The Marlowe-Shakespeare Continuum

The Marlowe-Shakespeare Continuum: Christopher Marlowe, Thomas Nashe, and the Authorship of Early Shakespeare and Anonymous Plays

By

Donna N. Murphy

CAMBRIDGE SCHOLARS

PUBLISHING

The Marlowe-Shakespeare Continuum:
Christopher Marlowe, Thomas Nashe, and the Authorship of Early Shakespeare
and Anonymous Plays, by Donna N. Murphy

This book first published 2013

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-4438-4988-X, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-4988-3

To Isabel Gortázar, d. April 26, 2013

An extraordinary woman, and a passionate and tireless Marlovian scholar.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Abbreviations

	Attrib. to Shakespeare
Ado	*Much Ado About Nothing*
Ant.	*Antony and Cleopatra*
AWW	*All's Well That Ends Well*
AYL	*As You Like It*
Cor.	*Coriolanus*
Cym.	*Cymbeline*
Err.	*The Comedy of Errors*
Ham.	*Hamlet*
1H4	*I Henry IV*
2H4	*II Henry IV*
H5	*Henry V*
1H6	*I Henry VI*
2H6	*II Henry VI*
3H6	*III Henry VI*
H8	*Henry VIII*
JC	*Julius Caesar*
Jn.	*King John*
LLL	*Love's Labour's Lost*
Lear	*King Lear*
Luc.	*The Rape of Lucrece*
Mac.	*Macbeth*
MM	*Measure for Measure*
MDN	*A Midsummer Night's Dream*
MV	*The Merchant of Venice*
Oth.	*Othello*
Per.	*Pericles*
PPilg.	*The Passionate Pilgrim*
R2	*Richard II*
R3	*Richard III*
Rom.	*Romeo and Juliet*
Son.	*Shakespeare's Sonnets*
TGV	*The Two Gentlemen of Verona*
Tim.	*Timon of Athens*
Tit.	*Titus Andronicus*
Tmp.	*The Tempest*
TN	*Twelfth Night*
TNK	*The Two Noble Kinsmen*
TOTS	*The Taming of the Shrew*
Tro.	*Troilus and Cressida*
Ven.	*Venus and Adonis*
Wiv.	*The Merry Wives of Windsor*
WT	*The Winter's Tale*

	Attrib. to Marlowe
DF	*Doctor Faustus* (with Nashe)
Dido	*Dido, Queen of Carthage*
E2	*Edward II*
HL	*Hero and Leander*
JM	*The Jew of Malta* (with Nashe)
LFB	*Lucan's First Book*
MP	*The Massacre at Paris*
OE	*Ovid's Elegies*
PS	*The Passionate Shepherd to his Love*
1T	*I Tamburlaine*
2T	*II Tamburlaine*

	Other Works		**Attrib. to Nashe**
CR	*Caesar's Revenge*	*Almond*	*An Almond for a Parrot*
Cont.	*The First Part of the Contention Betwixt the Two Famous Houses of York and Lancaster*	*Anatomy*	*Anatomy of Absurdity*
		Comets	*Two Dangerous Comets*
		Lenten	*Lenten Stuff*
		Pierce	*Pierce Penniless*
		Pref. to A&S	Preface to *Astrophel & Stella*
E3	*Edward III*	*Pref. to Menaphon*	Preface to *Menaphon*
FQ	*The Faerie Queene*, by Edmund Spenser	*Saffron*	*Have With You to Saffron-Walden*
Sol.	*Soliman and Perseda* , attrib. to Thomas Kyd	*Strange Summer*	*Strange News*
			Summer's Last Will and Testament
TOAS	*The Taming of a Shrew*	*Tears*	*Christ's Tears Over Jerusalem*
TT	*The True Tragedy of Richard, Duke of York*	*Terrors*	*Terrors of the Night*
		Unfortunate	*The Unfortunate Traveler*
Wood.	*Thomas of Woodstock*, or *Richard II Part One*	*Valentines*	*The Choice of Valentines*

Attributed in whole or part to Dekker (for an explanation of nontraditional attributions, see my *The Mysterious Connection Between Thomas Nashe, Thomas Dekker, and T. M.*)

Banq.	*The Bloody Banquet*	*DT*	*The Dead Term*
		EMIH	*Every Man in His Humor*
BB	*The Black Book*		
BL	*The Bellman of London*	*FHT*	*Father Hubburd's Tales*
BMC	*Blurt, Master Constable*	*GH*	*The Gull's Hornbook*
CC	*The Compter's Commonwealth*	*1HW*	*I The Honest Whore*
DD	*Dekker his Dream*	*2HW*	*II The Honest Whore*

ITBN	*If This Be Not Good, the Devil is in It*
JMM	*Jests To Make You Merry*
KC	*A Knight's Conjuring*
LC	*Lantern and Candlelight*
MG	*The Meeting of Gallants at an Ordinary*
MML	*Match Me in London*
NFH	*News from Hell*
NG	*News From Gravesend*
NH	*Northward Ho*
NSS	*The Noble Spanish Soldier*
NW	*No Wit, No Help Like a Woman's*
OA	*The Owl's Almanac*
OF	*Old Fortunatus*
OP	*O per se O*
Over.	*Sir Thomas Overbury his Wife*
PC	*Plato's Cap*
PG	*Patient Grissil*
PP	*The Penniless Parliament of Threadbare Poets*
PWPF	*Penny-wise, Pound-Foolish*
RA	*The Raven's Almanac*
RR	*A Rod for Runaways*
Sat.	*Satiro-Mastix*
SD	*The Sun's Darling*
SDS	*The Seven Deadly Sins*
SH	*The Shoemaker's Holiday*
SHR	*A Strange Horse-Race*
STW	*Sir Thomas Wyatt*
VD	*Villainies Discovered by Lantern and Candlelight*
VG	*Vox Graculi*
VM	*The Virgin Martyr*
WA	*Work for Armorers*
WB	*The Whore of Babylon*
WE	*The Welsh Embassador*
WH	*Westward Ho*
WofE	*The Witch of Edmunton*
WY	*The Wonderful Year*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many thanks to those who edited or otherwise offered comments to help improve this book as it mutated and took shape over the years, above all Cynthia Morgan, and also Alex Jack, Jane Nelson, Dan Sayers, Eileen Vasey, Elaine Williams and Erica Wong. I am also grateful to David More and Clare Murphy for help with previous work. Any errors, of course, are my own.

I suppose I am starting a new category for candidacy of the authorship of the works of Shakespeare: Christopher Marlowe as the main author, with Thomas Nashe as the heretofore unrecognized co-author of certain works; and George Peele, John Fletcher, Thomas Middleton, and George Wilkins as co-authors of others.

I wish to acknowledge the brave and brazen Marlovians who blazed the way and now rest in peace: Wilbur G. Zeigler, author of the novel *It Was Marlowe*; David Rhys Williams, who wrote *Shakespeare, Thy Name is Marlowe*; Calvin Hoffman, author of *The Murder of the Man who was* "*Shakespeare*"; A. D. (Dorothy) Wraight, who penned *In Search of Christopher Marlowe*, *The Story that the Sonnets Tell*, and *Christopher Marlowe and Edward Alleyn*; and Louis Ule, who wrote *A Concordance to the Works of Christopher Marlowe*, and *Christopher Marlowe (1564-1607): a Biography*.

I honor contemporaries who are challenging the conventional wisdom, from a Marlovian point of view, that Stratfordian William Shakspere wrote the works of Shakespeare, especially: Peter Farey, author of two Hoffman Prize-winning essays, "Hoffman and the Authorship," and "Arbella Stuart and Christopher Marlowe," and publisher of www2.prestel.co.uk/rey/index.htm; Mike Rubbo, creator of the Hoffman Prize-winning documentary, *Much Ado About Something*; Ros Barber, author of the Hoffman Prize-winning verse novel *The Marlowe Papers* and the Ph.D. thesis *Writing Marlowe as Writing Shakespeare*, rosbarber.com/research/dphil-phd-thesis; Daryl Pinksen, author of *Marlowe's Ghost*; Carlo di Nota, publisher of marlowe-shakespeare.blogspot.kr and the International Marlowe-Shakespeare Society site at www.marloweshakespeare.org; Cynthia Morgan, publisher of www.themarlowestudies.org; Alex Jack, author of *Hamlet. Christopher Marlowe and William Shakespeare*, and *As You Like It. Christopher Marlowe and William Shakespeare*; David More, author of the essay in

verse *The Marliad*, and publisher of www.marlovian.com; Samuel Blumenfeld, author of *The Marlowe-Shakespeare Connection*; and John Baker, publisher of the now defunct www2.localaccess.com/marlowe.

The above-named works and websites contain puzzle pieces related to Christopher Marlowe writing the works of William Shakespeare. No one work tells the full story or gets everything right, to the extent that we know what "right" is, but each one moves the case for Marlowe forward. It takes a Globe to uncover and describe all the aspects of this vast mystery that is "Shakespeare." We hope you will join us!

Donna N. Murphy
www.donnanmurphy.com

FOREWORD

Some law of logic should fix the number of
coincidences, in a given domain, after which they
cease to be coincidences, and form, instead, the living
organism of a new truth.
—Vladimir Nabokov

In this book, Donna Murphy provides a host of linguistic and other coincidences between Christopher Marlowe and William Shakespeare. Indeed, they are so numerous that, taken together with what else we know about Marlowe's education, travel, foreign language ability and excellence in writing, and the absence of knowledge about the same for William Shakspere of Stratford, these coincidences appear to create Nabokov's organism of a new truth. In this instance, the new truth would be that Marlowe, about to be imprisoned, certainly tortured, and likely executed as a "heretic," faked his own death and continued to write, at times with others, under the name "William Shakespeare." Murphy's thesis is that one can document a continuum from Marlowe's early work through Shakespeare's early canon and, via use of language, show how Marlowe "became" Shakespeare.

Thomas Nashe was the newsmonger of his time. He wrote about anybody who was somebody in the literary realm: Christopher Marlowe, Robert Greene, Gabriel Harvey, Thomas Kyd, Samuel Daniel, Arthur Golding, John Lyly, George Peele, Sir Philip Sidney, Edmund Spenser, and many others—but he gave nary a word-nod to William Shakespeare.[1] The silence of a pamphleteer like Nashe speaks volumes, especially since many believe, as does Murphy, that Nashe co-authored *Henry VI, Part I.*

In fact, Murphy forges new trails regarding co-authorship between Marlowe and his friend Nashe, finding the presence of both hands in seven plays. Her theory is that for the most part, in plays they jointly authored, Marlowe's was the voice of wisdom, Nashe's wit. Many will flinch at this new idea, even though it is the same comedic voice we find in both Marlowe and Shakespeare. The reader will judge for his or her self after viewing Donna's collection of Nasheian lines in various plays along the Marlowe-Shakespeare continuum.

After receiving his M. A. from Cambridge and his initial success as a

playwright, Marlowe's most practical use to the State would have been through the medium of drama. I propose that Lord Burghley and Sir Francis Walsingham asked Marlowe, who had already done the Queen unspecified "good service" by the time he graduated, to write plays for the State.[2] At that time, England was a Protestant theocracy, and contained a large population of closet Catholics. The leaders' greatest fear was civil war, spurred on by Catholic Spain and France. As Marlowe phrased it in his translation of part of Lucan's *Pharsalia*, about the civil war between Caesar and Pompey: "So when the world's compounded union breaks, Time ends, and to old Chaos all things turn" (73-4). A people unified in their identification with country was necessary to combat religious division. National pride and allegiance to Queen now depended on a generally illiterate people knowing their history, with a Tudor twist. What better way to accomplish this task than to have them see their former kings brought to life again on-stage and, at the same time, see their enemies vanquished? What better way to advance subtler agendas?

Marlowe wrote *The Massacre at Paris*, which took place partly during the time Sir Francis Walsingham was England's ambassador to France. Walsingham lived through the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre of 1572, when thousands of Protestant Huguenots were murdered in the streets. Marlowe's play depicts the duplicity of Catholic French leaders, as well as vengeance when the evil Duke of Guise is stabbed to death. David Riggs wrote about Marlowe's sources for this play:

> He had an intimate, firsthand knowledge of the feud between King Henri III and the Guise. Much of the factual material in the latter part of *The Massacre* can only be verified by recourse to confidential sources in the State Papers. Marlowe obtained this information by word of mouth, from men who had been witness to these events. In contrast to the partisan accounts of Protestant and Catholic pamphleteers, he gives an even-handed, densely factual report on the feud. The brief documentary scenes that succeed one another in *The Massacre at Paris* resemble diplomatic dispatches; these were the raw materials of intelligence fieldwork.[3]

The Massacre at Paris weakened the position of English Catholics, bolstered Protestants, and was based in part on diplomatic correspondence to which Marlowe had surprising access.

Marlowe's play *Edward II* appears to illustrate Sir Francis Walsingham's concerns about King James. Walsingham made the long journey to Scotland in 1583 to confer privately with James in order to countercheck the influence of Spain on him. His foremost reservation had to do with James's relationship with his male cousin Esmé Stuart, who

was the king's strongest political influence. Stuart had been sent to Scotland by the Duke of Guise in order to restore French Catholic interests. Walsingham later wrote a report for the Queen detailing his communication with James, the theme of which seems to be echoed in *Edward II*. I've put part of what Walsingham said to King James here, and it is a theme that runs throughout the Shakespeare canon:

> That therefore divers princes . . . have been deposed, for that being advised to remove the said counselors from them rather than to yield to them, have been content to run any hazard or adventure, whereof both the histories of England and Scotland did give sufficient precedents . . . That as subjects are bound to obey dutifully so were princes bound to command justly; which reason and ground of government was set down the deposition of **Edward the Second**, as by ancient record thereof doth appear (emphasis added).

Walsingham's "said counselors" that might induce a "prince" to "run any hazard or adventure" refers to James' close relationship with Stuart, to whom he formed a romantic attachment. James was in the line of succession to the English Crown. His attitude about governance was of extreme importance to Lord Burghley and Sir Francis Walsingham. As for Walsingham's warning to James that princes have been deposed for showing too much favor to "said counselors," in the play Marlowe has Lancaster tell Edward, "Look for rebellion, look to be deposed . . ." One of Walsingham's chief qualms was that King James had showered Stuart with gifts and political power; he'd been made a member of the Privy Council, Gentleman of the Bedchamber, and governor of Dumbarton Castle. In Act I of *Edward II* we find King Edward speaking the following lines that mirror Francis Walsingham's concern with the giving away of the body politic:

> *Edward*. I here create thee Lord High Chamberlain,
> Chief Secretary to the state and me,
> Earl of Cornwall, King and Lord of Man . . .
> I'll give thee more, for but to honor thee
> Is Edward pleased with kingly regiment.
> Fear'st thou thy person? Thou shalt have a guard.
> Wants thou gold? Go to my treasury.
> Wouldst thou be loved and feared? Receive my seal (Sc. i.153-5, 163-7)

These worries were well founded. After James VI of Scotland became James I of England, he continued to have male favorites. The most famous was George Villiers, whom James created, in succession, Gentleman of

the Bedchamber, Baron Whaddon, Viscount Villiers, Earl of Buckingham, Marquess of Buckingham, and finally Earl of Coventry and Duke of Buckingham. The wealth and attention James showered upon his male favorites had a debilitating effect on the court.

It is possible the motive for writing *Edward II* was to discredit James so that the Queen would more seriously consider Arbella Stuart as her successor. Arbella was the great great granddaughter of King Henry VII and first cousin to James; both she and James were contenders for the throne. A man named "Morley" tutored her for 3½ years, and was dismissed after Arbella's grandmother found cause to be "doubtful of his forwardness in religion."[4] Peter Farey wrote a Hoffman prize-winning essay that presented a compelling case in favor of this Morley being Christopher Marlowe. Walsingham may not have lived to view *Edward II*. While Murphy dates the play's composition to 1590, Walsingham died early in the year, on April 6.

Of the plays Murphy explores in this book, *II Henry VI*, *III Henry VI* and *Edward III* not only brought England's rulers to life, they were far different from the late medieval morality plays preceding them. The morality plays reinforced the Church; these history plays reinforced the State. *II Henry VI* and *III Henry VI*, first published anonymously, are about the infighting, wrack, and ruin of civil war. This is symbolized most poignantly in *III Henry VI* when a son drags on-stage the body of a man he has killed in battle, only to realize it is his own father, followed by a man about to pillage the body of an enemy he has slaughtered, belatedly realizing it is his son. The Shakespeare plays also served State interests, depicting the constant scheming, chaos, and years of destruction that could ensue if Catholics and Protestants fought each other.

The anonymous play *Edward III*, printed as Shakespeare's in the 2005 Oxford edition of Shakespeare's works, is also a play that fits with State interests. *Edward III* is a morality tale about how to be a good king, and ingeniously celebrates the victory of the English over the Spanish Armada. As Murphy says, *Edward III* is a natural extension of *Edward II*. In fact, evidence from the 16th century—a sequence of allusions in the works of Robert Greene—tells us that Marlowe wrote *Edward III*. This sequence not only matches Marlowe as the author of the play, it also points to the great Elizabethan actor Edward Alleyn as the Upstart Crow in Greene's infamous *Groatsworth of Wit*. There is no documentary evidence that William Shakspere wrote *Edward III* or was the man alluded to as the Upstart Crow, but the following allusions establish an historical context for both Marlowe and Alleyn.

Greene's antipathy toward Marlowe had its origins around 1587, when he wrote a play in poor imitation of *Tamburlaine* entitled *Alphonsus, King of Aragon*. The envious Greene took his first stabs at Marlowe in the preface of a fiction pamphlet published during 1588, *Perimedes the Blacke-Smith*, in which he described an author whom scholars have identified to be Marlowe as having "wantonlye set out such impious instances of intolerable poetrie, such mad and scoffing poets, that have propheticall spirits, as bred of *Merlins* race."[5]

Greene's next envious taunts were in *Menaphon*, which appeared in 1589. Scholars have identified a poke at Marlowe, who was the eldest son of a cobbler in Canterbury, through the mouth of the character Melicertus:

> Whosoeuer *Samela* descanted of that loue, tolde you a *Canterbury* tale; some propheticall full mouth, that as he were a Coblers eldest sonne, would by the laste tell where anothers shooe wrings, but his sowterly aime was iust leuell, in thinking euerie looke was loue, or euerie faire worde a pawne of loyaltie.[6]

In 1590, Greene alluded to Marlowe and Alleyn in *Francesco's Fortunes*:

> Why *Roscius*, art thou proud with *Esops* Crow, being pranct with the glorie of others feathers? of thy selfe thou canst say nothing, and if the Cobler hath taught thee to say, *Aue Caesar*, disdain not thy tutor, because thou pratest in a Kings chamber: what sentence thou utterest on the stage, flowes from the censure of our wittes, and what sentence or conceipte of the inuention the people applaud for excellent, that comes from the secrets of our knowledge.[7]

Greene is referring to the play *Edward III*, where the Black Prince, son of King Edward, cries "Ave Caesar" after his father decides to go to war with France:

> *Prince.* As cheerful sounding to my youthful spleen
> This tumult is of war's increasing broils,
> As at the coronation of a king
> The joyful clamours of the people are,
> When *Ave Caesar* they pronounce aloud. (I.i.160-4)

Just as we would instantly recognize "Here's looking at you, kid" as Humphrey Bogart's line in *Casa Blanca*, it was likely Greene's readers knew he was alluding to the great actor Edward Alleyn (various scholars have identified him as Greene's "Roscius") and the dramatist Marlowe (the Cobler), who wrote the words "Ave Caesar" spoken in the "Kings

chamber" during the first act of *Edward III*. "Esop's Crow" was an apt metaphor for an actor. Alleyn played the leading roles in *Doctor Faustus*, *Tamburlaine*, and *The Jew of Malta*. His relationship with Marlowe is highlighted in this allusion.

Here we do not find the scholar's path barred by evidence that has been destroyed by time, but the rare occasion of literary proof spared from the damp of the centuries, yet these allusions have not been taken into account by Marlowe's biographers. Neither do the most recent publications of *Edward III*, the 1998 New Cambridge and 2005 Oxford editions, mention them in their introductions.

To build a strong navy and keep it strong required a nation undivided. Edward III was the founder of England's navy. After the battle of Sluys in 1340, in which the English navy destroyed the French navy, Parliament awarded King Edward III the title "Sovereign of the Sea." It was this naval victory that would have given Burghley and Walsingham's dramatist an analogy for the victory over the Spanish Armada. A. D. Wraight first suggested the play was a celebration of England's victory over the Spanish Armada in her book *Christopher Marlowe and Edward Alleyn*, published in 1965. She voiced the opinion that Marlowe's biographers hadn't seen the connection earlier because the 1588 Armada association was obscured by the play's publication date of 1596. I suggest this lapse in time might also have obscured Marlowe's biographers' association of Greene's 1590 allusions to the play's author.

When *Edward III* is seen to be Marlowe's play, the gap shrinks between Marlowe the rebel and Shakespeare the upholder of the covenants on which honor and civilization depend. Should we be convinced Marlowe wrote this play, *Edward III* marks the paradigm shift in one-dimensional interpretations of Marlowe's character as well as his work. *Tamburlaine* and *Doctor Faustus* can no longer be seen as projections of Marlowe's own desires, but characters developed with the objectivity of the artist in his early twenties, the time when genius has not fully developed an in-depth philosophy that will guide its dramatic forms.

Many current Shakespeare scholars want to ascribe *Edward III* and the early versions of *II* and *III Henry VI* (*The First Part of the Contention betwixt the two famous Houses of Yorke and Lancaster* and *The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of Yorke*) to Shakspere from Stratford. The only way they can do this is to place him as a dramatist before we have any documented evidence he was in London writing plays.

In 1766, Thomas Trywitt first suggested that the Upstart Crow and Shake-scene in Greene's 1592 *Groatsworth of Wit* might be Shakspere from Stratford. Greene wrote:

> Yes trust them not: for there is an vpstart Crow, beautified with our feathers, that with his *Tygers heart wrapt in a Players hide*, supposes he is as well able to bumbast out a blanke verse as the best of you: and being an absolute *Iohannes fac totum*, is in his owne conceit the onely Shake-scene in a countrie.[8]

It was Edward Alleyn to whom Greene referred as "Crow" two years earlier, specifically "proud with *Esops* Crow, being pranct with the glorie of others feathers." In *Groatsworth*, Greene addresses three writers who have been identified as Marlowe, Nashe and Peele, telling them not to give their words or "feathers" to the Crow. We know Marlowe gave Alleyn "feathers" in at least three plays. "*Tygers hart wrapt in a Players hide*" is a quote from *III Henry VI* (also included in its early version, *The True Tragedy*). Murphy provides detailed linguistic evidence that Marlowe wrote this play, and cites others who propose that Alleyn did "bumbast out a blanke verse" by writing *Faire Em* and the lost play *Tambercam*. As for the capitalization of "vpstart Crow" and "Shake-scene," A. D. Wraight pointed out that these words are capitalized as common nouns, just as other nouns in the *Groatsworth* text, such as Father, Teacher, Sonne, and Schollers. All the proper names, however, are both capitalized and printed in italics, such as *Greene, Caine, Iuuenall,* and *Iohannes fac totum*. From this examination of the text it is clear we have no need to seek for a man named by Greene as "Shake-scene," any more than we should be looking for a man named "Crow."

Assumptions become a part of history when they are not questioned. The assumption Greene was alluding to Shakspere from Stratford as the "vpstart Crow" and "Shake-scene" that various scholars have made filled the void of his writing career before *Venus and Adonis* was published with the William Shakespeare name attached, less than two weeks after Marlowe "died" at Deptford. Removing the Greene allusion means that the first mention of any connection between Shakespeare and the theater is a March 15, 1595 record of payment to him, Will Kemp, and Richard Burbage for a performance of the Lord Chamberlain's Men before the Queen in December 1594.

Richard III, written later than *Edward III*, c. 1592-3, advanced Tudor interests once again with its evil king, for whom the *Henry VI* plays had laid a solid foundation. Richard III was portrayed as a Marlovian over-reacher in the mold of Tamberlaine, Doctor Faustus, the Guise, and the Jew of Malta. The Tudor lineage descended from Henry VII, who overthrew King Richard and his House of York. *Richard III* famously demonizes Richard III, in reality an able administrator who cared about his subjects, and a loving husband and father who did not murder Henry VI or

the Duke of Clarence, or plot to kill his wife and marry his niece—as in the play; it is unknown who had the two princes in the Tower of London killed. The drama made Richard a monster, and Henry VII a hero for killing him in battle. In the theater, audience members are relieved when Queen Elizabeth's grandfather slays Richard III, who in reality was killed by a common soldier at Bosworth Field.

The Massacre at Paris, *Edward II*, *Edward III*, the *Henry VI* plays, and *Richard III* can all be viewed as having been written to advance State interests. The uncommon linguistic similarities to Marlowe's writing that Murphy has discovered, along with the evidence from Robert Greene, show Marlowe to be the mastermind behind them all.

It is no great leap to viewing Marlowe as the author of sonnets intended to advance Lord Burghley's private interests. Many scholars believe that Burghley commissioned Shakespeare Sonnets 1-17 to convince the Earl of Southampton to marry Burghley's granddaughter, Elizabeth de Vere. Burghley possessed known connections to Marlowe, both as a signer of a letter requesting Cambridge University to grant Marlowe his M. A. because contrary to rumors otherwise, the young man had done her Majesty good service, and because when Marlowe was remanded to Burghley from the Netherlands on charges of the capital crime of coining, he was quickly released, raising suspicion that he had been working abroad on Burghley's behalf. Marlowe overlapped in attendance at Cambridge with Southampton. Shakspere from Stratford had no known ties to Burghley or Southampton.

The same thread involving the use of skillful rhetoric to coax a reluctant individual to mate runs through Marlowe's *Hero and Leander*, Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis*, and these Sonnets.

Hero and Leander:

> Like untuned golden strings all women are,
> Which long time lie untouched will harshly jar.
> Vessels of brass oft handled brightly shine;
> What difference betwixt the richest mine
> And basest mold but use? for both, not used,
> Are of like worth. Then treasure is abused
> When misers keep it; being put to loan,
> In time it will return us two for one. (Sestiad I 229-36)

Venus and Adonis:

> Torches are made to light, jewels to wear,
> Dainties to taste, fresh beauty for the use…
> By the law of nature thou art bound to breed,
> That thine may live when thou thyself art dead;
> And so in spite of death thou dost survive,
> In that thy likeness still is left alive. (163-4, 171-4)

Sonnet 6:

> Then let not winter's ragged hand deface
> In thee thy summer, ere thou be distilled.
> Make sweet some vial, treasure thou some place
> With beauty's treasure, ere it be self-killed.
> That use is not forbidden usury
> Which happies those that pay the willing loan:
> That's for thyself to breed another thee,
> Or ten times happier, be it ten for one; (1-8)

Both *Venus and Adonis* and Sonnet 6 encourage someone to breed before he dies or winter defaces him. Both *Hero and Leander* and Sonnet 6 within a similar context mention "treasure," "loan," and "two for one" vs. "ten for one."

Richard II, on the other hand, ran counter to the interests of the State. In this history play written c. 1595, the English Bolingbroke invades from abroad and deposes an unpopular king who has surrounded himself with bad advisors. Queen Elizabeth told William Lambarde, Keeper of the Records at the Tower of London, that she knew King Richard II was intended to represent her. The deposition scene was omitted from the original printing and not restored until the fourth quarto in 1608 (the first quarto printed after the Queen's death). During Act I, King Richard banishes two men, Mowbray and Bolingbroke, who then speak eloquently about the pain of exile:

> The language I have learnt these forty years,
> My native English, now I must forgo,
> And now my tongue's use is to me no more
> Than an unstringèd viol or a harp,
> Or like a cunning instrument cased up,
> Or, being open, put into his hands
> That know no touch to tune the harmony. (I.iii.154-9)

Note that both the *Richard II* excerpt and the one from *Hero and Leander* quoted above employ clever stringed instrument analogies. We know of no reason why William Shakspere would have written against the Queen. On the other hand, if she had played a role in saving Marlowe's life, yet sent him into exile because she would not stand up for him vis-à-vis the Archbishop of Canterbury, Marlowe would have had ample cause to be bitter.

You are about to read a well reasoned argument, backed up by a multitude of linguistic evidence, that Marlowe, sometimes writing with Thomas Nashe, started off with the early anonymous plays *Caesar's Revenge* and *I* and *II Tamburlaine*, advanced to the anonymous *A Taming of a Shrew* and the history plays I have discussed, and later co-authored with Nashe *Romeo and Juliet* and *I Henry IV*.

The exploration of who wrote the works of Shakespeare in and of itself has much to teach us. As Anthony Kellet has written:

> The authorship debate is gold-dust. It is not only a perfect vehicle for analyzing and exploring personal content—in all sorts of works, by numerous authors, then relating them back to the Shakespeare canon, for what that might reveal about its author—but also a way to teach young people how to question preconceived ideas and dogma. It can teach them how to reason from basic principles. It teaches them not to blindly accept what they are presented as fact, to analyze data for themselves, and to debate their findings with others.[9]

Cynthia Morgan[10]
The Marlowe Studies

Notes

[1] List of contemporary English authors Nashe referred to by name: Thomas Achlow, Robert Armin, Roger Ascham, William Camden, Henry Chettle, Thomas Churchyard, Anthony Chute, Samuel Daniel, Thomas Deloney, William Elderton, Abraham Fraunce, George Gascoigne, Arthur Golding, Robert Greene, John Harington, Gabriel Harvey, Richard Harvey, Raphael Holinshed, John Lyly, Christopher Marlowe, Richard Mulcaster, Thomas Newton, George Peele, Countess of Pembroke Mary Sidney Herbert, Matthew Roydon, Sir Philip Sidney, Edmund Spenser, Richard Stanyhurst, Philip Stubbs, Dick Tarleton, George Turberville, William Warner, Dr. Thomas Watson, and poet Thomas Watson. Nashe is believed to have made an uncomplimentary reference to Thomas Kyd as "the kid in Aesop" in his preface to Robert Greene's *Menaphon*.

[2] "Good service" quote from the record of a letter from the Privy Council dated June 29, 1587, PRO *Privy Council Registers* PC2 / 14 / 381.

[3] David Riggs, *The World of Christopher Marlowe* (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 2004), 313.
[4] British Library, *Lansdowne*, MS.71, f.3.
[5] Robert Greene, *The Life and Complete Works in Prose and Verse of Robert Greene*, ed. Alexander B. Grosart (London and Aylesbury: Printed for private circulation only, 1881-86), vol. 7, 7.
[6] Grosart, vol. 6, 86.
[7] Grosart, vol. 8, 132.
[8] Grosart, vol. 12, 144.
[9] Anthony Kellet, "Praying We See the Light," March 22, 2013, http://marlowe-shakespeare.blogspot.ca/2013/03/praying-we-see-light-by-anthony-kellett_22.html. Accessed August 7, 2013.
[10] I'd like to thank Donna Murphy for her support of my theory about Marlowe as State play writer and her additions to that theme. What began as a Foreword by me turned into a collaboration between Donna and myself.

TABLE 1

PROPOSED DATES AND AUTHORSHIP FOR KNOWN PLAYS BY MARLOWE AND NASHE, AND OTHER PLAYS DISCUSSED IN THIS BOOK

Dates are for composition. In some cases, the extant versions of the plays are revisions.

Title	**Date**	**Authorship**
Caesar's Revenge	c. 1586-7	Marlowe
I Tamburlaine	c. 1587	Marlowe
II Tamburlaine	c. 1587	Marlowe
Doctor Faustus	c. 1587-88 (by March 1588)	Marlowe & Nashe
Dido, Queen of Carthage	c. 1588	Marlowe
The Massacre at Paris	c. 1589	Marlowe
The Contention (*Q1 2H6*)	c. 1590 (by June 1590)	Marlowe & Nashe
The Taming of a Shrew	c. 1590 (by June 1590)	Marlowe & Nashe
True Tragedy (*O1 3H6*)	c. 1590	Marlowe
Edward II	c. 1590	Marlowe
The Woman in the Moon	c. 1590	Lyly
Edward III	c. 1590-91 (by March 1591)	Marlowe
Soliman and Perseda	c. 1590-1	Kyd
The Jew of Malta	c. 1591	Marlowe & Nashe
Summer's Last Will and Testament	c. 1592	Nashe
Titus Andronicus	c. 1591-3	Marlowe & Peele
Thomas of Woodstock	c. 1593-4	Marlowe & Nashe
Romeo and Juliet	c. 1595-6	Marlowe & Nashe
I Henry IV	c. 1596-7	Marlowe & Nashe

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

A book discussing the overthrow of King Richard II enraged Queen Elizabeth. She doubted Dr. John Haywarde wrote it, even though he signed its dedication and his initials appeared on the title page, suspecting "some more mischievous author." The Queen told Sir Francis Bacon, her Counsel Learned, that she wanted Haywarde tortured to uncover the truth. Bacon replied, "Nay, Madam, he is a doctor; never rack his person, but rack his style; let him have pen, ink, and paper, and help of books, and be enjoined to continue the story where it breaketh off, and I will undertake, by collating the styles, to judge whether he were the author or no."[1]

Thomas Nashe claimed to be able to tell by "collation of stiles" that a letter flattering the author in Gabriel Harvey's *Foure Letters and Certain Sonnets* was penned by Harvey himself.[2] Robert Greene protested that even though some said the style "bewrayed" him as author of an anonymous book, *The Cobbler of Canterbury*, he did not write it. My modern-day linguistic analysis indicates that yes, he did.[3]

If Bacon and Nashe were confident that they could identify an Elizabethan author by his style, and others correctly fingered the author of *The Cobbler*, why has it been so difficult to assign authorship of various anonymous Elizabethan-era plays? They float around like jetsam on the ocean, drifting first toward one name, then another, finding nowhere a fixed harbor. And how to account for the miracle of Shakespeare: an actor with no university education possessing a bottomless vocabulary; knowledge of five languages; a love of setting plays abroad and an uncanny awareness of Italy, even though there's no evidence he ever stepped foot off the island of Britain; and excellence in writing styles ranging from the high poetry of kings, to the crude humor of servants?

The findings in this book support the theory that poet/playwright Christopher Marlowe, who had gotten himself into trouble with religious authorities and was about to be imprisoned, certainly tortured and probably executed, did not die at Deptford in 1593 but continued writing as "William Shakespeare." By exploring certain anonymous and Shakespeare plays, I provide linguistic evidence of a Marlowe-

Shakespeare continuum beginning with *Caesar's Revenge*, c. 1586-7; through *The Taming of a Shrew* and the first versions of *II* and *III Henry VI*, c. 1590; the first version of *Edward III* c. 1590-1; *Titus Andronicus* c. 1591-3; and the first version of *Thomas of Woodstock* c. 1593-4; then onward to *Romeo and Juliet* c. 1595-6; and *I Henry IV*, c. 1596-7. My research shows how Christopher Marlowe, living on after he supposedly died, appears to have "become" Shakespeare on a linguistic basis.

Central to an understanding of Marlowe and Shakespeare, however, is an understanding of Marlowe's friend Thomas Nashe. As early as 1588 with *Doctor Faustus*, I maintain that Marlowe and Nashe engaged in a writing partnership. In certain plays co-authored by the two of them, we hear Marlowe's adept plotting, his development of complex characters, and his superb flights of poetry. But we also hear Nashe, an endlessly inventive, comic author with an enormous vocabulary, creating servants, members of the lower class, clowns and miscreants of all stripes, encouraging us to laugh at their vices. Marlowe wrote the parts of kings, queens, noblemen, the lovers and the damned, taking theater-goers outward on journeys through English history and countries across the sea, and inward, compelling us to think about ourselves. In certain works they co-authored, Marlowe's was the voice of wisdom, and Nashe's, wit. In *Romeo and Juliet*, I will suggest that Marlowe wrote lines for the title pair, and Nashe, Mercutio and the servants. In *I Henry IV*, I will propose that Marlowe wrote the role of King Henry, while Nashe created Falstaff.

Challenges

Various challenges confront those who attempt to make authorship attributions. First, authors copied verbiage from each other: Christopher Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* plays (*1T* and *2T*) lifted wording from Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*; Robert Greene inserted "triple world," a phrase from Marlowe's *2T*, into *Alphonsus, King of Aragon*; George Peele's *The Old Wives Tale* contains two lines from Robert Greene's *Orlando Furioso*, while his *Edward I* shares variants of three lines with Marlowe's *Edward II*. In all of these cases, however, it is clear on the basis of style and other indicators that the duplicated author was not involved in the penning of the pieces that copied him.

Second, as authors matured, their style and vocabulary improved. Marlowe's *Edward II* (*E2*) is far superior to *Tamburlaine*; the plot and language of Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* are significantly more complex than in *Alphonsus, King of Aragon*; and "Shakespeare" changed markedly during the course of his career, as evidenced by the

differences between *III Henry VI* (*3H6*), *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and *King Lear.*

Third, Elizabethan-era playwrights sometimes worked together, as theater manager Philip Henslowe's Diary attests. Indeed, scholars have detected co-authorship in Shakespeare's *I Henry VI* (with Thomas Nashe), *Titus Andronicus* (with George Peele), *Pericles* (with George Wilkins), *Timon of Athens* (with Thomas Middleton), and *Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (both with John Fletcher).[4] Thus, the byline "Shakespeare" includes at least six authors. Any given play might be the work of more than one author, even when only one person received title-page credit. When authors worked together, one of them may have edited the work of another, muddling a strict division of authorship. Fourth, plays were sometimes revised; the printed version may not be the first version, and the changes may have been made by someone other than the original author, or by an original author whose style had altered over time.

We can increase the chances of success by becoming thoroughly familiar with the biography, style, and ability of the main playwrights who were active during the primary focus years of my research, 1586-1593: Robert Greene, Thomas Kyd, Thomas Lodge, John Lyly, Christopher Marlowe, Anthony Munday, Thomas Nashe, George Peele, William Shakespeare (a special case), and Robert Wilson. I have spent several years endeavoring to do this, and have published a series of articles about English Renaissance authorship attribution.[5]

We must also keep in mind the potential for deception. In a previous book, *The Mysterious Connection between Thomas Nashe, Thomas Dekker, and T. M.: An English Renaissance Deception?*, I presented linguistic evidence that after pamphleteer, poet, and playwright Thomas Nashe was banished from London by authorities, he reentered the city under the name "Thomas Dekker," and that after the Archbishop of Canterbury banned him from all future publishing, Nashe pretended to die and permanently assumed the new persona. I also presented linguistic evidence that in addition to writing under the name Thomas Dekker, Thomas Nashe published anonymously, wrote two pieces under the initials T. M. (work heretofore believed to be by Thomas Middleton), and one piece each under the names Adam Evesdropper, Jocundary Merry-brains, Jack Daw and William Fennor, making it appear that several authors could write in Nashe's seemingly distinctive style.

I view Nashe and Dekker as one and the same author, but have recorded "their" works separately on my List of Abbreviations to conform to convention and lessen confusion. In the body of my text, I refer to this author as Nashe, Dekker, and Nashe & Dekker.

We then choose methods to help us detect evidence of the hand of one or more playwrights in a given play. Authorship attribution studies prior to the second half of the 20th century centered around parallels—similarities of thought or expression between a work of known authorship and a work whose authorship was in question. Unfortunately, some of the parallels were common phrases, or untested to determine how uncommon they were; claimed on the basis of an exceedingly small known body of work by an author; or made due to commonplace similarities of thought. They also failed to take into account the possibility of parody. Some of the most skillful attributions based largely upon parallels have been quite convincing, such as Donald J. McGinn's finding that Thomas Nashe wrote the anonymous *An Almond for a Parrot*, and G. D. Monsarrat's argument that John Ford wrote *A Funeral Elegy* by "W. S."[6] Others, including the assignment of *The Famous Victories of Henry V* to Samuel Rowley, and *Edward III* to Robert Wilson, were founded upon sand. [7]

In the latter part of the 20th century, attention shifted to a "stylometric" examination of texts for linguistic preferences ("pish," "i'th," "'em"), contractions, and rare words within an author's canon. Researchers including Cyrus Hoy and David J. Lake made great progress with 17th century texts, helping to distinguish authorship of works in the Beaumont and Fletcher folios, and to pin down which plays were written by Thomas Middleton. The attribution of the 17th century *Pericles* to George Wilkins and Shakespeare was aided by the fact that both the play and the texts used to differentiate Wilkins were written close together in time. It was slower going with 16th century plays, however, which exhibit fewer uncommon linguistic preferences.

With the advent of computers, "computational stylistics" came to the fore, with machines counting function words ("and," "but," "in"), lexical words (conjunctions, pronouns, prepositions), or performing principal components analysis derived from applied linear algebra, to find the most frequent words and filter out the others. The results of such studies are, on the whole, unconvincing. Sir Brian Vickers, a respected authority in the field of authorship attribution who appreciates studies that pay attention to language and directly engage with the text, wrote, "Two independent surveys [of computer-assisted attribution studies] by leading practitioners have made the same diagnosis—that the discipline is in a permanent state of confusion."[8]

Stylometric studies must be based on assumptions, including the assumption that an author wrote all the words in the works that are employed to establish his baseline vocabulary and linguistic preferences, and that, for the purposes of such baselines, works written several years