

Appendix VI

*Ben Jonson's Tribute to Shakespeare**

First published in the First Folio edition.

To draw no enuy (Shakespeare) on thy name,
Am I thus ample to thy Booke, and Fame:
While I confesse thy writings to be such,
As neither *Man*, nor *Muse*, can praise too much.
'Tis true, and all mens suffrage. But these wayes
Were not the paths I meant vnto thy praise:
For seeliest Ignorance on these may light,
Which, when it sounds at best, but eccho's right;
Or blinde Affection, which doth ne're aduance
The truth, but gropes, and vrgeth all by chance;
Or crafty Malice, might pretend this praise,
And thinke to ruine, where it seem'd to raise.
These are, as some infamous Baud, or Whore,
Should praise a Matron. What could hurt her more?
But thou art prooffe against them, and indeed
Aboue th'ill fortune of them, or the need.
I, therefore will begin. Soule of the Age!
The applause! delight! the wonder of our Stage!
My *Shakespeare*, rise; I will not lodge thee by
Chaucer, or *Spenser*, or bid *Beaumont* lye

* Herford, C. H. and Percy and Evelyn Simpson, ed. *The Poems: The Prose Works*, Vol. 8, of *Ben Jonson*. Oxford, 1947.

A little further, to make thee a roome:
Thou art a Monument, without a tombe,
And art aliue still, while thy Booke doth liue,
And we haue wits to read, and praise to giue.
That I not mixe thee so, my braine excuses;
I meane with great, but disproportion'd *Muses*:
For, if I thought my iudgement were of yeeres,
I should commit thee surely with thy peeres,
And tell, how farre thou didst our *Lily* out-shine,
Or sporting *Kid*, or *Marlowes* mighty line.
And though thou hadst small *Latine*, and lesse *Greeke*,
From thence to honour thee, I would not seeke
For names; but call forth thund'ring *Aeschilus*,
Euripides, and *Sophocles* to vs,
Paccuius, *Accius*, him of *Cordoua* dead,
To life againe, to heare thy Buskin tread,
And shake a Stage: Or, when thy Sockes were on,
Leaue thee alone, for the comparison
Of all, that insolent *Greece*, or haughtie *Rome*
Sent forth, or since did from their ashes come.
Triumph, my *Britaine*, thou hast one to showe,
To whom all Scenes of *Europe* homage owe.
He was not of an age, but for all time!
And all the *Muses* still were in their prime,
When Like *Apollo* he came forth to warme
Our eares, or like a *Mercury* to charme!
Nature her selfe was proud of his designes,
And ioy'd to weare the dressing of his lines!
Which were so richly spun, and wouen so fit,
As, since, she will vouchsafe no other Wit.
The merry *Greeke*, tart *Aristophanes*,
Neat *Terence*, witty *Plautus*, now not please;
But antiquated, and deserted lye
As they were not of Natures family.
Yet must I not giue Nature all: Thy Art,
My gentle *Shakespeare*, must enioy a part.
For though the *Poets* matter, Nature be,
His Art doth giue the fashion. And, that he,
Who casts to write a liuing line, must sweat,
(Such as thine are) and strike the second heat

Vpon the *Muses* anuile: turne the same,
 (And himselfe with it) that he thinkes to frame;
 Or for the lawrell, he may gaine a scorne,
 For a good *Poet's* made, as well as borne.
 And such wert thou. Looke how the fathers face
 Liues in his issue, euen so, the race
 Of *Shakespeares* minde, and manners brightly shines
 In his well torned, and true-filed lines:
 In each of which, he seemes to shake a Lance,
 As brandish't at the eyes of Ignorance.
 Sweet Swan of *Auon!* what a sight it were
 To see thee in our waters yet appeare,
 And make those flights vpon the banks of *Thames*,
 That so did take *Eliza*, and our *James!*
 But stay, I see thee in the *Hemisphere*
 Aduanc'd, and made a Constellation there!
 Shine forth, thou Starre of *Poets*, and with rage,
 Or influence, chide, or cheere the drooping Stage;
 Which, since thy flight from hence, hath mourn'd like night,
 And despaire day, but for thy Volumes light.

Ben: Ionson

Appendix VII

*Tamburlaine's Defiance of Mohammed**

From *Tamburlaine, Part II, Act 5, Scene 1.*

Now *Casane*, wher's the Turkish *Alcaron*,
 And all the heapes of superstitious bookes,
 Found in the Temples of that *Mahomet*,
 Whom I haue thought a God? they shal be burnt.

.....
 In vaine I see men worship *Mahomet*.
 My sword hath sent millions of Turks to hell,
 Slew all his Priests, his kinsmen, and his friends,
 And yet I liue vntoucht by *Mahomet*:
 From whom the thunder and the lightning breaks,
 Whose Scourge I am, and him will I obey
 So *Casane*, fling them in the fire.

.....
 Now *Mahomet*, if thou haue any power,
 Come downe thy selfe and worke a myracle,
 Thou art not woorthy to be worshipped,
 That suffers flames of fire to burne the writ
 Wherein the sum of thy religion rests.
 Why send'st thou not a furious whyrlwind downe,
 To blow thy *Alcaron* vp to thy throne,
 Where men report, thou sitt'st by God himselfe,
 Or vengeance on the head of *Tamburlain*,

* Brooke, C. F., ed. *The Works of Christopher Marlowe*. London, 1910; p. 128-129.

That shakes his sword against thy majesty,
And spurns the Abstracts of thy foolish lawes.
Wel souldiers, *Mahomet* remains in hell,
He cannot heare the voice of *Tamburlain*,
Seeke out another Godhead to adore,
The God that sits in heauen, if any God,
For he is God alone, and none but he.

Appendix VIII

The Theatre of God's Judgements

By Thomas Beard, published 1597.

Not inferior to any of the former in Atheism and Impiety, and equal to all in manner of punishment, was one of our own nation, of fresh and late memory called Marlowe, by profession a scholar, brought up from his youth in the University of Cambridge, but by practice a playwright and a Poet of scurrility, who, by giving too large a swing to his own wit, and suffering his lust to have the full reins, fell (not without just desert) to that outrage and extremity, that he denied God and His son Christ, and not only in word blasphemed against the Trinity, but also (as it is credibly reported) wrote books against it, affirming our Saviour to be but a deceiver, and Moses to be but a conjurer and seducer of the people, and the Holy Bible to be but vain and idle stories and all religion but a device of policy.

But see what a hook the Lord put in the nostrils of this barking dog. It so fell out, that in London streets as he purposed to stab one whom he sought a grudge unto with his dagger, the other party, perceiving so, avoided the stroke, that withal catching hold of his wrist, he stabbed his own dagger into his head, in such sort, that notwithstanding all the means of surgery that could be wrought, he shortly after died thereof. The manner of his death being so terrible (for he even cursed and blasphemed to his last gasp, and together with his

breath an oath flew out of his mouth) that it was not only a manifest sign of God's judgement, but also an horrible and fearful terror to all that beheld him.

But herein did the justice of God most notably appear, in that he compelled his own hand which had written those blasphemies to be the instrument to punish him, and that in his brain, which had devised the same. I would to God (and I pray it from my heart) that all atheists in this realm, and in all the world beside, would, by the remembrance and consideration of this example, either forsake their horrible impiety, or that they might in like manner come to destruction; and so that abominable sin which so flourished among men of greatest name, might either be quite extinguished and rooted out, or at least smothered and kept under, that it durst not show its head any more in the world's eye.

Appendix IX

Authenticity of Coroner's Report Disputed by Shakespearean Scholars

A.

"The Coroner's inquest was a perfunctory matter . . . his story can not be accepted as a faithful account of what actually transpired . . . One who knows the anatomy and pathology of the human brain knows that it is almost impossible for death to follow immediately upon the infliction of such a wound (Marlowe's) . . . The Coroner's 'grim tale' of Marlowe's violent and untimely end, therefore, is not a true account of what happened . . . the Coroner was influenced by certain powers not to inquire too curiously into the violent death of an outcast Ismael." *

* *The Assassination of Christopher Marlowe*, by Samuel A. Tannenbaum (Hamden, Shoe String Press, 1962; pp. 41-43).

B.

"The discovery of the documents relating to Marlowe's death raises almost as many questions as it answers . . . Doubts persistently arise about (it) . . . The fact that Marlowe was at this time held by the Privy Council . . . makes matters still more suspicious. . . . One wonders whether he may not have been killed deliberately. . . . Frizer probably owed his easy escape to the Walsinghams for whom he was transacting business the very next day (i.e., after his pardon by Queen Elizabeth on the charge of murder) . . . There is something queer about the whole episode." *

* *The Tragical History of Christopher Marlowe*, by John Bakeless (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1942, Vol. I; pp. 158-182).

C.

"It is surprising that the references to the event (i.e., Marlowe's murder) in the years immediately following should have been so scanty and so curiously vague or misleading. Mistakes began on the very day of the Inquest . . . Nor is there any indication in the churchyard of the place of the grave . . . Gabriel Harvey thought Marlowe died of the plague in 1593! In his 'Gorgon or the Wonderful Year'—September 18, 1595—the line, 'the great disease sternly struck home the stroke' must surely imply Marlowe's death from the plague! The more Harvey's references are considered the more enigmatic they become." *

* *Christopher Marlowe*, by Frederick S. Boas (Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1940; pp. 277-279).

Appendix X

*The Similarities of Shakespeare and Marlowe**

"A reading of Marlowe's known works shows the following characteristics found in Shakespeare:

1. Each used poetic blank verse. Although the verse changes somewhat in Shakespeare's works, it would not be difficult for a poet of Marlowe's versatility to make such change. Note the difference between his *Tamburlaine the Great* and *Edward the Second*.
2. Each wrote concerning the authority and pageantry of kings and princes.
3. Throughout the two works scholars are often used as characters in the plays.
4. Much of the same vocabulary and beautiful imagery appear in the plays of each.
5. Both dote on pomp and ceremony.
6. The same sources—Ovid and Holinshed's *Chronicles*—are used by each.
7. The complicated plots and counterplots appear in both works. Compare *Edward the Second* with the later historical dramas of Shakespeare.
8. Marlowe's characterization was often weak. The same failure is found in Shakespeare's early plays.
9. Much of the writing of each is uninteresting, but is eternally saved by the most beautiful poetic passages in the English language.

* *The Laurel Bough*, by Sherwood E. Silliman (New York, 1956, privately printed; pp. 12-13. By permission). *The Laurel Bough* is a fanciful play based on the theme that it was Audrey Walsingham, the wife of Thomas Walsingham, who was responsible for saving the life of Marlowe.

This and other circumstances lead to the theory that no two human minds could have such striking similarities. Begin with *Dido* and continue to *The Tempest* and you see one mind, one genius, developing from a youthful translator of the *Aeneid* to the mature creator of a world of perfect imagery."