may have stood in the left margin before the third of these lines and have served both for an entrance and a speaker's name, as was not unusual in dramatic manuscripts (e.g. 'Enter Seriant* in *Sir Thomas More*, add. II, I. 139). If so, and the editor moved the direction to its present more normal position, Mephostophilis* speech would be left without prefix.

² B was again printed from MS. In *Sir Thomas More*, at 1.*647, five speeches are added in the margin, but only the first has a prefix.

Introduction

on 1922 and 2036) and while in some cases it may be indifferent (e.g. in 1813, 1947, 2074) there can be no question but that the great exordium of Faustus' last speech (A 1450-1),

Ah Faustus,
Now hast thou but one bare hower to liue,

and its later echo (A 1481-2),

Ah, halfe the houre is past:
T wil all be past anone:

lose much of their effect when introduced in B by '0' This, I am convinced, is nothing but an assimilatory trick of the compositor, of which the editor may be acquitted.

To the compositor may also be credited, or debited, a number of misprints, not many in number though occasionally startling in character. The following are worth noting. At 139—40 (in spite of the use of A as copy) Faustus

Will be as cunning as *Agrippa* was,
Whose shadow [A: shadowes] made all *Europe* honour him.

It was *Agrippa's* shadow-pictures not his shadow that brought him fame. At 237-8 we read,

Figures of euery adiunct to the heauens,
And Characters of Signes, and euening [A: and erring] Starres,

that is, the symbols of the zodiac and the planets. Here B is printing from A, though using MS for correction; but the same surprising mistake is found again at 613, which was printed from MS. Evidently the compositor was persuaded that heavenly bodies could not err. In the bond (printed from A) there are a number of variants probably due to the compositor (see p. 68), and in the *'Dirge'* (printed from MS) one if not two accidental omissions (see p. 73, note). At 1446 'I call' can only be a misprint for 'I air (i.e. Ay, all). Lastly, there is one variant in Faustus' last speech (B 2057),

Gape earth [A: Earth gape]; O no, it will not harbour me

of which, since B was here printed from A and there is no evidence that MS was present, I can see no explanation but carelessness on the part of the compositor.

There is one further matter that I feel I should touch on here. In the course of our discussion two facts have come to light, one in connexion with A and the other with B, of which we have so far sought no explanation. To begin with, why was it that the

Nature of the B-text

reporter, who could reproduce the serious parts of the play with substantial and at times minute accuracy, seems sometimes to have been able to remember little beyond the bare outline of the comic and clownage scenes that he set out to preserve, and even to have been forced on one occasion (at the beginning of iv, ii) to go back to the source-history to eke out his recollection?¹ And secondly, why was it, as has become evident in the present section (p. 72), that it was almost exclusively scenes of the tragical action that were absent from MS, or if present were mutilated or obscured?

These two facts would find a common and natural explanation if we were to assume that the lighter portions of the play had been added in the course of revision; and in fact a plausible occasion for such revision immediately suggests itself. When in the autumn of 1594, some four months after establishing themselves at the Rose, the Admiral's men gave their first performance of *Doctor Faustus*, they were reviving a piece that, whether it had been in their repertory from the first or had been acquired from some other company, had probably not been seen in London for close on two years, and it would be likely enough that they should wish to give some new polish to a popular play that may have become a little stale. Any such revision must have been carried out between June and September 1594.

Suppose then that after the revised play had been put on the stage a report was attempted by someone who was familiar with the text as it had been originally performed, he would probably produce something not unlike the A-version. Of those portions, substantially the tragic action, that came from Marlowe's pen and had been in existence at any rate since the beginning of 1593, he would have an adequate knowledge; but if he aimed at producing an up-to-date version, he would have to supplement the text he knew by what he could pick up in the theatre of the recent additions, and this might well be of a rather fragmentary character.² Regarding MS, if, as assumed, it consisted of the foul

¹ See p. 59. The suggestion that the reporter was an actor who knew some portions of the text better than others because they were more intimately connected with his own part or parts—a suggestion that has proved helpful in the case of some piracies—will not serve us here. The only actor who could have produced the generally close report of the tragical action, particularly in the opening and closing scenes, is the one who played Faustus, and he would have been in a position to furnish an equally good report of those comic scenes that are in fact preserved in A.

² It is not only that the reporter shows an inadequate knowledge of the comic scenes themselves. In the Marlowan parts there are also occasional passages that one is tempted to suppose insertions by another hand (as will appear in the next section) and these passages

Introduction

papers, not of the tragical part alone, but also of the comic and farcical portions, we should have to suppose that the revision was made, not on the original prompt-copy, but on the author's draft from which the book had been prepared; and this would indeed, I think, be the natural procedure, supposing the original foul papers to have survived.¹ If that was so, it is quite possible that twenty years later, when the same foul papers came to be used in preparing the B-text, the additions written in 1594 might be in a substantially better state of preservation than the original text written two years earlier.

The theory of a revision of the play in 1594, in the course of which the less serious portions were added or, at least, largely recast, affords a plausible and in some ways an attractive explanation of the twin problems we have encountered. There are, however, difficulties in the way of its adoption. For one thing, it looks as though its scope would have to be restricted. It is true that most of the lacunae in MS affected the tragic action, but one of the most notable was the loss of the comic, or rather clownage, scene that must once have divided 11. i from 11. ii (p. 108). Another clownage scene (1. iv, see p. 32) is known to have been in existence before the date of the supposed revision, since it is quoted in *The Taming of a Shrew*, which was registered on 2 May 1594. Little, moreover, can be inferred from the loose reporting of the farcical scenes. The elaboration they underwent was evidently deliberate, and in any case such scenes would be very much at the mercy of the comic actors. This would have a twofold effect. The text would tend to depart more and more from that originally written, so that even an accurate report of a late performance might bear but a distant resemblance to the prompt-book. Also the text would throughout remain fluid, and would thus have less opportunity to stamp itself on the memory of a reporter, supposing him to be one who derived his knowledge

are sometimes less accurately reported than their surroundings. It is true, however, that these insertions are usually more or less comic in character, and being somewhat of the nature of gag would be liable to like variation on the stage. A good example of such a passage is 826-31, and it may be significant that 846-53, which I believe to be another insertion by the same hand, but which is meant to be serious, is quite well reported.

¹ Any revision made at a time when the prompt-book was needed for current performance would necessarily have to be based on the foul papers. But such revision would be exceptional, and anyhow, since no performance of *Faustus* was given during the first four months almost of the company's occupancy of Henslowe's theatre, it was not so in the present instance. However, it may have been the intention to work a fair copy of the additions into the existing prompt-book rather than to prepare a new one, and if so the book-keeper would be reluctant to allow it out of his own hands *if* a substitute was available.

Nature of the B-text

of the play from repeated performance. There is thus no reason to assume that the clownage scenes did not form as much part of the original play as the tragic, and some evidence that they did. We shall, therefore, be wise to confine any hypothesis of revision to what I have called the comic action. It is true that we find the two strands, comic and farcical, interwoven in Act iv, and, indeed, it is in the clownage episodes in Scenes vi and vii of that Act that this theme finds its culmination. But it is conceivable that these episodes may be a later elaboration of the action to which they belong; or, alternatively, the author of the comic part may have taken pre-existing clownage scenes and interwoven them with his new (or revised) plot. Indeed, such interweaving would afford a plausible explanation of certain apparent contradictions in the action of iv. vii that we shall have to consider in the next section (p. 119).

But even if we succeed in disentangling the comic from the farcical action, it is possible that further deductions will have to be made. In Act II the pageant of the Seven Deadly Sins is probably not Marlowe's, and it is natural to ascribe it to the author of the comic scenes: yet, apart from the transposition of two speeches and a few probably deliberate alterations, it is well reported in A, and the reporter evidently knew it as well as he did the strictly tragical portion. Moreover, in Act v there is, among the passages peculiar to B, one episode (B 1983—2034) in which the frequent rhyming couplets point strongly to the comic writer; and, as we shall see in the next section, there is something to be said in favour of Bullen's suggestion that these passages peculiar to B are original drafts discarded in the final make-up for performance. If this view is correct there can, of course, be no question of their being additions of 1594, and if there was indeed a revision at that time, we should probably have to suppose that it was made by a writer who had also collaborated in the original composition of the piece. This is an untidy hypothesis, but it is not intrinsically impossible, or even, indeed, improbable.

There are, however, other objections to the theory we are considering. In the first place, there is no evidence whatever that the play was, in fact, revised in 1594, and had it been, we should, perhaps, have expected Henslowe to mark it as a new piece.¹

¹ *The Spanish Tragedy*, under the title of *Jeronimo*, was acted by Strange's men as an old play in 1592-3, but when it was revived by the Admiral's on 7 Jan. 1597 Henslowe marked it as new. Similarly he marked 1 *Tamar Cam* as new when performed by the Admiral's men in May 1596, though it had previously been acted by Strange's, also as new, in 1592-3. He apparently marked Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* as new (j¹) when the Admiral's

Introduction

Another objection is that if the comic scenes were added in the autumn of 1594, the report preserved in the A-text can hardly have been made before 1595, when theatrical affairs had again settled down to normal.¹ This is, of course, possible, since some companies no doubt continued to lead the purely provincial existence for which the report seems to have been designed. At the same time, analogy with other texts of this nature suggests that A is much more likely to have owed its origin to the dis-organization of the plague years 1592-4.² But the most serious objection, to my mind, is the difficulty of imagining what the play can have been like before it was revised. Marlowe's two internal choruses (B 778-801 and A 930-47) prove that two middle acts, one at Rome and one at the imperial court, and, therefore, more or less on the lines of those we now possess, formed part of the original plan. Moreover, the opening of Act in, which again seems to be in part Marlowe's, likewise appears to envisage just the sort of action that, in fact, follows, although as soon as it gets under way Marlowe hands over to a collaborator. There can, therefore, be no question of the comic action being a completely new importation, and we should have to believe that the original version of these two middle acts proved sufficiently unsatisfactory to induce the company to face, besides the comparatively trivial expense of revision, the considerable inconvenience involved in the disturbance to the prompt-book and the actors' parts that such revision would necessarily entail.³

It is not altogether easy to balance the evidence for and against the theory of a revision of the text in 1594; but, on general

men revived it in Aug. 1594, though it had been printed as early as 1590 as acted by an earlier Admiral's company. A piece called *The French Comedy* was performed by the Admiral's men as new ('j') on 11 Feb. 1595, and again marked as new when revived on 18 Apr. 1597; and another called *Alexander and Ludovick*, both on 14 Jan. and n Feb. 1597-

¹ It is true, of course, that the A-text contains allusions to Dr. Lopez (1177) and to French crowns (394) that are probably as late as 1595, but since the text underwent progressive alteration (see pp. 37 ff.), it is natural to regard them as later insertions.

² To account for the accurate reporting of the "Dirge" at the end of Act rn I suggested (pp. 58-9) that a script used on the stage was available. It would be much more difficult to imagine how this got into the hands of a pirate, if the scene in which it was used was an addition made by the Admiral's men after they acquired the piece, than it would be if the scene already formed part of the text acted earlier by some other company, in whose hands the script may have remained, and of which the reporter may have been a member.

³ It might be suggested that Marlowe had himself tried to supply the middle portion of the play, and that his treatment of themes that invited and even demanded lighter treatment had proved a failure. In view of our complete—or almost complete—ignorance of Marlowe's capacities as a comic writer, the possibility cannot be denied, but it is not one that I am tempted to argue.

Nature of the B-text

grounds, I do not think that in any case revision should be postulated unless the weight of evidence is clearly in its favour. On the whole, therefore, I am inclined to reject the hypothesis, and in the next section I shall proceed on the assumption that the B-text is substantially of one date, and represents the play as drafted in the autumn of 1592. The great unevenness of the reporting may be due merely to the temper of the reporter. The tragic action is, after all, the essence of the play and alone gives it interest and value: the reporter's neglect of the comic action is in large part deliberate; the general weakness and occasional complete breakdown of his memory of these scenes may be due to no more than lack of interest. And as regards MS, the fact that the comical scenes were more completely preserved, and it would seem more legible, than the tragic may be due to difference of authorship. It would not be altogether surprising if in Marlowe's portion of the play the text was more hastily written and the sheets less tidily put together than in that of his humbler collaborator.

V. Authorship and composition

There seems to be general agreement among editors and critics that neither the A-text nor the B-text of *Doctor Faustus* can be ascribed to Marlowe as a whole.¹ With this I fully agree, but to determine the number of the contributors and to distinguish their contributions is another matter, and I have made it no part of the plan of this edition to discuss the problem of

¹ While no one, so far as I am aware, has actually asserted the Marlowan origin of the whole of either text, a sceptical or agnostic attitude has sometimes been assumed. Thus Kirschbaum writes (p. 274): 'there has been altogether too much cocksureness in the determination of what is Marlowe's and what is not. . . . I am just as convinced that he could and did write slapstick comic scenes and uninspired serious scenes as I am that Shakespeare could and did.' Earlier, in 1889, and more cautiously, Breymann quoted with approval W. Wagner's opinion 'dass eine bloss Ssthetische Kritik in dem englischen Drama, ftr die Auffindung spaterer Einschiebungen nicht rathsam ist. Man ffnet damit der Willkur Thiir und Thor,' adding '(T)ber solche Fragen vermag, m. E., einzig und allein die philologische-grammatische Behandlungsweise Aufschluss zu geben,' and further 'Nur einer sich zunachst auf die (ibrigen Marlowe'schen Werke erstreckenden, streng methodischen Untersuchung, die sich nicht etwa in den beliebten allgemeinen Ausdrcticken bewegen, sondern ins Einzelne gehen und Marlowe's metrische, stilistische und syntaktische Eigenthumlichkeiten, sowie den ihm eigenthumlichen Gebrauch der Bilder und Vergleiche etc. in erschopfender Weise erforschen muss, wird es vielleicht noch einmal gelingen, einige sichere Anhaltspunkte fiir die Beurtheilung der in B. uns vorliegenden Redaktion zu gewinnen' (ed. *Faustus*, pp. xxxvi-xxxvii). I am fully conscious of the dangers of impressionistic criticism, and I recognize the value of intensive study of

Introduction

authorship except incidentally, or to offer any *ex cathedra* pronouncements upon the identity of the authors or the extent of their shares. Without claiming any more competence to pronounce than the next man, I do feel that I can say with confidence of some passages that they are by Marlowe and of others that they are not, though not necessarily to do so in the case of every particular one. But here there is one important consideration that I should make clear. The extremes of style that to my mind make a distinction of authorship inevitable are not those that characterize the tragic verse and the farcical prose scenes. Between these there is such a vast difference of intention that little can be inferred from a comparison of their execution, and had the play consisted of these two elements only, I do not know that a distinction of authorship would have been critically valid. But there are also what I have called the comic scenes, and these provide a comparison *in pari materia*, for they are, like the tragic scenes, almost wholly in verse, and much of the writing is quite serious in intention. And here there does seem to be a difference of style and metre that is unmistakable to my mind, and will be, I think, to anyone at all familiar with Marlowe's writing. Nor can one possibly miss the distinction between the earnest intensity that characterizes the essential and obviously Marlowan portions of the tragic action and the merely theatrical and conventional seriousness which is the most that the writer of the main scenes of the comic action is capable of achieving. I cannot doubt that we have here valid critical grounds for assuming a difference of authorship; and once we have been forced to recognize more than one hand, I doubt whether anyone will be inclined to suppose Marlowe rather than a collaborator responsible for the clownage scenes either. At the same time it is by no means easy on grounds of style alone to make the distinction definite, or to say, particularly at the beginning of Act in, exactly which lines were written by Marlowe in a careless and uninspired mood, and

metrical, linguistic, and stylistic details, but I think the experience of sixty years has taught us that the latter may lead to conclusions no less questionable than the former. We have, moreover, come to recognize that those who rely most blindly on material statistics are usually those who know themselves incompetent to form an individual judgement of style and are most loud in decrying it. And I believe that there is a profound difference between the genuine stylistic impression of an honest and capable critic and the mere wilfulness of one who fails in either of these respects, nor do I doubt that it is within the power of the ordinary student to distinguish between the one and the other, though he may not have the capacity to make the judgement himself. Thus for my part I would rather rely upon the impression of a critic in whose judgement I feel confidence than on an accumulation of mechanical tests*

Authorship and Composition

which by a collaborator writing more or less in his manner. We can, however, at least feel certain that a few individual passages composed in an exaggeratedly Marlowesque style, one might almost say in a parody of that style, are not his.

I have, therefore, attempted in what follows (as also in the head-notes to the several scenes) to distinguish between the Marlowan and the non-Marlowan passages of the play. At the same time I would warn the reader that when I assign a passage to Marlowe I wish him to understand, that I am not asserting a demonstrable fact, but am merely registering a personal and perhaps superficial impression. I repeat that whereas in some instances my conviction amounts to moral certainty, in others it is lightly held; and that in all I willingly leave the decision to the reader, who may very well be better qualified than I am to form a judgement. For me, in what follows, distinction of authorship is not a main purpose, but merely one of several instruments for probing into the history of the text, and one, I am well aware, that is liable to prove dangerous if used carelessly or with over-confidence.

At the end of this section I shall consider certain reasons for supposing that Samuel Rowley may have had some hand in the original composition of the play, but this is a possibility to which I shall meanwhile allude only incidentally. Nor shall I here consider explicitly the question whether more than one hand besides Marlowe's can be traced in the composition, particularly whether the comic and the farcical scenes are the work of a single writer. In the course of our discussion we shall probably find some evidence in favour of either view, and this it may be worth while summing up at the end. Meanwhile I content myself with pointing out that in fact previous critics have discovered traces of Rowley's hand in both.

With these warnings in mind let us go through the scenes seriatim and try to see how they took the form in which they have come down to us. It follows from what has been said in previous sections that the basis of our investigation must be the B-text, and indeed I shall only mention the A-text in so far as it happens to throw light on the rather intricate problems we shall have to consider. But before proceeding there is one feature to which I wish to direct attention. Broadly speaking, the tragic and comic scenes are in verse and the clownage scenes in prose, but none of the three categories is consistent in this respect. To some extent this is obviously intentional, most notably in the tragic scenes, I. ii, between Wagner and the Scholars, which in

Introduction

spite of its lighter character belongs essentially to the tragic action, is in prose except for a few lines at the end; and wholly in prose is Faustus' farewell to the Scholars in v. ii. Also obviously designed are Faustus* verse soliloquy (itself tragic) in the farcical Horse-corser scene (iv. v), and Mephostophilis' entrance and exit lines when summoned by the Clowns in in. iii. To these should presumably be added some prose passages in the comic action—the rather farcical ending of the Roman business in in. ii, some speeches (those of the horned Knight) that interrupt the main action in Iv. ii, and, curiously, the marvellous business with the Duke and Duchess of Vanholt in iv. vii, which is, however, rather closely interwoven with the farcical action. At other points departures from the usual medium may be taken to raise a suspicion that there has been some interference with the original plan. By such interference I do not mean necessarily or usually an alteration made at a definitely later stage, but merely an insertion or modification in the course of composition. And here it may be well to distinguish three several types or strata of alteration. In the first place, and it would appear much the most frequent, are those modifications of the original design made in writing the foul papers, and, therefore, naturally appearing in B. Next there are those alterations made in preparing or revising the prompt-book: these manifest themselves in A, but may in some instances have been taken over by the editor of B. Lastly there are alterations made in the course of performance after the preparation of the original prompt-book: these again will show themselves in A, and can only appear in B if borrowed by the editor.¹

Except for the clownage scenes the first two acts are entirely devoted to the tragic action. So far as the Prologue and i. i are concerned there is little doubt of Marlowe's authorship, nor except at one point do they raise any problems of construction or composition. The action is straightforward and is managed with admirable firmness and complete confidence. The few lines that appear in A only have been accidentally or intentionally omitted in B (which is here printed from A). It is, however, worth notice that the Valdes and Cornelius episode is one of the two major incidents of the play that have no source in the

¹ The third category has no authority so far as any recognized version of the play is concerned; but it may be as well to remind readers that had we not rejected the possibility that the A-text might embody additions of 1602, we might have had to take into account some theatrical sanction even for its latest modifications.

Authorship and Composition

Damnable Life (the other being the Bruno business in the comic action).¹ And it is in this episode that the one real textual difficulty occurs. The passage runs thus (170-5):

Corn. . . . Then tell me *Faustus* what shall we three want?

Faust. Nothing *Cornelius*, O this cheeres my soule:

Come, shew me some demonstrations Magicall,

That I may coniure in some bushy Groue, ' "

And haue these ioies in full possession.

VOL. Then hast thee to some solitary Groue . . .

We have already seen (p. 66) that 'bushy' should perhaps be 'lustie', pleasant, as in A. But there is no apparent, or indeed imaginable, reason why *Faustus* should wish to conjure in a grove rather than anywhere else, and the phrase looks like an anticipation of that used two lines below. Such anticipations do, of course, occur in reporting, and there may be some deep-seated corruption in A. At the same time, 'bushy' probably implies consultation of MS, and all difficulty would be removed if we were to regard 172-4 as an insertion by a collaborator designed to bridge what seemed to him an abrupt transition.² And this suspicion is confirmed when we observe that the trick of inversion in 'demonstrations Magicall' is later found to be a favourite one with the collaborator (see pp. 114 and 133-4), and moreover that this collaborator does occasionally duplicate phrases of the original (see pp. 107, 113).

The short scene (1. ii) in which *Faustus'* Scholars learn of his dabbling in magic has not usually been ascribed to Marlowe (though Boas (p. 27) is inclined to do so), but the speeches of the Scholars, though naturally less intense, and more inclined to fall into verse rhythm, are not unlike those in their farewell scene (in v. ii), which I am convinced is Marlowe's, and their solicitude for their master is in the same vein; moreover Wagner's flippancy (apart from embroidery in A) is throughout in the academic manner suitable to a university wit, and distinguishable, I think, from that of his grammar-school tags in 1. iv. I have little doubt that we have here one of Marlowe's rare experiments

¹ I here leave out of count the farcical scenes, of which only the Horse-corser episode (iv. v) and the final discomfiture of the Clowns (in IV. vii) have any prototype in *EFB*. Concerning the dramatic function of Valdes and *Cornelius*, see *The Damnation of Faustus*, pp. 97-9.

² If 'the ring of Marlowe' be detected in the last line of *Faustus'* speech, one might suggest, giving the rein to fancy, that what he wrote was:

Nothing *Cornelius*: I long to proue my art
And haue these ioies in full possession.

Introduction

in humour and in prose.¹ It calls for no comment save to observe that after Wagner's exit the Scholars lapse into rather irregular verse, as though this medium came more naturally to the writer.

Marlowe's authorship of i. iii, the conjuration scene, is again unquestioned, nor does the text itself raise any problems. The initial direction, however, does. It runs: '*Thunder. Enter Lucifer and 4 devils, Faustus to them with this speech.*' Faustus is obviously unaware of their presence, which is natural enough, since they are doubtless 'above*'. But it involves a contradiction with the text. We are, in fact, offered two inconsistent views of the conjuring. According to the more fundamental, which is certainly Marlowe's, Faustus by his invocation really did raise the spirit or devil Mephostophilis. Of course, as Mephostophilis is careful to explain (272 ff.), his hocus-pocus had nothing to do with it; but it was the blasphemy of the incantation, and the jeopardy in which Faustus thereby placed his soul, that was the effective cause that attracted the spirit to its prey. The present direction on the contrary implies that Satan was already lying in wait for him, and that the invocation at most gave him the opportunity to interfere.² Now, this direction cannot be dissociated from the entrance of '*Lucifer, Belzebub, and Mephostophilis,*' also with '*Thunder*' and clearly 'above', which opens v. ii (1894), and the conception of a plot by the infernal powers is there borne out by Mephostophilis' boast that the toils were laid from the first (1989-92),

'Twas I, that when thou wer't i'the way to heauen,
Damb'd vp thy passage, when thou took'st the booke,
To view the Scriptures, then I turn'd the leaues
And led thine eye

words that can only refer to Faustus' *apparently* chance collocation of scriptural passages in l. i (66-75), which is the immediate cause of his revolt from God. There can then be very little doubt that the direction at the head of l. iii was inserted to conform with the conception manifest in B's additions to Act v and at the time

¹ Short prose speeches are not infrequent in *Tamburlaine*, but there is no example of sustained prose dialogue. The Soldier's speech in the manuscript fragment from *The Massacre at Paris* (see *The Library*, 1934, xiv. 447-69) is in prose and seems to me to bear some resemblance to Wagner's in style of argument.

² A possible reconciliation of these views might be sought on the theological level by pointing out that Mephostophilis is a subordinate spirit—he may, as he alleges, have been attracted by Faustus' blasphemy—whereas Lucifer is of a higher order—he may have planned and guided the temptation. But, as we shall see in a moment, it is this that Mephostophilis himself claims to have done.

Authorship and Composition

these were written; and that a later interpretation of the incantation has, therefore, been superimposed on that originally intended. Thus inner consistency has been in a measure sacrificed, not, as might at first sight appear, to theatrical effect, but to an altered conception of the hero's downfall. The lines quoted above might pass as Marlowe's but they occur in a clearly un-Marlowan passage. We cannot, therefore, be certain that Marlowe assented to the later view of the invocation or took any responsibility for the direction at the head of i. iii; though both views clearly found a place in the play as originally written.¹ The contradiction disappears in A with the absence of the direction and additions, and we consequently do not know whether it was ever in the play as acted. (On the whole difficult question see below, pp. 129-32.)

I. iv, in which Wagner engages the Clown as his servant, begins the farcical theme. Boas (p. 27) 'can see no sufficient reason why Marlowe should not have written Act I. ii. and iv.', linking them, I suppose, because of their concern with Wagner. There are, it is true, points of resemblance, for in each Wagner shows some signs of education, and the phrase 'leave your iesting' recurs (197, 365). Still they belong, one to the tragic, and the other to the farcical action, and though, as I said to start with, it is not possible to disprove Marlowe's authorship of the latter, I can see no reason to assume it.

So far, apart from the two Wagner scenes, B is printed from A, although the text was present in MS, if only, perhaps, in a somewhat mutilated form (see p. 72). In Act II we face much more complicated problems. Substantially II. i, the scene in which Faustus barter his soul, is no doubt Marlowe's, and most of it is printed from MS. But we have already observed (pp. 68—9) that for two passages, Faustus' first speech (389-401) and the reading of the bond (487-507), A served as copy, and there is nothing to suggest that they were in MS at all. Their authorship may thus be open to challenge. The absence of the first speech from MS might, of course, be due to accidental damage at the opening of the scene; on the other hand, abrupt transitions later suggest that Marlowe may well have begun, equally abruptly, with the

¹ If Marlowe had any hand in the additions that B makes to Act v, as on the whole seems probable, then he must be supposed to have been cognizant of, and have assented to, the alteration in the conception of I. iii, which was clearly made to agree with those additions. It is even possible that the lines quoted above are in fact Marlowe's (see note on 1983-2034).

Introduction

entrance of the Angels.¹ And, to my mind at least, the first twelve lines read more like an imitation of Marlowe's writing than his genuine work. I am, therefore, inclined to ascribe this speech of Faustus to a collaborator, and to suppose that it was one of those added in the prompt-book (see p. 82). As regards the text of the bond, which is closely and competently paraphrased (in prose, of course) from *EFB*, it might be anybody's work, and there is no internal indication that it is not Marlowe's. But the surroundings are suspicious. MS was certainly available down to 486 and again from 510 onwards. But 504-5 are in prose like the bond, and 505 lacks Marlowe's dignity. Consider also 507—8: the periphrasis in

Tell me, where is the place that men call Hell?

comes not quite naturally after the straightforward statement

First, I will question [with]² thee about hell:

and suggests patching. I conclude, therefore, that Marlowe, having washed his hands of the bond, started off again with 508 on a different subject and left it to a collaborator to join the slats. Where then did Marlowe break off? Down to 469 there is no doubt that the verse is his; but I can trace his hand no farther. The careless repetition—'to delight his minde', 'to delight thy mind' (470, 476; cf. 1023)—and the couplets (478-81) are quite unlike what precedes, and we shall see that other shows in this act, in tone with the devil-dance here, appear to be the work of a collaborator. Yet 470—86, unlike what follows, was not only in MS but was printed from it. This raises a suspicion that the authorship of this portion (470—507) may be more complicated than at first appears, and closer examination confirms this. Certain discrepancies between the terms of the bond and the implications of the play (discussed in the notes, 487-503), together with technical ability shown in the drafting, suggests that the bond itself was drawn up (on the basis of *EFB*) by a hand other than those of the regular authors, the hand possibly of someone with

¹ There is some suggestion that n. i, beginning at this point, was at one time continuous with l. iii: see note on 402-10.

² The absence of this metrically necessary and stylistically desirable word proves conclusively that B is here still dependent on A, since it was accidentally omitted in A3. It follows that the tinkering in 506, whereby the prose line

Now Faustus aske what thou wilt

became **the** metrical

So, now *Faustus* aske me what thou wilt

must be ascribed to the editor of B.

Authorship and Composition

legal experience. What I think may have happened is this. Marlowe broke off at 469 leaving his colleague to supply the dull bond business and resumed with a different subject and on a fresh sheet of paper at 508. The actual drawing of the bond was entrusted to someone familiar with legal terminology, and it was naturally drafted on a separate leaf. It remained then to fit it into place and to bridge the gaps, and this task naturally fell to Marlowe's usual collaborator. Starting from the point at which Marlowe had left off, and writing on his unfinished sheet, the collaborator supplied 470-86 including the show of the devil-dance, to connect Faustus' hesitation at the sight of the inscription on his arm with the text of the bond. Then at the foot of the leaf containing the bond he wrote 504—6 to connect up with the point at which Marlowe had begun again at 508. But this still left the transition a little awkward. It will be noticed that 508, not 507, is the natural line with which to have begun the discussion of hell, if Marlowe was starting on a fresh subject, and it is also the first line here that can have been printed from MS. Since, then, there are reasons for thinking that 507 and 508 are from the same hand (see note ad loc.) I conjecture that Marlowe, on reading the sheet containing 487-506, noticed the bad join, and himself wrote in 507 at the foot to remedy it. Lastly, in the course probably of preparing the prompt-book, the additional leaf containing 487—507 became detached and was lost.

Later, in the show of the devil-wife, we have another fairly obvious insertion. Either Marlowe left the whole comic episode to his collaborator to fill in, or possibly made one of his abrupt transitions, writing (cf. 530—41):

Faust. Nay, and this be hell, I'le willingly be damn'd.
What sleeping, eating, walking and disputing?
But I am wanton and lasciuious,
and cannot lue without a wife.¹

Meph. Marriage is but a ceremoniall toy,
And if thou louest me thinke no more of it. . .

In any case the passage as a whole, which is in prose, beginning with the conventional 'But leauing this', including the 'woman deuilV and 'fier workes' (if we may trust A), and its slightly vulgar

¹ This line and a half (from 532-4) is perhaps not un-Marlowan, but it is fairly closely paraphrased from a passage in *EFB*—*I am not able to resist nor bridle my fantasie, I must and will haue a wife*—that is used throughout the insertion, and it might have been written by anybody.

Introduction

ending, may be credited to the collaborator who had already supplied the devil-dance. But it remained a little sketchy, and as we saw in the previous section (pp. 82—3) it was revised and expanded in accordance with *EFB* in preparing the prompt-book, the text of which is substantially preserved in A.

A transition as abrupt as any I have assumed above marks Mephostophilis' passing at 548 from the promise of 'the fairest Curtizans' to the gift of the magic book. So inconsequent is the transition, and so slight the latter episode, that one cannot help suspecting that Marlowe first broke off at 547 and later added 548-56 as something that *faute de mieux* would do to finish off the scene. The ending was evidently felt at the time to be unsatisfactory, for the collaborator, whom we have just seen revising his own addition, now came to Marlowe's assistance and added in the prompt-book the prose coda or elaboration preserved in A (see pp. 81-2). But this is not the end of the story, for 11. ii also closes with the gift of a magic book. It can hardly be doubted that the nine lines of the present passage are Marlowe's, since, although they are not themselves particularly distinctive, they follow immediately upon some of the most Marlowan lines of the play without noticeable incongruity. The subsequent much briefer passage shows a close similarity of phrasing, but it is appended to a passage that is undoubtedly the work of a collaborator, and it would be extravagant to suppose that Marlowe took up the pen to add these few and quite superfluous lines to the work of his colleague. That two successive scenes of the tragic action should conclude with the same incident is so curious, and on the face of it so improbable, that one is at first tempted to suppose that there has been some accidental duplication. Yet each incident has its own distinct prototype in the *Damnable Life*. There, in Chapter 10, immediately after the talk of marriage, Faustus again summons Mephostophilis,

which being come, brought with him a booke in his hand of all maner of diuelish and enchanted artes, the which he gaue to *Faustus*, saying: hold my *Faustus*, worke now thy hearts desire.. .

The passage at the end of 11. ii runs:

Luc. . . . Meane while peruse this booke, and view it throughly,
And thou shalt turne thy selfe into what shape thou wilt.

Faust. Thankes mighty *Lucifer*:
This will I keepe as chary as my life.

Authorship and Composition

Here the original in *EFB*, Chapter 19, is:

Saith *Faustus* I will that thou teach me to transforme my selfe in like sort as thou and the rest haue done: then *Lucifer* put forth his Pawe, and gaue *Faustus* a booke, saying holde, doe what thou wilt . . .

It is clear then that the collaborator was merely following his source in duplicating the incident, and his repetition of Marlowe's phrases shows that he was aware of the duplication and had the earlier passage in mind. The recollection, however, may have been more or less subconscious, or he may have written hastily, intending to go back and rewrite the lines if it were in the end decided to let both passages stand, an intention he never carried out. But there is a further very curious point. The collaborator was content to borrow verbatim the closing line of Marlowe's speech (a line that was sacrificed when the coda was tacked on in the prompt-book).¹ On the other hand, the opening line reappears in a somewhat different form. Here are the two versions as they stand in B, together with the corresponding lines in A,

B 548: Here, take this booke, and peruse it well:

A 607: Hold, take this booke, peruse it thorowly,

B 736: Meane while peruse this booke, and view it throughly,

A 801—2: in mean time take this booke, peruse it throwly . . .

Now, Marlowe is unlikely to have written B 548 as it stands, and A, supported by *EFB* and the collaborator, is there to prove that he did not. The line in A is perfectly satisfactory, and 'Hold* is guaranteed correct by the source and thorowly' by B 736.² It is not very difficult to imagine what happened. Marlowe wrote his inconsequent conclusion of 11. i (B 548—56)—for which he may have intended to provide a link that in fact he never supplied—on a separate slip of paper, which was then somehow roughly attached to the previous sheet. In consequence, by the time the foul papers came to be used in the preparation of the B-text, the first line had become partly illegible, being perhaps obscured by gum or torn by pinning. The editor failed to notice a defect that he could easily have supplied from A, and the compositor had

¹ If I understand him rightly, Kirschbaum (p. 294) believes that this duplication originated in the report and was taken over (on the second occasion) by B from A. But the line is not duplicated in the report, since A omits it on the first occasion. Moreover, B shows no dependence on A in 11. ii.

² The collaborator, recasting this line to fit the context, abandoned the 'Hold', though this was in his source likewise, and (if it was verse he intended) gave the line a feminine ending by writing 'throughly' for 'thoroughly', as is proved by the 'throwly' of A's prose version. A begins with the unidiomatic 'in mean time' (cf. 'leauing off this*' at A 587) and conflates its rendering of B 736 with recollection of its own correct version of B 548.

Introduction

to make what he could of it. He failed to read the first word (except for the 'IT) and the last, and erroneously thought that there was a word lost in the middle: these he supplied by guess-work.

Between the first and second scenes of Act n B inserts A's version of the Chorus that properly belongs between Acts n and in, which it there replaces by the authentic version derived from MS. By this clumsy insertion the editor showed that he was aware that something had been lost at this point both from A and from MS. And, as Boas has pointed out, it is easy to conjecture that what is missing is another comic, or rather farcical, scene between Wagner and the Clown. In i. iv we see Wagner hiring the Clown, and in II. iii we find that the Clown has become an ostler at the inn and is in the possession of one of Faustus' books of magic. We shall hardly therefore be assuming more than reasonable consistency in the farcical plot if we conclude that the missing scene described how the Clown came to leave Wagner's service and how on departing he stole one of Faustus' *grimoires*. We might even venture the guess that the writer identified this book with the one just given by Mephostophilis, and introduced the episode as some sort of excuse for the subsequent presentation of a similar book by Lucifer himself. If this is so we may perhaps see in it evidence that the writer of the conclusion of n. ii and of the lost farcical scene were the same.

II. ii describes Faustus' first revolt against the powers of evil and the intervention of Lucifer with the pageant of the Seven Deadly Sins. That the first part is by Marlowe is not questioned. It is, I think, substantially his down to 666 (*plus* A 726-8, censored in B), at which point there is a fairly obvious change of tone and style. There are, however, even in this earlier portion, two passages that raise a doubt. In the astronomical discussion the clumsy, pedantic, and incidentally inaccurate data of 621—4 look very like an insertion. We might suppose that the passage (618 ff.) was originally written thus,

These slender questions *Wagner* can decide:
Hath *Mephostophilis* no greater skill?
Who knowes not the double motion of the Planets ?
Tush these are fresh mens suppositions . . .*

¹ Adopting A's reading in the last line, which in B reads 'These are fresh mens questions'. Clearly the editor, not understanding the technical term 'suppositions', repeated 'questions' from 618. At the same time he may have deleted 'Tush' as vulgar: A is of course very fond of it, and -prefixes it wrongly to 618, but it is used by Marlowe (see p. 75), and there is not the same objection to it here as there is at 1550. If A is right, the line closes the verse bracket round the prose insertion.

Authorship and Composition

and that, since this was felt to be somewhat abrupt and repetitive, 621—4 were added in the margin, perhaps by Marlowe himself, rather as a note for possible amplification than with any definite intention of incorporation. I am the more inclined to suspect this passage, because I think there is a small but clear insertion a little later. Lines 661-5 run:

Lucif. Thou calst on Christ contrary to thy promise.

Bels. Thou should'st not thinke on God.

Lucif. Thinke on the deuill.

Belz. And his dam to.

Faust. Nor will *Faustus* henceforth: pardon him for this . . .

Here 663 and 664 together, but the latter especially, are obviously intended to raise a laugh, which is tasteless in the context. Moreover, while 663 completes 662 metrically, 664 is left in the air, so that this at least we may reject as an insertion. But in 665 Faustus replies to 662, ignoring 663 as well as 664; it follows that both lines are probably interpolated, and that Marlowe left 662 metrically incomplete. The addition was probably suggested by Mephostophilis' 'think thou of hell' at 642, and how the phrase tickled the vulgar ear is shown by further embroidery at A 736 and 806. With these two possible exceptions the text is, as I have said, Marlowe's down to 666, after which the editor cut out three lines. With 667 there is not only a sudden lapse from verse to prose and a marked change of style, but a revulsion of tone also. Up to this point Lucifer is a shape of terror and Faustus is abjectly cowed. This is in agreement with *EFB*, which continues in the same vein with Lucifer's proposal to show Faustus what he ironically calls 'some of our hellish pastimes' and with the appearance of a show of seven devils, the obvious intention of which is to terrify Faustus into permanent submission. In the play, on the contrary, Faustus has no sooner recanted than Lucifer becomes benign—'we will highly gratify thee'—and the 'pastime' (no longer 'hellish pastimes') that follows is nothing more terrifying than a serio-comic entertainment led by a piper (B 730). This departure from the source is apparently designed and has dramatic justification. For on the occasion of Faustus' second revolt, after his talk with the Old Man in v. i, it is by threats of bodily torture that he is cowed into submission. This is fitting where the play approaches its tragic climax, and it is also needed to point the contrast between him and the Old Man (see p. 131). But at this earlier point the tension is less, and it was a happy thought to avoid too close

Introduction

a repetition in the two incidents by here replacing methods of terrorism by cajolery. As regards the authorship of the show Simpson is persuaded that 'The pageant of the Seven Deadly Sins is unlike Marlowe; he would have lavished his splendid verse on these seven figures'. I am less confident on this point, but since the setting of the procession is certainly, to my mind, the work of his collaborator, so too doubtless are the speeches of the Sins themselves. Two points in these claim our attention. Pride concludes (686—9):

But *fye*, what a smell is heere? Pie not speake a word more for a Kings ransom, vnlesse the ground be perfum'd, and couer'd with cloth of Arras.

Part of this is repeated by Sloth (725):

hey ho: Pie not speak a word more for a kings ransome.

It will be noticed that the common phrase is more organically related to the rest of the speech on the first occasion, but more essential to it on the second. It is clear that the author, coming again upon a context where the phrase was suitable, repeated it, either carelessly or else with the intention of going back and altering it in the first instance. And although he did not carry out this intention immediately, it was apparently carried out in the prompt-book. For the phrases in question appear in A,

(Pride) He not speake an other worde,

(Sloth) He not speake an other word for a Kings raunsome.

Of course A has contaminated the second by recollection of its version of the first, but this itself, which avoids noticeable duplication, would appear to be a deliberate and authoritative revision.¹ It is all the more natural to see prompt-book revision here, that we have already assumed it in the speech of Sloth, in which A 786—8 appears to be an authoritative addition to the *text* as it appears in B (see p. 83). The Sins vanish, and, in accordance with *EFB*, Faustus, still in un-Marlowan language, begs to see hell, which Lucifer promises. But of the ensuing visit the play knows nothing; instead we have the gift of the second book, drawn from an incident in the show of the devils that was ousted in favour of the Sins. If there is any flavour of Marlowe about this it is of course due to borrowing from his parallel episode at

¹ There are two or three other small changes in Pride's speech as reported in A that may be regarded as improvements, and it will be best to treat the whole sentence, 'but fie . . . arras' (A 745-7), as revised. Kirschbaum (p. 294) would explain the duplication as an actor's repetition in A taken over by B. But B makes no use whatever of A in the present scene, and had B copied the speech from A, it would have read 'an other word' and not 'a word more'.

Authorship and Composition

the end of n. i, its relation to which we have already discussed at length (pp. 106-7).

Next comes a farcical scene, 11. iii, in which the Clowns plan to make use of the magic book stolen from Faustus. There is nothing to connect it in any way with Marlowe, and it calls for no comment. (It is the scene misplaced in A.)

Acts 11 and 111 are separated by what is properly the first (internal) Chorus (as in A) though it erroneously appears as the second in B, owing to a duplication by the editor (see p. 108). Following *EFB* it describes Faustus' dragon-borne wanderings, first 'to find the secrets of Astronomy' through the universe, and next 'to proue *Cosmography*, That measures costs, and kingdomes of the earth', and finally his arrival at Rome. It is, of course, Marlowe's.

The beginning of 111. i is the worst-written section of the play; in it the speeches repeat and return upon one another in undigested contortions. There is at least a substratum of Marlowe, but it is an uninspired Marlowe carelessly versifying guide-book matter from his source and apparently sometimes interrupted by his collaborator. And somewhere in the medley one author replaced the other, for when the text once again achieves order and cohesion with the entry of the papal procession, it is clearly the collaborator who is in charge. We must look closer at this confusion. Faustus begins with a long speech (23 lines) in which he describes to Mephostophilis the sights they have seen on their journey. There is no clear sequence as Marlowe's pen runs on and his eye follows the sentences of his source. The pair leave Paris without getting there, nor do they ever arrive at Mainz to see the confluence of Main and Rhine. In what sense they can have gone Vp to' Naples is quite obscure,¹ and the grammar gets badly tied up in the streets of Naples, forcing the editor to omit one line (A 833) in desperation. Worse follows (B 817—18):

From thence to *Venice, Padua*, and the East,
In one of which a sumptuous Temple stands . . .

'East' should be 'rest' and 'one' should be 'midst', both as in A; they are tinkering by the editor, striving to make sense of the passage. It is absurd to mention a string of places ('rest' must cover several) and then say that in an unspecified 'one' of them is a world-famous building—still more absurd if the view is extended to embrace the whole orient, and lack of grammar is

¹ B3 emended it to 'vnto\

Introduction

added to lack of sense. What apparently happened was that Marlowe, his eye on *EFB*, raced ahead and wrote 'to Venice, Padua, and the rest'—these are the only towns named in the source between Naples and Rome—before he decided that he really must say something about St. Mark's, the description of which in *EFB* of course precedes the mention of Padua; or else perhaps he finished the speech and only later added 818-21 in the margin. This speech of Faustus' was printed by B from A, MS being damaged or partly illegible, though it was able to supply a couple of lines (820—1) to A's report (see p. 69). Consequently some of the confusion may be due to errors in A; but whereas it would be comparatively easy to emend the Neapolitan passage (though the editor failed to do so), no satisfactory correction of the Venetian passage seems possible (as the editor found when he tried). Mephostophilis (after a few lines to which I shall return) takes his turn at versifying the guide-book, this time in a description of the wonders of Rome, concluding with an over-condensed allusion to the gates of the city and the obelisk before St. Peter's (fully described in *EFB*) 'That *Iulius Cesar* brought from *Africa**. I do not think that we can trace Marlowe's hand except in these two speeches. But his collaborator has already been at work. Faustus' speech ends with the question,

Hast thou, as earst I did command,
Conducted me within the walles of *Rome* ?

The text actually continues (B 826-32),

Meph. I haue my *Faustus*, and for prooffe thereof,
This is the goodly Palace of the Pope:
And cause we are no common guests,
I chuse his priuy chamber for our vse.

Faust. I hope his Holinesse will bid vs welcome.

Meph. All's one, for wee'l be bold with his Venson.
But now my *Faustus*, that thou maist perceiue,

and so on, with the rest of Marlowe's speech already mentioned. Here the repetition of 'my *Faustus*' is suspicious, even if we could allow the familiar address to be Marlowe's, and the facetious tone is out of keeping with the context. We could well believe that, as Marlowe wrote it, Mephostophilis' reply to Faustus' question began simply:

Faustus I haue, and that thou maist perceiue . . . I

¹ In A, 826 does in fact begin 'Faustus I haue', and 432 'And now', but this must be an accident.

Authorship and Composition

At the same time, 'the Popes Pallace . . . and priuie chamber where he was' come from *EFB*, and the Pope himself is about to enter, and if Marlowe had omitted to locate the scene, some addition was clearly desirable. It is therefore probable that 826—31 were supplied for this purpose by his collaborator. To Mephostophilis* account of the wonders of Rome Faustus replies with an extraordinary piece of rodomontade, swearing by the three rivers of Hades—that he wants to see the sights! It is sheer parody of the Marlowesque style, and must be credited to the collaborator: incidentally it includes a rather curious use of the word 'situation*' that can be paralleled in Rowley. And from this point on the collaborator takes control—if control it can be called, for the thirty-seven lines that intervene before the Pope's entry are a strange rigmarole. To Faustus' declaration Mephostophilis replies (B 854-9),

Nay stay my *Faustus*: I know you'd see the Pope
And take some part of holy *Peters* feast,
The which this day with high solemnity,
This day is held through *Rome* and *Italy*,
In honour of the Popes triumphant victory.

Riming lines appear as soon as the collaborator begins; but he is writing carelessly, as the duplication of 'this day' shows.¹ The error is due to too clumsy a borrowing from the end of Marlowe's Chorus—

To see the Pope and manner of his Court,
And take some part in holy *Peters* feast,
The which this day is highly solemnized—

a borrowing in which the occasion is mistaken or rather deliberately altered. What is in question in the Chorus is the annual feast of St. Peter, 29 June, on which day, according to Marlowe, Faustus happens to arrive in Rome; here we have to do with a feast specially held to celebrate the victory of the Pope over the Emperor and the capture of 'Saxon *Bruno*\ the Antipope, for which the collaborator drew, not on the *Damnable Life*, but on Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* (see note on 891 ff.). Moreover, this is not the only borrowing from and duplication of the Chorus, for in a later speech by Faustus we find mention both of the 'eight

¹ Unless, of course, the passage is somehow corrupted in B i. It is just at this point that A breaks off, so that we lack the control of its report. In B2 the third line runs,

The which in state and high solemnity,

but whether this happy emendation has any authority is a question I must leave open for the present: it is discussed in the Appendix.

Introduction

daies' of the journey (870, cf. 790) and the 'Dragons' by which it was accomplished (872, cf. 782, 789). This reminds us of the collaborator's filching of Marlowe's phrases in the incident of the second magic book (see p. 107), but unless we are content to regard it as sheer carelessness, we can hardly refrain from suspecting that when these passages were penned it was intended to suppress the Chorus, an intention that was, of course, never carried into effect.¹ To Mephostophilis' invitation to wait and see the Pope, Faustus replies with an irrelevant declaration that (862-3)

My foure and twenty yeares of liberty
Tie spend in pleasure and in daliance,

ending with another couplet. Very well, replies Mephostophilis, here they come. 'Nay stay', says Faustus, one thing 'and then I go'—he has not been asked to go anywhere, but only to 'stand by me'. And then amazingly he launches into a description of their cosmic flight, previously narrated by the Chorus, as a reason for being allowed to be an actor in the papal 'shew'. So be it, replies the spirit, 'but first stay'—for the third time—and 'view their triumphs', and whatever pranks you like to play, I will see to it that they take effect—and here really does come the procession. It will be obvious how all this cries aloud for revision, but although it is true that not much more than half is confirmed by A, there is no reason to suppose that in fact it ever was revised. And then suddenly, with the entrance of the papal train, the author, as if shaking off the bonds of some alien constraint, proceeds in perfectly orderly and competent fashion to unfold his plot of the humiliation and rescue of 'Saxon Bruno'. The frequent rhyming couplets (e.g. 899-904, 907-8, 915-16, 928—9) show the hand of the collaborator, and a repeated trick of inversion (e.g. 898 'State Pontificall') is characteristic of Rowley (see pp. 133-4).

After a purely formal break, in. ii continues the same action, and it is obviously by the same hand at least to the point where the papal party sit down to the banquet (and A resumes its continuous report). The rest is partly in prose and more broadly comic in tone, and is once more based on *EFB*, but there is no

¹ As is proved by the appearance of an eviscerated version of the Chorus in A (809-20). A also retains, at 868-9, just enough to show that duplication was actually present in the version reported. The fact that the third (really the second) Chorus is missing from B (after 1126) cannot, of course, be used as evidence of an intention to dispense with internal choruses altogether: it must have at some time existed in the foul papers, and we know from A that it survived on the stage.

Authorship and Composition

obvious reason to suspect a change of authorship. Two points attract attention. One is that the initial direction (not in A) prefixes 'A *Senit** (sennet) inappropriately to the laying of the banquet, whereas it is in A alone that the entrance of the Pope (at 1043) is so heralded. The inference is that the two directions in B were originally one, and that the intervening passage (1015-42) was an afterthought. In any case A represents the normal stage usage, which was presumably introduced in the prompt-book. The second point is that, as we have already seen (p. 82), the episode of the Pope's crossing himself seems to have been somewhat expanded in the prompt-book, 1101—6 being replaced by the original of A 898-906; and as we have also seen (p. 75) the direction after the '*Dirge*' comes from A itself.

The Chorus that follows at this point in A does not appear in B. It was, we may conclude, missing from MS, but why the editor did not supply it from A remains obscure. One reason may have been that it is misplaced, for, as Boas has pointed out, it is obviously intended to separate Acts III and iv. How it came into its present position is impossible to say, since its misplacement can hardly be connected with that of the following farcical scene in A (see p. 38). Another possible reason may have been that it is somewhat inconsistent with the text of the play. It was probably drafted by Marlowe (for though uninspired it is undoubtedly his) on the general lines of *EFB* before his collaborator had written his version of the visit to the Emperor (just as he obviously wrote the earlier Chorus before his collaborator filched from it in his account of the Roman adventures). For it mentions Faustus' return to Wittenberg and implies a stay of some duration; whereas in the play he passes from the papal to the imperial court with only a flying visit to Constantinople (mentioned in in. iii, B 1161, 1180) while Bruno's 'proud pac'd Steed, as swift as thought' (1018) is bearing him from Rome to Innsbruck, where Bruno and Faustus apparently arrive together (1190). Seeing that we have only A's report of this Chorus, it may, of course, have been cut in the same way as the earlier one. In *EFB* not only does Faustus visit the court of the Great Turk after leaving Rome, but he later makes a second journey, during which from the Caucasus he obtains a glimpse of Paradise. The Chorus concludes with an anticipation of the events at the palace of '*Carolus* the fift', which 'I leaue vntold, your eyes shall see performed'.

Act in ends with a farcical scene, rather more elaborate than

Introduction

its predecessors, concerning a Vintner and a stolen goblet, in which the Clowns, to their undoing, actually succeed in conjuring up Mephostophilis. On entrance B gives him a verse speech of four lines, the first of which A expands to three, and these so closely recall the rodomontade of 848—52 that I think there is little doubt that they were written into the prompt-book by the original author, rather than evolved in representation or reporting (pp. 83—4). (This is the scene that has been provided with alternative endings in A.)

In Act iv I can find no trace at all of Marlowe's hand. It opens with a scene between three knights, who discuss the arrival of Faustus and Bruno at the imperial court (at Innsbruck, according to *EFB*) and one of whom, Benvolio, makes light of the pretences of the magician. The scene is in verse except for a final speech of Benvolio's which, like his interruptions in the following scene, is prose. The two are, in fact, continuous, since Benvolio remains throughout at his window to watch the proceedings.

The Emperor and his court enter along with Bruno, Faustus, and Mephostophilis. The Emperor promises Faustus his favour for the release of his protege, and the scene proceeds, except for Benvolio's speeches and Faustus' replies, in smooth verse, showing a general imitation of Marlowe's style that occasionally becomes specific (e.g. in 1256—9), evidently from the same hand as the preceding and following scenes, and characterized by riming couplets and one inversion (1266 'state Maiesticall') of the type we have already noticed. (As far as the show of Alexander, A has a wholly different version, independently reconstructed from *EFB* (see p. 59). This is mostly in prose, but gives the Emperor one speech that is mainly verse and is partly printed as such.) The show is more elaborate than is implied either by the text or the source, which only mention Alexander and his Paramour and say nothing of Darius (who is also absent from A). When it is over, Benvolio, now asleep at his window, is seen by the delighted court to be wearing a large pair of antlers, of which, still vowing vengeance on his tormentor, he is at length relieved at the entreaty of the Emperor.

His attempted revenge is the theme of Scenes iii and iv, evidently again from the same hand. The author has developed the cutting off of Faustus' head, of which there is no hint in *EFB*, out of the loss of his leg in the Horse-corser episode (iv. v). (By a curious coincidence *EFB* in its account of the revenge, duplicates the vanishing-horse incident from the same episode.)

Authorship and Composition

It looks as though there had been some revision near the beginning of iv. iv, and that it had first been drafted in couplets—

Deere *Frederick* here.—*Martino* see,
Benuo/io's homes again.—O misery!—
Defend me heauen, shall I be haunted still?—
Nay feare not man we haue no power to kill.—
My friends transformed thus: O hellish spite,
Your heads are set with homes.—You hit it right,
It is your owne you meane feele on your head.—
'Zons, homes again!—Chafe not, we all are sped . . .

—and then interpolated to make it more intelligible. If we admit this we may trace an interpolation in iv. iii likewise. On Faustus' entrance at 1412, if we omit 1416-17 and 1422-8, we get a continuous passage in couplets down to 1430 or perhaps 1432, and the sense is uninterrupted. Moreover 1416-17 are not verse at all, and there is something very peculiar about the three speeches that make up 1422—8. They begin respectively, 'Was this that sterne aspect . . .', 'Was this that damned head . . .', 'I, that's the head . . .', and it is difficult to believe that they were not written with Marlowe's 'Was this the face . . .' (1874) in mind and in a rather mischievous spirit of parody.¹ In that case parts at least of Act v were already in existence;² or else, as its position suggests, the present passage was a later addition.

iv. v, which is mainly occupied by the Horse-corser episode and serves as a link between the visit to the court of the Emperor and that to the Duke of Vanholt, is a farcical scene; but it is of a more composite nature than the others, for it includes a passage of serious verse, and at the end an appearance of Wagner that properly belongs to the comic action. The episode occurred on Faustus' way home to Wittenberg, as is explicitly stated in A and *EFB*, though not in B. *EFB* connects it with 'a fair called Pheiffring' (*FB* 'einen Iahrmarckt, PfeifFering genannt') where Faustus 'lay' at an 'Inne'. This agrees with B, in which Faustus directs the Horse-corser to 'the Hostler' (1542), and is not inconsistent with the Horse-corser speaking of it as 'his house'

¹ Cf. 1708-9 in the farcical action (see note). Nor is it easy to believe that Shakespeare was oblivious of Marlowe's line when he wrote in *Richard II* (iv. i. 281-6):

Was this face the face
That every day under his household roof
Did keep ten thousand men? was this the face
That, like the sun, did make beholders wink?
Was this the face that faced so many follies,
And was at last out-faced by Bolingbroke?

² As may have been the case, see note on 368.

Introduction

(1625). While the Horse-corser is out getting his drenching, Faustus lulls himself to sleep with six lines of mediocre verse. I cannot understand how anyone can have mistaken them for Marlowe's.¹ Nothing could be farther from his manner than the combined piety and bad taste of the line (1550),

Tush Christ did call the Theefe vpon the Crosse . . .

This vein of rather sentimental piety, which sometimes intrudes itself upon the play, has usually been thought to point to Dekker, but as we shall see later (pp. 135—6), Rowley was equally capable of it. At the end, after the Horse-corser has made his escape, Wagner enters with an invitation from the Duke of Vanholt, who has 'sent some of his men to attend you with prouision fit for your iourney'. This incident is written in prose like the rest of the scene (except for Faustus' lines) though it is really connected with the comic action. It should be noticed that Mephostophilis has no part in this scene: the appearance of his name in the initial direction is due to the editor, who borrowed it from A. (In A he plays an important role, part of the general elaboration that the scene underwent, which also involved borrowing from the Horse-corser's description of the incident in the following scene (see p. 34). Moreover, the fact that in A the Horse-corser episode is continuous with that at the Emperor's court necessitated a head-link, very possibly the work of the reporter himself, which begins with four lines of verse in the same vein as, and written in imitation of, Faustus' meditation in B 1546—57, of which A gives a very correct report.)

Wagner's brief appearance alone separates the farcical Horse-corser business from another clownage scene (iv. vi) in which the various dupes meet at a tavern to plot revenge on Faustus.

It is rather curious that the brief episode with the Duke and Duchess of Vanholt, which forms the first part of iv. vii and of course belongs to the comic theme, should be in prose. Perhaps the explanation, as in the case of Wagner's brief appearance in iv. v, is that it is intimately connected with the clownage business, which is resumed in the later part of the scene. We may see in this a possible indication that the comic and farcical actions are the work of one hand, and the resemblance of Faustus' verses in iv. v to Rowley's work may be taken to point in the same

¹ I naturally do not agree with Simpson, who sees, not only in these lines, but in A 1134-7 likewise, a fragment from the scene of Faustus' home-coming* by Marlowe fitted in here by some unidentified *botcher*.

Authorship and Composition

direction. Having decided to use prose, the author was content to paraphrase from *EFB* in an unusually stiff and slavish manner. No doubt the rather intractable nature of the material offered was partly responsible; still the collaborator paraphrasing from *EFB* here, and the reporter paraphrasing from the same at the beginning of iv. ii, have produced rather strikingly similar results. The preposterous explanation of winter and summer in 1666—70 has been meekly repeated from the source. With the irruption of the Clowns we return to the farcical theme, and indeed to the culmination of that action, for which an episode in *EFB* is rather ingeniously used. But there is a curious difficulty. We left the Clowns, at the end of iv. vi, repairing to another room in the inn to continue their potations and plot revenge, and on their re-appearance, evidently rather drunk, they clearly believe themselves to be still in the alehouse. This is proved by such phrases as 'we will be wellcome for our mony' (1704) and 'the house is good enough to drink in' (1710): they offer money for the drink they order (1704—6) and threaten to smash the barrels 'in the house' (1711); it is the Hostess who brings the drink, and she demands payment and complains of Faustus' driving away her 'guesse' (1767). On the other hand, it is clear that the scene is really at the ducal palace. Faustus has come a 'iourney' (1573) at the invitation of the Duke, who puts his servants and his 'Courts' at his command (1717). We must therefore suppose that Faustus engineers the whole incident as a 'merriment' for his hosts, and by his magic brings the Clowns and the Hostess from the inn to the palace when they think they are merely passing from one room to another. The author, however, has hardly made his intention as clear as he might have done, and one gets the impression that he is rather adapting an already written scene to his purpose than freely composing a new one (cf. p. 95). This, however, would not necessarily imply a different authorship, and we have already (pp. 117 note 1, 118) seen some indication that in this act at any rate the comic and farcical themes are from the same hand, and a further point in favour of this view may be found at 1677 (see note). Perhaps further evidence of adaptation may be seen in the fact that in this part of the scene the Duke, and Faustus when addressing the Duke, and also the Servant, speak in verse, clearly for the sake of distinction. And when, the Clowns stricken dumb and driven out, the action briefly returns to the comic theme with Faustus' leave-taking (1769-73), it is once more in verse with a final

Introduction

couplet. It is worth noting that with the exception of iv. i, the provocation offered Faustus by Benvolio in iv. ii, and iv. vi, the whole of the very diverse incidents of this act have some prototype in *EFB*. Not a line of it is Marlowe's.

With Act v we are back at Wittenberg, and in the first scene we find Faustus feasting with the Scholars, while Mephostophilis acts as major-domo and devils serve the dishes. The scene begins with a speech by Wagner, who is waiting in the ante-room, a speech that presents some curious problems. It has two themes, Wagner as Faustus* heir, and his surprise over his master's carousal. The first of these is taken up again in a short conversation between Faustus and Wagner in v. ii (1915—20). The two passages (like those relating to the two magic books) are based on different chapters of *EFB*, in one of which Faustus draws up his will and in the other informs Wagner that he has made him his heir. But as they stand in the play the two passages are slightly inconsistent, for here Wagner already knows the contents of the will, whereas in the later scene he has only just been shown it, and it has indeed only just been drawn. Moreover, the later incident is very perfunctory and comes most awkwardly between passages of much greater and more serious import. Since, therefore, there is no trace of it in A, we may perhaps suspect—and hope—that it was cancelled in the prompt-book.¹ I am a little doubtful about the authorship of the present speech. I would not deny the possibility of its being by Marlowe; at the same time it is quite within the competence of his collaborator, and comparison with the speech of Faustus that follows hard upon it certainly makes common authorship seem unlikely. It will be safer to assign it to another hand. It is printed in B as prose, and may perhaps have been conceived as such; but if so it must be regarded as 'emergent' verse. It is, in fact, readily divisible, though the first line,

I think my Maister means to die shortly,

which is unaltered in A, and the seventh,

with the schollers, where ther's such belly-cheere,

which is different in A, are rather shaky: in the last line,

and see where they come, belike the feast is done

A removes the unwanted 'and' at the beginning, and at the end

¹ One would feel more confident of this did we not know that, in spite of textual duplication, both passages concerning the magic book (548-56 and 736-9) found their way into the stage version (see pp. 106-8).

Authorship and Composition

replaces 'done' by 'ended', a slight change that rhythmically makes all the difference. The relation with A is curious: only the first and last lines are closely preserved, the middle is entirely recast. I do not think that A as a whole can represent a more metrical rewriting of the speech for the prompt-book; but that there was some rewriting is probable. There seems no reason why the first four verse lines of B should have been altered (since the first rickety line was in any case left as it stood); they are fuller than in A, whose variants look like corruptions. But in the last six lines of A the logical connexions are better and the verse smoother, and it appears more likely that the improvement was made by the author rewriting the lines in the prompt-book than by the fortuitous agency of a reporter. I should like, therefore, to tack the last six lines of A onto the first four of B (ending 'ready coin'd') making a speech of ten lines in all.¹

One is the readier to suspect revision in this speech, though by a collaborator, since Marlowe undoubtedly revised the speeches of the Scholars a little later. These we discussed at length in the last section (pp. 8c—i), and they form, indeed, one of the main supports of my case. Separating them from Wagner's speech there is only a speech by the First Scholar and another by Faustus. For both, as we previously saw (p. 70), A served as copy, and there is no reason to suppose that they were present in MS. As drafted, therefore, the scene appears to have opened with the procession of devil-servitors and Wagner's misgivings, after which the traverse was withdrawn revealing Faustus and the Scholars at dinner, Helen was immediately brought in by Mephistophilis, and the Scholars made their appreciative comments and departed. This is a perfectly possible, if bare and abrupt, rendering of the action: it might be said to be hardly more than notes for the incident, the importance of which made some amplification clearly desirable. When, therefore, Marlowe revised what might be called the Scholars' doxology, he at the same time prefixed an introductory speech by Faustus. This speech is based fairly closely on *EFB*, and while it makes an effective opening, it does imply previous discussion such as that recorded in the speech of the First Scholar. The origin of the latter is more difficult to determine. It is in prose and is obviously not Mar-

¹ No doubt A's report of these six lines may be to some extent corrupt, and conflation of the two versions would be critically permissible. In particular the first of them would be improved by reading: 'And yet I wonder, for if death were nie . . .'

Introduction

lowe's, and though there is a corresponding speech in *EFB*, it does not follow it very closely; moreover, it verbally anticipates phrases in the following speeches by Faustus and the Scholars.¹ It must either be an insertion made by the collaborator in the prompt-book, or have originated in A, either as an elaboration by the actors or an invention of the reporter. The stiffness of the prose recalls alike that of the reporter at the beginning of the scene at the Emperor's court (iv. ii, A 1040 ff.) and that of the collaborator in the scene with the Duke of Vanholt (iv. vii, B 1639-74). But both these passages are more closely paraphrased from the source than is the present speech, so that in them some stiffness was not unexpected. That an actor or reporter should duplicate phrases of the original text would not, of course, surprise us; at the same time we must remember that this is just what the collaborator did, both in the episode of the second magic book (see pp. 107-8) and in the opening of Act in (see pp. 113-14). But I find it hard to believe that the collaborator, when he revised his own version of Wagner's speech in a perfectly competent manner, at the same time made this clumsy and plagiaristic insertion; and if a decision of some sort is necessary I incline to regard the reporter as responsible—an actor would not have had the requisite knowledge of *EFB*. The motive in either case was, of course, to avoid Marlowe's abrupt opening.

The exit of the Scholars is immediately followed by the entrance of the Old Man, who comes from *EFB*. I can find no trace of Marlowe's hand before the reappearance of Helen. It is true that there is in the writing of this episode an earnestness and even an intellectual intensity that might be thought to point to him, and it might be contended that he deliberately kept the verse in a lower key between the two Helen passages in order that these should stand out the more vividly. On the other hand, there is a distinct similarity of tone, and I think some resemblance of style, between the Old Man's first speech and the serious verses in the middle of the Horse-corser episode (1546-51) that suggest that the collaborator was capable of writing it, and on the whole I conclude that it is best assigned to him, writing in

¹ In this instance I believe Kirschbaum (pp. 293-4) to be right in supposing that the duplication of the line 'Whom all the world admires for maiesty' originated in A (1282-3, 1292) and was thence taken over by B (1792, 1807). I also, of course, agree that the Scholars' speeches in A 1291-5 are a report, but certainly not that in them variation from B is (at any rate mainly) due to the reporter. Nor can I allow the pessimism of the assertion that 'we shall never know* the original position of the duplicated line. It is surely obvious.

Authorship and Composition

an unusually serious vein. The latter portion of the dialogue is very closely reported in A, in contrast to the opening speech which is entirely different; and since in the later speeches there was almost certainly some revision in the prompt-book (see p. 84), we may legitimately wonder whether the first speech was not rewritten at the same time. B's version, which reflects (though with little verbal echo) the mild and polite expostulation of the Old Man who invited Faustus to dinner in *EFB*, is certainly the better written of the two. But it is rather long, and its gentleness may appear inadequate to provoke the violent reaction it does in Faustus. This seems to have been felt by whoever was responsible for the version in A. There the speech, beginning in a vein of sentimental piety, soon passes to stern moral denunciation and what is intended for 'strong' writing. No doubt the collaborator was capable of both. What makes one hesitate to see in it the hand of the author revising his own composition is the logical inconsequence of the imagery (on which see the notes). But I do not know that this is any more characteristic of the reporter in those verse passages (such as A 1056—76 and A 1134—7) that I have ascribed to him. On the whole I am inclined to see rewriting in the prompt-book, chiefly because of the temptation to revision and of the amount of it that there seems to be hereabouts; but I am far from feeling any deep conviction on the point. We have already noticed (p. 84) the curious repetition of 1830 in 1843 and the probability here of some slight revision in the prompt-book, but we have not so far considered how the duplication came about. The lines are too far apart for scribal repetition, even by the author, to be a likely explanation. But there is nothing essential in the intervening passage, so that 1843 may have originally followed immediately upon 1829, and the whole incident of Faustus* attempted suicide may be an afterthought of the author's. It is obviously suggested by, and may be looked on as no more than a dramatization of, words spoken by Faustus earlier in the play (that may be thus reconstructed from B 590-4 and A 649-50):

Scarce can I name saluation, faith, or heauen,
But feareful ecchoes thunders in mine eares,
Faustus, thou art damn'd, then gunnes and kniues,
Swords, poyson, halters, and inuenomb'd Steele,
Are laid before me to dispatch my selfe:
And long e're this, I should haue done the deed,
Had not sweete pleasure conquer'd deepe despaire.

Introduction

But the text leaves us vague as to the manner in which Faustus proposed to do away with himself: the Old Man's exclamation,

O stay good *Faustus*, stay thy desperate steps

suggests that he is rushing wildly from the room, and is surely inconsistent with the direction '*Meph. giues him a dagger**. This direction is in both texts, but since it was undoubtedly taken over by B from A (see p. 77), it was presumably not in MS, and there is some evidence that even in A it was a late insertion in proof (see note). There is, then, no reason whatever to suppose that Mephostophilis was on the stage at all at this point. In B he led the procession of devil-servitors at 1775—6 and brought in Helen at 1802, but it would be most inappropriate for him to be present at the interview with the Old Man, and he would make a natural and effective entry with the line (1847),

Thou traytor *Faustus*, I arrest thy soule

where, I suggest, the necessary direction has been removed. I conclude, therefore, that the Old Man's '*Exit*' (now at 1842) originally stood after 1829, that 1830—42 (without the direction for Mephostophilis and the dagger) were an insertion in MS, and that 1843 was subsequently revised in the prompt-book in order to remove the duplication with 1830.

Mephostophilis' threats make short work of the tardy repentance of Faustus, who renews his fealty to Lucifer, signs a fresh bond, begs for vengeance on his would-be saviour, and finally, as a safeguard against relapse, requests that he may have Helen to his love. Mephostophilis joyfully assents, and there follows the great lyrical address to immortal beauty. This, of course, is Marlowe's and there is nothing else to be said about it. But when Helen and Faustus have retired, a curious thing happens: B omits the end of the Old Man episode, which is preserved in A. It is certainly by the same author as the earlier portion, whoever he may have been, and seems too essential to be an afterthought added in the prompt-book. Short as it is, it consists of two sections.. The first (A 1377-9) laments Faustus' final renunciation of grace, and is important for the interpretation of his union with Helen;¹ the second (A 1380-6) concerns his 'sifting' by

¹ The significance of the lines spoken by the Old Man and by the Good Angel (1997-2016) for the understanding of this crucial incident in the play is discussed in *The Damnation of Faustus*, p. 107. My view of their union was in fact anticipated by Kirschbaum when he spoke of Helen as 'a succuba' ('Marlowe's Faustus: a reconsideration', *R.E.S.*, July 1943, xix. 239).

Authorship and Composition

the devils. It should be noticed that from the extant text (which of course may not be complete) it is uncertain whether what is represented is the Old Man's triumph or his martyrdom—the words 'hence I flie vnto my God' are to say the least ambiguous. Since, however, in *EFB* he remains unharmed, we are bound, in default of express statement, to believe that such is the intention here. But how come the lines to be absent from B? We could, of course, postulate accidental loss in MS and carelessness on the part of the editor in not restoring them from A. But I think there is a more plausible explanation. The import of the first three lines depends naturally on the Old Man having witnessed what has just taken place. On the other hand, taking Faustus' address to Helen as the poetic rather than the moral climax of the play, to have the Old Man sneaking in to eavesdrop (as he does in A) would inevitably distract attention and impair the theatrical effect. To avoid this the editor of B may have decided to sacrifice these nine lines altogether. Nor, perhaps, was he without authority. For the shift from moral implication to poetic appeal would, I think, be inevitable in representation, and though we know from A that the passage stood in the original stage version, it is quite likely to have been cut in later performances.

v. ii falls into four distinct sections or episodes. First we have what may be called the infernal conclave, with a brief end-link concerning Faustus' will; secondly, Faustus' farewell to his students; thirdly, what we might call the judgement, in which Mephostophilis and the Angels affirm the final damnation of the hero and reveal the secrets of heaven and hell; and lastly Faustus' agony. Of the first and third of these there is no trace in A, nor (except for the will) any hint in *EFB*. Of them Bullen wrote (pp. xxxi-xxxii): 'As to the additions to the terrific scene it is not easy to speak with confidence. In my judgment the text of the earlier edition is preferable. . . . At the departure of the scholars . . . the intrusion . . . of the Good and Evil Angels is an artistic mistake. Nor does the entrance of Lucifer and Mephistophilis [*sic*] at the beginning of the scene contribute in the slightest degree to the terror of the catastrophe. . . . But the new matter found in the later edition is undoubtedly powerful; it was penned by no hack writer, but has the ring of Marlowe. My impression is, that the text of the later edition gives us the scene in its first state; and that Marlowe on revising his work heightened the dramatic effect of the profoundly impressive catastrophe by cancelling the passages which found their way

Introduction

into' the B-text. His conclusion I propose to reserve for discussion later (pp. 129 *ff.*): here I am rather concerned with his judgement of authorship. As regards the third section, 1983-2034, I find it very difficult, indeed impossible, to believe that, with its piety and its frequent rimes, it is Marlowe's,¹ and it seems to have some stylistic affinity with the work of his collaborator.² On the other hand, I agree that part of the first section, 1894—1920, is probably by Marlowe. But it is only at the beginning that I can find any clear suggestion of his hand, and it will be noticed that the talk between the infernal powers could very well end either at 1903 with Mephostophilis' announcement of Faustus' coming, or at 1910 before the lines introductory to the brief episode of his will, an episode that I see no reason whatever to ascribe to Marlowe. The alternatives are considered in the notes (1894—1914). On the whole I incline to credit Marlowe with 1894-1903 only, and to regard the rest as a continuation by the collaborator. This section has the initial direction,

Thunder. Enter Lucifer, Be/zebub, and Mephostophilis.

They evidently appear 'above', for they announce their intention of staying to watch the action (1904—5) and must be assumed to do so. They are therefore present at Faustus' farewell to the Scholars, and also at his death (except Mephostophilis, who goes out at 1994). This, of course, implies a quite different dramatic conception from that of A, whose simpler arrangement can, however, be accounted for by its more primitive scenic resources.

The Wagner link we have already discussed (p. 120) in connexion with his speech at the beginning of v. i, and I expressed at least a hope that it was cancelled in the prompt-book. The extent of the link is not quite certain. It of course includes 'Gramercies Wagner' in 1920. But Faustus' greeting to the Scholars, 'Welcome gentlemen', completes this line, and the next,

Now worthy *Faustus*: me thinks your looks are chang'd

strikes me as clumsy and un-Marlowan, and is, moreover, verse like the link, whereas what follows is prose. Add to this that neither 1920 nor 1921 appears in A, and I think we may safely

¹ Strikingly un-Marlowan seems the tripping cadence of 2008,

Pleasures vnspeakeable, blisse without end

—cf., however, 600.

² On no other occasion are the Angels said to enter 'at seuerall doores*'; but we find the phrase 'at seuerall doores' used in directions at 1181 and 1489, and 'at one [dore] ... at the other' at 1293, all in comic scenes.

Authorship and Composition

regard them as belonging to the link, which is thus seen to be dovetailed both into the conclave at the beginning and into the farewell at the end. In the latter case the object was doubtless to provide an easier transition. As it stands in A, and as I conjecture it originally stood in MS, the farewell scene begins in Marlowe's abrupt manner, just as I believe the earlier interview with the Scholars to have begun (1794), and it must I think be allowed to be an effective opening. The farewell is in prose, and is probably the only considerable prose scene that Marlowe ever wrote. I do not doubt for a moment that it is his; its moral earnestness marks it off from anything the collaborator was capable of writing. From 1932 onwards this section was actually printed in B from A, but MS was evidently present and was used for correction, so that it is not necessary to see any significance in this circumstance.

With the departure of the Scholars the medium changes to the un-Marlowan verse of the third section of the scene. It is not quite clear whether Mephostophilis descends from the balcony: there is no direction to indicate it, but if not, Faustus must here become aware that he is being watched, and this seems unlikely. In any case Mephostophilis leaves the stage at 1994 (to return at the end, on the main stage, as proved by Faustus' cry at 2092) and only Lucifer and Beelzebub remain as observers.¹ The two Angels appear, and their speeches differ from earlier ones, not only in their assumption of Faustus' inevitable damnation, but in the character of the verse and its association with spectacle. First there is '*Musicke while the Throne descends*' from the 'heavens'. After his lament the Good Angel '*Exit*' and the throne doubtless is drawn up again. Next '*Hellis discovered*' For this the Admiral's men may have used the 'Hell mought' that they had among their properties (see p. 11). It would be placed in the alcove under the balcony, and would disappear again after the Bad Angel's speech of triumph, for it seems unlikely that it remained as a background for Faustus' soliloquy or was even used in the catastrophe.

Immediately the Bad Angel has vanished the clock strikes eleven and Faustus begins his final speech. For this A served as copy, and there is no indication that it was present in MS. Something there must always, of course, have been, but as it is we have only A to rely on. The speech is obviously well reported,

¹ Boas removes them along with Mephostophilis at 1994, but for this there is no authority.

Introduction

as indeed we should expect; so far as it is possible to judge there are few if any corruptions, certainly less than those due to censoring in B. Otherwise Marlowe's consummate effort does not need comment.

The last scene of the play, v. iii, records the finding of Faustus' dismembered body by the Scholars. Different views have been held regarding the authorship. Boas (p. 43) asserts that 'it cannot be doubted that the dialogue was one of the 1602 additions'. Earlier Bullen took the opposite view, though perhaps with some hesitation: 'To my ear', he wrote, 'the lines are solemn and pathetic, thoroughly worthy of Marlowe.' With Bullen's verdict I agree. They are not, of course, characteristic, being deliberately written in a minor key for the sake of contrast with the tremendous speech upon which they follow; but I do not see who else can have written them. Bullen added the suggestion that 'It is not improbable . . . that the poet afterwards substituted for this scene the chorus speech of compassion and warning'. It is some confirmation of this view that the last speech by the second Scholar provides much the same sort of epitaph or summing up as the Chorus, and the juxtaposition of the two somewhat dissipates the effect; and it may be significant that the Chorus was apparently not in MS, whereas of course the Scholars' scene, of which A knows nothing, was.

B printed the Epilogue from A. Boas alone, so far as I know, has questioned its Marlowan authorship. He writes: 'The first three lines have a wistful note suitable to Marlowe's interpretation of the tragical history of Faustus. LI. 4—8, on the other hand, are in the vein of "the damnable life and deserved death" of the *E.F.B.* title-page. Their pietistic exhortation runs contrary to all that is most characteristic of Marlowe, who is very unlikely also to have written the final couplet. These five lines are probably a playhouse addition.' An 'addition' in the strict sense they can hardly be, for we cannot suppose that Marlowe intended an epilogue of three lines. If Boas is right, then either Marlowe gave up in despair, leaving a colleague to complete the passage, or else he wrote something that the discretion of his colleague suppressed. Either supposition seems to me improbable. What really was Marlowe's 'interpretation' of his chosen theme is a question on which I apprehend widely different views might be entertained and which I rather doubt whether we have sufficient objective evidence to answer with confidence. For the purposes of the pl&y he accepted the Christian mythos and the Christian ethic, and

Authorship and Composition

the Epilogue does not appear to me to imply anything that is not implicit in other passages that have generally passed as his and that I agree came from his pen. Behind the mask Marlowe remains inscrutable. There is, it is true, a change of tone in the Epilogue, and the later lines are, we may admit, inferior to and less characteristic than the earlier. It is, indeed, difficult to judge objectively of lines as familiar as these, but they do not appear to me essentially different from what Marlowe might be expected to write if constrained to furnish a conventional ending. Boas appears to assume that he would have refused to do so.¹ Nor do I think that the final couplet need raise any difficulty: 2 *Tamburlaine* also ends with one. Couplets are, indeed, not wholly uncommon in *Tamburlaine* there are at least five in the First Part, and some fifteen in the Second (including a bunch of five within less than thirty lines). There are fourteen in *Edward II* Some of these are probably accidental. It is true that Marlowe appears to have eschewed them altogether in the more characteristic parts of *Faustus*, but that is obviously no reason why he should not have closed the play with one, especially if he were writing under some measure of constraint, and therefore not in his most natural vein. On the whole I see no reason to doubt that the Epilogue is throughout Marlowe's, written in part, maybe, as a necessary concession to the demands of the contemporary drama.

I have been at pains hitherto to avoid mention of one matter that I now wish to bring into consideration. It has been noted (pp. 125—6, 128) how Bullen suggested that certain portions of Act v peculiar to the B-text, namely the conclave, the judgement, and the discovery, were cancelled in revision, the last being replaced by the Epilogue. Translated into the assumptions of the present analysis, this would mean that the passages in question were suppressed in the prompt-book. The conclusion is so far borne out that the passages do not in fact appear in A and that in the Epilogue it was A that provided the copy for B. Now if there is anything in this idea it can be related to a wider hypothesis.

The conference of the infernal powers and their presence as spectators of the entire action in the tragic climax of the play, as well as the appearance of the Angels with their antiphonal

¹ If we were to deny the Marlowan authorship of the infernal conclave (1895-1910) and the last scene of the Scholars (2094-2112) there would be more reason to question the Epilogue. It is true that 'hellish fall' and 'fiendfull fortune' are rather suggestive of an imitator of Marlowe's style, but it must be remembered that it is just the mannerisms of a master in his weaker moments that become the vices of his followers. Cf. 2105, 'With dreadful horror of these damned fiends'.

Introduction

speeches, the descent of the heavenly throne, and the opening of the gates of hell, introduce elements that, with our greater familiarity with the A-text, we feel to be incongruous and to detract from the tragic effect. Bullen, while admitting the power of the writing, condemned them; and I am certain that from the normal dramatic point of view he was right. But if without preconception we compare the two versions, I think we shall hardly escape the conclusion that the difference lies not so much in the greater or less success with which they attain a common end, as that the effect at which they aim is entirely different. The supernatural elements in B all tend to place and keep the action on what can perhaps best be described as an allegorical plane. Reality is, in a measure at any rate, deliberately sacrificed to a more abstract effect. By cutting out these elements almost wholly from the catastrophe, A undoubtedly heightens the effect of the human tragedy. Of course, it is easy to account for the cutting without assuming any dramatic intent, though we should still have to explain A's apparent substitution of the Epilogue for v. iii; but it would be a little surprising that a purely fortuitous agency should have produced such strikingly happy results.

There are of course throughout the play elements that recall the old religious and moral drama. Its theme is the temptation of a human being—in this case not a representative of *humanum genus* as a whole, but of the inquiring spirit of the new age—by the powers of evil.¹ Specifically, one of the more obvious elements is the introduction, at critical points in the play, of diabolical agents to preside over the action. The scene of Faustus' conjuring (i. iii) opens with the direction (225—6),

Thunder. Enter Lucifer and 4 devils, Faustus to them with this speech

and Faustus' farewell and agony (v. ii) with a similar provision for an unseen audience (1894),

Thunder. Enter Lucifer, Belzebub, and Mephostophilis.

We may even compare the direction at the head of the banquet scene (v. i) that is to introduce Helen (1774—6),

Thunder and lightning: Enter devils with couer'd dishes; Mephostophilis leads them into Faustus study . . .

¹ This conception, as I have already remarked (pp. 102 ff.), seems to have been superimposed on Marlowe's more original one of a soul that wilfully seeks its own damnation; but this change of intention appears to have occurred in the course of composition. Evidence of the change is seen in the insertion of the direction at the head of I. iii, which we may suppose to have been added at the time V. ii was written.

Authorship and Composition

Another supernatural feature, even more suggestive of the moralities, is the repeated appearance of the Good and Evil Angels, projections of the warring elements in Faustus' soul. These move, even more than the demonic figures, on a plane different from that of the human action. Then there is the anonymous Old Man, the 'Good Counsel' of many an earlier play. Though clearly a human character, he too stands at a remove from the level of actuality, for his function is not only to exhort, but to point a spiritual contrast. He stands for Faith defying and victorious over the assaults of evil; while Faustus, repenting and revolting, is ever cajoled or frightened into slavery and damnation.¹

But whereas these 'allegorical' elements are incidental in the earlier part of the play, they become predominant in the fifth act of the B-text, especially in v. ii. Here two of the four sections are definitely on the 'moral' plane, with their several *scenes* or 'mansions'. In the first, introduced by the direction already quoted, the powers of hell assemble aloft to witness Faustus' end now that the time has come to claim the forfeit of his soul. In the third Mephostophilis descends, apparently, from his post of observation to insult upon his victim, the Good and Bad Angels enter to lament and triumph over the final ruin of all hope, and to act as chorus to the visions of the glory of heaven, typified by a resplendent throne, and the horrors of hell made visible, in their midst, for complement, an 'euer-burning chaire'. Between these two sections comes Faustus' farewell to his students. This is, of course, on the human plane, but it is possible to see in its speeches an almost ritual formality which preserves the general tone, and is found again in those at the discovery of his remains (v. iii). But there is one section, namely Faustus' final soliloquy, that is wholly out of key with the 'morality' element, and seems indeed irreconcilable with such a conception. And this speech is not only the dramatic climax of the play, it is also the culmination of Marlowe's writing, manifestly embodying his final conception and entirely satisfying the tragic requirements of the human situation. There is in it no hint of action on the allegorical plane on which the catastrophe elsewhere moves—or rather, if there are traces of such a treatment, as in the sudden appeal to

¹ The parallel is pointed by the fact that the Old Man's immunity is just what had been promised to Faustus (650-1):

Bad [Angel], If thou repent, deuils will teare thee in peeces.
Good [Angel], Repent and they shall neuer raise thy skin.

Introduction

Lucifer and the vision of the wrath of God, they are transmuted out of their original mode and fused into that of intense human passion. This makes one wonder whether we have the speech as originally conceived or even as first written. When Marlowe set about composing this great climax to his play, did the soliloquy itself burst the allegorical bounds that he had sought to impose upon the representation of his hero's downfall, and so make it necessary to jettison the medieval trappings? Or—and this is the point I am driving to—did Marlowe first draft a speech for Faustus in keeping with the 'morality' tone of the rest of the scene, and only then, growing dissatisfied with the treatment, cut out the presiding devils and the Angels with their visions of heaven and hell, only keeping the farewell to the Scholars—as, in spite of some stiffness of style, not seriously interfering with the desired effect—and write a new soliloquy on a higher, or should we merely say an intenser, spiritual plane? In spite of the absence of any prototype in *EFB*, it is obvious that for dramatic purposes there must always have been a speech in this position; yet we know that for some reason the editor of B was unable to make use of MS for it. It may, of course, have been accidentally lost. Or was it perhaps the original version of the speech that appeared in MS? and is that the reason why the editor, recognizing the superiority of the version offered by A—and deciding to include it in his own text, however out of key with its surroundings—was unable to follow his usual authority? If either of these possibilities respecting the origin of the speech is correct, it follows of course that the 'morality' setting of the scene was abandoned in the prompt-book, and I am therefore myself inclined to fall in with Bullen's conjecture that those passages in v. ii that are peculiar to B were in fact discarded before ever the play came into production. But I am conscious of having here reached, if I have not already transgressed, the bounds of legitimate speculation.¹

¹ If the suggestions here advanced are correct, there is one earlier conclusion that will need reconsideration. Starting with the revision of the Scholars' speeches at 1804-10, we have already postulated quite a number of additions and alterations in the prompt-book. We are now conjecturing further extensive changes in the last act. It begins to look as though there might have been an intermediate transcript between MS and the prompt-book—though it would not be easy to account for the preservation of the original foul papers rather than the revised draft. But if the revision was not made on the prompt-book itself, we could no longer infer that the latter was prepared before Marlowe's death (see p. 81, note 3). In that case the play may have been left unfinished and completed by another hand, such a theory might be convenient in accounting for certain features, such as the abrupt transitions and the collaborator's interpolations (as at the beginning

Authorship and Composition

It only remains to consider what little evidence there is respecting the identity of Marlowe's regular collaborator. I shall not trouble to argue whether there was more than one.¹ It is quite impossible to pronounce definitely one way or another, but such indications as we have noticed seem to point on the whole to the same hand being found both in the comic and the farcical scenes.² I have more than once mentioned Samuel Rowley in this connexion. Critics were, of course, first led to look for his hand in the play on account of the additions to it that he and Birde wrote for Henslowe in 1602, and they were not entirely unsuccessful. It is true that he has not left us a great deal of work for comparison. For the Admiral's men he wrote a play called *Judas [Maccabaeus]* also in collaboration with Birde and possibly with Haughton late in 1601, and another called *Joshua* by himself the following autumn. These have not survived. Later, after the Admiral's men had come under the patronage of Prince Henry, he wrote for the company his only extant piece, a rambling chronicle of Henry VIII entitled *When you See me you Know me* which was printed in 1605.³ In this both verse and prose scenes occur, and verse and prose are found to alternate within the scene in the same manner as in *Faustus*. Rime, too, is used in much the same way in the two plays. There is, of course, nothing individual about this; one merely notes the absence of any marked distinction. More personal is a trick of placing adjectives ending in *-al* after the nouns they qualify, and a tendency to end a line with this combination.⁴ Such an inversion might indeed occur in the verse of any dramatist writing in a rather heightened style,⁵ but repetition, and (as in *Faustus*) repetition in a bunch, points to an individual trick of composition. In *Faustus* (B-text) we find: 172

of Act in), but it would be less helpful in respect of others; for example we should still have to assume the collaborator's participation in the original draft so far at least as what I have called the judgement (1983-2033) is concerned.

¹ Apart, that is, from the writer of legal experience who, I believe, was entrusted with the drawing of the bond (487-503).

² See pp. 108, 117 note 1, 118, and 119, and note on l. 1100.

³ I have used, and quote from, photostats of the Bodleian copy of the very rare first edition. But I add references to the edition of 1613 as well, since this is accessible in Farmer's facsimile. Rowley is sometimes credited with the authorship of *The Noble Soldier* printed in 1634 as by 'S. R.' This play, however, was twice entered for publication as Dekker's, and I can discover no resemblance of style between it and *When you See me*.

⁴ As first pointed out by Dugdale Sykes, see pp. 134-5.

⁵ Or who used a heightened style for humorous effect. In *The Marriage Broker (Gratiae Theatrales, 1662)* occur the lines:

I have procured a Priest apochriphal,
Who not regards the hours Canonical.

Introduction

'demonstrations Magicall', 898 'State Pontificall', 912 and 992 'Statutes Decretair, 953 'authority ApostolicallP, 1004 'blessing Apostolicair, 1266 'state MaiesticalF (all except the example in 992 at the end of the line).¹ I have noted five instances in *When you See me* (1605 (1613)): sig. A3 'pompe pontificall', C4 (Di) 'blessing AppostolicallP, E4 (Fi) 'pompe imperiall', G4 (Hi^v) 'Deitie supernall', I4 (Ki^v) 'treason Cappitall' (all except the last at the end of the line). There is also in both plays what may be a peculiar use of the word 'situation' (see note on 852). It would be very unwise to pretend that this evidence proves that Rowley had a hand in *Doctor Faustus*, but it would be almost as unwise to ignore it.² We shall do well therefore to inquire whether Rowley could have taken part in the original writing of the play.

Of his theatrical career we know little. He first appears on 3 August 1597 as a witness together with several members of the Admiral's company. On 16 November the following year he bound himself to play at Henslowe's theatre, being then or soon afterwards a sharer in the same company and frequently authorizing payments on behalf of his fellows from 12 December onwards. He must, then, when we first hear of him, have already been an actor of some standing, and he had very likely been with the company as a hired man since its re-formation in 1594. We have already seen that he was writing for the Admiral's men in 1601 and 1602, and he may therefore have had some previous experience of authorship. If he had had a hand in the original writing of *Faustus*, he would of course have been the obvious person to write the additions of 1602.³ Beyond this we know little for certain. He may have been the Samuel Rowley who was married at St. Michael's, Crooked Lane, on 7 April 1594, and he was still writing, though probably not acting, for the Palsgrave's men (descendants of the Admiral's) as late as 1623—4 (Bentley, ii. 555). But in an interesting paper read before the Shakespeare Association in 1919, Dugdale Sykes traced Rowley's

¹ The first example occurs in a Marlowan scene, but there are other grounds for suspecting that the passage may be an interpolation (see p. 101). The next five are in the serious portion of the Roman scenes, in speeches spoken by or in the presence of the Pope; the last is in iv. ii and is spoken by the Emperor. These are, I think, the only scenes in which such a formal style is used.

² The case for Rowley's authorship of the non-Marlowan parts of the Roman scenes at any rate is considerably strengthened by Oliver's discovery that the * Saxon *Bruno*' episode, like portions of *When you See me*, is derived from Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* (see note on 891 ff.).

³ For references see *Hensl&we's Diary*, ii. 307.

Authorship and Composition

hand, not only in *When you See me* and *Faustus* (both texts), but also in parts of *The Famous Victories of Henry V* (1598, entered 1594), *The Taming of a Shrew* (1594), *Orlando Furioso* (1594), and *Wily Beguiled* (1606), and concluded that some of his work was done 'in or shortly after 1592'. Some of Sykes's contentions, especially that all these plays belonged at one time to the old Admiral's company, can hardly be accepted, but that Rowley did at an early date have a hand in some of them seems probable enough.¹ Since he was an actor as well as a dramatist, Rowley is not very likely to have written for a company of which he was not a member, but if he was with the Admiral's men in 1594, it is quite possible that he may have been with Pembroke's men (cf. pp. 61—2) a couple of years before.²

The pietistic tone that characterizes certain passages of *Faustus* has led some critics, such as Fleay, to see in them the hand of Thomas Dekker. But if Dekker was not born till about 1572 he is perhaps not very likely to have been an original collaborator in the play. It is therefore not impertinent to remark that Rowley was no less able to write in this vein, as may be seen from what is unquestionably the best speech in *If you See me* (1605, sig. G4; 1613, sig. H1^v), a speech that serves at the same time to illustrate some of Rowley's other characteristics:

Musicke is heauenly, for in Heauen is Musicke,
For there the Seraphins doe sing continually,
And when the best was borne, that euer was man,
A Quire of Angels sang for ioy of it,
What of Celestiall was reueald to man,
Was much of Musicke, tis sayd the beasts did worship
And sang before the Deitie supernall,
The kingly Prophet sang before the Arke,
And with his Musicke charmd the heart of *Saule*,
And if the Poet fayle vs not my Lord,
The dulcet tongue of Musicke made the stones

¹ See *Alcazar and Orlando*, pp. 358-61.

² So, for that matter, may Birde, if there was any sort of continuity between the Pembroke's company of 1592-3 and that of 1596-7 (see p. 62). He joined the Admiral's company, from Pembroke's, in 1597 as a sharer, and was later one of the leaders of the Palsgrave's men; he died at the beginning of 1624 (Chambers, ii. 131, 303; *Hensl-yvoe's Diary*, ii. 241-3; Bentley, ii. 379). It is therefore not inconceivable that Birde should have collaborated with Rowley in the original *Faustus* of 1592, as well as in the additions of 1602 and in the *Judas* of 1601, though none of his writing is known to have survived. Sykes, it is true, detected his hand in the B-text, of which he assigned iv. iii and iv to him on account of the frequent use of antithesis, which he believed to be uncharacteristic of Rowley. But antithetical lines are also found in Act v, e.g. 1816-17, 1829, 1911, 1994, and 2009.

Introduction

To mooue, irratiōnall beast[s], and birds to daunce
 And last, the Trumpets Musicke shall awake the dead,
 And cloath their naked bones in coates of flesh,
 T'appare in that high house of Parliament,
 When those that gnash their Teeth at Musicke sound,
 Shall make that place where Musicke nere was found.¹

So far as I am aware only two critics have committed themselves to a definite identification of Marlowe's share in *Doctor Faustus*. That by Fleay will be found in an appendix to Ward's edition (of which the analysis given in his *Biographical Chronicle*, ii. 61, is merely a careless copy) and that by Simpson in the article from which I have already repeatedly quoted. (I here reprint their conclusions with references to the A-text in the present edition.)

FLEAY
 [Prologue ?—not mentioned.]

Sc. i.
 Sc. iii.
 Sc. v, except 583-6 ('&c.'), 590-8,
 and 614-27.
 Sc. vi, 628-30 and 639-61, also 704 (to follow
 630) and 708 (to follow 645).
 Chorus 1 (altered).
 Sc. vii, 822-67 except 844-8 (read 'Faustus, I
 have; and that thou mayst perceive').
 Chorus 2, 931-41 only.
 Sc. xi, possibly 1134-42 (except 'sweet Mephisto-
 philis'); and certainly 1169 ('what')-74.
 Sc. xiii, 1285 ('for')-1386 except 1301-5.
 Sc. xiv.
 Epilogue.

SIMPSON
 Prologue.

Sc. i.
 Sc. iii.
 Sc. v, except 585-99
 (614-27 a prose abbreviation).
 Sc. vi, 628-72, and 696-729
 (798-807 a prose abbrev.).
 Chorus 1.
 Sc. vii, 822-67 (844-8 a prose
 abbreviation).
 Chorus 2.
 Sc. xi, 1134-7, and
 1169 ('what')-74.
 Sc. xiii, 1285 ('Gentlemen')-1386.
 Sc. xiv.
 Epilogue.

¹ The most recent speculations on the subject of Marlowe's collaborator are those of P. H. Kocher (1942), who supposes 'the prose scenes' to have been added to the play by Thomas Nashe in 1594, basing his conclusion mainly on a number of similarities of expression. The most interesting of these—not necessarily those that Dr. Kocher considers most evidential—I have noted in their place. They do not as a whole appear to me to establish much of a case. The most significant connexion, were it proved, would be the proposed equation of 'fryer Sandelo' (n 19) with the 'frier *Pendela* mentioned in *Nashe's Lenten Stuff*, 1599 (ed. McKerrow, iii. 210), names that Kocher takes to be graphic corruptions of a single unspecified original. Nashe's 'frier *Pendela*, he argues, is the Pope; and like the Pope *fryer Sandelo*" received 'a blow on the pate' from Faustus. Admittedly no explanation has hitherto been found for either name. The relevant context in *Lenten Stuff* is too long to quote: I can only say that it appears to me very doubtful whether Nashe meant 'frier *Pendela* to refer to the Pope, even if any relevance could be suggested for the name ('pendele', by the way, is an early sixteenth-century term for an altar-cloth), and inconceivable that '*Cursed be he that took fryer Sandelo a blow on the pate*" can refer to Faustus' assault on the Pope, which has just been the subject of the separate and more dignified malediction * *Cursed be he that stroke his holinesse a blow [on] the face*". Nor is there any real mystery about the passage (see note ad loc). There seems therefore no ground for connecting '*Sandelo*" and '*Pendela*" at all,

Authorship and Composition

Here, for the most part, agreement is fairly close, Fleay being the more meticulous, and Simpson assuming, erroneously I think, that certain obviously un-Marlowan passages are what he calls 'prose abbreviations' of original verse by him. Both deny him the scene (ii) between Wagner and the Scholars, which seems to me likely to be his. In Sc. v their analysis differs somewhat: both are disturbed by the '&c' at A 586, which they assume to be a direction for *ex tempore* continuation, but which more likely only indicates a break-down in reporting; and by the devil-wife episode, where there has clearly been interpolation, the extent of which is admittedly doubtful. The widest divergence is in Sc. vi. Simpson gives it to Marlowe down to the point where the Seven Deadly Sins come in question, except for the prose passage in the astronomy lecture; Fleay only allows him the three opening lines (A 628-30) together with A 639, the passage with the Angels (A 640-6), and Faustus' ensuing speech down to the point where he addresses Mephostophilis (A 662). I think the truth may lie somewhere between the two. Fleay's attempt in this scene to pick out single lines and assign them to other places seems to me hazardous. In Sc. vii their division is the same, and Fleay's reconstruction of the dubious lines A 844-9 agrees with my own, and is indeed pretty obvious. But I cannot understand how both critics came to believe that A 862-7 were Marlowe's. I see no sufficient reason for Fleay's dissection of Chorus 2. Both find Marlowe's hand in the verse passages in Sc. xi: mistakenly I think. The first is clearly a link necessitated by the cutting in A, and the second is decidedly unlike Marlowe. In Sc. xiii there is no doubt at which line Marlowe begins, but I have grave doubts whether he wrote the Old Man episode (A 1301-56 and 1377-86). There is, of course, no doubt that Marlowe wrote the whole of Sc. xiv as the A-text gives it, and I agree that the Epilogue is his. Neither Fleay nor Simpson considered the

and in the absence of such a connexion no necessary significance attaches to the resemblance between the subsequent mention of a 'distressed soule . . . long in Purgatorie', who 'had leaue . . . to haue egress and regress to Rome, to craue theyr beneuolence of dirges' and the 'Ghost crept out of Purgatory' of 1095-1100, which in any case comes from *EFB*. (Nashe uses 'dirge' correctly for the office of the dead; so does the author of ill. ii at 1099, but not at 1112 and 1121.) *Lenten Stuff* was written in the autumn of 1597, during or soon after Nashe's stay at Yarmouth, whither he fled to escape arrest for his share in *The Isle of Dogs*. That he was familiar with *Faustus* on the stage and Recalled passages and phrases in it is likely enough (cf. p. 8).

There is, of course, nothing impossible in the theory that Nashe contributed comic scenes to *Faustus* either in 1592 or 1594, but had he in fact done so, one would have expected them to possess rather more savour than is to be found in any of those that now appear in the play.

Introduction

question whether there is any writing of Marlowe's in the additions of the B-text. This is not perhaps a very serious omission, for apart from a few odd lines, such as B 836-7 (accidentally lost in A) and B 1804-5 (revised), the A-text appears to contain all that Marlowe wrote of the play except for a cut in Chorus 1 (of A: B 783—95, 797) and possibly the infernal conclave (in v. ii: B 1894—1903) and the scene (v. iii) of the finding of Faustus' body (B 2093-2112).¹

Boas is much less explicit, and most of his statements on authorship are incidental. He is inclined to allow Marlowe 11. iv as well as 11. ii, but none of the other farcical scenes. He specifies B 856-1105 in in. i-ii, iv. i-iv, and B's additions in Act v, as un-Marlowan, and would allow Marlowe only the first three lines of the Epilogue. Some of the un-Marlowan passages he believes to be early work of Rowley's written for the original play, others to represent the Rowley—Birde additions of 1602; but he is not very specific, and I think that v. iii is the only scene that he actually asserts to belong to the additions, though he may mean to include parts of in. i—ii, and the whole of iv. i, iii, iv as well (see Boas, pp. 30 note, 32, 34, 43). From much of this I naturally dissent.

To conclude I add a table summarizing my own suggestions respecting authorship.

Tentative Analysis of Authorship in the B-text

For convenience I have named Rowley as Marlowe's regular collaborator, but the name may best be regarded as no more than a label for one or possibly more writers. I have, as a rule, ignored B's attempts at censorship. Stage directions have been included in the sections to which they belong without intending any implication regarding authorship, pb. = prompt-book.

<i>Sc.</i>	<i>Lines</i>	<i>Author</i>	<i>Sc.</i>	<i>Lines</i>	<i>Author</i>
Prolog.	1-28	Marlowe	(11. i)	402-69	Marlowe
I. i	29-171	Marlowe		470-86	Rowley
	172-4	Rowley		487-503	Lawley
	175-88	Marlowe		504-6	Rowley
I. ii	189-224	Marlowe		507-31	Marlowe
I. iii	225-339	Marlowe (225-6, s.d. added)		532-9	Rowley [of this A 587-98 is a pb. revision]
I. iv	340-88	Rowley		540-56	Marlowe
II. i	389-401	Rowley's addition in pb. taken over from A		[A 614-27	Rowley's addition in pb.]

¹ Of course "those passages that B printed from A without reference to MS (see p. 72) may have suffered unsuspected cuts. But of these passages only B 1794-1801, 2036-92, and 2114-21 are by Marlowe.

Authorship and Composition

Sc.	Lines	Author	Sc.	Lines	Author	
Ch. 1	557-68	A's version of Marlowe's first Ch. misplaced	IV. iv	1489-1522	Rowley (beginning revised?)	
II. ii	569-620	Marlowe	IV. v	1523-76	Rowley	
	621-4	marginal note by Marlowe?	IV. vi	1577-1636	Rowley	
	625-62	Marlowe	IV. vii	1637-1773	Rowley	
	663-4	Rowley	V. i	1774-84	Rowley [1781 (he would)-4 replaced by A 1270-4 in pb.]	
	665-6	Marlowe [<i>plus</i> A 276-8 censored in B]		1785-93	reporter's addition in A taken over by B	
	667-725 (bank:)	Rowley [686 (But)-9 replaced by A 745-7 in pb.]		1794-1801	Marlowe's addition in pb. taken over from A	
	[A 786-8 (Leachery,)	Rowley's expansion in pb.] ¹		1802-11	Marlowe [replaced by A 1290-1301 in pb.]	
	725(hey)-742	Rowley		1812-71	Rowley [1813-29 replaced by A 1302-13 and 1843 revised as A 1329 in pb.] (1830-42 added)	
	II. iii	743-76	Rowley		1872-93	Marlowe
	Ch. 2	777-801	Marlowe		[A 1377-86	Rowley: omitted in B]
III. i	802-25	Marlowe	V. ii	1894-1903	Marlowe (cancelled in pb.?)	
	826-31	Rowley		1904-21	Rowley (cancelled in pb.?)	
	832-47	Marlowe		1922-82	Marlowe	
	848-1011	Rowley		1983-2034	Rowley (cancelled in pb.?)	
III. ii	1012-1126	Rowley [1101-6 replaced by A 898 (once)-906 in pb.]		2035-92	Marlowe	
[Ch. 2	A 930-47	Marlowe: omitted in B: should follow III. iii]		2093-112	Marlowe (cancelled in pb.?)	
III. iii	1127-80	Rowley [1159 replaced by A 1023-5 in pb.]	V. iii		Marlowe (cancelled in pb.?)	
IV. i	1181-1232	Rowley	Epil.	2113-21	Marlowe (addition in pb. taken over from A)	
IV. ii	1233-1370	Rowley				
IV. iii	1371-1488	Rowley (1416-17 and 1422-8 added?)				

Omitting the duplicated chorus (557-68), this allows Marlowe 805 lines out of a total of 2109 in the B-text. A (930-47) preserves Marlowe's second internal chorus, which B omits, and scattered through the play about 16 Marlowan lines censored or otherwise lost in B, as well as 4 additional lines due to revision in the prompt-book. Of whatever Marlowe wrote for the play some 825 lines therefore survive.

¹ There may have been more revision in the prompt-book than is here recognized, e.g. about 718-21.

APPENDIX

The Variants of B2

THE quarto of 1619 was of course printed from that of 1616, either directly or through an intervening edition. The readings in which it departs from its copy are, however, numerous and sometimes important; noticeable are a number that restore the reading of A from which Bi had departed. In all 112 verbal variants of B2 are recorded in the apparatus to the present edition. Of these, 38 occur in those parts of the text (rather over half) where A and B are parallel: 20 in those parts (rather under a quarter) where Bi was actually printed from A3. Of the 38, 14 restore (at least partially) the reading of A, and the other 24 alter a reading of Bi that agrees with that of A. The corresponding figures in passages of Bi printed from A3 are 6 and 14 respectively. In those parts of the text that appear in B alone or in which A is only correspondent, there are 74 variants, of which 20 have been starred in the apparatus as being in one way or another of interest or importance.¹

¹ The resemblance between B2 and A is not confined to verbal readings; it is also marked in punctuation and to a less extent in spelling. I have counted 52 instances of agreement in punctuation between B2 and A where Bi differs, against 23 of divergence in B2 where Bi agrees with A. On the face of it this looks impressive: I believe it to be in fact misleading, and I have consequently included only a few important corrections in the apparatus. I suspect that the figures may be to some extent weighted by my having been more alert in noting agreements than differences, though I trust that this is not a serious source of error. The differences between B2 and Bi are in fact very numerous, and the instances of reversion to A are not really surprising. Partly they seem due to the habits of different compositors. Bi tends to introduce commas within the line, often unnecessarily, sometimes against the sense (see, for instance, 20, 525, 601, 887, 906, 916). These B2 frequently removes, while itself tending to add commas mechanically at the end of lines, whether or no they are logically justified. The result is that the punctuation of B2 often returns to that of A, which is altogether more erratic and generally sparser than that of Bi. Further, B1 often has false or inferior punctuation where that of A is right or preferable, and correction or improvement in B2 naturally leads to reversion to A. B2's partial correction of the stops in 331 is a case in point: more surprising are the corrections in the Latin quotations at 44, 66, 68, 430, and 635—the reviser, it would seem, must have had some knowledge of the language. The instances in which B2 rejects the better punctuation of Bi for the worse of A (as in the removal of the comma after T in 1976, and the substitution of a comma for the semicolon after 'strikes' in 2084) are few and easily within the bounds of coincidence. On the whole, therefore, there is nothing surprising in the number of reversions to A. What is at first sight surprising is the relative scarcity of the cases in which B2 alters punctuation common to A and Bi. But here we must remember that the total number of cases in which the punctuation of B2 differs from that of Bi is very great; the scarcity of the particular differences in question is the measure of the wide difference between the punctuation of Bi and A: there are many more cases in which A, Bi, and B2 all differ. How large a part chance plays in the matter may be seen at 1885, the first line of G4^v. Here there is a comma after the first word, 'Yea*', in Bi but not in A: it is also absent from the line in B2, but it duly appears in the catchword at the foot of G4, showing that the apparent reversion to A is accidental. Perhaps the most striking case of reversion is in line 8, where A has 'this (Gentlemen)*, Bi 'this, Gentes:*, and B2 'this (Gentles)';

The Variants of B2

This tendency of B2 to return to the readings of A, sporadic though it is and due in part to the correction of fairly obvious errors, is manifestly no accident, since it involves at one point the insertion of a whole line (2048+), and it is sufficiently remarkable to make us wonder whether the readings in question are truly variants of B2, or whether they may not rather be readings taken over from a copy of B_i the sheets of which were in a different state of correction from that represented by those of the only surviving copy. That copies of the 1616 quarto should occasionally differ in their readings would not be in the least surprising—such variation is common in books of the time—and if any variants of B2 are indeed of this origin, they will possess for an editor an interest and possible authority that would not otherwise be theirs. Clearly the matter needs looking into.

The rationale of such variation is clear. Suppose A3 to be serving as copy for B_i. The compositor accidentally substitutes a word of his own for what is in his copy; during the course of printing the press reader notices this and restores the reading of the copy. In this case the original reading of B_i will differ from A and the correction will agree with it. If the extant copy of B_i has the original reading and the copy from which B2 was printed had the corrected reading, B2's variant will appear as a return to A. If, on the other hand, the extant copy has the corrected and that used for B2 had the original reading, B2's variant will appear as a departure both from A and from B_i. Contrariwise, the compositor may wrongly retain a reading of A3 through failure to notice that it had been marked for alteration, and the press reader may insist on the alteration being made. In this case the original reading of B_i will agree with A and the correction will differ from it. If then the extant copy of B_i has the original reading and the copy from which B2 was printed had the corrected reading, B2's variant will appear as a departure both from A and B_i; whereas if the extant copy has the corrected

but the agreement here is discounted by the fact that B2 introduces similar parentheses elsewhere, viz. 1820 '(Faustus)' and 2015 '(poore soule)'—see also the abortive attempt to improve the punctuation at 1940.

Agreements in spelling are less frequent, but one recurrent instance attracts attention, that of 'diueir in A and B2 where B_i has 'deuut. But this is an idiosyncrasy of compositors, which persists where A is absent. In a rough count I found the *i-e* spelling 32 times in A_i and the *e-i* spelling only once (A 722). (In A3 the former alone occurs.) B_i is less consistent: there are 26 cases of *e-i* against 9 of *i-e*. (Of the latter there is a consistent batch of five between 1274 and 1471 and another of three between 1817 and 2010, indicating perhaps the intrusion of a second compositor.) B2 has the *i-e* spelling consistently. Obviously no influence of A on B2 can be inferred. Some of the other spelling agreements between B2 and A are due to B_i having presumably taken over an antiquated spelling from MS or perhaps introduced an erroneous one of its own: thus we have, 119 'leauy' B_i, 'leuy' A_i, B2, 'leuie* A2,3; 361 'tare' B_i, 'teare' A1-3, B2; 610 'ioently' B_i, 'Jointly* A1, 'ioyntly' A2, 3, B2; 808 'Coasting' B_i, 'coasting' A1-3, B2 (cf. 797 'costs' B_i, 'coasts' B2). That B2 would be unlikely to tolerate archaic forms is clear from its altering B_i's 'Guesse' or 'guesse' to 'guests' in 1581 and 1768, where A is absent. It is all the more curious to find a few agreements between B2 and A in obsolete or erroneous spellings. Thus in 852 A1-3 and B2 alike have 'scituation' and 'splendant', whereas B_i has the more normal 'situation' and 'splendent'; and at 2062 A1-3 and B2 have 'smoaky', where B_i has 'smoky*. But there is no reason to suppose that this is anything but coincidence.

Appendix

and that used by B2 had the original reading, B2's variant will appear as a return to A. From this it evidently follows that a reversion on the part of B2 to a reading of A may represent either a correction or an error; and the same is of course equally true of a variant that departs from both A and B1.

Now it is well recognized that the unit of variation is the forme, and any investigation of the variants of B2 will therefore involve an analysis of them according to the formes of B1.¹ So far, therefore, as the B2 variants represent variants between different states of B1, those occurring in any one forme must be either all original readings or all corrections. I have attempted this analysis, and have found it impossible to come to any conclusion, owing in the first place to the difficulty of distinguishing between original readings and corrections in the hypothetical states of B1, and in the second place to that of distinguishing (except in the case of reversions to A) between variants possibly derived from states of B1 and those introduced in the printing of B2 itself.²

The hypothesis of variation between copies of B1 becomes less attractive when we consider the distribution of the variants in B2. Only 6 out of the 14 cases in which B2 restores a reading of A occur in passages in which B1 was printed from A3, and in which therefore, as we have seen, such a restoration could be accounted for by a normal process of press-correction in B1. The other 8 cases are found in passages where B1 was printed from MS. In these cases, since presumably neither the compositor nor the press reader can have known anything of A, it is difficult if not impossible to associate the restoration in any way with correction in the course of printing.

¹ In fact, except for a trifling discrepancy at one point (H2^v-H3—of which more anon, p. 143) B2 is a page-for-page reprint of B1, and the formes therefore, with this exception, correspond.

² If variation between states of B1 has anything to do with variation between the extant copy of B1 and B2, then we shall naturally refer to this source those fourteen instances in which B2 restores a reading of A: on the other hand, variants of B2 that depart from readings common to A and the extant copy of B1 we shall be bound to consider equally likely to have originated in B2 as to have been inherited from a variant state of B1, and therefore to reject as evidence. Now the fourteen restorations happen to include six pairs belonging to the same forme (only 154 in A(i) and 1125 in E(i) stand apart). The analysis of these twelve variants is shown in the following table, in which '(o)' and '(i)' stand of course for the outer and inner formes of sheets respectively; 'cor/' indicates a reading that on internal grounds one would take to represent a press-correction in B1 (a question-mark expressing some uncertainty); 'dbt' one that in this respect seems doubtful; and 'error' one that if it stood in B1 must have been an original reading later corrected.

A(o) {	B(o) {	B(i) {
66 cor.	238 cor.	408 cor.
89 dbt.	369 cor. ?	419 cor.
C(i) {	G(o) {	H(o) {
574 dbt.	1784 cor. ?	1937 cor.
576 cor.	1892 cor.	2048 + error

Thus in only one pair (B(ii)) can we say with any approach to confidence that both variants are corrections: in four pairs, though one appears to be certainly a correction, there is at least some doubt about the other: in H(o), while one is presumably a correction, we know (for reasons to be given later, p. 143) that the restoration of 2048+ cannot possibly have been a press-correction in B1. All that we can say, therefore, is that while one pair is certainly and four are probably or possibly consistent with the hypothesis we are examining, one pair is inconsistent with it, and would have to be somehow explained away.

The Variants of B2

It seems therefore on the whole unlikely that variation in *Bi* should be a cause of any of the variants of *B2*.

We may approach the matter from another angle. There are two variants of *B2* that involve a whole line: it omits 909 and it inserts a line after 2048. Though 909 is not absolutely necessary to the sense, it completes a couplet and is obviously original, and there could be no possible reason for its omission. If, therefore, it was absent in some copies of *Bi*, it must have been originally omitted by accident and inserted in the course of printing. In that case the page in the state in which the line appears (as in the extant copy) should be a line too long. But there is no evidence of this. The page in question, *D2*^v, contains 38 lines like every other page of the sheet except one.¹ In *B2*, on the contrary, the page from which the line is missing has only 37 lines, and moreover the previous line (which, if the line is omitted, ends a sentence) closes with a comma as in *Bi*. This is conclusive proof of accidental omission in *B2*.

The opposite is the case with 2048+. This was one of the lines censored by the editor of *Bi*. Its suppression cannot have been an afterthought made in the course of printing, since the following line, which depends on it, was altered. If, therefore, it appeared in any copies of *Bi*, it can only have been because the compositor wrongly included it (owing to insufficiently clear deletion in the copy) and it must have been removed in the course of printing. In that case the page without it (as in the extant copy) should be a line short. But again there is no evidence of this. The page in question, *H2*^v, has 37 lines like every other normal page of the sheet.² In *B2* the page has again 37 lines, a one-line direction being carried over to *H3* (where space is made by the suppression of a blank). Again, therefore, the addition must have been made in *B2*, and any idea of variation in *Bi* can be definitely rejected.

Our conclusion, therefore, must be that while in the nature of the case it is impossible to prove that none of the variants of *B2* are due to variation between copies of *Bi*, there is no evidence whatever that such variation existed.

What then is the source of the variants in *B2*, and in particular of those readings that appear to show a knowledge of *A*? Before speculating further it will be well to attempt a rough classification of the 112 verbal variants of *B2* recorded in the apparatus. A good many can be assumed to be corrections, or would-be corrections, of readings in *Bi* that are either evident errors or that the reviser might take for such; corrections that it would be within the competence of any careful reader to make. A lesser number may be dismissed as mere misprints or errors in *B2*. More can be set down

¹ That is excluding the headlines, signatures, and catchwords, but allowing for blank lines in the text. *D3*^v was deliberately left a line short so as to begin a three-line stage direction at the top of *D4*.

² The text ends on *H3*^v with a short page of 25 lines: *H4* and *H4*^v were presumably blank—the leaf has not survived.

Appendix

as accidental variations such as are to be found in all but the most careful reprints; these, like the misprints, are probably the responsibility of the compositor. We are left with a small group of variants that appear to be of some evidential importance. Naturally we shall expect to find the reversions to A in the first and last of these classes rather than in the second and third, and in fact the only exception appears to be one accidental variant. The fourth class will require detailed discussion; meanwhile a few remarks on the first three may help to clear the ground.

Corrections.—Some thirty variants can be explained as more or less obvious corrections or intended corrections. These include exactly half of the fourteen reversions to A, and of these only one calls for specific mention. At 238 Bi's 'euening Starres' is a glaring error, and it is a little surprising that a reviser who had the intelligence to make the correction 'erring' here should not have made it also at 613.¹ Apart from reversions much the most important correction is one at 856. It would appear that the author, copying too slavishly from an earlier passage, wrote,

And take some part of holy *Peters* feast,
The which this day with high solemnity,
This day is held through *Rome* and *Italy*,

which B2 emended quite satisfactorily by reading,

The which in state and high solemnity . . .

In doing so, however, the reviser was not restoring a reading deformed by later corruption, but rather substituting what we may suppose the author should have written for what he did in fact write.² Closely but fortuitously connected with this is another correction. At 568 Bi printed

That to this day is highly solemnized

exactly as it stands in A 820. When the reviser substituted 'on' for 'to' he showed that he was aware of the true sense of the passage as proved by B 801,

The which this day is highly solemnized

—the line that the writer mechanically copied at 856. That some of the intended corrections are in fact erroneous or misconceived is no surprise. One again implies reference to another part of the B-text. At 1157 occurs that name of mystery ⁱ*demogorgon* correctly spelt in the Clown's mock-invocation. When B2 misspells it [^]*Demigorgor*? it shows that the reviser must have turned back to or remembered Faustus' conjuration, in which

¹ How haphazard are B2's corrections appears from another reversion at 419. Here Bi omits the prefix to a speech by Mephostophilis, though it is present in A: B2 duly inserts '*Meph** Yet it failed to make similar corrections at 1855 and 1857, though here too A has the necessary prefixes, and at 1028 it omitted one on its own.

² I think we may dismiss any possibility of the error in Bi being due to the compositor. It must, one would suppose, have been corrected in the prompt-book, and quite possibly in the same manner as in B2. At the same time it may be pointed out that either 'in state with high solemnity' or 'with state and high solemnity' would be slightly nearer to what the author actually wrote.

The Variants of B2

at 244—5 B i, printing from A, had given it in that erroneous form. Doubtless he thought that a demi-gorgon at least meant something. He showed less intelligence at 1597 and 1616 when he substituted the orthodox '*Faustus*' for the intentional perversion '*Fauster*'* (of which at 1143—4 A had made game as 'Fustian'). A rather doubtful case occurs at 20, where Bi follows A in reading,

Till swolne with cunning, of a selfe conceit,

(only introducing one of its senseless medial commas). Though there is nothing necessarily suspicious about this, it does not afford an altogether perspicuous meaning, and obviously Bi may have taken over an error from its copy, A. In that case B2,

Till swolne with cunning and a selfe conceit,

may preserve the true reading, and one would be the more inclined to suppose so were it not for the other instances of fussy interference just quoted. There is perhaps another instance at 2101 where we find the 'deuils' of Bi altered to 'Diuell', perhaps on the assumption that the master 'whom *Faustus* seru'd' must refer to Lucifer himself. Since, however, it was left to B3 to make the consequential change of 'haue' to 'hath', B2's 'Diuell' may be a mere misprint. Lastly B2 omitted the '*Exeunf*' at the end of *Faustus*' final speech (2092). This may possibly imply a realization of the fact that, though theatrically an exit or curtain is unavoidable, dramatically there is no reason why the devils should not tear *Faustus* to pieces on the stage and leave his limbs lying about *in situ* for the Scholars to find. This would indeed be a natural and effective end; but since the devils at any rate have to leave the stage, the omission of '*Exeunt*' is more probably another simple mistake.

Errors.—A dozen or more misprints in B2 call for little notice. The most interesting is that in 461, 'attaine' for 'obtain', probably one of those quasi-oral substitutions to which compositors are liable. It was corrected again in B3, rather unexpectedly, for 'attaine' was used in practically the same sense in older English.

Accidental Variants.—Over fifty variants, or something approaching half the total, may be set down as more or less accidental. One is the restoration of a reading of A3. At the beginning of ll. ii Bi is printed from MS; therefore in 574,

But think'st thou heauen is such a glorious thing?

the presence of 'is' both in Bi and Ai proves it to be original, though it is not necessary either to the sense or the metre: it was accidentally omitted in A2, and is therefore absent from A3; its absence from B2 must be set down to coincidence. Twice we find a word inserted: first 'most' in the line (403),

Goe forward *Faustus* in that most famous Art

where, though unwanted, it happens to do little harm to the verse; next 'meere' at 519,

I thinke hell's a meere fable

Appendix

where it seems due to anticipation of 527,
these are trifles, and meere old wiuies Tales.

One is an alternative device for indicating the author's intention; but whereas in the line (58),

Exhereditare filium non potest pater; nisi—

the dash in Bi clearly indicates that the reader breaks off, the '*nisi* ffr.' of B2, which is imitated from 56, might imply a spoken '*etcetera*'. The most interesting perhaps is in 1210,

And at his heeles a thousand furies waite,

where B2's 'ten thousand' is rather suggestive of an actor's exaggeration.

Significant Variants.—We are left with a dozen important variants to discuss. Of these all but two are in passages where A is parallel and half are in passages in which A3 served as copy for Bi. This is curious but not necessarily significant. Six represent reversions to A, 'four alter readings common to A and Bi. Perhaps it will be best to take the reversions first, and begin with the insertion after 2048 of the line,

See where Christs blood streames in the Firmament,

which is only slightly altered from A 1463,

See see where Christs blood streames in the firmament,

and suffices to prove that the reviser had some knowledge of the play apart from Bi.

More detailed knowledge is shown by other reversions. At 1892 B2 alters 'azure' to 'azur'd' (A1 'azurde', A2 'azurd', A3 'azur'd'), and it is as unlikely that it would have introduced the less usual form on its own as it is that the reporter of A would have done so.

At 408 we have mention in Bi of 'illusions, fruits of lunacy',

That make them foolish that do vse them most.

In A and again in B2 they make 'men' foolish, which avoids the awkward repetition of 'them' with different reference, and is therefore possibly correct

Similarly at 1784 Wagner ends his speech with the line,

see where they come, belike the feast is done.

But A and B2 have 'belike the feast is ended', and this is rhythmically so much preferable¹ that again one would like to think it original.

Two other reversions may perhaps be due to chance. At 369 the Clown, learning what he has let himself in for by accepting earnest-money from Wagner, says in Bi,

Here, take your Guilders I'le none of'em.

B2 adds 'again' after 'Guilders'. A is not closely parallel, but at this point it reads,

No, no, here take your gridirons againe.

It is quite possible that the word was accidentally omitted in Bi and that A

¹ Preferable too as avoiding the quasi-rime 'come': 'done*.

The Variants of B2

preserves a genuine stage survival: at the same time the addition would be a very natural one, and B2 may have made it without prompting.

The other case is more important. At 89 we read in B1,

Here tire my braines to get a Deity.

Whatever the truth about the first half of this perplexing line, B2 reproduces it exactly; but in the second half, for 'get' it substitutes 'gaine', which is also the reading of A. But it is not certain that this may not be an accidental reversion. B1 is here printing from A3 but is correcting it from MS, and the presumption is that 'get' is such a correction. It will bear, as Boas points out, a not unlikely interpretation, but this is rather recondite and may easily have been overlooked by the reviser of B2; and if 'get' is taken in its most obvious sense of 'obtain', it would be quite natural for the more explicit and dignified 'gaine' to be substituted. This may have happened independently in A and B2.

The other half-dozen variants in B2 either alter passages in which B1 agrees with A (four instances) or occur in passages in which A and B are not parallel (two instances). And first let us consider a case in which, though there is no direct parallelism, B2's reading may yet conceivably depend on A. At 1618—19 the Horse-corser, describing his adventure to his copemates in the tavern, says according to B1,

I thinking the horse had had some quality that he would not haue me know of,
whereas according to B2 he speaks of 'some rare quality'. Now, although the tavern scene does not appear in A, the present passage is anticipated in A's account of the original adventure (iv. v), and in this we also find mention of 'some rare qualitie' (A 1181). It is evident, therefore, that either B2 had a knowledge of the A-text, or else that 'rare' was accidentally omitted in B1 and that A and B2 had independent knowledge of the authentic text.

Another possible correction in B2 is found at 116. Faustus, in B1, will have his servile spirits 'wall all Germany with Brasse',

And make swift *Rhine*, circle faire *Wittenberge*:

which is also in effect the reading of A, from which B1 is here printed. But in B2 the line stands,

And with swift *Rhine* circle faire *Wittenberge*:

the sense is the same, but stylistically B2 seems slightly preferable, and in any case it is difficult to see why it should have made the alteration unless there was some authority for it.

Perhaps the most intriguing of all B2's alterations is that at 49. Faustus boasts of his remedies

Wherby whole Cities haue escap't the plague,
And thousand desperate maladies beene cur'd

according to B1, whereas B2 claims only 'diuers' cures. A here agrees with B1 (which was printed from it) but later reads 'easde' in place of 'cur'd'. These variants need to be discussed together, and this has been done in the notes. The upshot is that 'thousand' is probably an actor's

Appendix

exaggeration taken over by B_i from A, in which case B₂ may preserve the original reading.

If this is so, there is probably a similar case at 152. Speaking again of the serviceable spirits, Valdes says in B_i,

From *Venice* shall they drag huge *Argosies*,

(with which A, its copy, agrees) whereas B₂ makes it 'whole *Argosies*', It will at once be apparent how much greater is the effect of B₂'s emphasis on "*Argosies*" than the clumsy attempt to add to it by an exaggerative epithet.

The two remaining variants of B₂, on the other hand, are certainly, I think, to be rejected. At 126 B_i makes Faustus welcome his friends with the words,

Come *Germane Valdes* and *Cornelius*,
And make me blest with your sage conference.

Instead of 'blest' (which is also the reading of A, the copy) B₂ has 'wise'. This, though not formally tautological, is still objectionable as merely duplicating the idea of 'sage', and is unlikely to be what Marlowe wrote. One can hardly help suspecting that the alteration is due to fussy interference by the reviser, who thought 'blest' an inappropriate word to use in connexion with the first step that Faustus takes towards damnation. I do not know whether this idea was present to Marlowe's mind: if it was he may have used the word ironically.

The same mentality may perhaps be traced in an alteration at 1196. Faustus, we are told in B_i (A is here absent), is to

bring in presence of his Maiesty,
The royall shapes and warlike semblances
Of *Alexander* and his beauteous Paramour.

For 'warlike' B₂ substitutes 'perfect'. Though 'warlike' is of course a purely conventional epithet, it seems here to be original: 'royall' and 'warlike' emphasize the balance of 'shapes' and 'semblances'; 'royall' and 'perfect' do not. But the interference is clearly intentional. Possibly the reviser argued that 'warlike' fitted ill with 'Paramour'. In a sense this is true; but by 'warlike' the author merely meant 'heroical', and the loves of heroes are traditionally heroic.

To sum up: of the dozen most important changes made in B₂, two are to be rejected as impertinent, one (89 'gaine') may be an accidental reversion and in that case is probably wrong, and the remaining nine may be accepted with varying degrees of confidence as at least possibly correct. They include the restoration of one whole line and unquestionably imply some knowledge of the play not gained from B₁.

What then, we ask again, is the source of this independent knowledge on the part of the reviser? Any idea that he had access to a manuscript may be dismissed as improbable. It follows that his knowledge must have been derived either from A or from current performance. But it is quite certain

The Variants of B2

that he did not make his alterations with a copy of A before him. Had he done so it is inconceivable that he would have restored the line already mentioned (2048+, and that in a slightly different form) without also restoring the line that followed it to its obviously original reading; and it is highly probable that he would have undone some of the other mischief due to censoring. If, therefore, his knowledge was derived from A, it was based on memory, just as it must have been if it was derived from performance. It may be observed that if it was derived from A, the whole question becomes unimportant. We possess A and can judge of its readings for ourselves; nothing that the reviser happened to remember of it or approve in it can add to our knowledge or affect our judgement. If, on the other hand, he derived his knowledge from current performance, his recollections, whether always accurate or not, are of considerable importance, since they may include corrections of the printed tradition; and of particular interest will be his restoration of readings of A where these differ from B i.

At first sight it may appear significant that out of the twelve variants, apart from correction of obvious errors, that appear of major importance, no less than ten occur in parts of the text where A is parallel; but this is discounted by the fact that of these ten only six restore the reading of A and four depart from it. Evidence that A was in fact the source of variants in B2 would be the appearance in B2 of readings of A known to be erroneous. One agreement between B2 and A (89 'gaine') may very likely be an error, but as we have seen, it may also very likely be accidental, and if so is without evidential value. More significant are the variants of B2 where A and B i are in agreement. Should any of these be correct it would of course argue on the part of B2 a knowledge of the text apart from both A and B i. Now, we have seen that two of these variants (49 'diuers' and 152 'whole') have the appearance of original readings substituted for actors' exaggerations preserved in A and taken over thence by B i; and if they are really such, they prove that B2 was indeed possessed of knowledge altogether independent of the printed editions.

If, as I think we safely may, we exclude the possibility of access to a manuscript, the only possible source of such knowledge would appear to be a contemporary performance of the play. If the reviser of B2 knew the play on the stage certain important consequences follow. One is that those readings of A that he restored should represent genuine original readings. Now, out of six or possibly seven major variants that come under this head (for we ought perhaps to add 1619 'rare') we should be prepared to accept all but one (89 'gaine'). The exception is doubtful, for if the reading is not original, the agreement is probably accidental. The five variants that get no support from A need not be correct. Two in fact appear to be impertinent conjectures of the reviser's (126 'wise', 1196 'perfect': cf. 1157 'Demigorgon' (p. 144) and 1597 and 1616 *Faustus* '(p. 145)); but the remaining three show internal signs of being genuine (49 'diuers', 116 'with', 152 'whole'). A slight confirmation of B2's dependence on the stage may be found in its apparent reproduction of an actor's exaggeration at 1210, 'ten

Appendix

thousand' (p. 146).¹ The hypothesis would of course help to explain, and would lend possible authority to, those corrections in B2 that we were before content to set down to unaided conjecture, especially the important emendation in 856 (p. 144).

But if a performance was the source of the undoubted independent knowledge shown by B2, we may still wonder why ten out of twelve major variants are found in parts of the text where A and B are parallel. The answer is no doubt partly that these parts include, of course, those passages *in which* A3 actually served as copy for B i, and in which therefore the text of the latter is the most likely to contain errors. But perhaps of equal importance is the fact that our selection of major variants is perforce arbitrary, and that several have been included because they are reversion to A that might otherwise pass as due merely to normal variation.

Another objection that might be raised is that the text as we have it in B1 includes a number of passages that either certainly or very likely underwent revision in preparing the prompt-book, and that we should therefore expect these passages to supply a large proportion of the variants in any text influenced by stage performance (as in fact we find they do in A). In this case the answer is fairly obvious, namely that the reviser's recollection was at best superficial, and that where the stage text differed materially from B i, though he might be aware of the fact, it was beyond his power of memory to reproduce the revised version, even if he felt at liberty to make such extensive alterations in his copy. In fact he did make two changes, one reverting to A in a passage in which A is suspected to contain a revised text (1784 'ended'), and one in a passage (not in A) in which the prompt-book must certainly have been revised (856, p. 144), and both bear out what has just been said in that the revision appears to have involved only minor alteration in the lines in question.

The conclusion, I think, must stand that the most likely source of the reviser's independent knowledge was a recollection of a current performance of the play.² His alterations may therefore be assumed to possess some authority. It is a restricted authority, for some of them are probably unwarranted, in some his memory may have been at fault, in some the stage version may itself have been corrupt: at the same time it cannot be neglected. The editorial implications would, therefore, appear to be as follows. Before a variant of B2 is entitled to consideration it must show itself inherently plausible. If it does this, especially if it shows itself in some way more suitable than the reading of B i, or if it restores a reading of A, then it is entitled to the respect due, not merely to a persuasive contemporary emendation, but to one that may actually derive from an authoritative source. The decision in each instance is, of course, the responsibility of the editor.

¹ This is not inconsistent with B2's apparent correction of similar errors at 49 and 152. When a play is produced by different companies actors will naturally corrupt the text at different points.

² I have elsewhere suggested (note on 2061) that recollection of a performance may account for a correction made in his copy (A3) by the editor of B i.

NOTE ON THE PRESENT EDITION

THIS is a parallel-text edition, exhibiting side by side the A and B versions as contained in the quartos of 1604 and 1616 respectively. Where the two texts are closely comparable they have been printed so as to bring out as clearly as possible the resemblances and differences between them: this has meant departing in prose, and to a lesser extent in verse, from the line-division and other formal features of the originals. In other respects I have sought to preserve the typographical arrangement of the quartos. But it has been a compromise throughout, and I can only hope that I have succeeded in facilitating the detailed comparison of the texts without suggesting in either an arrangement at variance with the original.

There are a few passages in which the texts are fully parallel but which occupy different positions in the two versions. In such cases each text has been printed in its own consecutive order, and the corresponding parallel passage from the other text has been duplicated opposite; but this has been printed in small type and indented, so as clearly to differentiate it from its surroundings. By this device it is possible to bring a passage in either text into comparison with its counterpart in the other and at the same time to preserve the individual order of each text.

In the case of a passage in one version having nothing corresponding in the other, the opposite page is of course blank. But there are several scenes that occupy corresponding positions in the two texts and present similar episodes, without however exhibiting more than occasional verbal resemblances. Such passages are here printed opposite one another, but with a thick rule down each inner margin as a warning that the parallelism is of a general nature only. In them no attempt has usually been made to bring what detailed resemblances there may be into typographical relation to one another, but attention is called to similarities of expression by means of references in the margin.¹ I call such passages 'correspondent' as distinguished from those more strictly 'parallel'. The distinction between full parallelism and general correspondence is however, of course, a matter of degree, and although as a rule the difference is clearly marked, it occasionally happens that fragments of closely parallel text are found embedded in scenes that correspond only in a general way, or fragments of widely divergent text appear in the midst of parallel scenes. Such fragments are distinguished from their surroundings in the usual manner.

Where correspondent as distinct from parallel scenes occur in different positions in the play, they are not duplicated *in extenso*, but those phrases that exhibit verbal resemblance, or form points of contact in thought or action, are repeated within brackets and in small type.

The original quartos are printed in black letter with incidental use of

¹ I have also availed myself of the margin to draw attention to certain repetitions within each text.

Note on the Present Edition

both roman and italic type, though the latter is comparatively rare in the quarto of 1616. In the present edition black letter has been replaced by roman: this has meant using italic both for the italic and for the roman of the originals. A distinction has been made by using ordinary *italic* to represent the original roman (which is the normal incidental type) and *spaced italic* to represent the original italic (used mainly for stage directions in 1604 and only exceptionally in 1616). This differentiation has not been made in passages duplicated in small type or in the collations.¹

Generally speaking, apart from the type and typographical arrangement, the texts have been reproduced exactly, including errors. The only corrections silently made have been of single wrong-fount letters and of turned letters or other sorts.² Long V, however, has not been retained,³ nor have the tied letters, so frequent in black letter (in which the accent on the 'ee' ligature has been omitted), except in the case of the digraphs 'æ' and 'oe'. There are a few instances of non-initial V: these have been retained, but are not noted as errors.⁴ Word-division has been preserved even when erroneous, but a space has always been allowed after a mark of punctuation (and where customary before) whether there was one in the original or not. The different founts used for punctuation, which are erratic in the originals, have been normalized. Leads have always been placed above and below entrance directions where these are centred (except above when an exit on a separate line immediately precedes): their appearance in the originals is very arbitrary. Anomalous leads elsewhere have been disregarded. The position of directions varies a good deal: those that occupy a line (or more) by themselves have been either centred or placed on the right according as they approximated to one or other position; those that follow in the same line at the end of a speech have been placed as nearly as possible in the same position as in the original.

Since it has often been impossible to follow the originals line for line, upright bars have been introduced to indicate the line-division of the quartos in the case of prose and also of run-over verses (unless the over-run was tucked in at the end of another line). The division is of little importance,⁵ but it makes possible a continuous numbering of the type-lines in each quarto (excluding head-titles, running-titles, signatures, and catchwords) and so provides a system of reference independent of any particular modern edition.

¹ There is in the originals only one (roman) fount of arabic numerals, which is used differently with black letter, roman, and italic. I have followed them in this respect. The plain and swash forms of italic capitals have not been distinguished.

² See, however, A 1499. I ought strictly to say 'apparent turned letters', for what has been assumed to be a turned 'u' may really be an 'n' and vice versa: the difference is generally not observable in black letter, often not in italic, sometimes not even in roman. Apart from the instance at A 1499, the following are all that I have noticed: A 165 'stiffes', 411 'aud', 799 *aud', 812 'firmament', 840 'Fanstus', 847 'holiuesse', 1259 'man', 1285 'deuie'; B 668 'Aud', 714 'come', 907 'men', 1212 'this;', '1474 'yonr', 1707 ⁱFanst.. 2020 'sonles*.

³ But see A 145 and B 866.

* In A we have 325 'deprived, 329 'deprid', 363 'pickadevaunts*, 651 'invenomd', 1054 'therevnto'j in B the name 'Bemtotio* from 1323 to 1426, and 500 'inviolat*.

* It has been ignored in lemmas and in passages duplicated in small type.

Note on the Present Edition

The numbering (by fives) is indicated for each text in the margin, and the numbers are placed opposite the *beginning* of the relevant lines.¹ It should be mentioned that every speech is to be assumed to begin a fresh typographical line unless the opposite is clearly indicated.² Run-over lines of verse that form two typographical lines are of course counted as two: on the other hand the end of a line that is run over and tucked in at the end of another line is here printed either as part of the metrical line to which it belongs (if there is room for it) or else as in the original; it is of course not separately counted, and the division is therefore not indicated by a bar. If for any reason a metrical line, or a short prose speech, that is a single type-line in the original, is over-run in the present edition, it is still of course only counted as one line.³

The pagination of the original quartos is also indicated in the margin by placing the relevant signature opposite the beginning of the *first* line of each page. It will be understood that a plain signature, without superior affix, indicates a recto page.

Also in the margin are indicated the dramatic divisions of the play. In the A-text I have marked only a division into fourteen scenes. This agrees with Breymann's (originally introduced by Ward in 1878), which is undoubtedly correct. It should be observed, however, that according to the arrangement and directions of the quarto, there is no break whatever between Scenes v and vi, and Scenes x, xi, and xii also appear to be continuous.⁴ For the B-text I have adopted Boas's division into acts and scenes: I doubt whether there is much advantage in introducing an act-division, but it makes a handy distinction between references to the two versions, and I have found it convenient in discussing the construction of the play.⁵

There are two ranges of footnotes below each text. The upper range records doubtful readings and obvious misprints in the copy-text. On the whole the press-work of the quartos is not too bad, but there are inevitably a number of readings that are not quite clear in the originals. Moreover,

¹ It occasionally happens that two lines of the original begin within one line of the present edition: in these cases I have numbered *the first* of the lines, even if it is not a *fifth\

² The only exceptions are two short speeches in B that are tucked in at the end of lines 299 and 626 respectively.

³ Bars have been freely introduced whenever there appeared to be any possible doubt respecting the arrangement of the original, as when an exit, tucked in at the end of a line in the original, here occupies one by itself.

+ As a warning I have therefore placed the marginal headings of Scenes vi, xi, and xii in parentheses.

s Boas is emphatic that act-division is necessary in order to do justice to the structure of the piece. But his arrangement, though the only fivefold division practicable, is not altogether satisfactory. It is as follows: the Evocation (397 lines), the Compact (383 lines), the Pope (391 lines), the Emperor and the Duke (323 + 235 = 55% lines), the Catastrophe (356 lines). Thus the five-act structure is only achieved by crowding two unrelated episodes into a disproportionately long fourth act. There is, indeed, a fivefold locality division, viz. Wittenberg, Rome, Innsbruck, Vanholt, and Wittenberg again. But this would result in a first act of 780 lines, which would be worse still. In fact the only natural division would be a sixfold one. But I see no reason to suppose that any act-division was originally contemplated.

Note on the Present Edition

while the Bodleian quarto of 1604 is in an excellent state of preservation (except for the shaving of a few headlines) the British Museum quarto of 1616 has unfortunately suffered some minor damage to the text. At a few points the impression seems to be imperfect, at others the surface of the paper is rubbed; there are several small holes that have been mended with transparent paper, and this tends to obscure neighbouring letters; lastly there is a minute horizontal crease across the middle of most of the leaves, though luckily this nowhere interferes seriously with the legibility of the text. At a few points a pen has been at work making alterations: so far as I have observed no obscurity has resulted, but it is possible that here and there the interference has escaped detection.¹ Whenever, even though the impression may be to some extent defective or obscure, there is no reasonable doubt of the exact reading, no notice has been taken. But in many instances it has been recorded that a letter or a stop is 'broken' or 'faint', or 'lost' through mutilation, or 'obscured' by mending, or that the impression is 'defective'.² In these instances it is to be understood that the defect is such as to make the identity of the type to some extent uncertain, and the reading here printed therefore to a like extent conjectural, though the degree of doubt naturally varies from case to case. In no instance, however, do I think there can be any serious doubt of the reading intended. There are also, of course, in either text many errors of one kind and another. But as a rule the more important they are, the more uncertain is their nature, and the more necessary therefore critical discussion. The record in the footnotes is confined to obvious literal errors and the like, and to correspondingly evident errors of punctuation; mere slips of the compositor that it is sufficient to record and then ignore. They were for the most part corrected in one or another later edition, it matters little which: no notice has been taken of the fact in the collations, but in some cases I have added after the correction a note of the edition in which it was made. There is, of course, throughout great laxity of punctuation, and the compositors were evidently quite satisfied with many stops that an editor would now regard as erroneous. The mistakes recorded are confined to such as the printer would himself presumably have recognized as indefensible had they been pointed out to him: they are for the most part cases of speeches ending with an inadequate stop or with none at all, periods where a lighter stop if any is called for, and a few of the more striking instances of the absence of a question-mark or other significant stop.

¹ For example, if a comma has been converted into a semicolon by the careful addition of a dot, the fact is hardly likely to be discovered without the sort of microscopic examination that an editor will of course be prepared to apply to a disputed reading but that he can scarcely be expected to extend to a whole text. Of course, in all detected cases of interference I print the reading as it originally stood. I do not record the alteration.

² The note 'impression defective*' means that it appears so now: it may always have been so, or it may have become so through abrasion of the surface of the paper—it is not always possible to tell. Where a mutilation, such as a tear or a wormhole, has been repaired, it is generally impossible to tell from a photograph whether a reading has been lost or only hidden, but this can be ascertained by holding the original up to the light, and this I have done in all cases of uncertainty.

Note on the Present Edition

The lower ranges of footnotes provide collations. Under the text of 1604 are given variants from the editions of 1609 and 1611. These are necessary in view of the occasional dependence of the quarto of 1616 on some form of the A-text. I first thought that a complete record of all variations of spelling and so forth would be needed to determine which of the earlier quartos the printer of 1616 had used. This would have involved much labour, would have swamped the significant variants, and would have involved considerable risk of error.¹ Happily experiment with a few pages showed that minor variations of spelling and typographic form were of no significance: the text of 1616 was found to agree almost impartially now with one and now with another of the earlier editions. It became apparent that only when the more important variants were isolated could such a relation be established as to prove that the quarto of 1616, when it depended at all upon the A-text, depended in fact upon the edition of 1611. I therefore decided that beyond verbal variants I would only record the more striking or unexpected differences of form or spelling. This reduced the collations for the A-text to manageable dimensions. By way, however, of emphasizing the significance of the variants, I have distinguished by a star (*) the verbal as opposed to the merely formal variants; and, of the variants that agree with the readings of 1616, I have marked with a dagger (j") those that are truly evidential for the relationship of the texts, and with a double cross (£) those that, being no more than modernizations or corrections of obvious errors, are not.

In the lower range of footnotes below the text of 1616 I record variants from the later editions of the B-text. It might be plausibly argued that the readings of these editions can throw no light on the relation between the two versions, and therefore that, in an edition designed merely to investigate that relationship, any record of them must be irrelevant. Be this as it may, the variants possess some interest in themselves, for it has been observed that at least one of the later quartos occasionally reverts to readings of the A-text from which that of 1616 had departed. I decided therefore that it would be desirable to give a selection of what appeared to be the more important variants. As soon, however, as I began to collect them, it became apparent that the edition of 1619 might possess some independent authority (even apart from its reversions to the A-text) and I decided to give a full list of its verbal variants, obvious misprints and corrections excepted.² I have also distinguished by a dagger (f) those variants of 1619 that return (at least partially) to the readings of 1611 where 1616 had departed from them, and with a double cross (£) those that depart from readings common to 1611 and 1616. The more important of the many variants of 1619 in passages for which there is nothing parallel in the A-text I have marked with a star (*). Thus the collations below the text of 1616 comprise all significant

¹ Breymann attempted such a collation for all editions of both texts—a singularly-thankless task—and examination proves how far he was from achieving consistent accuracy.

² Later I added some of its more important corrections of punctuation.

Note on the Present Edition

variants of 1619 (B2), the more striking ones of 1620 (B3), a very few of 1624 (B4) and 1631 (B5), but none of the debased text of 1663. I only mention the earliest edition to contain the reading in question: as a rule it is repeated (sometimes with minor variation) in subsequent editions. When this is not so I either add 'only' to the sigil or give the variants in full.

For the edition of 1604 I originally used Farmer's facsimile, first published in 1914 and reissued in 1920. It is for all practical purposes adequate. Through the courtesy of Bodley's Librarian I have since been able to substitute photostats of the original.¹ For the editions of 1609 and 1611 I fortunately already possessed photostats from the originals in the Huntington Library.² The variants recorded are the result of an independent collation. If, as I hope, my record is found to be more reliable than those of Breymann and Tucker Brooke and Boas, it must be remembered that I have had the advantage of being able to check my results by theirs.

For the edition of 1616 I have used photostats of the British Museum copy in my possession.³ Of the quarto of 1619 I have been fortunate enough to obtain photostats, and these I have collated throughout.⁴ The variants quoted from later editions do not rest on any independent collation, but are taken from published sources.⁵ They form no essential part of the present investigation, and several of the originals were not accessible when my text was being prepared. I therefore relied on Tucker Brooke's apparatus, checked by those of Breymann and Boas.⁶ But I have since verified all

¹ A few doubtful readings were kindly examined for me in the original by Mr. C. J. Hindle: I have since had the opportunity of checking them personally.

² All variants of the quarto of 1609 recorded in my notes have been checked with the copy at Petworth House, which I have been able to examine through the kindness of Lord Leconfield and his secretary Miss Harris. I found only one small difference (A 1491). I learned of the existence of this copy through Dr. Percy Simpson.

³ I am much indebted to the Museum authorities for enabling me to have these made at a time when access to the original was far from convenient. To Dr. Victor Scholderer my thanks are due for examining a number of passages in the original where small defects have obscured the readings. These too I have now re-examined myself.

* In this connexion my special thanks are due to the courtesy of Mr. Robert Garrett of Baltimore, the owner of the quarto, to the generosity of the Rockefeller Foundation, which placed funds at my disposal for the purchase of photographs, and to Dr. Julian P. Boyd, Librarian of Princeton University, who kindly acted as intermediary.

^s The quarto of 1628 (B4*: see pp. 13-14) has never, so far as I know, been collated, and I have disregarded it.

⁶ How necessary such checking is may be seen for example at B 126, where the variants are thus recorded: sage] wise B2 (Breymann); blest] wise B3 (Tucker Brooke); blest] wise B2 (Boas). Here Breymann is wrong; he mistook the lemma. So is Tucker Brooke; he gave the wrong sigil. Dr. Boas alone is correct; which is curious, since of the three he alone had never seen the quarto of 1619, so he informs me. Breymann collated it when it was still in the Locker-Lampson collection at Rowfant. Professor Tucker Brooke, in a letter written only a few weeks before his death, told me that he had collated it after it had crossed the Atlantic in 1905 and was already in the hands of its present owner: he also kindly sent me the bibliographical notes he made at the time. But neither his nor Breymann's collation appears to have been very thorough, for both assign a number of variants to the quarto of 1620 that in fact appear in that of 1619. At B 2098 Breymann, Tucker Brooke, and Boas all erroneously report B2 as reading 'has' for *haue]

Note on the Present Edition

variants quoted with the copies in the British Museum,¹ and have thus been able to resolve the discrepancies, and they are not few, between the collations of previous editors.²

¹ I am indebted to Colonel C. H. Wilkinson for information concerning the readings of the copy of the quarto of 1620 in the library of Worcester College, Oxford.

² In the footnotes and collations, if a word occurs more than once in a line I distinguish the several occurrences by prefixing a superior numeral to the lemma, and I adopt the same expedient to distinguish between repeated occurrences of a letter within a word. Thus at B 963 a collation *seales*] 'e' would refer to the first V in the first '*seales*' in the line.

DRAMATIS PERSONAE

in the order of their appearance, including individual *Mutes

1604

Chorus
 Faustus
 Wagner
 Good Angel
 Evil Angel
 Valdes
 Cornelius
 First Scholar
 Second Scholar
 Mephostophilis
 a Clown (Robin)
 Lucifer
 •Beelzebub
 Pride
 Covetousness
 Wrath
 E n v y S i
 Gluttony
 Sloth
 Lechery
 The Pope
 The Cardinal of Lorraine
 a Friar
 Ralph, a clown
 a Vintner
 The Emperor
 a Knight
 •Alexander and
 •his Paramour
 a Horse-corser
 The Duke of Vanholt and
 his Duchess
 Third Scholar
 •Helen (of Greece)
 an Old Man
 Also Devils, Friars, and Attendants

1616 *contd.*

Third Scholar
 •Helen (of Greece)
 an Old Man
 Also Devils, Bishops, Monks and Friars,
 Attendants, Soldiers, and two Cupids

1616

Chorus
 Faustus
 Wagner
 Good Angel
 Bad Angel (Spirit)
 Valdes
 Cornelius
 First Scholar
 Second Scholar
 Lucifer
 Mephostophilis
 a Clown (Robin)
 Beelzebub
 Pride
 Covetousness
 Envy
 W r a t h S
 Gluttony
 Sloth
 Lechery
 Dick, a clown
 The Pope (Adrian)
 Raymond, King of Hungary
 Bruno
 two Cardinals (of France and Padi
 The Bishop (of Rheims)
 a Friar
 a Vintner
 Martino
 Frederick
 Benvolio
 The German Emperor (Charles)
 The Duke of Saxony
 •Darius
 •Alexander and
 •his Paramour
 two Soldiers
 a Horse-corser
 a Carter
 a Hostess
 The Duke of Vanholt and
 his Duchess
 a Servant

DOCTOR FAUSTUS

1604 & 1616

PARALLEL TEXTS

THE TRAGICALL

Hiftory of D. Fauftus.

As it bath bene A Eted by the Right

Honorable the Earle of Notting bam his scrants

Written by c h . Marl.



LONDON

Printed by v. s. for Thomas Bushell .1604

Title-page of A i : Bodleian Library (Malone 233)

The Tragical Hiftory
of the Life and Death
of "*DoBor Faujlm.*
Written by *Qb. Mar.*

WOODCUT

LONDON,
Printed for *Iohn IVright*, and are to be fold at his fhop
without Neweate, at the figne of the
Bible. 1616.

Title-page of B1: British Museum (C. 34. d. 26: letterpress restored)

In the original half an inch of the woodcut has been cut away on the right, and three words in the imprint are obscured or mutilated, viz. *f<g>ne o>f. . . Bib<le.>' The abbreviated author's name has been altered and expanded with pen and ink to read **MackUn**

sigA2 *The tragical I Historie
of Doctor Faustus.*

Prol

Enter Chorus.

A N o t marching now in fields of *Thracimene*^
 N V Where *Mars* did mate the Carthaginians,
 Nor sporting in the dalliance of loue,
 5 In courts of Kings where state is ouerturnd,
 Nor in the pompe of prowde audacious deedes,
 Intends our Muse to daunt his heauenly verse:
 Onely this (Gentlemen) we must performe,
 The forme of *Faustus* fortunes good or bad.
 10 To patient Iudgements we appeale our plaude,
 And speake for *Faustus* in his infancie :
 Now is he borne, his parents base of stocke,
 In *Germany*, within a towne calld *Rhodes*:
 Of riper yeeres to *Wertenberg* he went,
 15 Whereas his kinsmen chiefly brought him vp,
 So soone hee profites in Diuinitie,
 The fruitfull plot of Scholerisme grac't,
 That shortly he was grac't with Doctors name,
 Excelling all, whose sweete delight disputes
 20 In heauenly matters of *Theologie*,
 Till swolne with cunning of a selfe conceit,
 His waxen wings did mount aboue his reach,
 And melting heuens conspirde his ouerthrow.
 For falling to a diuelish exercise,
 25 And glutted more with learnings golden gifts,
 sig. A2^v He surffets vpon cursed Negromancy,
 Nothing so sweete as magicke is to him

5 †ouerturnd] ouer-turnd A3
 23 fouerthrow] ouer-throw A3

14 *Wertenberg]* *Wirtenberg* A 2: *Wittenberg* A3

*TRAGEDIE OF
Doctor Faustus.*

Enter Chorus.

Prol.

7V T O t marching in the fields of *Thrasimen*,
 I V Where *Mars* did mate the warlicke *Carthagens*,
 Nor sporting in the dalliance of loue
 In Courts of Kings, where state is ouer-turn'd 5
 Nor in the pompe of proud audacious deeds,
 Intends our Muse to vaunt his heauenly verse
 Onely this, Gentles: we must now performe
 The forme of *Faustus* fortunes, good or bad,
 And now to patient iudgements we appeale, 10
 And speake for *Faustus* in his infancie.
 Now is he borne, of parents base of stocke, i
 In *Germany* within a Towne caPd *Rhodes*:
 At riper yeares to *Wittenberg* he went, •
 Whereas his kinsmen chiefly brought him vp;
 So much he profits in Diuinitie, . 15

That shortly he was grac'd with Doctors name, •
 Excelling all, and sweetly can dispute
 In th'heauenly matters of Theologie,
 Till swolne with cunning, of a selfe conceit, 20
 (His waxen wings did mount about his reach,
 And melting, heauens conspir'd his ouer-throw:
 For falling to a diuellish exercise,
 And glutted now with learnings golden gifts,
 He surfets vpon cursed Necromancie: •
 Nothing so sweet as Magicke is to him; sig. A2^v

5 ouer-turn'd] read ouer-turnM, 7 verse] 2 blotted, read verse: (B2) 23
 diuellish exercise] read diuellish exercise 26 him 5] read him, {and perhaps place
 the semicolon at the end of 27).

8 fthis, Gentles:] this (Gentles) B2 9 bad,] bad: B2 20 \$of] and B2
 25 ^vpon cursed] on the cursd B2

A-1604 *The tragical! History of I Doctor Faustus.*

Which he preferres before his chiefest blisse,
 29 And this the man that in his study sits. *Exit.*

Sc. 1 *Enter Faustus in his Study.*

Faustus Settle thy studies *Faustus*, and beginne
 To sound the deapth of that thou wilt professe:
 Hauing commencde, be a Diuine in shew,
 Yet leuell at the end of euery Art,
 35 And Hue and die in *Aristotles* workes:
 Sweete *Anulatikes* tis thou hast rausht me,
Bene disserere est finis logicis,
 Is, to dispute well, Logickes chiefest end
 Affoords this Art no greater myracle :
 40 Then reade no more, thou hast attaind the end:
 A greater subiect fitteth *Faustus* wit,
 Bid *Oncaymaon* farewell, *Galen* come:
 Seeing, *vbi desinit philosophus, ibi incipit medicus.*
 Be a physition *Faustus*, heape vp golde,
 45 And be eternizde for some wondrous cure,
Summum bonum medicine sanitas,
 The end of physicke is our bodies health:
 Why *Faustus*, hast thou not attaind that end ?
 Is not thy common talke sound Aphorismes ?
 50 Are not thy billes hung vp as monuments,
 whereby whole Citties haue escapt the plague,
 And thousand desprate maladies beene easde,
 Yet art thou still but *Faustus*, and a man.
 wouldst thou make man to Hue eternally ?
 55 Or being dead, raise them to life againe?
 Then this profession were to be esteemd.
 Physicke farewell, where is *Iustinian* ?
Si vna eadem res legatus duobus,
Alter rem alter valorem rei, &c.
 60 A pretty case of paltry legacies:
Ex hareditarij ilium non potest pater nisi:

36 *Anhdatikēs*] read *Anulatiches* 37 *logicis,*] read *logicis.* 58 *legatus*] read
legator 61 *Ex hareditari]* i trace only: read *Exhareditare* non] 0 trace only.

36 † *nulatikes*] *Analitikes* A1,z 39 % *myracle:*] *miracle?* A2,3 42 † *Oncaym-con]*
Oeconomy A2,3 43 *philosophus]* *pkilosopus* A2,3 52 ^*desprate]* *desperat* A2:
desperate A3 54 **\$man]* *men* A3 59 %*rtm]* *rem,* A2,3 61 †*x*
heriditari] *Exhereditari* A2,3 %*pater]* *pater,* A3

Which he preferres before his chiefest blisse,
And this the man that in his study sits.

Faustus in his study. l. i

Faust. Settle thy studies *Faustus*, and begin 30

To sound the depth of that thou wilt professe,

Hauing commenced, be a Diuine in shew,

Yet leuell at the end of euery Art,

And Hue and die in *Aristotles* workes.

Sweet *Analitikes*, tis thou hast rausht me, 35

Bene disserere est finis Logicis.

Is to dispute well Logickes chiefest end? •

Affbords this Art no greater miracle?

Then read no more, thou hast attain'd that end;

A greater subiect fitteth *Faustus* wit: 40

Bid *Oeconomy* farewell; and *Galen* come:

Be a Phisitian *Faustus*, heape vp gold, •

And be eterniz'd for some wondrous cure:

Summum bonum, medicine sanitas,

The end of Physicke is our bodies health: 45

Why *Faustus*, hast thou not attain'd that end? •

Are not thy bills hung vp as monuments,

Wherby whole Cities haue escap't the plague,

And thousand desperate maladies beene cur'd?

Yet art thou still but *Faustus*, and a man. . . 5 0

Couldst thou make men to Hue eternally,

Or being dead, raise them to life againe,

Then this profession were to be esteem'd.

Physicke farewell: where is *Justinian*?

Si vna eademque res legatus duobus, 55

Alter rem, alter valorem rei, & c.

A petty case of paltry Legacies,

Exhereditari filium non potest pater, nisi—

40 greater]²r impression defective. 41 *Oeconomy*] ec impression defective. 42

Phisitian] Phis impression defective. 43 etemiz'd] ter impression defective. 44

bonum,'] read bonum (B2) 55 legatus'] read legator 58 *Exhereditari ita*A*Exhereditare*

A-1604 *The tragicall History of | Doctor Faustus.*

Sc. i

Such is the subiect of the institute
sig. A3 And vniuersall body of the Church :
His study fittes a mercenary "HruHge,
65 who aimes at nothing but external! trash,
The deuill and illiberall for me:
when all is done, Diuinitie is best.
Jeromes Bible Faustus, view it well.
Stipendium peccati mors est: ha, Stipendium, &c.
70 The reward of sinne is death: thats hard.
Sipeccasse negamus,j allimur, £? nulla estinnobis Veritas.
If we say that we haue no sinne,
We deceiue our selues, and theres no truth in vs.
Why then belike we must sinne,
75 And so consequently die.
I, we must die an euerlasting death:
What doctrine call you this, *Che sera, sera*,
What wil be, shall be ? Diuinitie, adieu,
These Metaphisickes of Magicians,
80 And Negromantike bookes are heauenly
Lines, circles, sceanes, letters and characters:
I, these are those that *Faustus* most desires.
O what a world of profit and delight,
Of power, of honor, of omnipotence
85 Is promised to the studious Artizan ?
All things that mooue betweene the quiet poles
Shalbe at my commaund, Emperours and Kings,
Are but obeyd in their seuerall prouinces:
Nor can they raise the winde, or rend the cloudes:
90 But his dominion that exceedes in this,
Stretcheth as farre as doth the minde of man.
A sound Magician is a mighty god:
Heere *Faustus* trie thy braines to gaine a deitie.

Enter Wagner.

95 *Wagner*, commend me to my deerest friends,
The *Germaine Valdes*, and *Cornelius*,
Request them earnestly to visite me.
Wag. I wil sir. *exit.*

87 commaund] d broken. 96 *valdes*] s trace only. *Cornelius*] s trace only.

66 deuill] Diuell A2,3 70 ðhats] that's A3 79 fMagicians] Magitians A2,3
87 ^Shalbe] Shall be A2,3 88 obeyd] obaied A2: obeyed A3 92 fMagician]
Magitian A3 95 *Wagner*, commend] *Wagner*, commend {indented} A2

The Tragical Historie | Of Doctor Faustus.

B-1616

I. i

Such is the subject of the institute,
And vniuersall body of the law.
This study fits a Mercenarie drudge,
Who aims at nothing but externall trash, 60
Too seruile and illiberall for mee. *
When all is done, *Diuinitie* is best:
Ieromes Bible *Faustus*, view it well:
Stipendium peccati, mors est: ha, stipendium, &c. sig. A3
The reward of sin is death? that's hard:
Si peccasse, negamus, jallimur, & nulla est in nobis Veritas:
If we say that we haue no sinne
We deceiue our selues, and there is no truth in vs. 70
Why then belike we must sinne,
And so consequently die,
I, we must die, an euerlasting death.
What doctrine call you this? *Che sera, sera:*
What will be, shall be; *Diuinitie* adew. 75
These Metaphisicks of Magitians,
And Negromantick bookes are heauenly,
Lines, Circles, Letters, Characters.
I these are those that *Faustus* most desires.
O what a world of profite and delight, 80
Of power, of honour, and omnipotence,
Is promised to the Studios Artizan ?
All things that moue betweene the quiet Poles
Shall be at my command: Emperors and Kings,
Are but obey'd in their seuerall Prouinces: 85

But his dominion that exceeds in this,
Stretcheth as farre as doth the mind of man:
A sound Magitian is a Demi-god,
Here tire my braines to get a Deity.

Enter Wagner.

Wagner, commend me to my deerest friends, 90
The Germane *Vaides* and *Cornelius*,
Request them earnestly to visit me.

Wag. I will sir.

Exit.

63 aad] read a n d 8 peccasse, "] read peccasse (B2)

66 -peccath-] peccati B2 -fha,] ha ? B2 89 fget] gainc B2

A164 *The tragical History of | Doctor Faustus.*

99 *Fau.* Their conference will be a greater help to me,
 sig. A3^V Thn all my labours, plodde I nere so fast.

Enter the good Angell and the euill Angell.

Good. A. O *Faustus*, lay that damned booke aside,
 And gaze not on it, lest it tempt thy soule,
 And heape Gods heauy wrath vpon thy head,
 105 Reade, reade the scriptures, that is blasphemy

Euill A. Go forward *Faustus* in that famous art,
 Wherein all natures treasury is containd:
 Be thou on earth as *huc* is in the skie,
 Lord and commaunder of these Elements.

Exeunt.

no *Fau.* How am I glutted with conceit of this?
 Shall I make spirits fetch me what I please,
 Resolue me of all ambiguities,
 Performe what desperate enterprise I will ?
 He haue them flye to *India* for gold,

115 Ransacke the Ocean for orient pearle,
 And search all corners of the new found world
 For pleasant fruites and princely delicates:
 He haue them reade mee straunge phiTosdphie,
 And tell the secrets of all forraine kings,
 120 He haue them wall all *Iermany* with brasse,
 And make swift *Rhine* circle faire *Wertenberge*,
 He haue them fill the publike schooles with skill.
 Wherewith the students shalbe brauely clad:
 He leuy souldiers with the coyne they bring,

125 And chase the Prince of *Parma* from our land,
 And raigne sole king of all our prouinces:
 Yea stranger engines for the brunt of warre,
 Then was the fiery keele at *Antwarpes* bridge,
 He make my seruile spirits to inuent :

130 Come *Germaine Vaides* and *Cornelius'*,
 And make me blest with your sage conference,
FaldeSy sweete *Valdes*, and *Cornelius*,

100 Thn] catch-word Than 102 Good. "] read Good 122 skill.] read skill,

100 †Thn hen A2,3 102 Good. A.] Good, A. A2 : Good A A3 103 flest]
 least A2,3 104 *wrath] rod A2,3 107 *ftreasury] treasure A2,3 no this?]
 this, A2,3 115 Ocean] Ocean A2,3 117 pleasant] pleasants A3 120
[Iermany] Germany Ai,2 123 †halbe] shall be A2,3 126 †our] the 2,3
 128 †Antwarpes] Antvoerpes A2,3 132 †Faldes,] Valdes A2,3 Cornelius,
 Cornelius. A2,3

Faust, Their conference will be a greater helpe to me,
Then all my labours, plod I ne're so fast. 95

• *Enter the Angell and Spirit.*

Good A. O *Faustus*, lay that damned booke aside,
And gaze not on it least it tempt thy soule,
And heape Gods heauy wrath vpon thy head. 99
Reade, reade the Scriptures: that is blasphemy. • sig. A3^v
Bad A. Go forward *Faustus* in that famous Art **B403**

Wherein all natures treasure is contain'd:
Be thou on earth as *hue* is in the skye,
Lord and Commander of these elements: *Exeunt An,*

Faust. How am I glutted with conceit of this ? *vanity* 105
Shall I make spirits fetch me what I please ?
Resolue me of all ambiguities ?

Performe what desperate enterprise I will ?
Fie haue them flie to *Indian* for gold;
Ransacke the Ocean for Orient Pearle, **no**
And search all corners of the newrfound-world *America*

For pleasant fruites, and Princely delicates.
Tie haue them read me strange Philosophy,
And tell the secrets of all forraine Kings:
Fie haue them wall all *Germany* with Brasse, 115

And make swift *Rhine*, circle faire *Wittenberge*:
Fie haue them fill the publique Schooles with skill,
Wherewith the Students shall be brauely clad.

Fie leauy souldiers with the cojne they bring,
And chase the Prince of *Parma* from our Land, 120
And raigne sole King of all the Prouinces.

Yea stranger engines for the brunt of warre,
Then was the fiery keele at *Anwerpe* bridge,
Fie make my seruile spirits to inuent.

Come *Germane Valdes* and *Cornelius*, 125
And make me blest with your sage conference. *Enter Valdes*
Valdes, sweete *Valdes* and *Cornelius*, *and Cornelius.*

94 a greater] a g impression defective. 95 so fast] o fas impression defective.
104 elements:] read elements. (B2) 109 Indian] read India (B2) 126 sage
conference] space doubtful.

116 †make] with B2 126 †blest] wise B2 126-7 s.D.] opposite 125-6 B2

A-1604 *The tragkall History of I Doctor Faustus.*

Sc. i

Enter Valdes and Cornelius,

134 Know that your words haue woon me at the last,

sig. A4 To practise Magicke and concealed arts:

Yet not your words onely, but mine owne fantasie,

That will receiue no obiect for my head,

But ruminates on Negromantique skill,

Philosophy is odious and obscure,

140 Both Law and Phisicke are for pettie wits,

Diuinitie is basest of the three,

Vnpleasant, harsh, contemptible and vilde,

Tis Magicke, Magicke that hath rausht mee,

Then gentle friends ayde me in this attempt,

145 And I that haue with Consissylogismes

Graueled the Pastors of the Germaine Church,

And made the flowring pride of *Wertemberge*

Swarme to my Problemes as the infernall spirits

On sweet *Musosus* when he came to hell,

150 Will be as cunning as *Agrippq* was,

Whose shadowes made all *Europe* honor him.

Vald. Faustus, these bookes thy wit and our experience

Shall make all nations to canonize vs, ,,

As Indian Moores obey their Spanish Lords,

155 So shall the subjects of euery element

Be alwaies seruiceable to vs three,

Like Lyons shall they guard vs when we please,

Like *Almaine* Rutters with their horsemens staues,

Or Lapland Gyants trotting by our sides,

160 Sometimes like women, or vnwedded maides,

Shadowing more beautie in their ayrie browes,

Then in their white breasts of the queene of Loue:

For *Venice* shall they dregge huge Argoces,

And from *America* the golden fleece,

165 That yearely stufes olde *Philips* treasury

If learned *Faustus* will be resolute.

Fau. Valdes as resolute am I in this

As thou to Hue, therefore obiect it not.

134 that your] *space doubtful** 140 wits] *s broken.* 145 Confiflylogifmes]
read Comm sylogismes 152 *Faustus,*] *comma faint.*

134 †woon] won A2,3 145 *†Consissylogismes] *subtile sylogismes* A3 160
Sometimes] *Some-times* A3 163 *†For] *From* A2,3 *they] *the* A2 †dregge]
drage A2,3

Know that your words haue won me at the last.
To practise Magicke and concealed Arts.

Philosophy is odious and obscure: 130
Both Law and Physicke are for petty wits,

Tis magick, magick, that hath rauisht me.
Then gentle friends aid me in this attempt,
And I, that haue with subtle Sillogismes
Grauel'd the Pastors of the *Germane* Church, 135
And made the flowring pride of *Wittenberg*
Sworne to my Problemes, as th'inferrall spirits
On sweet *Mus*us* when he came to hell,
Will be as cunning as *Agrippa* was, sig. A 4
Whose shadow made all *Europe* honour him. 140

Val. Faustus, these bookes, thy wit, and our experience,
shall make all Nations to Canonize vs,
As *Indian Moores*, obey their *Spanish* Lords:
So shall the spirits of euery element,
Be alwaies seruiceable to vs three: 145
Like Lyons shall they guard vs when we please,
Like *Almaine* Rutters with their horsemens stauers,
Or Lopland Giants trotting by our sides,
Sometimes like women or vnwedded Maides:
Shadowing more beauty in their Airie browes, 150
Then has the white breasts of the Queene of loue.
From *Venice* shall they drag huge *Argosies*,
And from *America* the Golden Fleece,
That yearely stuffd old *Phillips* treasury,
If learned *Faustus* will be resolute. 155

Faust. Valdes, as resolute am I in this,
As thou to Hue, therefore obiect it not.

128 last.] read last, (B2) 137 Sworne] read sarme (B2) 145 Be] e impression defective. 146 Like] k impression defective. 148 Lopland] read Lapland
149 Maides:] read Maides, (B2) 157 thou] h impression defective.

151 has] haue B2 152 :fhuge] whole B2 154 fstuff'd] stuffes B2

Cor. The myracles that Magicke will performe,
170 Will make thee vow to studie nothing else,

He that is grounded in Astrologie,

sig.A4^v Inricht with tongues well seene minerals,

Hath all the principles Magicke doth require,

Then doubt not *(Faustus)* but to be renowmd,

175 And more frequented for this mystery,

Then heretofore the Dolphian Oracle.

The spirits tell me they can drie the sea,

And fetch the treasure of all forraine wrackes,

I, all the wealth that our forefathers hid

180 Within the massie entrailes of the earth.

Then tell me *Faustus*, what shal we three want ?

Fau. Nothing *Cornelius*, O this cheares my soule,

Come shewe me some demonstrations magicall,

That I may coniure in some lustie groue,

185 And haue these ioyes in full possession.

Val. Then haste thee to some solitary groue,

And beare wise *Bacons* and *Albanus* workes,

-The Hebrew Psalter, and new Testament,

And whatsoever else is requisit

190 Wee will enforme thee ere our conference cease.

Cor. *Vaides*, first let him know the words of art,

And then all other ceremonies learnd,

Faustus may trie his cunning by himselfe.

Val. First He instruct thee in the rudiments,

195 And then wilt thou be perfecter then I.

Fau. Then come and dyne with me, and after meate

Weele canuas euery quidditie thereof:

For ere I sleepe He trie what I can do,

This night He coniure though I die\therefore.

200

Exeunt.

Sc.ii

Enter two Schollers.

1. *Sch.* I wonder whats become of *Faustus*, that was | wont
to make our schooles ring with, *sic probo.*

180 entrailes]²e trace only. 183 magicall] c trace only. 198 He] I trace only.

172 ^tongues] tongues, A3 *^scene] scene in A2,3 173 principles]
principals A2 _ 174 renowmd] renown'd A2 : renownd A3 176 *heretofore]
hetherto A2,3 †Dolphian] Delphian A2,3 179 fforefathers] fore-fathers A3
184 *lustie] little A2,3 186 fhaste] hast A2,3 190 †enforme] informe A2,3
193 may] my A3

The Tragkall Historie I Of Doctor Faustus. B-16X6

Corn. The miracles that magick will performe,
Will make thee vow to study nothing else.

He that is grounded in Astrology, 160

Inricht with tongues, well scene in Minerals,

Hath all the Principles Magick doth require:

Then doubt not *Faustus* but to be renowm'd,

And more frequented for this mysterie,

Then heeretofore the *Delphian* Oracle. 165

The spirits tell me they can dry the sea,

And fetch the treasure of all forraine wrackes:

Yea all the wealth that our fore-fathers hid,

Within the massy entrajles of the earth: p»ii

Then tell me *Faustus* what shall we three want? 170

Faust. Nothing *Cornelius* \ O this cheeres my soule:

Come, shew me some demonstrations Magicall,

That I may coniure in some bushy Groue, B175

And haue these ioies in full possession! 174

Val. Then hast thee to some solitary Groue, B173

And beare wise *Bacons*, and *Albanus* workes,

The *Hebrew* Psalter, and new Testament;

And whatsoeuer else is requisite,

We will informe thee e're our conference cease.

Cor. *Vaides*, first let him know the words of Art, 180

And then all other ceremonies leaned,

Faustus may try his cunning by himselfe.

Val. First Fie instruct thee in the rudiments,

And then wilt thou be perfecter then I.

Faust. Then come and dine with me, and after meate 185

We'le canuase euery quidditie thereof:

For e're I sleep, Tie try what I can do:

This night Fie coniure tho I die therefore. *Exeunt om.*

Enter two Schollers.

I. ii

1 *Sch.* I wonder what's become of *Faustus* that was wont | 190
To make our schooles ring, with *sic probo.* *Enter Wag.* A205

159 Will] ill *impression defective.* 161 Inricht] ric *impression defective.* 164
more] m *impression defective.* 165 Then] n *impression defective.* 185 after
meate]space doubtful.

204 2. 6V/4. That shall we know, for see here comes his
 boy.

B191 *Enter Wagner.*

1. *Sch.* How now sirra, wheres thy maister?

Wag. God in heauen knowes.

2. Why, dost not thou know?

sig. Bi *Wag.* Yes I know, but that followes not.

210 1. Go too sirra, leaue your ieasting, and tell vs where | hee is.

Wag. That follows not necessary by force of argument, |
 that you being licentiate should stand vpon't, therefore
 acknowledge your error, and be attentive.

215 2. Why, didst thou not say thou knewst?

Wag. Haue you any wisse on't?

1. Yes sirra, I heard you.

Wag. Aske my fellow if I be a thiefe.

2. Well, you will not tell vs.

220 *Wag.* Yes sir, I will tell you, yet if you were
 not dunces | you would neuer aske me such a question, for is
 not he *cor-ꝑus naturak*, and is not that *mobile*, then wherefore
 should I you aske me such a question: but that I am by nature
 fleg-|maticke, slowe to wrath, and prone to leachery, (to loue I |
 225 would say) it were not for you to come within fortie foote of | the
 place of execution, although I do not doubt to see you | both
 hang'd the next Sessions. Thus hauing triumpht ouer | you, I
 will set my countnance like a precisian, and begin to | speake
 230 thus: truly my deare brethren, my maister is within | at dinner
 with *Vaides* and *Cornelius*, as this wine if it could | speake, it would
 enforme your worships, and so the Lord | blesse you, preserve
 you, and keepe you my deare brethren, | my deare brethren.

exit.

235 1. Nay then I feare

 he is false into that damned art,
 for I which they two are infamous through the world.

 2. Were he a stranger, and not alied to me,
 yet should | I grieue for him:

but come let vs go and informe the Rector, | and see
 if hee by his graue counsaile can reclaime him.

210 ‡Go too] Go to A2,3 213 vpon't] vpon it A2,3 216 on't] {*apostrophe*
trace only) on it A2,3 228 countnance] countninance A2,3 231 ‡enforme]
 informe A3 worships] worshiþe A2 : worshiþ A3 239 counsaile] counceU A2,3

The Tragical! Historie | Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

2 Sch. That shall we presently know, here comes his
boy.

1 Sch. How now sirra, where's thy Maister?

Wag. God in heauen knowes.

2 Sch. Why dost not thou know then! 195

Wag. Yes, I know, but that followes not.

1 Sch. Go to sirra, leaue you esting, & tell vs where he is.

Wag. That followes not by force of argument,
which I you, being *Licentiats*, should stand vpon, therefore
acknow-|ledge your errour, and be attentiuē. 200

2. Sch. hen you will not tell vs?

Wag. You are deceiu'd, for I will tell you: yet if you | were
not dunces, you would neuer aske me such a question: | For is
he not *Corpus naturale*? and is not that *Mobile*? Then | wherefore 205
should you aske me such a question? But that I | am by nature
flegmatique, slow to wrath, & prone to letcherie | (to loue I
would say) it were not for you to come within for-jtie foot of the
place of execution, although I do not doubt but | to see you both
ihangd'd the next Sessions. Thus hauing tri-|umpht ouer you, 1210
will set my countenance like a Precisian, | and begin to speake
thus: Truely my deere brethren, my M^r. | is within at dinner, sig.Bi
with *Vaides* and *Cornelius*, as this wine, | if it could speake, would
informe your Worships: and so | the Lord blesse you, preserue
you, and keepe you, my deere | brethren. *Exit.* 215

1 Sch. O *Faustus*, then I feare y which I haue long suspected:
That thou art false into that damned Art
For which they two are infamous through the world.

2 Sch. Were he a stranger, not allyed to me,
The danger of his soule would make me mourne: 220
But come, let vs go, and informe the *Rector*:
It may be his graue counsell may reclaime him.

204 For] before the F is an accidental mark, which has been mistaken for an apostrophe.
209 hangd'd] read hanged 216 y] superior letter doubtful.

222 \$him] omit B2

Sc. ii

240

1. O but I feare me nothing can reclaime him.
2. Yet let vs trie what we can do.

Exeunt.

Sc. iii

Enter Faustus to coniure.

Fau. Now that the gloomy shadow of the earth,

245 Longing to view *Orions* drisling looke,

sig. B1^v Leapes from th'antartike world vnto the side,

And dimmes the welkin with her pitchy breath:

Faustus, begin thine incantations,

And trie if diuels will obey thy hest,

250 Seeing thou hast prayde and sacrific'd to them.

Within this circle is *Iehouahs* name,

Forward and backward, and Agramithist,

The breuiated names of holy Saints,

Figures of euery adiunct to the heauens,

255 And characters of signes and erring starres.

By which the spirits are inforst to rise,

Then feare not *Faustus*, but be resolute,

And trie the vttermost Magicke can performe.

Sint rnihi dei acherontis propitij, valeat numen
 260 *triplex Iehou^e, ignei, | aerij, Aquatani spiritus saluete,*
Orientis princeps Belsibub, injerni | ardentis monarcha
& demigorgon, propitiamus vos, vt apariat £? | surgat
Mephastophilis, quod tumeraris, per Iehouam
gehennam & | consecratam aquam quam nunc spargo,
signumque crucis quod nunc | facto, & per vota nostra
 265 *ipse nunc surgat nobis dicatis Mephasto-philis.*

Enter a Diuell.

I charge thee to returne and change thy shape,

Thou art too vgly to attend on me,

Goe and returne an old Franciscan Frier,

270 That holy shape becomes a diuell best. *Exit diuell.*

I see theres vertue in my heauenly words,

255 starres.] read starres, 264 quod nunc] space doubtful. 265 dicatis] # indistinct.

247 dimmes] dimmes A3 256 ¶inforst] inforc't A2,3 259 "¶ignei,](trace
 only of comma in A2): ignei A3 260 ae'rij] aerii Ai2,3262 ¶quod] quod Az,2
 %Iehouam| Iehouam, A2,3 263 pigntimque] signumque A2,3 265 dicatis] dicatis A2,3

The Tragical Historie | Of Doctor Faustus. **B-1616**

1 *Sch.* I feare me, nothing will reclaime him now. **I.ii**
2 *Sch.* Yet let vs see what we can do. *Exeunt.* 224

Thunder. Enter Lucifer and 4 deuils,
Faustus to them | with this speech. **I. iii**

C *Faust.* Now that the gloomy shadow of the night,
Longing to view *Orions* drisling looke,
Leapes from th'*Antarticke* world vnto the skie,
And dymes the *Welkin*, with her pitchy breathe: 230
Faustus, begin thine Incantations,
And try if deuils will obey thy Hest, ~~COMME~~ ^{COMME} ~~MA~~ ^{MA} ~~VO~~
Seeing thou hast pray'd and sacrific'd to them
Within this circle is *Iehoua's* Name,
Forward, and backward, *Anagramatis'd*: 235
Th'abreuiated names of holy Saints,
Figures of euery adiunct to the heauens,
And Characters of Signes, and euening Starres,
By which the spirits are inforc'd to rise:
Then feare not *Faustus* to be resolute 240
And try the vtmost Magicke can performe.

Thunder, Sint mihi Dij Acherontis propitij, valeat numen
tri-plex Iehouae, ignei Aerij, Aquatani spiritus saluete:
Orientis | Princeps Belzebub, inferni ardentis monarcha
<y demigor-gonj propitiamus vos, vt appareat, & surgatz+s
Mephostophilis | Dragon, quod tumeraris; per lehouam,
gehennan, & con-secratam aquam, quam nunc spargo;sig.Bi^v
signumq; crucis quod | nunc facio; & per vota nostra
ipse nunc surgat nobis dicatis I Mephostophilis.

Enter a Deuill. 250

I charge thee to returne, and change thy shape,
Thou art too vgly to attend on me:
Go and returne an old *Franciscan* Frier,
That holy shape becomes a deuill best. *Exit deuill.*
I see there's vertue in my heauenly words. 255

238 †euening] erring B2 243 ‡Aquatani]qtdtani B2
gehennam B3 248 dicatis] dicat() B2 : dicatus B3

246 gehennan]

Sc. iii

Who would not be proficient in this art ?

How pliant is this *Mephistophilis* ?

Full of obedience and humilitie,

275 Such is the force of Magicke and my s ^{King laureate}
 No *Faustus*, thou art Coniurer laureate
 That canst commaund great *Mephistophilis*,
Quin regis Mephistophilis fratris imagine.

Enter Mephistophilis.

280 *Me.* Now *Faustus*, what wouldst thou haue me do ?

Fau. I charge thee wait vpon me whilst I Hue,

sig. B2 To do what euer *Faustus* shall commaund,

Be it to make the Moone drop from her speare,

Or the Ocean to ouerwhelme the world.

285 *Me.* I am a seruant to great *Lucifer*,

And may not follow thee without his leaue,

No more then he commaunds must we performe.

Fau. Did not he charge thee to appeare to mee?

Me. No, I came now hither of mine owne accord.

290 *Fau.* Did not my coniuring speeches raise thee? speake.

Me. That was the cause, but yet per accident,

For when we heare one racke the name of God,

Abiure the scriptures, and his Sauour Christ,

Wee flye, in hope to get his glorious soule,

295 Nor will we come, vnlesse he vse such meanes

Whereby he is in danger to be damnd:

Therefore the shortest cut for coniuring

Is stoutly to abiure the Trinitie,

And pray deuoutly to the prince of hell.

300 *Fau.* So *Faustus* hath already done, & holds this principle

There is no chiefe but onely *Belsibub*,

To whom *Faustus* doth dedicate himselfe,

This word damnation terrifies not him,

For he confounds hell in *Elizium*,

305 His ghost be with the olde Philosophers,

But leauing these vaine trifles of mens soules,

Tell me what is that *Lucifer* thy Lord ?

276 No] read Now

281 *Fau.*] a mark above the period is accidental,

273 *Mephistophilis*] *Mephistophilis* A3 275 ‡spels,] spels. A2 (A3 doubtful) 279
 , *Mephistophilis*] *Mephistophilis* A2,3 284 ouerwhelme] ouer-whelme A3 290 speeches]
 spirits A2,3 301 ‡*Belsibub*] *Belsebub* A3 .302 himselfe,] him-selfe: A2,3

Who would not be proficient in this Art?
How pliant is this *Mephostophilis*?
Full of obedience and humility,
Such is the force of Magicke, and my spels.

Enter Mephostophilis.

260

Meph. Now *Faustus* what wouldst thou haue me do?

Faust. I charge thee waite vpon me whilst I Hue

To do what euer *Faustus* shall command:

Be it to make the Moone drop from her Sphere,

Or the Ocean to ouerwhelme the world.

265

Meph. I am a servant to jgreat Lucifer,

And may not follow thee without his leau;

No more then he commands, must we performe.

Faust. Did not he charge thee to appeare to me?

Meph. No, I came now hether of mine owne accdrd.

270

Faust. Did not my coniuring raise thee? speake.

Meph. That was the cause, but yet *per accident*:

For when we heare one racke the name of God,

Abiure the Scriptures, and his Sauour Christ:

We flye in hope to get his glorious soule;

275

Nor will we come vnlesse he vse such meanes,

Whereby he is in danger to be damn'd:

Therefore the shortest cut for coniuring

Is stoutly to abiure all godlinesse,

And pray deuoutelv to the Prince of hell.

280

Faust. So *Faustus* hath already done, and holds this principle,

There is no chiefe but onely *Beelzebub*:

To whom *Faustus* doth dedicate himselfe.

sig. B2

This word Damnation, terrifies not me,

For I confound hell in *Elizium*:

285

My Ghost be with the old Phylosophers.

But leauing these vaine trifles of mens soules,

Tell me, what is that *Lucifer*, thy Lord?

270 accdrd] read accord

270 †now] omit Bz

272 accident] accidens B4

, A-1604 *The tragical History of | Doctor Faustus.*

Sc.iii

Me. Arch-regent and commaunder of all spirits.

Fau. Was not that *Lucifer* an Angell once ?

310 *Me.* Yes *Faustus*, and most dearely lou'd of God.

Fau. How comes it then that he is prince of diuels ?

Me. O by aspiring pride and insolence,

For which God threw him from the face of heauen.

Fau. and what are you that Hue with *Lucifer* }

315 *Me.* Vnhappy spirits that fell with *Lucifer*,

Conspir'd against our God with *Lucifer*,

And are for euer damnd with *Lucifer*.

Fau. Where are you damn'd?

sig. B*^v *Me.* In hell.

320 *Fau.* How comes it then that thou art out of hel ?

Me. Why this is hel, nor am I out of it:

Thinkst thou that I who saw the face of God,

And tasted the eternal ioyes of heauen,

Am not tormented with ten thousand hels,

325 In being depriv'd of euerlasting blisse:

O *Faustus*, leaue these friuolous demaunds,

which strike a terror to my fainting soule.

Fau. What, is great *Mephistophilis* so passionate,

For being deprivd of the ioyes of heauen ?

330 Learne thou of *Faustus* manly fortitude,

And scorne those ioyes thou neuer shalt possesse.

Go beare those tidings to great *Lucifer*,

Seeing *Faustus* hath incurrd eternall death,

By desprate thoughts against *hues* deitie :

335 Say, he surrenders vp to him his soule,

So he will spare him 24. yeeres,

Letting him Hue in al voluptuousnesse,

Hauing thee euer to attend on me,

To giue me whatsoever I shal aske,

340 To tel me whatsoever I demaund,

To slay mine enemies, and ayde my friends,

And alwayes be obedient to my wil:

Goe and returne to mighty *Lucifer*,

And meete mee in my study at midnight,

326 friuolous] 1 broken.

315 †fell] liue A2,3 315 & 316 *Lucifer,*] *Lucifer*] Ai,i 322 *†who] that
A2,3 325 ‡depriv'd] depriu'd A3 327 fstrike] strikes A2,3 329 ^deprivd]
depriv'd Ai: depriu'd A3 335 *vp] omit A2,3 336 ‡24.] foure and twenty A3
339 *me] omit A2,3 341 *†and] and to A2,3

The Tragicall Historie I Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

I. III

Meph. Arch-regent and Commander of all Spirits.

Faust, Was not that *Lucifer* an Angell once? 290

Meph, Yes *Faustus,* and most deerey lou'd of God.

Faust, How comes it then that he is Prince of Deuils?

Meph, O: by aspiring pride and insolence,

For which God threw him from the face of heauen.

Faust, And what are you that Hue with *Lucifer*? 295

Meph, Vnhappy spirits that Hue with *Lucifer,*

Conspir'd against our God with *Lucifer,*

And are for euer damn'd with *Lucifer.*

Faust, Where are you damn'd?

Meph, In hell. |

Faust, How comes it then that thou art out of hell? * 300

Meph, Why this is hell: nor am I out of it.

Think'st thou that I that saw the face of God,

And tasted the eternall Ioyes of heauen,

Am not tormented with ten thousand hels,

In being depriu'd of euerlasting blisse? 305

O *Faustus* leaue these friuolous demandes,

Which strikes a terror to my fainting soule.

Faust, What is great *Mephostophilis* so passionate

For being depriued of the Ioyes of heauen?

Learne thou of *Faustus* manly fortitude, 310

And scorne those Ioyes thou neuer shalt possesse.

Go beare these tydings to great *Lucifer,*

Seeing *Faustus* hath incur'd eternall death,

By desperate thoughts against *hues* Deity:

Say he surrenders vp to him his soule, 315

So he will spare him foure and twenty yeares,

Letting him Hue in all voluptuousnesse,

Hauing thee euer to attend oin me,

To giue me whatsoever I shall aske;

To tell me whatsoever I demand:

32°

To slay mine enemies, and to aid my friends,

sig. B2^v

And alwaies be obedient to my will.

Go, and returne to mighty *Lucifer,*

And meet me in my Study, at Midnight,

A-1604 *The tragicall History of | Doctor Faustus.*

345 And then resolue me of thy maisters minde.

Me. I will *Faustus.* *exit.*

Fau. Had I as many soules as there be starres,

Ide giue them al for *Mephastophilis*:

By him He be great Emprour of the world,

350 And make a bridge through the moouing ayre,

To passe the *Ocean* with a band of men,

He ioyne the hils that binde the *Ajfricke* shore,

And make that land continent to *Spaine*,

And both contributory to my crowne:

355 The Emprour shal not Hue but by my leauē,

sig. B3 Nor any Potentate of *Germany*:

Now that I haue obtaind what I desire,

He Hue in speculation of this Art,

Til *Mephastophilis* returne againe. *exit.*

Sc. i v *Enter Wagner and the Clowne.*

361 *Wag.* Sirra boy, come hither.

Clo. How, boy? swowns boy,

I hope you haue seene ma-|ny boyes with such
pickadevaunts as I haue. Boy quotha?

Wag. Tel me sirra, hast thou any commings in?

365 *Clo.* I, and goings out too, you may see else.

Wag. Alas poore slaue, see how pouerty iesteth in his na-|ked-
nesse, the vilaine is bare, and out of seruice, and so hun-|gry,
that I know he would giue his soule to the Diuel for a | shoulder
of mutton, though it were blood rawe.

370 *Clo.* How, my soule to the Diuel for a shoulder of mut-[ton
though twere blood rawe? not so good friend, burladie I
had neede haue it wel roasted, and good sawce to it, if I pay
so I deere.

Wag. wel, wilt thou serue me, and He

375 make thee go like | *Qui mihi discipulus* ?

Clo. How, in verse?

Wag. No sirra, in beaten silke and stauēs acre.

Clo. how, how, knauēs acre? I, I thought that was al | the
380 land his father left him: Doe yee heare, I would be sorie | to robbe
you of your liuing.

347 as] a broken.

352 Affricke] r trace only.

379 left] 1 trace only.

363 quotha] quoth ha A3

The Tragical Historie Of Doctor Faustus. &-1616

l. iii
325

And then resolue me of thy Maisters mind.

Meph. I will *Faustus.* *Exit.*

Faust. Had I as many soules, as there be Starres,

Fde giue them all for *Mephostophilis.*

By him, Fie be great Emperour of the world,
And make a bridge, through the mouing Aire,

330

To passe the Ocean: with a band of men
Fie ioyne the Hills that bind the *Affrick* shore,
And make that Country, continent to *Spaine*,
And both contributory to my Crowne.

The Emperour shall not Hue, but by my leaue,
Nor any Potentate of *Germany.*

335

Now that I haue obtain'd what I desir'd

Fie Hue in speculation of this Art

Till *Mephostophilis* returne againe.

Enter Wagner and the Clowne.

l. iv

Wag. Come hither sirra boy.

34'

Clo. Boy? O disgrace to my person: Zounds boy in
your I face, you haue seene many boyes with
beards I am sure.

Wag. Sirra, hast thou no commings In ?

Clow. Yes, and goings out too, you may see sir.

345

Wag. Alas poore slaue, see how pouerty iests in his naked-
nesse, I know the Villaines out of seruice, and so hungry, |
that I know he would giue his soule to the deuill, for a shoul-|der
of Mutton, tho it were bloud raw.

Clo.

35°

Not so neither;

I

had need to haue it well rosted, | and good sauce to it, if I pay
so deere, I can tell you.

Wag. Sirra, wilt thou be my man and waite on me ? and | I will
make thee go, like *Qui mihi discipulus.*

Clow. What, in Verse ?

Wag. No slaue, in beaten silke, and stauers-aker.

35s

344 hast] before the h is an accidental mark like a broken Utter. In] read in (B2)

331 †Ocean:] Ocean B2

men] men. B3

344 Sirra, hast] Hast B3

Sc. iv

Wag, Sirra, I say in staues acre.*Clo*, **Oho**, oho, staues acre, why
then belike, if I were | your man, I should be ful of vermine.384 *Wag*, So thou shalt, whether thou beest with me, or
B365 no: I but sirra, leaue your iesting, and binde
your selfe presently | vnto me for seauen yeeres, or He turne al the
lice about thee | into familiars, and they shal teare thee in peeces.*Clo*. Doe you heare sir? you may saue that labour,
they I are too familiar with me already, swowns they are as
390 bolde I with my flesh, as if they had payd for my meate and
drinke.*Wag*, wel, do you heare sirra? holde,
take these gilders.*Clo*, Gridyrons, what be they?sig. B3V *Wag*, Why french crownes.394 *Clo*, Mas but for the name of french crownes a man | were as
good haue as many english counters, and what | should I do with
these?*Wag*, Why now sirra thou art at an houres warning |
whensoeuer or wheresoeuer the diuell shall fetch thee.*Clo*, No, no, here take your gridirons againe.400 *Wag*, Truly He none of them.*Clo*, Truly but you shall.*Wag*, Beare witnessse I gaue them him.*Clo*, Beare witnessse I giue them you againe.*Wag*. Well, I will
405 cause two diuels presently to fetch | thee away *Baliol* and
Belcher.*Clo*, Let your *Balio* and your *Belcher* come here, and He |
knocke them, they were neuer so knocht since they were di-|uels,
say I should kill one of them, what
would folkes say? do | ye see yonder tall fellow in the round slop,
410 hee has kild the di-|uell, so I should be cald kill diuell all the
parish ouer.*Enter two diuells, and the clowne runnes vp |
and downe crying.*

408 them,] comma doubtful.

395 english counters] English-counters A3 405 away] away, A2,3 409 *2the]
f or j Az: that A3 412 *crying| the Stage A2,3

The Tragical/ Historie | Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616
Li?

Clow, Staues-aker ? that's good to kill Vermine:
then be-like if I serue you, I shall be lousy. sig. B3

Wag. Why so thou shalt be, whether thou dost it or
no: I for sirra, if thou dost not presently
bind thy selfe to me for | seuen yeares, Tie turne all the 360
lice about thee into Familiars, | and make them tare thee in peeces.

Clow. Nay sir, you may saue your selfe a labour,
for they | are as familiar with me,
as if they payd for their meate and |
drinke, I can tell you. 364

Wag. Well sirra, leaue your iesting, and A385
take these Guilders.

Clow. Yes marry sir, and I thanke you to.

Wag. So, now thou art to bee at an howres warning,
whensoeuer, and wheresoeuer the deuill shall fetch thee.

Clow. Here, take your Guilders
Fie none of 'em. |

Wag. Not I, thou art Prest, prepare thy selfe, for I will | 370
presently raise vp two deuils to carry thee away: *Banio,* \
Belcher.

Clow. *Belcher!* and *Belcher* come here, Tie
belch him:
I am I not afraid of a deuill.

Enter 2 deuils. \
375

Wag. How now sir will you serue me now? 375

A-1604 *The tragicall History of I Doctor Faustus.*

Sc. iv

Wag. *Balioll* and *Belcher*, spirits away. *Exeunt.*

414 C/OW. what, are they gone? a vengeance on them, they | haue
vilde long nailes, there was a hee diuell and a shee di-|uell, He
tell you how you shall know them, all hee diuels has | homes, and
all shee diuels has clifts and clouen feete.

Wag. Well sirra follow me.

Clo. But do you hear? if I should serue you, would
420 you I teach me to raise vp *Banios* and *Belcheos*?

Wag. I will teach thee to turne thy selfe to anything,
to I a dogge, or a catte, or a mouse, or a ratte, or any thing.

Clo. How? a Christian fellow to a dogge or a catte, a |
424 mouse or a ratte? no, no sir, if you turne me into any thing, | let
B68zff. it be in the likenesse of a little pretie frisking flea, that I | may
be here and there and euery where, O He tickle the pre-|tie
wenches plackets He be amongst them ifaith.

sig. B4 *Wag.* Wei sirra, come.

Clo. But doe you heare *Wagner*?

430 *Wag.* How *Balioll* and *Belcher*.

Clo. O Lord I pray sir, let *Banio* and *Belcher* go sleepe.

Wag. Vilaine, call me Maister *Wagner*,
and let thy left | eye be ^v diametarily
fixt vpon my right heele, with *quasi vesti-|gias nostras*
insist ere. *exit*

435 *Clo:* God forgiue me, he speakes Dutch fustian: well, | He
folow him, He serue him, thats flat. *exit*

Sc. v

Enter Faustus in his Study.

Fau. Now Faustus must thou needes be damnd,
And canst thou not be saued?

440 what bootes it then to thinke of God or heauen?

Away with such vaine fancies and despaire,

Despaire in God, and trust in Belsabub:

Now go not backward: no Faustus, be resolute,

why wauerest thou? O something soundeth in mine eares:

445 Abiure this Magicke, turne to God againe,

I and Faustus wil turne to God againe.

420 to] t trace only. 421 anything]possibly any thing (A2) 430 Balioll]
I trace only. • 434 & 436 exit] read exit.

425 *little] omit Ai,3 427 plackets] plackets; A2,3 444 eares:] eares A3
445 againe,] agayne. A2 : againe: A3

The Tragicall Historie | Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

I. iv

Clow. I good *Wagner* take away the deuill then.

Wag. Spirits away;

now sirra follow me.

Clow. I will sir; but hearke you Maister, will
you teach | me this coniuring Occupation ?

Wag. I sirra, Fie teach thee to turne thy selfe 380
to a Dog, I or a Cat, or a Mouse, or a Rat, or any thing.

Clow. A Dog, or a Cat, or a
Mouse, or a Rat ?

O braue | *Wagner*.

Wag. Villaine, call me Maister *Wagner*, and see that you |
walke attentiuely, and let your right eye be alwaies *DiaAmetrally* 385
fixt vpon my left heele, that thou maist, *Quasi vesti-\gias nostras*
insistere.

Clow. Well sir,
I warrant you. *Exeunt.*

Enter Faustus in his Study. II. i

Faust. Now *Faustus*, must thou needs be damn'd? | 390

Canst thou not be sau'd? |

What bootes it then to thinke on God or Heauen ?

Away with such vaine fancies, and despaire, sig. B3^v

Despaire in *GOD*, and trust in *Belzebub*,

Now go not backward *Faustus*, be resolute. 395

Why wauerst thou? O something soundeth in mine eare.

Abiure this Magicke, turne to God againe.

385 attentiuely] read attentiuely 385-6 *Diametrally*] e trace only. 396 eare.] read
eare, (B2)

395 backward] backe B3

To God? he loues thee not, desire
 The god thou seruest is thine owne appetite,
 wherein is fixt the loue of Belsabub,
 450 To him He build an altare and a church,
 And offer luke warme blood of new borne babes.

Enter good Angell, and Euill

Good Angel Sweet Faustus, leaue that execrable art.
Fan. Contrition, prayer, repentance: what of them?
 455 *Good Angel* O they are meanes to bring thee vnto hea-|uen.
Euill Angel Rather illusions frutes of lunacy,
 That makes men foolish that do trust them most.
 459 *Good Angel* Sweet Faustus thinke of heauen, and hea-|uenly
 things.
Euill Angel No Faustus, thinke of honor and wealth.
Fau. Of wealth, *exeunt.*
 Why the signory of Emden shalbe mine,
 464 when *Mephistophilus* shal stand by me,
 sig. B4^v What God can hurt thee Faustus? thou art safe,
 Cast no more doubts, come *Mephistophilus*,
 And bring glad tidings from great *Lucifer*:
 Ist not midnight? come *Mephistophilus*,
Veni veni Mephistophile enter Meph:
 470 Now tel, what sayes *Lucifer* thy Lord?
Me: That I shal waite on Faustus whilst I Hue,
 So he wil buy my seruice with his soule.
Fau: Already Faustus hath hazarded that for thee.
Me: But Faustus, thou must bequeathe it solemnely,
 475 And write a deede of gift with thine owne blood,
 For that security craues great *Lucifer*:
 If thou deny it, I wil backe to hel.
Fau: Stay *Mephistophilus*, and tel me, what good wil | my soule
 do thy Lord?
 480 *Me*: Inlarge his kingdome.
Fau: Is that the reason he tempts vs thus?

469 *Mephistophile*] read *Mephistophile*.

448 ‡god] Qod A2,3 449 ^Belsabub] Belsebub A3 451 fluke warme]
 luke-warme A2,3 456 ^illusions] illusions, A3 457 makes] makee A3
 461 *£wealth] of wealth A2,3 463 ^shalbe] shallbe A2 : shall be A3 464, 466,
 468, 478 *Mephistophilus*] *Mephistophilis* A2,3 466 *Cast] Come A3

The Tragical/ Historie | Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

Why he loues thee not: (appetite
The God thou seru'st is thine owne |
Wherein is fixt the loue of *Belzebub*,
To him, Fie build an Altar and a Church, 400
And offer luke-warme bloud, of new borne babes.

Enter the two Angels.

Euill An. Go forward *Faustus* in that famous Art. \$101

Good An. Sweete *Faustus* leaue that execrable Art.

Faust. Contrition, Prayer, Repentance? what of these? 405

Good A. O they are meanes to bring thee vnto heauen.

Bad A. Rather illusions, fruits of lunacy.

That make them foolish that do vse them most.

Good A. Sweet *Faustus* think of heauen, & heauenly things.

Bad A. No *Faustus* thinke of honour and of wealth. *Ex. An.* 410

Faust. Wealth?

Why the Signory of *Embden* shall be mine: |

When *Mephostophilis* shall stand by me,

What power can hurt me? *Faustus* thou art safe.

Cast no more doubts; *Mepho*: come

And bring glad tydings from great *Lucifer*. 415

Ist not midnight? come *Mephostophilis*.

Veni veni Mephostophile.

Enter Mephosto.

Now tell me what saith *Lucifer* thy Lord.

That I shall waite on *Faustus* whilst he Hues,

So he will buy my seruice with his soule. 420

Faust. Already *Faustus* hath hazarded that for thee.

Meph. But now thou must bequeath it solemnly,

And wright a Deed of Gift with thine owne bloud;

For that security craues *Lucifer*.

If thou deny it I must backe to hell. 425

Faust. Stay *Mephosto*. and tell me,

What good will my soule do thy Lord?

Meph. Enlarge his Kingdome.

Faust. Is that the reason why he tempts vs thus? sig. B4

407 lunacy.] read lunacy, (B2)
with pen and ink.

419 before this line the letter *M.* has been added

403 *famous] most famous B2

405 £of] be B2

408 f^hem] men B2

417 \$ *Mephostophile*] *Mephostophilis* B2 419 †That] *Meph.* That B2

A1604 *The tragkall History of I Doctor Faustus.*

Sc.v

Me: *Solamen miseris socios habuisse doloris.*

Fau: Haue you any paine that tortures others?

Me: As great as haue the humane soules of men:

485 But tel me Faustus, shal I haue thy soule,
And I wil be thy slaue, and waite on thee,
And giue thee more than thou hast wit to aske.

Fau: I *Mephastophilus*, I giue it thee.

Me: Then stabbe thine arme couragiously,
490 And binde thy soule, that at some certaine day
Great *Lucifer* may claime it as his owne,
And then be thou as great as *Lucifer*.

Fau: Loe *Mephastophilus*, for loue of thee,
I cut mine arme, and with my proper blood
495 Assure my soule to be great *Lucifers*,
Chiefe Lord and regent of perpetual night,
View heere the blood that trickles from mine arme,
And let it be propitious for my wish.

499 *Meph:* But Faustus, thou must write it in manner of a | deede
of gift.

Fau. I so I will, but *Mephastophilis*
sig. Ci my bloud conieales | and I can write no more.

Me. He fetch thee fier to dissolue it straight. *Exit.*

Fau. What might the staying of my bloud portend?
505 Is it vnwilling I should write this bill?
Why streames it not, that I may write afresh?
Faustus giues to thee his soule: ah there it stayde,
Why shouldst thou not? is not thy soule thine owne?
Then write againe, Faustus giues to thee his soule.

510 *Enter Mephastophilis with a chafer of coles.*

Me. Heres fier, come Faustus, set it on.

Fau. So now the bloud begins to cleare againe,
Now will I make an ende immediately.

Me. O what will not I do to obtaine his soule?

515 *Fau.* *Consummatum est*, this Bill is ended,
And Faustus hath bequeathe his soule to *Lucifer*.
But what is this inscription on mine arme?

496 perpetual] r trace only.

485 soule J soule ? A2,3 487 aske,] aske ? A2,3 488,493 *Mephastophilus*
Mephastophilis A2,3 511 Heres] Here's A2,3 514 *not I] I not A2,3 517
•mine] my A2,3

The Tragical! Historie | Of Doctor Faustus. **B-1616**

ll. i

Meph. *Solamen miseris, socios habuisse doloris.*

430

Faust. Why, haue you any paine that torture other?

Meph. As great as haue the humane soules of men.

But tell me *Faustus*, shall I haue thy soule?

And I will be thy slaue and waite on thee,

And giue thee more then thou hast wit to aske.

435

Faust. I *Mephostophili* Tie giue it him.

Meph. Then *Faustus* stab thy Arme couragiously,

And bind thy soule, that at some certaine day

Great *Lucifer* may claime it as his owne,

And then be thou as great as *Lucifer*.

440

Faust. Loe *Mephosto*: for loue of thee *Faustus* hath cut his arme,

And with his propexfbloud assures his soule to be great *Lucifers*,

Chiefe Lord and Regent of perpetual) night.

Veiw here this bloud that trickles from mine arme,

And let it be propitious for my wish.

445

Meph. But *Faustus*

Write it in manner of a Deed of Gift.

Faust. I so I do; but *Mephostophilis*

My bloud congeales, and I can write no more.

« *Meph.* rie fetch thee fire to dissolue it streight. *Exit.*

450

Faust. What might the staying of my bloud portend?

Is it vnwilling I should write this byll?

Why streames it not, that I may write a fresh?

Faustus giues to thee his soule: O there it staid.

Why shouldst thou not? is not thy soule thine owne?

455

Then write againe: *Faustus* giues to thee his soule.

Enter Mephostoph: with the Chafer of Fire.

Meph. See *Faustus* here is fire, set it on.

Faust. So, now the bloud begins to cleere againe:

Now will I make an end immediately.

460

Meph. What will not I do to obtaine his soule?

Faust. Consummatum est: this byll is ended,

And *Faustus* hath bequeath'd his soule to *Lucifer*

But what is this iscription on mine Arme? 464

, 2 prope rbloud] read proper blood 453 a fresh] read afresh (B2)

430 fmiseris,] miseris B2 431 other] others B4 437 thy] thine B3 461
^obtaine] attaine B2 (only)

A-1604 *The tragicall History of | Doctor Faustus.*

So v

Homo fuge, whither should I flie?

IfvriTo TjB3TheeTe tHrowe thee downe to hell,

520 My sences are deceiu'd, here's nothing writ,

I see it plaine, here in this place is writ,

Homo fuge, yet shall not *Faustus* flye.

Me. He fetch him somewhat to delight his minde. |

exit.

525 *Enter with diuels, giuing crownes and rich apparell
to I Faustus, and daunce, and then depart.*

Fau. Speake Mephistophilis, what meanes this shewe?

Me. Nothing Faustus, but to delight thy minde withall,

And to shewe thee what Magicke can performe.

530 *Fau.* But may I raise vp spirits when I please?

Me. I Faustus, and do greater things then these.

Fau. Then theres inough for a thousand soules,

Here Mephistophilis receiue this scrowle,

A deede of gift of body and of soule:

535 But yet conditionally, that thou performe

All articles prescribed betweene vs both,

sig. Ci^v *Me.* Faustus, I swear by hel and *Lucifer*

To effect all promises betweene vs made.

Fau. Then heare me reade them:

540 on these conditions fol-|lowing.

First, that Faustus may be a spirit in forme and substance.

*Secondly, that Mephistophilis shall be his seruant, and at \ his
commaund.*

544 *Thirdly, that Mephistophilis shall do for him, and bring \ him
whatsoever.*

Fourthly, that hee shall be in his chamber or house in-uisible.

*Lastly, that hee shall appeare to the said lohn Faustus at all \
times, in what forme or shape soeuer he please.*

550 *I lohn Faustus of Wertenberge, Doctor, by these presents, do \
giue both body and soule to Lucifer prince of the East, and his \
minister Mephistophilis, and furthermore grauntvnto them, \
that*

24. *yeares being expired, the articles about*

533 Mephistophilis] 1 trace only.

518 ‡whither] whether A2,3 519 hee'le] heele A3 523 somewhat]
some-what A2,3 532 theres] ther's A2,3 539-40 following.] following, A3
549 *for] and A2,3 553 ‡24.] foure and twenty A3

The Tragical! Historie | Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

Homo fuge, whether should I flye ? sig. B4*
If vntojieauen, hee'le throw me downe to hell.

My sences are deceiu^d, here's nothing writ:

O yes, I see it plaine, euen heere is writ

Homo fuge, yet shall not *Faustus* flye.

Meph. Iie fetch him somewhat to delight his minde. | 470

Exit.

^ *Enter Devils, giuing Crownes and rich apparell to* \

Faustus: they dance, and then depart. \

Enter Mephostophilis.

Faust. What means this shew ? speake *Mephostophilis*, 475

Meph. Nothing *Faustus* but to delight thy mind,

And let thee see what Magicke can performe.

Faust. But may I raise such spirits when I please ?

Meph. I *Faustus*, and do greater things then these.

Faust. Then 480

Mephostophilis receiue this scrole, |

A Deed of Gift, of body and of soule:

But yet conditionally, that thou performe

All Couenants, and Articles, betweene vs both.

Meph. *Faustus*, I swear by *Hell* and *Lucifer*,

To effect all promises betweene vs both. 485

Faust. Then heare me read it *Mephostophilis.* \

On these conditions following.

First, that Faustus may be a spirit in forme and substance.

Secondly, that Mephostophilis shall be his seruant, and be by \ him 4⁹
commanded.

*Thirdly, that Mephostophilis shall doe for him, and bring him *
whatsoever.

Fourthly, that he shall be in his chamber or house inuisible.

*Lastly, that hee shall appeare to the said John Faustus, at all *
times, in what shape and forme soeuer he please. 495

*/ Iohn Faustus of Wittenberg, Doctor, by these presents, doe *
giue both body and soule to Lucifer, Prince of rhe East, and \ his
Minister Mephastopkilis, and furthermore grant vnto them \ that
four and twentie yeares being expired, and these Articles \ about 500

The Tragical/ Historie I Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

written being inviolate, full power to fetch or carry the | said Iohn sig. Ci
Faustus, body and soule, flesh, bloud, into their habitation
wheresoeuer. \

By me Iohn Faustus.

Meph. Speake *Faustus*, do you deliuer this as your Deed ?

Faust. I take it, and the deuill giue thee good of it. 505

Meph. So, now *Faustus* aske me what thou wilt.

Faust. First, I will question thee about hell:

Tell me, where is the place that men call Hell ?

Meph. Vnder the heauens.

Faust. I, so are all things else; but whereabouts? 510

Meph. Within the bowels of these Elements,

Where we are tortur'd, and remaine for euer.

Hell hath no limits, nor is circumscrib'd,

' Intone selfe place :Jbut where we are is hell,

¹ And wliereTiell is there must we euer be. 515

And to be short, when all the world dissolues,

And euery creature shall be purifi'd,

All places shall be hell that is not heauen.

Faust. I thinke Hel's a fable.

Meph. I, thinke so still, till experience change thy mind. 520

Faust. Why, dost thou think that *Faustus* shall be damn'd?

Meph. I, of necessity, for here's the scrowle

In which thou hast giuen thy soule to *Lucifer*.

Faust. I, and body too, but what of that:

Think'st thou that *Faustus*, is so fond to imagine, } Dramatic 1797
That after this life there is any paine ?

No, these are trifles, and meere old wiues Tales,

Meph. But I am an instance to proue the contrary:

For I tell thee I am damn'd, and now in hell.

Faust. Nay, and this be hell, Tie willingly 530

be damn'd. |

What sleeping, eating, walking and disputing ?

But leauing this, let me haue a wife, the fairest Maid in

Germany, for I am wanton and lasciuious, and cannot Hue

without a wife.

501 †flesh, bloud] flesh and blood B2

505 †1] I, B2

518 is] are B2

519 †a] a meere B2

The Tragicall Historie Of Doctor Faustus. B-16X6

Meph. Well *Faustus*^ thou shalt haue a wife. 535

He fetches in a woman deuill.

Faust. What sight is this ?

Meph. Now *Faustus* wilt thou haue a wife ? sig. Ci^v

Faust. Here's a hot whore indeed; no, Fie no wife.

Meph. Marriage is but a ceremoniall toy, 540

And if thou louest me thinke no more of it,

Tie cull thee out the fairest Curtezans,

And bring them euery morning to thy bed:

She whom thine eye shall like, thy heart shall haue,

Were she as chaste as was *Penelope* \ 545

As wise as *Saba*, or as beautifull

As was bright *Lucifer* before his fall.

Here, take this booke, and peruse it well: B736

The Iterating of these lines brings gold;

The framing of this circle on the ground 550

Brings Thunder, Whirle-winds, Storme and Lightning:

Pronounce this thrice deuoutly to thy selfe,

And men in harnesse shall appeare to thee,

Ready to execute what thou commandst. 554

Faust. Thankes *Mephostophilis* for this sweete booke. B738

This will I keepe, as chary as my life. *Exeunt.* B739

A-1604 *The tragicall History of I Doctor Faustus.*

Sc. v

Fau: O thou art decerned.

Me: Tut I warrant thee. *Turne to them*

[Chor. i] 809 *enter Wagner solus.*

Wag. Learned Faustus,
To know the secrets of *Astronomy*,
Grauen in the booke of *hues* hie firmament,
Did mount himselfe to scale *Olympus* top,
Being seated in a chariot burning bright,
815 Drawne by the strength of yoky dragons neckes,
He now is gone to prooue *Cosmography*,
And as I guesse, wil first ariue at *Rome*,
To see the Pope, and manner of his court,
And take some part of holy *Peters* feast,
820 That to this day is highly solemnizd. *exit Wagner*

(Sc. vi) *Fau:* When I behold the heauens, then I repent,
And curse thee wicked *Mephastophilus*,
630 Because thou hast depriu'd me of those ioyes.

Me: why Faustus, |
Thinkst thou heauen is such a glorious thing?
I tel thee tis not halfe so faire as thou,
Or any man that breathes *on* earth.

635 *Fau:* How proouest thou that?

Me: It was made for man, therefore is man more excel-) lent.

Fau: If it were made for man, twas made for me:
I wil renounce this magicke, and repent.

640 *Enter good Angel, and euill Angel.*

Good An: Faustus, repent yet, God wil pittie thee.

euill An: Thou art a spirite, God cannot pittie thee.

Fau: who buzzeth in mine eares I am a spirite ?

Be I a diuel, yet God may pittie me,
6451 God wil pittie me, if I repent.

644 Be] e broken.

632 *is] omit A2,3

640 *2Angel] omit A3

Enter Wagner solus.

Chor. i

Wag. Learned *Faustus*
To know the secrets of Astronomy
Grauen in the booke of *hues* high firmament, 560
Did mount himsele to scale *Olympus* top,
Being seated in a chariot burning bright,
Drawne by the strength of yoaky Dragons necks,
He now is gone to proue *Cosmography*,
And as I gesse will first arriue at *Rome*, 565
To see the Pope and manner of his Court;
I And take some part of holy *Peters* feast,
That to this day is highly solemnized. Exit Wagner.

Enter *Faustus* in his Study, and *Mephostophilis*.

II. ii

Faust. When I behold the heauens then I repent 570
And curse thee wicked *Mephostophilis*,
Because thou hast depriu'd me of those Ioyes. sig. C2
Meph. 'Twas thine owne seeking *Faustus*, thanke thy selfe.
But think'st thou heauen is such a glorious thing?
I tell thee *Faustus* it is not halfe so faire sis
As thou, or any man that breathe on earth.
Faust. How prou'st thou that?
Meph. 'Twas made for man; then he's more excellent.
Faust. If Heauen was made for man, 'twas made for me:
I will renounce this Magicke and repent. 580

Enter the two Angels.

Good A. *Faustus* repent, yet God will pittie thee.
Bad A. Thou art a spirit, God cannot pity thee.
Faust. Who buzzeth in mine eares I am a spirit?
Be I a deuill yet God may pittie me, 585
Yezy. God will pittie me if I repent.

558 *Faustus*] s indistinct, probably turned. 583 art] r blotted. cannot] 2n
blotted.

563 yoaky] yoaked B4 (only) Jnecks] necke B2 (only) 568 \$to] on B2 574
fis] omit B2 576 †(-breathe] breaths B2

euill An: I but Faustus neuer shal repent.

exeunt \

Fau: My hearts so hardned I cannot repent,
 Scarce can I name saluation, faith, or heauen,
 But feareful ecchoes thou nders in mine eares,
 650 Faustus, thou art damn'd, then swordes and kniues,
 Poyson, gunnes, halters, and inuenomd Steele
 Are layde before me to dispatch my selfe,
 And long ere this I should haue slaine my selfe,
 Had not sweete pleasure conquerd deepe dispaire.
 65s Haue not I made blinde *Homer* sing to me,
 Of *Alexanders* loue, and *Enons* death,
 And hath not he that built the walles of *Thebes*,
 With rauishing sound of his melodious harp
 Made musicke with my *Mephistophilis*,
 660 Why should I dye then, or basely dispaire ?
 I am resoled *Faustus* shal nere repent,
 Come *Mephistophilis*, let vs dispute againe,
 And argue of diuine *Astrologie*,
 Tel me, are there many heauens about the Moone ?
 665 Are all celestiall bodies but one globe,
 As is the substance of this centricke earth ?
Me: As are the elements, such are the spheares,

Mutually folded in each others orbe,
 And *Faustus* all ioyntly moue vpon one axletree,
 670 Whose terminine is tearmd the worlds wide pole,
 Nor are the names of *Saturne*, *Mars*, or *Iupiter*
 Faind, but are erring starres.

Fau. But tell me, haue they all one motion? both *situ* & |
tempore.

675 *Me.* All ioyntly moue from East to West in 24.
 heures | vpon the poles of the world, but differ in their motion
 vpon I the poles of the Zodiake.

Fau. Tush, these slender trifles *Wagner* can decide,
 Hath *Mephistophilus* no greater skill ?

680 Who knowes not the double motion of the plannets ?

646 *exeunt*] read *exeunt*. 649 thou nders] read thunders [the type is loose, and the
 apostrophe from the line below has worked up into the gap].

647 hearts] heart's A2,3 670 tearmd] term'd A2,3 675 24.] 24, A3 679
Mephistophilus'] Mephistophilis A2,3

The Tragicall Htstorie I Of Doctor Faustus. B-16X«

II. ii

- *Euill An.* I, but *Faustus* neuer shall repent. |

Exit Angels,

Faust. My heart is hardned, I cannot repent:
Scarce can I name saluation, faith, or heauen. 590

Swords, poyson, halters, and inuenomb'd Steele,
Are laid before me to dispatch my selfe:
And long e're this, I should haue done the deed,
Had not sweete pleasure conquer'd deepe despaire.
Haue not I made blind *Homer* sing to me 595

Of *Alexanders* loue, and *Oenons* death ?
And hath not he that built the walles of *Thebes*,
With rauishing sound of his melodious Harpe,
Made musicke with my *Mephostophilis* ?
Why should I die then, or basely despaire ? 600

I am resolu'd, *Faustus* shall not repent.
Come *Mephostophilis* let vs dispute againe,
And reason of diuine Astrology.
Speake, are there many Spheares about the Moone ?
Are all Celestiall bodies but one Globe, 605
As is the substance of this centricke earth ?

Meph. As are the elements, such are the heauens, sig. *Ci'*
Euen from the Moone vnto the Emperiall Orbe,
Mutually folded in each others Spheares,
And ioyntly moue vpon one Axle-tree, 610
Whose termine, is tearmed the worlds wide Pole.
Nor are the names of *Saturne*, *Mars*, or *Iupiter*,
Fain'd, but are euening Starres.

Faust. But haue they all one motion, both *situ* &
tempore?

Meph. All moue from East to West in foure and | twenty 615
houres, vpon the poles of the world, but differ in | their motions
vpon the poles of the Zodiacke.

Faust. These slender questions *Wagner* can decide:
Hath *Mephostophilis* no greater skill ?
Who knowes not the double motion of the Planets ? 620

610 ioyntly] read ioyntly (B2)

611 Whose] s faint. Pole.] period obscured.

591 ꝑpoyson] poysons B2

A-1604 *The tragicall History of | Doctor Faustus.*

Sc. vi

The first is finisht in a naturall day, |

The second thus, as *Saturne* in 30. yeares,

gig. C3^v *Iupiter* in 12. *J Mars* in 4. the *Sunne*, *Venus*, and

Mercury in a yeare: the | *Moone* in 28. dayes.

685 Tush these are fresh mens suppositions, | but tell me, hath euery
spheare a dominion or *Intelligentip*,

Me. I.

Fau. How many heauens or spheares are there?

Me. Nine, the seuen planets, the firmament, and the im-
periall heauen.

690 *Fau.* Well, resolute me in this question, why haue
wee not coniunctions, oppositions, aspects, eclipsis, all at
one I time, but in some yeares we haue more, in some lesse ?

Me. *Per inaequalem motum respectu totius.*

Fau. Well, I am answered, tell me who made the world?

695 *Me.* I will not.

Fau. Sweete Mephistophilus tell me.

Me. Moue me not, for I will not tell thee.

Fau. Villaine, haue I not bound thee to tel me any thing ?

Me. I, that is not against our kingdome, but this is,

700 Thinke thou on hell *Faustus*, for thou art damnd.

Fau. Thinke *Faustus* vpon God that made the world.

Me. Remember this. *Exit.*

Fau. I, goe accursed spirit to vgly hell,

Tis thou hast damn'd distressed *Faustus* soule:

705 Ist not too late ?

Enter good Angell and euill.

euill A. Too late.

good A. Neuer too late, if *Faustus* can repent.

euill A. If thou repent diuels shall teare thee in peeces.

710 *good A.* Repent, & they shal neuer race thy skin. *Exeunt.*

Fau. Ah Christ my Sauour,
seeke to saue distressed *Fau-*stus soule.

704 damn'd] there is a space and perhaps a trace of the apostrophe.

684 dayes. Tush] daies: tush A2,3 688 seuen] seauen A2,3 688-9 imperiall]
Imperiall A2,3 692 *2] in] omit A2,3 696 Mephistophilus] Mephistophilis A2,3
698 *† not] not I A2,3 706 *euill] euil Angel A3

The Tragical! Historie I Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616
II. ii

That the first is finisht in a naturall day?

The second thus, *Saturne* in 30 yeares;

Iupiter in 12, *Mars* in 4, the *Sun*, *Venus*, and

Mercury in a yeare; the Moone in twenty eight daies.

These are fresh mens questions: But tell me, hath euery 1625
Spheare a Dominion, or *Intelligentia* ?

Meph. I. I

Faust. How many Heauens, or Spheares, are there ?

Meph. Nine, the seuen Planets, the Firmament, and the |
Emperiall heauen.

Faust. But is there not *Cesium igneum*, & *Christalinum* ? 630

Meph. No *Faustus* they be but Fables.

Faust. Resolue me then in this one question: | Why are
not Coniunctions, Oppositions, Aspects, Eclipses, | all at
one time, but in some years we haue more, in some lesse ?

Meph. *Per in<equalem motum, respectu tonus.* 635

Faust. Well, I am answer'd: now tell me who made the world?

Meph. I will not

Faust. Sweet *Mephostophilis* tell me.

Meph. Moue me not *Faustus*.

Faust. Villaine, haue not I bound thee to tell me any thing? 640

Meph. I, that is not against our Kingdome.

This is: Thou art damn'd, think thou of hell.

Faust. Thinke *Faustus* vpon God, that made the world.

Meph. Remember this.—*Exit.* 644

Faust. I, go accursed spirit to vgly hell: | sig. C3
'Tis thou hast damn'd distressed *Faustus* soule.

Ist not too late ? |

Enter the two Angels.

Bad. Too late.

Good. Neuer too late, if *Faustus* will repent.

Bad. If thou repent, deuils will teare thee in peeces. 650

Good. Repent and they shall neuer raise thy skin. Ex. A.

Faust. O Christ my Sauour, my Sauour, |
Helpe to saue distressed *Faustus* soule.

637 not] read not.

635 †motum,] motum B2

Enter Lucifer, Belsabub, and Mephistophilus.

Lu. Christ cannot saue thy soule, for he is iust,

715 *Theres* none but I haue intrest in the same.

Fau: O who art thou that lookst so terrible?

Lu: I am *Lucifer*, and this is my companion Prince in | hel.

7x9 *Fau:* O Faustus, they are come to fetch away thy soule.

sig. C4 *Lu:* we come to tell thee thou dost iniure vs,

Thou talkst of Christ, contrary to thy promise |

Thou shouldst not thinke of God,

A736,806

thinke of the deuil, |

And of his dame too.

Fau: Nor will I henceforth: pardon me in this,

725 And Faustus vowes neuer to looke to heauen,

Neuer to name God, or to pray to him,

To burne his Scriptures, slay his Ministers,

And make my spirites pull his churches downe.

Lu: Do so,

and we will highly gratifie thee: |

730 Faustus, we are come from hel to shew thee

some pastime: | sit downe, and thou shalt see al the seauen

deadly sinnes ap-peare in their proper shapes.

Fau: That sight will be as pleasing vnto me, as paradise |
was to *Adam*, the first day of his creation.

735 *Lu:* Talke not of paradise, nor creation, but marke this |

A722,806 shew,

talke of the diuel, and nothing else: come away.

Enter the seauen deadly sinnes.

Now Faustus, examine them of their seueral names and |
dispositions.

740 *Eau:* What art thou? the first.

Pride I am Pride, I disdaine to haue any parents, I am | like
to *Quids* flea, I can creepe into euery corner of a wench, | some-
times like a periwig, I sit vpon her brow,

or like a fan | of feathers,

724 Y] trace only.

740 Eau:] read Fau:

713 †[*elsabub*] *Belsebub* A3 *Mephistophilus*] *Mephistophilis* A2,3 715 †[intrest]
interest A2,3 720 *come] came A3 722 *of] on A3 deuil] diuell A2,3
724 henceforth] hence forth A2 : hence fourth A3

The Tragical/ Historie Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

11. ii

Enter Lucifer, Belzebub, and Mephostophilis.

Lucif. Christ cannot saue thy soule, for he is iust, 6\$\$
There's none but I haue interest in the same.

Faust. O what art thou that look'st so terribly.

Lucif. I am *Lucifer*, and this is my companion Prince in hell.

Faust. O *Faustus* they are come to fetch thy soule.

Belz. We are come to tell thee thou dost iniure vs. 660

Lucif. Thou calst on Christ contrary to thy promise.

Bels. Thou should'st not thinke on God.

Lucif. Thinke on the deuill.

Belz. And his dam to.

Faust. Nor will *Faustus* henceforth: pardon him for this, 665
And *Faustus* vowes neuer to looke to heauen.

Lucif. So shalt thou show thy selfe an obedient seruant,
And we will highly gratify thee for it.

Belz. *Faustus* we are come from hell in person to shew | thee 669
some pastime: sit downe and thou shalt behold the seuen J
deadly sinnes appeare to thee in their owne proper shapes | and
likenesse.

Faust. That sight will be as pleasant to me, as Paradise |
was to *Adam* the first day of his creation.

Lucif. Talke not of Paradice or Creation, but marke | the 675
shew,

go *Mephostoph.* fetch them in.

Enter the 7 deadly sinnes.

Belz. Now *Faustus*, question them of their names and |
dispositions. 679

Faust. That shall I soone: What art thou the first? sig. C?

Pride. I am *Pride*; I disdaine to haue any parents: I am | like
to *Quids* Flea, I can creepe i nto euery corner of a | Wench: Some- A425E
times, like a Perriwig, I sit vpon her | Brow: next, like a Necke-
lace I hang about her Necke: | Then, like a Fan of Feathers, ^

682 creepe i nto] read creepe into

673 to] vnto B3

677 f7] seauen B2

sc. v *The tragical/ History of J Doctor Faustus.*

A-i604

I kisse her lippes,

745 indeede I doe, what doe I not? J but fie,
A788 what a scent is here? He not speake an other worde, |
except the ground were perfumde and couered
with cloth of J arras.

Fau:
second.

What art thou? the

749 *Coue:* I am *Couetousnes*, begotten of an olde churle, in | an
olde leatherne bag: and might I haue my wish, I would |
desire, that this house, and all the people in it were turnd to j
golde, that I might locke you vppe in my good chest, O my j
sweete golde

Fau: What art thou? the third.

762 *Enuy* I am *Enuy*, begotten of a Chimney-sweeper, and an
Oyster wife, I cannot reade, and therefore wish al bookes were
burnt: I am leane with seeing others eate, O that there would
come a famine through all the worlde, that all might die, and
I Hue alone, then thou shouldst see how fatt I would be: but
must thou sit and I stand? come downe with a vengeance.

769 *Fau:* Away enuious rascall: what art thou? the fift.

755 *Wrath* I am *Wrath*, I had neither father nor mother, I | leapt
»ig. C4^v out of a lions mouth, when I was scarce half an houre | olde, and
euer since I haue runne vp and downe the worlde, | with this
case of rapiers wounding my selfe, when I had no | body to
760 fight withal: I was borne in hel, and looke to it, for | some of
you shalbe my father.

Fau: what art thou? the fourth.

Enuy I am *Enuy*, begotten of a Chimney-sweeper, and | an
Oyster wife, I cannot reade, and therefore wish al bookes | were
765 burnt: I am leane with seeing others eate, O that | there would
come a famine through all the worlde, that all | might die, and
I Hue alone, then thou shouldst see how fatt I | would be: but
must thou sit and I stand? come downe with | a vengeance.

Fau: Away enuious rascall: what art thou? the fift.

770 *Glut:* who I sir, I am *Gluttony*, my parents are al dead, | and
the diuel a peny they haue left me, but a bare pention, | and
that is 30. meales a day, and tenne beauers, a small J
triffle to suffice nature, O I come of a royall parentage, my |
grandfather was a gammon of bacon, my grandmother

753 golde] read golde.

773 triffle] read trifle

745 indeede I doe.] indeed, I do A3

760 ^shalbe] shall be A2,3

The Tragickall Htstorte Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

11. ii

I kisse her; And then tur-[#]ning my selfe to a wrought
Smocke do what I list. But fye, |
what a smell is heere? Fie not speake a word more for a j B725
Kings ransome, vnlesse the ground be perfum'd, and couer'd |
with cloth of Arras.

Faust. Thou art a proud knaue indeed: What art thou | the 690
second? ACIH t<⁵/

v *Couet.* I am *Couetousnesse*: begotten of an old Churle | in a
leather bag; and might I now obtaine my wish,
this house | you and all, should turne to
Gold, that I might locke you safe | into my Chest: O my 695
sweete Gold!

Faust. And what art thou the third ?

Enuy. I am *Enuy*, begotten of a Chimney-sweeper, and | an
Oyster-wife: I cannot read, and therefore wish all books |
burn'd. I am leane with seeing others eate: O that there | would 699
come a famine ouer all the world, that all might die, and |
I Hue alone, then thou should'st see how fat Fde be. But
must I thou sit, and I stand ? come downe with a vengeance.

Faust. Out enuious wretch: But what art thou the fourth?

Wrath. I am *Wrath*: I had neither father nor mother, I | leapt 704
out of a Lyons mouth when I was scarce an houre old, | and
euer since haue runne vp and downe the world with these |
case of Rapiers, wounding my selfe when I could get none | to
fight withall: I was borne in hell, and look to it, for some | of
you shall be my father.

Faust. And what art thou the fift? 710

697 *Enuy.* I am *Enuy*, begotten of a Chimney-sweeper, and an
Oyster-wife: I cannot read, and therefore wish all books
burn'd. I am leane with seeing others eate: O that there would
come a famine ouer all the world, that all might die, and
I liue alone, then thou should'st see how fat Fde be. But
must thou sit, and I stand ? come downe with a vengeance.

703 *Faust.* Out enuious wretch: But what art thou the fourth ?

Glut. I am *Gluttony*; my parents are all dead, and
the de-|uill a peny they haue left me, but a small pention, and
that I buyes me thirty meales a day, and ten Bggupjs: a small *
trifle I to suffice nature. I come of a Royall Pedigree, my
father | was a Gammon of Bacon, and my mother was 11\$

704 *Wraith*| an accidental mark makes the colon look like a semicolon.

775^a | hogs head of Claret-wine: My godfathers were these, Pe-|ter
 Pickle-herring, and Martin Martlemas-biefe, O but | my god-
 mother she was a iolly gentlewoman, and welbelo-|ued in
 euey good towne and Citie, her name was mistresse | Margery
 780 March-beere: now *Faustus*, thou hast heard all my | Progeny,
 wilt thou bid me to supper ?

Fau. No, He see thee hanged, thou wilt eate vp all my |
 victualls. *'w'

Glut. Then the diuell choake thee.

Fau. Choake thy selfe glutton: what art thou ? the sixt.

785 *Sloth.* I am sloath, I was begotten on a sunny
 banke, | where I haue laine euer since, and you haue done me
 great j iniury to bring me from thence, let me be carried thither
 a-|gaine by Gluttony and Leachery, He not speake an
 A745 other J word for a Kings raunsome.

790 *Fau.* What are you mistresse minkes? the seauenth | and
 last.

Lechery Who I sir? I am one that loues an inch of raw |
 sig. Di Mutton better then an ell of fride stock-fish, and the first | letter
 of my name beginnes with leachery.

795 Away, to hel, to hel. *exeunt the sinnes.*

Lu. Now Faustus, how dost thou like this?

Fau: O this feedes my soule.

Lu. Tut Faustus, in hel is al manner of delight.

Fau. O might I see hel, and returne againe, how happy |
 800 were I then ?

Lu. Thou shalt, I wil send for thee at midnight,
 A607 in mean | time take this booke, peruse it throwly,
 and thou shalt turne | thy selfe into what shape thou wilt.

A614 *Fau.* Great thankes mighty Lucifer,

805 this wil I keepe as | chary as my life.

A722, 736 *Lu.* Farewel Faustus, and thinke on the diuel.

Fau. Farewel great *Lucifer*, come *Mephastophilis*.

exeunt omnes.

[Sc. viii]

776 Martlemas-biefe] *hyphen, trace only.*

787 thither] *z faint.*

775 †hogs head] hogshhead A2: hogshead A3 †Claret-wine] Claret wine A2,3
 776 †Martlemas-biefe] Martlemas-beef A2 : martlemas-beef A3 781 *hanged] hang'd
 first A2,3 788 an other] another A3 802 †throwly] throughly A2,3,

The Tragical/ Historie | Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

a Hogs-head of Claret Wine. My godfathers were these: Peter-1
pickeld-herring, and Martin Martlemasse-beefe: But my god-j
mother, O she was an ancient Gentlewoman, sig. C4

her name was | Margery
March-beere: Now *Faustus* thou hast heard all my | progeny, 720
wilt thou bid me to supper ?

Faust. Not I.

Glut. Then the deuill chooke thee

Faust. Choke thy selfe Glutton: What art thou the sixt ?

Sloth. Hey ho; I am *Sloth*: I was begotten on a sunny-|
bank: ^ 725\$

hey ho: Fie not speak aB687
word more for a kings ransome. B688

Fau. And what are you Mistris Minkes, the seuenth &
last?

Letch. Who I I sir? I am one that loues an inch of raw |
Mutton, better then an ell of fryde Stockfish: and the first | letter
of my name begins with *Letchery*.

Luc. Away to hell, "" away on piper. *Ex. the 7 sinnes.* 730

Faust. O how this sight doth delight my soule.

'*Luc.* But *Faustus*, in hell is all manner of delight.

Faust. O might I see hell, and returne againe safe, how | happy
were I then.

Luc. Faustus, thou shalt, at midnight I will send for thee; 735
Meane while peruse this booke, and view it throughly, B548
And thou shalt turne thy selfe into what shape thou wilt.

Faust. Thankes mighty *Lucifer*: | B555
This will I keepe as chary as my life. B556

Luc. Now *Faustus* farewell. 740

Faust. Farewell great *Lucifer*: come *Mephostophilis*
Exeunt omnes, seuerall waxes.

Enter the Clowne.

II. in

What *Dick*, looke to the horses there till I come againe. |

717 god-] hyphen, impression defective. 722 *Glut.*] t. lost in wormhole. 727 11 |
read I (B2) 741 *Mephostophilis*] read *Mephostophilis*.

y2j Who] Who? (B2) 730 away] away, B2

A-1604
[Sc. viii]

The tragkall History of I Doctor Faustus.

949 [here I ha stolne one of doctor Faustus coniuring books J

955 [*Robin*, prethee come away, theres a Gentleman tarries to
haue his horse,]

960 [Keepe out, keep out,]

963 [Come, what doest thou with that same booke thou
canst not reade ?

961 [keepe out,
for I am about a roaring peece of worke.]

966 [he for his forehead,]

966 [she for her priuate study,]

966 [shee's borne to beare with me,]

968 [Why Robin

971 what booke is that?] [Canst thou coniure with it?]

952 [dance at my pleasure starke naked before me]

972 [I can
make thee druncke with ipocrase at any taberne in Europe
for nothing,]

982 [letts goe and]

The Tragical Historie I Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

II. iii

I haue gotten one of Doctor *Faustus* coniuring bookes, and | now 745
we'le haue such knauery, as't passes.

Enter Dick.

Dick. What *Robin*, you must come away & walk the horses.

Rob. I walke the horses, I scorn't 'faith, I haue other | matters 749
in hand, let the horses walk themselues and they will. | *A perse a,*
t. h. e the: 0 per se 0 deny orgon, gorgon: keepe | further from me
0 thou illiterate, and vnlearned Hostler.

Dick. 'Snayles, what hast thou got there a book? why thou |
canst not tell ne're a word on't. 754

Rob. That thou shalt see presently: keep out of the cir-|cle, sig. C4v
I say, least I send you into the Ostry with a vengeance. A1214

Dick. That's like 'faith: you had best leaue your foolery, |
for an my Maister come, he'le coniure you 'faith.

Rob. My Maister coniure me? I'le tell thee what, an my |
Maister come here, I'le clap as faire a paire of homes on's | head 760
as e're thou sawest in thy life.

Dick. Thou needst not do that, for my Mistresse hath
done it.

Rob. I, there be of vs here, that haue waded as deepe in-|to
matters, as other men, if they were disposed to talke.

Dick. A plague take you, I thought you did not sneake | vp 765
and downe after her for nothing. But I prethee tell me, in | good
sadsnesse *Robin*, is that a coniuring booke ?

Rob. Do but speake what thou't haue me to do, and Tie | do't:
If thou't dance naked, put off thy cloathes, and I'le | coniure thee 770
about presently: Or if thou't go but to the Ta-|uerne with me,
Tie giue thee white wine, red wine, claret f wine, Sacke, Muska-
dine, Malmesey and Whippincrust, | hold belly hold, and wee'le
not pay one peny for it.

Dick. O braue, prethee let's to it presently, for I am as | dry 774
as a dog.

Rob. Come then let's away.

Exeunt.

751 *perse* read *per se* (B2)
conjectural; lost in voornhole ?

753 there] *read there ?* (B2)

759 what,] *comma*

760 homes] *o partly lost in voornhole.*

749 horses,] horses ? B2 'faith] ifaith B2 750 and] an B2 751 *se 6*] *se o*, B2
754 not] *omit* B2 tell] *omit* B3 757 'faith] ifaith B2 758 'faith] ifaith B2
J60 as faire a] a fayre B2 772 Whippincrust] Whippincrust B2 (only) 774
prethee] I pritheee B2 776 let's] let vs B2

A-1604 *The tragkall History of | Doctor Faustus.*

Chor. i *enter Wagner solus.*

810 *Wag.* Learned Faustus,
To know the secrets of *Astronomy*,
Grauen in the booke of *hues* hie firmament,
Did mount himselfe to scale *Olympus* top,
Being seated in a chariot burning bright,
815 Drawne by the strength of yoky dragons neckes,

He now is gone to prooue *Cosmography*,

And as I guesse, wil first ariue at *Rome*,
To see the Pope, and manner of his court,
A869 And take some part of holy *Peters* feast,
820 That to this day is highly solemnizd. *exit Wagner*

Sc. vii *Enter Faustus and Mephistophilus.*

Fau. Hauing now, my good Mephistophilus,
Past with delight the stately towne of *Trier*,
Inuirond round with ayrie mountaine tops,
825 With walles of flint, and deepe intrrenched lakes,
Not to be wonne by any conquering prince,
From *Paris* next coasting the Realme of France,
Wee sawe the riuier *Maine* fall into *Rhine*,
Whose bankes are set with groues of fruitful vines.

815 by] y blotted, 820 Wagner] read Wagner.

813 himselfe] him-selfe A2 815 yoky] yoaky A3 821 Mephistophilus]
Mephistophilis A3 822 Mephistophilus] Mephistophilis A3

The Tragical! Historie | Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

Enter the Chorus.

Chor. 2

Learned *Faustus*

to find the secrets of Astronomy, |
Grauen in the booke of *hues* high firmament,
Did mount him vp to scale *Olimpus* top. 780
Where sitting in a Chariot burning bright,
Drawne by the strength of yoked Dragons neckes;
He views the cloudes, the Planets, and the Starres, ^
The Tropick, Zones, and quarters of the skye,
From the bright circle of the horned Moone, 785
Euen to the height of *Primum Mobile*: \
And whirling round with this circumference,
Within the concaue compasse of the Pole, 788
From East to West his Dragons swiftly glide, B872
And in eight daies did bring him home againe. B870
Not long he stayed within his quiet house, sig. Di
To rest his bones after his weary toyle, 792
But new exploits do hale him out agen,
And mounted then vpon a Dragons backe,
That with his wings did part the subtile aire: 795
He now is gone to proue *Cosmography*,
'That measures costs, and kingdomes of the earth:
And as I guesse will first arriue at *Rome*,
To see the Pope and manner of his Court, 799
And take some part of holy *Peters* feast, B855
The which this day is highly solemnized. *Exit.* B856

Enter Faustus and Mephostophilis.

[II. i

Faust. Hauing now my good *Mephostophilis*,
Past with delight the stately Towne of *Trier*:
Inuironed round with airy mountaine tops, 805
With wals of Flint, and deepe intrrenched Lakes,
Not to be wonne by any conquering Prince.
From *Paris* next, costing the Realme of *France*,
We saw the Riuer *Maine*, fall into *Rhines*,
Whose bankes are set with Groues of fruitfull Vines. 810

795 with] i partly lost in wormhole. aire:] read aire, (B2) 797 the earth space
doubtful. 809 *Rkines*] read *Rhine* (B3)

784 *Tropick,] Tropicke B2

A-1604 *The tragkall History of I Doctor Faustus.*

830 Then vp to *Naples*, rich *Campania*,
sig. Div Whose buildings faire and gorgeous to the eye,
The streetes straight forth, and pau'd with finest bricke,
Quarters the towne in foure equiuolence.
There sawe we learned *Maroes* golden tombe,
835 The way he cut an English mile in length,
Thorough a rocke of stone in one nights space.
From thence to *Venice*, *Padua*, and the rest,
In midst of which a sumptuous Temple stands,
That threats the starres with her aspiring toppe.

840 Thus hitherto hath Faustus spent his time,
But tell me now, what resting place is this ?
Hast thou as erst I did commaund,
Conducted me within the walles of *Rome* ?
Me. Faustus I haue,

845 and because we wil not be vnpro-|uided,
I haue taken vp his holinesse priuy chamber for | our vse.
Fau. I hope his holinesse will bid vs welcome.
Me. Tut, tis no matter man, wee be bold with his good cheare,
And now my Faustus, that thou maist perceiue
850 What *Rome* containeth to delight thee with,
Know that this Citie stands vpon seuen hilles
That vnderprops the groundworke of the same,

Ouer the which foure stately bridges leane,
That makes safe passage to each part of *Rome*.
855 Vpon the bridge calFd *Ponto Angelo*,
Erected is a Castle passing strong,
Within whose walles such store of ordonance are,
And double Canons, fram'd of carued brasse,
As match the dayes
within one compleate yeare,
860 Besides the gates and high piramides,
Which *Iulius Caesar* brought from *Africa*.

833 equiuolence] readequiuolents groundworke] k broken.

833 *foure equiuolence] forme equiuolent A3 840 hitherto] hetherto A2,3
852 vnderprops] vnder-props A3 ("groundworke] ground-worke A3 857
^ordonance] ordinance A2,3

Then vp to *Naples*, rich *Campania*,
Whose buildings faire, and gorgeous to the eye,
The streetes straight forth, and pauer with finest bricke.

There saw we learned *Maroes* golden tombe:
The way he cut an English mile in length,
Through a rocke of stone in one nights space j
From thence to *Venice*, *Padua*, and the East,
In one of which a sumptuous Temple stands,
That threates the starres with her aspiring top,
Whose frame is pauer with sundry coloured stones, 820

And roofft aloft with curious worke in gold.
Thus hitherto hath *Faustus* spent his time.
But tell me now, what resting place is this ?
Hast thou, as earst I did command,
Conducted me within the walles of *Rome* ? 825

Meph. I haue my *Faustus*, and for prooffe thereof,
This is the goodly Palace of the Pope: sig. Di^v

And cause we are no common guests,
I chuse his priuy chamber for our vse.
Faust. I hope his Holinesse will bid vs welcome. 830

Meph. All's one, for wee'l be bold with his Venson.
But now my *Faustus*, that thou maist perceiue,
What *Rome* containes for to delight thine eyes.
Know that this City stands vpon seuen hils,
That vnderprop the ground-worke of the same: 835

Iust through the midst runnes flowing *Tybers* streame,
With winding bankes that cut it in two parts;
Ouer the which two stately Bridges leane,
That make safe passage, to each part of *Rome*.
Vpon the Bridge, call'd *Ponto Angelo*, 840

Erected is a Castle passing strong,
Where thou shalt see such store of Ordinance,
As that the double Cannons forg'd of brasse,
Do watch the number of the daies contain'd,
Within the compasse of one compleat yeare: 845

Beside the gates, and high Pyramydes,
That *Iulius Casar* brought from *Africa*.

812 eye] 'e blotted. 824 command,] a dot above the comma is accidental. 831
Venson.] n. obscured. 844 watch] read match (B2)

811 †vp to] vnto B3 814 learned] learn'd B2-4 816 Through] Thorow B5
830 vs] you B3 833 eyes.] eyes: B2

Fau. Now by the kingdomes of infernall rule,
 \ Of *Styx*, *Acheron*, and the fiery lake
 of euer-burning *Fhlegiton* I sweare,
 865 That I do long to see the monuments
 And scituation of bright splendant *Rome*,
 Come therefore lets away,
 sig. D2 *Me.* Nay *Faustus* stay, I know youd faine see the Pope,
 A819 And take some part of holy *Peters* feast,
 870 Where thou shalt see a troupe of bald-pate Friers, (
 Whose *summum bonumism* belly-cheare.

The Tragical Historie | Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

Faust. Now by the Kingdomes of Infernall Rule,
Of *Stvc*, of *Acheron*, and the fiery Lake,
Of euer-burnlng *Phlegeton*, I sweare, 850
That I do long to see the Monuments
And situation of bright splendent *Rome*,
Come therefore, let's away.

Meph. Nay stay my *Faustus*: I know you'd see the Pope 854
And take some part of holy *Peters* feast, B800
The which this day with high solemnity, B801
This day is held through *Rome* and *Italy*,
In honour of the Popes triumphant victory.

Faust. Sweete *Mephosto*. thou pleasest me 860
Whilst I am here on earth: Let me be cloyd
With all things that delight the heart of man.
My foure and twenty yeares of liberty
Fie spend in pleasure and in daliance,
That *Faustus* name, whilst this bright frame doth stand, 864
May be admired through the furthest Land. sig. D2

Meph. 'Tis well said *Faustus*, come then stand by me
And thou shalt see them come immediately.

Faust. Nay stay my gentle *Mephostophilis*,
And grant me my request, and then I go. 869
Thou know'st within the compasse of eight daies, B790
We veiw'd the face of heauen, of earth and hell.
So high our Dragons soar'd into the aire, B789
That looking downe the earth appear'd to me,
No bigger then my hand in quantity.
There did we view the Kingdomes of the world, 875
And what might please mine eye, I there beheld.
Then in this shew let me an Actor be,
That this proud Pope may *Faustus* comming see.

Meph. Let it be so my *Faustus*, but first stay, 880
And view their triumphs, as they passe this way.
And then devise what best contents thy minde,
By comming in thine Art to crosse the Pope,
Or dash the pride of this solemnity;
To make his Monkes and Abbots stand like Apes,
And point like Antiques at his triple Crowne: 885

849 *Acheron*] *e* broken (resembles *c*). 866 well f aid] read well said 878 &
882 comming] read cunning (B4) 884 Apes,] a dot above the comma is accidental.

851 \$the] those B2 852 '(situation] scituation B2-4 †splendent] splendant B2-4
856 •this day with] in state and B2 859-60 me . . . earth: Let] me, .. earth let B2

A-1604
Sc. vii

The tragical! History of | Doctor Faustus.

The Tragical Historie | Of Doctor Faustus.

B-1616
III. i

To beate the beades about the Friers Pates,
Or clap huge homes, vpon the Cardinals heads:
Or any villany thou canst deuise,
And Tie performe it *Faustus*: heark they come:
This day shall make thee be admir'd in *Rome*.

890

*Enter the Cardinals and Bishops, some bearing Crosiers, some |
the Pillars, Monkes and Friers, singing their Procession: |
11 Then the Pope, and Raymond King of Hunga-ry,
" with Bruno led in chaines.*

Pope. Cast downe our Foot-stoole.

895

Ray. Saxon *Bruno* stoope,

Whilst on thy backe his hollinesse ascends
Saint *Peters* Chaire and State Pontificall.

Bru. Proud *Lucifer*, that State belongs to me:
But thus I fall to *Peter*, not to thee.

900

Pope To me and *Peter*, shalt thou groueling lie,
And crouch before the Papall dignity:
Sound Trumpets then, for thus Saint *Peters* Heire,
From *Bruno's* backe, ascends Saint *Peters* Chaire.

sig. D2^v

A Flourish while he ascends.

905

Thus, as the Gods, creepe on with feete of wool,
Long ere with Iron hands they punish men,
So shall our sleeping vengeance now arise,
And smite with death thy hated enterprise.

Lord Cardinals of *France* and *Padua*,

910

Go forth-with to our holy Consistory,
And read amongst the Statutes Decretall,
What by the holy Councill held at *Trent*,
The sacred Sinod hath decreed for him,
That doth assume the Papall gouernment,
Without election, and a true consent:

915

Away and bring vs word with speed.

1 *Card.* We go my Lord. *Exeunt Cardinals.*

Pope. Lord *Raymond*.

Faust. Go hast thee gentle *Mephostophilis*,
Follow the Cardinals to the Consistory;
And as they turne their superstitious Bookes,

920

906 Gods,] read Gods (B3) wool] 1 obscured.

889 it] omit B2

891 the] omit B2

909 'omit B2

911 our] the B2

A-164
Sc. vii

The tragkall History of | Doctor Faustus.

The Tragickall Historie | Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

Strike them with sloth, and drowsy idlenesse;
 And make them sleepe so sound, that in their shapes,
 Thy selfe and I, may parly with this Pope: 925
 This proud confronter of the Emperour,
 And in despite of all his Holinesse
 Restore this *Bruno* to his liberty,
 And beare him to the States of *Germany*,
Meph, Faustus, I goe. 930
Faust, Dispath it soone,
 The Pope shall curse that *Faustus* came to *Rome*,
Exit Faustus and Meph,
Bruno, Pope *Adrian* let me haue some right of Law,
 I was elected by the Emperour. 935
Pope, We will depose the Emperour for that deed,
 And curse the people that submit to him;
 Both he and thou shalt stand excommunicate,
 And interdict from Churches priuiledge, sig. D3
 And all society of holy men: 940
 He growes to prowd in his authority,
 Lifting his loftiehead aboue the clouds,
 And like a Steeple ouer-peeres the Church.
 But wee'le pul downe his haughty insolence:
 And as Pope *Alexander* our Progenitour, 945
 Trode on the neck of *Germane Fredericke*,
 Adding this golden sentence to our praise;
 That *Peters* heires should tread on Emperours,
 And walke vpon the dreadfull Adders backe,
 Treading the Lyon, and the Dragon downe. 950
 And fearelesse spurne the killing Basiliske:
 So will we quell that haughty Schismaticque;
 And by authority Apostolicall
 Depose him from his Regall Gouernment.
Bru, Pope *Iulius* swore to Princely *Sigismond*, 955
 For him, and the succeeding Popes of *Rome*,
 To hold the Emperours their lawfull Lords.
Pope, Pope *Iulius* did abuse the Churches Rites,
 And therefore none of his Decrees can stand.
 Is not all power on earth bestowed on vs? 960
 And therefore tho we would we cannot erre.

931 Dispath] read Dispatch
 read downe, (B5)

942 loftiehead] readloftivt, head

950 downe.]

925 this] the B2

A-1604
Sc. vii

The tragkall History of | Doctor Faustus.

The Tragcall Historie | Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

Behold this Siluer Belt whereto is fixt
Seuen golden seales fast sealed with seuen seales,
In token of our seuen-fold power from heauen,
To binde or loose, lock fast, condemne, or iudge, 965
Resigne, or seale, or what so pleaseth vs.
Then he and thou, and all the world shall stoope,
Or be assured of our dreadfull curse,
To light as heauy as the paines of hell.

Enter Faustus and Mephosto. like the Cardinals. 970

Meph. Now tell me *Faustus*, are we not fitted well ?

Faust. Yes *Mephosto.* and two such Cardinals
Ne're seru'd a holy Pope, as we shall do.
But whilst they sleepe within the Consistory, 974
Let vs salute his reuerend Father-hood. sig. D3^v

Ray. Behold my Lord, the Cardinals are return'd.

Pope. Welcome graue Fathers, answere presently,
What haue our holy Councell there decreed,
Concerning *Bruno* and the Emperour,
In quittance of their late conspiracie 980
Against our State, and Papall dignitie ?

Faust. Most sacred Patron of the Church of *Rome*,
By full consent of all the Synod
Of Priests and Prelates, it is thus decreed:
That *Bruno*, and the Germane Emperour 985
Be held as Lollords, and bold Schismatiques,
And proud disturbers of the Churches peace.

And if that *Bruno* by his owne assent,
Without inforcement of the German Peeres,
Did seeke to weare the triple Dyadem, 990
And by your death to clime S. *Peters* Chaire.,
The Statutes Decretall haue thus decreed,
He shall be streight condemn'd of heresie,
And on a pile of Fagots burnt to death.

Pope. It is enough: here, take him to your charge, 995
And beare him streight to *Ponto Angelo*,
And in the strongest Tower inclose him fast,
To morrow, sitting in our Consistory,

991 Chaire.,] read Chaire,

963 teales] scales B3

Fau. Well, I am content, to compasse then some sport,
And by their folly make vs merriment. |
Then charme me
that I may be inuisible,
875 to do what I J please vnseene of any whilst I stay in Rome.

872 then] ?read them

The Tragical Historie | Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

With all our Colledge of graue Cardinals,
We will determine of his life or death. 1000

Here, take his triple Crowne along with you,
And leaue it in the Churches treasury.
Make haste againe, my good Lord Cardinals,
And take our blessing Apostolicall

Meph. So, so, was neuer Diuell thus blest before. 1005

Faust. Away sweet *Mephosto*, be gone,
The Cardinals will be plagu'd for this anon. *Ex. Fa. & Mep.*

Pope. Go presently, and bring a banket forth,
That we may solemnize S. *Peters* feast,
And with Lord *Raymond*, King of Hungary, 1010
Drinke to our late and happy victory. *Exeunt.*

*A Senit while the Banquet is brought in; and then Enter |
Faustus and Mephastophilis in their owne | shapes.*

III. ii
•
as78^D

Meph. Now *Faustus*, come prepare thy selfe for mirth, 1015
The sleepy Cardinals are hard at hand,
To censure *Bruno*, that is posted hence,
And on a proud pac'd Steed, as swift as thought,
Flies ore the Alpes to fruitfull Germany,
There to salute the wofull Emperour. 1020

Faust. The Pope will curse them for their sloth to day.
That slept both *Bruno* and his crowne away,
But now, that *Faustus* may delight his minde,
And by their folly make some merriment,
Sweet *Mephasto*: so charme me here, 1025
That I may walke inuisible to all,
And doe what ere I please, vnseene of any.

Meph. *Faustus* thou shalt, then kneele downe presently,
Whilst on thy head I lay my hand,
And charme thee with this Magicke wand, 1030
First weare this girdle, then appeare
Inuisible to all are here:
The Planets seuen, the gloomy aire,
Hell and the Furies forked haire,
Pluto's blew fire, and Hecafs tree, 1035
With Magicke spels so compasse thee,
That no eye may thy body see.

1021 day.] read fay, (B2)

1001 his] this B3

1028 *Meph.*] omit B2 (only: line indented)

A-16∞4

The tragicall History of | Doctor Faustus.

Sc. vii

Me. So Faustus, now
877 do what thou wilt, thou shalt not | be discerned.

B1012

Sound a Sonnet, enter the Pope and the Cardinall of

B1046

Lorraine \ to the banket, with Friers attending.

880 *Pope* My Lord of *Lorraine*, wilt please you draw neare.

876 *Me.*] period, trace only.

878 *Sonnet*] *Sinet* A2,3 **Hhe*| omit A2,3

The Tragicall Historie | Of Doctor Faustus.

B-1616
III. ii

So *Faustus*^ now for all their holinesse,
Do what thou wilt, thou shalt not be discern'd.

Faust, Thankes *Mephosto*: now Friers take heed,
Lest *Faustus* make your shauen crownes to bleed.

1040

Meph, *Faustus* no more: see where the Cardinals come.

*Enter Pope and all the Lords, Enter the Cardinals |
with a Booke,*

Pope, Welcome Lord Cardinals: come sit downe.
Lord *Raymond*, take your seate, Friers attend,
And see that all things be in readinesse,
As best beseemes this solemne festiuall.

104
A879 sig. D4^v

1. *Card*, First, may it please your sacred Holinesse,
To view the sentence of the reuerend Synod,
Concerning *Bruno* and the Emperour.

1050

Pope, What needs this question? Did I not tell you,
To morrow we would sit i'th Consistory,
And there determine of his punishment?
You brought vs word euen now, it was decreed,
That *Bruno* and the cursed Emperour
Were by the holy Councell both condemn'd
For lothed Lollords, and base Schismatiques:
Then wherefore would you haue me view that booke?

1055

1. *Card*, Your Grace mistakes, you gaue vs no such charge. 1060

Ray, Deny it not, we all are witnesses
That *Bruno* here was late deliuered you,
With his rich triple crowne to be reseru'd,
And put into the Churches treasury.

Amb, *Card*, By holy *Paul* we saw them not.

1065

Pope, By *Peter* you shall dye,
Vnlesse you bring them forth immediatly:
Hale them to prison, lade their limbes with gyues:
False Prelates, for this hatefull treachery,
Curst be your soules to hellish misery.

1070

Faust, So, they are safe: now *Faustus* to the feast,
The Pope had neuer such a frolicke guest.

Pope, Lord Archbishop of *Reames*, sit downe with vs.

Bish, I thanke your Holinesse.

A104 *The tragical/ History of J Doctor Faustus.*

Sc. vii

Fau. Fall too, and the, diuel choake you and you spare.

Pope How now, whose that which spake? Friers looke | about.

Fri. Heere's no body, if it like your Holynesse.

885 *Pope.* My Lord, here is a daintie dish was
sent me from | the Bishop of *Millaine*.

Fau. I thanke you sir. *Snatch it.*

Pope. How now, whose that which snatcht the meate | from me?
will no man looke? |

890 My Lord, this dish
was sent me from the Cardinall of Flo-|rence.

Fau. You say true, He hate.

Pope. What againe? my Lord He drinke to your grace

Fau. He pledge your grace.

895 *Lor.* My Lord, it may be some ghost
newly crept out of | Purgatory come to begge
a pardon of your holinesse.

Pope It may be so,

Friers prepare a dirge
to lay the fury | of this ghost,
once againe my Lord fall too.

The Pope crosseth himselfe.

900 *Fau.* What, are you crossing of your selfe?
We ll vse that tricke no more, I would aduise you.

Crosse againe.

Fau. Well, theres the second time, aware the third, |
904 I giue you faire warning.

sig. D2^v *Crosse againe, and Faustus hits him a hoxe oj the eare, *

and they all runne away.

893 grace] read grace.

888 whose] who's A3

899 himselfe] him-selfe Ki

903 theres] ther's A2,3

905 *of] on Aa,3

The Tragcall Histork J Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

III. ii

Faust. Fall to, the Diuell choke*you an you spare. 1075

Pope. Who's that spoke? Friers looke about, .

Lord *Raymond* pray fall too, I am beholding
To the Bishop of Millaine, for this so rare a present.

Faust. I thanke you sir.

Pope. How now? who snatch't the meat from me! | 1080

Villaines why speake you not? |
My good Lord Archbishop, heres a most daintie dish,
Was sent me from a Cardinall in France.

Faust. Fie haue that too. sig. Ei

Pope. What Lollards do attend our Hollinesse, 1085

That we receiue such great indignity? fetch me some wine.

Faust. I, pray do, for *Faustus* is a dry.

Pope. Lord *Raymond*[^] I drink vnto your grace.

Faust. I pledge your grace.

Pope. My wine gone too? yee Lubbers look about 1090

And find the man that doth this villany,
Or by our sanctitude you all shall die.
I pray my Lords haue patience at this
Troublesome banquet.

Bisk. Please it your holinesse, I thinke it be some Ghost | 1095
crept out of Purgatory, and now is come vnto
your holi-nesse for his pardon.

Pope. It may be so:

Go then command our Priests to sing a Dirge,
To lay the fury of this same troublesome ghost. 1100

Faust. How now? must euery bit be spiced with a Crosse?

Nay then take that.

Pope. O I am slaine, help me my Lords:
O come and help to beare my body hence:
Damb'd be this soule for euer, for this deed.

Exeunt the Pope and his traine.

1087 a dry] read&diy

1088 *Kaymond*] read *Raymond* (B2)

1081 you] ye B2

1092 you] ye B2

1095 'it] omit B2

1105 •'this] his B2

1106 *the*] omit B2

The Tragical! Histone Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

III. ii

Me, Now *Faustus*, what will you do now ? for I can tell you |
You'le be curst with Bell, Booke, and
Candle.

Faust, Bell, Booke, and Candle; Candle, Booke, and Bell,
Forward and backward, to curse *Faustus* to hell. mo

*Enter the Friers with Bell, Booke, and Candle, *
for the Dirge,

1 *Frier,* Come brethren, let's about our businesse with | good
deuotion.

Cursed be he that stole his holinesse meate from 1115
*the Table, \ Maledicat Dominus, *

Cursed be he that stroke his holinesse a blow the face,
Maledicat Dominus,

Cursed be he that strucke fryer Sandelo a blow on the pate.

sig. Ei*

Maledicat Dom,

1120

Cursed be he that disturbeth our holy Dirge,

Maledicat Dom,

Cursed be he that tooke away his holinesse wine.

Maledicat Dom,

Beate the Friers, fling fire worke among them, |
and *Exeunt,* *Exeunt.*

1125

1117 *blow*] read *blow on* (B2)

1125 †*fire worke*] *iire-workes* B2

A-1604 *The tragicall History of I Doctor Faustus.*

Chor. 2

sig. D3 Which *Faustus* answerd with such learned skill,

941 As they admirde and wondred at his wit.

Now is his fame spread forth in euey land,

" Amongst the rest the Emperour is one,

Carolus the fift, at whose pallace now

945 *Faustus* is feasted mongst his noblemen.

What there he did in triall of his art,

I leaue vntold, your eyes shall see performd.

Exit.*

Sc. viii *Enter Robin the Ostler with a booke in his hand*

Robin O this is admirable! here I ha stolne one of doctor |
950 *Faustus* coniuring books, and ifaith I meane to search some j
circles for my owne vse: now wil I make al the maidens in |
parish dance at my pleasure starke naked before me, and | so by
that meanes I shal see more then ere I felt, or saw yet.

Enter Rafe calling Robin.

955 *Rafe Robin*, prethee come away, theres a Gentleman | tarries
to haue his horse, and he would haue his things rubd | and made
cleane: he keepest such a chafing with my mistris | about it, and
she has sent me to looke thee out, prethee come | away.

960 *Robin* Keepe out, keep out, or else you are blowne vp, you |
are dismembred *Rafe*, keepe out, for I am about a roaring | peece
of worke.

Rafe Come, what doest thou with that same booke thou |
canst not reade?

965 *Robin* Yes, my maister and mistris shal finde that I can | reade,
he for his forehead, she for her priuate study, shee's | borne to
beare with me, or else my Art failes.

Rafe Why *Robin* what booke is that?

Robin What booke? why the most intolerable booke for |
970 coniuring that ere was inuented by any brimstone diuel.

Rafe Canst thou coniure with it?

Robin I can do al these things easily with it: first, I can | make

941 wondred] e broken. 945 noblemen] possibly noble men 948 hand] read
hand. 949 admirable] e trace only. here] 'e trace only.

942 *his] the A3 945 *mongst] amongst A2,3 noblemen] Noble men A2,3
946] *omit A2,3 951 *my] mine A2,3 *wil I] I will A3 955 theres] there's
A2,3 963 *that] the A2,3 966 forehead] fore-head A2,3

The Tragkall Historie I Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

[cf. II. iii]

[II. iii]

- 745 [I haue gotten one
of Doctor *Faustus* coniuring bookes,]
- 769 [I f thou't dance naked,]
- 748 [*Dick.* What *Robin*, you must come away & walk
the horses.]
- 751 [keepe further from me]
- 755 [keep out of the circle, I say,
least I send you into the Ostry with a vengeance.]
- 753 [*Dick.* 'Snayles, what hast thou got there a book?
why thou canst not tell ne're a word on't.]
- 760 [a paire of homes on's head]
- 763 [haue waded as deepe into matters,] [sneake vp and
765 downe after her]
- 765 [in good sadnesse *Robin*, is that
a coniuring booke?]

A-1604 *The tragical/ History of | Doctor Faustus.*

Sc. viii

thee druncke with ipocrase at any taberne in Europe | for nothing,
thats one of my coniuering workes.

975 *Rafe* Our maister Parson sayes thats nothing.

Robin True *Rafe*, and more *Rafe*, if thou hast any mind |
sig. D3^v to *Nan Spit* our kitchin maide, then turne her and wind hir j
to thy owne use, as often as thou wilt, and at midnight.

979 *Rafe* O braue *Robin*, shal I haue *Nan Spit*, and to mine | owne
vse? On that condition He feede thy diuel with horse-| bread as
long as he Hues, of free cost.

Robin No more sweete *Rafe*, lets goe and make cleane | our
bootes which lie foule vpon our handes, and then to our | con-
iuering in the diuels name. *exeunt.*

Sc.ix *Enter Robin and Rafe with a siluer Goblet.*

986 *Robin* Come *Rafe*, did not I tell thee, we were for euer | made
by this doctor Faustus booke? *ecce signurn*, heeres a sim-|ple
purchase for horse-keepers, our horses shal eate no hay as | long
as this lasts.

enter the Vintner. |

990 *Rafe* But *Robin*, here comes the vintner.

Robin Hush, lie gul him supernaturally: Drawer, I | hope al
is payd, God be with you, come *Rafe*.

Vintn. Soft sir, a word with you, I must yet haue a gob-|let
payde from you ere you goe.

995 *Robin* I a goblet *Rafe*, I a goblet? I scorne you:
and you | are but a &c. I a goblet? search me.

Vintn. I meane so sir with your fauor.

Robin How say you now?

Vintner I must say somewhat to your fellow, you sir.

1000 *Rafe* Me sir, me sir, search your fill: now sir, you may be |
ashamed to burden honest men with a matter of truth.

Vintner Wei, tone of you hath this goblet about you.

B1151 *Ro.* You lie Drawer, tis afore me: sirra you, He teach ye | to
1005 impeachonest men: stand by, He scowre you for a goblet, | stand

1001 honest] *e faint.*

1004 impeachonest] *read impeach honest*

973 ^taberne] Tauerne A2,3

975 thats] that's A2

977 *her] *omit* A 2,3

978 *thy] thine A2,3

987 heeres] her's A2,3

770 [go but to the Tauerne with me, Fie giue thee ... Whippin-
crust, hold belly hold, and wee'll not pay one peny for it.]

774

[let's to it presently.]

Enter Clowne and Dicke, with a Cup,

III. in

Dick. Sirra *Robin*, we were best looke that your deuill | can
answere the stealing of this same cup, for the Vintners | boy 1130
followes vs at the hard heeles.

Rob. 'Tis no matter, let him come; an he follow vs, Fie so |
coniure him, as he was neuer coniu'r'd in his life, I warrant | him:
let me see the cup.

Enter Vintner.

Dick. Here 'tis: Yonder he comes: Now *Robin*, now or | neuer 1135
shew thy cunning.

1 *Vint.* O, are you here? I am glad I haue found you, you |
are a couple of fine companions: pray where's the cup you | stole
from the Tauerne?

Rob. How, how? we steale a cup? take heed what you say, | 1140
we looke not like cup-stealers I can tell you.

Vint. Neuer deny't, for I know you haue it, and Fie | search
you.

Rob. Search me? I and spare not: hold the cup *Dick*, | come, "44
come, search me, search me.

Vint. Come on sirra, let me search you now.

Dick. I, I, do, do, hold the cup *Robin*, I feare not your |
searching; we sorne to steale your cups I can tell you.

1148 searching] e blotted.

1131 an] and B2

A-1604 *The tragcall History of I Doctor Faustus.*

Sc. ix

aside you had best, I charge you in the name of Belza-|bub: lookej
to the goblet *Rafe*.

Vintner what meane you sirra ?

Robin He tel you what I meane. *He reads.* \

Sanctobulorum Periphrastricon: nay He tickle you *Vintner*, |

1010 looke to the goblet *Rafe, Polypragmos Belseborams jramanto*
pa-\costiphos tostu Mephastophilis, &c.

*Enter Mephastophilis: sets squibs at their baches: *
they runne about.

sig. D4 *Vintner* O nomine *Domine*^ what meanst thou *Robin*} thou |
1015 hast no goblet.

Rafe Peccatum peccatorum> heeres thy goblet, good
Vint-|ner.

Robin Misericordia pro nobis, what shal I doe? good diuel |
forgiue me now, and He neuer rob thy Library more.

1020 *Enter to them Meph.*

Meph. Vanish vilaines, th'one like an Ape, an other like | a
Beare, the third an Asse, for doing this enterprise.

Monarch of hel,

vnder whose blacke suruey

Great Potentates do kneele with awful feare,

1025 Vpon whose altars thousand soules do lie,

How am I vexed with these vilaines charmes ?

From *Constantinople* am I hither come,

Onely for pleasure of these damned slaues.

Robin How, from *Constantinople*} you haue had a great |
1030 iourney, wil you take sixe pence in your purse to pay for your j
supper, and be gone ?

1021 th'one] *apostrophe, trace only.*

1005-6 Belzabub] Belzebub A3 1009 *Sanctobulorum*] *Sanctabulorum* A2,3 1012
Mephastophilis] *Mephastophilis* A2,3 1014 meanst] meanest A2,3 1016 heeres]
heer's A3 1020 ‡*Meph.*] *Mephastophilis.* A3 1021 an other] another A3
1023 Monarch] Monarke A2,3 1026 *these] this A2,3 1027 hither] hether A3

The Tragical/ Historie I Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

Vint. Neuer out face me for the matter, for sure the cup is |
betweene you two. 1150

Rob. Nay there you lie, 'tis beyond vs both. A1003

Vint. A plague take you, I thought 'twas your knauery | to sig. E2
take it away: Come, giue it me againe.

Rob. I much, when can you tell: *Dick*, make me a cir-iclcle, and 1154
stand close at *my* backe, and stir not for thy life, *Vint*\ner you
shall haue your cup anon, say nothing *Dick*: *O per \ se O*,
demogorgon. Belcher and *Mephostophilis*.

Enter Mephostophilis.

Meph. You Princely Legions of infernall Rule,

How am I vexed by these villaines Charmes? 1160
From *Constantinople* haue they brought me now,
Onely for pleasure of these damned slaues.

Rob. By Lady sir, you haue had a shroud iourney of it, |
will it please you to take a shoulder of Mutton to supper, and j
a Tester in your purse, and go backe againe. 1165

Dick. I, I pray you heartily sir; for wee cal'd you but in | ieast
I promise you.

1154 when ... tell:] *read* when, ... tell ?

1165 againe.] *read* againe ?

1157 **demogorgoti*] *Demigorgon* B2

A-1604 The *tragkall History of* | *Doctor Faustus*.

Me. wel villaines, for your presumption, I transforme | thee
into an Ape, and thee into a Dog, and so be gone. *exit.*

Rob. How, into an Ape ? thats braue, He haue fine sport | with
the boyes, He get nuts and apples enow.

Raje And I must be a Dogge. *exeunt.*

Robin Ifaith thy head wil neuer be out of the potage pot.

The Tragical/ Historie I Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

Meph. To purge the rashnesse of this cursed deed,
First, be thou turned to this vgly shape,
For Apish deeds transformed to an Ape. 1170

Rob. O braue, an Ape? I pray sir, let me haue the carry-|ing
of him about to shew some trickes.

Meph. And so thou shalt: be thou transformed to a dog, and |
carry him vpon thy backe; away be gone.

Rob. A dog? that's excellent: let the Maids looke well to | 1175
their porridge-pots, for Fie into the Kitchin presently: come j
Dicky come. *Exeunt the two Clownes.*

Meph. Now with the flames of euer-burning fire,
Fie wing my selfe and forth-with flie amaine
Vnto my *Faustus* to the great Turkes Court. *Exit.* 1180

Enter Martino, and Frederick at seuerall dores. IV. i

Mart. What ho, Officers, Gentlemen,
Hye to the presence to attend the Emperour,
Good *Fredericke* see the roomes be voyded straight, 1184
His Maiesty is comming to the Hall;
Go backe, and see the State in readinesse. sig.^{E2v}

Fre. But where is *Bruno* our elected Pope,
That on a furies back came post from *Rome*,
Will not his grace consort the Emperour.

Mart. O yes, and with him comes the *Germane* Coniurer. 1190
The learned *Faustus*, fame of *Wittenberge*,
The wonder of the world for Magick Art;
And he intends to shew great *Carolus*,
The race of all his stout progenitors;
And bring in presence of his Maiesty, 1195
The royall shapes and warlike semblances
Of *Alexander* and his beauteous Paramour.

Fre. Where is *Benuolio* ?

Mart. Fast a sleepe I warrant you,
He took his rouse with stopes of Rhennish wine, 1200
So kindly yesternight to *Bruno's* health,
That all this day the sluggard keeps his bed.

Fre. See, see his window's ope, we'l call to him.

Mart. What hoe, *Benuolio*.

1189 Emperour.] read Emperour? (B2) 1190 Coniurer.] read Coniurer, (B2)

1196 *warlike] perfect B2

The Tragical Historie | Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

Enter Benuolio aboute at a window, 1205
in his I nightcap: buttoning.

Benu. What a deuill ayle you two?

Mar. Speak softly sir, least the deuill heare you:

For *Faustus* at the Court is late arriu'd,
And at his heeles a thousand furies waite, 1210
To accomplish what soeuer the Doctor please.

Benu. What of this?

Mar. Come leaue thy chamber first, and thou shalt see
This Coniurer performe such rare exploits,
Before the Pope snd royall Emperour, 1215
As neuer yet was seene in *Germany*.

Benu. Has not the Pope enough of coniuring yet?
He was vpon the deuils backe late enough;
And if he be so farre in loue with him, 1219
I would he would post with him to *Rome* againe. sig. E3

Fred. Speake, wilt thou come and see this sport ?

Ben. Not I.

Mar. Wilt thou stand in thy Window, and see it then ?

Ben. I, and I fall not asleepe i'th meane time.

Mar. The Emperour is at hand, who comes to see 1225
What wonders by blacke spels may compast be.

Ben. Well, go you attend the Emperour: I am content | for
this once to thrust my head out at a window: for they say, | if
a man be drunke ouer night, the Diuell cannot hurt him in | the 1230
morning: if that bee true, I haue a charme in my head, | shall
controule him as well as the Coniurer, I warrant you. |

Exit.

A Senit. Charles the Germane Emperour, Bruno, | Saxony, IV. ii
Faustus, Mephostophilis, Frede-ricke Martino, and Attendants.

Emp. Wonder of men, renown'd Magitian, 1237
Thrice learned *Faustus*, welcome to our Court.

This deed of thine, in setting *Bruno* free
From his and our professed enemy, 1240
Shall adde more excellence vnto thine Art,
Then if by powerfull Neromantick spels,

1213 shalt] t blotted {resembles f}. 1215 snd] {short 8} read and 1223 *Mar.*] period
doubtful. 1234-5 *Fredericke*] read *Fredericke*, (B2)

1210 *a] ten B2

The tragicall History of I Doctor Faustus.

that thou let me see some prooffe of thy J skil, that mine eies may
be witnesses to confirme what mine | eares haue heard reported,
and here I sweare to thee, by the | honor of mine Imperial crowne,
1049 that what euer thou doest, [thou shalt be no wayes preiudiced or
indamaged.

B1261 *Knight* Ifaith he lookes much like a coniuurer. *aside.*

sig. D4^v *Fau.* My gracious Soueraigne, though I must confesse | my
selfe farre inferior to the report men haue published, and | nothing
answerable to the honor of your Imperial maiesty, | yet for that
1055 loue and duty bindes me therevnto, I am con-|tent*to do what-
soeuer your maiesty shall command mp.

Em. Then doctor Faustus, mkrke what I shall say, As | I was
sometime solitary set, within my Closet, sundry | thoughts arose,
about the honour of mine auncestors, howe | they had wonne by
1060 prowesse such exploits, gote such riches, | subdued so many
kingdomes, as we that do succede, or they | that shal hereafter
possesse our throne, shal (I feare me) ne-|uer attaine to that degree
of high renowne and great autho-|ritie, amongst which kings is
*Alexander*the great, chiefe | spectacle of the worldes prehemince,)

1065 The bright shining of whose glorious actes
Lightens the world with his reflecting beames,
As when I heare but motion made of him,
It grieues my soule I neuer saw the man :
If therefore thou, by cunning of thine Art,

1070 Canst raise this man from hollow vaults below,
B1264 where lies intombde this famous Conquerour,
B1272 And bring with him his beauteous Paramour,¹

Both in their right shapes, gesture, and attire
They vse to weare during their time of life,
1075 Thou shalt both satisfie my iust desire,

And giue me cause to praise thee whilst I Hue.

Fau. My gracious Lord, I am ready to accomplish your |
request, so farre forth as by art and power of my spirit I am |
1079 able to performe.

B1278 *Knight* Ifaith thats iust nothing at all. *aside.*

Fau. But if it like your Grace, it is not in my abilitie to | present
before your eyes, the true substantiall bodies of those | two
deceased princes which long since are consumed to dust.

1074 vsde] d broken.

1080 Ifaith] f broken.

1046 *mine] my A2,3 1052 *men]ofmen A3 1055 *whatsoever] what A2,3 1057
*sometime] sometimes A3 1063 amongst] amongst A2,3 1066 & 1072 **omitA2,2

The Tragicall Historie I Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

IV. ii

Thou couldst command the worlds obedience:

For euer be belou'd of *Carolus*.

And if this *Bruno* thou hast late redeem'd, 1245

In peace possesse the triple Diadem,

And sit in *Peters* Chaire, despite of chance,

Thou shalt be famous through all *Italy*,

And honour'd of the Germane Emperour.

Faust, These gracious words, most royall *Carolus*, 1250

Shall make poore *Faustus* to his vtmost power,

Both loue and serue the Germane Emperour,

And lay his life at holy *Bruno's* feet.

For prooffe whereof, if so your Grace be pleas'd, 1254

The Doctor stands prepaid, by power of Art, sig. E3^v

To cast his Magicke charmes, that shall pierce through

The Ebon gates of euer-burning hell,

And hale the stubborne Furies from their caues,

To compasse whatsoere your grace commands.

Ben, Bloud he speakes terribly: but for all that, I doe not | 1260

greatly beleuee him, he lookes as like Coniurer as the Pope to | A1050

a Coster-monger.

Emp, Then *Faustus* as thou late didst promise vs,

We would behold that famous Conquerour, A1071

Great *Alexander*, and his Paramour, 1265

In their true shapes, and state Maiesticall,

That we may wonder at their excellence.

Faust, Your Maiesty shall see them presently,

Mephosto away. A1097

And with a solemne noyse of trumpets sound, 1270

Present before this royall Emperour,

Great *Alexander* and his beauteous Paramour. A1072

Meph, *Faustus* I will.

Ben, Wei I M. Doctor, an your Diuels come not away | quickly, 1274

you shall haue me asleepe presently: zounds I could | eate my

selfe for anger, to thinke I haue beene such an Asse | all this

while, to stand gaping after the diuels Gouvernor, and | can see

nothing. A1080

Faust, Il'e make you feele something anon, if my Art faile |

me not. | 1280

1268-9 presently, ... away.] read presently. . .. away,

1274 We11] razafWell

1250 These] Those B2 1261 like] like a B2 1269 *Mephosto*] *Mephostophilis* B2

1271 this] the B2 1274 an] and B2

A-1604 *The tragkall History of Doctor Faustus.*

Sc. x

1084 *Knight* I mary master doctor, now theres a signe of grace | in
you, when you will confesse the trueth. *aside.*

Fau: But such spirites as can liuely resemble *Alexander* | and
sig. Ei his Paramour, shal appeare before your Grace, in that | manner
that they best liu'd in, in their most flourishing estate, | which I
1090 doubt not shal sufficiently content your Imperiall f maiesty.

Em Go to maister Doctor, let me see them presently.

Kn. Do you heare maister Doctor? you bring *Alexander* |
B1287-8 and his paramour before the emperor?

1094 *Fau.* How then sir?

B1290 *Kn.* Ifaith thats as true as *Diana* turnd me to a stag.

B1288-9 *Fau:* No sir, but when *Acteon* died, he left the homes for |you:
B1269 *Mephistophilis* be gone. *exit Meph.*

Kn. Nay, and you go to coniuring, He be gone. *exit Kn:*

Fau. He meete with you anone for interrupting me so: | j
1100 heere they are my gracious Lord.

Enter Meph: with Alexander

and his paramour. |

B1310ff. *emp.* Maister Doctor, I heard this Lady while she liu'd | had
a wart or moale in her necke, how shal I know whether | it be so
or no ?

B1314 *Fau:* Your highnes may boldly go and see. *exit Alex:*

1106 *emp:* Sure these are no spirites, but the true substantiall |
bodies of those two deceased princes.

1091 *Em*) read *Em.*
trace only.

1096 sir,] *comma faint.* 1102 liu'd] *apostrophe,*

1084 master] maister A2,3 theres] ther's A2,3
or wart A2,3 1107 *those] these A2,3

1103 *wart or moale] moale

The Tragical Historic \ Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

IV. ii

My Lord, I must forewarne your Maiesty,
That when my Spirits present the royall shapes
Of *Alexander* and his Paramour,
Your grace demand no questions of the King,
But in dumbe silence let them come and goe. 1285

Emp. Be it as *Faustus* please, we are content.

Ben. I, I, and I am content too: and thou bring *Alexander*
and his Paramour before the Emperour, Il'e be *Acte-on*, andA1092-3
turne my selfe to a Stagge. A1096

Faust. And Il'e play *Diana*, and send you the homes pre-| A1095
sently. 1291

Senit. Enter at one the Emperour *Alexander*, at the other | *Darius*; sig. E4
they meete, *Darius* is throwne downe, *Alexan-der* kils him; takes off
his Crowne, and offering to goe \ out, his Paramour meetes him, he 1295
embraceth her, and \ sets *Darius* Crowne vpon her head; and com-\
mig backe, both salute the Emperour, | who leauing his State, offers
to ern-brace them, which *Faustus* seeing, \ suddenly staires him. 1300
Then trum-pets cease, and Musicke \ sounds.

My gracious Lord, you doe forget your selfe,
These are but shadowes, not substantiall.

Emp. O pardon me, my thoughts are so rauished 1305
With sight of this renowned Emperour,
That in mine armes I would haue compast him.

But *Faustus*, since I may not speake to them,
To satisfie my longing thoughts at full, 1309
Let me this tell thee: I haue heard it said, Auo2ff.
That this faire Lady, whilst she liu'd on earth,
Had on her necke a little wart, or mole;
How may I proue that saying to be true?

Faust. Your Maiesty may boldly goe and see. A1105

Emp. *Faustus* I see it plaine, 1315

1290 Il'e] *apostrophe, trace only.* 1296-7 *commig]* read *canning* (B2)

1292 *one] *one dore* B2

1304 These] *They* B2

1311 whilst] *while* B2

Fan: wilt please your highnes now to send for the knight | that
was so pleasent with me here of late ?

mo *emp:* One of you call him foorth.

Enter the Knight with a paire of homes on his head.

emp. How now sir knight? why I had thought thou | hadst
beene a batcheler, but now I see thou hast a wife, that | not only
1115 giues thee homes, but makes thee weare them, feele | on thy head.

Kn: Thou damned wretch, and execrable dogge,

Bred in the concaue of some monstrous rocke:

How darst thou thus abuse a Gentleman ?

B1338 Vilaine I say, vndo what thou hast done.

sig. Eiv *Fan:* O not so fast sir, theres no haste but good, are you |
1121 remembred how you crossed me in my conference with the |
emperour ? I thinke I haue met with you for it.

emp: Good Maister Doctor,

1108 *Fau:*] catchword *Faustus*

1109 *here] omit A2,3

n1120theres] ther's A2,3

The Tragical Historie I Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

And in this sight thou better pleasest me,
Then if I gain'd another Monarchic

Faust, Away, be gone. *Exit Show,*

See, see, my gracious Lord, what strange beast is yon, that |
thrusts his head out at window. 1320

Emp, O wondrous sight: see Duke of *Saxony*,
Two spreading homes most strangely fastened
Vpon the head of yong *Benvolio*.

Sax, What is he asleepe, or dead ?

Faust, He sleeps my Lord, but dreames not of his homes. 1325

Emp, This sport is excellent: wee'l call and wake him. |
What ho, *Benvolio*,

Ben, A plague vpon you, let me sleepe a while. sig. E4^v

Emp, I blame thee not to sleepe much, hauing such a head |
of thine owne. 133^o

Sax, Looke vp *Benvolio*, tis the Emperour calls.

Ben, The Emperour ? where ? O zounds my head.

Emp, Nay, and thy homes hold, tis no matter for thy | head,
for that's arm'd sufficiently.

Faust, Why how now sir Knight, what hang'd by the | homes ? 1335
this most horrible: fie, fie, pull in your head for shame, | let not
all the world wonder at you.

Ben, Zounds Doctor, is this your villany? A1119

Faust, O say not so sir: the Doctor has no skill,
No Art, no cunning, to present these Lords, 1340
Or bring before this royall Emperour
The mightie Monarch, warlicke *Alexander*,
If *Faustus* do it, you are streight resolu'd,
In bold *Acteons* shape to turne a Stagge.

And therefore my Lord, so please your Maiesty, 1345
IFe raise a kennelll of Hounds shall hunt him so,
As all his footmanship shall scarce preuaile,
To keepe his Carkasse from their bloody phangs.

Ho, *Belimote*, *Argiron*, *Asterote*,

Ben, Hold, hold: zounds hee'l raise vp a kennell of Diuels | 135^o
I thinke anon: good my Lord intreate for me: 'sbloud I am |
neuer able to endure these torments.

Emp, Then good M. Doctor,

1333 matter] tte *obscured*. 1346 kennell] *read kennell*

1320 *at] at the B2 1336 *this] this is B2 1338 is this . . . villany?] this
is . . . villany. B4 (only) 1347 As] And B2,5: That 83,4

A-1604 *The tragicall History of | Doctor Faustus.*

Sc. x

at my intreaty release him, |
he hath done penance sufficient.

1125 *Fau:* My Gracious Lord, not so much for the iniury hee |
offerd me heere in your presence, as to delight you
with some | mirth, hath *Faustus* worthily requited this iniurious
knight, I which being all I desire, I am content to release him of
his I homes: and sir knight, hereafter speake well of Scholers: |
1130 *Mephistophilis*, transforme him strait.

Now my good

Lord I hauing done my duety, I humbly take my leaue.
emp: Farewel maister Doctor, yet ere you goe, expect | from
me a bounteous reward. *exit* *Emperour.*

The Tragical/ Historie I Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

IV. ii

Let me intreate you to remoue his homes,
He has done penance now sufficiently. 1355

Faust. My gracious Lord, not so much for iniury done to |
me, as to delight your Maiesty
with some mirth: hath *Faustus* | iustly requited this iniurious
knight, which being all I de-|sire, I ^m content to remoue
his homes. *Mephistophilis*, | transformie him; and hereafter sir, 1360
looke you speake well of | Schollers.

Ben. Speake well of yee? 'sbloud and Schollers be such |
Cuckold-makers to clap homes of honest mens heades o'this |
order, ll'e nere trust smooth faces, and small ruffes more. 1364
But I an I be not reueng'd for this, would I might be turn'd to sig. Fi
a I gaping Oyster, and drinke nothing but salt water.

Emp. Come *Faustus* while the Emperour Hues,
In recompence of this thy high desert,
Thou shalt command the state of *Germany*,
And Hue belou'd of mightie *Carolus*. *Exeunt omnes.* 1370

Enter Benvolio, Martino, Fredericke,'and | Souldiers. IV. iii

Mar. Nay sweet *Benvolio*, let vs sway thy thoughts
From this attempt against the Coniurer.

Ben. Away, you loue me not, to vrge me thus, 1375
Shall I let slip so great an iniury,

When euery seruile groome ieasts at my wrongs,
And in their rusticke gambals proudly say,
Benvolws head was grac't with homes to day?
O may these eye-lids neuer close againe, 1380
Till with my sword I haue that Coniurer slaine.

If you will aid me in this enterprise,
Then draw your weapons, and be resolute:
If not, depart: here will *Benvolio* die,
But *Faustus* death shall quit my infamie. 1385

Fred. Nay, we will stay with thee, betide what may,
And kill that Doctor if he come this way.

Ben. Then gentle *Fredericke* hie thee to the groue,
And place our seruants, and our followers
close in an ambush there behinde the trees, 139°
By this (I know) the Coniurer is neere,
I saw him kneele, and kisse the Emperours hand,
And take his leaue, laden with rich rewards.

1355 has] hath B2

1385 my] thy B3

1390 *an] omit B2

A-1604 *The tragkall History of I Doctor Faustus.*

The Tragka/I Historie I Of Doctor Faustus.

B-1616
IV. iii

Then Souldiers boldly fight; *if Faustus die,*
Take you the wealth, leaue vs the victorie.

1395

Fred. Come souldiers, follow me vnto the groue,
Who kills him shall haue gold, and endlesse loue.

Exit Frederick with the Souldiers.

Ben. My head is lighter then it was by th'hornes,
But yet my heart more ponderous then my head,
And pants vntill I see that Coniurer dead.

1399

sig.FI^v

Mar. Where shall we place our selues *Benvolio* ?

Ben. Here will we stay to bide the first assault,
O were that damned Hell-hound but in place,
Thou soone shouldst see me quit my foule disgrace.

1405

Enter Fredericke.

Fred. Close, close, the Coniurer is at hand,
And all alone, comes walking in his gowne;
Be ready then, and strike the Peasant downe.

Ben. Mine be that honour then: now sword strike home,
For homes he gae, 11'e haue his head anone.

1410

Enter Faustus with the false head.

Mar. See, see, he comes.

Ben. No words: this blow ends all,
Hell take his soule, his body thus must fall.

1415

Faust. Oh.

Fred. Grone you Master Doctor ?

Ben. Breake may his heart with grones: deere *Frederik* see
Thus will I end his griefes immediatly.

Mar. Strike with a willing hand, his head is off.

1420

Ben. The Diuel's dead, the Furies now may laugh.

Fred. Was this that sterne aspect, that awfull frowne,
Made the grim monarch of infernall spirits,
Tremble and quake at his commanding charmes ?

Mar. Was this that damned head, whose heart conspir'd
Benvolio's shame before the Emperour.

1425

Ben. I, that's the head, and here the body lies,
Iustly rewarded for his villanies.

1423 spirits] s broken.

1426 Emperour.] read Emperour ?

1394 boldly] brauely B3
the] that B3

1400 *heart] heart's, B2

1401 that] the B2

1409

1412 *the] his B2

The Tragical Historie I Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

IV. iii

Fred, Come, let's deuisse how we may adde more shame
To the blacke scandall of his hated name. 1430

Ben, First, on his head, in quittance of my wrongs,
Il'e naile huge forked homes, and let them hang
Within the window where he yoak'd me first,
That all the world may see my iust reuenge.

Mar, What vse shall we put his beard to? 1435

Ben, Wee'l sell it to a Chimny-sweeper: it will weare out | sig. F2
ten birchin broomes I warrant you.

Fred, What shall eyes doe?

Ben, Wee'l put out his eyes, and they shall serue for but-|tons 1439
to his lips, to keepe his tongue from catching cold.

Mar, An excellent policie: and now sirs, hauing diuided |
him, what shall the body doe?

Ben. Zounds the Diuel's aliuie agen.

Fred, Giue him his head for Gods sake.

Faust. Nay keepe it: *Faustus* will haue heads and hands, 1445
I call your hearts to recompence this deed.

Knew you not Traytors, I was limited
For foure and twenty yeares, to breathe on earth?
And had you cut my body with your swords,
Or hew'd this flesh and bones as small as sand, 1450
Yet in a minute had my spirit return'd,
And I had breath'd a man made free from harme.
But wherefore doe I dally my reuenge?

Asteroth, Belimoth[^] Mephostophilis, (*Ent. Meph. &?*
Go horse these traytors on your fiery backes, [*other Diuels.* 1455

And mount aloft with them as high as heauen,
Thence pitch them headlong to the lowest hell:
Yet stay, the world shall see their miserie,
And hell shall after plague their treacherie.
Go *Belimothe[^]* and take this caitife hence, 1460

And hurle him in some lake of mud and durt:
Take thou this other, drage him through the woods,
Amongst the pricking thornes, and sharpest briers,
Whilst with my gentle *Mephostophilis,*
This Traytor flies vnto some steepie rocke, 1465
That rowling downe, may breake the villaines bones,

1446 I call] read I all (= Ay, all). 1458 stay]st obscured by crease.

1438 *eyes] his eyes B2 1439 P u t] p u l l B 3^x447 y o u] ye B² 1457 Thence]
Then B2 1463 Amongst] Among B2

The Tragcall Historie | Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

IV. iii

As he intended to dismember me.

Fly hence, dispatch my charge immediatly.

Fred. Pitie vs gentle *Faustus*, saue our Hues,

Faust. Away.

1470

Fred. He must needs goe that the Diuell driues.

Exeunt Spirits with the knights.

Enter the ambusht Souldiers.

sig. F2^v

1 *Sold.* Come sirs, prepare your selues in readinesse,

Make hast to help these noble Gentlemen,

1475

I heard them parly with the Coniurer.

2 *Sold.* See where he comes, dispatch, and kill the slaue.

Faust. What's here? an ambush to betray my life:

Then *Faustus* try thy skill: base pesants stand,

For loe these Trees remoue at my command,

1480

And stand as Bulwarkes twixt your selues and me,

To sheild me from your hated treachery:

Yet to encounter this your weake attempt,

Behold an Army comes incontinent.

Faustus strikes the dore, and enter a deuill playing on a Drum, | 1485
after him another bearing an Ensigne: and diuers with \ weapons,
Mephostophilis with fire-workes; they set vpon \ the Souldiers and
driue them out.

Enter at seuerall dores, Benuolio, Fredericke, and Martino, \ IV. iv
their heads and faces bloody, and besmeared with | 1490
mud and durt; all hauing homes on \ their heads.

Mart. What ho, *Benuolio*.

Benu. Here, what *Frederick*, ho.

Fred. O help me gentle friend; where is *Martino*?

1495

Mart. Deere *Frederick* here,

Halfe smother'd in a Lake of mud and durt,

Through which the Furies drag'd me by the heeles.

Fred. *Martino* see,

Benuolio V homes againe.

1500

Mart. O misery, how now *Benuolio* ?

1468 charge immediatly] space doubtful. 1469 Hues.] readouts. (B2)

1491 all hauing] hauing all Bz

(Sc. xi) *Fau:* Now Mephastophilis, the restlesse course that time |
 1135 doth runne with calme and silent foote,
 Shortning my dayes and thred of vitall life,
 Calls for the payment of my latest yeares,
 Therefore sweet Mephastophilis, let vs make haste to *Wer-*\
tenberge.

1140 *Me:* what, wil you goe on horse backe, or on foote?

Fau: Nay, til I am past this faire and pleasant greene, ile |
 walke on foote.

*enter a Horse-courser *

B1597& *Hors:* I haue beene al this day seeking one maister Fu-|stian:
 1616 masse see where he is, God saue you maister doctor.

1145 *Fau:* What horse-courser, you are wel met.

Hors: Do you heare sir? I haue brought you forty dol-|lers
 Bi525-6 for your horse.

1142 -courser] read -courser.

1140 horse backe] horse-backe A2 : horse-back A3

The Tragical/ Historie | Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

IV. iv

Benu. Defend me heauen, shall I be haunted still ?

Mart. Nay feare not man we haue no power to kill.

Benu. My friends transformed thus: O hellish spite,
Your heads are all set with homes.

1504

sig. F3

Fred. You hit it right,

It is your owne you meane feele on your head.

Benu. 'Zons, homes againe.

Mart. Nay chafe not man, we all are sped.

Benu. What deuill attends this damn'd Magician,
That spite of spite, our wrongs are doubled?

1510

Fred. What may we do, that we may hide our shames ?

Benu. If we should follow him to worke reuenge,
He'd ioyne long Asses eares to these huge homes,
And make vs laughing stockes to all the world.

1515

Mart. What shall we then do deere *Benuolio* ?

Benu. I haue a Castle ioyning neere these woods,
And thither wee'le repaire and Hue obscure,
Till time shall alter this our brutish shapes :
Sith blacke disgrace hath thus eclipt our fame.

1520

We'le rather die with grieffe, then Hue with shame.

Exeunt omnes.

Enter Faustus, and the Horse-courser, and \ Mephostophilis. IV. v

Horse. I beseech your Worship accept of these forty | Dollors. Ai 146-7

Faust. Friend, thou canst not buy so good a horse, for so | 1527
small a price: I haue no great need to sell him, but if thou |
likest him for ten Dollors more, take him, because I see thou |
hast a good minde to him. Ai 148-9

1505 all set] *space doubtful.*
read fame, (B2)

1514 He'd ioyne] *space doubtful.*

1520 fame.]

1508 'Zons] Zounds B2 (but cf. 1710)

1519 *this] these B2

A-1604 *The tragicall History of I Doctor Faustus.*

Sc. xi

B1530 *Fau:* I cannot sel him so: if thou likst him for fifty, take | him.

1150 *Hors:* Alas sir, I haue no more, I pray you speake for | me.

Me: I pray you let him haue him, he is an honest fellow, | and he has a great charge, neither wife nor childe.

B1534& *Fau:* Wei, come giue me your money, my boy wil deli-
x5.42 uer him to you: but I must tel you one thing before you haue | him, ride him not into the water at any hand.

1157 *Hors:* why sir, wil he not drinke

of all waters ?

Fau: O yes, he wil drinke of al waters, but ride him not | into
1160 the water, ride him ouer hedge or ditch, or where thou | wilt, but not into the water.

Hors: Wei sir, Now am I made man for euer, He not | leau
my horse for fortie: if he had but the qualitie of hey | ding,
ding, hey, ding, ding, Ide make a braue liuing on him; | hee has
1165 a buttocke so slicke as an Ele: wel god buy sir, your | boy wil deliuer him me: but hark ye sir, if my horse be sick, or | ill at ease, if I bring his water to you, youle tel me what is ?

Exit Horsecourser.

Fau. Away you villaine: what, doost thinke I am a horse-
doctor ?

what art thou Faustus but a man condemnd to die ? |
1170 Thy fatall time doth drawe to finall ende,
Dispaire doth driue distrust vnto my thoughts,
Confound these passions with a quiet sleepe:
Tush, Christ did call the thiefe vpon the Crosse,
Then rest thee Faustus quiet in conceit. *Sleepe in his chaire.*

1175 *Enter Horsecourser all wet, crying.*

Hors. Alas, alas, Doctor Fustian quoth a, mas Doctor | *Lopus*
was neuer such a Doctor, has giuen me a purgation, | has purg'd
me of fortie Dollers, I shall neuer see them more: | but yet like
1180 an asse as I was, I would not be ruled by him, | for he bade me
I should ride him into no water; now, I thin-|king my horse had
B1618-19 had some rare qualitie that he would not | haue had me knowne
of, I like a ventrous youth, rid him in-|to the deepe pond at the
"84 townes ende, I was no sooner in the | middle of the pond, but
B1561 my horse vanisht away, and I sat vp-|on a bottle of hey, neuer so

1161 *made] a made A2,3
Horse-courser Az,2
bad A3

1175 *ye] you A2,3
‡*Horsecourser*] *horse-courser* A2,3

1167 *Horsecourser*]
1180 bade]

u82of]offA2

The Tragical/ Historie J Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

IV. v

Horse. I beseech you sir accept of this; I am a very poore | 1531
man, and haue lost very much of late by horse flesh, and this j
bargaine will set me vp againe.

Faust. Well, I will not stand with thee, giue me the mo-|ney: A1154
now sirra I must tell you, that you may ride him o're | hedge and 1536
ditch, and spare him not; but do you heare? in any | case, ride
him not into the water.

Horse. How sir, not into the water? why will he not drink j
of all waters? 1539

Faust. Yes, he will drinke of all waters, but ride him not | into sig. F3^v
the water; oVe hedge and ditch, or where thou wilt, but | not into
the water: Go bid the Hostler deliuer him vnto you, | and A 1154-5
remember what I say.

Horse. I warrant you sir; O ioyfull day: Now am I a | made 1544
man for euer. *Exit.* I

Faust. What art thou *Faustus* but a man condemn'd to die?
Thy fatall time drawes to a finall end;
Despaire doth driue distrust into my thoughts.
Confound these passions with a quiet sleepe:
Tush Christ did call the Theefe vpon the Crosse, 1550
Then rest thee *Faustus* quiet in conceit. | *He sits to sleepe.* |

Enter the Horse-courser wet.

Horse. O what a cosening Doctor was this? I riding my |
horse into the water, thinking some hidden mystery had beene | 1555
in the horse, I had nothing vnder me but a little straw, and | had
much ado to escape drowning: Well Tie go rouse him, | and Ai 18^v
make him giue me my forty Dollors againe. Ho sirra | Doctor, An86
you cosoning scab; Maister Doctor awake, and rise, | and giueAi205
me my mony againe, for your horse is turned to a | bottle of 1561
Hay, — Maister Doctor. A1185

He puis of his leg. |
Alas I am vndone, what shall I do? I haue puld off his leg. A1207
Faust. O help, help, the villaine hath murder'd me.
Horse. Murder or not murder, now he has but one leg, | Fie 1564
out-run him, and cast this leg into some ditch or other.

Faust. Stop him, stop him, stop him——ha, ha, ha, *Fau-stus*
hath his leg againe, and the Horse-courser a bundle of hay | for
his forty Dollors.

Enter Wagner.

How now *Wagner* what newes with thee? 1570

The Tragical/ Historie | Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

IV. v

Wag. If it please you, the Duke of *Vanholt* doth earnestly entreate your company, and hath sent some of his men to | attend you with prouision fit for your iourney.

Faust, The Duke of *Vanholt**s an honourable Gentle-|man, sig. F4 and one to whom I must be no niggard of my cunning; | Come 1576
away. *Exeunt.*

Enter Clowne, Dick, Horse-courser, and a Carter.

IV. vi

Cart. Come my Maisters, Fie bring you to the best beere | in Europe, what ho, Hostis; where be these Whores ?

Enter Hostis.

1580

Host. How now, what lacke you? What my old Guesse | welcome.

Clow. Sirra *Dick*, dost thou know why I stand so mute ?

Dick. No *Robin*, why is't?

Clow. I am eighteene pence on the score, but say nothing, | 1585
see if she haue forgotten me.

Host. Who's this, that stands so solemnly by himselfe: | what my old Guest ?

Clo. O Hostisse how do you? I hope my score stands still.

Host. I there's no doubt of that, for me thinkes you make | no 1590
hast to wipe it out.

Dick. Why Hostesse, I say, fetch vs some Beere.

Host. You shall presently: lookevp into th'hall there ho. *Exit.*

Dick. Come sirs, what shall we do now till mine Hostesse |
comes ? 1595

Cart. Marry sir, Tie tell you the brauest tale how a Con-|iurer
seru'd me; you know Doctor *Fauster.* A1143-4

Horse. I, a plague take him, heere's some on's haue cause | to
know him; did he coniuere thee too?

Cart. Tie tell you how he seru'd me: As I was going to | 1600
Wittenberge t'other day, with a loade of Hay, he met me, | and
asked me what he should giue me for as much Hay as he | could
eate; now sir, I thinking that a little would serue his | turne, bad
him take as much as he would for three-farthings; | so he presently 1605

1571 earnest-] st- obscured. 1572 to] obscured. 1594 till mine] space doubtful.

1573 you] omit B2 1581 Guesse] guests? B2 1587-8 himselfe: what] himselfe?
What B2 1593 th'hall] the Hall B2 there] there, B2 *Exit.*] omit B2 1594 now]
omit B2 1597 **Fauster*] *Faustus* B2

The Tragical/ Historie | Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

IV. ʒi

gaue me my mony, and fell to eating; and as I am a cursen man,
he neuer left eating, till he had eate vp all | my loade of hay.

ALL O monstrous, eate a whole load of Hay!

Clow. Yes, yes, that may be; for I haue heard of one, that | sig. F4V
ha's eate a load of logges. 1610

Horse. Now sirs, you shall heare how villanously he seru'd |
mee: I went to him yesterday to buy a horse of him, and he |
would by no meanes sell him vnder 40 Dollors; so sir, because |
I knew him to be such a horse, as would run ouer hedge and |
ditch, and neuer tyre, I gaue him his money; so when I had | my 1615
horse, Doctor *Fauster* bad me ride him night and day, and | Ai 143-4
spare him no time; but, quoth he, in any case ride him not in-|to
the water. Now sir, I thinking the horse had had some | quality A1180-2
that he would not haue me know of, what did I but | rid him into 1620
a great riuer, and when I came iust in the midst | my horse vanisht
away, and I sate straddling vpon a bottle | of Hay.

ALL O braue Doctor.

Horse. But you shall heare how brauely I seru'd him for | it; 1624
I went me home to his house, and there I found him | asleepe;
I kept a hallowing and whooping in his eares, but | all could not A1204
wake him: I seeing that, tooke him by the leg, | and neuer rested
pulling, till I had pul'd me his leg quite off, | and now 'tis at
home in mine Hostry.

Clow. And has the Doctor but one leg then ? that's excellent, 1630
for one of his deuils turn'd me, into the likeness of an | Apes face.

Cart. Some more drinke Hostesse.

Clow. Hearke you, we'le into another roome and drinke | a 1634
while, and then we'le go seeke out the Doctor. |

Exeunt omnes.

Enter the Duke of Vanholt; his Dutches, |
Faustus, and Mephostophilis.

IV. vii

Duke. Thankes Maister Doctor, for these pleasant sights, |
Nor know I how sufficiently to recompence your great de-|serts 1640
in erecting that enchanted Castle in the Aire: the |
Sight whereof so delighted me, |
As nothing in the world could please me more.

Faust. I do thinke my selfe my good Lord, highly recom-| sig. Gi

1605 my] omit B2 1609 of] omit B2,3 (only) 1616 **Fauster*] *Faustus* B2
1619 *quality] rare quality B2 1641-2 Aire: the | Sight] Ayre: | The sight B2
1642 delighted] delighteth B2

B1647 but it may
 B1650 be Madame, you take no delight in this, I | haue heard that great
 bellied women do long for some dainties or other, what is it
 B1649 Madame? tell me, and you shal haue | it. I

1236 *Dutch.* Thankes, good maister doctor, |
 And for I see your curteous intent to pleasure me, I wil not |
 hide from you the thing my heart desires,
 and were it nowe | summer, as it is January, and the dead time
 1240 of the winter, I | would desire no better meate then a dish of
 ripe grapes. •

Fau: Alas Madame, thats nothing, *Mephistophilis*, be I
 gone: *exit Meph.* were it a greater thing then this, so |
 it would content you, you should haue it |

enter Mephasto: |
with the grapes.

1244 here they be madam, wilt please you taste | on them.

Du: Beleeue me master Doctor, this makes me wonder |
 about the rest, that being in the dead time of winter, and in |
 the month of January, how you shuld come by these grapes.

Fau: If it like your grace, the yeere is diuided into twoo |
 1250 circles ouer the whole worlde, that when it is heere winter |
 with vs, in the contrary circle it is summer with them,
 as in I *India, Saba*, and farther countries in the East,

and by means | of a
 swift spirit that I haue, I had them brought hither, as
 ye I see, how do you like them Madame, be they good?

1255 *Dut:* Beleeue me Maister doctor, they be the best grapes |
 sig. E3^v that ere I tasted in my life before.

Fau: I am glad they content you so Madam.

1243 haue it] *readhzuz* it: (A2,3). The S.D. is printed at the end of lines 1243 and 1244.

1240 *ripe] *omit* A2,3 1243 † *Mephasto:] Mepha.* A3 1246 master] maister A2
 1253 hither] hether A2,3

The Tragicall Historie Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

IV. vii

penced, in that it pleaseth your grace to thinke but well of | 1645
that which *Faustus* hath performed. But gracious Lady, it | may A1232
be, that you haue taken no pleasure in those sights; | therefor
I pray you tell me, what is the thing you most de-|sire to haue, 1649
be it in the world, it shall be yours: I haue heard | that great A1234
bellyed women, do long for things, are rare and | dainty. A1233

Lady. True Maister Doctor,
and since I finde you so kind | I will
make knowne vnto you what my heart desires to | haue,
and were it now Summer, as it is Ianuary, a dead | time 1655
of the Winter, I would request no better meate, then | a dish of
ripe grapes.

Fau. This is but a small matter: Go *Mephostophilis*, away. |
Exit Mephosto.

Madam, I will do more then this for your content.

Enter Mepho. agen with the grapes. 1660

Here, now taste yee these,

they should be good |

For they come from a farre Country I can tell you.

Duke.

This makes me wonder more
then all the rest, that | at this time of the yeare, when euey Tree
is barren of his | fruite, from whence you had these ripe grapes. 1665

Faust. Please it your grace, the yeare is diuided into two |
circles ouer the whole world, so that when it is Winter
with I vs, in the contrary circle it is likewise Summer with them, |
as in *India*, *Saba*, and such Countries that lye farre East, | where 1669
they haue fruit twice a yeare. From whence, by meanes | of a
swift spirit that I haue, I had these grapes brought as |
you see.

Lady And trust me, they are the sweetest grapes
that I e're I tasted.

The Clowne bounce at the gate, within. 1675

Duke. What rude disturbers haue we at the gate ?

Go pacifie their fury set it ope,

sig. Gi^v

And then demand of them, what they would haue.

1664 euey] er *blotted.*

1665 ripe] *omit* B3

1675 bounce] *bounceth* B3

A-1604

The tragkall History of | Doctor Faustus.

The Tragical/ Historte I Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

IV. vii

They knocke againe, and call out to talke with Faustus,

A Seruant. Why how now Maisters, what a coyle is | there? | 1680
What is the reason you disturbe the Duke ?

Dick, We haue no reason for it, therefore a fig for him.

Ser, Why saucy varlets, dare you be so bold.

Horse, I hope sir, we haue wit enough to be more bold | then 1685
welcome.

Ser, It appeares so, pray be bold else-where,
And trouble not the Duke.

Duke, What would they haue ?

Ser, They all cry out to speake with Doctor *Faustus,* 1690

Cart, I, and we will speake with him,

Duke, Will you sir? Commit the Rascals.

Dick, Commit with vs, he were as good commit with his J
father, as commit with vs.

Faust, I do beseech your grace let them come in, 1695
They are good subiect for a merriment. A1229

Duke, Do as thou wilt *Faustus,* I giue thee leaue.

Faust, I thanke your grace:

Enter the Clowne, Dick, Carter, and | Horse-courser, 1699

Why, how now my goods friends ?

'Faith you are too outragious, but come neere,

I haue procur'd your pardons: welcome all.

Clow, Nay sir, we will be wellcome for our mony, and | we 1704
will pay for what we take: What ho, giue's halfe a do-|sen of Beere
here, and be hang'd.

Faust, Nay, hearke you, can you tell me where you are ?

Cart, I marry can I, we are vnder heauen.

Ser, I but sir sauce box, know you in what place? 1709

Horse, I, I, the house is good enough to drink in: Zons | fill sig. G²
vs some Beere, or we'll breake all the barrells in the hou se, |
and dash out all your braines with your Bottles.

Faust, Be not so furious: come you shall haue Beere.

My Lord, beseech you giue me leaue a while,

Fie gage my credit, 'twill content your grace. 1715

1684 bold.] *read* bold? (B3) 1691 him,] *read* him. 1701 goods] *read* good (B2)

1706 Beere here] *space doubtful.*

1711 hou se] *read* house

1713 *Faust.*]

t apparently defective and touched up with pen and ink.

1696 for] to B3

1698 grace:] Grace. B2

A-1604
Sc. xii

The tragkall History of Doctor Faustus.

The Tragical Historie I Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

IV. vii

Duke. With all my heart kind Doctor, please thy selfe,
Our seruants, and our Courts at thy command.

Faust. I humbly thanke your grace: then fetch some | Beere.

Horse. I mary, there spake a Doctor indeed, and 'faith He | 1720
drinke a health to thy wooden leg for that word.

Faust. My wooden leg ? what dost thou meane by that ?

Cart. Ha, ha, ha, dost heare him *Dick*, he has forgot his |
legge.

Horse. I, I. he does not stand much vpon that. 1725

Faust. No faith, not much vpon a wooden leg.

Cart. Good Lord, that flesh and bloud should be so fraile |
with your Worship: Do not you remember a Horse-courser | you
sold a horse to ?

Faust. Yes, I remember I sold one a horse. 1730

Cart. And do you remember you bid he should not ride | into
the water ?

Faust. Yes, I do verie well remember that.

Cart. And do you remember nothing of your leg ?

Faust. No in good sooth. 1735

Cart. Then I pray remember your curtesie.

Faust. I thank you sir.

Car. 'Tis not so much worth; I pray you tel me one thing.

Faust. What's that ?

Cart. Be both your legs bedfellowes euery night together? 1740

Faust. Wouldst thou make a *Colossus* of me, that thou as-|kest
me such questions ?

Cart. No truelie sir, I would make nothing of you, but | I
would faine know that.

Enter Hostesse with drinke. 1745

Faust. Then I assure thee certainelie they are.

Cart. I thanke you, I am fully satisfied. sig. Gz^v

Faust. But wherefore dost thou aske ?

Cart. For nothing sir: but me thinkes you should haue a |
wooden bedfellow of one of 'em. 1750

Horse. Why do you heare sir, did not I pull *off* one of your |
legs when you were asleepe ?

1721 drinke a] *space doubtful.* 1725 I, I.] *read I, I, (B2)* 1744 I] *obscured.*

1723 dost] dost thou B2 1731 *ride] ride him B2

Du: Come Madame, let vs in, where you must wel re- | ward
1260 this learned man for the great kindnes he hath shewd | to you.
B1771 *Dut:* And so I wil my Lord, and whilst I Hue, |
B1770 Rest beholding for this curtesie.
Fau: I humbly thanke your Grace.
1264 *Du:* Come, maister Doctor follow vs, and receiue your |
B1771 reward. *exeunt.*

Sc.xiii

enter Wagner solus.

Wag. I thinke my maister meanes to die shortly,
For he hath giuen to me al his goodes,

And yet me thinks, if that death were neere,
1270 He would not banquet, and carowse, and swill
B1784 Amongst the Students, as euen now he doth,
B1783 who are at supper with such belly-cheere,
As *Wagner* nere beheld in all his life.
See where they come: belike the feast is ended.

The Tragical/ Historie Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

. IV. vii

Faust. But I haue it againe now I am awake: looke you heere sir.

All. O horrible, had the Doctor three legs? 1755

Cart. Do you remember sir, how you cosened me and eat vp my load of——|

Faustus charmes him dumb.

Dick. Do you remember how you made me weare an

Apes—————1760

Horse. You whoreson coniuring scab, do you remember | how you cosened me with a ho——

Clow. Ha'you forgotten me? you thinke to carry it away 1763
with your *Hey-passe*, and *Re-passe*: do you remember the | dogs A1188
fa — *Exeunt Clownes.* |

Host. Who payes for the Ale? heare you Maister Doctor, now you haue sent away my guesse, I pray who shall pay | me for my A — ? *Exit Hostesse.* /

Lady. My Lord, 1769
We are much beholding to this learned man. A1262

Duke. So are we Madam, which we will recompence A1261&
With all the loue and kindnesse that we may. 1265
His Artfull sport, driues all sad thoughts away. *Exeunt.*

Thunder and lightning: Enter deuils with couer'd \ dishes; V. i
Mephostophilis leades them into | Faustus Study: 1776
Then enter | Wagner.

Wag. I think my Maister means to die shortly,
he hath made | his will, & giuen me h is wealth,
his house, his goods, & store of | golden plate; sig. G3
besides two thousand duckets ready coin'd:
I I wonder what he meanes, if death were nie, 1781
he would not fro-|lick thus: hee's now at supper A1272

with the schollers, where ther's | such belly-cheere, A1271
as *Wagner* in his life nere saw the like:
and I see where they come, belike the feast is done. *Exit.*

1762 yo] read you (B2) 1779 h is] read his 1782 ther's] s*impression defective.*

1763 Ha'you] Haue you B2 1767 guesse] guests B2 1773 sport.] sports B2
driues] driue B5 1780 besides] beside B2 (only) 1784 †done] ended B2

A-1604 *The tragkall History of I Doctor Faustus.*

Sc. xiii

1275

Enter Faustus

with two or three

Sch oilers

1. *Sch.* Maister Doctor *Faustus*, since our conference a-bout
faire Ladies, which was the beutifulst in all the world, | we
haue determind with our selues, that *Helen* of *Greece* | was the
1280 admirablest Lady that euer liued: therefore master | Doctor, if
you wil do vs that fauor, as to let vs see that peere-lesse
A1292 Dame of *Greece*, whome al the world admires for ma-liesty, wee
should thinke our selues much beholding vnto j you.

1284 *Fau.* Gentlemen, for that I know your friendship is vn-| fained,
and *Faustus* custome is not to denie
the iust requests | of those that wish him well,
you shall behold that pearelesse | dame of *Greece*,
no otherwaies for pompe and maiestie,
then I when sir *Paris* crost the seas with her,
1289 and brought the spoiles | to rich *Dardania*.
Be silent then, for danger is in words.

sig. E4

Musicke sounds,

and Helen

passeth ouer the Stage. |

2. *Sch.* Too simple is my wit to tell her praise,
A1282 Whom all the world admires for maiestie.

3. *Sch.* No maruel tho the angry Greekes pursude
With tenne yeares warre the rape of such a queene,
1295 Whose heauenly beauty passeth all compare.

1. Since we haue seene the pride of natures workes,
And onely Paragon of excellence, *Enter an*
Let vs depart, and for this glorious deed *old man.*
Happy and blest be *Faustus* euermore.

1300 *Fau.* Gentlemen farwel, the same I wish to you.
Exeunt Schollers.

Old. Ah Doctor *Faustus*, that I might preuaile,
To guide thy steps vnto the way of life,

1275 *Schollers*] read *Schollers*.

1285 *{and] omit A2,3 *{requests] request A2,3 1293 maruel] maruaile A2,3
1297-8 S.D.] at end of 1297 A2,3

The TragicallHis tor ie | Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

Enter Faustus, Mephostophilis, and two or three | 1785
Schollers.

1. *Schol.* M. Doctor *Faustus*, since our conference about |
faire Ladies, which was the beautifullest in all the world, we j
haue determin'd with our selues, that *Hellen* of Greece was | the 1789
admirablest Lady that euer liu'd: therefore M. Doctor, if |
you will doe vs so much fauour, as to let vs see that peerelesse |
dame of Greece, whom all the world admires for Maiesty, we | B1807
should thinke our selues much beholding vnto you.

Faust. Gentlemen, for y I know your friendship is vnfaun'd,
It is not *Faustus* custome to deny 1795
The iust request of those that wish him well:
You shall behold that peerelesse dame of Greece,
No otherwise for pompe or Maiesty,
Then when sir *Paris* crost the seas with her,
And brought the spoyles to rich *Dardania*: 1800
Be silent then, for danger is in words.

*Musicke sound, Mephosto brings in Hellen,
she passeth | ouer the stage,*

2 Was this faire *Hellen*, whose admired worth
Made *Greece* with ten yeares warres afslict poore *Troy*? 1805

3 Too simple is my wit to tell her worth,
Whom all the world admires for maiesty. B1792

1 Now we haue seene the pride of Natures worke,
Wee'l take our leaues, and for this blessed sight
Happy and blest be *Faustus* euermore. *Exeunt Schollers.* 1810
Faust. Gentlemen farewell: the same wish I to you.

Enter an old Man.

sig. G^{3V}

Old Man. O gentle *Faustus* leaue this damned Art,
This Magicke, that will charme thy soule to hell,

1794 y] *superior letter doubtful.* 1805 afslict] *read afflict*

1794 fy] that B2

A104 *The tragical! History of I Doctor Faustus.*

Sc. xiii

By which sweete path thou maist attaine the gole
1305 That shall conduct thee to celestial rest.
Breake heart, drop blood, and mingle it with teares,
Teares falling from repentant heauinesse
Of thy most vilde and loathsome filthinesse,
The stench whereof corrupts the inward soule
1310 With such flagitious crimes of hainous sinnes,
As no commiseration may expel,
But mercie Faustus of thy Sauour sweete,
Whose blood alone must wash away thy guilt.

A1329 *Fau.* Where art thou Faustus? wretch what hast thou done?

1315 Damnd art thou Faustus, damnd, dispaire and die,
Hell calls for right, and with a roaring voyce
Sayes, Faustus come, thine houre is come, *Mepha. giues*
And Faustus will come to do thee right. *him a dagger.*

Old. Ah stay good Faustus, stay thy desperate steps,

1320 I see an Angell houters ore thy head,
And with a violl full of precious grace,
Offers to powre the same into thy soule,
Then call for mercie and auoyd dispaire.

1324 *Fau.* Ah my sweete friend, I feele thy words

sig. E TO omfort my distressed soule,

Leaue me a while to ponder on my sinnes.

Old. I goe sweete Faustus, but with heauy cheare,
fearing the ruine of thy hopelesse soule.

A1314 *Fau.* Accursed Faustus, where is mercie now?

1330 I do repent, and yet I do dispaire:

Hell striues with grace for conquest in my breast,
What shal I do to shun the snares of death?

Me. Thou traitor Faustus, I arrest thy soule
For disobedience to my soueraigne Lord,

1335 Reuolt, or He in peece-meale teare thy flesh.

Fau: Sweete *Mephistophilis*, intreate thy Lord
To pardon my vniust presumption,
And with my blood againe I wil confirme

1317 ‡*Mepha Meph.* A2,3

The Tragkall Historie Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

And quite bereaue thee of saluation. 1815

Though thou hast now offended like a man,

Doe not perseuer in it like a Diuell;

Yet, yet, thou hast an amiable soule,

If sin by custome grow not into nature:

Then *Faustus*, will repentance come too late, 1820

Then thou art banisht from the sight of heauen;

No mortall can expresse the paines of hell.

It may be this my exhortation

Seemes harsh, and all vnpleasant; let it not,

For gentle sonne, I speake it not in wrath, 1825

Or enuy of thee, but in tender loue,

And pittie of thy future miserie.

And so haue hope, that this my kinde rebuke,

Checking thy body, may amend thy soule. 1829

Faust, Where art thou *Faustus*? wretch, what hast thou done? B1843

Hell claimes his right, & with a roaring voice, *Meph, giues*

Saies *Faustus* come, thine houre is almost come, *him a dag-*

And *Faustus* now will come to do thee right. *ger.*

Old, O stay good *Faustus*, stay thy desperate steps.

I see an Angell houer ore thy head, 1835

And with a vyoll full of pretious grace,

Offers to poure the same into thy soule,

Then call for mercy, and auoyd despaire.

Fa, O friend, I feele thy words

to cofort my distressed soule, |

Leaue me a while, to ponder on my sinnes. 1840

Old, *Faustus* I leaue thee, but with grieve of heart,

Fearing the enemy of thy haplesse soule. *Exit*,

Faust, Accursed *Faustus*, wretch what hast thou done? B1830

I do repent, and yet I doe despaire,

Hell striues with grace for conquest in my breast: 1845

What shall I doe to shun the snares of death?

Meph, Thou traytor *Faustus*, I arrest thy soule,

For disobedience to my soueraigne Lord,

Reuolt, or Fie in peece-meale teare thy flesh. sig. G4

Faust, I do repent I ere offended him, 1850

Sweet *Mephasto*: intreat thy Lord

To pardon my vniust presumption,

And with my bloud againe I will confirme

1827 miserie.] read miserie;

A-1604 *The tragcall History of I Doctor Faustus.*

Sc. xiii

My former vow I made to *Lucifer*.

1340 *Me*. Do it then quickly, with vnfained heart,
Lest greater danger do attend thy drift.

Fau: Torment sweete friend, that base and crooked age,
That durst dissuade me from thy *Lucifer*,
With greatest torments that our hel affoord.

1345 *Me*: His faith is great, I cannot touch his soule,
But what I may afflict his body with,
I wil attempt, which is but little worth.

Fau: One thing, good seruant, let me craue of thee
To glut the longing of my hearts desire,
1350 That I might haue vnto my paramour,
That heauenly *Helen* which I saw of late,
Whose sweete imbracings may extinguish cleane
These thoughts that do dissuade me from my vow,
And keepe mine oath I made to *Lucifer*.

1355 *Me*. *Faustus*, this, or what else thou shalt desire,
Shalbe performde in twinckling of an eie.

enter Helen. |

Fau: Was this the face that lancht a thousand shippes?
And burnt the toplesse Towres of *Ilium* ?

^Sweete *Helen*, make me immortall with a kisse:

1360 Her lips suckes forth my soule, see where it flies:
sig. Fi Come *Helen*, come giue mee my soule againe.

Here wil I dwel, for heauen be in these lips,
And all is drosse that is not *Helena*: *enter old man*
I wil be *Fads*, and for loue of thee,

1365 Insteede of *Troy* shal *Wertenberge* be sackt,
And I wil combate with weake *Menelaus*,
And weare thy colours on my plumed Crest:
Yea I wil wound *Achillis* in the heele,
/ And then returne to *Helen* for a kisse.

1370 O thou art fairer then the euening aire,
Clad in the beauty of a thousand starres,
Brighter art thou then flaming *Iupiter*,
when he appeard to haplesse *Semele*,

1363 *man*] read *man*. 1364 *Pacts*] read *Paris*

1354 **mmme*] my A2,3
stead A2,3

1356 †*Shalbe*] Shall be A3

1365 †*Insteede*] In

1368 †*Achillis*] *Achilles* A3

The Tragical/ His tor ie | Of Doctor Faustus.

B-1616
V.i

The former vow I made to *Lucifer*.
O(Do it then *Faustus*, with vnfained heart,
Lest greater dangers do attend thy drift.
Torment sweet friend, that base and aged man,
That durst dissuade me from thy *Lucifer*,
With greatest torment that our hell affoords.

1855

Meph. His faith is great, I cannot touch his soule;
But what I may afflict his body with,
I will attempt, which is but little worth.

1860

Faust. One thing good seruant let me craue of thee,
Tojllut the longing of my hearts desire,
That! may haue vnto my paramour,
That heauenly *Hellen*, which I saw of late,
Whose sweet embraces may extinguish cleare,
Those thoughts that do dissuade me from my vow,
And keepe my vow I made to *Lucifer*.

1865

Meph. This, or what else my *Faustus* shall desire,
Shall be perform'd in twinkling of an eye.

1870

Enter Hellen againe, passing ouer betweene \ two Cupids.

Faust. Was this the face that Launcht a thousand ships,
And burnt the toplesse Towers of *Ilium* ?
Sweet *Hellen* make me immortall with a kisse:
Her lips sucke forth my soule, see where it flies!^
Come *Hellen*, come, giue me my soule againe,
Here will I dwell, for heauen is in these lippes,
And all is drosse that is not *Helena*.

1875

1880

I will be *Paris*, and for loue of thee,
In stead of *Troy* shall *Wittenberg* be sack't,
And I will combat with weake *Menelaus*,
And weare thy colours on my plumed crest.

1884

Yea, I will wound *Achilles* in the heele,
And then returne to *Hellen* for a kisse.
O thou art fairer then the euenings aire,
Clad in the beauty of a thousand starrest
Brighter art thou then flaming *Iupiter*,
When he appear'd to haplesse *Semele*:

sig. G4^v

1890

1868 vow] o blotted. 1870 desire] *e blotted.

1859 torment] torments B3
crest, B2

1861 £may] omit B2-4 can B5

1884 crest.]

A104 *The tragkall History of | Doctor Faustus.*

Sc. xiii

y More louely then the monarke of the skie
1375 In wanton *Arethusaes* azurde armes,
And none but thou shalt be my paramour. *Exeunt.*
Old man Accursed *Faustus*, miserable man,
That from thy soule excludst the grace of heauen,
- And fliest the throne of his tribunall seate,

1380 *Enter the Diuelles.*

Sathan begins to sift me with his pride,
As in this furnace God shal try my faith,
My faith, vile hel, shal triumph ouer thee,
Ambitious fiends, see how the heuens smiles
1385 At your repulse, and laughs your state to scorne,
Hence hel, for hence I flie vnto my God. *Exeunt.*

The Tragicall Historie I Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

v. i

j More louely then the Monarch of the sky,
In wanton *Arethusas* azure armes,
And none but thou shalt be my Paramour. *Exeunt.*

Thunder. Enter Lucifer, Belzebug, and Mephostophilis. v. ii

Lucif. Thus from infemail *Dis* do we ascend 1895
To view the subjects of our Monarchy,
Those soules which sinne, seales the blacke sonnes of hell,
'Mong which as chiefe, *Faustus* we come to thee,
Bringing with vs lasting damnation,
To. wait vpon thy soule; the time is come 1900
Which makes it forfeit.

Meph. And this gloomy night,
Here in this roome will wretched *Faustus* be.

Bets. And here wee'l stay,
To marke him how he doth demeane himselfe. 1905

Meph. How should he, but in desperate lunacie.
Fond worldling, now his heart bloud dries with grieffe;
His conscience kils it, and his labouring braine,
Begets a world of idle fantasies,
To ouer-reach the Diuell; but all in vaine, *t* 1910
His store of pleasures must be sauc'd with paine.
He and his seruant *Wagner* are at hand,
Both come from drawing *Faustus* latest will.
See where they come. *Enter Faustus and Wagner.*

Faust. Say *Wagner*, thou hast perus'd my will, 1915
How dost thou like it?

Wag. Sir, so wondrous well,

1892 fazure] azur'd B2

A1604 *The tragical! History of | Doctor Faustus.*

Sc. xiv

Enter Faustus with the Schollers.

Fau: Ah Gentlemen!

i. *Sch:* what ailes Faustus ?

1390 *Fau:* Ah my sweete chamber-fellow! had I Hued with | thee,
then had I liued stil, but now I die eternally:
looke, I comes he not ? comes he not ?

2. *Sch:* what meanes Faustus?

1394 3. *Scholler* Belike he is growne into some sicknesse, by |
*ig. Fi^v being ouer solitary.

1. *Sch:* If it be so, weele haue Physitians to
cure him, |
tis but a surffet, neuer feare man.

Fau: A surffet of deadly sinne that hath damnd both body |
and soule.

1400 2. *Sch.* Yet Faustus looke vp to heauen, remember gods |
mercies are infinite.

Fau. But Faustus offence can nere be pardoned,
The Serpent that tempted *Eue* may be sau'd,

1404 But not Faustus: Ah Gentlemen, heare me with patience, | and
tremble not at my speeches, though my heart pants and | quiuers
to remember that I haue beene a student here these | thirty yeeres,
O would I had neuer seene *Wertenherge*, ne-|uer read booke: and
what wonders I haue done, al *Germany* | can witnes, yea all the
1410 world, for which Faustus hath lost | both *Germany*, and the world,
yea heauen it selfe, heauen the | seate of God, the throne of the
blessed, the kingdome of ioy, | and must remaine in hel for euer,
hel, ah hel for euer, sweete | friends, what shall become of Faustus,
being in hel for euer ?

3. *Sch.* Yet Faustus call on God.

1415 *Fau.* On God whome Faustus hath abiurde, on God, | whome
Faustus hath blasphemed, ah my God, I woulde | weepe, but the
diuel drawes in my teares, gush foorth bloud, | insteade of teares,
yea life and soule, Oh he stayes my tong, | I would lift vp my
1420 hands, but see, they hold them, they hold | them.

1398 damnd] damb'd A2 : dam'd A3 1407 †thirty] 30. A2,3 would] I would A3
1418 insteade] in stead A2 : in steed A3

The Tragick Historie I Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

v. ii

As in all humble dutie, I do yeeld
My life and lasting seruice for your loue.

Enter the scholars. \

Faust. Gramercies *Wagner.* Welcome gentlemen. sig. Hi

1 Now worthy *Faustus*: me thinks your looks are chang'd. 1921

Faust. Oh gentlemen.

2. What ailes *Faustus*?

Faust. Ah my sweet chamber-fellow, had I liu'd with thee,
Then had I liued still, but now must dye eternally. 1925

Looke sirs, comes he not, comes he not ?

1. O my deere *Faustus* what imports this feare ?

2. Is all our pleasure turn'd to melancholy?

3. He is not well with

being ouer solitarie.

2 If it be so, wee'l haue Physitians, and *Faustus* shall bee | 1930
cur'd.

3 Tis but a surfet sir, feare nothing.

Faust. A surfet of deadly sin, that hath damn'd both body |
and soule.

2 Yet *Faustus* looke vp to heauen, and remember 1935
mercy is | infinite.

Faust. But *Faustus* offence can nere be pardoned,
The serpent that tempted *Eue* may be saued,

But not *Faustus*. O gentlemen, heare with patience, and
trem-ble not at my speeches, though my heart pant & quiuer 1940
to re-|member that I haue beene a student here these 30 yeares.

O I would I had neuer seene *Wittenberg*, neuer read book, &
what I wonders I haue done, all *Germany* can witnesse: yea all the |

world, for which *Faustus* hath lost both *Germany* & the world, [
yea heauen it selfe: heauen the seate of God, the Throne of | the 1945

Blessed, the Kingdome of Ioy, and must remaine in hell | for euer.

Hell, O hell for euer. Sweet friends, what shall be-|come of *Faustus*

being in hell for euer ?

2 Yet *Faustus* call on God.

Faust. On God, whom *Faustus* hath abiur'd? on God, whom | 1950
Faustus hath blasphem'd? O my God, I would weepe, but the |

Diuell drawes in my teares. Gush forth bloud in stead of | teares,
yea life and soule: oh hee stayes my tongue: I would | lift vp my

hands, but see they hold 'em, they hold 'em.

1920] as two lines B3 Gramercies] Gramercy B2 1939 fheare] heare me B2
1940 though] (though B2 (only: the parenthesis is not closed) 1942 ‡neuer] nere B2
1943 witnesse:] witnesse; B2 1944 ‡world,] world: B2

A-1604 *The tragical! History of | Doctor Faustus.*

Sc. xiv

All Who Faustus?

Fau. Lucifer and *Mephistophilis*. \

Ah Gentlemen! I gaue them my soule for my cunning.

All God forbid.

1425 *Fau.* God forbade it indeede, but Faustus hath done it: | for
vaine pleasure of 24. yeares, hath Faustus lost
eternall | ioy and felicitie, I writ them a bill with mine owne bloud, |
the date is expired, the time wil come, and he wil fetch mee.

1. *SchoL* why did not Faustus tel vs of this before, that |
1430 Diuines might haue prayed for thee ?

sig. ¥2 *Fau.* Oft haue I thought to haue done so, but the diuell |
threatned to teare mee in peeces, if I namde God, to fetch | both
body and soule, if I once gaue eare to diuinitie: and | now tis
too late: Gentlemen away, lest you perish with me.

1435 2. *Sch.* O what shal we do to Faustus?

Faustus Talke not of me, but saue your selues, and de-|part.

3. *Sch.* God wil strengthen me, I wil stay with Fau-|stus.

1440 1. *Sch.* Tempt not God, sweete friend, but let vs into the | next
roome, and there pray for him.

Fau. I pray for me, pray for me, and what noyse soeuer | yee
heare, come not vnto me, for nothing can rescue me.

1444 2. *Sch.* Pray thou, and we wil pray that God may haue | mercy
vpon thee.

Fau. Gentlemen farewell, if I Hue til morning, He visite |
you: if not, Faustus is gone to hel.

All Faustus, farewell.

Exeunt Sch.

1430 thee] t broken.

1425 forbade] forbad A2,3
1444 God] GOD A2

1434 †lest] least A2,3

1441 *fthere] omit A3

The Tragicall Historie I Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

V. ii
1955

AIL Who *Faustus*?

Faust. Why *Lucifer* and *Mephostophilis*:

O gentlemen, | I gaue them my soule for my cunning. sig. Hi^v

AIL O God forbid.

Faust. God forbade it indeed, but *Faustus* hath done it: for |
the vaine pleasure of foure and twenty yeares hath *Faustus* | lost 1960
eternall ioy and felicitie. I writ them a bill with mine | owne bloud,
the date is expired: this is the time, and he will | fetch mee.

1 Why did not *Faustus* tell vs of this before, that
Diuines | might haue prayd for thee? 1965

Faust. Oft haue I thought to haue done so: but the Diuel |
threatned to teare me in peeces if I nam'd God: to fetch me j
body and soule, if I once gaue eare to Diuinitie: and now | *s
too late. Gentlemen away, leas't you perish with | me. 1970

2 O what may we do to saue *Faustus*?

Faust. Talke not of me, but saue your selues and depart.

3. God will strengthen me, I will stay with *Faustus*.

1. Tempt not God sweet friend, but let vs into the next |
roome, and pray for him. 1975

Faust. I, pray for me, pray for me: and what noyse soeuer | you
heare, come not vnto me, for nothing can rescue me.

2. Pray thou, and we will pray, that God may haue mer-|cie
vpon thee.

Faust. Gentlemen farewell: if I Hue till morning, Il'e vi-|sit 19*0
you: if not, *Faustus* is gone to hell.

AIL *Faustus*, farewell. *Exeunt* *Schollers*.

Meph. I *Faustus*, now thou hast no hope of heauen,
Therefore despaire, thinke onely vpon hell;
For that must be thy mansion, there to dwell. 1985

Faust. O thou bewitching fiend, 'twas thy temptation,
Hath rob'd me of eternall happinesse.

Meph. I doe confesse it *Faustus*, and reioyce;
'Twas I, that when thou wer't i'the way to heauen,
Damb'd vp thy passage, when thou took'st the booke, 1990
To view the Scriptures, then I turn'd the leaues
And led thine eye.

What weep'st thou? 'tis too late, despaire, farewell,
Fooles that will laugh on earth, most weepe in hell. *Exit* *Sig. H 2*

1969 'ts] read *tis

1994 *Exit*] read *Exit*.

1959 [forbade] forbad B2

1969 *ts]'tis B2: it is B3

1994 *most] must B2

A-1604
Se. xiv

The tragkall History of | Doctor Faustus.

The Tragicall Historie I Of Doctor Faustus. R-1616

V. ii

*Enter the good Angell, and the bad Angell
at I seuerall doom.*

1995

Good. Oh *Faustus*, if thou hadst giuen eare to me,
Innumerable ioyes had followed thee.
But thou didst loue the world.

Bad. Gaue eare to me, 2000
And now must taste hels paines perpetually.

Good. O what will all thy riches, pleasures, pompes,
Auaile thee now ?

Bad. Nothing but vexe thee more,
To want in hell, that had on earth such store. 2005

Musicke while the Throne descends.

Good. O thou hast lost celestiall happinesse,
Pleasures vnspeakeable, blisse without end.
Hadst thou affected sweet diuinitie,
Hell, or the Diuell, had had no power on thee. 2010

Hadst thou kept on that way, *Faustus* behold,
In what resplendant glory thou hadst set
In yonder throne, like those bright shining Saints,
And triumpht ouer hell, that hast thou lost,
And now poore soule must thy good Angell leaue thee, 2015
The iawes of hell are open to receiue thee. *Exit.*

Hell is discovered.

Bad. Now *Faustus* let thine eyes with horror stare
Into that vaste perpetuall torture-house,
There are the Furies tossing damned soules, 2020
On burning forkes: their bodies broyle in lead.
There are Hue quarters broyling on the coles,
That ner'e can die: this euer-burning chaire,
Is for ore-tortur'd soules to rest them in.

These, that are fed with soppes of flaming fire, 2025
Were gluttons, and lou'd only delicates,
And laught to see the poore starue at their gates:
But yet all these are nothing, thou shalt see
ten thousand tortures that more horrid be. sig. H2^V

Faust. O, I haue seene enough to torture me, 2030

Bad. Nay, thou must feele them, taste the smart of all.
He that loues pleasure, must for pleasure fall:
And so I leaue thee *Faustus* till anon,

1995 *bad Angell*] *bad*, B2: *Bad*, B3 2012 *set] sit B2 2016 are open] is
ready B3 2021 broyle] boyle B3

*The clocke strikes eleauen.*1450 *Fau.* Ah Faustus,

Now hast thou but one bare hower to Hue,
 And then thou must be damnd perpetually:
 Stand stil you euer moouing spheres of heauen,
 That time may cease, and midnight neuer come:

1455 Faire Natures eie, rise, rise againe, and make
 Perpetuall day, or let this houre be but a yeere,
 A moneth, a weeke, a naturall day,
 That Faustus may repent, and saue his soule,
O lente lente curite noctis equi:

1460 The starres mooue stil, time runs, the clocke wil strike,
 The diuel wil come, and Faustus must be damnd.
 O He leape vp to my God: who pulles me downe?
 See see where Christs blood streames in the firmament,
 One drop would saue my soule, halfe a drop, ah my Christ,

1465 Ah rend not my heart for naming of my Christ,
 Yet wil I call on him, oh spare me *Lucifer*

sig. F2^v Where is it now? tis gone:

And see where God stretcheth out his arme,
 And bends his irefull browes:

1470 muntaines and hilles, come come, and fall on me,
 And hide me from the heauy wrath of God.
 No no, then wil I headlong runne into the earth:
 Earth gape, O no, it wil not harbour me:
 You starres that raignd at my natiuitie,

1475 whose influence hath allotted death and hel,
 Now draw vp Faustus like a foggy mist,
 Into the intrailles of yon labring cloude,
 That when you vomite foorth into the ayre,
 My limbes may issue from your smoaky mouthes,

1480 So that my soule may but ascend to heauen:

Ah, halfe the houre is past: *The watch strikes.*
 Twil all be past anone:

Oh God, if thou wilt not haue mercy on my soule,
 Yet for Christs sake, whose bloud hath ransomed me,

1485 Impose some end to my incessant paine,

1454 time] t broken. 1474 natiuitie] n blotted.

1449 †leauen] †leuen A2,3 1451 †hower] houre A2,3 1459 †curite'] currite
 A2,3 1462 *to] vnto A2,3 1468 *out] forth A2,3 1477 *intrailes]
 entrance A3 †labring] laboring A2: labouring A3

The Tragical/ Historie | Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

V.ii

Then wilt thou tumble in confusion. *Exit.*

The Clock strikes eleuen.

Faust. O *Faustus*,

Now hast thou but one bare houre to Hue, 2035

And then thou must be damn'd perpetually.

Stand still you euer mouing Spheares of heauen,
That time may cease, and midnight neuer come.

Faire natures eye, rise, rise againe and make 2040

Perpetuall day: or let this houre be but a yeare,

A month, a weeke, a naturall day,
That *Faustus* may repent, and saue his soule.

O lente lente currite noctis equi:
The Stars moue still, Time runs, the Clocke will strike.

The deuill will come, and *Faustus* must be damn'd. 2045

O Fie leape vp to heauen: who puis me downe?

One drop of blood will saue me; oh my Christ,

Rend not my heart, for naming of my Chrise 2050

Yet will I call on him: O spare me *Lucifer*.

Where is it now? 'tis gone. |

And see a threatning Arme,

an angry Brow. |

Mountaines and Hills, come, come, and fall on me,
And hide me from the heauy wrath of heauen. 2055

No? Then will I headlong run into the earth:

Gape earth; O no, it will not harbour me.

You Starres that raign'd at my natiuity,

Whose influence hath allotted death and hell;

Now draw vp *Faustus* like a foggy mist, 2060

Into the entrals of yon labouring cloud,

That when you vomite forth into the aire,

My limbes may issue from your smoky mouthes,

But let my soule mount, and ascend to heauen.

The Watch strikes. 2065

O halfe the houre is past: 'twill all be past anone: sig. H3

O, if my soule must suffer for my sinne,

Impose some end to my incessant paine:

2036 *Faustus*,] *comma, doubtful trace only (period in B2).* 2046 strike.] *readsrike, (B3)*

2050 *Christ*.] *read Christ, (B3)* 2052 *gone*.] *read gone;*

2048 -+ †See where Christs blood streames in the Firmament, **B2** 2059 †**hath**] **haue B2** † **hell;**] **h e l l , B 2** n] your **B3**

A-1604 *The tragicall History of | Doctor Faustus.*

Sc. xiv

/Let Faustus Hue in hel a thousand yeeeres,
A hundred thousand, and at last be sau'd.

O no end is limited to damned soules,
Why wert thou not a creature wanting soule?

1490 Or, why is this immortall that thou hast?

Ah *Pythagoras metem su cossis* were that true,
This soule should flie from me, and I be changde
Vnto some brutish beast:

al beasts are happy, for when they die,

Their soules are soone dissolud in elements,

1495 But mine must Hue still to be plagde in hel:

Curst be the parents that ingendred me:

No Faustus, curse thy selfe, curse *Lucifer*,

That hath depriude thee of the ioyes of heauen:

The clocke striketh tve/ue.

1500 O it strikes, it strikes, now body turne to ayre,

Or *Lucifer* wil beare thee quicke to hel:

Thunder and lightning,

Fig. F3 Oh soule, be changde into little water drops,

And fal into the *Ocean*, nere be found:

1505 My God, my God, looke not so fierce on me: *Enter diuels.*

Adders, and Serpents, let me breathe a while:

Vgly hell gape not, come not *Lucifer*,

He burne my bookes, ah *Mephistophilis.* *exeunt with him*

1487 sau'd] *apostrophe, trace only.* 1499 clocke']²c turned (not a broken 0 as has been assumed). 1505 diuels] *I* broken. 1508 him] read *him*.

1491 †*metem su cossis*] *metem sucossts* (Pet.) *metemsucosis* (Hunt.) A2 : *metemsycosis* A3
1499 *''†*triketh*] *strikes* A3 1504 †*Oceani*] *Ocean* A2 : *Ocean*, {*comma faint*} A3
1506 †*Adders, and Serpents,*] *Adders and Serpents* A2,3

The Tragical/ Historie I Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

Let *Faustus* Hue in hell a thousand yeares,
A hundred thousand, and at last be sau'd. 2070

No end is limited to damned soules.

Why wert thou not a creature wanting soule ?

Or why is this immortall that thou hast ?

Oh *Pythagoras Metemscycosts* \ were that true,
This soule should flie from me, and I be chang'd 2075
Into some brutish beast.

All beasts are happy, for when they die,

Their soules are soone dissolu'd in elements,

But mine must Hue still to be plagu'd in hell.

Curst be the parents that ingendred me; 2080

No *Faustus*, curse thy selfe, curse *Lucifer*,

That hath depriu'd thee of the ioies of heauen.

The clocke strikes twelue

It strikes, it strikes; now body turne to aire,

Or *Lucifer* will beare thee quicke to hell. 2085

O soule be chang'd into small water drops,
and fall into the Ocean ne're be found.

Thunder, and enter the deuils,

O mercy heauen, looke not so fierce on me;

Adders and serpents let me breathe a while: 2090

Vgly hell gape not; come not *Lucifer*,

Fie burne my bookes; oh *Mephostophilis*. *Exeunt.*

Enter the Schollers. v. iii

1 Come Gentlemen, let vs go visit *Faustus*,

For such a dreadfull night, was neuer seene, 2095

Since first the worlds creation did begin.

Such fearefull shrikes, and cries, were neuer heard,

Pray heauen the Doctor haue escapt the danger.

2 O help vs heauen, see, here are *Faustus* limbs,

All torne asunder by the hand of death. 2100

3 The deuils whom *Faustus* seru'd haue torne him thus: sig. H3^v

For twixt the houres of twelue and one, me thought

2083 *twelue*] read *twelue*.

2095 *such*] c *broken*.

2098 *Pray*] P *obscured*.

2092 †*Exeunt*.] omit B2

2093 *the*] omit B2

2099 *heauen*] *heauens* B2

2101 **deuils*] Diuell B2 haue] hath B3

Epil.

Enter Chorus,

1510 Cut is the branch that might haue growne ful straight,
And burned is *Apolloes* Laurel bough,
That sometime grew within this learned man:
Faustus is gone, regard his hellish fall,
Whose fiendful fortune may exhort the wise,
1515 Onely to wonder at vnlawful things,
whose deepnesse doth intise such forward wits,
To practise more than heauenly power permits.

Terminal hora diem. Terminal Author opus.

[device]

1511 Laurel] Laurell A2,3 1512 sometime] some time A3 †man;]man,A3
1514 fiendful] fiend-ful A2: fiendfull A3 1516;intise] intice A2,3 1517 †than]
then A2,3 1518 ²Terminat] terminat A3 ^Device replaced by FINIS in A3

The Tragicall Historie I Of Doctor Faustus. B-1616

V. iii

I heard him shreeke and call aloud for helpe:
At which selfe time the house seem'd all on fire,
With dreadfull horror of these damned fiends. 2105

2 Well Gentlemen, tho *Faustus* end be such
As euery Christian heart laments to thinke on:
Yet for he was a Scholler, once admired
For wondrous knowledge in our *Germane* schooles,
We'll giue his mangled limbs due buryall: 2110
And all the Students clothed in mourning blacke,
Shall waite vpon his heauy funerall. *Exeunt.*

Enter Chorus, Epil.

Cut is the branch that might haue growne full straight,
And burned is *Apollo's* Lawrell bough, 2115
That some time grew within this learned man,
Faustus is gone, regard his hellish fall,
Whose fiendfull fortune may exhort the wise
Onely to wonder at vnlawfull things:
Whose deepnesse doth intice such forward wits, 2120
To practise more then heauenly power permits.

Terminat hora diem, Terminat Author opus.

FINIS.

NOTES

The main object of the notes is to elucidate the relation of the texts and the composition of the play. These matters are discussed at length in the Introduction, and to this frequent reference is made in order either to avoid repetition or to bring particular passages into relation with others of a similar nature. Since, however, questions of interpretation are often involved, it seemed worth while to add such further notes as might assist the understanding of the text. I trust they may prove a help to readers, who, however, must not expect to find in them a full exegesis. The basis of the commentary is necessarily the B-text, and to this all line-numbers refer unless preceded by ⁴A \ Stars in the margin refer to the additional notes on pp. 403-5.

Prologue

The variation of the texts puts B's use of MS beyond doubt, though it may have been actually set up from a corrected copy of A. There is almost certainly a common error in 13, and another has been suspected in 20 (see also notes on 3 and 15): the inference is supported by small agreements between B_i and A₃ in 5 and 22. The use of A as copy is all the more likely since it is well established for 1. i; but collation with MS must have been careful, as was indeed to be expected in the opening lines if MS was available.

Marlowe's authorship is not in doubt.

The Prologue follows *EFB*, ch. 1, pretty closely.

2-28. The main variants in these lines are discussed in the Introduction, pp. 40-3.

2-6. It has been sought to find allusions here to other plays of Marlowe's. Lines 4-5 would apply well enough to *Edward II* (less well to *Dido*) and 6 to *Tamburlaine* \ but no play is known that would fit 2-3, and it is in these lines that allusion to a particular piece seems most clearly intended. At first sight the expression *our Muse* (7), i.e. our poet, appears to point to common authorship, and this is borne out by the consideration that whereas *Edward II* was produced by Pembroke's men, *Tamburlaine* (to which, it is true, allusion is less certain) was acted by the earlier and later Admiral's men. But it is quite possible that *Tamburlaine* was also in the hands of Pembroke's between the dates of the two Admiral's companies. It may be, therefore, that community of ownership rather than of authorship is implied, and that the play of *Thrasimen* should be sought, not among Marlowe's works, but in the repertory of Pembroke's men, concerning which we are ill informed. Consequently, if the second play acted by them at court in the winter of 1592-3 was not *Faustus* (Introd., p. 61), it may have been *Thrasimen*. But it would still follow that *Faustus* was written for Pembroke's company.

3. *mate* The most natural meaning to ascribe to the word is 'overcome*' (checkmate), and the passage is quoted for this sense in *O.E.D.*, on the assumption that Marlowe supposed Hannibal to have been defeated in the battle of Lake Trasymenus. On the other hand, it has been suggested that *mate* here means 'espouse (the cause of)', and Boas paraphrases it 'enter into alliance with', but there seems no close parallel for such a use. (The sense 'consort with' is not recorded before the nineteenth century and is intransitive.) Ward, however, compares *Henry Fill*, HI. ii. 274, 'Dare mate a sounder man than Surrey can be', where it has the sense of 'rival*'

Notes: Prologue

or 'cope with'. This would involve taking *Mars* as equivalent to the military power of Rome, and such an interpretation seems, indeed, reasonable. Of course, if B printed the Prologue from A, *mate* may be an error: it might, for instance, be a misprint for *mete*, either in the sense of 'measure (strength with)'—which, however, lacks authority—or simply as a spelling of *meet*—which, though recorded, is unusual.

5. *state* i.e. government, political order.
ouer-turn'd: A *ouerturnd* The hyphen was introduced in A3. Unless *mate* in 3 is an error, this is the first slight indication of B's use of A: see Introduction, p. 64, and cf. 22 *ouer-throw*.
7. *vaunt*: A *daunt* Most editors have recognized that here A is in error. Tucker Brooke indeed retained *daunt*, but it is not clear what meaning he attached to it. For the obsolete transitive use of *vaunt*, 'to display proudly', *O.E.D.* (sense 4) quotes Spenser and Kyd.
12. *borne, of*: A *borne, his* A's reading may be due to a subconscious desire to avoid the repetition of... of.
parents base of stocke Cf. *EFB*, 'his father a poore Husbandman'.
13. *Rhodes* See Introduction, p. 63. The error is unlikely to be Marlowe's, and though it is doubtless true, as Boas remarks, that *Rhodes* 'was more familiar to the printers', it would be unreasonable to suppose that two compositors made the error independently. It is, therefore, good evidence that here B was printed from A.
14. *Wittenberg-*. A *Wertenberg* (a corruption of Wittenberg, not of Wurttemberg: In *trod.* p. 31).
15. *his kinsmen* An uncle, 'a rich man, & without issue', according to *EFB*. If the original had *his kinsman*, meaning 'a kinsman of his', the error would be almost inevitable on the stage, and would afford further evidence that B was dependent on A.
- 16-19. Cf. *EFB*: '*Faustus* . . . was by the Rectors and sixteene Masters afterwards examined . . . and being found by them, that none for his time were able to argue with him in Diuinity . . . with one consent they made him Doctor of Diuinitie.'
- A 17. Not in B. Boas objects to the repetition of *ofgrac't* in this line and the next as 'merely awkward' and 'unlike the jingle' in 8-9, *performe* . . . *forme*, for which he quotes as parallel 'pitch their pitchy tentes' from 2 *Tamburlaine*, v. iii (4399): cf. also 611 *Whose termine, is tearmed the worlds wide Pole*. I am unable to appreciate the distinction. Boas concludes that the line 'looks like an interpolation' in A; but it was assuredly not invented by an actor or reporter, and to me at least it seems thoroughly Marlowan. Since B is an edited text, the slight obscurity of the line may have led to its omission (*Introd.* p. 87). The construction is absolute: *grac't* means 'being by him adorned'. Breymann's gloss, 'grac't = graz'd' (thus carrying on the suggestion of *plot*) is inadmissible. It is true that at A 710 we have *race* for *raze* (B *raise*), but this is a recognized variant, whereas *O.E.D.* affords no authority for 'grace' as a spelling of 'graze'. As Boas points out, the following line doubtless refers to the 'grace' or decree of the Senate whereby degrees are still conferred at Cambridge.
18. *and sweetly can dispute*: A *whose sweete delight disputes* See Introduction, p. 88. Koeppl proposed to emend A to read *whose sweete disputes delight* (a reading open

Notes: Prologue

to the same objection as B's) and he was followed by Breymann (whose own conjecture, *who sweetly like disputes*, hardly deserves consideration): Boas, too, assumed that A was corrupt. Dyce and Tucker Brooke, however, accept A as correct; and so does Ward, who, though thinking Koeppel's emendation *Very seductive*, interprets the reading to mean 'whose sweet delight it is to dispute'. This is undoubtedly right, *disputes* being a substantive, and 'is' (i.e. consists in) being understood after *delight*. And this, I conjecture, was also the reading of MS; but it is certainly awkward and apparently tempted the editor of B to substitute his own superficially specious version.

20. *cunning, of a selfe conceit* (no comma in A). I take the sense to be 'intellectual pride engendered by arrogance'. The root idea of *cunning* in a bad sense is learning or skill misapplied. The superfluous comma in B, like many others, was probably introduced by the compositor (Introd. p. 140, note). Several emendations have been proposed, though, as Boas remarks, none is needed. The earliest is B2's substitution of *and* for *of*, and there is a possibility that this may be derived from performance (Introd. p. 145).

22. *And melting, heauens* (no comma in A). The allusion is, of course, to Icarus, and either punctuation can be defended. In A the sense is 'heaven, through the heat of the sun, conspired his overthrow'; in B 'his wings melting, heaven conspired his overthrow'. Whether the comma (which B2 retained) came from MS must remain uncertain: the compositor seems to have had the habit of introducing medial commas (cf. note on 20), but here he would have been more likely to add one after *heauens* than before. There is in B a slight awkwardness involved in taking *heauens* in the sense of 'the heavens' or 'heaven', and this may be in favour of A's reading, in which, owing to the presence of an adjective, the absence of the article is less noticeable; at the same time this very awkwardness, if original, may have led to the change of construction. The figure may, as Boas thinks, have been suggested by *EFB*, ch. 2, in which Faustus, 'taking to him the wings of an Eagle, thought to flie ouer the whole world', but there is no hint of ensuing disaster.

ouer-throw Another link with A3. The unlikelihood of two editions having introduced the hyphen independently is emphasized by the fact that it disappeared again in B3.

25. Cf. *EFB*, 'he gaue himself secretly to study Necromancy and Coniuration'.

On the spelling of *Necromancie* see note on 77.

The reading of B2, *on the cursd*, awkward at the best, can only be explained on the assumption that the reviser, or at any rate the compositor, accented *Necromancy* on the second syllable.

27. i.e. 'which he sets before his hopes of salvation'.

28. Although, as Ward points out, 'this' sometimes appears as a contraction for 'this is' (see note on 1336), in the present instance it seems more natural to take the verb as understood.

The 'Chorus' here draws aside the traverse, disclosing *Faustus in his study*, and B, presumably following MS, emphasizes the theatrical continuity by omitting A's *Exit* and *Enter* and putting the direction (29) on the right. But of course the 'Chorus' has to go off.

Notes

Act I, Scene i

Here there is ample evidence that B was printed, with some correction, from A. The exact correspondence of line division at 68—72, the &c. in 66, and the repetition of errors, Latin in 55 and 58, English in 117 (probably), are cumulatively conclusive. Specific dependence on A3 is seen at 35, 98, 102, 121, and most notably in *Oeconomy* at 41, and *subtle Sillogismes* at 134 (the last being conclusive for A3 as against A2). Evidence of the use of MS for correction is less frequent, but still unmistakable: instances of varying degree of cogency are at 49, 51, 60, 63, 88, 99, and 144; the direction at 96 is clearly from MS. Nevertheless it seems that at other points MS was not available, or was not consulted. Line 78 was altered apparently without its help; the all but complete absence of variants in 90-129 is hardly consistent with its use, and it is unlikely that the following three lines of A (136—8) would have been omitted could they have been authoritatively emended. The natural inference is that MS was defective or in parts illegible.

Marlowe's authorship is not questioned.

Apart from a few possible reminiscences of ch. 1 (see notes on 42—9, 75, A 136, 160-1, 181), *EFB* is not drawn upon.

31. *professe* i.e. make a particular or recognized study of, 'adopt as the subject of public teaching' (Ward); in this case divinity, as appears from the next line. Behind the phrase may lie the fact that the official style of a Doctor of Divinity is *Sanctae Theologiae Professor*.

32. *commenced* i.e. graduated, in this case taken the degree of Doctor of Divinity. At Cambridge the Congregation of the Senate at which honours degrees are conferred is still called Commencement.

35. *Analitikes* \ A *Anulatikes* B's obvious correction is already found, with the same spelling, in A3. But the misprint in A points to Marlowe having written *Analutikes*-. cf. the spelling *metem su cos sis* at A 1491, where B's *Metemyscosis* again comes from A3.

36. It has been pointed out (by Ward) that this definition of the end of logic is derived, not from Aristotle, but from the anti-Aristotelian Peter Ramus (Pierre de la Ramee) and that Marlowe's residence at Cambridge coincided with the beginning in England of the Ramist controversy.

Logicis Editors are no doubt right in substituting the Greek genitive *Logices*, though the slip may be Marlowe's. Ramus wrote 'finis Logicae, bene disserere'.

37—8. The question-mark at the end of 38 was first supplied in A2; that at the end of 37, recognizing the independence of the two lines, first appeared in B.

39. *that*: A *the* B's reading is somewhat the more natural, and is supported by the conscious parallelism of 46. Dyce observed that confusion through the similarity of the contractions 'y^e' and 'y^t' is easy; but the error, if there is one, was more likely due to an actor.

41. *Oeconomy*: A *Oncaymteon* See Introduction, pp. 63-4. Bullen recognized that the reading of A is nothing but a slightly unusual spelling of the Aristotelian *ov KOX firj 6v*. But this was evidently not understood at the time, since already in A2 we find *Oeconomy*. This was clearly not the emendation of an ignorant compositor, but of one who knew something at least of Greek writings. Ward remarks that Aristotle is reputed to have written two books *OiKovofxiKwv*, besides treating the subject in book i of his *Politics*. But the emendator may merely have confused

Notes : Act I, Sc. i

Aristotle and Xenophon. We are bound to assume that MS also read *On cay mee on*, or something like it, and that the editor of B, not understanding it, allowed the reading of A3 to stand. But (unless he was prepared to accentuate 'Oecon6my') the line halted badly, and he evidently sought to mend it by inserting *and* before *Galen*. If, therefore, in the B-text *Oeconomy* be emended to *ον ΚΑΙ ην ον* (or its equivalent), the *and* should, of course, be omitted. This Breymann perceived: Boas did not. I am inclined to prefer the punctuation of A, which suggests that *Galen come* is dependent on *Bid*: it may have been the loss of connexion due to the omission of A 43 that led B to treat the phrase as an independent imperative.

A 43. The *philosophus* is the student of natural philosophy. The line, found only in A, is adapted from Aristotle *de sensu*. Obviously it was not the invention of actor or reporter; nor is there any obvious reason why the editor of B should have omitted it (Introd. p. 87), unless perchance it was absent in MS. That, of course, would mean that it had been added in the prompt-book (Introd. pp. 81 ff.). But the omission was more likely accidental. *Seeing* connects the line more naturally with what precedes than with what follows, and this is confirmed by the punctuation in A.

42—9. For these lines there is a hint in *EFB*, ch. 1, where it is related that Faustus called himself 'for a shadow sometimes a Physitian, and did great cures'.

44. Translated from Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*. The compositor's medial comma in Bi (cf. 20) makes nonsense of the quotation: it was removed in B2.

A 49. Another clearly Marlowan line found only in A. The editor of B may possibly have cut it out as unnecessary, and none too obvious in sense unless one understands the allusion to the *Aphorismes* of Hippocrates (Introd. p. 88). As Boas observes, there is no need to alter *sound to found*, as Dyce and others have done.

47. *bils* i.e. prescriptions. Sir Thomas More writes, 'After the billes made by the greate physicion God, prescrybynge the medicines hymselfe', and in *Hudibras* we read, 'Like him that took the Doctor's Bill And swallow'd it instead o' th' Pill' (see *O.E.D.*, s.v. Bill, sb.³, 5-b). A 'bill' can be almost any writing. As Ward (who misunderstood the passage) points out, Faustus repeatedly calls his bond with Lucifer a 'bill' (452, 462, 1961). The commonest 'bills' to hang up were, of course, advertisements (*cL* 'bill-poster'); but there is no doubt of its meaning here.

49. *thousand* (B2 *diuers*)... *cur*d* (*Aeasde*) The variants in this line are rather difficult to explain and assess. Much depends upon the sense of *maladies*, which may mean either diseases, or outbreaks of sickness (epidemics), or individual cases of illness. Its association with *whole Cities* escaping *the plague* in the previous line seems to rule out the last, and to imply that it is other grievous diseases that are meant. In that case *thousand* seems excessive and suggests an actor's exaggeration in A (Introd. p. 58) taken over by B i; and B2's *diuers* is seen to be eminently plausible, its moderation being, in fact, far more effective. To account for the second variant we may suppose that even the reporter felt the extravagance of the claim, but pitched on the wrong point for emendation. His solution, that the *maladies* were only *easde*, is feeble; he may have thought that *cur*d* was inconsistent with *desperate*, though this only means that cure was despaired of, not that it was impossible. On the whole it seems likely that B2 preserves the correct form of the line.

51. *Couldst. . . men : A: couldst... man* Sense, and *them* in the next line, prove A's

Notes: Act I, Sc. i

readings to be corrupt (the second, perhaps a repetition from 50, was corrected in A3: Introd. p. 46). A's question-marks at the end of this line and the next are also wrong—the sentence is conditional, as shown by 53—but actors and reporters tend to take a short view, and once the lines are treated as interrogative the change to *wouldst* becomes inevitable. B may have corrected from MS, but it could easily have done so by conjecture.

55-6. A conflation apparently from more than one source, according to Ward.

55. 58. *legatus ... Exhereditari* The errors have been taken over from A: Marlowe must have written *legatur* and *Exhereditare*. The division and spelling of Ai's *Ex htereditari* were corrected in A2.

56. *Alter rem*, The comma was supplied by A2.

57. *petty* : A *pretty* Most likely *pretty* is a mere slip, though it might be an attempt to avoid the repetition of *petty . . . paltry*. Original irony removed by the editor of B seems less probable.

58. Alluding to one of the rules of the *Institutes*, but not, according to Ward, a verbal quotation. For the dash B2 substitutes &c (Introd. p. 146).

59. *institute* The 'Institutionum libri iv' was 'an elementary treatise on Roman Law, compiled by order of the Emperor Justinian in 533 A.D., and intended as an introduction to the Pandects' (*O.E.D.*).

60. *law* : A *Church* A is, of course, in error, but the error is difficult to explain. The Church as a (physical) body is a common Pauline figure, and the universality of the Church was a familiar idea. Perhaps the two notions combined to pervert the text. No doubt the correction might have been made by conjecture; but since it is certain, *law* was presumably the reading of MS (Introd. p. 47).

61. *This*-. A *His* If the latter is not a slip it may be original, referring either to the *institute* (59) or even back to *lustinian* (54). In either case, for different reasons, the change to *This* might commend itself to an editor (Introd. p. 89).

63. *Too seruire* : A *The deull* How this admitted nonsense got into A is hard to guess, but it is no worse than that in 60. There is, of course, some graphic resemblance, but it is slight.

64. That is, being a divine in show as a cloak for the study of other arts (32-3) has proved an illusion.

65. *Jeromes* Boas prints *Jerome's* to indicate a trisyllable; but he cites no authority for the pronunciation, and it is not really necessary for the metre.

66. Rom. vi. 23: 'Stipendia enim peccati, mors.' The comma introduced by the compositor of B after *peccati* is ungrammatical, but not as in 44 nonsensical: it was removed in B2.

ha was wrongly italicized (or romanized) in B i : it is, of course, Faustus' exclamation. B2 corrected the error.

&c. Unlike its use in 56, where it is part of the spoken text, it seems here to be a direction for repetition: Faustus murmurs the words over to himself, his voice dying away. In that case it originated in A and was taken over by B.

67-72. Though these lines are printed as verse in both texts (thereby showing B's dependence on A) it is clear that at this point Faustus suddenly lapses into prose. (That the Latin can be treated as two quite passable blank-verse lines is doubtless accidental.) The effect is calculated: for a moment the world reels as the founda-

Notes: Act I, Sc. i

tions of religion give way beneath him. And it makes effective the return to verse at 73. It is, of course, the turning-point in Faustus' life, when, renouncing his faith, he embraces magic. And Mephostophilis later claims that it was his doing: 'when thou took'st the booke, To view the Scriptures, then I turn'd the leaues And led thine eye' (1990—2: Introd. p. 102).

67. *death P* | A *death*: The question-mark is unnecessary and rather unexpected, and for that reason the less likely to have been introduced by the compositor. Whatever the original intention, the interrogative form would hardly have survived in a report. However, the question-mark may have been used for one of exclamation, as occasionally happens: there is no evidence that MS was available between 63 and 88.
68. 1 John i. 8: 'Si dixerimus quoniam peccatum non habemus, ipsi nos seducimus, et ueritas in nobis non est.' The comma after *peccasse* in Bi is presumably a compositor's error (cf. 44, 66); it was removed in B2.
- 74—5. Partially quoted in a marginal note by Nashe: see Introduction, p. 8, note 2.
74. *sera* An earlier form of *sara*, but also accentuated on the second syllable.
75. *IVhat will be, shall be* cf. *Edward II*, sc. xviii (1962), 'that shalbe, shalbe'.
Diuinie adeiw. Marlowe may have found a hint of Faustus' sudden decision in *EFB*, ch. 1: 'and sometime he would throw the Scriptures from him as though he had no care of his former profession . . . in so much that hee could not abide to bee called Doctor of Diuinie'.
76. *Metaphisicks* Used in its etymological sense of something lying beyond, or whose study comes after that of, physics or the order of nature. Boas cites 2 *Tarnbur I aine*, iv. ii (3944-5), 'Tempered by science metaphisicall, And Spels of magicke'.
77. *Negromantick* At 25 B substituted *Necromancie* for A's *Negromancy*, presumably in obedience to MS. Here B follows A's spelling and we are, therefore, free to conjecture that MS again had the correct form. We find *Necromantick* at 1242. 'Necromancy' is literally divination by means of the dead, *veKpoixavrtla*, but came to be applied to black magic in general through confusion with Latin *niger*, and was spelt 'negromancy' throughout the Middle Ages. The etymological spelling was restored in England in the course of the sixteenth century, the earliest instance cited in *O.E.D.* being from Skelton.
78. *Letters, Characters*-. *A sceanes, letters and characters* Boas defends B (with, however, the addition of *and*) declaring *sceanes* 'unintelligible', which it is. But I hesitate to attribute such a line to Marlowe, though possible enough in some writers. Probably *Signes* is the most obvious word to supply (it is coupled with *Characters* at 238) and of this *sceanes* might be a mishearing. I do not know that the jingle with *Lines* would be any objection. On the other hand, *EFB*, ch. 1, couples 'Figures, Characters, Coniurations, Incantations', and ch. 2, '*Vocabula*, Figures, Characters, Coniurations' (as also 'Circles and Characters') so that *Figures* is an alternative possibility. B, it would seem, omitted *sceanes* as nonsense, and *and* perhaps accidentally. It will be noticed that if we read *figures* in place of *sceanes*, the *and* becomes superfluous and may not have been in MS. However, we can hardly suppose that B omitted *and* in deference to MS, and was yet unable to emend *sceanes*. There is every reason to suppose that in this passage MS was not available.

Notes: Act I, Sc. i

83. *quiet Poles* Because they remain still while all revolves about them:
To that still centre where the spinning world
Sleeps on its axis, to the heart of rest.
- A 89. 'An awkward monosyllabic line, found only in A, and probably interpolated', says Boas. I see nothing suspicious in the line itself, though it is perhaps within the capacity of a reporter who wished to emphasize the magician's powers. If MS was still unavailable for control, the editor of B may have felt justified in omitting the line for reasons discussed in the Introduction, p. 87.
86. *exceeds* is no doubt a possible reading, though to judge from the examples quoted in *O.E.D.* (sense 5) it might not be easy to find an exact parallel. If, however, A is here the only ultimate authority, one may suspect a confusion between *excels* and *succeeds*, either of which might have been the original reading.
88. *Demi-god* \ *A mighty god* (a characteristic exaggeration: Introd. p. 58). This seems clearly to prove that MS was again available. Goethe's instinct was right: 'Du hast sie zerstört, Die schöne Welt, mit mach tiger Faust: Ein Halbgot hat sie zerschlagen!'
89. *Here tire my braines to get* (B2 *gaine*) *a Deity*: *A Heere Faustus trie thy braines to gaine a deitie* The line as it stands in B1 can hardly be regarded as altogether satisfactory; but we must be cautious how we meddle with it if MS was here again available, as seems to be implied by 88 and by the otherwise inexplicable alteration *of gaine to get*. In *A Faustus* is extra-metrical, and such insertions are common with actors, though vocatives outside the strict measure may be original (cf. 141). Its only importance here is that it supports or necessitates the following *thy*. Of course *tire*: *trie* might be due to literal transposition in either text: but 'try, my brains, to get a deity' is too banal for consideration. It would seem, therefore, that we must accept Bi's readings as they stand. There appear to be three possible interpretations, all rather forced, according as we take *my braines* to be the subject ('my brains tire themselves'), or the object ('let me tire my brains'), or as a vocative ('tire yourselves, my brains,'): perhaps the last is the least objectionable. As regards the remaining variant, Boas glosses *get* as 'beget', which at first sight seems rather far-fetched: Faustus wanted to be a god, not to father one. Still, taken in conjunction with the previous line, it may give a rather subtle meaning. We might paraphrase: In this endeavour, exhaust yourselves, my braines, by making me a great magician, to create a new divinity. The attractiveness of this interpretation lies in the fact that the point would easily be missed, in which case the substitution of *gaine* for *get* would be very likely, and may have occurred independently in A and in B2 (Introd. p. 147).
- Enter Wagner.* The position of the direction is essentially the same in the two texts; that in B it appears tucked in at the end of 89 (where there happened to be comfortable room for it) is probably due to the compositor's desire to save space. But it may well have stood in the margin in MS, with no very definite indication of its intended position. Wagner presumably enters at 90 in answer to Faustus' summons.
91. Why one or both of Faustus' friends should be specifically described as *Germane* (cf. 125) no one has ever explained, but compare the rather similar description of Faustus as *the Germane Coniurer* at 1190. Corruption can almost certainly be ruled out. Nothing whatever is known of the pair, who are an invention of Marlowe's: Cornelius is not, of course, the famous Cornelius Agrippa of Nettesheim, whom Faustus mentions at 139.

Notes; Act I, Sc. i

96. The form of the direction in B proves that MS was followed here. The use of *Spirit* is significant; it means an evil spirit or devil, as at 1472. See *The Damnation of Faustus*, p. 103, and note on 488.
98. *least*. A *lest* (A2,3 *leat*) A small indication that B is still dependent on A3. Cf. 1970.
99. *wrath* This reading in B, however, is from MS and not from A, since A3 reads *rod* (apparently one of those quasi-oral mistakes to which compositors are liable). The line is echoed at 2055.
102. *treasure*: A *treasury* (A2,3 *treasure*) B's reading is not a correction, but an error taken over from A3. In fact there is no certain evidence of the use of MS in the rest of this scene (though there are possible indications at 126—7, 144, and 173). The more individual reading is just sufficiently unexpected to make corruption easy.
104. *these elements* can hardly, in the context, be other than *earth* and *skye* (air), mentioned in the previous line. Between these, however, there is an antithesis. The meaning, therefore, would appear to be: Be you rulers in your respective spheres. The construction is a little awkward, but not I think impossible. Previous editors (Dyce, Ward, Boas) have supposed *these* to be merely equivalent to 'the', which seems to me in the context hardly possible. Boas refers to *these Elements* at 511, but the connotation there is different (see note). At the same time, since B is here dependent on A, *these* might quite easily be an error for *the*.
The explanatory *An'gels* added to the direction in B may well be editorial.
105. The question-mark at the end of this line is in accordance with Elizabethan usage, where modern punctuation would require a mark of exclamation. B restored it after A2,3 had substituted a comma. At the same time B added unnecessary question-marks at the end of the next two lines as well. None of this implies recourse to MS, any more than does the correction of A3's *pleasants* at 112.
109. *Indian* is, of course, a mere misprint in B 1, corrected in B2. Whether Marlowe had the gold of Ophir or of America (cf. 153) most in mind it is difficult to say. The *new-found-world* is mentioned in *i n*, but the *Orient* comes between, suggesting an antithesis. On the whole I am inclined, against Boas, to suppose that the East Indies are meant. That the name was used indifferently appears from *Purchas his Pilgrimage* (1614, p. 451, cited in *O.E.D.*), 'The name of India, is now applied to all farre-distant Countries, not in the extreme limits of Asia alone; but even to whole America, through the error of Columbus'; but it seems to have been used less commonly of the west, and according to *O.E.D.* 'Mostly reproducing Spanish or Portuguese usage*.'
- 110-11. A parallel has been cited from *The Taming of a Shrew* (Introd. p. 31, note 4), but the resemblance is not very close and may be accidental.
- n o*. *Orient* i.e. precious; originally, of course, pearls from the orient.
- i n*. *new-found-world* The hyphens, found in B only, may be the compositor's. For the habit of putting a hyphen, not only between the elements of a compound adjective, but between this and the substantive it qualifies, see McKerrow's *Prolegomena*, pp. 26-7, my *Variants in "King Lear"*, p. 109, and *The Library*, Mar. 1942, xxii. 212-13. B2 reads *new-found World*.
116. *make* One cannot help wondering why B2 should have substituted *with* unless it had some authority for doing so (in which case we have here further evidence

Notes ; Act I, Sc. i

of the dependence of Bi on A). It is a rather attractive reading, and an actor would be liable to substitute *make* in order to avoid the inversion. See Introduction, p. 147.

117. *skill* Dyce was probably right in reading *silk*, an emendation that has been generally accepted, and seems to be confirmed by some marginalia of Nashe's, if these have been correctly read (Introd. p. 8, note 2). Boas remarks that 'Faustus would have the gownsmen' *brauely clad* 'in defiance of University sumptuary regulations'. Indeed, I think that *brauely* disposes of the possibility that, by a rather forced metaphor, the students were meant to be attired in *skill*. If the emendation is correct Marlowe may have had in mind Greene's commendation of Oxford with its 'schollers seemely in their graue attire' in *Friar Bacon* (sc. viii (n 19)), if that play was in fact earlier than *Faustus* (Introd. p. 7).

120. *Prince of Parma* see Introduction, p. 7.

121. *the Prouinces*: A *our prouinces* Boas argues (against Ward) that the reference is to the United Provinces of the Netherlands (where Parma was Spanish governor-general from 1579 to 1592) rather than to the provinces of the Empire generally, of which the Netherlands formed part, though *Prouinces* is used in a quite general sense in 85. But *the* was not a correction of B's but merely a variant taken over from A(2)3. Of course, *our* may have been accidentally repeated from the previous line, and A2 in removing the repetition may have stumbled on the right reading. Still I doubt whether Faustus would have been content with the crown of the Netherlands, cf. 334-6.

122. *brunt* i.e. assault, onset (*O.E.D.*, s.v., sb.¹, 2.a; quoting the present passage): here apparently generalized to mean little more than the conduct of war.

123. *Anzverpe*: A *Antwarpes* Neither spelling is likely to be anything but a misprint (A2,3 have *Antwerpes*). As regards the possessive, even supposing that MS lacked the *-s*, it may be doubted whether the editor would have troubled to remove it, so that for this, too, the compositor was probably responsible. For the allusion see Introduction, p. 7.

126-7 s.D. The position of the direction is uncertain and has evidently puzzled editors. A places it after 127 (A 132) which cannot be right: Bi to improve matters and to save space inserts it at the end of 126 and 127. This may, of course, be how it stood in MS. (B2 places it at the end of 125 and 126.) Breymann, following Dyce, placed it before 125 in both texts. Tucker Brooke, editing A, placed it after 126 (which, of course, can be read as the intention of B). I do not know whether he intended to imply that 125-6 express Faustus' impatience for the arrival of his friends, who then incontinently enter, and are greeted in 127: but this would be a possible interpretation of the double address. Boas, like Dyce, placed the entrance before 125, but *prefixed* a direction of his own, 'He calls within'. I am at a loss to know what he meant, unless he regarded 125-6 as a call to the visitors to enter—which is contradicted by his arrangement. (Faustus, being on the stage, cannot call 'within' in the technical sense.) No doubt the double address is unusual, but in view of the important information Faustus is eager to impart it does not seem unnatural. I should adopt Dyce's arrangement.

On the dramatic function of Valdes and Cornelius, see *The Damnation of Faustus*, pp. 97-9.

126. *blest* For this B2 substitutes *wise*, probably an impertinent conjecture (Introd. •p. 148). Breymann's collation, making *wise* a variant of *of sage*, is wrong.

Notes ; Act I, Sc. i

A 136—8. The editor of B apparently omitted these lines as unintelligible (Introd. p. 88). Boas thinks them 'possibly interpolated', but does not say by whom: they can hardly be credited to an actor or reporter. There is, indeed, no reason to suppose that they were not in MS, though the editor's apparent inability either to confirm or correct them suggests that it was not here available. They are probably corrupt, at least in punctuation. Editors since Dyce have punctuated the second line after *object* instead of after *head*. Various explanations have been proposed. Ward, following a suggestion of Robert Adamson's, would connect *object* with the *disciplinae obiectivae (obiecta intellectionis)*, that is, the four major arts or studies. In that case the *objects* that Faustus' *fantasie* will not entertain would be the philosophy, medicine, jurisprudence, and theology that we have already seen him reject, and whose rejection he now proceeds to confirm (A 139-41). This is a very attractive interpretation, but its basis is somewhat doubtful. (If it is correct, it would not be really necessary, though it might still be desirable, to alter A's punctuation, since the meaning might be, 'that will entertain no "object" as a study fit for my mind', with *fantasie* and not *head* the subject of *ruminates*?) Logeman would take *object* to mean 'objection' (i.e. 'that will admit no objection (to the pursuit of magic)'). Minsheu records this (otherwise medieval) sense as late as 1614 (*O.E.D.*, sense 1). Or, alternatively, it might mean 'obstacle, hindrance', cited, apparently as a school term, from the mid-sixteenth century (*O.E.D.*, sense 2). This would be the simplest explanation, but the senses involved are rare and of doubtful currency. Boas's interpretation, 'My imagination that will not be impressed by solid realities', puts a strain on the ordinary meaning of 'object'. There may be more deep-seated corruption.

A 136. *mine ozune fantasie* Cf. *EFB*, ch. 1: 'Doctor *Faustus* . . . fell into such fantasies and deepe cogitations, that he was marked of many'. Thus it seems that *by fantasie* we are not to understand anything fanciful, but rather meditation and study. At 1909 *idle fantasies* are vain devices.

A 141—2. Not in B. This is the first of the cuts made by the editor with an eye on the statute of 1606 against profanity (Introd. p. 85).

A 141. *basest of the three* i.e. even baser than the other three.

134. *subtle Siiiogismes: A Consissylogismes* (A3 *subtile sylogismes*) This is perhaps the most conclusive of the many evidences of B's dependence on A3 (Introd. p. 64).

135. *GraueFd* i.e. confounded; a figurative use apparently of the obsolete sense 'run aground'.

137. *Sworne: A Szvarme* The reading of Bi (corrected in B2) may be a compositor's unconscious substitution rather than a literal error.

Problemes i.e. questions propounded in disputation: proximity to 134 suggests that the technical logical sense of the question expressed or implied in a syllogism • may also have been in mind (*O.E.D.*, s.v., 2,a,b).

140. *shadow: A shadowes* Probably no more than a compositor's slip in B (Introd. p. 92). Boas aptly quotes from the court prologue to Lyly's *Campaspe*, 'Whatsoever we present, we wish it may be thought the daunsing of *Agrippa* his shadowes'—though these, since 'in the moment they were seene, were of any shape one woulde conceiue', Lyly seems to have imagined as phantasms rather than as 'shades of the dead'. Ward points out that in his work *de occulta philosophic* Cornelius Agrippa gives directions for the operations of sciomancy, the **conjuring**

Notes: Act I, Sc. i

- up of a mere shadow or image of the dead, as opposed to the apparent resuscitation of a corpse through possession by an evil spirit. But I think he is wrong in trying to read this distinction into the play. Faustus' words at 52 are irrelevant—there is a question of restoring its human spirit to a dead body—and in the show of Alexander in iv. ii, the A-text at least (following *EFB*) makes it clear that, while there is no question of the reanimation of corpses, the apparitions are not mere simulacra, but that it is 'spirits' who appear (A 1081—3, 1086—90; cf. B 1282). Alexander and Helen are not as innocent as Ward would have us believe
- (see *The Damnation of Faustus*, pp. 103, 105-6).
143. *Moore*s a term often applied to any dark-skinned people.
144. *spirits*: A *subiects* There can be very little doubt that B is right, and *spirits* was probably the reading of MS; at the same time the editor was presumably capable of making the correction without its aid. The conception of 'elemental spirits' must have been a familiar one in contemporary demonology, although, according to *O.E.D.*, the actual term is not found before the nineteenth century ('elementary' in this sense seems to be quoted a century or more earlier). For they are clearly the 'elementall shapes' discussed by Bungay and Vandermast in *Friar Bacon* (sc. viii (1154)). The erroneous reading of A is probably due to carrying on the sense of the preceding line. It was, however, retained both by Ward and by Tucker Brooke, and the former defended it by reference to a peculiar use of 'subject' in two passages of 2 *Tamburlaine* (sc. iii (4557, 4561)), where he took the word to mean 'body' or 'bodily form'. He then argued that the bodily forms of the elements were those taken by the spirits belonging to them, which would make the reading practically equivalent to that of B. This appears to be a forced extension of a doubtful interpretation. According to *O.E.D.* (s.v., II. 5) the word 'subject' has in *Tamburlaine* the Aristotelian sense of the 'substance' of which something consists, which would afford no meaning in the present passage.
147. *Rutters* i.e. (German) cavalry soldiers.
148. *Lopland*: A *Lapland* There seems to be no authority for B's spelling, which is presumably a mere misprint, though it was repeated in subsequent editions.
151. *has the*: A *in their* Since MS was probably not available here, B's reading is presumably the editor's attempt to make sense. But it is clumsy and unattractive, whether (with Breyman and Boas) we allow the ungrammatical *has*, or whether (with Dyce and Bullen) we follow B2 in altering it to *haue*. A's reading is, of course, impossible as it stands, but *their* may possibly have been repeated from the previous line in place of *the*, in which case the construction might be loosely equivalent to 'than is shadowed in the . . .'. Marlowe has 'shadowing in her browes Triumphs and Trophées' in 1 *Tamburlaine*, v. ii (2294-5).
152. *huge Argosies* B2 has *whole Argosies*. It seems probable that the reading of B1 is an actor's exaggeration taken over from A, and that B2 preserves the original
- reading, recovered perhaps from current performance (Introd. p. 148).
154. *stuff* V: A *stuffes* Boas's suggestion that the past tense was substituted after Philip's death in 1598 seems less likely than mere error; it was corrected again in B2. That the action of the play in fact takes place in the reign of Charles V, historically the contemporary of Faustus, is recognized in Act iv and also in *EFB*. Thus the mention of his son Philip II (1556-98) Simpson calls a 'startling contradiction'. But allusions to current events are common enough in Elizabethan plays whatever the historical setting.

Notes : Act I, Sc. i

158. One might be tempted to read *that magick can performe*, as at 477; but here it is rather what he *will* in fact find magic performing that may lead Faustus to pursue it.
- 160—I. Cf. *EFB*, ch. 1, where we are told that Faustus 'accompanied himselfe with diuers that were seene in those diuelish Arts, and that had the *Chaldean, Persian, Hebrew, Arabian, and Greeke* tongues . . . and named himselfe an Astrologian'. This is the only hint in *EFB* of a source for Valdes and Cornelius.
161. The comma after *tongues* was supplied in A3, the *in* after *seene* already in A2.
164. *frequented* i.e. resorted to; seldom used except of a place, and only so recognized in *O.E.D.* Shakespeare expresses a similar idea by 'haunt', as in *Antony and Cleopatra*, iv. xiv. 54, 'Dido and her Aeneas shall want troops, And all the haunt be ours'.
165. *Delphian* : A *Dolphian* The correction had already been made in A2. If Ai's reading is anything but a misprint, it may be due to an ignorant actor's confusion with 'Dolphin'.
169. *massy* means simply 'massive'. According to Ward 'Shakespeare uses this word of metals; hence it is here used of the metal-bearing earth'. This is misleading, even apart from the implication that Marlowe derived the use from Shakespeare. Shakespeare, of course, applies the epithet to metals among other things, and *O.E.D.* notes that it is 'Said esp. of the precious metals', but it is in no way particularly connected with the notion of metallic, nor would it be appropriate to describe the earth as metal-bearing merely because *wealth* had been hidden in it. In *Friar Bacon* (sc. viii (1168)) the 'earthly fiends', i.e. the elemental spirits of earth, are • said to be 'grose and massie'.
173. *bushy* : A *lustie* (A2,3 *little*) At the end of the sixteenth century *lusty* could still mean 'pleasant', but that it was ceasing to be an appropriate adjective here is shown by the substitution of *little* in 1609. This, however, is pointless; and confronted with it, the editor substituted the rather conventional *bushy*. Of course, *lusty* might be a graphic error for *bushy*, and this might be suggested by the 'thicke Wood' of *EFB*, ch. 2. If this was so, the alteration must have been made from MS; but alternatively MS may have had *lusty* and the editor have misread this as *bushy*.
- There seems, however, no reason why Faustus should wish to do his conjuring in a grove, and the duplication with 175 (identical in *some . . . Groue*) is not only clumsy but silly: it makes Valdes say in effect, 'If you want to conjure in a wood, then go to a wood!' For the probability that 172—4 are an insertion, see Introduction, p. 101, where reasons are given for seeing in them the hand of the collaborator. To these add that the expression *O this cheers my soule* anticipates 731, *O how this sight doth delight my soule* (A, *O this feedes my soule*) which is certainly his. At the same time there is possibly a Marlowan ring in 174, so that there may have been rewriting rather than mere insertion.
176. *Albanus* This is either an error of Marlowe's or a corruption taken over by B from A. Two suggestions have been made. One (Mitford's) is that the famous Albertus Magnus (1193-1280) is meant, he who shares with Roger Bacon the claim to have fashioned the brazen head. The other (Diintzer's) would see an allusion to Pietro d'Abano (not 'd'Albano', as Boas has it) or Petrus de Apono (1250—1316), a medical and philosophical writer who was posthumously convicted of sorcery and burned in effigy by the Inquisition. The fact that, according

Notes: Act I, Sc. i

to Ward, his name is coupled with Bacon's ('Bachon et Apponus') by Cornelius Agrippa in his work *de incertitudine artium et scientiarum*, makes the identification plausible. The objection, of course, is that Marlowe would presumably have known him, not as Abano, but as Apono. If Abano is really intended, the form *Albanus* may be due to confusion with Albertus.

- 181.** Cf. *EFB*, ch. i: 'many other ceremonies belonging to these infernal Arts'.
186. *quidditie* i.e. essential particular, 'The real nature or essence of a thing' (*O.E.D.*); a term of school logic.
188. *coniure* (cf. A 243). 'To constrain (a person to some action) . . . by appealing to something sacred' (*O.E.D.*, sense 3), hence (sense 5) to constrain a spirit to appear by means of a spell. These senses are at least as old as the beginning of the fourteenth century, and that of 'to effect by jugglery' was already current early in the sixteenth. Both modern accentuations (ultimately derived from Old French) occur in Middle English, but that with the stress on the first syllable (as here) was much the more usual, and they had not yet come to be associated with the difference in meaning.
Exeunt om. The *om\nes* may have been in MS, or it may have been added by the compositor. The direction *Exeunt omnes* is found at 742 (also in A), 1370, 1522, and 1636; but not except here apparently in Marlowe's share of the play.

Act I, Scene ii

In this short prose scene the reporting, as we should expect, is somewhat less accurate, though Wagner's main speech is remarkably close. B was clearly printed from MS: there are no significant links between it and A3, and its variants are generally superior. A 215-18 are clearly a stage addition and out of keeping with the rest.

The scene has not usually been recognized as Marlowe's, but like Boas I believe it to be his: see Introduction, p. 101.

There is no hint of the scene in *EFB*.

Kocher thinks that the scene is imitated in Lodge's *Wounds of Civil War*, 1594, iv. ii, in which some soldiers inquire of the Clown the whereabouts of Antony, but there is little resemblance beyond the phrases, 'I pre thee leaue these rymes, and tell vs where thy master is' (1780-1; cf. 197), and 'Shall I tell you this wine is for him?' (1788; cf. 212-13).

- 189** S.D. This is identical in the two texts, but no inference of dependence can be drawn.
190-1. It is, of course, the same evening, and rather soon, one would suppose, for Faustus' students to have missed him. The implication is that he had been unsettled for some time (cf. 216) and had been neglecting his teaching.
191. *sic probo* 'thus I prove it', i.e. his demonstrations.
Enter Wag. The position of Wagner's entrance differs in the two texts; MS apparently marked it where the Scholars become aware of his approach, A naturally where he comes in view of the audience.
192. B's *presently* adds a significant touch, whereas A's *for see* is a superfluous connective (Introd. p. 56).
198-9. A's *necessary*, an error for *necessarily*, is an otiose addition; *that* for *which* is indifferent but repetitive; *licentiate* just possible, but clearly less probable than

Notes : Act I, Be. iii

Licentiats; and *vpoft* for *vpon* ungrammatical (cf. 213 and Introd. p. 48). A 'licentiate' is specifically 'the holder of a . . . degree between bachelor and master or doctor'; at Cambridge the degree of Licentiate of Medicine was not abolished till 1859 (*O.E.D.*). But the term was often used, as doubtless here, for the holder of any of the lower degrees. Faustus' students would not be undergraduates, but probably bachelors *in statu pupillari*: Wagner would not be so familiar with seniors.

A 215-18. An insertion, in which Wagner drops his academic style for the benefit of a ruder audience. A similar insertion in l. iv also plays on the idea of *zwitnesse* (A 402-3; Introd. pp. 36, 52).

201-15. A's *Well* (and statement) is slightly less apposite than B's *Then* (and question), and *Yes sir*, misses the elaboration of Wagner's style in *Tou are deceit?d, for*. The rest of this long speech is verbally correct in A (though less carefully punctuated) except for the omission of *but* from 208 and the ungrammatical insertion of *it* in 213 (Introd. p. 48). At the end A underlines Wagner's parody of puritan affectation by its repetition of *my deare brethren* (Introd. p. 58).

203-4. the 'Dunses' or 'Scotists' were the followers of the celebrated scholastic theologian Johannes Duns Scotus (died 1308), who became notorious for their cavilling sophistry. Here *dunses* probably retains something of its original application, 'a hair-splitting reasoner' (*O.E.D.*), since Wagner proceeds to argue much in this vein. Ward points out, following Adamson, that *Corpus naturale seu mobile* was the current scholastic expression for the subject-matter of physics.

208. *place of execution* i.e. scene of action (here the dining-room) with the obvious double meaning. Cf. the figurative and humorous use of 'to do execution' meaning to eat heartily.

210. *Precisian* was at the time usually synonymous with 'puritan'.

216-24. There is a good deal of verse rhythm in these lines, but it is so uncertain and intermittent that it is doubtful whether they are really intended as verse, and whether their printing as such in B may not be accidental (cf. 1778-84). The variants in A seem mostly due to failure of memory; they reduce the passage to
• plain prose, and so it is printed.

Act I, Scene iii

The relation of the texts is the same as in l. i. The exact reproduction of the corrupt Latin of the invocation (242-9) and the general absence of variants in the speeches that follow, together with common errors in 272 and possibly 228, and mislining at 281, show clearly that B was printed from A; and later the same conclusion follows from a series of readings reproduced from A3, viz. in 296, 302, 307, 321, two of them obvious errors. On the other hand, the use of MS is apparent in the initial direction and in those that accompany the invocation (at 242, 246), in the spelling *Mephostophilis* at 245, and in corrections at 227, 235, and perhaps 236. But after the invocation its use cannot be traced (unless doubtfully in 315, 319, 333, 337). Its absence is suggested by the cancelling instead of correction of A 276-8, the omission instead of emending of A3's reading at 271, and the retention of A3's careless error in 296. Thus MS seems to have been available only for the beginning of the scene, or, at any rate, only there to have been consulted. This accounts for the general absence of variants from 250 onwards, though A must be given credit for good reporting.

Marlowe's authorship is not in doubt.

The scene is based on *EFB*, ch. 2, but makes use of some points from later chapters (see 261, ch. 3; 288 ff., chs. 10, 13).

225-6 S.D. Obviously B's direction comes from MS, and the simplification in A could readily be explained by the habitual tendency of the reported version to avoid spectacular staging (Introd. p. 33). I do not understand by what authority Breymann and Boas, editing the B-text, discard the direction, though Boas actually explains its action in a note. At the same time this direction, which in a manner contradicts the text (Introd. p. 102), may not have formed part of the original draft of the scene but have been introduced to harmonize with the staging of Act v. If, therefore, Act v, as seems possible, was recast when the prompt-book was prepared (Introd. pp. 129-32), it is probable that the present direction was cancelled at the same time.

The scene, of course, is the *solitary Groue* mentioned in 1. i (175), not Faustus' study as represented in the woodcut in the quarto of 1616. There is no actual mention of the locality in the present scene, but in *EFB* we read how Faustus 'for his Speculation was so wonderfull, being expert in vsing his *Focabula*, Figures, Characters, Coniurations, and other Ceremoniall actions, that in all the haste hee put in practise to bring the Diuell before him. And taking his way to a thicke Wood neere to *Wittenberg*, called in the Germane tongue *Spisser Waldt* . . . he came into the same wood towards euening into a crosse way'.

227-30. This is one of the passages borrowed in *The Taming of a Shrew* (Introd. pp. 31-2), where it runs (sig. A2):

Lord. Now that the gloomie shaddow of the night,
Longing to view Orions drisling lookes,
Leapes from th'antarticke World vnto the skie
And dims the Welkin with her pitchie breath . . .

This confirms the old spelling *antartike* or *Antarticke* and also the rather unexpected *vnto* in A and B, but differs from both in having *lookes* in place of *looke*. Since B is here dependent on A, *lookes* may very well be the correct reading. The chief importance of the quotation, however, is to confirm the reading *night* (B) as against *earth* (A), and thus to prove that B had access to MS (Introd. p. 47).

The four lines mean no more than 'now that it is night': but how came Marlowe to put forward the astonishing view that night comes not from the east but from the southern hemisphere? We might suppose some accidental failure in the attempt to translate astronomy into poetry, were it not that a similar idea seems to underlie 2 *Tamburlaine*, 1. iii (2542-3),

When *P* has *bus* leaping from his Hemi-Spheare,
Discendeth downward to the con' Antipodes

though this does not indeed state the conception so explicitly. But, assuming a geocentric universe, it is, after all, a not altogether unnatural misconception, though one that we can hardly suppose that Marlowe would have countenanced in his less poetical moments. Curiously enough there is a yet more surprising and more involved confusion on the subject of summer and winter in iv. vii (1666 ff.), but that (unlike the present passage) has at least a basis in *EFB*, and, moreover, cannot be imputed to Marlowe.

227. The *shadow of the night* seems to have borne a special meaning in certain circles at the time, and Chapman entitled one of his poems *JENNY WINKLES* (1594). It has

Notes: Act I, 8c. tit

been suggested that this was written for a coterie apparently called 'the Schoole of night*' in *Love's Labour's Lost* (iv. iii. 255) and identifiable with the so-called 'school of atheism' of which in 1592 Chapman and Marlowe as well as Raleigh and Harriot were members (see *L.L.L.* ed. Quiller-Couch and Dover Wilson, 1923, pp. xxix-xxxii).

228. *Orions drisling looke* The constellation appears in northern latitudes at the beginning of winter; hence Virgil, *Aeneid*, i. 535, 'nimbrosus Orion', and iv. 52, 'aquosus Orion'.

234. *circle* i.e. the circle that the conjuror draws round him on the ground both as a spell to enforce the spirits to appear and as a protection against them (see 239-40). *Within this circle* means 'on this circle' (see note on 238).

lehouas Name would be represented, of course, by the tetragrammaton.

235. *Anagramatis'd: A and Agramithist* A's is a characteristically ignorant perversion, perhaps with some recollection of 'amethyst' behind it, and due presumably to the actor or reporter or both (Introd. p. 47). There is no reason why a compositor should make such a blunder, unless he had to guess at a very illegible copy. B doubtless corrected it from MS.

236—9. These lines lack a principal verb, unless we take them as loosely dependent on *is* in 234. In that case 235 is a participial phrase qualifying *name* and not the complement of *is*, and the colon that B substituted for A's comma at the end of the line is misleading.

236. *Th'abreuiated: A The breuiated* This may be again from MS; but it may equally well be editorial tinkering.

238. *euening: A erring* Since B is here printed from A, its error, repeated in 613, cannot be graphic, but must be an aberration of the compositor's (Introd. p. 92). B2 corrected the first but not the second instance. It is, of course, the constellations of the zodiac and the planets moving through them that are in question, and it is the symbols of these that are in fact inscribed on the circle within which Faustus stands in the woodcut of 1616. *EFB* also describes how, in the wood, Faustus 'made with a wand a Circle in the dust, and within that many more Circles and Characters'.

240. *to: A but* In B the sense, of course, is 'fear not resolutely to try . . .', but confining his attention to the single line, an actor might find the construction in A the more natural.

241. *vtmost: Avttermost* This would probably have been regarded as litde more than a difference of spelling. B is slightly more regular metrically, and may reveal the editorial touch.

242-9. That B is printed from A appears clear from the corrupt Latin, particularly in the vulgar misunderstanding implied in *demigorgon*, the senseless *quod tumeraris*, and the absence of the necessary comma after *ignei*, which disappeared in A3 (Introd. pp. 64-5). The compositor was probably responsible for the more usual *Dij* in place of *dei* and for several other *-ij* spellings. (A1, using italic, naturally employed the regular *ij* ligature; A2 and A3, using roman, naturally printed two separate letters *ii* that B1, also using roman, printed the separate letters *ij* can only be due to an idiosyncrasy of the compositor.)

That MS was available is shown by the two directions inserted by B, *Thunder* at 242 and *Dragon* at 246 (Introd. pp. 33, 67). The former might, of course,

Notes: Act I, Sc. iii

be editorial, but it bears out the initial direction (225—6) by suggesting that the powers of darkness already know about Faustus' conjuring and are ready to enter into the game. Boas seems to have been the first to see the significance of *Dragon*, which the compositor mistook for part of the text. This is most unlikely to be the editor's, and must be assumed to derive from MS. It is inserted immediately after Faustus' first unsuccessful attempt to summon Mephostophilis (see note on 246), and it is at this point, just as he renews his invocation, that according to *EFB*, 'sodainly ouer his head hanged houering in the ay re a mighty Dragon'. Moreover, we know that the Admiral's men (in 1598 at latest) had 'j dragon in fostes' (Introd. p. 11), and they would hardly have missed an opportunity of exhibiting it. On the other hand, the makeshift company for which A was prepared are unlikely to have owned so elaborate a property. Boas (p. 3) thinks that the emergent creature in the 1616 woodcut is a dragon. It is, of course, a devil (Mephostophilis); but if the cut is in any way based on recollection of a performance (which it may be in spite of substituting a room for a wood) it is just possible that the creature's bat-like wings were suggested by those of the hovering dragon. A stage devil would not be very likely to have wings at all.

Boas attempted the emendation of these lines, a task for which I can pretend no competence. I will only add a few suggestions, *valeat* certainly means 'Away with' (Boas) and not 'prevail' (Ward): this is clear from 278-81 (cf. A). In the next line Boas prints *Ignis, aeris, aquae, terree spiritus*; but *ignei,] Aerij, . . . spiritus* is all right, *Aquatani* might be an error for *Aquatici*, and *terreni* could be supplied, if it was thought necessary to complete the tale of elemental spirits (cf. 144). Schroer's conjecture *Quidtu moraris?* for *quod* (A *quod tumeraris* (246) may be accepted as almost certainly correct in view of *EFB*, 'Faustus all this while [was] halfe amazed at the Diuels so long tarrying', *dicatis* (248) was corrected to *dicatus* in B3 (if not in B2). I agree with Boas (against Ward) that, in spite of the lack of a necessary comma, *Orientis Princeps* (243-4) can only mean Lucifer (as at 497) and must be distinct from *Belzebub, inferni ardentis monarcha*. I would go farther and presume that the name *Lucifer* was accidentally omitted by the reporter. Lucifer and Beelzebub, with Demogorgon, then appropriately constitute an infernal trinity in place of the holier one abjured. It is true that at 282 Beelzebub is spoken of as the only *chiefe* (cf. also 394 and 399) as if he were one with Lucifer (already named at 266) and that it might be contended that in the passages where he appears as a distinct character (658 ff., 1894 ff.) a collaborator has gone counter to Marlowe's conception. Actual identification of two such familiar figures seems, however, highly improbable: it is more likely that the new trinity was also thought of as triune, so that the name of one could indifferently stand for all, much as Faustus in his last agony calls indifferently on *Christ* and *God* (i.e. Deus Pater, etymologically equatable with Jupiter, whence *Joue* in the same sense at 314).

244-5. *demigorgon* Evidently B took over from A what can only be an actor's or reporter's misunderstanding of or substitute for *Demogorgon*, a name that must have been familiar to Marlowe (no less than to Spenser and Milton) from Boccaccio's *Genealogia deorum*, where the *nomen horribilis* appears as that of the primordial god of classical mythology. (It first appeared, so it is said, in Lactantius' scholia on Statius.) The actor's error may have been due to recollection of the intentional perversion of the name in the mock-invocation of n. iii (which A omits), where B (751), printing of course from MS, has *deny orgon, gorgon*. (In the second mock-invocation, in in. iii, B (1157) has the correct form

Notes: Act I, Sc. Hi

demogorgon, where A has gibberish: but see Introd. p. 144.) When in 1 *Tamburlaine*, iv. i (1389) Marlowe wrote, 'As monstrous as *Gorgon*, prince of Hell', he probably meant Demogorgon, and it is perhaps significant that he already regarded him as one of the rulers of the underworld.

245. *Mephostophilis*-. A *Mephostophilis* The former was evidently Marlowe's spelling: *FB* (which seems to have invented the name) and *EFB* have 'Mephostophiles' (Introd. pp. 39-40). Since this is the first time the name occurs, B must have made the correction from MS. Neither the play nor its source explains why Faustus should have chosen this particular spirit to evoke, and the play, though it calls him great (A 277), does not even tell us who he is. In *EFB*, ch. 5, the Spirit explains, 'I am a prince, but seruant to *Lucifer*-, and all the circuit from *Septentrio* to the *Meridian*, I rule vnder him'. This, however, is hardly consistent with ch. 12, according to which the ten kingdoms of hell 'are governed by flue kings, that is, *Lucifer* in the *Orient*, *Beelzebub* in *Septentrio*, *Beliall* in *Meridie*, *Astaroth* in *Occidente*, and *Phlegeton* in the middest of them all: whose rule and dominions haue none end vntill the day of Dome'.
246. *gehennan*: A *gehennam* B's reading is more likely to be a misprint (corrected in B3) than a Greek accusative.
- 250 s.D. a *Deuill* (cf. 254), i.e. *Mephostophilis*: the distinction between this direction and that at 260 is a theatrical, not a dramatic, one.
- A 276-8. After following A through the first nine lines of this speech without variation, B omits these last three. The editor must be held responsible (Introd. p. 87). Probably the Latin line, which is virtually unintelligible as it stands, together with the difficulty of the first, suggested the omission. J. H. Albers's emendation, *Now* for *No*, has been accepted by several modern editors, and is preferable, on ground of sense, to Nosworthy's recent suggestion of *Know*, which was not homonymous in Elizabethan English. Boas thinks the lines are 'possibly a later interpolation'—but whose? They are certainly not due to an actor or reporter, and the reason for such an addition is difficult to imagine.
- A 278. Boas reads *redis* for *regis*, taking *Mephostophilis* as a vocative (cf. note on 417). He writes: 'I have adopted the emendation of A. E. Taylor in *T.L.S.*, 6 Dec, 1917, by which the line becomes virtually a Latin rendering of 253. He adds: 'If *regis* is kept we must interpret "Indeed thou rulest Mephostophilis [*sic*] in the likeness of a friar." "Mephostophilis" would then be used here as an indeclinable proper name, and the line echo the previous one, and refer to the devil's disguise.' This, however, seems forced; and *regis* may well have crept in on account of the antecedent *command*.
260. *Mephostophilis* (both texts). There is only one other instance in A of this spelling (normal in B), namely, at A 1012, also in a stage direction (Introd. p. 40, note).
- 261 *if*. In *EFB*, ch. 2, Faustus, on Mephostophilis' first appearance, merely binds him to attend later at his house, and it is only then, in ch. 3, that the present conversation takes place.
270. *now* makes the line awkward and is probably an actor's insertion taken over by B from A. If the actor made a pause after *No*, he might naturally treat it as extrametrical and proceed to pad out the line. B2 was justified in removing the excrescence.
271. *coniuring* \ *K coniuring speeches* (A 2,3 *Couring spirits*) B, confronted with the

Notes: Act I, Sc. iii

senseless reading of A3, solved the difficulty by simply omitting *spirits*, which is reasonably conclusive evidence that MS was not here available. Of course *coniuring* by itself makes perfectly good sense, it is the verse that suffers by the omission. Boas was content to let B's reading pass: Breymann saw that A must be original.

272. *per accident* Bi italicized (or rather romanized) the phrase but did not correct it; this was first done in B4.
275. *glorious* Perhaps 'boastful', hence 'presumptuous'; but it may have its more usual meaning, here 'precious'.
279. *allgodlinesse: A the Trinitie* An editorial censoring in B (Introd. p. 86).
281. A hypermetrical line in both texts. Editors have printed it as two, divided after *hath*; but such a division would be very unusual for Marlowe, and an occasional fourteener is not impossible in blank verse. At the same time there is no indication that MS was available hereabouts, and if A is our only authority, the third person may have been introduced by the reporter in anticipation of 283—the repetition of *Faustus* is a little suspicious. In that case the line may have originally read, *So I haue done, and hold this principle*, for the switch from first person to third compare 262-3.
- 284-6. *me . . . I confound . . . My : A him . . . he confounds . . . His* Since there is no evidence of the use of MS hereabouts, there is an *a priori* presumption in favour of the readings of A. The editor of B seems to have lost patience with the third-person affectation as soon as it was no longer controlled by the use of the personal name. (It is true that there are equally abrupt changes of person in both texts at 263 and 318.) But in making the change the editor may have accidentally returned to the original readings, since if the reporter began by introducing the third person at 281 (as already suggested) he may well have continued it in 284—6.
- These lines of course recall the famous passage in Nashe's Preface to *Menaphon* about the writers 'that thrust *Elisium* into hell' (ed. McKerrow, iii. 316), and if commentators had been less busy chasing Kyd, they might have argued that it was to this phrase that Nashe was referring, and deduced a date for *Faustus* not later than Aug. 1589. As it is, I do not know that anyone has actually made the suggestion (though McKerrow, in his notes, mentions the present lines) and the passage as a whole can hardly apply to Marlowe. The names are already found coupled in 1 *Tamburlaine*, v. ii (2247), 'Hell and *Elisian* swarme with ghosts of men'.
- 288-94. The passage may contain reminiscences of *EFB*, ch. 13, in which Faustus inquires of Mephostophiles 'in what estimation his Lord *Lucifer* was when he was in fauour with God'. Mephostophiles replies that he 'was at the first an Angell of God . . . but when hee began to be high minded, proude, and so presumptuous that hee would vsurpe the seate of his Maiestie, then was he banished out from amongst the heauenly powers'; and also of ch. 10: 'Here *Faustus* said: but how came thy Lord and master *Lucifer* to haue so great a fal fro heaue? *Mephostophiles* answered: My Lord *Lucifer* was a faire AngellP but upon 'presumption the Lord cast him downe headlong'. But of course no specific source was required.
289. *Spirits*, i.e. devils, cf. 292. For the implication see note on 488.
296. *Hue: A fell* A2 accidentally repeated *Hue* from the previous line, and A3 and B reproduced the nonsense. Recognizing it as such, modern editors of B, of course, adopt the reading of A i, though the fact that they keep the reading of B in the parallel cases at 302 and 307 shows that they have failed to grasp the principle

Notes : Act I, Sc. iv

- involved. Boas's collations and note are misleading. The compositor of B1 was himself guilty of similar repetitions, see 838 and 1869.
302. *that: A who* Another error originating in A2, and this time involving nothing worse than an awkward repetition.
307. *strikes: A strike* Another, this time involving a false concord. It was corrected again in B5.
- 308—9. See note on 2082.
312. *these: A those* A's reading is an obvious error (due probably to repetition from the previous line) and B's correction may be the editor's.
315. *vp* is absent from A2 and A3. It doubtless stood in MS, but the editor may quite well have supplied it for the sake of the metre. He supplied *me* in similar circumstances in 319, where, however, the emendation was even more obvious.
316. *foure and twenty: A 24*. The figures had already been replaced by words in A3.
321. *to aid; ayde* The unnecessary *to* was inserted in A2.
- 327-8. It is, of course, a deliberate touch that each party to the bargain betrays his eagerness either in soliloquy or aside; cf. 461.
330. *through* B retains the spelling of A, though a dissyllable is required.
331. *Ocean: . . . men: A Ocean . . . men*. (B2 removed the colon after *Ocean* but left it to B3 to place a period after *men*.) Both Breymann and Boas follow A, and the latter does not even record the departure from his copy-text. The punctuation of B1 makes, of course, perfectly good sense, but it is unlikely sense, and metrically the punctuation is perhaps less probable for Marlowe. Only if 333 were thought to imply recourse to MS would B1's reading need to be seriously considered. On the whole it seems likely that the compositor of B1 placed the colon in the middle instead of at the end of the line accidentally, owing to insufficiently clear directions on the copy of A3 he had before him. Cf. 859-60 and note.
333. *Country: A land* I do not believe (any more than Dyce and Bullen) in the reading of A (though Breymann cites Abbot, §§ 484, 486, in defence of such metrical licence). But *Country* (whether correct or not) is such an obvious emendation that we cannot assume it to be derived from MS (Introd. pp. 6j, 89).
continent to i.e. continuous with. The present is the earliest passage quoted for this particular use in *O.E.D.*; the latest is of 1692.
337. *desir'd: A desire* B's reading has no advantage over A's: it may be a compositor's blunder, or possibly a fussy change made by the editor on some fancied ground of grammatical logic.

Act I, Scene iv

The texts, though still parallel, are widely divergent, and B was obviously printed from MS.

A purely farcical scene, which, unlike Boas, I see no reason to ascribe to Marlowe (Introd. p. 103).

There is nothing corresponding in *EFB*, but a hint may have been taken from ch. 56 (see note on 370-1).

I owe some points in the following notes to the elaborate analysis of the scene by Kirschbaum (pp. 280-4).

Notes : Act I, Sc. iv

340 s.D. The direction is the same in the two texts, but since it expresses the facts in the minimum terms no inference of dependence can be drawn.

341-3. This is another of the passages borrowed in *The Taming of a Shrew* (Introd. p. 32), where it runs (sig. C4^v):

Boy. Come hither sirha boy.
San[der]. Boy; oh disgrace to my person, souns boy
Of your face, you haue many boies with such
Pickadeuantes I am sure . . .

This agrees with B except for the error *Of for in*, the omission of *seene*, and the reading *such Pickadeuantes*, in which last it agrees with A. The term 'pickedevant' for a pointed beard came in about 1587, and it was still common in 1616, though it had doubtless lost the spice of novelty. It was presumably on this account that the editor substituted *beards* (Introd., p. 87).

The passage gives the measure and shows the type of corruption in A. There is simple transposition in *Sirra hoy* and *come hither*, and more elaborate in / *hope* at the beginning of the sentence instead of / *am sure* at the end; there is the omission of *O disgrace to my person* and of *in your face*; there is connective insertion in *How*, explanatory in *as I haue*, and repetitive in *Boy quotha?* All these are characteristic actor-reporter corruptions. We find *How* again at A 370, and replacing *What* at B 354, and *how, how* at A 378. Other connective insertions in A are, 364 *Tel me*, 374 *we I*, 382 *Oho, oho*, 388 and 391 *Doe (do) you heare*, and 399 *No, no*.

344. *commings In* i.e. earnings. This gives the Clown an opportunity of punning on *goings out* (345), i.e. expenses, by which he means that he is coming through his tattered clothes, as is evident from Wagner's allusion to his *nakednesse* (346-7).

347-8. The author accidentally and rather carelessly used the phrase / *know* twice over. In representation (possibly in the prompt-book) one of the occurrences (the first) was naturally and very properly omitted.

350. The repetition of the last words of the previous speaker in A (370-1) betrays the actor's anxiety to raise another laugh: but cf. 530, where a similar trick appears in a serious passage (Introd. p. 51). See, moreover, 380-2.

351. / *can tell you* may be intended as a characteristic phrase of the Clown's since it is repeated at 364. A omits it on each occasion, the emphasis it gives being here supplied by *burladie* and later by *swowns*.

352. *be my man and waite on me : A serue me* Here A anticipates B's *will you serue me now* at 375 (q.v.), but when it comes to B's / *serue you* at 357 it recalls the present passage and substitutes *if I were your man*.

353-4. It may seem surprising that the author should expect his Clown (or his audience) to recognize in *Qui mihi discipulus* the beginning of a didactic poem, but Lily's *Carmen de moribus* would be as familiar to every grammar-school boy as to Wagner.

355-7. See Introduction, p. 35. Stavesacre is a preparation from the seeds of a species of delphinium used for killing vermin, and there is no reason to suppose that it is here used for, or as a perversion of, the name of some material. (Commentators have been misled by A into supposing that there is mishearing in B also.) The clue is given by *beaten silke*, which means embroidered silk, but, of course, suggests a drubbing. In effect Wagner promises to dress his servant (or rather

Notes : Act I, Sc. iv

to dress him down) in silk—and adds that plenty of Keating's powder will be needed. Kirschbaum's suggestion that *staues-aker* is a corruption of A's taken over by B cannot be entertained, since there is no evidence that B is dependent on A in this scene.

A 378-81. An elaboration in A, depending, like that at A 392-6, on a comic mishearing by the Clown. Kirschbaum refers to the description of the Clown's gagging in *Hamlet*, in. ii. 42-50, and especially the more extended remarks found at this point in Qi (1603) only, sig. F2-2^v.

356-7. The reporter omitted the necessary explanation *that's good to kill Vermine*, but showed that the words remained in his memory by changing / *shall be lousy* to / *should be ful ofvermine*.

363-4. A meaning, though a different one, can be found in the jest in either version, but it is easy to see how the text of A arose as a perversion of B's. The latter means, 'they treat me with as little ceremony as if they were guests who had paid for their dinner and I the waiter whose business it was to serve them (with my own flesh and blood)'. By changing *their* to *my* A altered the sense to 'as if I had been their guest', and so missed the point. But it happened that a new meaning could now be read into it, namely, 'as if it was they who kept and fatted me up for their own eating'; and that this is how it was interpreted is shown by A's insertion of *had*,

365. *leaucyour iesting* The phrase is repeated from 197, but that may be accidental (Introd. p. 103). The reporter had already used it by anticipation in rendering 359, where it is inapposite, and consequently omitted it here (Introd. p. 54). In its place he introduced *do you heare*, a favourite phrase of his, which seems to have originated as a variant of B's *hearke you* at 378, whence it spread to the present passage and to 362, and appears later in an expansion at A 429.

A 392-6. See Introduction, p. 35. Another elaboration and mishearing—and a less plausible one. The prevalence of French coins, which the Clown suggests are worth no more than English counters, seems (according to Ward) to have become noticeable about 1595, so that the insertion may date from then. But the allusion is rather uncertain to base much on. (There is no need to see, with Kirschbaum, a reference to the pox.) The insertion replaces B 366; consequently in A the Clown never actually accepts the money and 367 loses its point. Incidentally guilders are not French crowns, but as A adopts the common spelling *gilders*, it may have connected it with 'gilt' and 'gilden', and thought it applicable to any gold coin.

368. Wagner here parodies the language of Faustus' compact with the devil. That he is anticipating 11. i rather than copying from *EFB* appears through comparison with 500-2, which has no verbal source (but cf. also 492, 495). It seems likely that the serious skeleton of the play was drafted before the comic trappings, even if these formed part of the piece as originally produced (Introd. p. 117).

369. *Guilders : Agridirons againe* B2 also adds *againe* (Introd. p. 146). Boas points out that in *The Taming of a Shrew*, sig. D i, sc. viii, Sander says, 'Here here take your two shillings again'. Since this follows hard upon the parallel already quoted (note on 341-3), there may well be some connexion, which would point to *againe* having been accidentally omitted in **B**.

A 399-403. I think that A deliberately divided the Clown's speech (B 369) between him and Wagner in preparation for introducing the comic business of their **both**

Notes; Act I, Sc. iv

appealing to the audience for *witnesse*. A had already used the idea of *witnesse* when farcing at A 215-18 (Intro. p. 52).

- 370—1.** There is no reason to suppose that when he wrote this passage the playwright knew the *Wagner-Buch*, which chronicled Wagner's exploits, but which was not printed till 1593. To make the servant comically ape the master would in any case be obvious. It may, however, be mentioned that *EFB*, ch. 56, introducing Wagner, mentions his bad reputation: 'this youth was very well acquainted with [Faustus'] knaueries and sorceries, so that hee was hated as well for his owne knaueries, as also for his Masters: for no man would giue him entertainment into his seruice, because of his unhappines, but *Faustus*, who, it may be mentioned, bequeathed him a 'Spirit *Akercocke**.
- 370.** *Prest* To 'press' (originally 'prest') is to hire or enforce to serve through the acceptance of money in earnest, 'press-(prest-)money\ (The past participle of 'prest' is 'prested'.)
- 371.** *carry: Afetch* Characteristically A repeats the phrase used a few lines earlier (368). For such assimilation see Introduction, p. 53.
- 371-2.** *BaniOy Belcher: A Baliol and Belcher* A makes much more play with the names than does B. Naturally, like the Clown, A gets hold of *Belcher* correctly; but *Banio* (whom the Clown ignores in B) figures in A both as *Banio* and *Balio* and *Baliol* or *Baliotl*. The retention of *Banio* in two instances (A 420, 431) shows that the reporter had the correct form at the back of his mind, and suggests that the deviations may have been intentional. But whether any allusion was intended, either to an 'illustrious Scottish' family (Boas) or to an Oxford college (Kirschbaum), I rather doubt: there can certainly be none to the Ballio of Plautus. Ward was probably nearer the mark when he suggested that *Baliol* was influenced by the name Belial.
- A 408—10.** Another interpolation, based on *A Looking-Glass for London and England* (Intro. pp. 52-3). This play was printed as by Lodge and Greene in 1594 (entered 5 Mar.), but according to Henslowe was already old when acted by Strange's men in the spring of 1592—which does not help with the date of the borrowing.
- 374.** B's (marginal) direction obviously owes nothing to the descriptive one in A: it doubtless reproduces a bare direction in MS; at the same time A probably indicates the traditional stage business.
- 375-6.** A omits these lines, but at 378 it inserts *if I should serueyou*, which echoes 375 as well as 352. On the other hand, as soon as Wagner has dismissed his devils, it inserts some characteristic bawdry by the Clown.
- 379.** *this coniuring Occupation* (as we should say 'this conjuring business'): A to *raise vp Banios and Belcheos* A endeavours to extract a little more amusement out of the names (as again at A 430-1) and in doing so picks up the *raise* that it omitted at 371.
- 381.** *any thing* A had already anticipated this in the previous line, and the repetition is the more helpless in view of yet another appearance of the word at A 424.
- 382.** A completely, and doubtless intentionally, alters the Clown's attitude to his metamorphosis. In B he is delighted with the idea. In A he professes to be scandalized, but this is only for the sake of introducing more indelicate embroidery, suggested apparently by anticipation of Ovid's flea at 682-6, a passage that is rather unexpectedly cut in A.

Notes: Act II, Sc. i

- 382-3.** *O braue Wagner-*. A *But doe you heare Wagner?* A, having for the sake of its elaboration altered the connexions of the speech, has somehow to get back to the over-familiar *Wagner*, and does so by means of its favourite phrase *doe you heare* (365, note). Having done so it is able to squeeze one more laugh out of the devils' names by having Wagner threaten to call them back, of which there is no hint in B.
- 385-6.** *Diametrally* : A *diametarily* *Diametrally* is a parallel formation to the more common 'diametrically': *diametarily* is an error (*O.E.D.*).
- 386.** *that thou maisf.* A *with* A thus reduces to nonsense the Latin which the reporter evidently did not understand, though he reproduced it exactly.
- 386-7.** *Quasi vestigias nostras insistere* Boas, retaining this 'ungrammatical reading', remarks that 'it is doubtful whether the use of the accusative for the dative is due to Wagner or the printers.' The exact agreement of A and B proves that the printers had nothing to do with it, for B is here printing from MS, and it would be extravagant to suggest that the editor or compositor happened to be unable to read the Latin words and went to A for help. Nor does there appear any reason why Wagner should speak ungrammatically. Any error there is must be the author's. In fact there is nothing intrinsically wrong about the use of *insistere* with the simple accusative. Virgil has *Vestigia insistere* more than once (*Aeneidy* vii. 690, xi. 574), though this is of course in poetry and the sense is that of planting one's feet rather than of following in the steps of another. A more glaring error is that of treating *vestigia* as a feminine singular instead of a neuter plural. Dyce's emendation *vestigii nostris* removes both objections, and this is undoubtedly what the author should have written, possibly what he meant to write but didn't.
- A **435—6.** A final bit of gag, making capital out of the Clown's inability to understand Latin (though in fact he appeared to at B 354) and echoing *folozu* and *serue* from A 418-19.

Act II, Scene i

This is a more composite scene than any in Act I (Intro. pp. 68 if.). The first speech (390—401) stands apart from what follows: the agreement in false lining at the beginning and the reproduction of a small peculiarity of A(2)3 in the last line suggest that here B is dependent on A, and the apparent inability to rectify the metre points indeed to the absence of MS. Later, the terms of the contract and a few lines following (487-507) are certainly printed from A, as appears from typographical and textual evidence, and in fact (as 495 and 507 prove) from A(2)3, presumably because MS was again absent. Apart from these two passages the whole scene in B is printed from MS, as is evident from the frequency and general superiority of its variants. The editor, however, appears to have kept an eye on A, for the directions at 457 and 472-4 (but not those at 402 and 536) have clearly been conflated (Intro. p. 76; cf. also 417).

That the scene is substantially Marlowe's is not in doubt (Intro. pp. 103-7). But if the first speech was not in MS it would lay it open to suspicion, and indeed it would be no surprise to learn that it came from another hand. In that case Marlowe began with the appearance of the Angels, an abrupt opening that would invite patching. We may compare the opening of the talk with the Scholars in v. 1; though there the introductory padding (1787-93) was done in A. In the present instance, though the first speech was printed from A, I do not think that it originated

Notes: Act II, Sc. i

there. The bond and the four lines that follow (487-507) were also apparently not in MS: Marlowe probably left this section to a collaborator, who may also have supplied 470 to 479 (or even 486), with the devil-dance and couplets, as a bridge between Faustus' hesitation and the delivery of the bond, though this passage was in MS. Nor, I think with Boas, should Marlowe be held responsible for the devil-wife (532-9), which looks like another insertion designed to ease the transition from the discussion of hell to that of marriage. Another abrupt transition is that (at 547-8) from courtesans to a magic book, though if a connecting link was intended here it was not supplied. The elaboration of the last episode in A (614-27) may have been added in the prompt-book.

The matter of the infernal compact, which is the subject of this scene, occupies chapters 4 to 7 of *EFB*. In ch. 4 Faustus and Mephostophiles each propose five articles for the agreement; in ch. 5 Faustus promises to execute the bond and prepares to write it with his blood; ch. 6 contains the 'Letter' or bond itself, written apparently when Faustus was alone; in ch. 7 the Spirit comes to fetch it. The discussion on hell is from ch. 11 (see notes on 507-8 and 516) and the dispute about marriage from ch. 19. The opening lines may have been suggested by a passage in ch. 3, and the closing incident elaborates one in ch. 10.

389-401. I have already suggested (in the head-note) that this first speech did not appear in MS and that B printed it from A. The initial direction is identical in the two texts and exactly reproduces that at A 30, and though there are several textual variants in B they all look like editorial changes rather than readings of MS. Moreover, there are some small indications that Bi was in fact printed from A3. The most important is the hyphen joining *luke* and *warm* in 401, which first appeared in A2: elsewhere the loss of the colon at the end of 396 in A3 may explain the full stop in Bi, and in 398 Ai's appropriate *god* had already become *God* in A2 as in Bi. In 399 A3's *Belsebub* is half-way from *Belsabub* (Ai) to *Belzebub* (Bi), but the latter is B's normal spelling (cf. 394); the period after 397 appeared in A2, but A3 has a colon, and the period in Bi is due to the omission of the next line; the exceptional small-capitals in 394 are presumably the printer's.

I am the readier to see in this speech an addition made by a collaborator, presumably in the prompt-book, and taken over by B from A, because of the apparently close connexion of the following speeches of the Angels with the closing words of l. iii (see note on 402-10).

390-2. Faustus here admits that he is damned, even before he has made his bargain with the devil. This seems to have been suggested by a passage in *EFB*, ch. 3, where, on Faustus demanding answers to his questions, Mephostophiles explains that the demons 'haue neuer as yet opened vnto any man the truth . . . or learned him any thing, except he promise to be ours. Doctor *Faustus* vpon this . . . said, I wil haue my request, and yet I wil not be damned. The spirit answered, Then shalt thou want thy desire, & yet thou art mine notwithstanding: if any man would detainee thee it is in vain, for thine infidelity hath confounded thee.' (This does not in fact render *the* German at all closely.)

390-1. B, misled probably by the question-mark at the end of 391 in A (439), which may have been used in place of a mark of exclamation (cf. 411), takes each clause interrogatively, placing a question-mark at the end of each line, and to make this even clearer omits the *And* at the beginning of 391. The metre is of course defective, and Dyce's arrangement (dividing after *must*) is mere tinkering

Notes: Act II, Sc. i

and intrinsically improbable. The original may have read: *Now Faustus must thou needes be damnd, canst not be saued!*' Such a terse line would almost inevitably get expanded by an actor or reporter (cf. 578 and 642).

392. *on:* A of The change is most likely due to the compositor. Either might, of course, be original (see note on 660-1). A is supported by 409, but that may not be from the same hand.

395-6. The metre suggests that there is something wrong with these lines. It was apparently in an attempt to improve it that the editor of B cut out *no* in the first, which enabled B3 to reduce it to measure by shortening *backward* to *back*. But the more obvious emendation would be to omit A's *Faustus*. If the second line originally ran *Why wauerest? Something soundeth in mine eares*, expansion would be very likely, as in 390—1. The change from *eares* to *eare* seems pointless, and may be accidental.

A 446. The line is not in B, but since there is no indication that MS contained the present speech, we cannot assume that there was any authority for the omission. It is true that the line is superfluous and might be a stage expansion, but without the personal *Faustus* reversion to the third person in the next line would be less natural. The omission might easily be the accidental result of similar endings in two consecutive lines; but in view of the alteration to the next line it seems more likely that the editor took alarm at so much talk of God (Introd. p. 86).

398. It was, of course, the compositor who to save space amalgamated two lines, and the editor who made the short line unmetrical by altering *To God?* into *Why*. The two lines are effective, and the only ones in the speech that to me carry any suggestion of Marlowe: 400-1 read more like parody. Of course it might be argued that Marlowe's original has only reached us through the distorting medium of the report; but that would imply a greater degree of corruption in A than is usually apparent in the serious portions of the play.

402-10. The divergent direction in B, supported by certain variants (405 *these* for *them*, 408 *vse* for *trust*), proves that MS has become available and that B is printed from it. (The small points of contact with A3 in 407, 408, and 410 are hardly evidential.) But if, as seems probable, the passage was designed in MS to begin the scene, it must be admitted that the opening was singularly abrupt, and that in 403-4 *that. . . Art* wants a point of reference (which, it will be observed, the preceding speech made no attempt to supply). It is, therefore, perhaps legitimate to wonder whether MS really represented Marlowe's intention at the time he wrote the passage. In this connexion there are three points to which I may direct attention. The first is that 403—4 find their natural antecedent in the final lines of 1.iii (338-9),

He liue in speculation of this Art
Till *Mephostophilis* returne again

the second, that there is throughout evidence that the tragical portions of the play were the first to be drafted, and in particular that 1. iv was of later composition (see note on 368), so that 1. iii and 11. i were, as written, consecutive; the third, that in *EFB* the conversation between Faustus and Mephostophiles rendered in 261-326 of 1. iii took place, like 11. i, in Faustus' study and not, as in the play as it now stands, in the *solitary Groue* (see note on 261 ff.). It seems possible, therefore, that as originally drafted 1. iii and 11. i were not merely consecutive but continuous. Further, if that was so, it will be noticed that the present passage would

Notes: Act II, Sc. i

begin just as well, perhaps more naturally, with the first speech by the Good Angel; and the possibility should, therefore, be borne in mind when considering the problem raised by 403.

403. This line, identical with 101, is not in A. The most obvious explanation is that it was accidentally lost in the report (there could be no reason for its omission) and was restored by B, following MS. But its exact repetition from an earlier passage is suspicious, and we have seen, in the preceding note, that there is a possibility that it is unoriginal. Moreover, it will be noticed that the prefix is *Euill An.* instead of the usual *Bad* (the only other instance of *Euill An.* in B is at 587) and that *Euill* is the consistent designation in A. I suggest, therefore, that the line was not in MS and that it was the editor of B who, finding the opening rather bare, and wishing to emphasize the antiphonal effect, copied the line in exactly as it stood from A 106. It may have been through a further effort at emphasis or definition that B2 read *that most famous Art.*

405. The phrase *what of these?* (*A what of them?*) should apparently be interpreted to mean 'of what avail are these now?' The line is in effect a reply to 404, since to renounce magic would imply and involve *Repentance*. But the reply is not very direct, and it may have been as a preparation for the despondency of Faustus' attitude that the collaborator introduced 392-3 into his introductory speech. The relevance of Faustus' reply would seem not to have been entirely clear to the B2 reviser, for he changed the reading to *What be these?* influenced apparently by the Angel's replies explaining what they are.

408. *make them* : *A makes men* In B the repetition of *them*, with different reference, is all the more awkward in that it is, on its first occurrence, emphatic. Since B2 reverted to the reading *men* we may perhaps believe that *them* was nothing but an error of the compositor of Bi (Introd. p. 146). The false concord in A is characteristic (see note on 518).

vse: *A trust* Though at first sight the sense is much the same, there is really a subtle difference. Marlowe means that the practice of prayer &c. renders men foolish: faith in their efficacy is the result, not the cause, of foolishness. But one would hardly expect a reporter to grasp this.

410. *of wealth*: *A wealth* B's reading is already found in A2,3; but this does not imply dependence, for the metre demands an insertion, and *of is* the natural word to supply.

Ex. An.: *A exeunt* B's more explicit direction may derive from MS, but cf. 104 where the editor appears to have made a similar addition.

411. *Wealth?*: *A Of wealth* A's reading (which incidentally shows that the loss of the *of in* the line before was accidental) is unnecessarily literal. There is no reason why Faustus should repeat the actual words of the Angel; it is merely the idea of wealth that the Bad Angel has implanted in his mind. But the more exact repetition would come easily to an actor. A is right in making a separate line of the exclamation (B, as we have seen, is compressing the text)—as it is, it leaves the line a trifle long, for *Why* is not an actor's connective insertion, but significant. In B the question-mark is used in place of a mark of exclamation.

Signory of Embden Either the lordship or the territory may be meant; it makes little difference. Emden, at the mouth of the Ems and the chief town of East * Friesland, was a flourishing port and had a considerable trade with England.

413. *powen A God* At first sight this looks like one of the editor's attempts at censorship (and was so explained by Ward). But I agree with Boas *that power* is original

Notes : Act II, Sc. i

(and in that case, of course, came from MS) though not so much because *What God* would impute polytheism to Faustus, as because it does not seem a natural expression, and because the whole line has been perverted in A.

me? Faustus: A thee Faustus? The awkward change of person in A shows that the reporter has upset the line by including *Faustus* in the first half.

414. *Mepho: come\ A come Mephostophilus* The contraction in B must be merely graphic, but since there was ample room in the line, it is unlikely to be due to the compositor. We are forced, therefore, to conclude that B represents MS exactly and that its order is correct. This is unexpected and even harsh, but the author may have wished to avoid exact duplication of 416, especially as this is echoed in the Latin that follows. An alternative (or supplementary) suggestion would be that *Mepho:* should be the verbal contraction *Mephosto* (in an intentionally short line). However, it is not certain that the name is ever shortened in speech (Introd. p. 40, note) and none of the suspected cases are in the obviously Marlowan portions of the play.

417. *Mephostophile* It is difficult to account for this form of the vocative, which, since it is in both texts, has the appearance of being original. (It would, of course, be the normal vocative of *Mephostophilus*, but the *-us* form is only found, apparently as a compositor's vagary, in A: Introd. p. 40 note.) Dr. Boas has suggested to me privately that Marlowe may have had in mind the *EFB* form *Mephostophile* Sy pointing out that for Greek proper names in *-es* a vocative in *-e* is correct. Professor D. S. Robertson tells me that this applies mainly to patronymics, though occasionally to other names, as in *'Epiiff* (at the beginning of the *Choephoroe*); but he rather doubts whether anyone would have thought of forming a vocative in *-e* from *Mephostophiles*. In any case, since Marlowe clearly adopted the form in *-is*, he is on the face of it unlikely to have used a vocative that presupposed the *-is* form. It seems on the whole most likely that a Latin vocative is after all intended. This is one of the sections of A in which *Mephostophilus* is normal, and the compositor responsible for introducing this form probably knew enough Latin to insist on *-e* for the vocative. And if the editor of B, though relying here on MS, still kept an eye on A, he may inconsiderately have adopted it thence. (We have seen that at 403 he may have deliberately supplemented MS from A (as he clearly did at 1125-6); and it is worth observing that in the present line the name in the direction is (differently) abbreviated in both texts although there is plenty of room.) The probability is that MS had *Mephostophilis*, and this form was restored in B2.

418. *tell me what saith* : A *tel, what sayes* A's unmetrical omission, ill disguised by the compositor's comma, was doubtless accidental, and the restoration of *me* would not necessarily imply the use of MS (though neither A2 nor A3 achieved it): on the other hand, the indifferent variant *sayes: saith* does point to an independent source for B.

419. The omission of the speaker's prefix, *Meph.*, in B may be due to tinkering by the editor (Introd. p. 91): B2 restored it.

he Hues : A / *Hue* However absurd, A's reading is a perhaps not unnatural slip on the part of the actor or reporter, caused possibly by recollection of 262.

422. *now* : A *Faustus* The emphasis of *now* is lost in A through its unnecessary repetition from the previous line. In B the line is also metrically smoother, an advantage after the *slightly* irregular *rhythm* of the line that precedes. The rime is no doubt accidental.

Notes: Act II, Sc. i

- 423.** *wright*: A *write* B's unetymological spelling (cf. *Friar Bacon*, 1141) appears not infrequently and in several different forms from the fifteenth to the seventeenth century. It was presumably that of MS.
with thine own blood In *EFB*, ch. 4, Mephostophiles' second demand is that Faustus 'should make him a writing, written with his owne blood', wherefore, in ch. 5, 'to confirm it the more assuredly, [Faustus] tooke a small penknife, and prickt a vaine in his left hand'.
- 424.** *Lucifer*: A *great Lucifer* The line reads equally well with or without *great*. Presumably it was not in MS, but an actor would be likely to supply it from recollection of 266 (cf. also 439-40 and 442). Accidental omission by the compositor of B is, of course, possible, but perhaps rather less probable.
- 425.** *must* \ *Awil* A misses the point: Mephostophilis is acting under orders from Lucifer (Introd. p. 45). But one may doubt whether the editor would have corrected it himself had he been printing from A.
- 426—8.** The verse and the line-division are uncertain. A treats the passage as prose, and omissions in 429 and 431 suggest that it was doubtful about these lines as well. *Mephosto.* has a full point and may be assumed to be a graphic abbreviation only. If we were to take *and* to be a slip of the author's (which got into the prompt-book and so upset the stage version in A) we could make two regular lines of *Stay Mephostophilis, tell me what good \ Will my soule do thy Lord?—Enlarge his Kingdome.* This is the solution adopted by Boas, but it does not explain how the lines came to be miswritten in MS.
- 429. 431.** Of course, neither *why* (*Why*) omitted by A is necessary to the sense, though each helps it, and both are required by the verse. The second omission is the more curious, since in this instance the word is one of those connectives that are liable to insertion in a report. Compare the like omission at 1956, where the *Why* is more than merely connective, since it indicates surprise, as it also does at 521.
- 430.** This line appears, with variants, in several works of the time. Medieval parallels, but no direct source, have been traced. The unnecessary comma inserted in B_i was removed again in B₂: cf. 44, 66, 68, and also 635.
- 431.** *torture other-*. A *tortures others* A's *tortures* might, of course, be an original false concord (see note on 518) corrected in B; but it is perhaps more likely a slip by the reporter, uncertain whether *paine* might not be the subject. A's *others*, though probably a modernization (as in B₄), might also be original: it was certainly already current c. 1590, though *other-* was probably still the more usual form for the plural.
- 436.** *him* : A *thee* While it is perhaps going too far to say, with Boas, that B's reading is 'proved' right by 442, it is probably correct. As a reply to 433, *thee* is, of course, the more natural, hence its appearance in A. But, as we saw at 425, Mephostophilis is acting as an agent merely, and his question *shall I haue thy soule?* really means 'Shall I win thee for my lord?' It is *great Lucifer* who is in the minds of both, as is plain from the next two speeches.
- 437.** The omission of *Faustus* in A is presumably accidental, and so is A's substitution of *thine* for *thy*.
- 441-2.** There must have been some confusion in MS to induce the compositor, even if he was trying to compress the text, to print three lines as two. (Had he accidentally left out a line when setting up the passage, he could have made room

Notes: Act I I , Sc. i

for it by reducing the leads round the direction at 457.) Moreover, when we have made the obvious redivision, we are left with a suspiciously long line (see, however, 463). Presumably some alteration in MS had left the text confused. It would be easy to omit the superfluous *proper*; but we know that this was in the stage version. A solved the difficulty very simply by substituting the first for the third person, to the great improvement of the passage, at any rate to modern taste, though the third person is quite in Marlowe's style. The alteration may, of course, have been made in the prompt-book.

447. *Write*: A *tkou must write* A has a very natural actor's expansion (Introd. p. 56), which, however, reduces the speech to prose, and this led to the following speech being likewise printed as prose in A.

448. *do* : A *will* B is correct in emphasizing that Faustus has already begun writing when his blood ceases to flow, as appears from 454 (Introd. p. 45). There is nothing in *EFB* about the blood congealing or the fetching of fire; all this is developed from a mere hint in the heading of ch. 6, 'How Doctor Faustus set • his blood in a saucer on warme ashes, and writ as followeth'.

454. O: A *ah* An early instance of this persistent variant, due I believe to the compositor of B (Introd. pp. 91-2 and notes on 1922 and 2036).

457. B has doubtless conflated the MS direction with that of A (Introd., p. 96). If we suppose MS to have read *with the Fire*, that is *the fire* mentioned at 450, it will explain the use of the definite article in B, which might otherwise be thought to refer to a particular *Chafer* among the properties and imply a connexion with the prompt-book (Introd. p. 78, note).

458. *See Faustus here is fire*: A *Heresfjer, come Faustus* B no doubt represents MS, for A's unmetrical version can hardly be original. Breymann (but not Tucker Brooke) actually altered it to *Come Faustus, here isfjer*; but with *come* this order is less natural.

// i.e. the saucer in which Faustus has caught his blood (see note on 448).

461. The line is, of course, spoken aside: Mephostophilis conceals his eagerness over the bargain, of which he had, however, given an indication at 433—5: cf. 326.

What: A O *what* The actor's preliminary exclamation in A would be the more likely because of the roughness of the verse. But to assimilate it metrically required the change of *not I to I not* first made in A2. It is to be noticed that this inversion is not in B, nor is the A2,3-reading *my* in 464, which shows that B is here independent. It is true that in 465 B, like A2,3, has *whether* for A's *whither*, but this was a very common spelling down to the eighteenth century, and the agreement is doubtless accidental.

For B2, *attain!* *his soule*, see Introduction, p. 145. It is certainly an error, for B1 is here printed from MS.

462. *Consummatum est* To announce the conclusion of the bond Faustus borrows the words of the dying Christ (John xix. 30)—not perhaps without ironic intent on Marlowe's part.

465-9. Based on *EFB*, ch. 5, where we are told that after Faustus had pricked a vein, 'for certaintie therevpon, were seene on his hand these words written, as if they had been written with blood, *6 homo fuge*; whereat the Spirit vanished, but *Faustus* continued in his damnable minde, & made his writing as followeth'.

466. *heaven* : A *God* A clumsy instance of the editor's censorship, which leaves the pronoun *hee* to refer to *heauen* (Introd. p. 86). The case should be distinguished

Notes : Act II, Sc. i

from the sort of personification we find in *Macbeth*, n. i. 5-6: 'There's husbandry in heaven; Their candles are all out.'

me: A thee The sudden use of the third person is presumably due to the actor.

468. The actor or reporter, having omitted the *O yes* at the beginning of this line, was later forced by the metre to expand *euen heere* into the unnecessarily emphatic *here in this place* (Introd. p. 56).

470-9. Here I think we can see the hand of a collaborator, writing rather carelessly, as the repetition in 470, 476 shows. He was either bridging one of Marlowe's abrupt transitions, or else filling in a definite and more extensive lacuna. If the former, then Marlowe continued with 480 (reading *Here* with A—though the agreement would, of course, be accidental): but see note on 480-6 and Introduction, p. 104. There is some authority for the devil-dance in *EFB*, ch. 7, in which Mephostophiles, when he comes to fetch the bond, is accompanied by a whole menagerie of devils (those in the dance may, of course, have appeared in animal form) on whose departure 'there lay before *Faustus* two great sacks, one full of gold, the other full of siluer'.

472-4 S.D. In A Mephostophilis introduces the devil-dance; in B he only re-enters after it is over. For the rest, though B's direction is not an exact copy of A's, it is substantially borrowed from it, and no doubt replaced a shorter direction in MS (Introd. p. 76). Its descriptive character is fitting in a report. Thus the position is the reverse of that in l. iii, where the text is printed from A supplemented by directions from MS.

Simpson assumes a cut here. Marlowe, he is confident, did not dismiss the show without at least a presenter's speech. But, as already mentioned, I see no reason to suppose Marlowe responsible for the devil-dance any more than for the devil-wife (536).

475. The order is more or less indifferent and would easily be changed in delivery.

477. *let thee see: A to shewe thee* A is condemned by the actor's assimilation with *shewe* in 475 and the awkward metre.

A 532. This feeble and unmetrical line, found only in A, is condemned, if by nothing else, by its jingle with the following couplet. *Faustus'* reply to Mephostophilis' assurance is to hand him the contract, but an actor might well think this a little abrupt and seek to smooth the transition. It is, of course, a reminiscence of 327-8 (A 347—8), lines that were not spoken for Mephostophilis to hear. Having inserted the line the actor had of course to change *Then* to *Here* in the next (Introd. p. 55).

480-6. Though these lines are perhaps less clearly un-Marlowan than those that precede, the couplets at 478-9 and 480—1 are likely to have come from the same pen, and the passage may I think be safely assigned to a collaborator. In that case Marlowe broke off definitely at 469, leaving the whole bond business to be filled in, and passed on to the disputation at 508. As we shall see, 487-507 were almost certainly not in MS, and with the exception of the last line are not by Marlowe (Introd. p. 105).

483. *Couenants, and Articles: A articles prescribed* Boas adopts the smoother reading of A for the curious reason that *EFB* mentions articles but not covenants (though *Faustus* does 'couenant')—the author was not tied to the vocabulary of his source. B is here printing from MS and must consequently be preferred, but its reading is not altogether satisfactory. I suspect editorial interference due to

Notes : Act II, Sc. i

misunderstanding of *covenant-articles*, i.e. agreed conditions, in MS. If A is preferred it would have to be on the assumption that the line was altered in the prompt-book; but I think that *prescribed* looks rather like an anticipation of *made* in 485 (see note).

485. *both:* A *made* Like Boas I assume A to be correct here, B having accidentally repeated the whole phrase from 483.

486. // *Mephostophilis-*. A *them* The omission of the name leaves the line short, and A treats it as prose. In B // is the *scrole* of 480, but it is natural that in A the pronoun should have been attracted to the nearer *promises* of 485.

487-507. Here once again we find B dependent on A, presumably because the contract and the four succeeding lines were not in MS. A and B both commit the mistake of treating the opening words of the bond, *On these conditions following*, as part of Faustus' speech, and B actually leaves a blank after 487, as both texts do after 503. (Incidentally this misunderstanding explains why B reverted to a period after *following*, as in A i, 2, although A3 had substituted a comma.) B duly follows A2,3 in reading *and* for *or* in 495, and A3 *infoure and twenty* for *24*. in 499. The omission of *with* in 507 shows that B is still printing from A3; but this seems to be in all probability the last line of dependence. It would, therefore, appear to have been the editor who at 506 turned the prose of A into the verse of B by two easy insertions. After 507 B returns to MS, as is shown by important differences between the texts (from 510 onwards) and by B's failure to reproduce variants of A3 (at 520, 527, 528-9: agreements at 517, *shall be*, and 541, *no more*, are not evidential). It is natural, therefore, to suppose that the text of the bond (487-503) together with lines 504-7 were written on a separate sheet of paper, which we may call the 'bond' leaf, and that this was lost from MS.

The bond itself is based on *EFB*, chs. 4 and 6. The former details the articles agreed upon between Faustus and Mephostophiles, who each propound a set of five; the latter contains the document itself, which is spoken of as a 'Letter*' and is drawn in more general terms than in the play. In ch. 4 we read how 'Doctor *Faustus* gaue him this answer, though faintly (for his soules sake) That his request was none other but to become a Diuel, or at the least a limme of him, and that the Spirit should agree vnto these Articles as followeth.

'1 That he might be a Spirite in shape and qualitie.

'2 That *Mephostophiles* should be his seruant, and at his commandement.

'3 That *Mephostophiles* should bring him any thing, and doo for him whatsoever.

'4 That at all times he should be in his house, inuisible to all men, except only to himselfe, and at his commandement to shew himselfe.

'5 Lastly, that *Mephostophiles* should at all times appeare at his commaund, in what forme or shape soeuer he would.

'Vpon these poynts the Spirit answered Doctor *Faustus*, that all this should be granted him and fulfilled, and more if he would agree vnto him vpon certaine Articles as followeth:

'First, that Doctor *Faustus* should giue himselfe to his Lord *Lucifer*, body and soule.

'Secondly, for confirmation of the same, he should make him a writing, written with his owne blood.

'Thirdly, that he would be an enemie to all Christian people.

'Fourthly, that he would denie his Christian beleeefe.

Notes : Act II, Sc. i

'Fiftly, that he let not any man change his opinion, if so bee any man should goe about to dissuade, or withdraw him from it.'

The *five conditions* of the bond are the first set of these articles, those proposed by Faustus, which they reproduce almost verbatim. The rest of the document is mainly based on ch. 6, though much less closely. The substance of the 'Letter' is in these terms:

'now haue I Doctor *Iohn Faustus*, vnto the hellish prince of Orient and his messenger *Mephostophiles*, giuen both bodie & soule, vpon such condition, that they shall learne me, and fulfill my desire in all things, as they haue promised and vowed vnto me, with due obedience vnto me, according vnto the Articles mentioned between vs.

'Further, I couenant and grant with them by these presents, that at the end of 24. yeares next ensuing the date of this present Letter, they being expired, and I in the meane time, during the said yeares be serued of them at my wil, they accomplishing my desires to the full in al points as we are agreed, that then I giue them full power to doe with mee at their pleasure, to rule, to send, fetch, or carrie me or mine, be it either body, soule, flesh, blood, or goods, into their habitation, be it wheresoeuer.'

But it would appear that the authors of the play were more familiar with, and relied more upon, the contract as presented in *EFB* than the bond included in the text, which, as we have seen, ignores the five conditions put forward by Mephostophiles. For example, there is nothing in the bond to justify Lucifer's complaint (661), *Thou calst on Christ contrary to thy promise*; whereas, as we have seen, one of the Spirit's conditions in *EFB*, ch. 4, was that Faustus 'would denie his Christian beleefe', and in his letter, ch. 6, he had written, among other things, 'I defie God and his Christ'. Furthermore, the Spirit's fifth condition is material to the whole episode of the Old Man in v. i, and in particular to Mephostophilis' lines, 'Thou traytor *Faustus*, I arrest thy soule, For disobedience to my soueraigne Lord' (1847-8). It will also be noticed that the words of the bond, / *Iohn Faustus . . . doe giue both body and soule to Lucifer*, are contradicted by 454 and 456 where the phrase is twice given as *Faustus giues to thee his soule*. This suggests that the drawing of the bond was not done by the authors themselves, but that it was entrusted to someone with experience of legal phraseology. He would naturally draft it on a separate sheet, and since it only runs to seventeen lines, there would probably be plenty of room for the addition of a few lines at the end.

The history of the complex patching in 470-507 is discussed in the Introduction, where my conclusions will be found at p. 105.

488. The first condition is more fully explained in *EFB*, ch. 4 (see note on 487-507). We find *spirit* used specifically for an evil spirit or devil throughout the play, see particularly 96, 289, 583-5, 1472: cf. *The Damnation of Faustus*, p. 103.

489-90. *be by him commanded*. A *at his commaund* That A is here original is proved by *EFB*, ch. 4: 'That *Mephostophiles* should be his seruant, and at his commandement.' Why the editor should have altered it is hard to imagine, but it is clear that all variants in the bond are either due to him or are errors of the compositor (Introd. p. 68).

495. *shape and forme* \ *A forme or shape* A is authenticated by *EFB* (see note on 487-507). B's *and* comes from A3, and the inversion is presumably due to the compositor.

Notes: Act II, Sc. i

- 498.** *Mephistophilis* This is the first of six instances of the *- spelling in B, and the only one directly derived from A (Introd. p. 40, note).
- 499-500.** *and these Articles . . . being inviolate: A the articles . . . inuiolate* Here *EFB* is not close enough to decide between the readings, but in B the slight clumsiness of the repeated *being* and the slight tautology of *these Articles about written* suggest tampering (Introd. p. 68).
- 501.** *flesh, bloud, & flesh, bloud, or goods*, The accidental omission in B would be obvious even without the evidence of *EFB* (see note on 487-507). *fa's flesh and blood* is mere tinkering, not a genuine correction.
- 505.** One is glad to be able to relieve Marlowe of this line. Either the editor or the compositor may have altered A's colloquial *on't* to *of it*,
- 506.** The metrical form of B is due to the editor (see note on 487-507). As it stands the line is ambiguous: *aske* might mean inquire or demand. The former is the sense here intended, but the line may have been suggested by a passage in *EFB*, ch. 7, where it has the latter meaning, for when Mephistophiles comes to fetch the bond he says, 'aske what thou wilt request of mee, that shalt thou haue'. This follows close upon the passage that seems to have suggested the devil-dance (see note on 470-9), and thus neatly confirms the limits of the non-Marlowan insertion.
- 507.** *I will: A will I* The inversion in B may be assumed to be accidental.
question thee : A question with thee The *with* (as already noted, 487-507) was dropped in A2,3-
- 507-8.** The originality of *with* can be further demonstrated from *EFB*, for the line in which it occurs is clearly based on the heading of ch. 11, 'How Doctor Faustus . . . questioned with his Spirit of matters as concerning hell'. But the next line, too, has its source in the same chapter, namely, Faustus' question, 'I pray thee resolue me in this doubt: what is hell, what substance is it of, in what place stands it, and when was it made?' (cf. also note on 516). (Needless to say, the philosophic answer owes nothing to *EFB*.) Lines 507 and 508 are, therefore, too closely associated in derivation to be likely to come from different hands. And yet 507 was printed from A, while for what follows (certainly for 510 and presumably from 508) MS was available. If, therefore, we are right in concluding that 504-6 are by a different hand from what precedes and follows (see note on 487-507), we shall have to suppose that not only did the collaborator add these lines at the foot of the 'bond' leaf (subsequently lost), but that Marlowe himself added 507 in the same place. And of this there is I think some confirmation, for, to my mind at least, 507-8 do not read quite naturally. When Marlowe started on the subject of hell, 508 would be the natural line to begin with. The expression *the place that men call Hell* should surely introduce a new subject rather than merely develop one already propounded, and in 507 *First* would have no relevance until 506 had been written. I suspect, therefore, that what happened was that when Marlowe broke off at 469, leaving the bond business in the hands of his colleague, he took a fresh sheet of paper and started to write the debate on hell, basing it on ch. 11 of *EFB* and beginning with 508. Later, when he received the 'bond' leaf, at the foot of which his collaborator had written 506 to link up with the debate, he found the transition (between 506 and 508) still a trifle abrupt, and wrote in 507 as a further link at the foot of the page, still having the heading of ch. 11, perhaps unconsciously, in mind. This hypothesis at least

Notes : Act II, Sc. i

accounts both for the slight awkwardness of 507-8 and for the fact that the second line but not the first appears to have been preserved in MS.

510. It will be noticed that the words *so are all things else*, which do not appear in A, are not actually essential (though they lend point to Faustus' reply) and that without them 509-10 make one metrical line. At the same time they are very unlikely to have been inserted by the editor, and we are, therefore, entitled to see in them evidence that B is now again printed from MS (a fact confirmed in 515—16). The *whereabouts* : *where about* variant is indifferent, the forms being equally current at the time. The present passage is echoed at 1708—9.

511. *these Elements* i.e., presumably, created things. According to the medieval conception hell was within or under the earth, to which, therefore, the phrase would appear to refer: but Marlowe takes a more philosophical view. According to this, hell is a state rather than a place, though we are to suppose that it still exists in the material universe.

515. The line can be read either with or without *there*, but it is more regular with it, and the emphasis it lends makes B the preferable version. It doubtless stood in MS.

516-18. Ward's note runs: '*shall be purified*, shall have been purified; in other words, when purgatory shall have come to an end. For the whole of this passage Marlowe may have had in mind 2 Epistle of St. Peter, iii. 10-14.' This interpretation I believe to be mistaken. There is nothing to show that purgatory had any place in Marlowe's cosmology; indeed it seems to be explicitly rejected at 2069—70 (1095—6 are, of course, not his). The *world* is, I think, the middle-earth; when this *dissolves* only heaven and hell will remain. Similarly, *euery creature* is not every soul, but every created thing (the original sense of the word), which shall in the end be *purified* in the sense that it will be no longer mixed, but of one essence, either wholly good or wholly evil. Nor can I find anything relevant in the eschatological verses of 2 Pet. beyond the use of the word 'dissolved'.

516. *be short* \ *A conclude* Intrinsically an indifferent variant, both readings giving much the same sense, but not quite what we should expect: 'And in the end' would sort better with what follows. Nevertheless, B is proved correct by *EFB*, ch. 11, in which the discussion concludes with the words: 'but to be short with thee *Faustus*, we know that hell hath neither bottome nor end.'

518. The false concord, since it appears in both texts and B was printed from MS, must be assumed to be original. Apparently the verb has been attracted to the neighbouring singular, *hell*. B2 altered *is* to *are*, perhaps automatically.

There are in all more than a dozen false concords in the two texts (viz. at B 151, 306-7, 518, 576, 706-7, 1519, and A 54-5, 456-7, 483, 572, 649, 851-2, 853-4, 857, 1360), but the present is the only one that appears both in A1 (572) and B1, and the only one that we can quite confidently ascribe to the author, in this case Marlowe. However, in 706-7 *these case of Rapiers* (A reads *this*) is probably original, and there is no particular reason to doubt *this our brutish shapes* in 1519: these are both the collaborator's. At 576 *any man that breathe* (A, B2 *breathes*) looks more like a misprint. At 306-7 *demandes*, *Which strikes* is simply a misprint of A3 taken over by B1 (A1 reads *strike*). In *Then has the white breasts* at 151, *has* is almost certainly a tinkering by the editor of B1 (altered to *haue* in B2). We have then one certain instance by Marlowe and two probable ones by his collaborator. The evidence of A is, of course, far less reliable. At A 456-7 *{illusions ... That makes}*, A 483 *{you ... that tortures}*, A 851-2 *{hilles*

Notes ; Act II, Sc. i

That underprops), A 853-4 (*bridges . . . That makes*), A 1360 (*Her lips suckes forth*), B, printing from MS, does not show the false concord: nor does it at A 54-5 (*man . . . them*) where MS was available for the correction of a passage certainly corrupt in A: at A 857 (*such store of ordonance are*) the reporter has recast the line. There remains A 649, *feareful echoes thunders*, in a passage omitted by B; but, in view of A's propensity to falsify concords elsewhere, there is no ground for supposing that Marlowe was guilty of this.

519. A's connective *Come*, makes the short line more metrical, but it is not certain that this speech and the next are meant to be verse. B2 reads *meere fable* by anticipation of 527 (Introd. pp. 145-6).

520. Breymann and Boas omit *still* for the sake of the metre; but its presence both in MS and on the stage proves its originality, and verse may not be intended. Since *ti'//* is unemphatic the jingle is not noticeable.

521. 523, 527. A shows small indifferent variations of the actor that do not disturb the verse. In the last *Tush*, though appropriate enough in the context, is characteristic—like *Tut* (see 540).

525-6. Wrongly divided in A.

528-9. In the first line the actor's intrusive *Faustus* is extra-metrical: in the second, having omitted *I tell thee*, he sought to restore the verse by repeating *am* and presumably pronouncing *damned* (Introd. p. 48). But it is hardly surprising that •A2,3 treated the lines as prose.

530—1. The extra-metrical connective *Nay* is in both texts and evidently original, but its presence laid the line open to further padding. A illustrates the actor's trick of repeating the last words of the previous speaker (Introd. p. 49), its intrusive *here* is tautological after *this*, and in the next line it breaks down altogether. The *&c.* might be regarded as actually part of the speech, but is more likely to be the reporter's admission that the line escaped his memory. The compositor of A treated the lines as prose like the rest of the speech.

531. *disputing* is a function as natural and normal to Faustus as the others, and moreover his chief delight (A 19)—how then can he be in hell?

532-9. The sudden change from verse to prose with the change of subject is nevertheless unexpected and suggests possible insertion by another hand. We obviously return to Marlowe with *Marriage is but a ceremoniall toy* at 540. But, abrupt as his transitions may be and unless we are to suppose a definite lacuna, there must have been something to link 531 and 540, and it will be noticed that 533, *for I am wanton and lasciuious*, makes a regular and perhaps not un-Marlowan line. It will also be noticed that in these lines A is widely divergent, as it tends to be in the comic scenes. But here there is reason to believe that A, rather than the barer version in B, represents the text as actually prepared for performance. For the episode is based on *EFB*, ch. 9, and whereas Faustus' argument, 'I am not able to resist nor bridle my fantasie, I must and will haue a wife', is the source of 533—4, common to both texts, Mephostophilis' refusal and Faustus' insistence in *EFB* are represented by A 590-2 only. Moreover, according to *EFB*, after the Spirit had introduced 'an ougly Diuell, so fearefull and monstrous to beholde, that *Faustus* durst not looke on him', he asked 'how likest thou thy wedding?', which clearly supports A's *how dost thou like thy wife?* against B's *wilt thou haue a wife?* at 538. We must suppose, therefore, either that the editor here altered the text of MS (for which there seems no possible motive) or else that the text was elaborated

Notes: Act II, Sc. i

in preparing the prompt-book (Introd. pp. 82-3). There is, however, no reason to suppose that such a line as A 594 had any authority but the actor's, whose activity can also be traced in A 590 and 593 (see notes). In *EFB* Mephostophiles explains his objection to Faustus' idea of marriage in the words, 'wedlock is a chiefe institution ordained of God, and that hast thou promised to defie\ We shall see that Marlowe himself made use of a passage from the end of the same chapter (note on 542-7).

- 532.** A's insertion of *off* is unidiomatic; nevertheless, Boas introduces it into the B-text in an endeavour to turn manifest prose into verse.
- A **590.** *How, a wife?* Assuming A's version of the incident to be based on a prompt-book revision, we may still see in these words an actor's connective and repetition.
- A **593.** *Well thou wilt* Awkward, and apparently influenced by the preceding / *will*. We may suppose that the prompt-book retained *Well Faustus, thou shalt* as in MS and B (535).
- 536** S.D. Unlike the directions at 457 and 472-4, this one in B is clearly from MS, uncontaminated by A (Introd. p. 76).
- A **597.** *Tel Faustus* Presumably a slip for *Tel me Faustus*; but the prompt-book may have preserved *Now Faustus* as in MS and B (538). Cf. A 470.
- 540—1.** A's *Tut Faustus* is an actor's connective, containing one of his favourite exclamations—the tell-tale *Tut* as Boas calls it at A 627. But the insertion so disturbed the verse that A treats a couple of lines as prose, naturally reducing the tautological *And if to if*. A further omitted the negative from *thinke no more*. (It was restored in A2, but this naturally does not indicate dependence on the part of B.) The omission was probably accidental, but it is just possible that the reporter intended *thinke more of it* to be understood as 'think it over'.
- 542-7.** These lines were suggested by *EFB*, ch. 9: 'After . . . Frier *Mephostophiles* . . . spake to *Faustus*: . . . thou shalt haue thy hearts desire of what woman soeuer thou wilt, bee shee aliuie or dead . . . These words pleased *Faustus* wonderfull well, and [he] repented himselfe that hee was so foolish to wish himselfe married, that might haue any woman in the whole Citie brought to him at his command; the which he practised and perseuered in a long time.'
- 544.** The agreement of B and A, i.e. of MS with the report, shows that *thine eye ... thy heart* is original (moreover, we have just seen that the latter is confirmed by *EFB*); but compositors were evidently for uniformity, since A2 changed *thine eye* to *thy eye* and B2 changed *thy heart* to *thine heart*.
- 545**•were;• A *Be* This is as perfect an instance of an indifferent variant as one could well find (Introd. p. 44). It is obvious that given two equal grammatical possibilities it would be pure chance which an actor would choose, unless he was far more word-perfect than we have any reason to suppose most Elizabethan actors were.
- 546.** *Saba* i.e. the Queen of Sheba. *Saba* is the Vulgate form of the name in 1 Kings x; it survived in the Bishops' Bible and in the heading, though not the text, of the Genevan version.
- 548-56.** We have here one of Marlowe's most abrupt transitions, indeed he made no attempt at all to connect this episode with what precedes. For the source of the passage and its relation to 736-9 see the Introduction, pp. 106-8.
- 548.** It is impossible to believe that the broken-backed line in B is what Marlowe

Notes; Chorus I (B)

wrote, whereas A looks genuine enough and its *Hold* is authenticated by *EFB*. The matter is discussed in the Introduction, p. 107.

551. A lapse of memory, always to be expected in such a catalogue as this, has upset the metre in A (Introd. p. 49).

553-4. *harnesse . . . commandst: A armour . . . desirst* The variants in A are just such as an actor would be likely to produce, the first a slightly more familiar word, the second a slightly less appropriate one (Introd. p. 45).

555-6. Faustus' reply, as it stands in B, is replaced in A by a prose elaboration, obviously from a different hand, designed to make the episode less scrappy. In it Faustus begs in succession for three further books that shall instruct him respectively in conjuration, in astronomy, and in botany, and each time Mephostophilis shows him that the book he has already received contains the desired information. (Simpson strangely misunderstood the passage to imply the gift of four separate books, and his criticism consequently misses the mark.) This supplement may perhaps have been added in preparing the prompt-book: it is hardly in the style of the comic elaborations found elsewhere in A (Introd. pp. 7, 6, 82). It makes no use of *EFB*, but A 616 echoes 478-9, in which Faustus had already been assured that he possessed the power to raise spirits.

A 619. *characters and planets* Ward thinks this is 'probably a hendiadys for "characters of planets"', and *O.E.D.* (s.v. *Hendiadys*) cites Clark and Wright's interpretation of *Hamlet*, 1. i. 87, 'law and heraldry', as meaning 'heraldic law*'. But in a reported text it is perhaps more likely to be simply an error for *characters of planets*, due to reminiscence of *characters of signes and erring starres* in A 255 (= 8238).

Chorus 1 (B)

This is nothing but A's version of the Chorus between Acts 11 and in moved by the editor of B to an earlier position. It is printed without alteration, including the peculiar heading and exit. For textual features see Chorus 2 (777-801); cf. Introduction, pp. 69, 79.

In spite of the manifest discontinuity of the text A indicates no break whatever. Simpson conjectured a cut in a continuous scene, and it is true that in the version represented by A the action would appear to have been continuous. But this cannot have been the original intention. Quite apart from the length of such a scene, an interval is implied, not only in *EFB*, but in the text itself (A 653 ff.). Nor can the two scenes have been consecutive, since the characters in them are the same and we cannot suppose an act-interval. It is clear, therefore, that a whole scene must have been lost, and lost, moreover, from MS as well as from A. This the editor of B evidently recognized, hence his endeavour to fill the gap with the wholly inappropriate chorus. Boas conjectures that what led him to do so was finding at the end of 11. i (in MS) a direction for the entrance of Wagner, similar to that at the head of the Chorus in A. This is ingenious, if a little fanciful. But I agree with Boas in believing that Wagner did appear in the lost scene and that this was comic, or rather farcical. Its probable action is discussed in the Introduction, p. 108.

568. For the reading of B2, *That on this day*, see Introduction, p. 144. At 563 its variant *necke* is a mere misprint.

Notes

Act II, Scene ii

Persistent variation shows that B was printed from MS: a specific indication may be seen in the divergent attempts to arrange the prose of 641—2 as verse, and in the non-survival in B of peculiarities of A3 at 574, 611, 634; agreement in an inversion at 640 is apparently accidental.

The earlier part of the scene, down to 666 and including A 726-8 (censored in B), is in substance unquestionably Marlowe's (with some reservation respecting 621-4, and doubt of 663—4). Simpson was persuaded that 'The pageant of the Seven Deadly Sins is unlike Marlowe; he would have lavished his splendid verse on these seven figures'. I feel less confident on this point, but since I am certain that the few lines introducing and following the pageant are the work of a collaborator, I think it likely that the pageant is his also. At the end, however, he borrowed a couple of lines of Marlowe's (736, 739). Simpson would also have A 729-36 (= 667-76) and A 798-807 (= 732-41) to be abbreviations of Marlowe's original, but I see no ground for the supposition.

The scene is based on two chapters of *EFB*, ch. 18, which supplied the astronomy lecture, and ch. 19, which contributed a hint for the opening, the quarrel with Mephostophilis, the appearance of Lucifer, the gift of the book, and again a hint for the Seven Sins (see notes on 570-3, 636, 641, 654, 659, 660-1, 669-70, 674, 732, 736-9). Further, ch. 20 clearly supplied one point (733-5), and chs. 4 (A 726-8) and 21 (625) possibly hints for others.

569. The direction may have been in MS, but it is suspiciously like that at 389, which was derived from A, and it may, therefore, have been added or at least expanded by the editor (Introd. p. 77).

570-3. In *EFB* ch. 19 is headed, 'How Doctor Faustus fell into despaire with himselfe: for hauing put forth a question vnto his Spirit, they fell at variance, whereupon the whole route of diuels appeared vnto him, threatning him sharply', and begins, 'Doctor *Faustus* . . . became so wofull and sorrowfull in his cogitations, that he thought himselfe already frying in the hottest flames of hell'. Boas thinks that these words suggested the opening lines of the scene, and this seems probable, for though the likeness is not very close the same chapter was certainly used later in the scene.

572-3. See note on 2082.

573-6. A replaces Mephostophilis' retort (573) by the merely connective *why Faustus*, which of course necessitates dropping *But* from 574, leaving the line short. Next, to avoid repetition, it omits *Faustus* in 575, and has consequently to borrow *as thou* from 576, leaving that line short also (Introd. pp. 48-9).

574. The presence of *is* in B shows that it is not printing from A3, which omitted the word: it is, of course, not essential and was omitted again in B2 (Introd. p. 145).

576. *breathe*: A *breathes* A mere misprint in B i, corrected in B2.

578. The terseness of B eluded the actor, whose looser phrasing reduces the line to prose (Introd. p. 56).

579. *Heauen was*: A *itwere* *Heauen* better fits the solemnity of Faustus' declaration than a repetition of the pronoun, and *was* rather than *were* with the following *'twas*. Similar actor's alterations appear in 586 (*I* for *Tea*) and 589 (*hearts so* for *heart is*).

Notes: Act II, Sc. ii

- 582.** The punctuation in A, which gives a possible but slightly less pointed sense, may be the compositor's.
- 584-5.** See note on 488. The phrase *Be I a deuillis*, of course, ambiguous; it may mean 'If I were a devil' or 'Though I am a devil'. Ward took it in the former sense, but Boas's gloss on *spirit* in 583, 'evil spirit, devil', is borne out by the other passages in which the word is used.
- A 649-50.** The lines are not in B. Boas thinks that B 'has apparently suffered from the censorship'. It is very difficult to see what censorship could object to in the statement of Faustus' damnation, seeing that this is the whole subject of the play; at the same time I can suggest no other motive for the omission of these unquestionably genuine lines, and can only point to the loss of the somewhat similar line A 1315. The awkwardness of the thought-sequence in B forbids our supposing that it preserves the original version and that A's lines were added in the prompt-book, and at the same time makes it curious that an accidental omission should not have been noticed: the period at the end of 590 shows intention on the part of the compositor at any rate. One is forced to fall back on the unsatisfactory conjecture that MS was here illegible and that the editor failed to consult A (cf. 548 discussed in the note on 736-9). He may not have noticed the illegibility, or not realized that it would trouble the compositor. It should be added that if the omission was intentional the editor may have modified 591 (which reads *Swords, poyson*, for A's *Poyson, gunnes*), whereas if it was accidental we must assume B's version of 591 to be original, in which case the second line omitted presumably read *then gunnes and kniues*. In any case we need not necessarily suppose that the false concord in A 649 is original. (B2's *poysons* is an accidental assimilation with the neighbouring plurals.)
- 591-2.** This foreshadows Mephostophilis' offer of a dagger at 1831-3.
- 593.** *done the deed: A slaine my selfe* The actor has substituted the more natural phrase, which the author avoided on account of duplication with the preceding line (Introd. p. 53).
- 597-8.** Amphion. The punctuation of B (followed by Boas) is ambiguous, that of A is wrong: 598 belongs to 597, not 599. It was by the magic of music that the walls of Thebes were raised.
- 598.** The line was borrowed in *The Taming of a Shrew* (Introd. p. 31, note 4).
- 600.** A suspicious line, but the same in both texts. It would, however, be extravagant to infer that it was illegible in MS and supplied by the editor from A.
- 601.** *not\ A nere* A's is, on the face of it, perhaps the more natural reading, but in fact it is the question of present repentance that exercises Faustus (cf. 588-9). I doubt whether the comma after *resold d*, found in B only, justifies Ward and Boas in placing a semicolon there, which materially alters the sense.
- 602-35.** The disputation on astronomy comes from *EFB*, ch. 18, in which 'Doctor Faustus . . . called vnto him *Mephostophiles* his spirit saying: . . . when I conferre *Astronomia* and *Astrologia*, as the Mathematicians and auncient writers haue left in memory, I finde them to vary and very much to disagree: wherefore I pray thee to teach me the truth in this matter'.
- 603.** *reason : A argue* There is a slight loss of dignity in A (Introd. p. 44). To the actor or reporter to *dispute* (602) of course suggested to *argue* (in the vulgar sense of the word): to Marlowe it meant the formal disputation of the schools (cf. 37).

Notes: Act II, Sc. ii

604-13. 'A difficult passage', as Boas admits; but I think he has given the correct interpretation: 'Faustus asks whether all the apparently different heavenly bodies form really one globe, like the earth. Mephistophilis [*sic*] answers that like the elements, which are separate but combined, the heavenly bodies are separate, though their spheres are infolded, and they move on one axle-tree. Hence we are not in error in giving individual names to Saturn, Mars or Jupiter; they are separate planets.' There is a good deal of variation between the texts, but since it does not affect the sense the difficulty cannot be due to corruption.

604. *Speake*: A *Tel me* A's reading, apparently an anticipation of 6 2 5, is unmetrical, but the actor or reporter was so pleased with it that he inserted it again at 614 (Intro. p. 53).

Speares: A *heauens* Spheres, heavens, and orbs are, of course, all the same. Concerning the elaborate series of substitutions started by this variant, see Introduction, p. 54.

608. This parenthetical and unessential line is not in A, though the retention of *orbe* (A 668) proves that it was in the version reported.

Emperiall Orbe, i.e. the empyreal sphere or empyrean (cf. 629). Marlowe's spelling is *Emperiall* (four times) except in 2 *Tamburlaine*, in. iv (3460) where he has *imperiall*. Boas argues that what is meant is "imperial", i.e. highest of all'; but the highest heaven is the empyrean. When Marlowe denied the *Caelum igneum* (630-1) he cannot have realized or else had forgotten that this was in fact the empyreal heaven. Miss Ellis-Fermor, whom Boas cites, privately recants her 'imperial' heresy in *Tamburlaine*. The matter has been recently discussed by F. R. Johnson in *E.L.H.*, vol. xii, Mar. 1945. At the same time it is possible that Marlowe confused the two words.

609. *Speares*: A *orbe* A, in borrowing *orbe* from 608, even keeps the singular form, though this emphasizes what is now felt to be the ungrammatical use of *Mutually*. That two (let alone several) circles should reciprocally enclose one another is, of course, nonsense. What is meant is that a series of spheres respectively or successively do so. This wider use of 'mutual' was common at the end of the sixteenth century and later.

610. The actor, having upset the verse by one of his favourite vocatives, further added *ally* in anticipation of 615, feeling no doubt that strict syntax required a fresh subject.

611. *termine*: A *terminine* It would not be surprising if this rather uncommon word, here meaning an end or extremity, had puzzled the actor or reporter, but in fact A's reading is more likely to be a simple misprint, unworthy of record in *O.E.D.* The word is properly disyllabic. For *termine*, *is teamed* cf. note on A 17.

teamed That the rather unusual spelling with *-ea-* is found in both texts must be an accident, but it at least shows that B was not dependent on A3, which has *termed*.

613. *euening*: A *erring* Boas's remark that A 'has the preferable reading' is a nice example of meiosis. Cf. 238, where the same error was corrected in B2.

614. From this point to Lucifer's entrance at 654 the scene is in prose with only occasional lines of verse (e.g. 618-19, 643, &c). But the structure is sometimes uncertain, and the printer seems to have been in doubt (e.g. at 622-4, 641-2, and 646). Boas divides 614, making the first four words complete 613, and treating *motion* as a trisyllable: this is possible, but I think less likely.

But haue: A *But tell me, haue* For A's insertion see note on 604.

Notes : Act II, Sc. ii

The use of £f in both texts looks at first sight like a graphic connexion, but is probably accidental: it may even be due to doubt at some stage whether Latin or English was intended. Breymann actually printed *and*; Ward and Boas have *et*, rightly as the differentiation of type shows.

615. *All moue*: A *All ioyntly moue* A's insertion is a repetition from 610 (see note).

617. *motions*: A *motion* The variant is strictly indifferent, but B may preserve the more technical use: the planets have all their several motions.

618. The actor's *Tush* in A is metrically redundant, and appears to be an anticipation of A 684, where its insertion has at least metrical justification.

questions: A *trifles* A's reading is tautological.

621-4. These lines, though printed as verse in B, look very much like a prose insertion in what may possibly, though by no means certainly, have originally been a rather disjointed verse speech (Introd. p. 108).

621-2. *That* at the beginning of the first line in B is unnecessary, though perhaps natural, and the same is true of *as* in the second line in A. So far as internal evidence goes either text might be original.

621. *natural I day* Echoed by Faustus at 2043.

622-4. The times given for the revolutions of the planets are, of course, only approximate, and in one instance incorrect. The true periods of revolution are, roughly, Saturn 29½ years, Jupiter 11½ years, Mars 1 year and 11 months, Venus 7½ months, and Mercury 3 months. But obviously, since the earth moves, the apparent periods of revolution (with respect to the fixed stars) are different, especially in the case of the inner planets. I have not ascertained what these periods actually are, but a popular handbook of the time, Robert Recorde's *Castle of Knowledge* (1556, pp. 572-9), gives them as Saturn 28 years, Jupiter 12 years, Mars 2 years, Venus, Mercury, and, of course, the sun 1 year, and the moon 1 month. It will be noticed that the dramatist is slightly more accurate than Recorde over Saturn but is wildly wrong over Mars; this is probably a slip: otherwise the figures agree.

625. A's *Tush* is essential if we are looking for verse, and there is no particular reason why it should not be original (Introd. pp. 50-1). On the other hand, it is by no means certain, even if we accept A's reading later in the line, that verse is intended.

questions'. A *suppositions* B's repetition from 618 would be in any case suspicious, and it is impossible to imagine that the technical school term was introduced by an actor or reporter. The word is found in *EFB*, ch. 21, in a passage that refers back to ch. 18, the immediate source of the astronomy lecture. Faustus says: 'I marueiled with my selfe how it were possible that the Firmament should bee knowne and so largely written of men, or whether they write true or false, by their owne opinions, or supposition [i.e. conjecture], or by due obseruations and true course of the heauens.' This, however, is not the meaning the term bears in the present passage, which is cited in *O.E.D.* for the sense, 'Something held to be true and taken as the basis of an argument'. The meaning of the line seems, therefore, to be: These are the sort of elementary facts we give freshmen to argue about. But to one not trained in the schools it would naturally suggest the conjectures of beginners, and so it was presumably understood by the editor of B, who, thinking the sense obscure, substituted the more obvious *questions*.

626. *Intelligentia* (roman) : A *Intelligentij* (italic). A's misprint is not altogether

Notes : Act II, Sc. it

easy to explain: the *ij* is, of course, a ligature, but there was no ligature in the fount for *ia*, at least none is used in *Misericordia* at A 1018.

Boas records C. B. Wheeler's apt quotation from Robert Boyle's *Free Enquiry* (1686): 'The School Philosophers teach the Coelestial Orbs to be moved or guided by Intelligences, or Angels.'

629. *Emperiall: A imperial I* See note on 608. The reporter was probably ignorant of the technical term.
- 630-1. The lines are not in A, either through a failure of memory, or more likely because their purport was not understood. Mephostophilis denies the fiery and crystalline spheres because they were the abode of God and the angels. There is no such denial in *EFB*, in which Mephostophilis says (ch. 18), 'there shalt thou know, *FaustuSj* wherefore the fiery sphaere above \\ [i.e. Saturn] and the signes of the Zodiack doth not burne & consume the whole face of the earth'.
630. £5f, being italic, or rather roman, should stand for *et*.
- 632-4. A supplies the independent connective *Well*, by anticipation of 636, and drops the more organic *then*. It also omits *one*, possibly because Faustus in fact goes on to ask a second question at 636. But he is there passing to a different subject, as is indicated by the *now* that A omits. In 633, in place of the simple *are*, A anticipates 634 with *haue wee*.
636. A omits *now*, but the word is significant as introducing a new subject, and it also has a spice of sly malice in it. Faustus, of course, knows the answer to his question—he himself gives it at 643—but Mephostophilis has just, by implication, denied the existence of God (see note on 630-1), and Faustus is bent on wringing an admission from him. In *EFB*, ch. 19, the question that rouses Mephostophilis' anger is 'how and after what sorte God made the world, and all the creatures in them, and why man was made after the Image of God?'
639. *Moue me not* may mean 'Do not anger me' or 'Do not urge me'. In B the former is probably the meaning here. But A, sacrificing the threatening brevity of B, replaces *Faustus* by the explanatory phrase *for I will not tell thee*, apparently taking the words in the second sense (Introd. p. 51).
640. *not I: A I not* (A2,3 *not I*) B's agreement with A3 here must be accidental: the persistent variation proves that B is printed from MS.
- 641-2. A and B make different attempts to render as verse what is obviously prose.
641. Evidently suggested by *EFB*, ch. 19, where Mephostophilis says, 'I am not bound vnto thee in such respects as concerne the hurt of our kingdome'.
642. Mephostophilis continues his brief angry style (*cf.* 644 and note on 639). This A dilutes, prefixing a connective *but* and recasting the rest, with another connective *for*, and addition of the *Faustus* it supplanted in the previous speech (Introd. p. 56). For the change from *ofto on*, *cf.* 660-1, where the opposite change occurs.
644. The speech is not broken off, as B may have meant to imply by the dash.
646. A is, of course, right in making two lines of this: the compositor of B is compressing as usual.
649. *will: A can* A is wrong in making the Angel doubt Faustus' ability to repent if he has the will to do so (Introd. p. 45). *Cf. will: A shall* in 650.
652. *O-AAh* See note on 454. A sacrifices the agonized repetition of *my Saviour*.

Notes : Act II, Sc. ii

- 653.** *Helpe*: A *seeke* It is, of course, only through the mediation of Christ that salvation can be attained; thus *Helpe* [*Helpe thou* would give smoother verse, if verse were intended) is theologically correct, whereas *seeke*, with its hint of tentative endeavour, seems to question the efficacy of the atonement (Introd. p. 46). The line intentionally echoes 646.
- 654.** From 658 it is evident that Beelzebub appeared in both versions, but he has no part in A, which transfers his speeches to Lucifer. In *EFB*, ch. 19, 'the greatest Diuel in hell appeared vnto [Faustus], with certaine of his hideous and infernal companie in the most ougliest shapes that it was possible to think vpon.' but Beelzebub is only one of several devils who figure in the 'hellish pastimes' devised by Lucifer (see note on 669-70).
- 657.** *what. . . terribly*: A *who . . . terrible* B's *what*, with its suggestion of vague monstrosity, is much more impressive than *who* (Introd. p. 44); and for the same reason I prefer A's *terrible* (i.e. of so terrible aspect) to B's *terribly* (i.e. that glarest so), which seems to me in any case too clumsy to be original: it may have been the compositor who was responsible for the adverb, which, however, Boas retains.
- 658.** The metrical form of the passage is not emphasized, but verse seems to be intended, in which case / *am Lucifer*, should stand as a short line by itself, as Boas prints it.
- 659.** In *EFB*, ch. 19, 'Faustus thought to himselfe, now are they come for me though my time bee not come'. The looseness of the metrical structure makes A's insertion of *away* less noticeable.
- 660-I.** In *EFB*, ch. 19, Lucifer says, 'Faustus, I haue seene thy thoughtes, which are not as thou hast vowed vnto me, by vertue of this letter' (i.e. the bond, see note on 487-507). A's *we come* in place of *we are come* is indifferent (though B's reading is perhaps the more natural after 659), but *talkst of for calst on* is an obvious debasement, the allusion being, of course, to 65 2 (Introd. p. 45). It would seem to be due to the change of preposition in this phrase that A has *Of* instead of *on* in 662 and 663 (see also 664). We have already seen the opposite change at 642; while at 392, when the same change is found as here, *ofhas* the better claim to originality. To us there is a distinct difference between thinking *of and* thinking *on*, and in the present instance the latter is clearly preferable; but I am not sure that the distinction was felt by Elizabethan writers, since they often used *on* (which seems to have been the more common) where we should use *of* (Introd. p. 43). (Notice that in 663 *thinke on the diuell* is already the reading of A3, but this agreement with B must be accidental, as is shown by 660 A i, 2 *come*'. A3 *came*: B *are come*.)
- 663-4.** Probably inserted, see Introduction, p. 109.
- 665.** I am inclined to believe that the clumsy and unmetrical form of this line in B is due to the editor. A is perfectly regular and straightforward, but the transition from the first to the third person (in 666) is undoubtedly awkward, and it seems to have been in an endeavour to remedy this that the editor ruined the line. *Wsfor* at the end may, of course, have been original, but A's *in* seems preferable and the editor may have altered it accidentally in rewriting the line, or intentionally in the supposed interest of precision. Boas follows A.
- A **726-8.** It was, of course, the editor's fear of profanity that led him to cancel these lines in B (Introd. p. 85). They are no more than a specific application of Mephostophiles' demand in *EFB*, ch. 4, that Faustus 'would be an enemie to all

Notes : Act II, Sc. ii

Christian people', and that they may be Marlowe's is suggested by *The Jew of Malta*, v. i (2066-7): 'Tie helpe to slay their children and their wiues, To fire the Churches, pull their houses downe.'

667. The sudden change to definite prose (though 667-8 are printed, and can at a pinch be read, as verse) and to a less serious style (Introd. p. 109) suggests a change of authorship, and there is very little doubt that the rest of the scene is the work of a collaborator. Equally marked is the greater divergence of A from this point on, but this is doubtless the natural result of the change from verse to prose, though it may partly be due to revision in the prompt-book.

669-70. In *EFB*, ch. 19, Lucifer says, 'I am come to visite thee and to shewe thee some of our hellish pastimes', but the show that follows is different from that in the play, for Lucifer commands 'the rest of the Diuels to appeare in their forme, as if they were in heP, which they do 'in forme of vnsensible beasts'; moreover, the purpose of the show is to terrify rather than to entertain (Introd. p. 109). The pageant of the Seven Sins may, however, have been suggested by the fact that the chief devils named in the 'hellish pastimes' (apart from Lucifer) are seven in number.

673-4. Editors have commonly printed this as two and a half lines of verse, and Boas adopts the readings of A for the purpose, but there is not the least reason to suppose that anything but prose is intended, in spite of the fact that B3 printed *vnto* as in A.

674. Possibly an unconscious echo of *EFB*, ch. 19, in which, referring to Faustus' question, 'how and after what sorte God made the world' (see note on 636), Lucifer at the end of the show asks, '*Faustus*, how likest thou the creation of the worlde?'

A 736. *talke of the diuel, and nothing else: come away.* For the comic tag see Introduction, p. 109, and for *come away*, singularly inappropriate as an invitation to the show, p. 38.

678-9. The indifferent variants in A are typical of the actor or reporter. Like differences are found throughout the show: I only note a few. As a rule A makes Faustus' comments rather barer, except at 721 where it expands for comic effect.

681-9. The end of Pride's speech is shortened in the report. The necklace is omitted. So is the mention of the smock, the indelicacy of the allusion surviving only in the vague suggestion of *what doe I not?* but this is presumably because A had already borrowed the idea for use at A 425-7.

682. *Ouids Flea* 'The lascivious "Carmen de pulice," formerly supposed to be by Ovid, is described by Bernhardy [*Grundriss der romischen Litteratur*] as "a production of the later Middle Ages"' (Ward).

685. *her: A her lippes* Probably an accidental omission in B: Boas restores it.

686. Kocher sees a reminiscence of this passage in some similar jesting about a 'wrought smocke' in *Friar Bacon*, sc. i (105-17). A connexion is possible though the theme was probably familiar.

687-8. *Pie not speake a word more for a Kings ransom*

A lie not speake an other worde

This is repeated at the end of Sloth's speech at 725:

*Pie not speak a word more for a kings ransome
A lie not speake an other word for a Kings ransome*

Notes: Act I, Sc. it

The duplication, more noticeable in B than in A, owing possibly to revision in the prompt-book, is discussed in the Introduction, p. n o; see also note on 724-5.

- 692-5.** This speech of Covetousness as rendered in A is a very epitome of the characteristics of a report: *haue* is a more common-place equivalent of *now obtaine*; *I would desire, that this house... were turnd* is a syntactical slackening of *this house . . . should turne* and *all the people in it* is an unnecessarily specific paraphrase of *you and a//*; *locke you vppe in* is less pointed than *locke you safe into*. Taken by themselves A's *an olde leatherne bag* and *my good chest* are slightly more colourful than *a leather bag* and *my Chest* but in fact *olde* is simply repeated from the preceding *olde churle*, and *good chest* is an attempt to balance *sweete golde*.
- 693.** The meaning of *in a leather bag* is not very clear. Perhaps Covetousness was begotten, not inappropriately, in a money-bag. Kocher sees in it an unrecorded use of *bag* for some article of clothing ('bags' for trousers is nineteenth century; but cf. Sack, *O.E.D.*, sb.⁴, a loose-bodied gown, before 1600) and compares Nashe, *Terrors of the Night*, 1594 (ed. McKerrow, i. 384): 'You that be pore mens children, know your own fathers; & though you can shift & cheate your selues into good cloathes here about Towne, yet bow your knees to their leathern bagges and russet coates, that they may blesse you from the ambition of Tiburne.' But even here it may be the beggar's scrip that is in question (McKerrow presumably so understood it since he has no note), and such an interpretation is presumably favoured by *Pierce Penniless*, 1592 (i. 162), 'to Westminster hall I went, and made a search of Enquiry, from the blacke gown to the buckram bagge', where McKerrow makes it plain that the allusion is to the cheap bags of stiffened cloth carried by lawyers' clerks.
- 697-709.** While the transposition of the speeches of Envy and Wrath in A cannot, of course, be due to an individual actor, it might still happen easily on the stage in the absence of an authoritative prompt-book, and just as easily in memorial reporting. (Since the Sins enter together at 677 and merely come forward in turn to speak their parts, their order would not be controlled by the plot.) Admittedly there is nothing to show which order is correct; had there been, the transposition would have been less likely to occur.
- 703.** *Out enuious wretch* : A *JAWaynuious rase all* An indifferent variant that can hardly have any but a memorial origin (Introd. p. 44).
- 705.** *an heure*: A *half an heure* An actor tends to emphasize by exaggeration (Introd. p. 58).
- 706.** *these* : A *this* A 'case' of rapiers or pistols is a pair, and hence in sense, though not in form, is plural, and so treated by B. A has the more grammatical singular. Boas, following Bullen and Ward, finds support for B in *The White Devil*, v. vi. 21, S.D., ^k*He enters with two case of pistols** (cf. 1. 18, 'two case of jewels'); but here two pairs are meant, as appears from ll. 93-4. According to Boas 'The reference is to a pair of rapiers in a single sheath'. I am no expert armourer, but I have never seen two rapiers in one scabbard, and I doubt whether anyone has. The original expression appears to have been 'a case of pistols (*or dags*)', i.e. a pair of pistols in a case, whence it was extended to rapiers, and generally to a brace of anything (e.g. by Jonson to coxcombs).
- 708-9.** *some of you shall be my father* No doubt the general meaning is 'one of you is bound to prove my father'. 'Some' for 'some one' was still common in the

Notes: Act II, Sc. it

seventeenth century. 'Shall' was 'In OE. *andoccas*. in ME. used to express necessity of various kinds' (*O.E.D.*, s.v., sense 3): and the use in weakened form (now expressed by 'should') survived in Elizabethan English, as in Lear's 'He that parts us shall bring a brand from heaven' (v. iii. 22), i.e. will need to bring.

711. A prefixes *who I sir*, by anticipation of 727 (Introd. p. 55).

713. *buys me*: A *is* A trifling change; but one would not expect the pension to be paid in kind.

Beauers i.e. either (literally) drinks or (hence) light meals, usually between dinner and supper: the precursors of our 'teas'.

714. I: A O I A anticipates the exclamation of 717-18 (see note).

Pedigree: A *parentage* A substitutes a commoner word under the influence of *parents* in 711.

714-15. *father . . . mother-. A grandfather . . . grandmother* The change in A is worse than pointless after *parentage-*, there may have been some confusion with the *godfathers* and *godmother* that follow

717. *Martlemasse-beefe* 'It was common to slaughter cattle at Martinmas to be salted for winter provision' (*O.E.D.*).

717-18. *But . . . O she: A O but . . . she* There is, at least to my mind, a certain subtlety in the placing of the exclamation in B that is lost in A; but this may be fanciful.

A 777-8. *and welbeloued . . . Citie* This looks genuine. It may have been accidentally omitted in B, or (in view of A 745-7 and 786-8) it may have been added in the prompt-book. In the latter case, A's *a tolly for an ancient* is probably also due to revision. A 781-2 might, of course, have been added at the same time, but these lines are more in the style of A's own embroideries; cf. 711.

719. *March-beere* A strong beer traditionally brewed in March.

720. *progeny* 'Here used in its older sense of "lineage"', says Boas. He means its • obsolete sense; the current sense is the original.

A 781. *hanged* (A2 *hang'dfirst*) A2 seldom attempts to emend its copy, though it frequently misprints it. Here the absence of *first* in Ai may well have been accidental, and its restoration unconscious.

722. Cf. 1075.

724-5. In B Sloth can find energy for little more than the lackadaisical *Hey ho*, and the refusal to speak, repeated from 687-8 (see note), is entirely appropriate, even essential. In A the speech is recast and expanded, but by no means in A's usual vein of comic vulgarization. I have little doubt that on consideration the brevity of the original draft was thought ineffective and that it was rewritten in preparing the prompt-book. But the expansion makes the refusal to speak less to the point, and if the duplication of 687-8 was noticed, as it appears to have been, one might have expected it to be omitted here rather than modified in the earlier passage.

726. *Mistris Minkes* Kocher refers to 'Mistris Minx' in Nashe's *Pierce Penniless*, 1592 (ed. McKerrow, i. 173), but she was 'a Merchants wife' and typified Pride, and the term was 'perhaps specially used of the tradesman class' (McKerrow; quoting 'Tell mistris minkes, shee that keepe the shop' from a pamphlet of 1615). But, as Kocher observes, 'Mistress Minx' is a prostitute in Lodge's *Alarum against*

Notes : Act II, Sc. iii

Usurers, 1583 (fols. 3^a, 7^{a,b}), and Florio (1598) equates 'minxe' with 'trull': see also Lyly, *Mother Bom hie* (1594), l. iii (207, 423).

727. The duplication of / in B is probably accidental, though sense can be made of it. It was removed in B2, and Boas disregards it even in his collations.
728. The fact that Lechery is *Mistris Minkes* should have warned Boas that *Mutton* does not here mean 'a loose woman'; but this indelicate subject need not be pursued. Ward by omitting the passage showed that he understood it.
- 728-9. *the first letter of my name begins with Letchery* This curious idiom was current and widespread, in French, it seems, as well as English, as was first pointed out by P. A. Daniel (*Athenaeum*, 14 Oct. 1876, and *apud* Ward), citing Lyly, *Euphues and his England* (ed. Arber, p. 340), 'a gentlewoman . . . the first letter of whose name . . . is Camilla', and Middleton, *The Family of Love*, n. iii (ed. Dyce, p. 131), 'Her name begins with Mistress Purge'.
- 730—1. *Away to hell, away on piper: A Away, to he I, to he I* See Introduction, p. 50. The show was evidently led by a piper in B, though probably not in A. A omits the speaker's name to 730, though the line is duly indented. This may somehow be connected with its insertion of a question by Lucifer designed to make less abrupt the transition to Faustus' exclamation of delight. The latter differs widely in the two versions without there being any internal indication which is the more original.
732. *But: A Tut* There seems so little point in *But* that Breymann may have been right in supposing it a misprint for *Tut*, in spite of this being peculiarly characteristic of A (Introd. pp. 50-1).
The line may have been distantly suggested by *EFB*, ch. 19, in Lucifer's offer 'to shewe thee some of our hellish pastimes' and Faustus' 'let mee see what pastime you can make'.
- 733-5. Cf. *EFB*, ch. 20 (that following the 'hellish pastimes'): 'Quoth *Faustus*, I would knowe of thee if I may see Hell and take a view thereof? That thou shalt (said the diuell) and at midnight I will fetch thee.' An account of the visit follows, but was not used in the play. Was a pageant of hell originally projected?
- 736-9. For the source of this passage and its relation to 548-56, see the Introduction, pp. 106-8 and n o.
740. For A's addition, *and thinke on the diuel*, cf. 662-4 and see Introduction, p. 109.

Act II, Scene iii

This is the first scene in which the two versions diverge so much that they cannot be regarded as parallel; they are no more than correspondent, treating the same episode with only occasional similarity of phrase. A displaces the scene, inserting it immediately before in. iii, to which I suggest it was intended to be an alternative in that text: see Introduction, p. 38. B was, of course, printed from MS, and made no use of A.

There is no reason to suppose that Marlowe had any hand in this scene, which owes nothing to *EFB*,

743. Robin is called *the Clowne* in B, thus connecting him with *the Clowne* of l. iv. A describes him as *the Ostler* in the initial direction (A 948): in B it is Dick who is called *Hostler* (752). B's *Dick* is *Rafe* in A. The reason for the change is not

Notes : Act II, Sc. iii

apparent, for seeing that *Robin* is common to both texts, the names are unlikely to be those of actors.

A 950-3. There is, of course, an improper allusion in *circles* (cf. *Romeo and Juliet*, 11. i. 24, and *Henry V*, v. ii. 320) of which B is innocent. Later Robin's wanton fancies seem to have grown out of the merest hint, *If thou't dance naked*, in B 769.

751. *A per se a, t. h. e. the* [&c] Boas's punctuation (*A per se; a, . . . O per se; O*) is wrong, and his remark that *A per se* was 'used in Eliz. [and much earlier] English of something unique', though true, is beside the point, and moreover does not explain *O per se* (cf. 1156—7). The phrase is here used in its literal and original sense: A by itself [spells] a; t. h. e. [spells] the; &c.

* *deny orgon, gorgon* See note on 244-5.

754. The dropping of the first negative in B2 may be accidental.

756. *Ostry* i.e. hostelry, see note on A 1214.

760. B2's substitution of *afayre* for *asfaire a* is an accidental variant.

770 ff. In B the scene ends with an invitation to the tavern, which links it with in. iii. There is nothing of this in A, which confirms the conjecture, advanced in the headnote, that in that text the scene was not meant as an introduction to the adventure with the Vintner, but as an alternative. The Nan Spit business (A 976 ff.) is peculiar to A.

771-2. *claret wine* was originally (as in French) a wine of light red colour, distinguished from both 'red' and 'white' wine: about 1600 (according to *O.E.D.*) the term came to be applied to red wines generally.

772. *Whippincrust* (A *ipocrase*) *Whippincrust* (which B2 misprints *Whippincursf*) appears to be a humorous perversion of 'hippocras' (i.e. *vinum Hippocraticum*, a concoction of wine and spices strained through a bag) with a suggestion of 'whipping-cheer'. It is curious that A should have substituted the normal form. Perhaps the joke proved unintelligible on the stage, or was thought far-fetched when the prompt-book was prepared.

773. *hold belly hold* i.e. as much as you can drink. Kocher compares *Nashes Lenten Stuffe*, 1599 (ed. McKerrow, iii. 190), 'the first shoulde haue his gut bumbasted with biefe and nothing else, till hee cride hold, belly, holde'. McKerrow notes that the phrase is also found in *Sir Giles Goosecap*, 1606 (sig. G4).

Chorus 2 (B)

B has the longer and apparently more original version, 25 lines against A's 11, clearly derived from MS. A's version (which the editor of B had already used, inappropriately enough, as Chorus 1) masquerades as a speech by Wagner (Introd. p. 58). The whole middle portion is omitted, the reporter being only concerned with getting Faustus to Rome.

Marlowe's authorship of the A-text is not questioned, and the additional lines in B are obviously by the same hand.

The Chorus is based on, or at least suggested by, Faustus' letter to a friend that forms ch. 21 of *EFB*; thence come his interest in the firmament, the dragon-car (but not the flight), and the eight days. But it also looks forward to his arrival at Rome in ch. 22 after a brief stay at home.

Notes: Chorus 2 (B)

778-9. Cf. *EFB*, ch. 21: 'I marueiled with my selfe how it were possible that the Firmament should bee knowne and so largely written of men.'

778. The printer, economizing as usual, ran together two lines correctly separated in A.

find\ A *know* The intended sense of discovery is more explicitly rendered in B, but there is not much to choose (Introd. p. 44).

780. *mount him vp*: A *mount himselfe* *O.E.D.* cites A for the obsolete sense (12) 'To cause to ascend or rise . . . Also with *up*\ The notion is better expressed by B, since A might mean 'obtained a mount' (sense 15).

781-2. Cf. *EFB*, ch. 21: 'and beholde, there stooede a Waggon, with two Dragons before it to drawe the same, and all the Waggon was of a light burning fire'.

781. *Where sitting*: A *Being seated* The change in A was doubtless conditioned by the following cut and a wish to make a smoother transition to 796, but the passage remains rather disjointed by comparison with the carefully articulated paragraph in B.

782. *yoked*'. A *yoky* If *yoky* is anything but an error it means the same as *yoked*. Curiously enough *O.E.D.* is able to cite some evidence from the later seventeenth century for the use of the word in this sense, 'yokie beasts'. If it was actually current A may, of course, have preserved the original reading, altered as unfamiliar by the editor of B. No support, however, is given by Chapman's use of 'yokie sphere' (*Iliad*, xvii. 382) as a periphrasis for 'yoke'.

784. *The Tropick, Zones, [&c.]* B2, followed by Breymann and Boas, makes the obvious emendation of omitting the comma. But though this has the support of *O.E.D.* (s.v. Tropic, adj. I. 1), it is not altogether satisfactory. Why should Faustus wish particularly to view what in modern parlance we call 'the tropics'? Moreover, there is, strictly speaking, only one tropic zone: thus *Recorde* (see note on 622-4) writes of 'all that space betweene the twoo Tropykes, the Burnynge Zone' (*O.E.D.*, s.v. Zone, 1.a). I think we should read *The Tropicks, Zones, [Sec]*, i.e. the tropics (of Cancer and Capricorn) and the five zones in which they (and the polar circles) divide or 'quarter' the heavens—for it is the sky, rather than the earth, that is in question. This interpretation is confirmed by a quotation from Twyne in 1578 (*O.E.D.*, s.v. Zone, i.b), 'These fiue quarters and zones, which the Astronomers doe describe in heauen, and vppon the earth'.

785-6. That is, from the lowest to the highest heaven. The *circle* is, of course, the orbit, not the disk, of the moon, and *Primum Mobile* the outermost sphere, regarded as imparting their common motion to the heavens.

787-8. Marlowe does not express astronomical ideas very clearly, but by *this circumference* he must mean 'this outermost sphere', the *Primum Mobile*, and by *the concaue compasse of the Pole*, 'all that revolves on the axis of the universe'. In *EFB*, ch. 21, 'It is the axle of the heauens that moueth the whole firmament'—which in fact is heterodox. The collocation of terms is somewhat unusual and recalls a passage in *Friar Bacon* (Introd. pp. 7-8), sc. viii (1146-9, 1155):

the compasse of ascending eliments
Exceed in bignesse as they doe in height.
Ludging the concaue circle of the sonne,
To hold the rest in his circomference . . .
Nor tell I of the concaue lattitudes . . .

Notes: Chorus 2 (B)

- 790.** Cf. [E.FB](#), ch. 21: 'on the Tewsdays went I out, and on Tewsdays seven-nights following I came home againe, that is, eight days'.
- 791-2.** Cf. *EFB*, ch. 22: 'he tooke a little rest at home'.
- 794.** In his terrestrial journey Faustus, according to *EFB*, ch. 22, 'set forward . . . *vpon his swift horse Mephostophiles'.
- 799-801.** Cf. 854-8 (note).
- 800.** *take some part of* The idiom was current beside the now usual 'take part in' (*O.E.D.*, s.v. Part, sense 23).
holy Peters feast In *EFB*, ch. 22, the feast is not that of St. Peter, but one that the Pope 'prepared for the Cardinall of *Pauias*' (cf. note on 910), and later in the B-text (856-8) it is inconsistently said to be in celebration of a papal victory.
- 801.** *The which*. A *That to* A misses the point (Introd. p. 47). (I know of no authority for Ward's assertion that *to this day* can mean 'to-day'.) B2 emended 568 in accordance with the present reading of B (see note).

Act III, Scene i

This scene, of which only the opening appears in A, is, of course, mainly printed from MS, all indeed except the first speech (802-25). This is sharply differentiated from what follows by the fact that there are hardly any variants, and that what there are are due to errors in B: there are also some difficulties and possible corruptions common to the two texts. Yet the speech was obviously not absent from MS, since B was able to supply a couple of lines (820-1) that had been accidentally lost in A. Probably the beginning of the scene was partly damaged or at least illegible in MS, and the editor, therefore, found it convenient to make use of the first twenty-three lines of A.

Only the opening, as far as 847, seems to be Marlowe's, and even in this 826-31 is pretty certainly an insertion. The rest, characterized among other things by frequent couplets, is evidently the work of a collaborator, whom there is some reason to suspect may have been Samuel Rowley.

The portion above assigned to Marlowe continues the use of *EFB*, ch. 22, begun in the Chorus. A later speech by Faustus (870-6) reverts to ch. 21, duplicating to some extent the matter already used. The rest has no source in *EFB*, but is derived from Foxe's *Booke of Martyrs* (see note on 891 ff.).

\$02. The exact correspondence of the direction may be noted, though it is not, of course, of much significance.

503-25. This speech (Introd. pp. 111-12) is closely and rather clumsily paraphrased from *EFB*, ch. 22, which recounts how Faustus 'set forward again on his journey . . . and came to *Treir* [*FB*: 'Trier'], for that he chiefly desired to see this towne, and the monuments thereof. . . there he saw . . . a mighty large Castle that was built of bricke, with three walles and three great trenches, so strong, that it was impossible for any princes power to win it . . . from whence he departed to *Paris* . . . He came from *Paris* to *Mentz*, where the riuer of *Mayne* falls into the *Rhine*; notwithstanding he taried not long there, but went to *Campania* in the Kingdome of *Neapolis* [*FB*: 'vnd kam in Campanien, in die Statt Neapoljs'], in which he saw . . . great and high houses of stone, the streetes fayre and large, and straight foorth from one end of the towne to the other as a line, and al the pauement of the Citie was of brick . . . there saw he the Tom be of

Notes: Act III, Sc. i

Virgil; & the high way that hee cutte through that mighty hill of stone in one night, the whole length of an English mile [This, from 'the streetes' to 'English mile', has no original in *FB*.] . . . From thence he came to *Venice*, whereas he wondered not a little . . . at the fayrenes of Saint *Markes* place, and the sumptuous Church standing therein called Saint *Markes*; how all the pauement was set with coloured stones, and all the Roode or loft of the Church double gilded ouer. [There is no mention of St. Mark's in *FB*.] Leauing this, he came to *Padoa* . . . Well, forward he went to Rome . . . ' Marlowe made no attempt apparently to give grammatical form to his breathless paraphrase; even the logical structure of the original is lost when he mentions only his departure from Paris and omits all mention of Mainz where Main and Rhine meet. A may no doubt be to some extent corrupt, but the original can hardly have been a model of lucidity.

804-5. h I t is a little us that the play should revert to the correct spelling of *Trier*, as in *FB*, when *EFB* had corrupted it to *Treir*. But the name may have been fairly familiar: Heylin, *Microcosmus* (1621, p. 150), spells it 'Triers' (cf. French 'Treves'). It has been suggested, to account for 805, that Marlowe mis-read 'monuments' in *EFB* as 'mountains': in fact Trier lies in the valley of the • Moselle, 'shut in by vine-clad hills'.

809. *Rhines* : A *Rhine* A mere misprint in B, perhaps due to attraction into rime with *Vines* in 810. It was corrected in B3.

811. In what sense you could go *vp* from Mainz to Naples is not apparent (B3 printed *vnto* for *vp to*). Marlowe seems to identify *Campania* appositionally with *Naples*, and this is indeed suggested by the wording of *EFB* (see notes on 803-25). The passage, however, is mistranslated: *FB* evidently means that Faustus 'came, in Campania, to the city of Naples'. Campania, originally the district of Capua, has steadily widened its application, till it now embraces a large area of southern Italy, of which the province of Naples is only a part, and which, popularly at any rate, includes the Roman Campagna.

812-13. See Introduction, p. 69. B can be made intelligible by the rather violent expedient of understanding *are* after *buildings* and *streets*, and this we may suppose was how the editor meant the passage to be read. But that will not help A, with its additional line (A 833). This, however, is not a line that can conceivably be due to an actor or reporter, and it must, therefore, be accepted as a genuine and integral part of the text. It is true that to Boas it 'looks like an interpolation', but he nevertheless admits it into his text, though he does not attempt to explain the construction. Indeed the text of A is unintelligible as it stands: we should have to make some such series of emendations as *With buildings . . . Whose streetes . . . Quarter . . . equiuolents*. (Boas makes the last, Ward the last two, of these corrections, which are indeed obvious.) It must be noted that A3, in an attempt at emendation, changed *foure equiuolence to forme equiuolent*, thus destroying the last vestige of sense. This was, of course, the reading that the editor of B had before him, and he had no choice but to omit the line in which it occurred. Clearly he was unable to make use of MS here, though it was available a few lines below.

813-21. This passage and the later description of Rome afford the main proof, supported by many minor points, that the play is based on *EFB* and not on the original German (see notes on 803-25 and 834-47; cf., however, note on 834).

814. When B2 shortened *learned* to *learned* it may have assumed that *Maroes* was trisyllabic (cf. note on 25).

Notes: Act III, Sc. i

816. *Through: A Thorough* Either Marlowe or the compositor of B was careless.
817. *East: A rest* Although, so near to 820—1, we must be wary of rejecting any reading of B, this is patently wrong. A's reading may be banal, but B's is nonsense, or at any rate makes nonsense of the following line. Padua is not east of Venice, and Venice is not, as Boas asserts, east, but considerably west of Naples. I suspect that the editor did consult MS, which was here becoming partially legible, found that it read *yfest* (the first letter lost), and interpreted this as *East*.
818. *one: A midst* A's reading does not make sense, but B's (which was adopted by Ward and retained by Boas) is clearly nothing but editorial tinkering. I believe the confusion to be original, and A to preserve, approximately at least, what Marlowe wrote. On the whole of this confused passage see Introduction, pp. 111-12.
819. Boas rightly calls this 'A characteristic Marlovian addition to the *E.F.B.* description', but, as Ward perceived, it is singularly inapplicable to the rather squat structure of St. Mark's—unless we think of this as including the detached campanile.
- 820—1. These lines, no doubt accidentally lost in A (cf. 836—7), must have been restored from MS, which was, therefore, here available. Marlowe's *rooft aloft* corresponds to *EFB*'s 'Roode or loft' (see note on 803-25), and Boas points out that in this 'Roode' might be a misprint for 'Roofe'. But the collocation of 'Roode' and 'loft' may have been suggested by the term 'rood-loft', and Marlowe appears to have echoed the sound rather than the sense of his original.
- 826—32. *I haue my Faustus . . . But now my Faustus* The repetition of the address neatly marks what I take to be an insertion (Introd. p. 112). Simpson regards the corresponding lines in A (rather widely divergent, as such comic passages are apt to be: Introd. p. 57) as a 'prose abbreviation' of a Marlowan original. B, however, is metrical (more or less) and there seems no adequate ground for doubting its originality: it follows *EFB*, ch. 22, 'the Popes Pallace . . . and priuie chamber where he was'. But I find it difficult to believe that this feeble jesting is Marlowe's, and in particular I do not believe him responsible for the Spirit's familiar address, *my Faustus*, in spite of its use in *EFB*. (In A the familiarity is emphasized and vulgarized in the phrase, A 848, *Tut, tis no matter man*; cf. A 1397.) Line 832, in which we return to Marlowe, has, of course, been modified to accommodate the insertion.
- 832-47. Among the properties belonging to the Admiral's company was 'the sittie of Rome', which may possibly have been a back-cloth for the present scene (Introd. p. n).
- 834-47. This speech continues the paraphrase of *EFB*, here from ch. 22: 'Well, forward he went to *Rome*, which lay, & doth yet lie, on the riuier *Tybris*, the which deuideth the Citie in two parts: ouer the riuier are foure great stone bridges, and vpon the one bridge called *Ponte S. Angelo* is the Castle of *S. Angelo*, wherein are so many great cast peeces as there are dayes in a yeare, & such Pieces that will shoote seuen bullets off with one fire . . . the Citie hath eleuen gates . . . Hard by . . . he visited the Church yard of *S. Peters*, where he saw the *Pyramide* that *Iulius Caesar* brought out of *Africa*⁷. This is all very different from *FB*. *EFB* makes Faustus visit the sights of Rome before reaching the papal apartments; Marlowe naturally takes him straight to the *priuie chamber* (though he omitted to say so and it was supplied by his collaborator) and only narrates the sights.

Notes: Act Illy Sc. i

- 834.** The seven hills are not mentioned in *EFB*, though in *FB* (ch. 26) 'begreiff die Statt sieben Berg vmb sich'. But the fact was too familiar for its mention to afford any ground to suppose that Marlowe consulted the German (cf. note on 1666-70).
- 835.** *vnderprop*: A *vnderprops* The false concord is only in the report; cf. A's *makes* at 839 (see note on 518). Note that B has no hyphen as in A3's *vnder-prop*s, though it does agree with A3 in having a hyphen in *ground-worke*: this must be a coincidence.
- 836-7.** These lines are not in A, where sense and grammar are incomplete. They must have been accidentally omitted by the compositor: had the reporter left them out, as he may have done 821-2, the context would have been recast.
- 838.** *two: Kfour* B's reading is a compositor's error, repeating the word from the previous line (cf. 296 and note): A agrees with *EFB* (see note on 834-47).
leane This is the reading of both texts and must be original (as must *Ponto* in 840). The metaphor is not really violent, and Breyman's emendation *leade* is quite unnecessary: for the meaning 'bend' or 'incline' see *O.E.D.* (sense 5).
- 840-1.** It may be worth pointing out that it is *EFB* that is responsible for the fiction that the castle stands on the bridge (see note on 834-47). This at least is the literal interpretation; but, after all, if a town can be said to be 'upon' a river, I suppose a building may be said to be 'upon' a bridge if it stands at one end of it (see, however, note on 996).
- 842-7.** A suddenly becomes markedly divergent, apparently through failure of memory, for metre is preserved. Contrary to its usual practice, the report has one terse line in place of the two by which B renders the simple phrase 'as there are dayes in a yeare' in *EFB*. By altering *Where thou shalt see* to *Within whose zvalles* in 842, A makes nonsense of 846-7 (Introd. p. 57). The dependence of 846 on 842 may be clumsy, and the account is certainly compressed, but Boas's complaint that 'These lines condense, to the point of obscurity, the passage in *E.F.B.** is perhaps a little severe. In 843 A's *frarrfd of earned brasse* is less appropriate to cannon than B's *forged of brasse* \ in 844 B's *watch* is, of course, a misprint.
- 846.** *Beside*: A *Besides* The sense is that now usually expressed by the latter, but at the time the forms were used indifferently, and so appear in the Bible of 1611, *Pyramydes*, in spite of balancing *gates*, must be meant for a singular since it refers to the obelisk that still stands before St. Peter's (actually brought from the Egyptian Thebes by Constantius c. A.D. 353). *EFB* has 'Pyramide'. Boas aptly refers to *The Massacre at Paris*, sc. ii (100-3), 'the high Peramides ... He either rend it with my nayles'. The form seems to have been current at the end of the sixteenth and in the first half of the seventeenth century, and during that period the word was rather loosely applied, for instance, to the spire of old St. Paul's.
- 848.** At this point, where the text suddenly ceases to depend on *EFB*, I am convinced that Marlowe, who had evidently been writing without interest, broke off. The next five sham-forcible and pointless lines read like parody (though Simpson takes them for genuine); after that the text is marked by the repetition of phrases from earlier (Marlowan) speeches and by persistent couplets, as well as by a general change of style. There are a few rather similar, if less ludicrous, bits of rodomontade later, but they are confined to A (1023-5, 1116-18).
- 849.** *of Acheron*: A *Acheron* Perhaps the actor called it *Acheron* (Gk. *Ar^pcov*).
- 850.** *euer-buming* A recurrent epithet; see 1178, 1257, and 2023, all, I think, in

Notes: Act III, Sc. i

non-Marlowan passages. It is not, in fact, a Marlowan compound. Apart from *Faustus* it is only found in the doubtfully Marlowan *Selimus*, l. 1822, 'That quench'd those lampes of euerburning light*. Note that B agrees with A_i in the hyphen, whereas A_{2,3} have *euer burning-*, the trifling agreements between B and A₃ in 842 and 854 are not significant.

852. *situation* properly means site or location, but here the notion seems to be rather that of internal disposition (of parts). The sense may be the same in *When you See me you Know me* (1605, sig. K3; 1613, sig K4^v):

Meane while, your Maiesty may heere behold
This warlike kingdome[s] faire *Metropolis*,
The Citty *London*, and the river *Thames*,
And note the scituation of the place.

bright splendid Cf. 2013, *bright shining*.

854—90. In this passage the writer seems for some reason to have been hampered by his material and forced to awkward repetition: 854 *Nay stay my Faustus*, 868 *Nay stay my gentle Mephostophilis*, 879 *Let it be so my Faustus, but first stay*. He was not following any original that we know of; it looks rather as though he were working on some earlier draft or more likely disjointed notes (cf. note on 869, and see *Introd.* p. 114).

854-8. These lines to some extent duplicate 799-801. The writer begins by echoing *To see the Pope in / know you'd see the Pope*, and proceeds to copy the next line and a half exactly, indeed so mechanically that he writes *this day* before deciding on what construction shall follow. The error was emended in B2 (possibly from recollection of a performance: *Introd.* pp. 149-50), but there can be little doubt that it was an original blunder and not a slip by the compositor. A breaks off just too soon to show what happened in the stage version, but we may assume that the mistake was corrected in the prompt-book, perhaps in the same way as in B2 (*Introd.* p. 144).

But, if the writer begins by copying from the Chorus, he later contradicts it. In *EFB* the Pope's feast is given in honour of the Cardinal of Pavia (see note on 800); Marlowe makes it the festival of St. Peter; his collaborator, in deference to a different source (see note on 891 if.), tells us that it was held to celebrate a victory of the papal forces.

In view of this duplication and contradiction, as well as of further matter borrowed from the Chorus in 870-6, it is difficult to believe that when this passage was written the Chorus was meant to stand. Yet sufficient remains in A to prove that the duplication at least survived in the stage version. We are reminded of the duplicate episodes at the end of 11. i and 11. ii, which also survived on the stage in spite of verbal borrowing. There must, it would seem, have been at least some haste in preparing the prompt-book. See *Introduction*, pp. 113-14.

854. Cf. *EFB*, ch. 22: 'he was desirous to see the Popes Pallace\ The line in B is a trifle uneven, with an extra syllable at the pause. Curiously enough A, whose opening, *Nay Faustus stay*, would give a perfectly smooth line, destroys it by inserting *faine* in the second half.

855. After this line the close correspondence of the texts ceases abruptly. A completes the *speech with a couple* of lines of its own, continues with two more that parallel 1023-4, adds four that contain a prose rendering of 1025-7 and 1039-40, and so passes on to the banquet in one continuous scene. All this is obviously due

Notes: Act III, Sc. i

to intentional cutting; there is no reason to suspect failure of memory. (The *bald-pate Friers* of A 870 hint at the *Friers Pates* of 886 and the *shauen crownes* of 1041; *belly-cheare* in A 871 anticipates 1783.) Here at least, therefore, it is impossible to regard A as the original version and divergence as due to revision in B, in spite of the curious fact that it is at this point that we get the first hint of the new source upon which B drew for the Bruno episode (see note on 891 ff. and In *tr.* p. 24).

A 870. Note *thou* in the reporter's insertion, inconsistent with *youd* in A 868 (= 854) but agreeing with A 876 (= 1039).

A 871. *summum bonum* A recollection perhaps of 44.

850-60. *me . . . earth: Let (B2me, . . . earth, let)* Though the punctuation of B_i gives sense of a sort there can be little doubt that it is a compositor's mistake, due probably to indistinct proof correction. B₂'s emendation, so far as it goes, is certainly justified: but the colon should have come after *me*. Cf. 331 and note.

862-3. It is just possible that the writer had in mind a phrase in *EFB*, ch. 56, which in recording Faustus' last days tells us how 'the rest of his time he meant to spend in Innes and Students company, drinking and eating, with other Iollitie'.

869. *and then I go* This, one would imagine, can hardly have been written to connect with Mephostophilis' preceding speeches, in which Faustus had been invited to *stay* and *stand by me*. Faustus' *request* is apparently that if he stays he shall be allowed to take part in the show (877), which is just what Mephostophilis has suggested (855); but the intervening lines (870-6) seem entirely irrelevant. The whole gives the impression of hasty patchwork (*Introd.* p. 114).

870-6. These lines, which recall Faustus' opening speech in this scene, duplicate in a manner the preceding Chorus, from which they repeat the eight days and the dragon, while adding (in 873-4)^a fresh point from *EFB*, ch. 21, 'me thought that the whole length of the earth was not a span long'. It is difficult to believe that the duplication was intentional (see note on 854-8).

878, 882. *comming* is in the first instance presumably, and in the second obviously, a misprint for *cunning*. So in *Troilus and Cressida*, in. ii. 140, both quarto and folio have *Comming* where modern editors read *Cunning*.

885. *Antiques* i.e. antics, grotesques. *O.E.D.* cites the present passage (s.v. *Antic*, B. 1. b) for the earliest use of the substantive for a grotesque human figure, and *Edward II*, 1. i (60), 'My men . . . Shall with their Goate feete daunce an an tick hay', for the earliest use of the adjective (A. 2. a) for grotesque in gesture.

890. *admir'di.e.* wondered at. The verb 'to admire' seems to have become current, both in this and its modern sense, about 1590, though *O.E.D.* cites an isolated instance of 'emyred' for 'regarded with admiration' from the fifteenth century.

891 ff. The contest between Pope and Emperor, with the former's victory and his capture of *Saxon Bruno*, the imperial nominee for the papal throne, is unknown to *EFB*, but L. M. Oliver has lately suggested that it has been developed from hints in John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments of these Latter Days* (i.e. *The Book of Martyrs*, 1563) and derives ultimately from Bale. In *Faustus* the Pope is named *Adrian* at 934 (in B only), and, in fact, Hadrian VI (1522-3) was contemporary with the historical Faustus. It is, however, uncertain whether the dramatist was aware of this, and it was Hadrian IV (1154-9) who came into conflict with the empire. Foxe (1563, sig. E6) records how 'Hadrianus .iiii. An English man, by

Notes: Act Illy Sc. i

his name called [Nicholas] Brekespere', was at enmity with Frederick Barbarossa, and continues (sig. F2^v): 'Although this Adrian was bad inouge, yet came the next muche worse, one Alexander iii. of that name. Who yet was not elected alone, For besides him, the Emperour . . . did set vp an other Pope named Victor the iiiii.' In the clash that ensued Frederick was forced to submit, and (sig. F3) 'The proude Pope setting his foote vpon the emperours necke, saide the verse of the Psalme: *Super aspidem et basilicum ambulabis et cocaltabis* [sic for 'concalcabis'] *Leonem et draconem*: That is. Thou shalt walke vpon the adder, & the Basiliske: And shalt treade downe the Lion and the dragon. &c. To whom the Emperour answering againe, saide: *Non tibi, sedpetro* that is: not to thee, but to Peter. The Pope again, *Et mihi, et Petro*. Bothe to me and to Peter.' The story was doubtless traditional, but the exchanges in 948-51 and 900-1 make it likely that it was from Foxe that the playwright derived his knowledge of it. It is, therefore, interesting to note that in Rowley's play *When you See me* Oliver finds a series of scenes describing the conspiracy to dislodge Queen Katharine Parr from Henry's favour (about a fifth of the whole) to be also directly dependent on *The Book of Martyrs*.

It will be observed that at 945 the Pope calls Alexander [III] his *Progenitour* he seems there to be speaking as Hadrian VI, though he acts as Hadrian IV, Alexander's immediate predecessor. Disregard of history (cf. note on 891-4) is also flagrant in *When you See me*.

- 892.** *the Pillars* Erroneously assigned to ecclesiastics at Rome. *O.E.D.* supplies the following explanation (s.v. Pillar, sense 5): 'Two of these, of silver gilt, were borne by pillar-bearers before Cardinal Wolsey and Cardinal Pole. They are not recorded otherwise, and appear to have been substituted by Wolsey for the silver mace or stick with a silver (or gold) head, to which a cardinal had a right, and to have been retained by Pole . . . they are figured as Corinthian columns with capital and base . . . 3[^] to 4 ft. long.' In *Henry Fill*, n. iv, at the proceedings for the divorce there 'Enter . . . a Gentleman Vsher bareheaded, accompanied with a Sergeant at Armes, bearing a Siluer Mace: Then two Gentlemen bearing two great Siluer Pillers: After them, side by side, the two Cardinals [Campeius and Wolsey], two Noblemen, with Sword and Mace'.

singing their Procession 'A lityny, form of prayer, or office, said or sung in a religious procession', *O.E.D.* (s.v., sense 5), citing the present direction as the latest instance of the use, except historically.

- 893-4.** The Pope is called *Adrian* at 934. Raymond King of Hungary is unknown to history or to *EFB*. Bruno was presumably suggested by Foxe's mention of Victor IV as the rival of Alexander III. A *Saxon Bruno* (896) had been Pope as Gregory V (996-9): he was a great-grandson of the Emperor Otto I (the Great), who was of Saxon stock. Gregory had himself a rival in the Antipope John X VI. Another Bruno, of Toul, related to the Emperor Conrad II, but not a Saxon, became Pope as Leo IX (1049-54). These are mentioned by Ward, who rejects as improbable the suggestion that there is any allusion to Giordano Bruno.

A pope's mitre was among the properties of the Admiral's company (Introd, p. 11).

- 895.** See note on 891 ff. But the writer seems also to have had in mind a similar episode in 1 *Tamburlaine*, iv. ii; cf. especially l. 1445: 'Bring out my foot-stoole', where Marlowe is following Mexia by way of Gruget and Whetstone.
- 898.** *State Pontifical* The first (except for that in 172) of the characteristic

Notes: Act III, Sc. i

Rowleian inversions, which are particularly frequent in this scene (Introd. • pp. 13 3-4). For *State*, i.e. chair of state (904), throne, see *O.E.D.* (s.v., sense 20).

900-1. See note on 891 ff.

910. *Cardinals of France and Padua* Was there ever a Cardinal of France? In any case it is an unexpected collocation. Line 1083 mentions *a Cardinal! in France*, where A has *the Cardinal I of Florence*. Was this perhaps a recollection of a passage previously omitted by A, and should the present line read *Florence and Padua*? Vague recollection of Medician cardinals would naturally suggest *Florence and Padua* might be a confused echo of the Cardinal of Pavia in *EFB* (see note on 800).

911. *Consistory* i.e. the meeting-place of the papal consistory or senate, where naturally the decrees of canon law would be kept.

912. *Statutes Decretal I* i.e. properly the collection of papal decrees that constituted one part of canon law; here evidently applied to the whole of ecclesiastical law, * including the decrees of councils.

913. *Councill held at Trent* The Council of Trent lasted from 1545 to 1563, and the allusion is therefore anachronistic whether for Hadrian IV or Hadrian VI, or even for the historical Faustus, who probably died about 1540.

914. *Sinod* in early use equivalent to a general council.

917. A short line, which may, of course, be original (cf. 824). At the same time / an omission, for example *of again* after *word*, may be suspected (cf. 983).

934. *Pope Adrian* see note on 891 ff.

934-5. *let me haue . . . Emperour* i.e. allow me some legal claim, since I was elected by the Emperor (referring to 915-16).

938. Another irregular line, this time too long. Perhaps the author wrote *thou stand*, intending a vague and impossible dependence on *will* (936), and either he or the editor later inserted the necessary, though grammatically dubious, *shalt*.

The Emperor Frederick I (Barbarossa) was, in fact, excommunicated by Alexander III in 1160.

939. *interdict* i.e. interdicted, under ecclesiastical interdict.

945. *Progenitour* i.e. predecessor: this figurative use was current in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Cf. 1194, where, however, the literal sense may be intended, supposing Charles V to have really thought himself descended from Alexander.

948-51. See note on 891 if.

955. The Emperor Sigismund (1368-1437) was not contemporary with any Pope Julius. It is true, however, that it was he who in 1414 forced John XXIII to summon the Council of Constance, which sought to end the Great Schism and establish its own authority above that of the rival popes.

958. *Rites* 'Rite' was, according to *O.E.D.*, 'in some cases perh. used for *right* as here it would seem.

963. The line is, of course, corrupt, and there is little doubt that Boas's emendation *Seuen golden keys* is correct: they are the keys of St. Peter.

966. *Resigne, or seale* In view of the parallel *binde or loose* (965) I think Boas is right in supposing that *Resigne* has here the literal meaning of the Latin *resignare*, to unseal. *O.E.D.* quotes Barnabe Barnes's *Divine Century of Sonnets* (1595),

Notes; Act Illy Sc. i

xxi, 'When Moyses first thy statutes did resigne', as an apparently unique instance of this use.

- 972.** *Mephosto*. If this is treated as a verbal shortening the line is normal. Nevertheless it has a full-point after it, and since no other clear instance of such abbreviation is found, it appears more likely that a twelve-syllable line was intended (Intro. p. 40, note).
- 983.** Another short line (cf. 917): one might, of course, read *sacred Synod*, as in 914.
- 986.** *Lollords* i.e. hereticks, without special historical connotation, and so at 1058: at 1085 *Lollards* is a mere term of abuse, like *Lubbers* at 1090.
- 996.** *Ponto Angehy* means, of course, the castle. This perhaps bears out the suggestion of 840-1 that the castle was understood actually to stand on the bridge.
- 999.** *Colledge* "*Sacred college, college of cardinals*", the 70 cardinals of the Roman Church, who constitute the Pope's council' (*O.E.D.*).
- 1001.** *his* There is no reason to adopt B3's emendation *this* (Breymann's text and collation are wrong). It is evident from 1063 that Bruno wears the tiara.
- 1003.** *afaine* -i.e. to return.
- 1006.** *Miphosto* Here, though there is no period, the abbreviation is presumably only gftfp\k (cf. note on 972).

Act III, Scene ii

It is only towards the end of this scene that there is anything corresponding in A, and there the texts differ for the most part widely. It is true that at the close the *Dirge* presents close verbal agreement, but even here the probability is that B was printed from MS, though A was consulted at least for the final direction.

The first part of the scene, to where A again shows continuous correspondence, is obviously by the same hand as the latter part of in. i, from which it is only formally divided. The rest is, in subject and treatment, more comic, and might or might not be by the same hand. Neither part is Marlowe's.

Down to 1072 the scene carries on the Bruno business suggested by *The Book of Martyrs*. The banquet is based on *EFB*, ch. 22, though the source is not followed at all closely.

1018. *a proudpac*d Steed, as swift as thought* Later Bruno is alleged to have arrived at the Emperor's court *on a furies back* (1188) and to have lately been *vpon the deuils backe* (1218). Since it was Mephostophilis' task to convey him from Rome to Germany (929), the means are likely to have been spectacular; but there is no necessary contradiction, since *Steed* may be figurative.

1023-7, 1038-9. A picks up these lines for its own purpose, as a necessary link between the introductory section of III. i and the horse-play at the banquet in in. ii. The *sport* of A 872 seems to be merely suggested by *delight* in 1023: *then* is probably only a misprint for *them*, i.e. the *Friers* of A 870. A 873 is only slightly varied from 1024. A 874-7^{atc} printed as prose: based fairly closely on B, they retain, of course, some metrical structure, but the attempt to make them regular by borrowing *Mephostophilis* from 1025, as Breymann does, is hardly justified. A does not retain the incantation: presumably the Spirit contented himself with a few magical passes.

Notes : Act Illy Sc. ii

1028. B2 accidentally omits the speaker's name, though it preserves the indentation.

1034. *forked haire* I suppose that the author had in mind the forked tongues of the snakes that were represented as forming the hair of the Furies.

1035. *blew fire* i.e. the sulphurous flames of hell.

Hecafs tree The disyllabic form of the name is, of course, Shakespearian. Boas may be right: 'No special tree seems to be traditionally associated with Hecate. Possibly the reading should be "three", in allusion to her triform divinity.' Still, Hecate was Trivia, the goddess of the cross-ways, so conceivably the gallows-tree may be meant.

1043—4 S.D. A prefixes a *Sonnet* (A2,3 *Sinet*) or sennet, borrowed from the *Senit* of 1012, where it inappropriately introduces the banquet. Its position in B suggests that 1015-42 may have been an afterthought, and there can be little doubt that A's arrangement goes back ultimately to the prompt-book (Intro. p. 114). The *Lords* include the King of Hungary (1046) and the Archbishop of Rheims (1073). A substitutes the Cardinal of Lorraine, doubtkss, as Ward points out, for topical reasons, the Cardinals of Lorraine of th g j ^ j j ^ p f Guise being familiar to an English audience. The third of these ^wriKHHjMvhose assassination in 1588 figures in Marlowe's *Massacre at Paris* (^WSmt/^K^T^)* though he is there only called 'the Cardenall'. (Cf. note onlfew 3J5Curiously enough there was also a Henry of Guise who was Archbishop of Rheims (as well as Duke), but that was not till later (*ob.* 1664).

1073. Here A again becomes parallel, though only loosely so. Some of the text is omitted, some paraphrased; however, one incident (1101-5) is rather fuller in A; verbatim agreement is only reached in the *Dirge*. B is at best only roughly metrical and is interspersed with prose; the distinction is difficult to draw, and troubled the printer. A makes less pretence at verse. Boas endeavours to make the text more regular by free conflation.

1075. Cf. 722, *the deuill chooke thee*. The repetition suggests that the banquet and the show of the Sins may be by the same hand.

1078. *the Bishop of Millaine* is a rare agreement between the texts.

1080—92. The food and drink snatching occurs in *EFB*, ch. 22, after the crossing episode (see note on 1095), and is differently managed. First Faustus 'took both dish *Sc* meate *Sc* fled vnto the Capitol' and then sent Mephostophilis back to fetch 'from before the Pope the fairest peece of plate or drinking goblet, *Sc* a flaggon of wine', and so on Monte Cavallo he made 'good cheare in spight of the Pope *Sc* al his fat abbie lubbers'. After that the Pope again 'sent commandement through al the whole Citie of *Rome*, that they should say Masse in euery Church, and ring al the bells for to lay the walking Spirit, *Sc* to curse him with Bel, Booke, and Candle'.

A 884. It is rather curious that A should here retain a speaking part, though of one line only, of which there is no 'trace in B till we come to the *Dirge*. The actor would, however, in any case be required for A 915-16. It is just possible that the line was accidentally lost in B and should come after 1081, where a reply from the Friars would be appropriate. Boas introduces it after 1076 as in A.

1083. *a Qardinall in France: A the Cardinal I of Florence* With Milan still in mind,

Notes; Act III, Sc. ii

the reporter might easily substitute *Florence* for *France*, especially if a Cardinal of Florence had been mentioned earlier (see note on 910). But that would not prevent a recollection of a French cardinal persisting and suggesting Lorraine (1043), as it naturally would to an Englishman.

1086. It is, of course, the compositor who is responsible for running two lines together.

1093-1106. Here the writing goes to pieces, and we find only scattered or fragmentary lines of verse interspersed with prose. How slipshod the writing is appears in the repetition of *troublesome* in 1094 and 1100 and the weak echo of 1070 in 1105. The whole has the appearance of a hasty draft, or rough notes intended for future elaboration. Indeed the crossing episode is so bare as to be hardly intelligible apart from action. A good deal more is made of it in A, and it is I think likely that the passage was rewritten in the prompt-book (Introd, pp. 36, 82). In that case the A-text is doubtless a mixture of revision and corruption. It will be noticed that the Pope's outcry (1103-5) disappears in A; but it is not clear whether the lines were cancelled in revision, or whether they were suppressed on the stage in favour of mere horse-play.

1095—1105. The sequence is, as I have said (note on 1080—92), different in *EFB*, ch. 22, which in other respects, however, the dramatist follows closely: 'as he sate at meate, the Pope would euer be blessing and crossing ouer his mouth; *Faustus* could suffer it no longer, but vp with his fist and smote the Pope on the face . . . the Pope perswaded his company that it was a damned soule, commanding a Masse presently to be said for his deliuerie out of Purgatory, which was done'.

1096. *crept out: A newly crept out* The intrusive adverb suggests that A may have mistaken the point (Introd. p. 46).

1099. *Dirge* ('dirige') is properly 'the antiphon at Matins in the Office of the Dead, used as a name for that service' and by extension for a requiem mass (*O.E.D.*). The term is employed here correctly by the Pope, but cf. 1112 and 1121.

1100. *fury* here seems to mean little more than 'importunity', and it is used in much the same sense at 1677, and *furious* at 1713, suggesting the same hand in the comic and farcical scenes.

1105. *this soule* is, of course, the *troublesome ghost* of 1100. The repetition of *this* within the line is of a piece with the careless writing of the whole passage (cf. *Now . . . now* in 1107). B2 (followed by Breymann and Boas) reads *his soule* \ this was doubtless intended as a correction, but the reference of the pronoun is rather remote. The Pope is less forgiving in the play than in *EFB*, in which he has a mass said for the *soule* (see note on 1095-1105).

1107-8. Printed in B as though it were verse. A treats it as the prose it is, and the division of the speech between two speakers is just the sort of change, perhaps improvement, that might suggest itself on the stage.

1109-10. A prefixes to the couplet a characteristic connective *How?* and adds another couplet of sorts of its own (printed as prose) that is one of the cruder manifestations of the antipapal sentiment that inspires both texts as well as *EFB* (Introd. p. 52).

1111-26. Textually this is an important passage even if the interpretation of the evidence is not altogether clear. After wide divergence the two versions now

Notes: Act III, Sc. it

come into almost complete agreement. No doubt A is unusually accurate. This can be explained on the supposition that the reporter had access to a written scroll used in performance (Introd. p. 58). But such a scroll, though it may have contained the speech of the First Friar, is most unlikely to have included the directions at the beginning and end. The close agreement in these must, therefore, be otherwise explained; and the second affords, in fact, the crucial proof of conflation, since, in spite of some conflict of evidence, there seems no doubt that B was printed from MS (Introd. p. 75). Unless at the end *Et omnes sancti Amen* (A 927) was accidentally omitted in B, it must have been added either in the prompt-book or the scroll.

1112. *Dirge* is a wholly inappropriate term for the cursing that follows, though it is the one used at 1121 to describe the same. It bears its proper meaning at 1099 (q.v.) where the Pope orders a requiem to be sung for the repose of the ghost and, since the writer identified this with the Friars' commination, the misapplication of the term followed almost inevitably. He may have been misled by *EFB*, which uses the word 'Masse' on both occasions, though it describes two separate services, first a requiem and then an exorcism (see notes on 1095—1105 and 1080—92).

Ward remarks that there appears to be a further confusion between the office of exorcism and that of excommunication. It is at the close of the latter, the ritual of which goes back to the twelfth or thirteenth century, that the bell is tolled, the book closed, and the candle dashed to the ground. This confusion is in *EFB* also.

1115. *stole* : A *stole away* The word *away* is already missing in A2,3, but this agreement with B is probably accidental (Introd. p. 73, note).

1117. *blow* : A *blow on* A compositor's omission in B_i corrected in B2.

1119. *strucke* : A *tooke* If A is here based on a stage document (see note on 1111-26) we must be chary of challenging its readings, and I agree with Boas that B probably repeated *strucke* accidentally from 1117, for the colloquial *tooke* agrees well with *pate*. (On the other hand, *tooke* might be an anticipation of 1123, though this seems less likely.)

Simpson thinks this versicle 'sheer irrelevance' and doubtless 'inserted for the benefit of a particular actor', although, seeing that it is sung by all the Friars, it is difficult to understand how this could be. It is obvious, however, from 1121 that Faustus is interfering with the *Dirge*, and evidently Friar Sandelo is here his victim. Something needed to be added to the rather scant material afforded by the banquet to give substance to the malediction. *Sandelo* stands most likely for *Sandalo*, in allusion to the sandals worn by friars. (For Kocher's attempt to connect *Sandelo* with Nashe's '*Pendela*' see Introd. p. 136, note.) Faustus' disturbance of the ceremony may have been suggested by his disposal of his thefts from the Pope's table in *EFB*, ch. 22: 'in the midst of the order of Saint *Bamards* bare footed Friars, as they were going on Procession through the market place, called *Campa de fiore*, he let fall his plate dishes and cup, and withall for a farwell he made such a thunder-clap and a storme of raine, as though Heauen and earth should haue met together'. The thunderstorm dwindles to fireworks * on the stage.

1125. *fire worke* : *After-workes* Doubtless a mere misprint in B_i : B2 restored both the plural and the hyphen.

Notes

A. Chorus 2

B has no trace of this chorus, which was presumably not in MS. That the editor failed to supply it from A may be due to its being there misplaced. It is obviously intended to introduce immediately the scenes at the Emperor's court, yet it is followed (in A) by two farcical scenes, from the second of which (the only one that properly belongs here: *Introd.* p. 21) we learn that Faustus is at Constantinople (1161, n80). Evidently the intention was that this scene should come before and not after the Chorus, thus making the second and third acts each end with a scene of clownage, as Boas does in his edition.

I see no reason to doubt that the Chorus, though undistinguished, is Marlowe's, and do not understand why Fleay wished to deprive him of the last six lines, unless it was because it is these that refer to the Emperor's court and thus raise the difficulty just discussed. The Chorus seems, however, to have been drafted with little regard to the play as it stands. It represents Faustus, instead of passing from Rome to Innsbruck via Constantinople, returning home and spending some time among his friends before his fame reaches the Emperor (*EFB*, ch. 29; see note on A 1040-90) and he is summoned to court (*Introd.* p. 115).

Apart from the passing allusion in the first two lines of the Chorus and the incidental mention of the visit to Constantinople in *in. iii*, the play knows nothing of Faustus' extended travels after leaving Rome, which occupy some space at the end of ch. 22 in *EFB*, or of a second journey recorded in ch. 23. His return to Wittenberg is briefly mentioned at the close of ch. 22, and the astrological questions of A 939 seem to have been suggested by the account of how Faustus 'was asked of certaine of his friends his iudgement or opinion in the matter' of a comet and other phenomena given in chs. 24-8. Faustus' visit to 'The Emperour *Carolus* the fifth of that name . . . at the towne of *Insbruck* where he kept his court' is narrated in ch. 29, which opens the third and last part of the History.

A 934. *beare* is an anomalous spelling for the past tense not recognized in *O.E.D.*

It should doubtless be *bare* (not *bear* as Boas prints): *bore* was rare before 1600.

A 942-3. The construction, if so it can be called, is very abrupt: most likely a line or more is missing.

A 944. The verse could be made regular by reading *Carolus quintus*, but it is '*Carolus* the fifth' in *EFB*.

A 945. *mongst* The present is the earliest instance of the aphetic form quoted in *O.E.D.*

A 947. Cf. 2 *Tamburlaine*, *prol.* (2325), 'Himselpe in presence shal vnfold at large'.

A. Scene viii

This scene, misplaced in A, corresponds to *ll. iii.* in B (q.v. for notes). See Introduction, pp. 21, 38.

Act III, Scene iii

A clownage scene, in which A and B are only roughly corresponding, except for a few lines of verse on Mephostophilis' entry, and these are expanded in A (see 1159-62). B is, of course, printed from MS.

There is no reason to suppose that Marlowe had any hand in the scene.

Notes: Act III, Sc. in

This is the first of the farcical scenes to depend in any way on *EFB*, in which Faustus' visit to the court of the Great Turk at Constantinople (1161, n 80) is recounted at length towards the end of ch. 22.

Kocher has pointed out that this scene appears to be imitated in *Mucedorus*, 1598, in. v, in which Mouse the Clown, who has carried off a pot of liquor from the tavern, is searched by the ale-wife while 'he drinketh ouer her head'. Kocher also regards the present as a burlesque of the previous scene in which Faustus snatches the goblet at the Pope's banquet; there is a cup involved in both, magic in one and juggling in the other, but there the resemblance ends, and conscious imitation seems unlikely.

A 987. *ecce signum* It is perhaps a little surprising to find A using Latin tags here and at A 1014, 1016, 1018. But there is no reason why the reporter, or whoever was responsible for the alternative ending at any rate, should not have had a smattering of learning.

1130. *at the hard heeles* i.e. at our very heels (*O.E.D.*, s.v. *Hard*, adj., sense 20): so in Robert Norton's translation of Camden's *Annals of Elizabeth*, 1630, 'That he might follow the report of his comming at the hard heeles'; cf. also Tyndale's *N. T.* (1526), John ii. 7, 'Filled them vp to the harde brym', and Udall's *Roister Doister*, 1. i (42), 'Vp is he to the harde eares in loue'. But Kocher has pointed out two early uses of the exact phrase in Nashe: *Strange News*, 1592 (ed. McKerrow, i. 276), 'if we followe you at the hard heeles as we haue begun'; and *The Unfortunate Traveller*, 1594 (ii. 256-7), 'ladie *Tabitha* and *Petro de campo Frego*, her pandor, folowed him at the hard heeles'. The adverbial use, as in the common phrase 'to tread hard on the heels of someone, is in fact the outcome of a different line of development, though the result is so similar.

A 991. *Drawer* According to Boas, Robin pretends to mistake the Vintner for a drawer, but in B (1129-30) Dick thinks it is *the Vintners boy* who is following them.

1138. *companions* was formerly often used 'As a term of familiarity or contempt' (*O.E.D.*, sense 4).

A 995-6. *you are but a &c.* Cf. A 1010. In both instances the &c. may be primarily a confession of failure of memory—no one could be expected to remember Robin's nonsensical incantation. But in both it is in consequence a direction to the actor to carry on as best he may. This is its usual meaning in dramatic texts. That such improvisation was a recognized expedient is well illustrated by an instance that Bullen pointed out in *The Trial of Chivalry* (1605), in. ii, where we find the direction, 'Enter Forrester . . . speaks anything, and exit'. On the other hand, the &c. at A 586, though it may also primarily mark a failure of memory, was perhaps meant to be actually spoken, as in *Julius Caesar*, n. i. 47, 51 (where it has its usual meaning of 'and so forth', and implied, in the letter, 'you know the rest'). But the symbol also occasionally marks the breaking off of a speech, as in *Orlando Furioso* (1594), 1242 (see *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements*, p. 236); see also R. S., *The Phoenix* Nest* (1593), p. 37. Under which, if any, of these uses we are to class the *Et cartera of Romeo and Juliet*, n. i. 38 * (in Q 1597), I do not know.

1156. *say nothing Dick* does not mean 'don't give the show away', but is a warning of the danger of speech when spirits are about; see note on 1801.

1156-7. It is significant for the nature of A that its incantation is pure gibberish,

Notes: Act III, Sc. iii

whereas B's bears some relation to that of Faustus in i. iii. Of course, *demogorgon* is the correct form of the name corrupted to *demigorgon* at 224-5, where B is copying the corrupt text of A. It is perhaps curious that Robin should get it right here, whereas he misread it as *deny gorgon* at 751 (in a passage omitted by A). That B2 here alters it to *Demigorgon* is due to recollection of 224-5 (Introd, p. 145). *Belcher* comes from Wagner's conjuring in 1. iv (372, & c), and perhaps serves to confirm the identification of Robin with the clown of that scene.

A 1012-22. Simpson and Boas recognized that we have in A two distinct endings to the scene (the text of which earlier editors tried to botch), but neither attempted to explain exactly what had happened (Introd. pp. 37-8). It should be noted that the writer of the alternative ending seems to have known the correct spelling of Mephistophilis' name (1012), which the reporter did not.

A 1014. O *nomine Domine* Boas remarks, no doubt truly, that this and the other tags at A 1016 and 1018 'are burlesque Latin invocations by the clowns to Mephistophilis [*sic*], in the language that he is supposed to understand', and, therefore, should not be corrected (cf. note on A 987).

1159—62. According to B Mephistophilis has seven verse-lines of soliloquy in this scene, four here and three at the end. The latter are discarded in A, but the former are not only retained but expanded; or, to be precise, the last three are retained and the first replaced by three different lines. In both versions the conscious imitation of Marlowe is obvious; but *blacke suruey* for 'angry glance' and the souls lying on altars border on parody. I suspect the expansion was made in the prompt-book (Introd. pp. 83-4); but A may not, of course, have reproduced the lines • quite correctly. Line 1161 may have been revised.

1160-2. Both Tucker Brooke (p. 141) and Simpson point out that these lines contradict Mephistophilis' explanation of conjuring at 272—80. Contradiction there is, and it may legitimately be cited as confirmation of the manifest difference of authorship; but it would in any case be unreasonable to expect the philosophical outlook of the serious scenes to be maintained in farce.

1161. *Constantinople* cf. 1180. There is no getting away from the fact that Faustus visited the Great Turk while the fury-borne Bruno (1188) was journeying *swift as thought* (1018) from Rome to Innsbruck, and if we insist on seeing contradiction in this it must be accepted. But Chorus 2 in A clearly states that Faustus' wanderings are now over, and Boas is justified in seeing in the present allusion confirmation of his conjecture that the Chorus should follow instead of preceding the present scene—always supposing that we accept both as integral to the play. Since, however, the Chorus is not in B, there is no proof that such was the original intention: the Chorus might have been added in the prompt-book, though that is unlikely. The presence of both Chorus and scene in A proves indeed that both did in fact figure in current performance, but the arrangement of the A-text hereabouts is too disturbed to permit any certain inference as to the order of the several elements in that performance.

1162. Dyce was no doubt right in supposing that the Vintner makes his escape at this point, unless he does so as soon as Mephistophilis appears (cf. 1177).

1163—80. It will be noticed that the conclusion of the scene had been already appreciably shortened in A even before the yet shorter alternative ending was written. A has got the transformations wrong. In B Robin becomes a dog (1175) and Dick an ape (1171-2); in A it is Robin who becomes an ape (A 1034) and

Notes: Act IV, Sc. i

Ralph (= Dick) a dog (A 1036). (1759-60 confirm the changes as given here in B; at 1630-2 a speech of Dick's appears to be misassigned to the Clown, • i.e. Ralph.)

1165. *Tester* the common Elizabethan term for sixpence. According to *O.E.D.* it is a corruption of 'teston', the silver shilling of Henry VIII, originally worth *izd.* but gradually debased, till in 1548, when it was recalled, its value had sunk to *6d.* Those that remained in circulation were later reckoned as low as *id.*

1166. /, *I pray* Boas prints *Aye, aye, I pray* wrongly.

1170. *Apish* i.e. foolish, vulgar. One might imagine that the *Apish deeds* were the mimicking of Faustus conjuring, which would support A's version of the metamorphosis (see note on 1163-80). But B is quite explicit on the point, and A does not even reproduce the phrase.

1178. *euer-burning* See note on 850.

Act IV, Scene i

This scene is found only in B and was, of course, printed from MS.

It introduces the episode of the scoffing Knight and it mentions Bruno: clearly the hand is the same as in the main portion of the papal scenes and in the scenes at the imperial court that follow, and that hand is not Marlowe's. It may be noted that in scs. i and iv we get the spelling *Benuolio* consistently (abbreviated to *Benu.* or *Ben.*), and in scs. ii and iii the equally consistent *Benvolio* (abbreviated to *Ben.*); but this can only point to a difference of composition, not of authorship.

The episode of the scoffing knight, to which this scene serves as introduction, was invented by the playwright as an excuse for the horning, which comes from *EFB*, ch. 30 (see note on 1319 if.). *EFB*, ch. 29, places the Emperor's court at Innsbruck (see note on A. Chorus 2).

1186. *State* i.e. chair of state, cf. 1298 and see note on 898.

1188. *on a furies back* See note on 1018.

1189. *consort* i.e. attend. The transitive and intransitive uses, which may, however, have distinct origins, came in together towards the close of the sixteenth century, but the former does not appear to have survived the first quarter of the seventeenth (*O.E.D.*).

1191. *fame of Wittenberge* This use of *fame* seems natural enough, but in fact it is the only instance *O.E.D.* is able to cite for the sense (3.C), 'One who constitutes the fame of a place; its "glory"'.

1194. *progenitors* See note on 945. Here either ancestors or predecessors may be meant. At A 1058 the word *auncestors* is used in the same connexion, rendering 'elders and auncesters' of *EFB*, ch. 29 (see note on A 1040-90). So in *When you See me you Know me* (1605, sig. K2^v; 1613, sig. K4) Henry VIII, also referring to Charles V, speaks of 'Great *Maximilian* his progenitour'.

1195-7. As represented in the next scene (1292-6) and narrated in *EFB*, ch. 29.

1196. *warlike* B2's reading *perfect* upsets the formal balance of the line (Introd. p. 148).

1200. *rouse* i.e. a drinking bout, 'Prob. an aphetic form of *carouse*, due to the phrase *to drink carouse* having been misapprehended as *to drink a rouse*' (*O.E.D.*). So

Notes: Act IV, Sc. i

Hamlet, i. iv. 8, 'The king doth wake to-night and takes his rouse . . . And, as he drains his draughts of Rhenish down'; cf. also i. ii. 127, 11. i. 58, and *Othello*, 11. iii. 66. The word seems to have been popularized by *Hamlet*, but if the dating proposed in this edition is correct, the present passage must be the earlier (cf. note on 1497).

1206 S.D. *buttoning* Boas notes that *O.E.D.* 'does not quote any example of the intransitive use of the word in this sense' of buttoning up a garment. The intransitive use of 'unbutton' is, however, common; the earliest instance quoted in *O.E.D.* being from *King Lear*, in. iv. 114, 'Off, off, you lendings [i.e. clothes]! come, unbutton here'.

121 o. *a thousand* B2's *ten thousand* looks like an actor's exaggeration, and suggests that B2 may possibly have been influenced by current stage production (Introd. pp. 146, 149-5°)-

1215. *Pope* i.e., of course, Bruno.

1232 S.D. *Exit.* The direction as it stands is certainly an error. Benvolio, to whom it ostensibly refers, remains at his window throughout (see note on A 1092-8) and is not mentioned as re-entering in the following scene. It would be most natural to suppose that Frederick and Martino leave the stage at 1227 upon Benvolio's words *go you attend the Emperour*; at the same time / *warrant you* in the present line may imply their continued presence, in which case it must be to them that the direction refers. This may have been abbreviated to *Ex.* in MS, and wrongly expanded by the compositor.

Act IV, Scene ii

In this scene the texts are only loosely correspondent, except for a few lines (1353-61) near the end, where they become parallel, though still variant. B was evidently printed throughout from MS.

The hand is no doubt the same as before: there is a general imitation of Marlowe's style, which becomes marked on occasion (1256-8), but there can be little doubt that it is that of an imitator.

The account of Faustus' visit to the Emperor and his conjuring up of the shapes of Alexander and his paramour occupies ch. 29 of *EFB*, but B's treatment of it is very free. The whole of the injurious-knight business is developed out of an episode recounted in ch. 30 (see note on 1319-66). For the exceptional direct dependence of A on *EFB*, see note on A 1040-90.

Strictly speaking there is no clear stage for this scene, which is in fact continuous with iv. i (see note on 1232 S.D.). It may be significant that there is no 'Enter*' in the initial direction: probably the court is 'discovered'. In that case Frederick and Martino would join it without any actual exit. It is a good instance of dramatic *enjambement* (Introd. p. 21).

1233-6 S.D. Contrast with this the very bare direction in A: the difference is even more marked in the description of the dumb show (1292-1302), and suggests how modest were the aims or capacities of the company for which the A-text was designed (Introd. p. 33).

A 1040-90. A widely divergent passage. No doubt considerable alteration was inevitable in A, seeing that all mention of the Bruno business had to be removed and that of the injurious Knight reduced to minor importance. Still the operative

Notes : Act IV, Sc. ii

cause can hardly have been other than failure of memory. That the reporter knew the B-text is clear from his imitating the Knight's interruptions, but apart from these he seems to have recollected nothing beyond the general situation. This being so, he had recourse direct to *EFB* (of which A elsewhere very rarely shows knowledge independent of B) and proceeded to paraphrase it in a remarkably literal manner. Here, for comparison, is the corresponding passage from *EFB*, ch. 29.

'Whereupon the Emperour . . . called vnto him *Faustus* . . . [and] sayd vnto him: *Faustus*, I haue heard much of thee, that thou art excellent in the black Arte, and none like thee in mine Empire, for men say that thou hast a familiar Spirit with thee, *Sc* that thou canst do what thou list: it is therefore . . . my request of thee that thou let me see a prooue of thine experience, and I vowe vnto thee by the honour of mine Emperiall Crowne, none euill shall happen vnto thee for so dooing. Herevpon Doctor *Faustus* answered his Maiestie, that vpon those conditions he was ready in any thing that he could, to doe his highness commaundement in what seruice he would appoynt him. Wei, then heare what I say (quoth the Emperour.) Being once solitarie in my house, I called to mind mine elders and auncesters, how it was possible for them to attaine vnto so great a degree of authoritie, yea so high, that wee the successors of that line are neuer able to come neere. As for example, the great and mighty monarch of the worlde *Alexander magnus*, was such a lanterne & spectacle to all his successors, as the Cronicles makes mention of so great riches, conquering, and subduing so many kingdomes, the which I and those that follow me (I feare) shall neuer bee able to attaine vnto: wherefore, *Faustus*, my hearty desire is that thou wouldst vouchsafe to let me see that *Alexander*, and his Paramour, the which was prayed to be so fayre, and I pray thee shew me them in such sort that I may see their personages, shape, gesture *Sc* apparel, as they vsed in their life time, and that here before my face; to the ende that I may say I haue my long desire fulfilled, & to prayse thee to be a famous man in thine arte and experience. Doctor *Faustus* answered: My most excellent Lord, I am ready to accomplish your request in all things, so farre forth as I and my Spirit are able to performe: yet your Maiestie shall know, that their dead bodies are not able substantially to be brought before you, but such Spirits as haue seene *Alexander* and his Paramour aliuie, shall appeare vnto you in manner and forme as they both liued in their most flourishing time: and herewith I hope to please your imperiall Maiestie.'

Down to 1055 the reporter was content with prose. After that the Emperor's speech (1056-76) is for the most part in verse, and so naturally follows the source less literally. However, it is printed as prose as far as 1064, and the writer evidently had trouble with the metre, for 1060-4 cannot be forced into strict verse, though there are verse elements in the lines. The breakdown is obviously due not to corruption but to the intractability of the material, since among the non-metrical elements is at least one phrase directly copied from the source. That A was printed direct from the manuscript as the reporter wrote it is shown by the parenthetic phrase (*I feare me*) in 1061, which reproduces (*I feare*) of *EFB*. About 1065 the writer settles down once more to regular verse, which is recognized as such by the compositor, and was doubtless so written in the manuscript. There seems to be a definite imitation of Marlowe's style in 1070 (as there is again in A 1116-17) and this is immediately followed by *the famous Conquerour* and his *beauteous Paramour*, which seem to be the only phrases that the reporter recalled (or at any rate preserved) from B (1264, 1272) apart from vague

Notes: Act IV, Sc. it

echoes in the speeches of the Knight. With Faustus' reply at 1077 the reporter relapses again into prose and more literal paraphrase.

The pedantic stiffness of the paraphrase, at least in the prose portions, is in marked contrast to the free composition of B, and indeed to the usual style of either version in the rest of the play. It bears, however, a remarkable resemblance to the opening speech of the First Scholar in v. i (1787-93, see note), and even begins with the same distinctive form of address, *Maister doctor Faustus*. This speech I believe to be again the invention of the reporter, and to have been taken over by the editor of B. The only other passage in at all the same style is the episode of the grapes in the Vanholt scene (1639-74), but there B's text is obviously the original, and some at least of the stiffness is due, as here, to the intractability of the material offered by *EFB* (e.g. in 1666-72).

- A 1059. *wonne . . . such exploits* i.e. 'achieved such exploits'. *O.E.D.* allows this as idiomatic, the transitive verb 'win' being 'Formerly used with a wider range of obj.' than now; still the nearest parallel it quotes is from Carew's translation of Tasso's *Gerusalemme* (1594), 'Conquests he wonned'.
- A 1067. *motion* Boas may be right in thinking that this should be *mention*, since *EFB* has the phrase 'as the Cronicles makes mention' in the corresponding passage. But he is hardly correct in saying that 'there appears to be no Elizabethan meaning of the word [*motion*] that fits the context'. That a generation earlier, at any rate, *motion* and *mention* might be practically synonymous is shown by Palsgrave, who in 1530 glossed *je entame* as 'I opyn a mater, I make first mocyon of it, or breke a mater to one' (*O.E.D.*, s.v. *Motion*, sense 7). It would be surprising were it not so, for to move a matter meant to bring it forward, at any rate from Langland to Bacon (*O.E.D.*, s.v. *Move*, sense 14).
- A 1088. *best* Dyce's emendation *both* is supported by *EFB*, 'in manner and forme as they both liued in their most flourishing time'.
- 1256-9. These lines are cited by Bullen as some of those that recall 'Marlowe's early manner' in scenes that are 'not from Marlowe's hand' though 'the work of a practised playwright'. The adjective *euer-buming*, however, a favourite with the collaborator, is not distinctively Marlowan (see note on 850).
1263. This agrees with iv. i (1193-7), but contradicts A (1056 ff.), in which (as in *EFB*) the Emperor first intimates his desire at the present interview.
1266. *state Maiesticall* Another, and the last, of the Rowleian inversions discussed in the Introduction, pp. 13 3-4.
1269. *Mephosto* is probably only a graphic abbreviation in spite of the absence of any point (Introd. p. 40, note).
- 1281-5. These are among the few lines in the scene in which B depends for more than the general situation on *EFB*: cf. ch. 29, 'you shall see them, yet vpon this condition that you demaund no question of them, nor speake vnto them'. Curiously enough this passage follows closely upon the point where A's dependence on *EFB* ceases.
- A 1092-8. This passage between Faustus and the Knight follows more closely than before on B, but still with considerable variation. The most important difference is the Knight's exit, necessitating the clumsy expedient of sending for him again at A 1108. In B he remains, of course, at his window the whole time, and no doubt the business of fastening horns on his head was managed when attention was concentrated on the elaborate show below. This evidently proved beyond the

Notes : Act I V , sc.ii

power of the actors for which A was prepared, and whose stage apparently had no balcony: hence the exit.

1292-1302. The dumb show in B is not only much more elaborate than that in A, but also more elaborate than anything indicated in *EFB*, ch. 29, where we read that there 'entred the great and mighty Emperour *Alexander magnus*, in all things to looke vpon as if he had been aliue . . . and so passing towards the Emperour *Carolus*, he made lowe and reuerent curtesie: whereat the Emperour *Carolus* would haue stode vp to receiue and greete him with the like reuerence, but *Faustus* tooke holde of him and would not permit him to doe it. Shortly after *Alexander* made humble reuerence and went out againe, and comming to the doore his Paramour met him, she comming in, she made the Emperour likewise reuerence.' In 1292 B2 supplied *dore*, an obvious correction.

That Faustus* evocation of Alexander was the reflection in legend of the reputed feats of Cornelius Agrippa (cf. 140) is likely enough. Nashe in *The Unfortunate Traveller*, 1594 (ed. McKerrow, ii. 252), tells how at Wittenberg Agrippa consented to Erasmus' request 'to see *Tully* in that same grace and maiestie he pleaded his oration *pro Roscio Amerino*'. This was before the Duke of Saxony (cf. 1321) not Charles V (as Kocher suggests). Any similarity of phrasing between this and the play (cf. e.g. 1798) may be explained by recollection on Nashe's part.

1295. Ward observes that *Paramour* (cf. 1197, 1265, 1272, 1283, 1288) comes from *EFB*, where it is used to translate the *Gemahlin* of *FB*, and he infers that Alexander's wife Roxana is meant rather than the courtesan Thais. But the attempt to show that 'paramour' (though its general meaning is that of a loved person of either sex) could be naturally applied to a wife is not very successful. (At A 1083 and 1107 *princes* may mean no more than illustrious persons.) Boas follows Ward, but his remark that the term 'had not in Elizabethan English its present association with unlawful love' is clearly incorrect, as appears by the quotations in *O.E.D.* (s.v., B.3), in particular that from Hall in 1548, 'She might so fortune of his peramour and concubyne to be chaunged to his wyfe *Sc* lawfull bedfellow', and that from Drayton in 1598, 'I sue not now thy Paramour to bee, But as a Husband to be link'd to thee', in both of which the antithesis is evident.

1305. An unmetrical line and possibly misprinted. We might either omit *are* (reading 'my thought's so ravished') or else read *raushed so*.

1308-17. Another passage closely based on *EFB*, ch. 29: 'for that the Emperour would be the more satisfied in the matter, he thought, I haue heard say, that behinde her necke she had a great wart or wenne, wherefore he tooke *Faustus* by the hand without any words, and went to see if it were also to be seen on her or not, but she perceiuing that he came to her, bowed downe her neck, where he saw a great wart, and hereupon shee vanished, leauing the Emperour and the rest well •contented'.

1319-66. Though A agrees with *EFB* in preserving the anonymity of the horned Knight, it is B that in other respects follows the source most closely. At the same time both texts elaborate the episode, especially in providing Faustus with a motive for what is in *EFB* a quite wanton piece of malice. The incident, according to *EFB*, took place after Faustus had left the presence-chamber, and is narrated in the next chapter (30), in which the relative portion runs as follows:

'Doctor *Faustus* . . . espyed a Knight leaning out at a window of the great hall; who was fast asleepe . . . but the person shall bee namelesse that slept, for that he was a Knight, although it was done to a little disgrace of the Gentleman: it

Notes; Act IV, Sc. it

pleased Doctor *Faustus*, through the helpe of his Spirit *Mephostophiles*, to firme vpon his head as hee slept, an huge payre of Harts homes, and as the Knight awaked thinking to pul in his head, hee hit his homes against the glasse that the panes therof flew about his eares. Think here how this good Gentleman was vexed, for he could neither get backward nor forward: which then the Emperour heard al the courtiers laugh, and came forth to see what was hapened, the Emperour also whe he beheld the Knight with so fayre a head, laughed heartily thereat, and was therewithall well pleased: at last *Faustus*, made him quite of his homes agayne, but the Knight perceiued how they came, &c.'

1319-39. Though several lines here are more or less metrical, and in some cases are printed as verse, the passage as a whole seems, like some of the later speeches, to be intended as prose.

1320. *out at window* is no doubt a possible expression, but B2's *out at the window* is more natural and may be original (cf. 1228).

1329. / *blame* . . . *much* meaning probably 'I do not much blame thee to sleep'.

A II16—19. For the Marlowan imitation in these lines compare the Emperor's speech earlier, particularly A 1070 (see note on A 1040—90); but here n 17 is actually lifted from 2 *Tamburlaine*, in. ii. (3279), 'Fenc'd with the concaue of a monstrous rocke' (Introd. p. 52).

A 1120. *theres no haste but good* The phrase, meaning apparently 'do not be precipitate', was proverbial: see Udall's *Roister Doister*, 1. iii (270): the fuller form seems to have been 'No haste but good speed'. Ward mispunctuates, 'there's no haste: but, good,' (with a note on *good* as a vocative) and Tucker Brooke and Boas follow him.

1336. *this* sometimes appears to be a contraction for 'this is' (see Abbott's *Shakespearean Grammar*, §461); still it may easily be a slip of the compositor's, and editors are perhaps right to follow B2 in reading *this is* (cf. 28).

1347. As **In Bi** *so*, *As* means, of course, 'in such a manner that'. For *As* B2 substitutes *And*, which gives equally good sense, since *so* may refer back to *In bold Acteons shape*. Still there is not the least reason to suppose Bi in error: probably the reviser or compositor of B2, misled by the line-division and Bi's comma, mistook the construction.

1349. Cf. 1454: the two passages are, of course, from the same hand. *Asterote* or *Asteroth* is obviously the Phoenician Ashtaroth or Astarte; *Belimote* or *Belimoth* may possibly have been suggested by Behemoth; about *Argiron* I can make no suggestion, unless it is a perversion of Acheron. It is perhaps worth notice that in Barnabe Barnes's *DeviPs Charter* (1607) the chief devil is Astaroth and that he calls on Orcus, Erebus, and Acheron as among 'those Ghosts that haunt . . . Cimerian shades'.

1353-61. Unexpectedly and for no obvious reason the texts here become parallel for a couple of speeches, though there are still important variants, in which neither is clearly the more original; we may note, however, that the Emperor's speech, which is verse in B, becomes prose in A, like that of *Faustus*. The sudden parallelism recalls that of 1159-62, though there the definite transition from prose to verse offers an explanation. Here the transition, at least so far as *Faustus'* speech is concerned, is from verse to prose, and is unexpected: there are, moreover, some curious details that may be significant. It is possible to detect in *Faustus'* speech something of the pedantic stiffness of the opening speeches of A (1040-90), and

Notes: Act IV, Scs. iii—iv

the address *good M. Doctor* (1353: A *Good Maister Doctor*), which recalls the *Maister doctor Faustus* of A 1040 (see note, and cf. A 1091-2), is not, I think, elsewhere found in B (though *Maister Doctor* occurs at 1639 in another passage of marked stiffness). Add to this the A-spelling *Mephistophilis* at B 1359, and we naturally begin to wonder whether B may not have taken over, in a modified form, a fragment of the A-version. If so, it was doubtless because hereabouts MS was damaged or partly illegible; though it must have been to some extent available to account for the variants. It will be noticed, however, that the injunction to *speake well of Schollers*, even if borrowed by B from A, must have formed part of the original text, since it is taken up and elaborated in B in a speech to which there is nothing corresponding in A.

- 1368.** Where B has *recompence* and A (1133) has *reward*, *EFB*, ch. 31, speaks of 'rewards and gifts', but the agreement with A is probably accidental; at 1393, where B makes use of the same passage again, it has *rewards*. In the parallel situation at the end of iv. vii, B (1771) again has *recompence* (vb.) and A (1265) *reward* (sb.); *EFB* uses neither word.

Act IV, Scenes iii-iv

These scenes are not in A: B is, of course, printed from MS.

The hand is evidently the same as in scs. i and ii: note the frequent riming couplets.

In *EFB* the unnamed Knight makes two attempts to be revenged on Faustus, which are narrated in chs. 31 and 52 respectively. In the earlier he, 'with other in hamesse', attacks Faustus in a wood as he leaves the court, but Faustus turns the bushes into horsemen, captures his assailants, and 'so charmed them, that every one, Knight & other for the space of a whole moneth did weare a pay re of Goates homes on their browes, and every Palfray a pay re of Oxe homes on their head'. On the second occasion the Knight and six companions again set on Faustus, who vanishes and sends a company of devils in the guise of horsemen against them. When they are surrounded Faustus reappears and takes away their weapons and horses. He then gives the Knight a horse, which vanishes when a page rides him into the water. From this, beyond the general idea, the dramatist has only taken occasional hints, which are noted in their place. But though, as Boas remarks, the 'two episodes are telescoped', a relic of the duplication remains in the separate encounters with the Knights and the soldiers. It may be only coincidence that whereas *EFB* duplicates the vanishing-horse motive, here and in the Horse-courser episode (ch. 34), the dramatist seems to have developed the false-head motive here out of the false leg in the same episode.

- 1376.** *let slip* i.e. to pass over without notice, usually an opportunity (*O.E.D.*, s.v. *Let*, sense 25).
- 1385.** *But* i.e. unless: the comma at the end of 1384 is unnecessary.
- 1388.** *hie thee to thegroue* An echo, possibly, of 175, *hast thee to some solitary Groue* (see note on 368).
- 1400.** In view of the continued construction in the next line B2 is probably right in emending *heart* to *heart's*.
- 1401.** (*my heart*) *pants* An anticipation possibly of 1940; but the use is not uncommon (*O.E.D.*, s.v., sense 3).

Notes; Act IV, Scs. iii—iv

- 1412 S.D. *with the false head* This recalls Bottom 'with the Asses head' in *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*, m. i. 105 (F). It is *the* head in the company's stock. This does not, however, prove MS to have been a prompt-copy: the author knew that the head was there or must be provided (Introd. p. 78). *Dyce* (and some other editors) were ill advised to alter *the* to *a*: it is the actor who wears the false head; Faustus is supposed to have his own head cut off and to restore it by magic. B2 was still worse advised in emending *the* to *his*—as *if* Faustus usually wore a false head, or at least carried one about with him!
1422. *Was this that sterne aspect* (cf. 1425, 1427). See Introduction, p. 117.
The meaning of *aspect* here is 'expression of countenance' rather than 'face', as appears from the appositional adjunct *that awful I frown*, and the same applies to its use in 1 *Tamburlaine*, 1. ii (365), 'And by thy martiall face and stout aspect' (see *O.E.D.*, s.v., sense 10, where the only passage cited in which the word is strictly equivalent to 'face' is that from Byron's *Manfred*, in. iv. 76, 'Ah! he unveils his aspect: on his brow The thunder-scars are graven': but the two meanings are, of course, very close).
1425. *heart* Most editors (except Breymann and Tucker Brooke) have altered this to *art*, but the emendation, however plausible, is not strictly necessary (as Boas admitted while nevertheless adopting it).
1438. *eyes* Breymann, Tucker Booke, and Boas all follow B2 in reading *his eyes*, but *the body* at 1442 makes this a little uncertain, in spite of the phrases not being altogether parallel.
1439. *put* Breymann (whose collation, however, is wrong) adopts the reading of B3, *pull* and in view of the ease with which the error might have occurred the emendation is plausible enough.
- 1439-40. *his eyes . . . shall serue for buttons*
He said 'I hunt for haddocks' eyes
Among the heather bright,
And work them into waistcoat-buttons
In the silent night. . . .'
1446. / *call* This can apparently be nothing but a compositor's error (Introd. p. 92).
recompence Though perhaps not very common the use both of the verb and the substantive in the sense of '(to make) retribution' was well established: *O.E.D.* quotes (vb.) Tindale's translation of Rom. xii. 17, 'Recompence to no man evyll for evyll' (and so A.V.) and Verstegan's *Decayed Intelligence*, 'His death was recompensed with the slaughter of Categerne', and (sb.) Elyot, 'an equal payne in recompence of a hurte'.
1447. *limited* Cf. 2071, *No end is limited*: perhaps another recollection (see note on 1388).
- 1449-50. On the resemblance of these lines with *The Taming of a Shrew*, iv. ii (1594, sig. F2), see Introduction, pp. 28, 31-2. The whole of this speech, of course, imitates Marlowe's style.
1453. *dally my reuenge* *O.E.D.* quotes this among other instances for the obsolete transitive use; earlier 'to dally off'.
- 14J4. See note on 1349.
- 1454-5 S.D. In the second encounter in *EFB* (ch. 52) 'The Knight that knew none

Notes: Act IV, Scs. iii-iv

other but that he was inuironed with an hoast of men, (where indeede they were none other than Diuels) yeilded'.

1461. See note on 1497, and cf. 1491.

1472 S.D. *Spirits* i.e. the devils aforesaid.

1480. So in the first encounter in *EFB* (ch. 31) 'sodainly al the bushes were turned •into horsemen, which also ran to incouter with the Knight & his company'.

1485 S.D. *a deuill playing on a Drum* In the second encounter in *EFB* (ch. 52) the Knight and his men, before being set upon by the devils, 'heard all manner of warlike instruments of musick, as Drummes, Flutes, Trumpets, and such like'.

1488. There should, of course, be an exit for Faustus, which Boas supplies. This provides a clear stage for the new scene, required, not by any necessary change of place, but by an interval of time.

1491-2 S.D. *all hauing homes on their heads* From *EFB*, ch. 31; see head-note to iv. iii-iv.

1496ff. For possible interpolation here see Introduction, p. 117. *Benuolio's homes againe*, i.e. 'Benvolio has horns again': Boas misspunctuates, *Martino*, see *Benvolio's horns again*. Some trifling insertions later might be due to the editor of B or even to the compositor. Line 1505 may originally have run, *Tour heads all set*, with 'are' understood and afterwards supplied. Lines 1508—9 may form an alexandrine; but query *we're sped* altered to *we all are sped* for emphasis.

1497. Partly repeated from 1461. The author may, as Boas thinks, have taken a hint from the second encounter in *EFB* (ch. 52), after which the page, when the horse vanished under him, was 'almost suncke and drowned', but escaped 'be myred'; however, it is rather remote. More important is the suggestion that Shakespeare had this passage in mind when he wrote *Merry Wives*, iv. v. 68 ff. (Introd. p. 28).

1502-3. Boas thinks that there is probably a play upon *haunted* and 'hunted', and that 'Martino means that though Benvolio has been partly transformed into animal likeness, his companions are not equipped for hunting him to death'—no doubt they are themselves too exhausted. Of course, *haunted* properly means frequented, 'run after', pursued, and so comes very near in sense to 'hunted'.

1511. *spite of spite*, a curious but fairly common phrase equivalent to 'despite opposition': *O.E.D.* (s.v., sb., 6.b) quotes W. Watson's *Decacordon*, 1602, '[The Jesuits] shall be lanced into the quicke, spite of spite it selfe'; and cf. (5«c) Warner's *Albion's England*, 'In spight of Spight in Hespera I golden fruit would pull.151 *laughing stockes* After the second encounter in *EFB* (ch. 52) the Knight says, 'this is *Faustus* his doing . . . only to make me a skorne and a laughing stock'.

1519. The horns remained for a month in *EFB*; see note on 1491—2. B2 removes the false concord by reading *these* for *this* (see note on 518).

1521. In the second encounter in *EFB* (ch. 52) the Knight, set upon by devils, 'tooke a good heart and ranne amongst the thickest, and thought with himselfe better to die than to liue with so great an infamie'.

Notes

Act IV, Scene v

The scene is present in both versions, but the texts are only generally correspondent, except in three passages: (i) five prose lines (1538-42) about not riding the horse into water, (ii) the six lines of verse meditation when Faustus is left alone, and (iii) at the end Wagner's announcement of the Duke of Vanholt's invitation, which links up with the following scenes; these passages are parallel, though the last only loosely. B was clearly printed from MS.

The scene must be classed with the farcical or clowning group, though from here on this is more closely connected with the comic, and though the scene itself contains passages of serious verse. These verse passages (A 1134-7 and B 1546-51 ~ A 1169-74) have been credited to Marlowe, but I am quite confident that they are not his. The first is a piece of botching by the reporter of A; the sentimental piety and the vulgar *Tush* of the second are alien to Marlowe's style.

The scene is based, fairly closely, upon an episode recounted in ch. 34 of *EFB*,

A 1134-42. These lines are peculiar to A. B, beginning a fresh scene, is able to plunge directly into the Horse-corser episode. But the omission of scs. iii-iv in A left two Faustus-scenes contiguous, and there was nothing for it but to make them, technically, continuous (Introd. p. 20). There is indeed no indication of a break at all in A. The Emperor (and, of course, his court) go out and Faustus and Mephistophilis are left alone on the stage. Even on a stage probably lacking the normal alcove and traverse (the closing of which in a regular theatre could be used to mark a break) this would not, I think, to an Elizabethan audience, necessarily imply continuity of place; and it is evident that in the passage added in A to make the transition the scene is no longer the palace. Boas, indeed, tacks the lines on to the end of iv. ii, on the assumption that *this faire and pleasant greene* (A 1141) was suggested by the Emperor's 'prieue garden', or 'court-pleasaunce' as he calls it, in which, in *EFB*, ch. 30, Faustus plays his mischievous prank on the unsuspecting and unoffending Knight. But it is the height of improbability that the reporter, called on to supply a few connecting lines, should have had recourse to *EFB* for an insignificant detail of which the author had made no use.

With the visit to the Emperor's court Faustus' journeyings are apparently at an end, and as he and Mephistophilis wander away from the palace it is natural that his mind should revert to Wittenberg and his approaching doom. The reporter has achieved four regular blank-verse lines (when the division of the first two is corrected) as we know from the Emperor's speech in A that he was quite capable of doing. He then proceeds in prose with practical matters: Faustus orders his attendant Spirit to fetch his horse and meet him beyond the stretch of *greene* on the edge of the town, on to which they have now emerged.

1523-4 S.D. and Mephistophilis There is no indication that he is present in this scene in B. In view, therefore, of the suspicious double *and*, there can be little doubt that the editor conflated the direction with A, where Mephistophilis is necessarily present (Introd. p. 75, note). B follows the source pretty closely, especially in the abrupt ending of the scene; A, appreciating its farcical possibilities, amplifies considerably, and avails itself to the full of Mephistophilis (Introd. p. 36), whom it retains on the stage throughout, though he has, of course, to be kept discreetly in the background during Faustus' soliloquy (1546-51 = A 1169-74).

In *EFB* the incident happens 'at a faire called *Pheiffring** (*FB* 'Pfeiffering'),

Notes: Act IV, sc v

and we are explicitly told that Faustus 'lay' at an 'Inne'. B clearly follows the source in this, since Faustus speaks of *the Hostler* (1542). Boas, however, places the scene in B outside Faustus' house (at Wittenberg), for the curious reason that A mentions *his glasse-windoes* (A n94-5, see note). A better reason would be that in iv. vi (1625) the Horse-corser says, *I went me home to his house*, but this (if it means more than 'the house where he lodged') is an oversight. In A the scene appears to be the *pleasant greene*. Ward thinks that it begins on the green but that by the time the Horse-corser enters the travellers have reached Wittenberg. But this Elizabethan licence is inadmissible in the present instance, since Faustus has just announced his intention of proceeding on horse-back once he has passed the *greene*. It is perhaps best not to assume that the reporter had any definite locality in mind: see notes on A 1174, 1194-5.

A 1143-4. *maister Fustian* (cf. A 1176, 1201). In B the Horse-corser does not address Faustus by name at all: in iv. vi (1616) he calls him *Fauster* (as the Carter does at 1597), but since this scene is not in A there is no inconsistency. It is probable, however, that A's perversion here is due to recollection of B's in iv. vi, which we know to have been present in the version reported (Introd. p. 34).

1534. *stand i.e. dispute*, haggie (*O.E.D.*, s.v., 79.a, quoting the present passage).

A 1153. *my hoy* (cf. A 1164-5). This corresponds to *the Hostler* in B (1542). By his *boy* Faustus presumably means Mephostophilis, whom the Horse-corser calls his *snipper snapper* at A 1187-8. He has, therefore, doffed his friar's disguise and appears as Faustus' servant: *boy* was, of course, often used for a manservant of any age, cf. 341-3.

1537. *ride him not into the water* (and so A, and cf. A 1180). *EFB* has 'he should not ride him ouer any water': this is correct, since the mere passing over *running* water was sufficient to dissolve a witch's spell, and *EFB* is consistent in making the Horse-corser ride his mount 'into the riuier'. It would, therefore, be safe to ride the horse *6*re hedge and ditch* (1535-6; cf. 1614-15: nothing corresponding in *EFB*) since the water would be stagnant. Nevertheless, it is doubtful whether either the dramatist or the reporter appreciated the point. The former insists here, and again at 1555, that the horse must not be ridden *into* the water, though at 1620 he follows *EFB* in speaking of *a great river*, the reporter makes the Horse-corser come to grief through riding into *the deepe pond at the townes ende* (A 1183), which notoriously would be stagnant. It seems clear that both thought the danger lay in riding *into* water of any kind.

A 1156. *at any hand i.e. on any account*, a sense (*O.E.D.*, s.v. Hand, 25.g) current from the fifteenth to the end of the seventeenth century. Kocher refers to Nashe, *Have with you*, 1596 (ed. McKerrow, iii. 69), 'I wold wish you ... at anie hand to warne him of these matters'.

1538-42. There seems no particular reason why A should reproduce these two speeches more accurately than the rest.

1538-9. To *drink of all waters* means, according to Boas, to be ready for anything, which is the sense of Feste's 'I am for all waters' in *Twelfth Night* (iv. ii. 68), perhaps literally 'I can sail all seas'. He also quotes an Italian saying, 'Ho mantello d'ogni acqua' (an all-weather waterproof) which means to be prepared for every eventuality. But I rather fancy that to *drink of all waters* means to go anywhere.

A 1162-3. *the qualitie of hey ding, ding* Pace Boas, the Horse-corser must mean

Notes: Act IV, Sc. v

something by this. I suspect he means a complete horse, not a gelding, and find support for the interpretation in Nashe's use of the phrase (pointed out by Kocher) in *Have with you*, 1596 (ed. McKerrow, iii. 113), 'Yea, Madam *Gabriela*, are you such an old ierker? then Hey ding a ding, vp with your petticoate, haue at your plum-tree'.

1546—51. Faustus' meditative lines have in A got mixed up with his reply to the Horse-corser, but this is a mere typographical confusion of no textual significance. The texts agree almost verbatim, but with just enough variation (1547 *drawes to a: A doth drawe to* and 1548 *into: A vnto*) to show that B is not derived from A, and to suggest that A is a report of B.

The striking contrast between these serious lines and their burlesque context has led some critics to suspect interpolation. Simpson, having already accepted the reporter's connective link (A n 34-7) as genuine Marlowe, 'cut short abruptly by the flat prose of the interpolator', saw in the present passage 'a second fragment from the scene of Faustus' home-coming; he returned with Mephistophilis [*sic*], and this is part of a final soliloquy when he was left alone' (with *Faustus* interpolated in the first line to fit it into its new position). 'The botcher was more than usually clumsy, and it is odd that he troubled to keep this scrap of the old material, but we ought to be grateful to him for letting us see the stitches.' Odd, indeed: and *Faustus*, if not necessary, is at least natural; nor is an alexandrine surprising. Moreover, that the lines were written for their present position is suggested by the apparently intentional antithesis between *a man condemned to die*, and the Horse-corser's *Now am I a made man for euer* (1544-5). Boas takes the opposite view: 'I do not think that we need assume that the verse lines are derelicts from a lost poetical scene.' But when he adds that 'in an age that took sorcery and witchcraft seriously, even the trick played on the horse-courser had its supernatural aspect', he is being, I think, a little solemn. The scene is, and is meant to be, mere buffoonery—with a spice of the marvellous, no doubt, thrown in. But an Elizabethan audience was tolerant of violent contrasts, as Shakespeare knew when he availed himself of the accorded licence to produce the tremendous effect of the Porter in *Macheth*; and lesser writers pandered to it, sometimes with effects that are to us merely incongruous.

The lines end with one of those touches of slightly sentimental piety that have led to the belief that Dekker had at some time some hand in the play, but of which Rowley was equally capable (Introd. p. 135).

1547. *final I end* Ward draws attention to the tautology here and also of *vital life* in A 1136. Such expressions cannot be said to be un-Marlowan; but neither of these verse passages is in my opinion Marlowe's, nor even by the same hand, though both written under his influence.

1550. *Tush* is not itself un-Marlowan (Introd. p. 51), but I hope and believe that its use here is. The composition of the lines moreover is clumsy, particularly in the alternation of the second and first persons.

1551. *quiet in conceit* (and so A), i.e. with quiet mind (Boas glosses *in conceit* as 'in thy thoughts'). I do not think that any exact parallel is cited in *O.E.D.* Presumably *conceit here* comes under the obsolete sense (2.a) of 'The faculty of conceiving; . . . understanding', where a quotation from Sidney (*via* Johnson) supplies perhaps the nearest parallel: 'I not looking for such a matter, had not my conceit open to understand them.'

1552 S.D. *He sits to sleepe: A Sleepe in his chaire* The direction in B, where the

Notes: Act IV, Sc. v

scene (as in *EFB*) is at an inn (see note on 1523-4), is non-committal, and might apply to the open country: that in A, which is ostensibly out of doors, seems nevertheless to imply a room (Introd. p. 59). It may be added that in *EFB*, ch. 34, the Horse-corser 'found Doctor *Faustus* fast a sleepee, and snorting [i.e. snoring] on a bed' in 'his Inne\

1553 S.D. The wetness of the Horse-corser is too essential a feature of the situation for its mention to imply borrowing.

1554-8. Concerning these lines and the longer version in A, which borrows from iv. vi, see Introduction, p. 34.

A 1176-7. *Doctor Lopus* For the implication of this allusion to Dr. Lopez see Introduction, p. 32. It was doubtless introduced by the actor in performance. Kocher points out that Nashe twice alludes to Lopez (ed. McKerrow, iii. 18, 216) and each time has the spelling 'Lopus*'. It was probably common.

1556. *a little straw* Later we get *a bottle of Hay* (1560—1) and *a bundle of hay* (1567) (and in iv. vi (1621—2) *a bottle of Hay* again). A also mentions it three times (though in rather different contexts: A 1185, 1202, 1218) and each time as *a bottle of hey*—a sure sign of a reported text (Introd. p. 53). It is 'a bundell of strawe' in *EFB*, but the heading of the next chapter (35) in *EFB*, 'How Doctor *Faustus* eate a lode of Hay' (cf. 1600—7), may supply a clue to the confusion.

A 1183. *the deepe pond at the townes ende* B has merely *the water* (1555), and later *a great riuer* (1620), which agrees with *EFB*, 'the riuer'. The reporter may perhaps have thought the *pond* more in keeping with the *pleasant greene* (A 1141) outside the town (cf. note on 1537).

1557. *had much ado to escape drowning-*, cf. A (1185) *neuer so neare drowning in my life* In *EFB*, ch. 34, 'the man was almost drowned', and in ch. 52 the page was 'almost suncke and drowned' (see note on in. iii-iv).

A 1188. *hey, passe* is here doubtless used for a juggler: with such it was a common phrase. In B, at 1764, *your Hey-passe, and Re-passe* means 'your conjuring', and the present use in A may very likely be due to recollection of the omitted portion of iv. vii (Introd. p. 35).

A 1194-5. *Ik hreake his glasse-windowes about his eares* There is nothing corresponding in B, but the phrase might be due to recollection of the original indoor setting of the scene, and is so taken by Ward and Boas. At the same time I am rather attracted by what Ward calls 'an ingenious alternative suggestion of Professor Wagner's' (which had occurred to me independently) that the Horse-corser means no more than 'I'll knock his spectacles over his head'. I cannot quote any close parallel, but More, writing against Tyndal in 1532, has 'the glasse windowes of hys eyen'. On the other hand, the phrase looks like a recollection of *EFB*, ch. 30, in which the an tiered Knight, seeking to draw his head in at the window, 'hit his homes against the glasse that the panes therof flew about his eares'. We know that the reporter did use *EFB* (A 1040-90), though he was probably less familiar with it than the author.

A 1204. The Horse-corser's outcry and the stage direction seem to be suggested by his account of *hallowing and whooping* in the next scene (1626) rather than by anything in the correspondent text.

A 1204-6. A's imperative directions, *Hallow in his eare* and *Pull him by the legge*,

Notes: Act IV, Sc. v

and pull it away, are clearly designed for performance. B's descriptive *He puis off his leg* is from MS and owes nothing to A.

A 1214. *Oastrie* i.e. hostelry, of which it is a parallel formation. A may have picked it up from B, either from 756, *Ostry*, in a scene of which it retains only a roughly corresponding version, or more likely from 1629, *Hostry*, where the Horse-corser himself uses it in a scene that A omitted, but unquestionably knew (see 1555-6 and *Intro.* p. 55). But the form was at least as common as 'hostelry' and remained in continuous use till the nineteenth century, whereas 'hostelry' seems to have dropped out in the first half of the seventeenth and to have been revived by Scott.

1569. Wagner's appearance here is unexpected, for there is no other indication that he accompanied Faustus on his travels. In fact, however, Faustus is now nearing home, so that it is perhaps not surprising that Wagner should come to meet him with the Duke's invitation. Probably the author troubled himself little about such matters. A messenger was wanted, and he found Wagner already connected with the Vanholt episode in *EFB*, where in ch. 40 he acts as butler in the magic castle (see note on 1641).

1570—6. A's tendency to comic elaboration ceases with the end of the Horse-corser episode, and the texts become parallel in this link with the Vanholt business. The omission of *and hath . . . your journey* may be deliberate in view of the continuity of the action in A; on the other hand, *come Mephastophilis let's away to him* seems inconsistent with the same.

A 1226 S.D. *exeunt* This is inconsistent with the immediately following direction, *Enter to them the Duke, and the Dutches*, which must indicate A's real intention. Probably the compositor wrongly expanded an *ex.* applying to Wagner alone.

Act IV, Scene vi

The scene is in B only and was, of course, printed from MS.

It is doubtless from the same hand as the earlier scenes of this act.

Boas remarks that it was suggested by the opening words of *EFB*, ch. 5: 'Doctor Faustus went into an Inne, wherein were many tables full of Clownes, the which were tipping kan after kan of excellent wine, and to bee short, they were all dronken.' This is rendered probable by the fact that the same chapter was used again near the end of sc. vii (see note on 1758 S.D.). Indeed the author has made very skilful use of this, in *EFB*, quite detached episode for the purpose of winding up his clownage business in an effective way.

1577 S.D. *Clowne* He is *Clowne* throughout in the directions, and remains anonymous in l. iv and iv. vii, but in ll. iii and in. iii he is *Robin* both in the text and (as *R06.*) in the speech-prefixes. In the present scene, and also in iv. vii, the prefixes are anonymous (*Clow*, or *Clo.*), but he is named at 1584 (see note on 1630).

1581. *Guesse* i.e. guests: according to *O.E.D.* the form is found only for the plural; cf. 1588. B2 modernizes both here and at 1767.

1593. *looke vp into ttf hall there ho* Boas notes: 'I have adopted 'in' instead of 'into' as I think this exclamation is addressed by the hostess to her servants within, bidding them to look alert with the drinks.' No doubt *ho*, or more likely *there ho*, is addressed to servants within (the crowding accounts for lack of punctuation)

Notes; Act IV, Sc. vii

but with the rest of the explanation I cannot agree. The reading *in* is not 'adopted*' from any authority, but is the editor's own emendation, and *looke vp* does not mean 'look alive'. The scene appears to be the ale-house door (1578), and *looke vp into tffhall* I take to be the Hostess' invitation to enter. Probably *tffhall* is the room to which they repair at the end of the scene. The conversation apparently takes place while they are waiting for their drinks (1594-5). There is, however, a seeming inconsistency, since *another roome* (1634) implies that they are already indoors, and *more drinke* (1633) that they have already been served. They are, then, supposed to have entered the inn, and doubtless they have had a cup while waiting to settle down to serious business. Of course, *another roome* is really nothing but a device to get them off the stage.

1597. For B2's substitution of *Faustus* for *Fauster* here and again at 1616 see Introduction, p. 145.

1600. The prank played on the Carter is the subject of ch. 35 of *EFB*, but there, at his entreaty, Faustus desists after he has eaten half the hay, and when the Carter reaches his destination the load is intact.

1606. *cursen* a dialectal form of 'christen', christian.

*

1615—22. For A's use of this passage in the previous scene (A 1176—85) see Introduction, p. 34.

1618-19. *some quality* B2 reads *some rare quality* as in A's borrowing at 1181. This might imply acquaintance with A, but it seems more likely that the word really stood in MS and was accidentally lost in B i, B2's knowledge of it being perhaps due to recollection of a performance (Introd. pp. 147, 149).

1629. The Horse-corser evidently did not carry out his intention to *cast this leg into some ditch or other* (1565). There is nothing to show what happens to the leg in A, though Boas supposes that Mephostophilis recovers it at A 1210. That would account, of course, for its owner saying that *Faustus has his legge againe* (A 1217-18)—but he says the same in B (1566-7). Apparently it really was a false leg that the Horse-corser stole; indeed 1721 *if.* imply that it was a wooden one (*cf.* note on 1412).

Hostry The Horse-corser also mentioned his *Oastrie* in the previous scene, but only in A (1214). The probability is, therefore, that A was anticipating the present passage.

1630. *Clow.* A slip; it was Dick who was changed into an ape at 1170 (Introd. p. 91; *cf.* 1759-60, 1763-5): that the metamorphoses are reversed in A is irrelevant.

Act IV, Scene vii

The scene comprises two distinct episodes, the relations between Faustus and the Duke and Duchess (1639-74 and 1769-73) and the incursion of the Clowns (1675-1768). Of the latter there is no trace in A. The former has its counterpart in A, opening with a passage only correspondent, having the main marvellous business parallel, and the leave-taking again only correspondent. But even in the parallel portion the texts are by no means close, and it is clear that B was printed throughout from MS, though it may have kept an eye on the directions of A (see note on 1660).

If the two portions of the scene are by the same hand this was no doubt the same as in the earlier scenes of the act. There is no suggestion of Marlowe's participation. Faustus' visit to the Duke and Duchess is narrated in chs. 39 and 40 of *EFB*.

Notes: Act IV, Sc. vii

The scene, except for the clowning, is based on the first of these; the second supplied no more than the allusion to the magic castle in the opening speech. The clowning episode makes use of ch. 37 in which Faustus strikes dumb some roystering clowns (see head-note to iv. vi).

1637-8 S.D. The direction in B is clearly independent of A and must have come straight from MS. A's implies that the action is continuous, and that no new scene is intended (see note on A 1226 S.D.). AS earlier the Emperor's court melted, on his departure, into the undefined country-side, so here, with the entry of the Duke and Duchess, the country-side merges into the palace (or whatever it may be) of Vanholt (Introd. pp. 20-1).

1637 ^{S-D} *the Duke of Vanholt* The name appears as *Vanholt* here and in the text at 1574. In A it is in the text only (A 1224). There can be no doubt of the form intended. In *EFB* it is *Anholt*, and in *FB Anhalt*, a duchy of central Germany, almost on the eastern borders of which lies Wittenberg (in Prussian Saxony). Boas writes (p. 144): 'With our increased knowledge of Marlowe's fidelity to his sources as regards geographical names, and considering how easily of *Anholt* might be corrupted in pronunciation, I have restored the *E.F.B.* spelling.' But that there should have been any oral link in the transmission of B is as unlikely as that Marlowe should have had any hand in these scenes.

1639-43. It is clear from the printing of B that in MS 1639 and 1643,^{at} least, must have been written as verse (and as such indeed they appear to be intended) and some, if not all, of the intervening prose lines may, therefore, have been an after-thought. But it will be noticed (1) that the construction of 1643 is more consonant with 1642 than with 1639, (2) that 1641 is not a full typographical line, and (3) that the colon after *Aire* is anomalous. It seems possible, therefore, that the passage originally stood thus:

Thanks Maister Doctor, for these pleasant sights,
The sight whereof [hath] so delighted me,
As nothing in the world could please me more.

and that *Nor know . . . Aire:* was then inserted, partly to introduce the magic castle of *EFB*, and partly to avoid the immediate repetition of *sights . . . Sight*. The lines must, of course, have been added at the time, despite the fact that there is no trace of them in A.

Instead of *these pleasant sights* in B, A has *this merriment*. Now, at 1696 Faustus says that the Clowns are *good subiect for a merriment*, and it seems likely that this was the origin of the expression in A, proving that the clownish incursion was part of the original text. Boas (p. 26) thinks that between scenes vi and vii there must have been some representation of the magic castle to make the text intelligible. Of course, a note for a dumb show may have been lost from MS, and such a spectacle would inevitably have been omitted in the A-version; but I doubt whether we need infer its existence. Boas also suggests (p. 26) that A's *merriment* actually was the discomfiture of the Clowns (1599-1768); but I fail to see how an expression in A, whatever its *origin*, can *refer* to events of which we only learn in B, and which in B have not yet happened.

1641. Faustus* *erecting that enchanted Castle in the Aire* is the subject of ch. 40 in *EFB*, which tells how by his art he 'placed a mightie Castel' on a hill 'called the *Rohumbuel* [*FB Rohmbuhel*]', complete with moat and zoo, in which he entertained the Duke and Duchess at 'a most sumptuous feast* served by Wagner,

Notes: Act IV, Sc. vii

and how, after they had departed, they saw 'a flame of fire* in which 'the Castle burned and consumed away cleane'. If B2's alteration of *delighted* to *delighteth* in 1642 was deliberate, it implies that the reviser was unaware that the castle had vanished.

1646-74. *But gracious Lady . . .* What follows is so closely based on *EFB* that it will be best to reprint the whole of ch. 39 for comparison:

'Doctor *Faustus* on a time came to the Duke of *Anholt*, the which welcomed him very courteously, this was in the moneth of Ianuary, where sitting at the table, he perceiued the Dutchesse to be with childe, and forbearing himselfe vntill the meate was taken from the table, and that they brought in the banquetting dishes [i.e. the dessert], said Doctor *Faustus* to the Dutchesse, Gracious Ladie, I haue alway heard, that the great bellied women doe alwaies long for some dainties, I beseech therefore your Grace hide not your mind from me, but tell me what you desire to eate, she answered him, Doctor *Faustus* now truely I will not hide from you what *my* heart dooth most desire, namely, that if it were now Haruest, I would eate my bellie full of ripe Grapes, and other daintie fruite. Doctor *Faustus* answered herevpon, Gracious Lady, this is a small thing for mee to doe, for I can doo more than this, wherefore he tooke a plate, and made open one of the casements of the windowe, holding it forth, where incontinent hee had his dish full of all maner of fruites, as red and white Grapes, Peares, and Apples, the which came from out of strange Countries, all these he presented the Dutchesse, saying: Madame, I pray you vouchsafe to taste of this daintie fruite, the which came from a farrre Countrey, for there the Sommer is not yet ended. The Dutchesse thanked *Faustus* highly, and she *fell* to her fruite with full appetite. The Duke of *Anholt* notwithstanding could not with-holde to aske *Faustus* with what reason there were such young fruite to be had at that time of the yeare? Doctor *Faustus* tolde him, may it please your Grace to vnderstand, that the yere is deuided into two circles ouer the whole world, that when with vs it is Winter, in the contrary circle it is notwithstanding Sommer, for in *India* and *Saba* there falleth or setteth the Sunne, so that it is so warme, that they haue twice a yeare fruite: and gracious Lorde, I haue a swift Spirit, the which can in the twinckling of an eye fulfill my desire in any thing, wherefore I sent him into those Countries, who hath brought this fruite as you see: whereat the Duke was in great admiration.'

It is very unusual for B to follow its source as literally as it does here. It rather recalls the opening of iv. ii in A, but there it is the reporter who transcribes from *EFB*, presumably because he was unable to remember the very free rendering of B. Here it is the original dramatist who does the transcribing, while A's version is obviously a memorial reconstruction of B.

16 53. / *will make knowne vnto you : AI wil not hide from you* It must be an accident that A is here closer to the wording of *EFB* than is B (see previous note). Immediately after, B's *what my heart desires* is closer to *EFB* than A's *the thing my heart desires*, though here B's addition to *haue* is neither in *EFB* nor in A.

1660 S.D. I think B's direction is due to conflation with A (Introd. p. 75). The grapes are so prominent in the text that the phrase *with the grapes* would hardly by itself prove a connexion between the directions, but it will be observed that in both Mephostophilis' name is abbreviated. In A, where the direction is tucked into the text, there was reason for this, but no such necessity confronted the compositor of B. Moreover, the abbreviation, which in A_{i,2} is *Mephasto:*, is in A₃ *Mepha.y* and it cannot be a coincidence that B has *Mepho*. Probably MS had

Notes: Act IV > Sc. vii

only *Enter agen*. If so, at 1658 it probably only had *Exit*: again there is no reason for abbreviation in B (in which the direction occupies a line by itself) and it was most likely influenced by A, though the abbreviation is in this case different.

1661-2. These two lines are printed as verse, though there is no reason to suppose that they were meant as anything but prose. No doubt the compositor followed the chance division of MS. The next speech is printed as prose, but the beginning can be read as verse, an accident that led Boas to print the whole as such.

1666-70. This perverse explanation is substantially the same in the two texts. The *two circles* that are relevant to the distinction between summer and winter are, of course, the northern and southern hemispheres; but it is clear from his adding *as in India, Saba, and such Countries that lye farre East*, that it is not of north and south but of east and west that the author is thinking. *EFB* avoids this particular absurdity, though its account is hardly less inconsequent (see note on 1646-74). Curiously enough the passage in *FB*, which is much more elaborate and even more preposterous, bears the dramatist out: 'E[uer]. Gnfaden]. sollen wissen dasz . . . wann es bey vns jetzt Winter, im Orient vnnd Occident Sommer ist . . . als in *Saba India*, vnnd recht Morgenland', though it shows a glimmer of sense by adding: 'Item, es ist bey vns nacht, bey ihnen hebt der Tag an.' But we can hardly infer from this that the author was familiar with the German text (cf. note on 834).

1669. *Saba* See note on 546. *Saba* or *Sheba*, now identified with the country of the Sabaeans in Yemen (southern Arabia), was formerly believed to be a city of Ethiopia.

1675-1768. This episode of the Clowns appears only in B. The climax, in which the Clowns are stricken dumb, comes from *EFB*, ch. 37 (see note on 1758). The location of the scene raises a difficulty, and it is not clear whether this is due merely to the dramatist's imperfect assimilation of his material (Introd. p. 119).

1675. *The Clowne bounce* We should undoubtedly read *Clownes* and not *bounceth* as B3 does. To strike or knock is the original meaning of 'bounce'.

1677. *pacifie their fury* (cf. 1713 *furios*). Probably the same hand wrote *to lay the fury* in in. ii (1100): in neither passage is *fury* a very appropriate word, but belongs to the pseudo-forceful style that imitation of Marlowe commonly bred.

1680. *coyle* i.e. 'row': cf. *Comedy of Errors*, in. i. 48: 'What a coile is there *Dromio*? * who are those at the gate?'

1708-9. A recollection or parody of 509-10.

1725. *he does not stand much upon that* In idiomatic use 'to stand upon' meant 'to attach importance to', 'to make account of (*O.E.D.*, s.v., 78.J); cf. 'to stand on ceremony'. There are many feeble jokes in the piece, and this play on words may be thought to be on a par with *make cleane our bootes which lie foule vpon our handes*, though that occurs only in A (982-3). There is sometimes not much to choose between the humour of the comic author and that of the actors or reporter.

1731. *ride* B2 prints *ride him*, supplying what was probably an accidental omission in B1.

Notes: Act V, Sc. i

- 1736.** *curtesie* A *leg* (1734) was, of course, as Boas points out, an Elizabethan synonym of a 'courtesy' or curtsy.
- 1758** S.D. *Faustus charmes him dumb* The charming is taken from the episode of the rowdy clowns at the inn in *EFB*, ch. 37 (see note on iv. vi): '*Faustus* . . . so coniuired them, that their mouthes stooede as wide open as it was possible for them to hold them, and neuer a one of them was able to close his mouth againe . . . wherefore one by one they went out, and as soone as they came without, they were as well as euer they were: but none of them desired to goe in any more.'
- 17 69-73. The leave-taking has again its correspondent text in A, and reverts to *EFB*, ch. 40. In this the *recompence* is 'an hundred Dollers'.
- 1773.** *sport* B2's *sports* is presumably an accidental variant, since it left it to B5 to alter *driues* to *driue*.

Act V, Scene i

A very complex scene in several ways. The first section (1774-84) is printed by B from MS; A omits the introductory dumb show, and in it Wagner's speech is partly rewritten. The next two speeches with the directions before and after them (1785—1803) B prints from A, with some adjustment by the editor. All the rest is printed by B from MS, but the direction at 1831-3 is taken from A, and that at 1802-3 (like 1872-3) shows conflation. For 1804-11 A substitutes a revised version made in preparing the prompt-book and thence, of course, adopted on the stage: for the Old Man's address (1813-29) A substitutes a different and shorter version, the origin of which is doubtful. After that the texts are parallel till after Helen's second appearance, when A adds the end of the Old Man episode (A 1377-86) which has been lost in B.

The essential parts of the scene are, of course, Marlowe's, but the writing between the two appearances of Helen and after the second is less characteristic than that of the appearances themselves and may be the work of a collaborator. Marlowe seems to have originally begun the scene with the appearance of Helen and the speeches of the Scholars. His original draft of these is preserved in B, but this was rewritten in the prompt-book, and at the same time, probably, he prefixed the speech by Faustus. Before this revision was made his collaborator had probably already inserted at the beginning the dumb show and Wagner's introductory speech. Finally it was probably the reporter of A who, finding the transition too abrupt, wrote the speech of the First Scholar to lead up to that by Faustus, and this addition was taken over by the editor of B. The end of the Old Man episode is original, and its loss in B either accidental or due to editorial interference.

For the dumb show at the beginning the author may have found a hint in *EFB*, ch. 44. The matter of Faustus' will in Wagner's speech comes from ch. 56. Helen's appearance before the students is narrated in ch. 45. The Old Man's exhortation to Faustus, the Spirit's anger and threats, Faustus' renewal of the bond, and his vindictiveness against the Old Man, as well as the devil's assault on the latter, form the subject of chs. 48 and 49. The second appearance of Helen and her union with Faustus are told in ch. 55.

1774-7 S.D. A knows nothing of the devil-servitors at Faustus' entertainment. Of course, it consistently avoids spectacular elaboration (Introd. p. 33). At the same time their appearance may belong to the same textual category as that of the major devils at 1894 (see note).

Notes: Act V, Sc. i

Neither is there any suggestion of devil-servitors in ch. 45 of *EFB*, whence comes the account of the appearance of Helen to the Scholars. However, the playwright may conceivably have found a hint for them in the previous chapter (44) in which Faustus, at a feast given him by the students, conjures up 'thirteene Apes, that tooke hands and danced round in a ring together, then they fell to tumble and to vaulting one ouer another, that it was most pleasant to behold, then they leaped out of the windowe and vanished away', and himself, it being 'a great Snow', departed in a sledge drawn 'with foure fiery dragons'.

1778—84. This speech is to some extent duplicated in 1915-20, and it is curious that two successive scenes should be introduced (after an appearance of supernatural characters) by an entrance of Wagner and the topic of Faustus' will. It is true that the two passages depend on different chapters of *EFB*: ch. 56, in which Faustus makes his will, and ch. 57, in which he tells Wagner about it. Still the duplication is unnecessary, and may point to imperfect collaboration between different playwrights. Of the two, the present speech is the more likely to be Marlowe's; though neither seems to me to suggest his writing, and I should prefer to assign both to a collaborator. Since there is no trace in A of the later passage, which is at best perfunctory, it is possible that it was cut out in preparing the prompt-book, and duplication thus avoided (Introd. pp. 120-1).

The chapter (56) in *EFB* on which the present speech is based is headed, 'How Doctor Faustus made his Will, in the which he named his seruant Wagner to be his heire', and the relevant passage runs: 'when the time drewe nigh that *Faustus* should end, hee called vnto him a Notary . . . in whose presence he gaue this *Wagner* his house and Garden. Item, hee gaue him in ready money 1600. gilders. Item, a Farme. Item, a gold chayne, much plate, and other householde stuffe. This gaue he al to his seruant, and the rest of his time he meant to spend in Innes and Students company, drinking and eating, with other Iollitie: and thus hee finished his Will for that time.' From what follows it appears that Wagner was not present; 'gaue' means bequeathed.

The speech is widely divergent in the two texts, only the opening and closing lines being closely parallel. It is evident that B is nearer to the source (but see note on 1782) and that A shows signs of reconstruction by someone capable of vamping up passable verse at need (as we know the reporter to have been: see A 1056 if. and A n 34-7) and as verse the speech is printed in A. B prints it as prose, and so, presumably, it stood in MS. (For the relation of the texts and possible partial rewriting in the prompt-book, see Introd. pp. 120-1.) In the text I have divided the speech in B as verse, chiefly in order to bring out its relation to A.

1782. *schollers*: A *Students* It is doubtless an accident that A preserves the reading of *EFB* (see previous note).

1784. *done*: A *ended* It is remarkable that B2 reverted to *ended*, the reading of A, which somehow fits the verse rhythm much better than *done* (Introd. p. 146). It is tempting to believe that *ended* was the original reading and stood in MS, and that it was accidentally altered by the compositor, who thought he was printing prose. He may even have been responsible for the insertion of *and* at the beginning of the same line. On the other hand, if the end of Wagner's speech was rewritten in the prompt-book (see note on 1778—84) both changes were doubtless part of the rewriting.

Exit. The absence of this direction in A is most likely accidental. At the same

Notes: Act V, Sc. i

time there is (as Ward remarks) no particular reason why Wagner should not remain. He is not an ignorant hireling but, as *EFB*, ch. 56, is careful to explain, 'a prety stripling . . . the which had studied also at the Vniuersitie of Wittenberg' he was, that is to say, *Faustus* famulus*, a student who earned his keep by serving one of the seniors. The direction may conceivably have been added by the editor of B.

178 5-1811. The episode of the appearance of Helen to the Scholars is recounted in *EFB*, ch. 45, in which we are told how the students came 'to Doctor *Faustus* his own house, and brought their meate and drinke with them: these men were right welcome guests vnto *Faustus*, wherfore they all fell to drinking of wine smoothly', and how *Faustus* himself conducted Helen in and out again.

1785-6 S.D. Since, as we shall see, what follows is printed by B from A, probably this direction is, too, with addition by the editor of an entrance for Mephostophilis necessitated by his presence later, certainly at 1847, possibly at 1802 and 1831 (see notes). At the same time there must, presumably, have been some entrance for the Scholars in MS (which certainly contained their speeches after the appearance of Helen: 1804-10), and it will be noticed that the indefinite form of the direction—and two or three Schollers—is more suggestive of an author, as yet uncertain how many he will need, than of a reporter, who must know how many (here three) actually speak. To assume, however, that B's direction was the original (even omitting Mephostophilis) would mean assuming that it was copied into the prompt-book without being made definite, that the reporter had once been familiar with the prompt-book, and that he recalled the form of the direction when reconstructing his text. None of these assumptions are individually impossible, but taken all together they seem highly improbable. It will be safer to assume that the reporter was merely careless in specifying the number.

1787-93. The speech of the First Scholar, written in stiff prose that recalls the opening of iv. ii in A, and anticipating phrases from the verse speeches that follow, is identical in the two texts except for a small normalization of the grammar in B. There can be no doubt that B printed the speech from A, and it is more likely that it originated there in an attempt by the reporter to avoid too abrupt an opening, and was for the same reason adopted by the editor of B, than that it was supplied by a collaborator in the prompt-book (Introd. pp. 121-2).

The speech is rather distantly based on *EFB*, ch. 45, in which the students, 'being merry, they began some of them to talke of the beauty of women, and euery one gaue foorth his verdict what he had seene and what hee had heard. So one among the rest said, I neuer was so desirous of any thing in this world, as to haue a sight (if it were possible) of fayre *Helena* of *Greece*, for whom the worthy towne of *Troie* was destroyed and razed downe to the ground, therefore sayth hee, that in all mens iudgement shee was more than commonly fayre, because that when she was stolne away from her husband, there was for her recouery so great blood-shed.'

1791. *so much*: A *that* The imperfect grammar of A would normally pass as an error of reporting, but if, as we saw in the previous note, the speech was probably written by the reporter himself it is more likely to be an original error corrected in B by the editor.

1791-2. *that peereiesse dame of Greece* anticipates 1797 and *whom all the world admires for Maiesty* 1807. It is sufficiently obvious that these phrases belong properly to the verse speeches and have been borrowed to give colour to the flat

Notes: Act V, Sc. i

prose of the present passage (Introd. p. 122, note). Boas omits the second phrase here, believing the duplication to be accidental.

1794—1801. In this speech, for the first time in the scene, we unquestionably find Marlowe's hand. But B is still printing from A (Introd. p. 70). In 1798 B's *otherwise* (A *otherwaies*) is the compositor's or possibly the editor's modernization. A prints the speech as prose, like the one before, but its metrical structure is obvious, and it is properly divided in B.

The fact that B printed the speech from A suggests and even implies that it was not in MS. And since the Scholars' speeches that follow (see 1804-10), which *were* in MS, were revised in preparing the prompt-book, there can be little doubt that the present speech was written as part of the same revision (Introd. p. 121).

The speech follows *EFB*, ch. 45: 'Doctor *Faustus* answered: For that you are all my friends and are so desirous to see that famous pearle of *Greece*, fayre *Helena* . . . I will therefore bring her into your presence personally, and in the same forme of attyre as she vsed to goe when she was in her chiefest iowres and pleasauntest prime of youth . . . but (sayd Doctor *Faustus*) I charge you all that vpon your perils you speake not a word, nor rise vp from the Table so long as she is in your presence.'

1795. For the variant construction here see Introduction, p. 70.

1800. *Dardania* The name of a city founded by Dardanus on the Hellespont, but commonly in poetry transferred to Troy, to which Paris brought *the spoyles of his* expedition to Sparta, including Helen. (Boas argues, surprisingly, that *the spoyles* means destruction, which is surely impossible.) Since we have only the authority of A for this speech we may suspect that in 1799 *with her* may be an error for *for her*, which would give a slightly more natural sequence of thought.

1801. The warning is from *EFB* (see note on 1785—93). A similar one was given to the Emperor (in B and *EFB*) before the appearance of Alexander (see note on 1281-5, and cf. *say nothing Dick* at 11 56). There is danger, of course, at the evocation of spirits. *EFB*, ch. 45, reports that the sight of Helen 'neere hand inflamed the hearts of the students, but that they perswaded themselues she was a Spirit, wherefore such phantasies [i.e. fancies, desires] passed away lightly with them'; in which they were fortunate, seeing 'that men fall in loue with Harlots, nay euen with Furies, which afterward cannot lightly be removed'. On the nature of the apparition see *The Damnation of Faustus*, pp. 105-6.

1802-3 S.D. As already mentioned (note on 1785 ff.) it is Faustus himself who escorts Helen in *EFB*. In A she apparently enters alone (as does Alexander at 1292 in B: in A Mephostophilis introduces him). B's direction here is mainly copied from A, except for the mention of Mephostophilis. The addition might be the editor's, but it more likely came from MS (here again available), which in that case probably had the bare direction, *Mephosto brings in He lien* (Introd. p. 77). But if Mephostophilis did bring Helen on to the stage he presumably escorted her off again. His action here hardly affects the question of his entrance at 1785.

1804-11. Here at last B begins printing from MS, and there are important differences between the texts. Besides minor variants (considered below), A omits the first speech of B, inserts a different speech between B's second and third, and inserts a fresh line in the third. Boas sought to combine the two versions, apparently on the assumption that lines had been accidentally lost from either text.

Notes: Act V, Sc. i

This seems to me an injudicious procedure based on a most improbable hypothesis, for the second speech in A appears to be a revised version of the first speech in B, the rather flat line,

Made *Greece* with ten yeares warres afflict poor *Troy*
becoming the magnificent

No maruel tho the angry Greekes pursude

With tenne yeares warre the rape of such a queene . . .

There were ample reasons for discarding the speech as it stood in B.

Was this faire *Heilen*, whose admired worth
was no bad line till Marlowe wrote (1874),

Was this the face that Launcht a thousand ships,
when it came to appear a pale anticipation that merely weakened the impact of a great image. (This was a different thing from the parody of the line in a comic scene (see note on 1422)—and what Marlowe thought of that we do not know.) Then, *admired worth* awkwardly anticipated *tell her worth* two lines later (however, see below), and *poore Troy* has a feebly sentimental effect that, to us at least, is almost comic. The line added in A to the third speech looks genuine; most likely it is part of the revision, though accidental omission in B is possible.

If this analysis is correct, and in it I am but elaborating Bullen's view, it of course follows that the passage was revised in preparing the prompt-book for performance and, since the revision is clearly Marlowe's, the important conclusion follows that production was at least in contemplation before the date of his death. The question of prompt-book revision, here and elsewhere, is discussed in the Introduction, pp. 80 ff.

It is in the light of this conclusion that we have to discuss the minor variants in the passage. *A priori* (and if we exclude tinkering by the editor of B) the readings of A, when they differ from B, may be either due to revision in the 'book' or to error in the report. In 1806 *Ah praise* seems on the whole preferable to B's *worth-*, but then the latter may be no more than a compositor's error, an accidental repetition from 1804. The variants (1808—9) *Now we haue seene . . . Wee*I take our leaues* in B and *Since zee haue seene . . . Let vs depart* in A appear to be linked, and because the simpler phrase of A seems, to me at least, more in keeping with the mood of the moment than the more ceremonious phrase of B, I am inclined to see revision. In 1808 the variant *worke : workes* seems completely indifferent. In 1809 Boas adopts A's *glorious deed* in preference to B's *blessed sight* 'to avoid the repetition of "blessed" and "blest" in successive lines'. But in this case A's reading strikes me as singularly inept, and *blessed . . . blest* I take to be one of Marlowe's characteristic jingles (see note on 8—9). I suspect, therefore, that the reporter may have introduced *glorious deed* for the very reason that made Boas prefer it. (It is to me slightly reminiscent of his phrase *for doing this enterprise* at A 1022.) In 1811 the variant, B *wish I: A I wish*, is more or less indifferent: A's reading is the more natural and would, therefore, come more easily to the lips of an actor; at the same time the inversion adds perhaps a touch of solemnity that may have been intentional.

It will be noticed that the order of the speakers is the same in the two texts, though the speeches assigned to them differ. This simply arises from the fact that, the First Scholar having already spoken at 1787, the first speech here is assigned to the Second Scholar in each text, and the others follow in rotation.

Notes: Act V, Sc. i

A 1295. *compare* i.e. comparison: mostly used in the phrase 'without (*or* beyond) compare*' and perhaps due to confusion with 'compeer' (*O.E.D.*).

1810 s.D. B marks the exit of the Scholars after their last speech and before Faustus' reply, apparently following MS. A marks it, more naturally, after the reply. It should be remarked that the position of the direction in B is not due to the compositor's endeavour to save space, since there is a blank line at the foot of the page (after 1811) in which it could have stood. Moreover, the compositor is no longer compressing the text here: there are two-line blanks on the opposite page above and below the direction at the beginning of the scene (1775—8).

1812 S.D. *Enter an old Man* is too simple and obvious a direction for its identity in the two texts to imply any direct connexion, and its position is different. We are passing to a fresh subject, drawn from a different part of the source, so that its placing in B is natural. In A he enters before the Scholars leave, which is pointless, since nothing he says can be conditioned by anything he overhears. But his next entry (at A 1363) is during Faustus' address to Helen, his knowledge of which is essential to the situation. It is possible, therefore, that the reporter confused the two appearances. Vaguely placed marginal directions, sometimes rather early, do, of course, occur in theatrical manuscripts, such as that from which A was presumably printed, but no other instance appears in the present text.

The Old Man comes from *EFB*, where ch. 48 begins: 'A good Christian an honest and vertuous olde man, a louer of the holy scriptures, who was neighbour vnto Doctor *Faustus* . . . suspected his euill life, wherefore like a friend he inuited Doctor *Faustus* to supper vnto his house'. In *FB* he is 'Ein Christlicher frommer Gottsforchtiger Artzt'. His appeal to Faustus, Faustus' repentance, recantation, and renewal of the bond, as well as the Old Man's 'sifting' (A 1377-86) form the subject of chs. 48 and 49. The dramatist was, however, little influenced by the wording of the original.

1813—71. I can find no unmistakable trace of Marlowe's hand before the reappearance of Helen and am on the whole inclined to ascribe the present episode to a collaborator (Introd. pp. 122-3).

1813-29. The Old Man's *exhortation* is quite different in the two texts. There is little in the way of verbal borrowing from the source to show which is the more original, though there seem to be a few distant echoes in B (especially at 1829), but there is no doubt that the tone of the 'Sermon' in *EFB* is more closely preserved in that version. Seeing that the rest of the episode is pretty faithfully reproduced in A, it is difficult to believe that the divergence of the first speech is due merely to failure of memory. It seems much more likely to be a deliberate attempt to produce a more telling effect, on the part either of the original writer (in revision) or of the reporter. It is not easy to determine which. The verse is remarkably smooth, and more regular than, for instance, the rewriting of Wagner's speech (A 1267-74); but the style is very bad. A goal cannot conduct to an end (A 1304-5), nor can a stench corrupt the soul with crimes of sins (A 1309-10). Tears may perhaps be said to fall from repentant heaviness of loathsome filthiness (A 1307-8), with a sort of perverted grammatical logic, since one can repent *of* as well as *for* one's sins; but commiseration cannot expel sins, and mercy can only forgive them (A 1311—12). The whole has a turgid extravagance that recalls the worst of 'English Seneca' rather than Marlowe, and how a critic as acute as Simpson can have supposed it to be his I fail to understand, though it may have been meant to imitate his style. (A 1306 perhaps echoes

Notes: Act V, Sc. i

1952-3, *Gush forth bloudin stead of tears?*) Bullen's remark that the speech 'reads better in the later than in the earlier edition' seems to me an understatement. The features of A are not inconsistent with deliberate rewriting, though the question by whom presents difficulties. One might play with the idea that it was the work of a robust actor, who excusably found the original version too tame; and in any case some of its character may be due to stage corruption. But on the whole I think that the rewriting is likely to have begun, at any rate, in the prompt-book (Introd. p. 123).

This leads me to mention a curious suggestion. Boas, following a conjecture by H. T. Baker (*Modern Language Notes*, xxi. 86—j), assigns A 1306-13 to Faustus, and moreover inserts these lines in the B-text after 1829 at the head of Faustus' following speech. He considers what he calls their 'poignancy' more suitable to Faustus than to the Old Man, and continues: 'Faustus's realization that for a second time [cf. 652-3] he has called upon his Saviour, contrary to his vow, would account for his agonized cry, "what hast thou done?" [1830], and for Mephistophilis's offer of a dagger wherewith he may kill himself.' But it is very risky to base any argument on supposed suitability of style in such a text as A, and what follows in B is already adequately explained. The suggestion seems to me quite irresponsible.

1813. O may be right, but it is worth noting that A has *Ah* (cf. 454): see again at 1834 and 1839, and notes on 1922 and 2036.

1817-19. There is here perhaps a distant echo of *EFB*, ch. 48, 'Wherefore haue you so long liued in your Diuelish practises'.

1818-19. i.e. You still retain a soul worthy of love so long as sin does not through custom become your nature.

1820. Cf. *EFB*, ch. 48 : 'But yet is it time enough Doctor *Faustus*, if you repent'.

1823-4. Cf. *EFB*, ch. 48 : 'let my rude Sermon be vnto you a conuersion'. There is perhaps an unconscious echo of A 142, *Vnpleasant, harsh, contemptible andvilde*.

1829. Cf. *EFB*, ch. 48: 'oh consider what you haue done, it is not onely the pleasure of the body, but the safety of the soule that you must haue respect vnto'.

1830-42. The possibility, suggested by the similarity of 1830 and 1843, that the intervening lines are an insertion, is discussed in the Introduction, pp. 12 3-4.

1830. In *EFB*, ch. 13, Faustus, after one of his early conferences with Mephostophilis, exclaimed, 'alas, ah, wo is me! what haue I done?' but it need not be supposed that the dramatist had the passage in mind.

A 1315. I think Boas is unquestionably right in believing that the line is original and was dropped or cut out of the B-text. At least *dispaire and die* seems needed both to explain *Hell claimes his right* and to prompt Mephostophilis' offer of the dagger (supposing the direction to be authentic). It may have been lost accidentally, but it is noticeable that two somewhat similar lines (A 649-50) have disappeared from B in 11. ii.

1831. *claimes his*: A *calls for* B is the more precise and explicit; but the reporter's phrase would come unbidden—the Senecan hell called for so many things.

1831-3 S.D. The similar wording of the direction, together with the way in which in both texts it is tucked in at the end of the lines, suggests that it was not in MS, but was borrowed by the editor from A, and this becomes a virtual certainty when we observe that B reproduces the exact form of the abbreviation, *Meph.*, found

Notes: Act V, Sc. i

in A3 (A1 has *Mepha.*). It cannot, therefore, be held authoritative, though the business may have become traditional on the stage (Introd. pp. 77, 123-4). Even in A the direction may have been an afterthought. It will be noticed that A 1317 and 1318 each lacks a word: it almost looks as though these had been removed in proof to make room for the direction.

- 1832.** It is tempting to conjecture that the author accidentally repeated *come* instead of writing *here*. The repetition of *come* in the next line is intentional and emphatic, and its effect should not be dissipated.
- 1835.** *houer*; A *houers* There is no doubt that *houer* is the smoother and more natural reading so far as this line is concerned, but in order to carry on the construction correctly we should have either to change *Offers* to *Offer* in 1837 or else *And* to *That* in 1836, and in these readings both texts agree. It might be a slip of the author's, corrected in A; but that seems unlikely. More probably A preserves the original reading that was instinctively altered by the compositor of B without noticing the difficulty he created.
- 1839—40.** The playwright has to get the Old Man off the stage, and he does it rather clumsily. At the same time the brief dismissal has its counterpart in Faustus' abrupt departure in *EFB*, ch. 48, which after the Old Man's 'Sermon' proceeds: 'All this while Doctor *Faustus* heard him very attentiuely, and replied. Father, your perswasions like me wonderous well, and I thanke you with all *my* heart for your good will and counsell, promising you so farre as I may to follow your discipline: whereupon he tooke his leaue.' This even contains a hint of 1839.
- 1839.** A carelessly hypermetrical line in B. Boas, following Breymann, prints the first four words as a separate line, but the division seems unlikely. It might be better to divide after *friend*, leaving an alexandrine. A has *Ah my sweete friend*, and makes two octosyllabic lines. This may be the reporter's patching, or it may
- have been altered in the prompt-book (cf. 1843, note).
- 1841-2.** A's version I feel to be slightly more commonplace and less individual than B's, as we might expect from an actor or reporter. The second line in B may be paraphrased, 'Fearing what the Enemy may do to your hapless soul'; but the form of the expression would easily lead to the substitution *oiruine*. A's *hopelesse* may be no more than a slip, though Ward and Tucker Brooke retain it.
- 1842.** There is no exit in A, though the Old Man, of course, goes out here since his re-entry is marked at A 1363.
- 1843.** *wretch what hast thou doneP: A where is mercie now?* Cf. 1830. A seems to have preserved a prompt-book revision (Introd. p. 84, and cf. pp. 123-4).
- 1844-5.** The lines give expression to the spiritual conflict symbolized elsewhere by the Good and Evil Angels, the dramatized projections of Faustus' inner consciousness.
- 1847—9.** Though neither text marks his entrance I think Mephostophilis should appear here (Introd. pp. 123-4). In *EFB*, ch. 48, it is only after Faustus' return home that 'sodainly his Spirit appeared vnto him clapping him vpon the head, and wrung it as though he would haue pulled the head from the shoulders, saying vnto him, Thou knowest *Faustus*, that thou hast giuen thy selfe body and soule vnto my Lord *Lucifer*, and hast vowed thy selfe an enemy vnto God and vnto all men; and now thou beginnest to harken to an olde doting foole which perswadeth thee as it were vnto God, when indeed it is too late, for that thou art the diuels, and hee hath good power presently to fetch thee: wherefore he hath sent me vnto

Notes: Act V, Sc. i

thee, to tell thee, that seeing thou hast sorrowed for that thou hast done, begin againe and write another writing with thine owne blood, if not, then will I teare thee all to peeces\ The new bond is given in full at the beginning of ch. 49.

- 1850.** A's omission of this unessential line is probably due to a lapse of memory.
- 1851.** *Mephisto*: The metre shows that this is merely a graphic abbreviation: A has the name in full. It is curious, however, that B should here have A's spelling, since it is certainly not printing from it (Intro. p. 40, note).
- 1853-4.** In *EFB* it is Mephostophilis who demands the renewal of the bond: see note on 1847-9.
- 1854.** *The*: A My B's reading is preferable, though tautological pronouns are not uncommon: see where the present line is echoed at 1869.
- 1855.** The omission of the speaker's name here and again in 1857 suggests that Mephostophilis' two-line speech was a marginal addition: it is not essential, and may well have been an afterthought (Intro. p. 91).
Faustus: A *quickely* If A's reading is an alteration by the actor or reporter it is at least a happy one, since it bears out the dangers of delay hinted at in the next line: it may, of course, have been in the prompt-book. I take *drift* here to mean 'drifting'—'your shilly-shallying', as we should say—rather than 'intention' or 'purpose' as Ward and Boas suppose. There is an old Scots use of *drift* in the sense of procrastination (*O.E.D.*, sense 6).
- 1857-62.** That it was Faustus who egged on Mephostophilis to pursue the Old Man is implied if not explicitly stated in *EFB*, ch. 49. In the new bond Faustus writes that 'I renounce all perswaders that seeke to withdrawe mee from my purpose by the word of God, either ghostly or bodily' (cf. the last article in the original bond, in note on 487—507), and the narrative proceeds: 'And presently vpon the making of this Letter, he became so great an enemie vnto the poore olde man, that he sought his life by all meanes possible'. The Spirit visits the Old Man only to be mocked, and on returning to Faustus has to report that 'the olde man was harnesssed, and that hee could not once lay holde vpon him'.
- 1857.** *aged man*: A *crooked age* A's reading is picturesque, but I am a little doubtful whether such an abstraction is in the author's vein. *O.E.D.* quotes no instance of *age* being used for an old man: Shakespeare's 'Crabbed age and youth' (*The Passionate Pilgrim*, 157) is a long way off; nearer is Autolykus addressing the Shepherd as 'Age' in *The Winter's Tale* (iv. iv. 787). However, the actual phrase occurs in *Richard II*, 11. i. 133, 'And thy unkindness be like crooked age'. *Richard II* was not printed till 1597; but any reminiscence in a reported text would be of a performance, and it was probably performed in 1595, a date at which the A-text was still liable to contamination (see notes on A 392-6 and A 1176-7).
- 1859.** *torment*: A *torments* Why Breymann and Boas follow B3 in adopting the reading of A I do not know. True, it is a slightly smoother reading—and therefore likely to have crept into a report and a reprint. The repetition of the word from 1857 is in any case rather clumsy.
- 1863 ff.** Faustus' union with Helen is the subject of ch. 55 of *EFB*, which tells how 'he had a great desire to lie with fayre *Helena* of *Greece* . . . wherefore he called vnto him his Spirit *Mephostophiles*, comanding him to bring him the faire *Helena*, which he also did. Whereupo he fel in loue with her, & made her his common Concubine & bedfellow, for she was so beautifull and delightful a peece,

Notes: Act V, Sc. i

that he could not be one houre from her, if hee should therefore haue suffered death, shee had so stolne away his heart: and to his seeming, in time she was with childe, and in the end brought him a man childe, whome *Faustus* named *Justus Faustus*: this childe tolde Doctor *Faustus* many things that were to come, and what strange matters were done in forraine countries: but in the end when *Faustus* *lost his life, the mother and the childe vanished away both together.'

1865. *may* : A *might* B's grammar is the more correct. In A there may have been confusion with some other construction, such as 'I would that I might have'.

1867. *embraces* : A *imbracings* It is perhaps rather more likely that the editor introduced the commoner word into B, than that the reporter introduced the less usual one into A.

cleare : A *cleane* Boas, following Breymann, adopted the reading of A, but without even recording the variant. But *cleare* was used in Elizabethan English in the sense of 'thoroughly' (*O.E.D.*, s.v., B.5), though it is now obsolete and was perhaps never as common as *cleane*. Either would, of course, be an easy graphic error for the other.

1869. *my vow* : A *mine oath* B's reading can be nothing but an accidental repetition from the line before (see note on 296). There can, therefore, be no significance in the fact that A2,3 substitute *my* for *mine*. We are bound to accept *oath* from A, but we are at liberty to suppose that MS read *the oath* and that the tautological pronoun was introduced by A as in 1854.

1870. A recasts the line, as might easily happen in delivery; but a double trochee is a little unusual at the beginning of an iambic line.

1871. There is, of course, no significance in the fact that A3, like B, has the more modern spelling in place of Ai's *Shalbe*.

1872-3 S.D. Obviously there is no direct conflation here, but *passing ouer* seems to have been copied from Helen's former entrance at 1802-3, where the phrase *passeth ouer the stage* was borrowed by B from A (Intro. p. 77). At this point MS may very likely have had no more than the note *Hellen betweene two Cupids*, which would be more in keeping with what we can elsewhere infer respecting the original directions in Marlowe's part of the play (Intro. pp. 77-9).

1874-93. The variants in these twenty lines are few and unimportant, and there are two small differences (1882 *In stead* and 1885 *Achilles*) in which B agrees with A3. But the evidence is insufficient to prove that B printed the passage from A. These crucial lines of the play would naturally be well reported, and there is at least one reading in B (1887) that is likely to have come from MS.

1874. A possible reminiscence of this line is to be found in *Nashe's Lenten Stuff* (1599, sig. E4; ed. McKerrow, iii. 184): '*Helens* . . . beautie, whereof the onely *Circes Heypasse* and *Repasse* was that it drewe a thousand ships to *Troy*, to fetch her backe with a pestilence.' McKerrow rightly observes that the passages may merely have a common source in the 'mille rates' of Ovid (*Metamorphoses*, xii. 7) and other classical writers; but the fact that '*Hey-passe*, and *Re-passe** is found in B 1764 (but not in A) perhaps points to direct borrowing.

1877. *sucke* : A *sukes* Little as one can rely on A, it seems just possible that the false concord is original and was corrected by the editor in B (cf. A 1384-5, and see 518). But false concords are rather frequent in A.

1879. *is :Abe* I do not know how to account for the reading of A except as a mere

Notes: Act V, Sc. i

slip. Ward (following Dyce) alters it without comment; Breymann and Tucker Brooke retain it.

1880. At this point A reintroduces the Old Man; see note on A 1377-86.

1887. *euenings: Aeuening* B presumably preserves the original rather unexpected reading, for which A substituted the more commonplace one.

1892. *azure: A azurde* Here, on the contrary, it seems probable that the variant is due to the editor or compositor of B having substituted a more usual form. Only familiarity perhaps makes A's seem what Boas calls 'The more euphonious reading'; but it is unlikely that the reporter would have introduced the less usual form, and it may be significant that B2 reverted to the reading of A (Introd, p. 146). There is no doubt that 'azured' was current in Elizabethan English. A familiar example is *The Tempest*, v. i. 43, "twixt the green sea and the azured vault"; still closer perhaps are 'Azured silke' cited by Ward from Peek's *Edward I* (l. 1127) and 'an azured stone' cited from 1604 in *O.E.D.* As applied to arms it might mean 'blue-veined' (cf. *Lucrece*, l. 419, 'Her azure vaines, her alabaster skinne', and *Friar Bacon*, l. 85, 'her christall skin, Checked with lines of Azur') but here it is probably the blue arms of the water nymph that Marlowe had in mind.

Since, as Ward and Boas observe, no episode of classical mythology is known to which the lines could refer, it would be not unreasonable to follow Van der Velde's suggestion (recorded by Ward) and see in the allusion no more than an image of the sun reflected in the blue waters of the fountain Arethuse.

A 1377-86. There is no trace of these lines in B, nor, of course, of the Old Man's entrance at A 1363. They have their source, however, in *EFB* (see note on 1857-62). The writing resembles that of the Old Man's earlier speeches in B and is presumably from the same hand. The passage is too important to have been an afterthought, and if it had been accidentally lost in MS the editor could have supplied it from A. I think the editor deliberately cut it out for scenic reasons (Introd. p. 125), and that he had some excuse for doing so. The significance of the passage is abstract and moral rather than theatrical (see note on A 1377-9) and Marlowe (who, I take it, designed the scene, though he did not write it all himself) deliberately sacrificed theatrical appeal to the spiritual demands of his drama.

The Old Man is, of course, a real character, but here at the end, where his triumph over the diabolic power is set in contrast to Faustus' defeat, he takes on some of the abstract or allegorical character of the Angels in the 'morality' set-up that becomes prominent in B in the course of the last act (Introd. p. 131).

A 1377-9. The Old Man realizes that Faustus, by his union with Helen, has put himself beyond salvation. To point this moral is the main function of the Old Man episode in the play. See *The Damnation of Faustus*, pp. 105-7.

A 1379. A strange and clumsy line that perhaps recalls the writing of A 1307-10. The meaning is simply 'and seekest to shun the divine judgement'; but *his* refers back to *heauen*, which must be taken to stand for 'God'. There may, of course, be some error of reporting, or even some rewriting.

A 1386. *Iflie vnto my God.* It would be possible to interpret this as the Old Man's martyrdom, taking the *repulse* of the *Ambitious fiends* to mean their spiritual rather than physical defeat. Mephostophilis promised to do his utmost against the Old Man's body though he could not touch his soul (**1860-2**). **In that case**

Notes: Act V, Sc. i

the point would be the Old Man's readiness to face torture and death, the threat of which always cowed Faustus into submission. It is clear, however, that in *EFB* the Old Man is unharmed, and in the absence of any certain indications to the contrary we must take this to be the dramatist's intention likewise (Introd. p. 125). If so, his rather easy victory over his assailants illustrates the immunity that the Good Angel promised Faustus if only he would defy the powers of evil (651), though the dramatic significance of the passage lies rather in the representation, on the symbolic and abstract plane of the moralities, of the triumph of virtue in contrast to Faustus' doom. The episode occupies a crucial position between Faustus' crowning sin and his downfall, and its kinship with the spirit of the allegorical drama is pointed by the appearance at this point of supernatural characters (Introd. pp. 129-32).

Act V, Scene ii

This scene, as it appears in B, falls into four main sections: (1) what we may call the infernal conclave, (2) Faustus' farewell to his students, (3) what may be called the judgement, in which Mephostophilis and the Angels assert the final damnation of Faustus, and (4) his final agony; the first and second are linked by a brief episode concerned with Faustus' will. Of these four sections the first, together with its link, and the third are unrepresented in A: they include all the supernatural business and were, of course, printed in B from MS. Of the second section B seems to have printed the first ten lines from MS, but from 1932 to 1982 it used A3, with, however, corrections from MS. The evidence is considered in the note on 1922-82. The last section (2035-92) was also printed in B from A3, but apparently without reference to MS.

Part of the first section seems to be by Marlowe, though not at his most characteristic. I believe, however, that the following link was supplied by a collaborator, and that his contribution extends from 1904 (or at any rate from 1911) to 1921 (see notes on 1894-1914 and 1914-21). The second section (1922-82) is unquestionably Marlowe's, and may be the only considerable prose scene he attempted. The third section (1983-2034) I believe to be the work of a collaborator, who may, however, conceivably in at least one passage (1989-92) have been able to use a fragment of Marlowe's writing. Finally the fourth section is, of course, Marlowe's, and the most powerful thing he ever wrote.

The supernatural matter added in B has no source in *EFB* and makes no use of it. The brief episode of Wagner and the will, however, is derived from *EFB*, ch. 58. Faustus' farewell to the Scholars is based on chs. 62 and 63. There is no prototype of the final monologue in *EFB*, but in writing it Marlowe made use of earlier matter in chs. 59 to 61, and may also have taken hints from chs. 13 (2080), 15 (2090), and 65 (2090).

1894-1914. These lines, which owe nothing to *EFB*, are not in A. They are not essential, and would in any case be liable to omission in a performance for which no upper stage was available (Introd. p. 33). For it is clear that it is on the balcony that the diabolical characters appear, to be spectators of Faustus' end. Their intention to remain throughout is clearly stated at 1904-5, but Mephostophilis presumably descends at 1983 (cf. 2092). It is most unlikely that Faustus is aware of their presence above, nor is it I think implied by his addressing Lucifer at 2051; indeed it would be inconsistent with 2091.

Notes : Act V, Sc. it

On the whole I am inclined to agree with Bullen, who thought that these lines 'have the ring of Marlowe'. But I am doubtful about the ending. Lines 1912-14 merely introduce the otiose little incident of Faustus' will (which need not be Marlowe's); 1911 is detached in grammar and sense, makes a rhyme (with 1908 as well as 1910) that suggests the hand of 1983—2034, and contains a possibly un-Marlowan image, in which *sauced* recalls the *spiced* of 1101 (in an un-Marlowan scene). I should, therefore, in any case deny 1911-14 to Marlowe (Introd. p. 126). Or alternatively, and perhaps more plausibly, it might be argued that it is only in the earlier lines of this section that any suggestion of Marlowe's style can be found, that it could appropriately end with 1903, and that Beelzebub's short speech (with its first line unexpectedly short) and Mephostophilis' reply are more likely to be additions by the collaborator. Indeed *Fond worldling* and *His conscience kills it* may well be thought to be more in his manner than Marlowe's, and if *desperate lunacie* and *idle fantasies* are indeed Marlowan echoes (see notes on 1906, 1909) they are as likely to be an imitator's as not.

Of course, if any part of the section is Marlowe's there can be no question of its being a late addition. At the same time I am far from certain that it formed part of the play as produced. Its absence from A is not, of course, evidence, as Bullen seems to have thought; but A also omits the Wagner incident as well as later on the Angels, and I suspect suppression in the prompt-book (Introd, pp. 129-32).

1895. *infemail Dis* i.e. the nether regions, after their ruler Dis Pater or Pluto. His older name was Hades, which came to be applied to his realm as well, and Marlowe here makes a similar extension of his Latin title. As a personal name it is found twice in *Tamburlaine*, linked with Jove and Neptune in Part I, 11. vi (vii. 888), and in Part II, as 'Infernall Dis' iv. ii (3974).

1897. The illogical comma after *sinne* indicates a pause, which serves both to emphasize the word and to aid the delivery of a sibilant line.

1899. The comma at the end would make this line parenthetical and leave *To wait* dependent on *we come*. But little reliance can be placed in the punctuation, and it is much more likely that *To wait* should be taken in conjunction with *damnation*, as Boas takes it.

1906. Cf. 407, *Rather illusions, fruits of lunacy*.

1909. Cf. A 136, *not your words onely, but mine ownefantasia*, probably omitted in B (but see note).

1911. *sauc'd with paine* 'To pay sauce' for something meant to pay dearly for it, but the earliest instance of the phrase quoted in *O.E.D.* (s.v. Sauce, sb. 3.0) is dated 1678, though Shakespeare's use of the verb in *The Merry Wives*, iv. iii. 11, 'I'll make them pay; I'll sauce them' (*O.E.D.*, vb. 4-a), shows that the meaning must have been current c. 1600. I doubt, however, whether Boas is right in supposing that the present phrase means anything but 'flavoured with bitterness' (cf. the use of *spiced* at 1101). Barclay, c. 1510, has 'Ioy sauced is with payne'.

1914-21. If the last lines of Mephostophilis' speech were added by a collaborator, it follows, of course, that so was the present incident. In A Faustus comes on already in conversation with the Scholars, and this makes a very effective opening to the leave-taking, which may be, and I believe or at least hope is, original. In B the collaborator, having (as I conjecture) introduced Wagner and Faustus ahead of the others, has to bring on the Scholars separately, and he supplies a rather

Notes: Act V, Sc. it

clumsy transition in 1921. He found Wagner and the will mentioned in *EFB*, ch. 57, 'How Doctor Faustus fell in talke with his seruant touching his Testament, and the couenants thereof', and apparently thought this a suitable point at which to introduce the subject (it was, of course, the last opportunity). Later, possibly, he changed his mind and decided to deal with it rather in Wagner's introductory speech in v. i (which may or may not have been already drafted), using for the purpose the account of the making of the will in the previous chapter of *EFB* (see note on 1778—84). There are contradictions between the two passages that suggest amalgamation and a conflation of sources (Introd. p. 120). We may, therefore, conjecture that the present passage (together with the introductory lines 1911-13) was first foisted into the scene as Marlowe wrote it, and afterwards removed in preparing the prompt-book. No special deletion was needed if, as I have already suggested (see note on 1894-1914), the earlier section of the scene was also cancelled. The episode of the will may be more logically associated with the leavetaking, but it is certainly less dramatically intrusive in its earlier position.

1922—82. According to *EFB*, chs. 62 and 63, Faustus' farewell to his 'brethren and companions', whom he also addresses as 'my welbeloued Lords, friends, brethren and followers', takes place in an inn at 'the Village called *Rimlich*, halfe a mile from *Wittenberg*. The play does not follow its source at all closely, though it takes a few particulars from it.

The report in A is evidently very accurate, except in a single passage (A 1393-7) where it omits one line and paraphrases the rest: the reason for this lapse is obscure. B was able to supply the correct text from MS. But from A 1398 (B 1933) onwards B seems to have taken advantage of the good text offered by A to use it as copy, as appears from several small points. Both texts erroneously print the beginning of Faustus' long speech (1937-9) as verse: B follows A3 in reading *30* instead of *thirty* (1941) and *least* instead of *lest* (1970), and most strikingly in omitting *there* in 1975 (but it does not retain A's *forbad* at 1959). At the same time MS was evidently available, as is shown by corrections at 1935, 1962, 1971, and perhaps at 1940, 1949, 1960, 1967, 1977.

1922. O: A *Ah* The first of a number of like variants in this passage. They are all the more significant that A is so well reported and that from 1933 it formed the copy for B. B has *Ah* only once, in 1924, where the compositor took it over (inadvertently it would seem) from MS; and it is significant that A, too, has *Ah* here. Against this, O is found nine times in B: twice it is an addition and does not appear in A (1927, 1958); twice A also has O (1941, 1971); in the other five instances A has *Ah* (or *ah*). It is difficult to believe that on all five occasions B's O is a correction derived from MS: it is more *likely* to be a compositor's idiosyncrasy, and we must, therefore, conclude that in this respect A is a better guide than B, though it may not be correct in every instance. See notes on 1813 and 2036.

1924—6. B wrongly prints these lines as verse, following doubtless the accidental divisions of MS; which shows that it is not yet using A as copy. A gives them correctly as prose (with a couple of minor corruptions) and so, of course, does Boas, though he actually tries to make verse of 1930-1.

¹**1927-32.** Noticeable in the badly reported version of these lines in A is the over-familiarity of *neuerfeare man* of A 1397 (cf. A 848, and see Introd. p. 58).

1928. Suggested perhaps by *EFB*, ch. 62, in which at their repeat 'Doctor *Faustus*

Notes: Act V, Sc. ii

- with them (dissemblingly) was merry, but not from the heart', and only told them
• of his trouble when they had adjourned 'into another rounge\
- 1933.** From this point down to the exit of the Scholars B appears to have used A as copy: see note on 1922-82.
- 1935-6.** *mercy is infinite: A gods mercies are infinite* The name of God occurs rather frequently in this scene and the editor may have taken the opportunity of cutting it out where it could be spared. On the other hand, the reporter missed the point of the remark (Introd. p. 46). B no doubt restored the reading from MS.
- 1937-8.** These two lines are printed as verse, and the next one begins with a capital: but this time B is not following MS (see note on 1924-6) but A, which has the same false arrangement.
- 1938-9.** Marlowe has retained the thought while varying the instance in *EFB*₉ ch. 63, where after the Scholars' appeals to Faustus, we read: 'This they repeated vnto him, yet it could take no holde, but euen as *Caine* he also said his sinnes were greater than God was able to forgiue'.
- 1939.** *heare: A heare me* While the *me* is not necessary to the sense I think it is more likely to have been accidentally omitted in B than deleted in accordance with MS. It may be significant that it was restored in B2, though it would be a rather natural addition.
- 1940—4.** Faustus in his agony strings clauses together in a way that makes logical punctuation difficult; at the same time B's is so much inferior to A's as to suggest that the meaning was misunderstood. In both texts there should have been a heavier stop after *speeches* (1940), but A's comma after *ye ares* (1941) is correct, and B's period makes poor sense both of what precedes and what follows. Similarly A's colon after *book* (1942) is indispensable (indeed the *and* that follows has no logical justification) and B's transference of it to after *witnesse* (1943) is an error. B2 only made things worse.
- 1940.** *pant and quiuer: A pants and quiuers* There is no need for the subjunctive here; indeed the indicative seems slightly preferable. It is, no doubt, possible that B was following MS in making the change, but I think it is more likely to have been due to the personal whim of the compositor (Introd. p. 44).
- 1945~6.** *the Throne of the Blessed* See note on 2006 S.D.
- 1949.** Cf. *EFB*, ch. 63: 'But when the Students heard his words, they gaue him counsaile to doo naught else but call vpon God'.
- 1951.** O: A *ah* See note on 1922.
- 1954.** *hold 'em : A hold them* (repeated). It is difficult to imagine why a compositor should have made the alteration, or why the editor should have done so unless in obedience to MS.
- 1956.** *Why* (omitted in A). It is more usual for a report to insert than to omit connective words of this sort. But here the exclamation is significant and expresses Faustus' surprise that the Scholars do not immediately perceive the powers of evil that thwart him. A not only omitted the word but quite unnecessarily printed *Lucifer and Mephistophilis* as a separate line. This also B rectified from MS. (Similar omissions of *Why* occur at A 481 and 483.)
- 1958.** I suspect that the compositor of B here actually introduced his favourite O: it is unwanted, and particularly awkward after O *gentlemen* in 1956.

Notes; Act v, Sc. it

- 1960.** *the vaine*: A *vaine* The *the* is not essential but seems more natural. Whether in adding it B was restoring the original reading or departing from it is anybody's guess.
- 1962.** *this is the time*: A *the time wil come* B's reading is presumably a correction from MS (Introd. p. 45). But see the quotation from *EFB* in note on 1967.
- 1964-5.** Cf. *EFB*, ch. 63 : 'one of the sayd vnto him; ah, friend *Faustus*, what haue you done to conceale this matter so long from vs, we would by the help of good Diuines, and the grace of God, haue brought you out of this net . . . whereas nowe we feare it is too late' (cf. 1968-9).
- 1966-8.** In *EFB* 'Doctor *Faustus* answered, I durst neuer doo it, although I often minded . . . to desire counsell and helpe' and told how, after the Old Man had counselled him, 'then came the Diuell and would haue had me away . . . and sayd so soone as I turned againe to God, hee would dispatch mee altogether'.
- 1967.** ²*me*: A *both* Presumably a deliberate change in B, and if so from MS (Introd. p. 44). There is little to choose between the readings intrinsically, though *me* consorts better perhaps with *teare me in peeces* just before. On the other hand, *both* has some support in *EFB*, ch. 63, 'this day, this dismall day those 24. yeares are fully expired . . . for out of all doubt this night hee will fetch mee . . . both body and soule'.
- 1971.** *may . . . to saue Faustus*: A *shal. . . to Faustus* Another certain correction in B, presumably from MS. Doubtless *saue* was accidentally omitted in A, and it might have been conjecturally restored. The other variant is more subtle (Introd. p. 45). Of course, if *saue* was lost on the stage or in reporting the change to *shal* would follow automatically.
- 1975.** *and pray*: A *and there pray* A3 accidentally omitted *there* and the editor failed to restore it.
- 1977.** *you*: *Ayee* Perhaps an accidental variant due to the compositor.
- 1978.** It is a small point, since little reliance can be placed on the punctuation of either text, but it may be noticed that the second comma, in B only, indicates that the clause *that God... zipon thee* depends upon both *prayh*. Boas, for some reason, follows A.
- 1983-2034.** This is another passage of which there is no suggestion in *EFB* and no trace in A, and which B must have printed from MS. (The spectacle would in any case have been omitted in A: Introd. p. 33.) Bullen seems to have thought that like the earlier addition, 1894 if., it was by Marlowe. This I find it hard to believe (Introd. p. 126). It is, however, possible that the collaborator may have worked in at least one fragment of Marlowe's writing: 1989-92 (perhaps 1986-92) have a solemnity and a restraint that contrast with their surroundings. Nevertheless, the present passage is clearly part of the attempt, already evident in 1894 ff., to transpose the action on to a more abstract plane, and as such is also presumably part of the original composition, even if it did not necessarily form part of the original production (Introd. pp. 129-32).
- 1983-94.** It is not clear whether in this passage Mephostophilis is speaking from his position on the upper stage, as Boas assumes (see note on 1894—1914), or whether he has come down to Faustus' level. There is possibly a certain 'aloofness' in his speeches that would be in keeping with the former supposition, as is the absence of any entrance for him. (He certainly goes off at 1994, to enter

Notes: Act V, Sc. it

again at 2092, also without a direction.) But if he remains aloft Faustus must become aware of his infernal audience, and this I think is definitely not the intention (see again note on 1894-1914).

- 1984.** *thinke only vpon hellseems* to be an echo of *Thinke on the deuill* at 664.
- 1989-92.** These lines (and perhaps 1986—8 also) read rather like Marlowe, and the short line (1992) may be evidence of suture (see note on 1983-2034). Boas, on the other hand, thinks that 'The end of the line seems to have been censored*. On the problem raised see Introduction, pp. 102-3.
- 1992.** Mephostophilis means that when Faustus tried to study the Bible it was he who selected the passages to which his attention was drawn. Thus Faustus in the opening scene was led to collocate the texts in 66 and 78 and so to abandon divinity in despair.
- 1994.** *most* is doubtless a mere misprint for *must*, the reading of B2.
Exit. Mephostophilis, whether above or below (see note on 1983-94), goes off here to reappear at 2092. Boas has no authority for removing Lucifer and Beelzebub at the same time.
- 1995-6 S.D.** The Angels, one would suppose, always enter *at seuerall doores*, but the fact has not been mentioned before. The same phrase is at 1181 and 1489, and *seuerall waies* at 742, all in non-Marlowan passages. This confirms the conclusion that the present section is not of Marlowe's writing.
- 1997.** *Oh* It is a fair guess that MS had *Ah* (see note on 1922).
- 2001.** An anticipation, it would seem, of 2038, which in that case was already written.
- 2006 S.D.** *the Throne* evidently stands as a symbol for heaven: cf. 1945-6, where heaven is *the Throne of the Blessed*. According to *EFB*, ch. 23, Faustus on one of his journeys visited the Caucasus, and from there had a view of paradise (cf. note on 2017).
- 2009.** As the Good Angel had called on him to do at 100.
- 2012.** *set* *O.E.D.* only quotes 'set' (or rather 'sete') as the past participle of 'sit' from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. B2 reads *sit*, which was certainly current in the sixteenth, and was followed by Dyce, Breymann, and Boas. On such a point the authority of B2 is more than usually doubtful, and if B1 is in error the true reading might, of course, be *sat*. However, as a graphic confusion / : e is more likely than a : e.
- 2013.** *bright shining* Cf. 853 *bright splendent* in a probably non-Marlowan passage. Boas's comment, 'The throne must have been large enough to contain more than one figure in shining costume', seems unnecessarily literal.
- 2016.** *Exit* The direction must be taken to include the withdrawal of the *Throne* into the 'heavens': perhaps the Good Angel ascends in it.
- 2017.** *Hell is discovered* According to *EFB*, ch. 20, Faustus had previously had a view of hell likewise, and of this the play retains a hint at 733-5. Here the traverse is, of course, withdrawn to disclose it in the alcove. A 'Hell mought' was among the properties of the Admiral's company (Introd. p. 11). Boas thinks that it was 'apparently a painted backcloth. It does not seem possible that the details so luridly described . . . could be otherwise represented'.
- 2019.** *perpetuall torture-house* Cf. 2038, *damn*dperpetually*.

Notes: Act V, Sc. it

- 2021.** *broyle* B3 reads *boyle*, which *in lead* proves to be almost certainly correct: the likelihood of *broyle* being a compositor's anticipation of *broyling* in the next line is increased by the identity of the spelling.
- 2023.** *this euer-burning chaire* The counterpart of the heavenly *Throne* above. For the non-Marlowan adjective see note on 850.
- 2026.** The writer may have had the *Princely delicates* of 112 in mind.
- 2034.** *Exit* The direction must be taken to indicate that hell disappears again, the Bad Angel perhaps retiring into it. Any suggestion that hell remains visible in the background during Faustus' soliloquy, though it would be at least as appropriate as Lucifer's presence above, is refuted by his exclamation *Vgly hell gape not* at 2091.
- 2035-92.** There is no suggestion of a final monologue in *EFB*, but in writing it Marlowe used an earlier meditation of Faustus' occupying chs. 59 to 61. The first of these begins: 'This sorrowfull time drawing neere so troubled Doctor *Faustus*, that he began to write his minde, to the ende he might peruse it often and not forget it, and is in maner as followeth.'
- The speech is printed in B from A. Apart from the editor's censoring, and a few minor tinkering that are pretty obviously his work, there are hardly any variants. This may, of course, be due to the undoubted faithfulness of the reporting. A possible, but by no means certain, error is reproduced at 2061-3. But wrong line-divisions at 2042-3, 2052, and 2076-7 put the source beyond doubt. There are small agreements between B and A3 (against A i) at 2035, 2037, 2045, 2061, 2074, 2083, and 2090, but none of them are individually significant: rather more evidential is the absence at 2087 in B of a necessary comma, which is present in A1 but which appears very faintly in A3 (cf. also note on 2049, end). Two variants of A3 that should have afforded clear evidence have disappeared in the censoring (2048, 2053). Whether MS was available cannot be certainly ascertained. One variant (at 2086) that might possibly have come from it proves on examination to be almost certainly due to editorial interference. The correction of a bad misprint in A3 (at 2061) suggests its use, but can in fact be otherwise explained. In view, therefore, of the retention of the erroneous line-divisions mentioned above we may conclude either that MS was not available or that the editor failed to make use of it. For the significance of this see Introduction, p. 132.
- 2036.** O *Faustus: A Ah Faustus* In *EFB*, ch. 59, the meditations begin 'Ah *Faustus**. Since here B is printing from A without, it seems, any reference to MS the fact that in the fifty-seven lines of this speech it has not a single *Ah* proves that the persistent use of O (*oh*) is a peculiarity of the compositor's. There are in A seven cases of O (or *Oh*): B omits two and retains *Rve* (not always in the same form); it also inserts one O of its own in an altered passage. A has six cases of *Ah* (*ah*): B again omits one; the other five it alters to O (or *Oh* or *oh*). See notes on 1813 and 1922.
- 2038.** *damndperpetually* Cf. *EFB*, ch. 61 : 'Ah thou perpetuall damned wretch'.
- 2039-47.** With this passage compare *Edward II*, sc. xix (2050—6):

Continue euer thou celestially sunne,
Let neuer silent night possesse this clime,
Stand still you watches of the element,
All times and seasons rest you at a stay,

Notes; Act V, Sc. it

That *Edward* may be still faire Englands king:
But dayes bright beames dooth vanish fast away,
And needes I must resigne my wished crowne . . .

- 2039.** The *Sphæares* are not the planets but the nine concentric spheres (according to Marlowe) which govern the motion of the heavens.
- 2042-4.** Cf. *EFB*, ch. 61: 'Ah . . . that there were time at last to quit me of this euerlasting damnation!'
- 2042-3.** The division should be after *hut*, not *yeare*, as it is in both texts. The error is, of course, due to the 'run on', which is unusually close for Marlowe. However, we here have nothing but a report, so perhaps Marlowe wrote *but he*, which would give a more normal division.
- 2043.** *a natural! day* Cf. 621.
- 2045.** *Amores*, I. 13, 1. 40: 'the line which Ovid whispered in Corinna's arms' (Symonds).
- 2048.** *leape vp to heauen: A leape vp to my God* Here the editor of B began his censoring of the speech (Introd. pp. 85—6). But A2,3 had been at the line before him, substituting *vnto* for *to*, and so getting rid of an anapaest at the cost of producing an alexandrine. B, censoring, reduces the line to normality. For 62's restoration of A 1463 see Introduction, p. 146.
- 2049.** In spite of recasting, the deletion of a whole line leaves the text in B barely intelligible. B2 restored the lost line, but without the initial repetition that so heightens its effect. (Would it be invidious to find significance in the fact that Wagner and Breymann delete the second *see*?) The following line in A is even more irregular and equally indicative of Marlowe's metrical genius: B's reconstruction reduces it to normality and insignificance. To Faustus* question in *EFB*, ch. 59, 'Ah whither is pitie and mercy fled?' these lines supply the answer: To heauen, beyond the reach of a sinner. (Note that B retains A's wholly inadequate comma at the end of this line.)
- 2050-3.** Faustus' terror is explained by 652-9 and 1844-9. The moment he calls on Lucifer even the distant vision of mercy vanishes. Boas's interpretation is unquestionably right.
- 2050.** The editor has cut out the extrametrical *Ah* at the beginning of this line in A. It may well have been an actor's addition, as it follows awkwardly on the *ah* (B *oh*) of the previous line.
- 2052.** The editor, reconstructing what follows, leaves this short line as it stands in A, thus proving that he had no independent source, for the passage is wrongly divided in A, where the three lines (A 1467-9) should have been printed as two, divided after *God* (and were so arranged by Dyce).
- 2053.** The editor, bent on censoring, has compressed the two powerful lines of A (1468-9) into one flat one, but not without some ingenuity. Owing to the reconstruction a variant of A2,3 at A 1468 has not been preserved.
- 2054-7.** Cf. *EFB*, ch. 60: 'Would God that I knew where to hide me, or into what place to creepe or flie. Ah, woe, woe is me, be where I will, yet am I taken.' But Marlowe has, of course, also in mind Hosea x. 8, 'and they shall say to the mountains, Cover us; and to the hills, Fall on us' (cf. Luke xxiii. 30), and Rev. vi. 16, 'And said to the mountains and rocks, Fall *on* us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb'.

Notes: Act V, Sc. it

- 2055.** *heauen*: A *God* The editor's censoring again. The line is an echo of **99**, which confirms the reading of A.
- 2056.** *Nop*: A *No no*, B reduced A's extrametrical exclamation to a single word, perhaps thinking the better to crowd it into the line. So reduced, he treated it as a question, making it contrast with rather than parallel the O *no* of the next line.
- 2057.** *Gape earth*: A *Earth gape* I can imagine no cause for this variant, certainly not an improvement, but an accidental inversion by the compositor of B (Intro. p. 92).
- 2058.** Cf. 1 *Tamburlaine*, iv. ii (1477), 'Smile Stars that raign'd at my natality', and 2 *Tamburlaine*, v. iii (4394), 'Fal starres that gouerne his natiuity'.
- 2059.** For *hath* B2 prints *haue*. In spite of its twice accidentally introducing a false concord (1773, 2101), B2 can hardly have done so deliberately, since it corrected others (151, 576, 1519). The most likely explanation is that the compositor subconsciously mistook *influence* for a plural.
- 2060—3.** These lines have naturally troubled editors. Boas explains *th&tyou* .. *your* (2062-3), which grammatically refer to *Starres*, 'have been attracted to the nearer substantive' *cloud*. Such a confusion is admittedly possible, but since the text here rests on the sole authority of the reporter we are entitled to emend it if we can. Dyce suggested tentatively that we should read *clouds* ... *they* ___ *their*, supporting the first (which he actually adopted) by reference to 'The labouring clouds' in Milton's *UAllegro* (l. 74), which might conceivably, I suppose, be a recollection of the present passage as performed. (Confusions between 'y' and 'th' often, of course, arise from contractions, and *your* could easily come from a 'y^r' intended for *their* \ but *you* could only come from 'y^u', which would stand for *thou* not *they*.)
- 2061.** Cf. 1 *Tamburlaine*, iv. ii (1488), 'Wrapt in the bowels of a freezing cloude'.
entrals: A *intrailes* (A3 *entrance*) The editor of B had, of course, before him the reading of A3, but he was somehow able to restore the correct sense as in A i. His rather unusual spelling (recognized however in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries) shows that he was not dependent on A i. The important question is whether the emendation must be held to prove that MS was available, an assumption inconsistent with the evidence of the rest of the speech. If it was a conjectural emendation it argues greater insight than, on a general view of his activities, we should naturally suppose the editor to have possessed, though he showed a good deal of care in his treatment of the text. There is, however, no reason, so far as I know, why he should not have been to some extent at least familiar with the play on the stage; and if he was there is of course no difficulty in accounting for the emendation. I do not, therefore, think it necessary to postulate the use of MS.
- yon* B3 altered this to *your*, which is, I think, unquestionably wrong. The compositor may simply have misread *yon* as *you* (which is quite easy to do in black letter) and assumed that it must be an error for *your*. But it might possibly be a rather clumsy attempt (by somehow identifying *Starres* and *cloud*) to get over the difficulty considered in connexion with 2060-3.
- cloud* As already mentioned, Dyce, and following him Ward, altered this to *clouds*, on the sole strength apparently of a supposed borrowing in *VALlegro*. Except as a basis for further emendation there seems to me neither reason nor excuse for the change, unless indeed we suppose it to be supported by the plural *mouthes* in 2063.

Notes : Act V_s, Sc. it

2064. *But let my soule mount, and ascend:* A *So that my soule may but ascend* There is undoubtedly a slight difficulty or at least awkwardness in the reading of A. *So that... but* is here equivalent to 'If only'—or 'Provided that' as Ward phrases it, referring to 316, where it is quite naturally used to express a bargain. But *So that* may also mean 'in order that', and it would be absurd to take the vomiting forth of Faustus' limbs as a necessary condition of salvation. It was perhaps either this ambiguity or else a sense of the impropriety of a bargain that led the editor of B to make his not very happy alteration (Introd. pp. 88-9).

2065. *The Watch strikes* (cf. 203 5, 2083). Obviously *Watch* means 'clock', but the early use of the word for a time-piece appears from *O.E.D.* to be rather obscure. The occasional use of the term 'pocket-watch' suggests that *watch* may have been used for a clock, but no instance has been found. The word was certainly used for the clock-face, but that does not help here. There is, however, a rare early use of *watch* for the 'Larum' of or connected with a clock, and since it was certainly later used for the 'works' it seems possible that it may have at one time meant the striking mechanism, which would fit the context here.

2066-7. A prints 2066, an alexandrine, as two lines, and takes advantage of this to tuck in the direction. No space, of course, is saved. Perhaps the division was intended to indicate a pause, though this seems unlikely in a reported text. In any case B disregards it.

A's nice contrast of *Ah* and *Oh* is, of course, lost in B.

B also recasts 2067 in order to get rid of *God*, and omits the following line of A for a similar reason. Its reconstruction reduces the line to metrical normality: in A it is, if anything, another alexandrine, but editors are probably right in making *Oh God* a line by itself.

2071. A's hypermetrical O, which the editor of B (followed by Wagner and Breyman) removed, may have been an actor's addition—but I do not think it was.

limited The fundamental sense of the verb is to appoint or ordain, with the notion of limitation implied, but at times remotely: *O.E.D.* cites, for instance, from the fifteenth century, the Towneley Plays (xix. 6), 'Apon the erth he send lightnes, Both son and moyne lymett thertyll', and from 1581, W. Stafford's (?) *Examination of Complaints*, 'Euery Artificer dwelling out of all townes . . . should bee limited to bee vnder the direction of one good Towne or other'. Cf. 1447.

2072—9. Cf. *EFB*, ch. 59: 'Wherefore was I created a man?' and ch. 61: 'howe happy wert thou if as an vnreasonable beast thou mightest die without soule, so shouldest thou not feele any more doubts?'

2074. Simpson would read:

Ah Pythagoras metemucosis,
Were that true,

'with the Greek words read according to the accent', a practice for which he is able to quote the authority of Jonson. I am not competent to judge of this, but I think the suggestion makes hay of the line-division. If Simpson meant *were that true* to stand as a short line by itself it is, I believe, an impossible one. If he meant to divide:

Were that true, this soul should fly from me
And I be changed unto some brutish beast
All beasts are happy, for when they die . . .

the first line is still awkward, and we are left with the same unsatisfactory last

Notes : Act V, Sc. it

line as in B (see note on 2076-7). As for the original Simpson says that 'the Quarto reads [it] as a line of prose'. In fact, however, the *Ah* is extrametrical (like the *O* in A 1488) and the rest forms a perfectly regular alexandrine—though in a speech that contains such lines as A 1463-4 it would be possible, by elision or slurring, to reduce the line to normal length (*thdgras me* making a trisyllabic foot).

- 2076-7.** Printed as one line in A. The editor, or maybe the compositor, of B made a very clumsy division, which cannot be correct. The lines should, of course, be divided after *happy*, with the extra light syllable in the final, not the medial, position, and a short line of two feet, not three. Editors, starting from the A-text, have naturally made the correct division.
- 2076.** *Into* : A *Vnto* The change in B to the more habitual construction may have been unconscious. The reporter is not likely to have introduced the less obvious reading.
- 2080.** Cf. *EFB*, ch. 13 : 'ah, woe is mee that euer I was borne' : but that was said on a much earlier occasion.
- 2082.** Faustus had sneered at Mephostophilis when he showed himself passionate *For being depriued of the loyes of heauen*: he has now lost his *manly fortitude* (308-ro). But he had already begun to waver at 570-2.
- 2084.** The editor was, I think, quite right to strike out the *O* from A's line, this being almost certainly an actor's anticipation of 2086.
- 2086.** *small* ; A *litttle* The editor of B apparently substituted *small* for the sake of metrical regularity, but this very regularity seems somehow to place undue emphasis on a not very essential word and makes an ugly line. (Of course, *small*, with its broad vowel and accumulated consonants, is a much 'weightier' word than *litttle*?) At the same time Simpson's remark, quoted with evident approval by Boas, that 'The slight hurry of the rhythm at the end of the line [in A] suggests the movement of the shower of falling drops', is perhaps fanciful. Moreover, I suspect that the reporter has anticipated *into* from the following line, and that Marlowe wrote *to*, parallel with *to aire* in 2084. This would make the line more regular while preserving the lightness of the ending.
- 2088** S.D. It was presumably the editor who combined the two directions in A, *Thunder and lightning* (1502) and *Enter diuels* (1505), into the single *Thunder, and enter the deuils*. But the position in A is the more effective: the parallel appeals of 2084-5 and 2086-7 are called forth, the first by the striking of the hour, the second by the commotion of the elements. The exact point at which the devils appear is important, and unfortunately uncertain. If they only appear after 2089, as on a strict interpretation of A, then *looke* is addressed to God (in recollection of A 1468-9); if, as in B, they enter before 2089, then *looke* is addressed to them, in spite of the invocation of God, which incidentally B has, of course, censored. Perhaps, however, the question is decided by the consideration that, whereas God may without disrespect be said to bend ireful brows (A 1469), looking fierce is more appropriately attributed to inferior powers.
- 2089.** *O mercy heauen*: A *My God, my God* The editor censors for the last time.
- 2090.** Cf. *EFB*, ch. 63: 'The Students lay neere vnto that hall wherein Doctor *Faustus* lay, and they heard a mighty noyse and hissing, as if the hall had bene full of Snakes and Adders'. 'Serpents*' and 'Adders' are also mentioned, as Boas

Notes: Act V, Sc. iii

observes, along with dragons, toads, and crocodiles, 'and all maner of venymous creatures', in the description of hell in ch. 15, but it is hardly necessary to suppose that Marlowe had the passage in mind here.

2091. *Vgly hell gape not* This, of course, proves that hell has not been visible throughout (see note on 2034), and also, I think, that it has not opened again to disgorge the devils at 2088. Boas thinks that, upon Faustus' cry, 'Hell may again have been "discovered" by the drawing of the curtain'. No doubt it might be theatrically effective to have Mephostophilis and the devils drag Faustus into hell-mouth, and such may indeed have been the *finale* in A (and, of course, in the original performance if the B-text 'additions' were then suppressed: see In trod. pp. 129-32). But according to B, as it stands and following *EFB*, Faustus was not carried off bodily, since his remains were later discovered by the Scholars (v. iii). Moreover, the inner stage is required for this discovery, and there would be no time to effect a change of setting. Faustus cannot, of course, remain on the stage, since his torn limbs (2099—2100) have to be disposed out of sight of the audience. Evidently the devils drag him through the traverse.

2091-2. By its punctuation B (but not A, which Boas follows) connects the books with the coming of Lucifer, that is, with the exaction of the forfeit. I think B may possibly be right. By a final twist Faustus' tortured mind suggests that since it was his magic books that first gave him power to compel the infernal spirits—which, of course, was not in fact the case—so by destroying them he may yet be able to break the bonds in which he has bound himself. This, no doubt, is the general sense; but whether it justifies connecting the resolve particularly with the appeal to Lucifer is less clear.

2092. Though no direction is provided Mephostophilis evidently enters at this point to claim his victim on behalf of Lucifer, who remains visible above.

A has the explicit direction *exeunt with him* (cf. note on 2091). This the editor reduced to a plain *Exeunt*, which B2 omitted (Introd. p. 145). The omission indicates a realization of the fact that dramatically there is no need of a change of scene, nor indeed of a new scene at all except to mark the lapse of time. The devils may tear Faustus limb from limb and leave him in the room for the Scholars to find. Theatrically this is, of course, impossible; hence the necessity for the inner stage and a new scene.

The place should not, I think, be defined as Faustus' study by any visible properties. An unlocalized scene would be more in keeping with the abstract treatment that governs v. ii in the B-text, and might in any case be more effective than any definite setting could be. There is, indeed, nothing to show where, if anywhere, Marlowe conceived the catastrophe as taking place: in *EFB* it was at the inn at Rimlich.

Act V, Scene iii

This short scene is not in A and was, of course, printed by B from MS.

Bullen wrote: 'To my ear the lines are solemn and pathetic, thoroughly worthy of Marlowe.' I should be prepared to let it go at that, though without much confidence. Further it was Bullen's 'not improbable' belief that the scene was subsequently withdrawn by Marlowe in favour of the Epilogue (Introd. p. 128). On the other hand, Boas (p. 43) asserts that 'it cannot be doubted that the dialogue was one of the 1602 additions'. This seems to me much less likely.

The scene is based on the end of the last chapter (63) of *EFB*. Here it is told

Notes: Act V, Sc. tit

how 'It happened between twelue and one a clock at midnight, there blewe a mighty storme of winde against the house, as though it would haue blowne the foundation therof out of his place . . . with that the hall doore flew open wherein Doctor *Faustus* was, then he began to crie for helpe, saying: murther, murther, but it came forth with halfe a voyce hollowly: shortly after they heard him no more*. At daybreak the students went to Faustus' room which they found sprinkled with blood and brains, and 'lastly they came into the yarde where they found his bodie lying on the horse dung, most monstrously tome, and fearefull to beholde, for his head and all his ioyns were dasht in peeces'.

2093. The Scholars approach the traverse, which now represents the door of Faustus' room, whether his study at Wittenberg or the 'hall' in the inn at Rimlich, and behind which lie Faustus' remains.

2095. *dreadfull night* may refer only to the commotion in the house (2097), but the phrasing of 2096 makes it probable that, the writer had in mind the storm mentioned in *EFB*.

2099. At this point the Second Scholar draws back the curtain to reveal the scattered remains of Faustus. Remembering the sheep's gather in the plot of *The Battle of Alcazar*, and the limbs of the Moor, Hercules, and Phaeton, besides four Turks' heads, in the inventory of the Admiral's company, I feel certain that the Elizabethan stage would have made the most of the gruesome sight. I must admit that there is no trace of Faustus' limbs in the inventory, though his dragon is there (Introd. p. n).

2101. *deuils* B2 altered this to *Diuell* (Introd. p. 145).

2107. *euery Christian* The writer may possibly have had in mind the conclusion of the history of Doctor Faustus in *EFB*, 'out of the which example euery Christian may learne . . . to feare God'.

2110. This would permit the Scholars *o collect Faustus' limbs and bear them out if thought fit.

2111. Did the writer recall the silk in which Faustus would have had the students bravely clad (117-18)?

Epilogue

There are no verbal variants in these lines, but since the report would probably be exact this does not go far towards showing whether B is printed from A or from MS. More telling are several small agreements in spelling between B and A3, e.g. at 2115, 2116, 2118, 2120, the most important being their agreement in the more old-fashioned *then* for *than* at 2121, though even this does not amount to much. What is probably decisive is the reproduction of A3's erroneous comma at the end of 2116, where the colon of A_{1,2} is the lightest admissible stop. The conclusion that B was printed from A is borne out by its retaining the motto at the end, which may very likely have been added in A by the printer (see note on 2122).

Nobody seems to have questioned Marlowe's authorship before Boas, who would allow him the first three lines only. I see no reason to doubt that all eight lines are his (Introd. pp. 128-9).

There is no direct source for these lines, but *EFB* also ends with a kind of epilogue, or address to the reader, and there is just enough similarity in the warning tone to suggest that Marlowe may not have been wholly unmindful of it: 'And thus

Additional Notes

ended the whole history of Doctor *Faustus* his coniuration, and other actes that he did in his life; out of the which example euery Christian may learne, but chiefly the stiffe-necked and high minded may thereby learne to feare God, and to be careful of their vocation, and to be at defiance with all diuelish workes, as God hath most precisely forbidden'. But Marlowe knew that it was the *wise* rather than the stiff-necked who might be expected to heed the warning.

2117. *regard i.e. pay* heed to, take warning by.

2122. The origin of this motto should I fancy be sought among the explicits of medieval scribes rather than in the classics. It occurs, as editors have pointed out, at the end of the manuscript play of *Charlemagne* in the British Museum MS. Egerton 1994. One might expect to find such a tag at the end of a literary rather than a theatrical manuscript; nevertheless *Charlemagne* appears to have been used as a prompt-book. This, however, hardly lessens the unlikelihood of its having appeared in such a manuscript as we have assumed the copy for A to have been. It is much more likely to have been appended by the printer himself along with the publisher's device.

ADDITIONAL NOTES

127. A is clearly correct in placing a comma before *and* it is Valdes who is addressed as *sweete*, though why we do not know. If 125 stood alone, *Germane* might be interpreted as 'cousin' (the word was occasionally used substantially, and we know from 219 that Faustus had relatives at Wittenberg). But such a suggestion is ruled out by the article in 91.

138. *Mus&us* A mythical bard closely connected with Orpheus, and here apparently identified or confused with him. Ward thought that the reference was to Virgil, *Aeneid*, vi. 666, 'where the Sibyl addresses the crowd in the "happy fields" of the lower regions':

Musaeum ante omnis: medium nam plurima turba
Hunc habet, atque humeris extantem suspicit altis.

This seems unnecessary, but the allusion may have helped the confusion. This Musaeus is, of course, distinct from the fifth-century (?) Musaeus Grammaticus, author of *Hero and Leander*, the poem translated or rather imitated by Marlowe and Chapman; but again Marlowe may have confused them. (The epithet *sweet* perhaps suggests as much, but it may mean no more than the sweet singer Musaeus-Orpheus.) There was yet a third Musaeus, of Ephesus or Alexandria, author of a *Perseid*. (Oxford Classical Dictionary.)

142. *Canonize* Accented on the second syllable, as in *Hamlet*, 1. iv. 47, 'Why thy canonized bones, hearsed in death'.

143. *Lords:: A Lords*, B's colon is misleading according to modern ideas of punctuation.

152. *dregge* in Ai is not a recognized spelling of 'drag', and if not a mere misprint may be due to confusion with the cognate 'dredge'.

Argosies *EFB*, ch. 22, mentions 'the number of Gallies, and Argozies' that Faustus saw at Naples.

221. *Rector* the head (permanent or acting) of a university. Cf. *EFB*, ch. 1: '*Faustus* continued at study in the Vniuersity, & was by the Rectors and sixteen Masters afterwards examined'. This does not render the German very closely, but *FB* does use the phrase 'ist er hernach in seinem *Examine* von den *Rectoribus*

Additional Notes

- so weit kommen Apparently 'Rector' is here used in the very rare sense of 'Regent' for which *O.E.D.* (s.v., sense 4.d) quotes only one example from 1535. A 'Regent' at Oxford and Cambridge (and apparently at Wittenberg) was originally a Master of Arts ruling or presiding over disputations in the Schools (*O.E.D.*).
- 412.** The punctuation in A is ambiguous, connecting the line equally with 411 and 413: B is presumably correct in linking it with what follows.
- 450.** Certainly no earthly lire, that will liquefy coagulated blood.
- 529-30.** Faustus shows surprise; but Mephostophilis had already explained this at 300 if.
- A 781-2.** This elaboration may also have been in the prompt-book, but being of obviously humorous intent is perhaps more likely to have been introduced in performance.
- A 963-4.** A's punctuation makes *thou canst not reade* a relative clause, but comparison with B 753 shows that the question-mark should have been placed after *booke*.
- 798.** *will first arrive at Rome* This is hardly consistent with the account of the journey in 803-25.
- 806.** *Lakes* evidently moats. There may possibly have been some confusion with the Middle English word 'lake' meaning a stream, which still survives in dialect.
- 807.** B has a full stop (A a comma) though the sentence is incomplete: but no logical punctuation is possible.
- 898.** For the use of such inversions in rhetorical speech see *Henry V*, 11. Prol. 10, 'With crowns imperial, crowns and coronets'; iv. i. 278, 'The sword, the mace, the crown imperial'; 284, 'Not all these, laid in bed majesticaP.
- A 927.** Whoever may have been responsible, the addition of *Et omnes sancti Amen* was possibly a mistake, for it implies the conclusion of the *Dirge*, whereas it would seem from B that the proceedings were interrupted.
- 1154.** / *much* (Ay, much!) 'I don't think!' This is the earliest instance quoted (as c. 1590) in *O.E.D.* for the elliptical use of *much* (obsolete except in U.S.A.) 'as a derisive exclamation indicating incredulity'. Cf. *2 Henry IF*, 11. iv. 143.
- 1159.** *Legions of infemal Rule* i.e. hosts of the kingdom of hell. Cf. *Macbeth* iv. iii. 55-6, 'the Legions Of horrid Hell'. *Legions* was in common use in connexion with spirits, after Matt. xxvi. 53 and Mark v. 9. In A the reviser, expanding, substitutes *Monarch of he I*.
- 1163.** *shroud* A recognized variant of 'shrewd' in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.
- 1207.** *What... ayle you two?* The intransitive use of 'ail' ('to have something the matter with one') arose out of the impersonal use ('what ails you?') in the fifteenth century 'By mistaking the personal obj. . . . for the subj.' (*O.E.D.*).
- A 1105.** *exit Alex:* and, of course, the lady.
- 1405.** *quit* i.e. requite (*O.E.D.*, sense II. 11).
- 1407.** Such scansion is not in the collaborator's style: an accidental omission may have left the line short (query *the hated Coniurer* or *near at hand*).

Additional Notes

- 1483-4.** One would certainly expect another rime here rather than a mere assonance. The author may have written *attent*. In the sense of 'attempt' the word is supposed not to have survived the fifteenth century, but Quarles has 'attented' for 'attempted' in 162a and 'attentate' is a recognized seventeenth-century variant of 'attemptate'(O.£.Z>.).
- 1485.** *the dore* of the stage, of course. The author uses the language of the theatre, as he does at 1292 and 1996.
- 1610.** *ha*s* is properly a contraction for 'he has', but both writers and composers "•were curiously uncertain in their use, and it frequently appears, as here, simply as a spelling of 'has'.
- 1685.** In iv. vi the prefix to the speeches of the Horse-corser is consistently *Horse*, in the present scene it is equally consistently *Horse*. No doubt the compositor was responsible.
- 1778-9. Faustus appears to have forgotten, here and at 1915, that he had already bequeathed his goods (A 555) as well as his body and soul to Lucifer. But the inconsistency is already in *EFB*. Faustus might be playing a rather cruel joke on his faithful servant, but of this there is no hint.
1817. *perseuer* The accent on the second syllable was habitual down to the middle of the seventeenth century.
1863. It will be noticed that it was Marlowe who connected Faustus' request for Helen with his revolt and submission. In *EFB* it happens several chapters, and years, later.
- 1932.** *surfet sir, feare nothing: A surfet, neuer feare man* The reporter may have unconsciously recalled 1503, *Nay feare not man*.

INDEX

The analytical Table of Contents and cross-references in the Introduction and Notes should make it easy to trace any matters of importance. The Index is therefore in the main confined to subjects only incidentally mentioned and to glossarial entries. Plain references are to the pages of the Introduction, superior figures indicating footnotes. References to the Notes are by line-numbers preceded by 'A' or 'B' as the case may be, a star indicating that they are to be found among the additions on pp. 403 ff.

- Abrupt transitions, 51, 101, 103, 105, 106, 121-2, 127.
Additions of 1602, 11, 22, 29, 138.
Adrian, Pope, B 891 ff.
Agrippa's shadows, B 140.
'A h' and *Oh', B 1922, B 2036, also B 652, B 1813, B 1834, B 1839, B 1951, B 1958, B 1997.
'ail', B 1207*.
'Albanus', B 176.
Antwerp, fire-ships at, 7.
*A per se', B 571.
'aspect', expression, B 1422.
'at any hand*', A 1156.
'attent', attempt, B 1483-4*.
'azured', B 1892.

Bakeless, J., on *Faustus* and *Friar Bacon*, 7; on acting at the Theatre, 9.
'bill', prescription, B 47.
Birde (or Borne), William, and *Faustus*, 11, 1352
Black Book, The, 8.
Boas, F. S., defends the text of 1616, 22; on the authorship of *Faustus*, 138; quoted *passim*.
Book of Martyrs, The, B 891 ff.
'bounce', knock, B 1675.
Breymann, Hermann, on the authorship, 97¹; quoted *passim*.
Brooke, C. F. Tucker, on the date of *Faustus*, io¹; on quarto 1619, 156⁶; quoted *passim*.
'Bruno, Saxon', B 893-4.
Bullen, A. H., vi, 64, 80, 125, 128, 129, B 41, B 1804-11, B 1894-1914, B 1983-2034, V. iii (head-note).

'Campania', B 811.
'case', pair, B 706.
'claret wine', B 771-2.
'commence', graduate, B 32.
Conjuring, contradictory treatment of, 102, B 1160-2.
'consistory', B 911.
'consort*', attend, B 1189.

Damnable Life, see *Historie of. . . Doctor Faustus*.
'decretals', B 911.
Dekker, Thomas, suggested collaboration in *Faustus*, 118, 135.
Demogorgon, B 244-5.
Dickson, M. J., on *Faustus*, 33¹.
Dido, possible allusion to, B 2-6.
'dirge', B 1099, B 1112.
'Dis', B 1895.
Door of stage, B 1485*, B 1995-6
'drink of all waters', B 1538-9.
Duplication in text, 37, 55, 101, 106-7, 110, 113-14, 120¹, 122.

EFB (English Faust Booh), see *Historie of... Doctor Faustus*.
Edward II, possible allusion to, B 2-6-j parallels with, 51, 675, B88 5, B 2039-47.
Empyrean sphere, B 608.
'&c.', B 58, B 66, B 530-1, A 995-6.
'ever-burning', B 850.

FB (Faust-Buch), see *Historia von D. Iohan Fausten*.
False concords, B 518, B 1773, B 2059.
'fame', B 1191.
Faustus, early allusions to, 5¹; ballads on, 6.
'first letter . . . begins with', B 728-9.
Fleay, F. G., on the authorship of *Faustus*, 135-8.
Fox's *Book of Martyrs*, possible source of Bruno episode, 113, B 891 ff.
'French crowns', 32.
Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay, question of priority, 7; parallels with, B 117, B 144, B 169, B 686, B 787-8.
'fury', B 1100, B 1677.

'glass windows', A 1194-5.
'graced', admitted to a degree, A 17.
'gravel*', confound, B '135.
'guesse*', guests, B 1581.

'hard heels', B 1130.
Harvey, Gabriel, mention of *Faustus* in his marginalia, 5¹.

