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This thesis is an attempt to examine Christopher Marlowe's *Tragical History of Dr. Faustus* from the point of view of Elizabethan popular theology. The first chapter deals with the problem of knowledge, the second, with witchcraft, and the third, with the question of sin and damnation. Each of these three topics, discussed frequently in Elizabethan theological treatises intended for popular use, represents a significant element in the play. The approach has been to ascertain what ideas found in Elizabethan popular theology are expressed in *Dr. Faustus*, and to suggest what these ideas indicate about possible meanings of passages involved.
CHAPTER I

Learning

The proper interpretation of learning as one of the important concepts in Christopher Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus* has long been a problem to scholars and critics. An accurate understanding of the significance of learning in the play is difficult for the modern reader because attitudes toward knowledge and science have changed greatly since the sixteenth century. For this reason, we sometimes unconsciously superimpose on the play ideas and assumptions which would not have occurred to the Elizabethan. The problem is especially difficult because *Dr. Faustus* was written during the Renaissance, a time when attitudes toward learning and science were changing. Furthermore, it was written by a man noted for advanced ideas and contempt for the conventional beliefs of his day. The possible interpretations are many -- is Faustus the symbol of a spirit of inquiry, breaking free of medieval restrictions? Is he a symbol of Marlowe's personal revolt against his time? Or is he a symbol of evil, justly punished? And punished because of his learning? Because his learning was not sufficient? Or because he used it sinfully?

In this chapter, an attempt will be made to evaluate the play in the light of the evidence of what was general
and acceptable belief about knowledge in Marlowe's day as revealed in popular theology, and to suggest what were probably some attitudes of Marlowe's audience toward Dr. Faustus in relation to learning.

Fundamentally, the Elizabethans had great reverence and appreciation for learning. They were aware of its value to society as well as of the satisfaction it afforded the individual. They recognized the advantages of a quiet and withdrawn occupation, free from the bustle and temptations of the ordinary world. The labor of scholarship was seen as superior to other work in that it was more interesting and varied, and instead of requiring recreation, was itself a recreation.

The fruits of knowledge were enough to make a man who enjoyed them consider worldly pleasures as bestial, and the estate of an ignorant rich man mean. The world of books and nature was always open for investigation by the man of learning. Bishop Joseph Hall gives a particularly exuberant expression of pleasure in this abundance of opportunity in an epistle to Matthew Melward:

To find wit in Poetry, in Philosophy Profoundness, in Mathematicks acuteness, in History wonder of events, in Oratory sweet eloquence, in Divinity supernatural light and holy devotion; as so many rich metals, in the proper mynes, whom would it not ravish with delight?

Expression of similar joy occurs in Marlowe's play, as Faustus begins his studies:
Later, when Faustus gives himself over to unholy magic, he ironically uses the same figure:

*Tis Magicke, Magicke that hath ravisht mee.* *(1. 34)*

The ability to communicate with men and minds of ages past was held a great privilege. With the aid of his books, a man could communicate in one small room with all the glorious martyrs, philosophers, and fathers of the church.*

It was especially wonderful that such a marvelous feat could be accomplished within the realm of safe and virtuous action, without the aid of offensive necromancy.* Evidently this privilege of his discipline did not suffice for Faustus, for from his holy books, he turned to the forbidden, saying:

> These Metaphisickes of Magicians
> And Negromantike bookes are heavenly:
> Lines, circles, scenes, letters and characters:
> I, these are those that Faustus most desires.
> Oh, what a world of profit and delight,
> Of power, of honor, of omnipotence
> Is promised to the studious Artizan? *(11. 77-83)*

The righteous advantages of the scholarly life were neither sought nor appreciated by Faustus.

Knowledge was considered to be divine, from God, and therefore the arts and sciences were legitimate and worthwhile pursuits. An example of this defense of learning is to be found in the translator's preface to the 1575 edition of Cornelius Agrippa's treatise *Of the Vanitie and Uncertaintie of Arts and Sciences*. Agrippa's work is a catalogue of abuses of learning, science, medicine, necromancy, and many
related arts, but the English translator felt it necessary to modify the indictment:

Sapience proceedeth of perfect Reason, joyned with learning and knowledge, which if it be true, then consequently it followeth, that artes and sciences are good. And although this author sharply inveyeth agaynst them (which to the rude multitude for that cause, may seem naught and noysome) yet his intent is not to deface the worthiness of arts and sciences, but to reprove and detect their evil uses, and declare the excellence of his wit in disproving them, for a shewe of learning: which evil uses, doubtlesse have crept in through the perverse doing of men.

Agrippa himself, however, asserts a scepticism with regard to learning which is not always completely contradicted by the Elizabethans, and which was an important element in their attitude toward learning, notwithstanding their respect for it. This scepticism is partly based on the belief that though sciences could reveal truth about nature, they had nothing to reveal about God:

All sciences be as well naught as good, and that they bring to us, above the limite of Humanitie, noe other blessing of the Dietie, but that perchance, which the auncient serpent promised to our first parents, saying, "Ye shall be as Gods, and shall know good and yll." Such ideas justified a lack of interest in learning, because knowledge of God was necessary for the salvation of the soul, an end to which the knowledge of nature had nothing to contribute.

There was even some scepticism about the value of sciences for revealing truth about nature. Agrippa, for
instance, says: "The knowledge of all Sciences, is so
difficulte (I will not say impossible) that all man's life
will faile, before one small jote of learning may per-
fectly be found out." George Gascoigne reflects the same
idea in his Drome of Domesday:

Let wyse men search narrowly, let them heedely
consider the height of the heavens, the breadth
of the yearth, and the depth of the Sea, let
them argue and dispute every one of this, let
them handle them all over, and let them alwayes
eyther learne or teach, and in so doing what
shall they fynde out of this beside experience
which sayed: I inclyned my hart to know learning,
& prudence, error & foolishnesse, and I percey-
ved that all was labor & affliction of the spyrite.
For as much as in great wisedome and knowledge
there is great disdayne, and he which increaseth
knowledge increaseth also payne & travayle, for
although whilist that he searcheth it out, he
must sweat many tymes, and watch many nightes
with sweat and labor, yet is there scarcely
anything so vyle, or any thing so easy, that
man can fully and thorowly understand it, nor
that he can clearly comprehend it, unless
perchance that is that nothing is perfectly
knowne.

Perhaps the most thorough expositon of this point of
view is Sir Fulke Greville's poem, "Of Human Learning."
Though the treatise was not intended as a widely popular
work, it does contain a conscientiously reasoned statement
of the sceptical outlook. Greville equates knowledge with
the knowledge of good and evil which was gained by origi-
nal sin. He sees all knowledge, therefore, as knowledge
of evil. Since it reflects God and his handiwork, it is
infinite; so our desire for it is a desire for the infinite,
that is, a desire to be as God, which is flagrant pride and
presumption. He says:

This Knowledge is the same forbidden tree,
Which man lusts after to be made his Maker;
For Knowledge is of Power's eternity,
And perfect Glory, the true image-taker;
So as what doth the infinite containe,
Must be as infinite as it againe.12

We are reminded here of the words of Faustus as he contemplates the knowledge and power offered through magic:

A sound Magician is a mighty god:
Here Faustus trio thy braines to gaine a doctic.

(ll. 90-91)

What leads Grevillo to scepticism is the idea that if knowledge is evil, and our desire for it evil, then our faculties for comprehending it are likewise corrupt, and so we are unable truly to understand anything. His treatise illustrates how our senses, imagination, memory, and understanding are imperfect and untrustworthy, and how the various disciplines of learning, based on our corrupt abilities, are equally imperfect:

For if Man's wisedomes, lawes, arts, legends, schooles,
Be built upon the knowledge of the evil;
And if these trophies be the onely tooles,
Which doe maintaine the kingdom of the divell;
If all these Babels had the curse of tongues,
So as confusion still to them belongs:

Then can these moulds never containe their Maker,
Nor those wise forms and different being show,
Which figure in His works, truth, wisedome, nature;
The onely object for the soule to know;
These Arts, moulds, workes can but expresso the same,
Whence by man's follie, his fall did beginne.13

Conversely, the only legitimate intellectual pursuit for man was what God had given, the Holy Scriptures.
Through them, man could come to an understanding of God, and be raised by Him to the point of being able to transcend his fallen state, and so be capable of true knowledge and understanding. Greville says that mankind

... in the first perfection of creation
Freely resign'd the state of being good,
To know the evil, where it found privation;
And lost her being, ere she understood
Depth of this fall, paine of regeneration:
"By which she yet must raise herselfe again
"Ere she can judge ALL OTHER KNOWLEDGE Vaine."

Another basis for the sceptical point of view lies in
Elizabethan beliefs about the nature of the mind and man's capacity to learn. It was recognized, as is dramatized vividly by Dr. Faustus himself, that the desire of the mind for knowledge was insatiable. Yet it was also held that man's mind was finite, and unable to comprehend all things. Even Faustus seems aware of this limitation, as, when speaking of the power potential to a magician, he says:

All things that move between the quiet poles
Shall be at my command, Emperours and Kings
Are but obeyd in their severall provinces;
Nor can they raise the winds, or rend the cloudes;
But his dominion that exceeds in this
Stretcheth as farre as doth the minde of man. (11. 84-89)

He is thinking, however, of the limit of his desire and imagination, not of his power to comprehend. Mephistophilis sees the other side when he promises to give Faustus "more than thou hast wit to aske" (1. 479).

Man was limited not only by his own finite mind, however, but also by what God had made available for him to know. There was no clear doctrine as to whether man was
capable of understanding that which was not available to him. Fulke Greville, the sceptic, explains that the mind of man and knowledge each stretch away infinitely, but in opposite directions:

The Mind of Man is this world's true dimension;  
And Knowledge is the measure of the minde;  
And as the minde, in her vaste comprehension, 
Contains more worlds than all the world can finde: 
So knowledge doth it selfe farre more extend, 
Than all the minds of men can comprehend.

A climbing height it is without a head, 
Depth without bottome, way without an end;  
A circle with no line invironed; 
Not comprehended, all it comprehends;  
Worth infinite, yet satisfies no minde 
Till it that infinite of the God-head finde.16

What was important for most Elizabethans, apparently, was to keep one's infinite desire for knowledge from carrying one into what was forbidden. The evil here lay not so much in the forbidden knowledge itself as in the fact that to obtain it, man had to sin. The mistake of Faustus was in following his desire for knowledge to the point of using unlawful means to satisfy it.

Beliefs about the limitations of knowledge led the pious and orthodox Elizabethan to a somewhat utilitarian viewpoint. It was held that God had made available the knowledge necessary for salvation as well as a certain amount of information about the natural world.17 Everything else, however, was in the realm of forbidden knowledge and eternal secret, about which it was prudent only to wonder. So the maxim governing the average person's
approach to learning wast that one learn first what was necessary for salvation, secondly what one's occupation required, and after that, what was convenient and near at hand. Beyond this, investigation and speculation were unwarranted prying into the secrets of the Almighty, and labelled "curiosity." The epilogue to 

Dr. Faustus gives a warning in this vein, cautioning the wise:

Onely to wonder at unlawful things, Whose deepeness doth intise such forward wits To practise more than heavenly power permits. (I. 1453-5)

Curiosity about things which did not concern one directly was not only reprehensible but dangerous. Alexander Barclay, in his translation of Sebastian Brandt's Ship of Fools, speaks of the "Over Great and Chargeable Curiosity of Men," saying:

That man that taketh upon his backe alone The hevy weght of the large fyrmament Or any burdyne which maketh hym to groane Which to sustayne his strength is ympotent No morvayle is if he fall incontynten And that when he lowe on the grounde doth lye He oft repentyth his purpose and folly We have in storyes many examples great Showynge the lewde ande of this curvysyte. 19

The point was that each man had enough business of his own to worry about, and that speculation about things which had no bearing upon this business was idle and foolish. Knowledge was not so much valued as abstract truth as for its practical benefits, ideally, holy, or, as in the case of Dr. Faustus, unholy. There were several reasons for which a man might affect to desire knowledge, some of which
were admirable, and some sinful. It was considered vanity to desire to know in order to gain a wide reputation. It was baseness to desire knowledge to sell it. It was wisdom to want knowledge for edification in spiritual matters. It was charity to want knowledge in order to edify others. And it was foolish curiosity to want to know only that one might know.20

The desire for knowledge of distant and unknown lands was especially singled out for ridicule. Barclay says of a certain fool:

He covetyth to know, and comprys in his mynde
Every regyon and every sundry place
Which ar not knowen to any of mankynde
And never shall be without a specyall grace
Yet such folys take pleasour and solace
The length and brede of the worlde to mesure
In vayle besynes, takynge great charge and cure ... 21

Perhaps such interest in distant lands, combined with an interest in their riches, is echoed in the words of Faustus as he makes plans for his spirits:

Ile have them flye to India for gold,
Ransacke the Ocean for orient pearle,
And search all corners of the new found world
For pleasant fruite and princely delicatess ... (11.110-113)

And again he boasts:

Ile ... make a bridge through the mooving ayre,
To pass the Ocean with a band of men,
Ile joyne the hills that binde the Affricke shore,
And make that land continent to Spaine. (11.343-344)

One of the more serious dangers of curiosity was the possibility of coming to wrong conclusions about the truths
of religion by overspeculation, and thus endangering the soul. La Prinsudaye says in his French Academy:

If men had from the beginning contained themselves within the limits of divine precepts, it is certain they would not so lightlie have abandoned the simplicitie and first modestie of their nature, to feede their mindes with a vaine curiositie and searching out of things supernaturall and incomprehensible to the sense and understanding of men. Which things the more they thought to know, the greater occasion of doubting they found in them.

Such overspeculation was blamed also for the abundance of theological controversy and argument of the day, for it was believed that when men began to think on things too difficult for them that they became confused, and began to differ from one another in their opinions, and from the truth. Curiosity about natural causes and science could also result in spiritual impoverishment, for it was thought that often those who inquired too curiously into the causes of natural things began soon to look for other beginnings than God, turning to atheism. Perhaps these dangers are what Cornelius Agrippa has in mind when he says:

It is an auncient, and almoste an agreeable and common opinion, of al the Philosophers, that every science dothe bring unto men some divinity . . . Notwithstanding I, being persuaded with other kine of reasons, am of opinion, that there can chaunce to the life & salvation of our soules nothing more hurtful and pestilent than these artes and sciences.

The career of Faustus illustrates the results of such curiosity and overspeculation about religious matters.
Throughout the play, he justifies himself by arguments about theology which are far from being the acceptable beliefs of his day. His logic reduces theology to fatalism—"What doctrine call you this, Che sera, sera, / What will be shall be? Divinitie, adieu" (ll. 75-76). His arrogance dispenses with hell as a fable, he "confounds hell in Elizium."

Another danger of curiosity, and the most obvious one in the case of Dr. Faustus, was the fact that it did lead men to try to gain unlawful knowledge by forbidden means, the most convenient of which was magic. This was apparently a familiar idea or pattern of behavior to the Elizabethans, a point at which learning and curiosity were linked with magic, and perhaps carried almost inevitably its suspicion. The Elizabethan attitude toward magic was a fairly complex one, for there were those who believed in "white magic," which supposedly could be practised without offense to God. Others were more reactionary about witchcraft, and considered white magic no better than black magic, and the more speculative branches of learning no better than either. King James in his Daemonology speaks of the way in which learned men were attracted to magic:

The learned have their curiosity wakened uppe: and fedde by that which I call his the Devil's school; . . . For divers men having attained to a great perfection in learning & yet remaining overbare (alas) of the spirit of regeneration and fruite thereof: finding all natureall things common, aswell to the stupide pedants as unto them, they assaile to vendicate unto them a greater name, by not onlie knowing the course
of things heavenly, but likewise to climb to
the knowledge of things to come thereby. Which,
at the first face appearing lawfull unto them,
in respect the ground thereof seemeth to proceed
of naturall causes onlie: they are so allured
thereby, that finding their practise to prove
true in sundry things, they studie to know the
cause thereof: and so mounting from degree to
degree, upon the slipperie and uncertalne scale
of curiousitie; they are at last entised, that
where lawfull artes or sciences failes, to
satisfie their restles mindes, even to seeks to
that black and unlawfull science of Magie.
Where, finding at the first, that such divers
formes of circles and conjurations rightly joyned
thereunto, will raise such divers formes of
spirites, to resolve them of their doubts; and
attributing the doing thereof, to the power
inseparablie tyed, or inherent in the circles:
and manie words of God, confusedlie wrapped in;
they blindlie glorie of themselves, as if they
had by their quicknes of ingine, made a conquest
of Plutos dominion, and were become Emperours
over the Stygian habaticles. Where, in the mean
time (miserable wretches) they are become in
verio deede, bond-slaves to their mortall enemie:
and their knowledge, for all that they presume
thereof, is nothing increased, except in knowing
evill, and the horrors of Hell for punishment
thereof, as Adams was by the eating of the
forbidden tree."°

This sequence is a close parallel to the career of
Faustus, and contains ideas almost identical with certain
lines in the play. Faustus is caught up with the power of
circles and conjurations:

Lines, circles, oceanes, letters and characters:
I, these are those that Faustus most desires. (ll. 79-80)

Or again, he vaunts circles, and "manie words of God,
confusedlie wrapped in:"

Within this circle is Jehovahs name
Forward and backward anagrammatiz"d
The breviated names of holy Saints,
Figures of every adjunct to the heavens,
And characters of signes and erring starres,
By which the spirits are inforst to rise. (ll. 242-247)
Faustus thinks the power inherent in the formulas, and
glories in his own ability; for after Mephistophilis appears,
he says:

I see therae vertue in my heavenly words,
Who would not be proficient in this art?
How pliant is this Mephestophilis?
Full of obedience and humilitie,
Such is the force of Magicke and my spels.
No Faustus, thou art Conjurer laureate
That can command great Mephestophilis. (ll. 262-268)

And it is curiosity and disillusionment with the lawful
sciences which forms the pattern of Faustus’s destruction,
leading him to deal in magic.

The Elizabethan attitude of moderation and restraint
toward learning was characteristic of orthodox belief in the
insignificance of man in the eyes of God, and in the humility
necessary for salvation. Bishop Hall gives a short but
meaningful summation of the whole question, significant
especially in connection with Dr. Faustus, whose "waxed
wings did mount above his reach, / And melting heavens
conspirde his overthrow." It is a good illustration of
pious Elizabethan attitude: "I had rather confess my igno-
rance, than falsely profess knowledge. It is no shame, not to
know all things, but it is a just shame, to over-reach in
any thing."27 The "over-reacher" image as applied to
learning occurs frequently in Elizabethan popular theology.
The figure of aspiring knowledge is appropriate to an almost
physical conception of God and heaven as the source of truth
and light. And the figure of the fall is appropriate to a
similar conception of pride, doomed to destruction, aspiring
in the same direction. The pattern of knowledge rising up, but to an eventual downfall, is quite common: "Learning in spite of fate will mount aloft;"28 "It is better therefore and more profitable to be Idiotes and know nothing, to believe by Faith and Charite, and to become next unto God, than beyng lofty and proude through the subtilties of sciences to fall into the possession of the Serpent."29 Thomas Nashe, in 1593, goes so far as to label the image, perhaps following Marlowe:

Philosophie's chiefe fulnesse, wisedoms adopted Father next unto Salomon, unsatiable Arte-searching Aristotle, that in the rounde compendiate bladder of thy brayne conglobedst these three great bodies (Heaven, Earth, and the wide worlde of Waters), thyne Icarian-soaring comprehencion, tossed and turmoyled but about the bounds and beginning of Nerus, in Nerus drownd it selfe, 30 being too sely and feeble to plunge thorow it.

For the pious Elizabethan, knowledge was from and of God, and the only real knowledge was knowledge of God. The purpose of knowledge was to increase goodness and love of God, an increase which true knowledge of God was bound to produce. By such a standard, many who professed great knowledge were actually to be counted ignorant, because they showed no love of God.31 This belief was the basis of the important distinction between knowledge and wisdom. Knowledge was mere learning, while wisdom was right use of learning. Knowledge was what could be acquired in books and schools by evil men as well as good; wisdom was what was
necessary to salvation. A man could be wise in things of the world, and still fail to have spiritual wisdom. Hugh Latimer says on this topic:

I speak not of worldly wysedome, for therin he /a "good fellow"/ is so wyse, yea, he is so wyse, that wyse men marvayle, hove he come truly by the tenth part of that he hath. But in wisdome which consistoth in rebus die, In rebus falutis, in godlye matters and apperaynyng to our salvacion, in this wysdome he is as blynd as a beatel.32

Conversely, a man could be ignorant of worldly wisdom, and yet have the gift of spiritual wisdom:

The deepest philosopher that ever was (saving the reverence of the schooles) is but an ignorant sot, to the simplest Christian. For the weakest Christian may, by plaine information, see somewhat into the greatest mysteries of Nature, because he hath the eye of Reason common with the best: but the best Philosopher, by all the demonstration in the world, can conceive nothing of the mysteries of godliness, because he utterly wants the eye of faith. Though my insight into matters of the world be so shallow, that my simplicity moveth pitie, or maketh sport unto others, it shall be my contentment and happinesse, that I see further into better matters. That which I see not, is worthless, and deserveth little better than contempt: that which I see, is unspeakable, inestimable, for comfort, for glory.33

Often the distinction between true and false wisdom was drawn sharply, not only between the secular and the holy, but specifically between scholarly learning and religious learning. Henry Bullinger says:

True faith before all things bringeth with it true knowledge, and maketh us wise indeed. For by faith we know God, and judge aright of the judgments and works of God, of virtues and vices. The wisdom that it bringeth with it is
without doubt the true wisdom. Many men hope
that they can attain to true wisdom by the
study of philosophy: but they are deceived as
far as heaven is broad. For philosophy doth
falsely judge and faultily teach many things
touching God, the works of God, the chief
goodness, the end of good and evil, and touch-
ing things to be desired and eschewed. But
the very same things are rightly and truly
taught in the word of God, and understood and
perceived by faith.  

Such comparisons are usually drawn to the disadvantage
of the scholars and philosophers, perhaps reflecting or
at least justifying a popular attitude of anti-intellect-
ualism. When secular learning is thus placed at the other
end of the scale from divine wisdom, it cannot but suffer.
A typical example of such treatment is found in George
Gascoigne's *Droome of Doomesday*:

The earnest desire of wysdome shall guid a
man to the perpetuall kyngedome. But what
wysdome? Not the wysdome of this world.
Not the wysdome of Phylosophers, Poets, or
Rethorycians. For (by the testymony of the
Apostle) God esteemeth the *wysdome of this
worlde* for meere folly. And Saint Hierome,
that holy Father, doth call Aristotle (who
was Prince of Philosophers) a father of
fooles or Prince of ignoraunce. But the
wordes before rehearced are ment by the
wysdome and perfect knowldge which is
conteyned in holy scriptures.

From the religious point of view, philosophy had
nothing to add to knowledge, and was even capable of false
teachings when it lacked proper instruction. But the idea
that God was above all human knowledge, and essential to
true understanding and true felicity, was present even in
works primarily oriented toward philosophy rather than
religion. La Primaundeye, for instance, says:

Philosophy cannot sufficiently be praised, seeing that whosoever obeith her may passe his daies without tediousnes. For the true scope thereof is to seek to glorifie God in his wonderfull workes, and to teach a man how to live well, and to helpe his neighbor. Which perfection cannot be attained unto without a special and heavenly grace, and that after the knowledge of the fountaine from whence all goodness cometh. And this hath bene the cause, as I thinke, why so many great Philosophers, knowing certeinly wherein the true and perfect felicity of man living consisted manely, in the tranquillity of the soule, and labouring continually to root out, or at least to weaken all the perturbations thereof, but the uprightness of reason, and to engrafe vertue therin, yet could never perfectly enjoy this soveraigne good, which they so much desired, because they were ignorant of the fountaine from whence it proceeded, which is, the grace and mercy of our God in his beloved son.

The idea was carried so far, that it was sometimes said that because philosophers were so wise in their own conceit, knowledge of higher and truly important things was deliberately withheld from them. If this belief was not widely accepted, the idea that those who gave themselves to the pursuit of learning were in danger of damnation was a familiar one:

What is the prayse, and the blessedness of wise men and Philosophers, of whom all Scholes do ring and sound with their glorie, whose soules Hell doth beare and see to be tormented with cruell punishments. Augustine knew this and was afraide, speaking with a loude voyce, this saying of Paules: "The ignorante aysye, and take the Kingdome of Heaven; and wee with our learning, fall headlong into Hell."
This attitude is well illustrated in the play by the attempts of the Old Man to save Faustus. The Old Man was wise in a way that the learned Faustus never had been. Even the devils respected him, saying, "His faith is great, even cannot touch his soul."

Beliefs that wisdom was concerned with spiritual things, and that the unlearned could be more wise than such a man as Faustus, may have led to a certain amount of popular disrespect for learning. Men who liked well enough to appear learned and own large libraries could excuse themselves from reading their books by saying:

Why sholde I stody to hurt my wyt therby
Or trouble my mynde with stody excossyve
Sythe many ar whiche stody right besely
And yet therby shall they never thryve
The fruyt of wysdome can they nat contryve
And many to stody so moche are inclynde
That utterly they fall out of theyr mynde...

Yet wisdom was to be obtained by study, for the reading of godly books was considered highly profitable, and a seemly occupation for a man as compared to other pastimes. Alexander Barclay, for instance, urges:

Harkyn to my wordes, grounde of goodnes and ryght
Lerne mortall men, stodyenge day and nyght
To knowe me wysdome, chefe rote of chastyte
My holy doctryne thy herte shall clere and lyght
My tunge shall shewo the right and equyte
Chase out thy foly, cause of adversyte,
And seke me wysdome which shall enduce thy mynde
With heith and welth wherby thou lyfe shalt fynde.

Wisdom was obviously much more concerned with the conduct of life than with abstract principles or theories learned from scholarly books. The wise man was careful to:
Yet it was to be hoped that scholars who had all the advantages of the learned life would prove somewhat more wise than other men. Barclay suggests that:

If men of wisdom were brought out of the school
And after their virtue set in most by degree
My sheep should not have led so many fools.

The problem of Dr. Faustus was that he had had the advantages which could have made him wise, yet had failed to profit by his opportunity, and succumbed instead to the pitfalls which were the other side of opportunity. We may note here the words of the epilogue:

Out is the branch that might have grown full straight.
And burned is Apollo's Laurel bough,
That sometime grew within this learned man. (11. 1478-1480)

The pious attitude toward learning was the most valid one according to Elizabethan popular theology. The substance, that is, Godliness, was much more important than any show of knowledge. It was likewise believed that parallel to the distinction between learning and wisdom, there was a distinction between the attitudes and operations of a man's mind as he pursued wisdom and learning. It was accepted that while the study of nature was to be carried on in terms of reason, faith, or the school of God, was to be approached in terms of belief rather than understanding. The man who reasoned least was considered God's best scholar. Not a
curious head, but a credulous and plain heart was to be accepted with God.

Even within the rational disciplines of scholarship the supremacy of religion was to be maintained. Not only was the scholar to bear in mind that God and salvation were of primary importance to him, but that the very arts he practiced were handmaids to divinity, and both served it, and were to be controlled by it. For instance, natural philosophy taught that nothing could be made of nothingness, but divinity corrected this by teaching of creation and resurrection. Philosophy taught to follow reason, but divinity taught to follow faith in things not seen. Logic taught to discourse and resolve, divinity, to assent without arguing. Law taught that customs prescribed, but divinity taught that old things were passed away.45

The dissatisfaction of Faustus with three of the four traditional branches of learning, medicine, philosophy, and law, was within orthodoxy insofar as it was a recognition that they did not have ultimate answers. Some of his very arguments against them are paralleled in pious texts of the day. For instance, Barclay says, speaking of logic:

I wyll nat say but that it is expedyent
The to knowe of Logyke the chrafte and connyng
For by argument it maketh evydent
Moche obscurenes, somtyme enlumynyng
The mynde: and sharpyng the wyt in mony a thyng
But oft by it a thyng pleyn bryght and pure
Is made diffuse, unknowne harde and obscure.46

Cornelius Agrippa reflects the same idea when he says:
Logike is joyned to rhetoric and grammar for a succour, and verily it is nothing els, but a skill ful of contention and darkness, by the whiche all other sciences are made more obscure and harder to learne, and she moreover tearmeth herself Logike, that is, the science of speaking and reasoning.

Another criticism found in the Ship of Fools perhaps comes closer to reflecting Faustus's dissatisfaction with the limitations of logic:

One with his speche rounde tournynge lyke a whyle
Of logyke the knottis doth lows and undo
In hand with his syllogysines, and yet doth he fele
No thinge what it menyth, nor what longesth therto ... 
Thus passe forth these folys the dayes of theyr lyfe
In two syllabils, not gyvynge advertence
To other cummynge doctryne, nor scyence.48

Faustus, eager for the benefits of learning, knows to stop when he has mastered the tool of logic:

Is to dispute well, Logickes chiepest end,
Affoords this Art no greater myracle?
Then reade no more ... (ll. 36-38)

The most frequent arguments against law in popular theology were based on its presumption, corruption, and confusing multiplicity. Agrippa speaks of law "which avaunteth she alone knoweth to make difference between true and false, just and unjust, honest and dishonest,"49 or again:

Perceive how this knowledge of the law presumeth to bear swaye over all other artes, and exerciseth tyrannie: and hove preferring it selfe before all other disciplines as it were the first begotten of the Gods, doth despise them as vile and vain although it be altogether made of nothing els but of fraile and very weake inventions and opinions of men, which things be of all other the weakest and is altered at every change of time, of the state end of the prince.50
Judges and lawyers were notorious for taking bribes, and for deciding cases in favor of wealthy clients. Barclay expresses this criticism, and attests to the frequency of such abuses, when he counsels:

Therefore ye yonge Studentes of the Chauncery:
(I speke nat to the olde the Cure of them is past)
Remember that Justyce longe hath in bondage be-
Reduce ye hir nowe unto lybertye at the last.*

Law was criticized by some for its complexity:

Either do these moste huge Giauntes also looke,
which contrari© to the ordinance of Justinian,
have made so many great and infinite volumes of
glosses, commentaries, and exposition, every of
them interpreting diversely one from another.*

The quarrel of Faustus with the law, however, is on a somewhat different basis, and, at first glance, a more pious basis, for he objects to the fact that the law deals only with material things:

A pretty case of paltry legacies:

Such is the subject of the institute
And universall body of the law:
His study fittes a mercenary drudge,
Who aimes at nothing but externall trash
Too servile and illiberall for me: . . . (II. 53, 60-64)

As far as this argument indicates contempt for riches, it is an expression of orthodoxy, but the chief complaint of Faustus seems to be the same as his eventual complaint against all the scholarly disciplines, the frustration of his genius.

More pious critics of medicine would have seen Faustus's objections to this discipline as characteristic of its
abuses. Physicians were supposed to work hand in hand with God, or rather, to let God work through them, and therefore maintain great humility in the face of any good which they were able to accomplish. They were supposed to give the glory for their achievements to God, and were to pray to Him both for help in their work, and out of gratitude for their success. Above all, the physician was to avoid pride in himself. Yet it is clear that all physicians were not able to live up to these high standards. Cornelius Agrippa gives a critique which may indicate what was more usually the case:

If by any chance the diseased shall happily recover in their hands, they rejoice without measure, no man will be able to set forth the glory of so great a miracle. They will say that he hath raised Lazarus from death, and he gave him his life, that he is bound to thanke them that he is alive, and by and by (attributing that to themselves, which belongeth only to God) they avaunt that they have drawen him out of hel, and say, that no reward can counter-vaille their desert. Some of them have been in such wise puffed up with pride, that they suff-ered themselves to be worshipped for Gods.

The position of Faustus here is curious, for though he is not guilty of Agrippa's charge, being too honest to make such claims for himself, yet rather than showing the proper humility, he admits he would like to be deserving of such a reputation, for he says:

Is not thy common talke sounde Aphorismes? Are not thy billes hung up as monuments Wherby whole Citties have escapt the plague, Yet art thou still but Faustus, and a man.
Wouldst thou make man to live eternally?
Or being dead, raise them to life again?
Then this profession were to be esteemed.
Physicke farewell, . . .

It is Faustus's rejection of divinity, however, which clearly identifies him as a sinful man. Both his argument, the specific point which he uses as an excuse to give up divinity, and the fact that he, a man of learning, rejects it at all, are in direct contradiction to orthodox practice. Faustus, wrenching scripture, uses the argument of fatalism to justify his sin. He puts together two separate passages and welds them into an argument which looks sound, but which actually has ample scriptural refutation:

Stipendium peccati mors est: ha, Stipendium, etc.
The reward of sinne is death: that's hard.
Si peccasse negamus, fallimur, & nulla est in nobis veritas.
If we say that we have no sinne,
We deceive our selves, and thers no truth in us.
Why then belike
We must sinne, and so consequently die.
I, we must die an everlasting death:
What doctrine call you this, Che sera, sera,
What wil be, shall be? Divinitie, adieu.

Hugh Latimer, speaking against this point, to those who read fatalistic doctrines into scripture and so try to evade responsibility for their acts, says, "If the most part be damned, the fault is not in God, but in themselves: for it is written 'God woulde that all menne should be saved.'"

Faustus is at fault here for two reasons. First, he is indulging in "curious questions," fruitless inquiry which was specifically cautioned against in popular theology. These questions took various forms, but were apparently a
frequent problem to the clergy. Whether about predestina-
tion, God's foreknowledge, or some contradiction in the-
ology or contrived scriptural argument, they character-
istically reduced to a fatalism which denied the efficacy 
of man's efforts to keep from sin. The danger was that once 
such an argument was established, one could give oneself 
freely to wrongdoing, which of course led straight to 
damnation. The other mistake of Faustus at this point was 
to juggle scripture. Henry Bullinger, speaking of similar 
cases, says "these men abuse the providence of God; for that 
out of it they gather that thing, which the holy scriptures 
do not teach them to gather." Interpreting scripture to 
one's own advantage was a frequent but reprehensible prac-
tice. Cornelius Agrippa says:

If any will resist with the authority of the holy 
scriptures, forthwith he shall here saie the 
letter killeth, it is deadly, it is disprofitable; 
but they will say that we ought to search out that 
which lieth hidden in the letter. Afterwaires they 
having recourse to interpreting, to expounding, to 
glossing, and to sillogizing, doe rather give it 
some other sense, than the proper meaning of the 
letter . . ."

Faustus's treatment of divinity, the supreme discipli-
ne, was his undoing. Had he rejected the other three 
branches of study and followed divinity, he could still 
have led a godly life. But upon rejecting divinity, his 
path became clear. Though the other studies were admittedly 
incomplete, divinity could have given them meaning. But 
without maintaining divinity in supreme position, nothing
made sense. And as soon as something took the place of divinity as the highest and best study, not to mention so evil a thing as necromancy, confusion and atheism were the result. To fail to recognize the positive virtue of divinity, the noblest of all intellectual pursuits, would be a complete inversion. The viciousness of Faustus is apparent as he says:

Philosophy is odious and obscure,  
Both law and physicke are for pettie wits,  
Divinity is basest of the three.  
Unpleasant, harsh, conteptible and vile.

(11. 134-137)

Faustus deviates from pious standards in both his motives and his means for gaining knowledge. Knowledge was to be pursued only in the fear and love of God, and for the purpose of glorifying Him. Marlowe is careful to tell us that Faustus is aiming "at the end of every Art," that is, he is interested only in what he can accomplish for himself:

Is to dispute well, Logickes chiefest end?  
. . . thou hast attaind the end:  
. . . the end of physicke is our bodies health:  
Why Faustus, hast thou not attaind that end?

Justinian's study fits a mercenary drudge,  
Who aims at nothing but externall trash,  
The reward of sinne is death: . . .

(11. 36, 38, 45-46, 62-63, 68)

Alexander Barclay speaks of those who want to use learning for their own purposes, saying:

Many . . . which greatly desyret an hye name  
And famous honour, or tytull of dignyte
Some are desyrous, to spread abroad their fame
To be called Doctors, or master of degrees
Moste clere in wyadome of the unyversyte
But these names convey they not for this intent
The christen to informe, that of wyt ar indigent
Nor in holy doctrine them self to occupy
As in scripture or lawes of Christ our savyour
Or other godly techynge our fayth to fortify
But onely they are drawn and led to this error
For desyre of fame, vayne laude, and great honour
Such walke in the way that is on the left syde
On rockes and clyffis and highe mountayne of pryde ...

Faustus is not satisfied with the ends of logic, medicine,
law, or divinity, but turns to magic, which promises
rewards more to his taste. His ambition includes power,
honor, riches, and magnificence. He says:

A sound Magician is a mighty god:
Hoere Faustus trie thy braines to gaine a dietie.  
(11. 90-91)

He wants to know of strange philosophy and secrets of
foreign kings. He wants to rule princes, and have the
emperor live but by his leave.

Faustus has in many ways shown himself at variance
with the attitude toward learning recommended in Elizabethan
popular theology. He has allowed his curiosity to lead him
into grave danger. He has failed to achieve the true end of
knowledge, wisdom. He has committed a grave error of
judgement in rejecting divinity as the queen of sciences.
And he has admitted to utterly reprehensible motives for
desiring knowledge.

Modern readers have often tended to show a more benevolent attitude toward these errors of Faustus than was
likely to have been the case with the Elizabethans. With several hundred years perspective on the Renaissance, we are aware of the process by which the spirit of free inquiry finally overthrew the restrictions of scholasticism, and we may be tempted to read Faustus as a symbol of this struggle. Whatever the process, however, it seems not to have attracted very much attention in popular theology, in which self-conscious statements of the problem are very rare. Cornelius Agrippa gives a tantalizing indictment when he says, "What a wicked Tyrannie it is, to bynde the wittes of students to certaine appointed Authors, and to take from schollars the liberty to search out truth." But what he is objecting to is only the fact that students are made to study philosophers who are at variance with holy scripture, instead of being free to devote all their thought to the Bible. Though the change in attitude taking place received surprisingly little justification or even documentation in popular theology, one conspicuous example of an attempt to dispell superstition in the light of fact was Reginald Scot's *Discoverie of Witchcraft*. His discussion of what he calls "natural magic" is typical of the approach:

In this art of naturall magick, God almightie hath hidden manie secret mysteries; as wherein a man may learne the properties, qualities, and knowledge of all nature. For it teacheth to accomplish maters in such sort and opportunitie, as the common people thinketh the
same to be miraculous; and to be compassed
none other was, but onlie by witchcraft.
And yet in truth, naturell magicke is nothing
else, but the worke of nature.⁵⁶

This cautious and reasonable attempt to alter old atti-
tudes for new if nothing else succeeded in arousing the
conservative King James to the defense of superstition
in his cogent treatise, Daemonology.

It has been suggested from time to time that Marlowe's
personal sympathies were actually with Faustus, and that
the Christian framework of the play was employed only to
avoid contradicting contemporary belief. Be that as it may,
from the point of view of popular theology there are
difficulties in reading Faustus as simply the symbol of
truth battling against arbitrary limitation. The motives of
Faustus are mixed, for though he wants knowledge, he wants
it for what it can get him — power, riches, honor.⁶⁷ And
Faustus is not made a martyr. Rather, at every point in
the play at which he states his motives and aspirations,
his guilt is made abundantly clear. The examination of his
career in the light of popular Elizabethan theological
thought on learning indicates that from that point of view,
Faustus, because of his accomplishments, was a truly learned
man, yet because of his pride, curiosity, and ambition, was
a deeply sinful man. Perhaps the most adequate and beauti-
ful summary of the attitude the Elizabethan would have taken
toward Faustus is to be found in the chilling chorus of
dispassionate comment, Marlowe's own prologue and epilogue:
Shortly he was graced with Doctor's name,  
Excelling all, whose sweet delight disputes  
In heavenly matters of Theologie,  
Till swolne with cunning, of a selle conceit,  
His waxen wings did mount above his reach,  
And melting heavens conspirde his overthrow.  
For falling to a divelish exercise  
And glutted now with learnings golden gifts,  
He surffets upon cursed Nagromancy.  

(11. 17-25)

Cut is the branch that mighthave groune ful straight,  
And burned is Apollos Laurel bough,  
That sometime grew within this learned man:  
Faustus is gone, regard his hellish fall,  
Whose fliendful fortune may exhort the wise,  
Onely to wonder at unlawful things,  
Whose deepenes doth intise such forward wits,  
To practise more than heavenly power permits.  

(11. 1478-85)
CHAPTER II
Witchcraft

The pact with the devil is the principal mechanism of Dr. Faustus. Though the main outlines of this transaction are clear cut, there are details whose meaning time has obscured for the modern reader. Furthermore, there are questions we may ask about the dealings of Faustus with the devil, which, though they do not necessarily constitute problems for us, yet may be answered with more precision in terms of the popular theology of Marlowe's day. What did Faustus want from the devil, and why did he think he could get it? Why did the devil treat Faustus as he did? What was the nature of the devil's hold on Faustus? Such questions can usually be answered only in a general way by the modern reader, but the Elizabethan audience had available popularly a body of devil lore which contained quite specific answers. This chapter is an attempt to examine some of the ideas in this body of information, and to show how they reflect on or are reflected in Dr. Faustus.

Though the Faust legend is the most familiar story of a pact with the devil which has come down to modern times, a great number of such histories were known to the Elizabethans. These stories, of which Dr. Faustus was merely another until given serious treatment by Marlowe, were
similar in plan, though differing in circumstance. None is exactly parallel to the Faust story, yet some examples drawn from the tradition may give us a conception of the background against which the Faust story appeared to the Elizabethan audience. Incidentally, it may give us an enlarged appreciation of Marlowe's genius in creating a spiritual monument from a very ordinary tale.

A typical example of such stories is to be found in Guazzo's *Compendium Maleficarum*. Though it does not exactly parallel the Faust legend, it does include the feature of a demon in the service of a man, of changeable form, and able to speak holy advice for its own purposes:

A youth named Theodore Maillot desired in marriage a maiden of wealthy family, but was quite without hope of winning her since he was poor and of humble birth... Young Maillot approached a fellow servant from Germany who, as he had heard, had a demon always at his service, and told him of his trouble, asking him not to begrudge him help. The German gladly accepted this chance; for such were the terms of his pact that he was compelled within a few days either to deliver up another man to take his own debt upon him, or to have his neck twisted and be killed by the demon. He appointed the following day for their business, and when they met there... the doors suddenly opened and there entered a maiden of the most beautiful and pleasing aspect (for so the demon chose to appear at first, lest Maillot should be revolted by his terrible appearance), who said that she would easily bring to pass the marriage, on condition that he would... abstain from theft, obscenity, lust, blasphemy, and practise piety and relieve the poor... doing all that befits and becomes a Christian man. Maillot seeing that so great a benefit was offered him on such holy and honourable conditions, thought that he need have no hesitation. But thinking more and more deeply of the matter, there was that in his face which
caused a certain priest of his house to guess that there was some cause for his distraction. This priest searched out what was troubling his mind and persuaded him not to sink to any further communing with the devil. The German, thus cheated of his hope, soon after paid the debt of his pact; for not many days later he fell on to his head from his horse on a level and open road, and was instantly killed.

Another story, from Henry Holland's *Treatise of Witchcraft*, parallels the Faust story in the details of the pact, which is signed in blood, though exchanging body and soul for wealth, rather than knowledge:

There was a young man about Wittenberge, who being kept bare and needie by his father, was tempted by way of sorcerie, to bargain with the Devill, or a familiar, to yield him selfe bodie and soule into the devils power, upon condition to have his wish satisfied with money: so that upon the same, an obligation was made by the young man, written with his owne blood, and given to the devill... Upon this soudaine wealth and alteration of this young man, the matter first being noted began afterwards more and more to be suspected, and at length after long and great admiration, was brought to Martin Luther to be examined. The young man whether for shame or feare long denied to confess, and would be known of nothing. Yet God so wrought being stronger than the devill that he utterd unto Luther the whole substance of the case, as well touching the money as the obligation, Luther understanding the matter, and pittyng the lamentable state of the man, willed the whole congregation to pray; and he himselfe ceased not with prayers to labour, so that the devil was compelled at the laste to throw in his obligation at the window, and bad him take it againe unto him.

This example of a man saved or released from his pact by the prayers and intervention of the clergy recalls the end of Marlowe's play, when the scholars, upon learning of
Faustus's sin, ask "Why did not Faustus tell us of this before, that Divines might have prayed for thee?" (1400-1)

An example which illustrates the tendency to suspect learned men of witchcraft is told of Cornelius Agrippa, by the English translator of his treatise Of the Vanity of Arts and Sciences:

If Socrates knewe so fewe things, then cannot this Author know all things, whose knowledge, although it were great, yet greatly he erred, and no marvel, for he gave his mind to unleeful artes, contrarie to the lawes of God and man: for it is sayd and his workes testifie the same, that hee exercised the Arte Magicke, and therein farre excelled all other of his time, but in the ende his wicked knowledge was the cause of his miserable deathes: for as John Manlius a Germaine writer doth recorde, when he was at the point of death he called to him a dog which went about with him and spake to him with these words ... Depart from me thou wicked beast which hast destroyed me. So forthwith the dog departing from him caste himselfe headlong into a river; this dog was without doubt a Devil of Hell.

Agrippa may have been particularly suspect for this devi- ation, because he, like Faustus, was not satisfied with the state of learning in his day, though for somewhat different reasons.

A useful distinction for reading Dr. Faustus is that made between magicians and witches or sorcerers, outlined clearly in the treatises attempting systematization of demonology, available to the Elizabethans. A very general definition of a witch was "one who wittingly and willingly uses devilish artes to attain his purposes." Yet the
definition itself implies the difference between the two kinds of practitioners. For though both witches and magicians used devils to perform their purposes, the purposes differed. A magician could use the devil to his own purposes, but a witch's purposes were always the purposes of the devil. Witches were considered to be servants of the devil both because they served the devil's uses rather than God's, and because they were actually tools of the devil for the working of evil. King James in his *Daemonology* makes the distinction quite clear. Philomathes questions Epistemon:

PHI: Then it appeares that there are more sortes nor one, that are directlie professors of his service: and if so be, I pray you tell me how manie, and what are they?

EPI: There are principalie two sortes, whereunto all the partes of that unhappie arte are redacted; whereof the one is called Magie or Necromancie, the other Sorcerie or Witch-craft.

PHI: What and how manie are the meanes, whereby the Devill allures persones in anio of these snares?

EPI: Even by these three passiones that are within our selves: Curiositie in great ingines: or greede appetite of gear, caused through great poverty. As to the first of these, Curiosity, it is onelie the inticement of Magicians, or Necromanciers and the other two are the allureres of the Sorcerers, or Witches.

King James also points out the difference in the relations of these practitioners with the devil:

PHI: What difference is there betwixt this arte, and Witchcraft.

EPI: Surelie, the difference vulgare put betwixt them, is verrie merrie, and in a manner true; for they, that the Witches ar servantes onelie, and slaves to the Devil; but the Necromanciers are his maisters and commanders.
PHI: How can that be true, yt any man being specially addicted to his service, can be his commanders?
EPI: Yea, they man be; but it is onelie secundum quid; For it is not be anie power that they can have over him, but ex pacto allanerlis: whereby he oblies himself in some trifles to them, that he may on the other part obteine the fruition of their body & soule, which is the onlie thing he hustes for.

By making a pact with a witch, the devil obtained both a soul and an agent through whom to work his evil. Faustus, however, made a magician's pact with the devil, giving up body and soul, but chinging himself to no servitude.

According to some sources, a magician was less reprehensible than a witch. A magician generally only worked illusions, desired to be transported from one place to another by his devils, called up the dead to converse with, and foretold the future. The crimes of witches, on the other hand, exceeded all these. They worked real harm on other people, giving them diseases, casting spells on them, killing them or their cattle. Their power usually manifested itself in the realm of the physical rather than the illusory, causing danger not only to themselves but to others. Yet King James maintains that the sin of magicians was greater than the sin of witches, not on the grounds of what it caused, but because it proceeded from greater knowledge. The magician, being a learned man, knew full well what he was supposed to do, and was aware of the dangers he was bringing upon himself. Therefore his crime, being more deliberate, was more reprehensible.
There was some confusion in terminology for the different types of practitioners of the occult. Sorcerers were included in the category with witches by King James, and were generally held to be those who through devilish arts foretold things to come. Though Faustus does not indulge in soothsaying, other definitions of sorcery include characteristics which do apply to him:

Of divination, there are eight kinds. Two depend on direct discourse with the devil, one being secret, the other being open. The latter sorcerers are called Obet or Lythomei, supposed to be those men of that sort which are thought to have of their own some domestical or familiar devil. The same openly and without dissimulation do talk and conferre with the divell, using him as it were a servant in fulfilling their commandements, so that they be altogether conversant with hym. Necromancy is considered to be another form of divination, but it is held to depend, not on direct communication with devils, but through the agency of the dead.

The first part of this jumbled definition describes Faustus, for Mephostophilis was his familiar and agent for twenty years. King James was apparently aware of overlaps and inconsistencies in such definitions, for he points out that the sorcerer had many characteristics in common with the magician, explaining that they both served the same master.

From the evidence in the play, Marlowe is trying to present Faustus as a magician rather than as a sorcerer. Not only does he refrain from having Faustus foretell the future, he is careful to include details which are typical of the magician as distinct from the sorcerer. Faustus is "grounded in Astrologie," and learns from Valdes and Cornelius magical
words, signs, incantations, and ceremonies, all of which were used by magicians in their conjurations. And Faustus is equally interested in necromancy; he "ruminates on Negromantique skill," which is the other dark discipline coupled by King James with magic.

Necromancers were said to be those who did "invocate deade mennes soules ... and whiche bore about con- sayling or helping spirits." According to King James, necromancers could call up the bodies of the dead, informed with devils or spirits, but not with the souls which had belonged to them, because these were at rest. Since the necromancer conversed with a devil rather than with the dead, there was some confusion as to the proper meaning of necromancy. The word became almost synonymous with "conjugation," the raising of devils from hell, since this was in effect what the necromancer did, but through the agency of a corpse. Mysodemon in Henry Holland's Dialogue of Witches wants to know "Whether there may be in verie truth at this daye such conjuration, and calling up of devilles (which they call Necromancie) such as the witch of Endor did," asking here not whether the dead could be raised, but whether devils could be loosed out of hell. But Marlowe's use of the word seems to have been literal, for Faustus is able to raise Alexander the Great and his paramour, and, later, Helen of Troy. He makes the distinction, however, that he cannot even use the actual bodies of these worthies,
but rather spirits which assume their shapes:

But if it like your Grace, it is not in my abilities to present before your eyes the true substantial bodies of those two deceased princes which long since are consumed to dust . . . But such spirits as can lively resemble Alexander and his Paramour, shall appear before your Grace, in that manner that they best liv'd in, in their most flourishing estate, which I doubt not shall sufficiently content you Imperiall majesty. (ll. 1053-63)

The technical transgression of Faustus, that of selling his soul to the devil, was an obscure transaction, the rules of which an Elizabethan probably would have had to consult in treatises on witchcraft and magic. Yet there were certain generally held beliefs about the devil which may have served as a background to Dr. Faustus for the average playgoer.

The story of the fall of the devils from heaven, as recounted to Faustus by Mephastophilis, was of course a familiar one. They were created good by God, but they did not remain steadfast in this goodness. Rather, like men, they were corrupt with their own malice, fell, and were thrown by God out of heaven. They were their own tempters, and responsible for their own downfall. They were cast out forever, and chained to hell with everlasting chains. Sin was to them as death is to us, the end of opportunity.

Essentially, the sin of the devils was pride. The will of God was of course hold to be the ultimate good for all creatures. But these spirits failed to benefit from it
because they did not order their own particular supposed good to the supreme good, which was the will of God. Instead, they suffered their will to dwell in a purpose of their own. In this way, they put themselves in the place of God, for they did not regulate their wills by the superior will, but made their own desires the rule of their will. This was in effect to set themselves on a level with God. For this fault, they were cast out of heaven, and, having once stepped into the great error, the basis for all sin, descended through every kind of sin imaginable. Thus their fall was both actual and figurative, for the more they fell into sin, the farther away from God they were, and, at the same time, the farther they were cast from him. In theology, the concept of the fall described the origin of evil and the archetype for all sin, in men as well as in spirits.

As punishment, the spirits were cast into darkness, for God himself was light. Yet they had enough light to see that they were miserable. This light may be understood as physical light as well as the light of wisdom which comes from God. It probably meant that the evil angels still had enough memory of heaven, or knowledge of it, that by comparison their own state seemed infinitely more miserable a punishment. It was believed that seeing God as they had, and then being unable to enjoy him, was the greatest anguish possible. The very sight, for instance, of the felicity of
the saints, was a torture to the devils. It is this concept which Mephistophilis expresses to Faustus when questioned about hell, for he says:

Why this is hell, nor am I out of it:
Thinkst thou that I who saw the face of God,
And tasted the eternal joyes of heaven,
Am not tormented with ten thousand hells,
In being deprived of everlasting bliss? (ll. 312-316)

This was precisely the nature of the suffering of the devils.

It is interesting to note in this connection that the Elizabethans believed that devils carried their hell with them wherever they went. Thomas Nashe in his Pierce Penilesse His Supplication to the Devil has the devil explain:

Hell is not meant of enie locall place in the earth, or under the waters; for as Austin affirmeth, we doe inhabite the Region under the moone, and have the thick aire assigned us as a prison, from whence we maie with small labour cast out nets as we list.23

And Bishop Hall puts it even more specifically, saying, "there is none of those evill spirits which doth not (wheresoever he is) carry his hell about him."24 So when Mephistophilis tells Faustus he is not out of hell, he is not so much expressing a revolutionarily spiritual idea as giving an accepted Elizabethan belief. Perhaps the origin of the theory lay in questions which might arise as to whether spirits could escape hell by coming to earth. Whatever the explanation, Mephistophilis's report of hell is quite orthodox.

There were many popular beliefs about the powers and abilities of the devils. For instance, it was thought they
could appear in the guise of the good and even the holy. The Elizabethans were interested in metaphors of change and transformation. Some changes were mere illusions worked by clever sorcerers and magicians. Some were only figurative, as in the saying "an evil man is half a beast, and half a devil." Others were the works of God, and true miracles. Still others were the work of the devil. It was hard for a man to tell the difference between these various kinds of transformations, for they were all apparently effective as far as outward appearance went. This was especially true when they were worked by the devil, who was even able to appear in the guise of a beautiful angel. There were many stories of the evils accomplished by such transformations. According to one, a spirit took the place of a sinful nun in a convent, who had sold herself to the devil for thirty years of fame. The transformed spirit was highly successful, and gained the nun a great reputation as a prophetess. Both good and bad spirits could make themselves bodies from the elements, and appear in whatever form they chose, though always defective in some particular. A devil could appear as a big black man, or as a black dog, or in the shape of a bull, wolf, viper, scorpion, leopard, bear, or dragon. According to his purposes, a devil could terrify with ugly shapes, or entice with fair shows. It would have been no surprise, then, to Marlowe's audience, that Mephistophilis was able to appear first to Faustus as a
dragon, and then as a friar, when so requested.

The devil was the father of lies, the original deviation from truth and the pattern for all other liars. He was so far from being expected to offer the truth of his own free will that it was even wondered if he could be compelled by God to tell the truth. Yet Mephistophilis contradicts this pattern by knowing only too well the truth which Faustus refuses to believe, and answering him with crushing honesty. That the truthfulness of Marlowe's devil may have been a surprise to some of his audience becomes evident when we examine Thomas Nashe's treatment of the same problem in Pierce Penilesse. Adopting a device similar, almost suspiciously similar, to Marlowe's, Nashe has the devil which Pierce conjures up answer questions frankly and freely. He apparently saw a difficulty here, for he found it necessary to make excuses for his characterization:

If I have not made my devil so secret or subtil in his Art, as Divels are wont, let that of Lactantius bee mine excuse, where he saith, the divels have no power to lie to a just manne, and if they adjure them by the majestic of the high God, they will not onlie confesso themselves to be Divels, but also tell their names as they are.

This qualification could not apply to Faustus, who is hardly a just man. But Marlowe's devil is at least in the realm of believable orthodoxy, for it was held that the devil could play the prophet or quote scripture when the need arose. Marlowe's use of this device is particularly subtle, for Mephistophilis does not twist the truth as with
intent to deceive, but utters it flatly, squirming because he knows it is reality. The effect upon Faustus is more to the point than if he had been lied to, for in the face of the truths with which Mephistophilis presents him, he himself twists and evades, to his own ruin.

The power of devils was directly controlled by God. They could do nothing without God's approval or permission; thus their powers were limited. Henry Holland in his treatise of witchcraft explains this point of view:

The multitude is in this grosse error, that witches have power to turne the worlde upside downe at their pleasure, but the truth is, it is nothing so, for they are but Sathanas instruments, and cannot worke these wonders without him, and as for Sathanas power also, it is limited by the Lord, for he can do nothing, but where and when the Lord sends him. When therefore he is sent for the execution of God's justice he pursuades his witches, that he can drive heaven and earth together at his pleasure, and they persuade the wicked worlde that they can worke wonders, whereas neither they, nor Sathan himselfe, can take away the least hair from the greatest sinner upon earth, but when God permits them.

Thus they were permitted only to perform God's purposes, that is, by tempting the faithful, or punishing the wicked. As to Satan's claim to being ruler of the world, he was actually not entitled to "one goosefeather." But aside from these limitations, the powers of the devils were great. They could work wonders which appeared good as well as evil, and were capable of all manner of tricks and illusions which their nature enabled them to
perform. The feats and magic worked for Faustus after his pact were probably completely believable to the Elizabethan audience, though their particular nature does not fit any obvious pattern of powers and abilities of devils. Witchcraft lore and treatises, as for instance the stories cited above, give many parallel examples of what devils could do.

The knowledge of spirits, for which Faustus yearned, had an established rationale in popular theology. There were believed to be many secrets of the world and nature which were not to be revealed to man. Although these secrets were not known on earth, they were known in heaven. Because the devils had dwelt in heaven, they had access to the secrets as did God and His angels. Devils were forbidden any divine illumination after their fall, and could not be said to vie with the heavenly angels in knowledge. But angels knew by intuition, not by learning; and when the evil angels were cast out of heaven, they did not forfeit their natural knowledge. So for this knowledge, the devils were envied and sought after by men like Faustus.

The ideal method of dealing with devils was to try to control or command them, to try to get their knowledge from them without endangering the soul. The practice of black magic was the result of the desire of men of learning and curiosity to make use of the power and knowledge which the devils possessed. Though the same power and knowledge
was possessed by the good angels, they, who obeyed the will of God, were not at the disposal of men, who were forbidden the knowledge of heaven's secrets. Cornelius Agrippa says:

And why these magicians do only serve the Devils of hell, that is the reason, because good angels do hardly appear, for they do abide looking for God's commandment, and do accompany with them only which are clean in heart and holy in life, but the wicked shew themselves ready to invocation, falsely favouring and counterfeiting the Divinitie, always ready to deceive men with their subtlety, to be reverenced, to be honored.

Speaking to devils and trying to get information from them was not strictly unlawful. So the object of witchcraft was to attempt to discover and use some means of coercing them without the extremity of selling the soul.

Whether there existed such an effective system or not Faustus failed to find out; the devils had answered him, not because of his power as conjurer, but because he was in danger of losing his soul. Apparently the real risk of witchcraft was that devils were willing to obey a man only if they thought they could trap him. It was believed that when devils saw a person sinning, they were quick to surround him and confirm him in his sin. Mephistophilis speaks for the policy of the devils when Faustus asks if it was not his conjuring that called him up:

That was the cause, but yet per accident,
For when we hear one rack the name of God,
Abjure the scriptures, and his Saviour Christ,
Wee flye, in hope to get his glorious soule,
Nor will we come, unless he use such means
Whereby he is in danger to be damned:
Therefore the shortest cut for conjuring
Is stoutly to abjure the Trinitie,
And pray devoutly to the prince of hell. (11. 281-289)

Mephistophiles says that witchcraft could not be both safe
and effective, for unless a man put himself in danger of
losing his soul, the devils would not answer him.

Bishop Hall attested that witches abounded in his day,
and in greater number than ever before.\(^2\) It was believed
that spirits did exist, and did at times appear before men,
so that knowing how to demean oneself before them was
actually a question of conscience.\(^3\) A man to whom spirits
appeared might be tempted to speak to them, and to try to
use or question them. There was nothing technically sinful
about this. Yet it was considered highly dangerous, for
spirits were so far superior to men in knowledge, experience,
and cleverness, that a man hardly stood a chance against
them. The devil had learned how to tempt all men, and
how to overthrow them.\(^4\) Exorcism of devils by churchmen
was quite respectable, and even admirable, because of the
good it did; it had Biblical precedent. But some, at least,
were able to wonder at the daring of men of no little holi-
ness who according to story had gone so far as to hold
familiar talk with devils, and had even made use of them
for intelligence.\(^5\) The great danger of such discourse was
the possibility of being trapped or lured into making a
pact with the devil, being deceived by the possibilities
offered into selling one's soul. In the case of Faustus,
Mephastophilis answers enough of his questions to tempt him beyond endurance. Of his own free will, he offers his soul to the devil, and in his delusion, says:

Had I as many soules as there be starres,
Ido give them al for Mephastophilis. (11. 338-339)

There were several kinds of agreements with the devil. Pacts which involved conjuration and manifest magic, such as the one made by Dr. Faustus, usually were direct and open. Other contracts were hidden and secret, as in works of divination, astrology, and palmistry. The devil would not work for nothing, but sometimes he could be prevailed upon to accomplish something outside the usual order of nature by the use of magic formulas or symbols. The most common examples of this were the popular superstitions, remedies, or preventives of disease or misfortune.

But to the orthodox mind, such symbols, incantations, potions, and herbs as were used in the conjuration of devils were really gross superstition, and had no effectual power at all; these were natural objects or man-made words or symbols, which were consecrated to witchcraft only by the men who used them. Thus they actually had no power above that which the witch was able to give them, which was none at all, though the devil might act as if it were otherwise in order to trap the conjurer. With this in mind, the vanity of the words of Faustus as he congratulates himself for calling up such a powerful spirit becomes more obvious:
I see there's vertue in my heavenly words,  
Who would not be proficient in this art?  
How pliant is this Mephostophilis?  
Full of obedience and humilitie,  
Such is the force of Magicke and my spels.  
No Faustus, thou art Conjurer laureate  
That canst command great Mephostophilis . . .(ll. 262-268)

There was really no virtue in the words of Faustus except that which he had given them by endangering his soul. He was right at least in saying "who would not be proficient in this art," for to the extent to which he succeeded, and for the reason he did, anyone would have been "conjurer laureate."

It was believed by some that witchcraft was the direct institution of the devil. He, of course, would not invent a means by which he could be trapped, bound, or compelled, but rather a means by which men could be tempted. So conjuring was actually a way of accomplishing the devil's purposes, though it appeared to be a means of enslaving him. Devils would comply with the requests and commands of the conjurer, to build his confidence so that he could be tricked into giving up his soul.

Another end which the devil accomplished through conjuration was that of having God blasphemed. Conjurers used the name of God as power and protection in their conjurations, sometimes obliquely, as Faustus did in writing God's name backward and forward in his circle, or often directly, praying to God, that in his name, devils would be made to appear and obey. Reginald Scot offers an example of
such conjuring:

Oh father omnipotent, oh wise sonne, oh Holie-ghost
by you three in one persons, one true godhead in
substance, which didst spare Adam and Eve in their
sins; and oh thou sonne, which diestd for their
sinnes a most filthie death, susteyning it upon the
holie crosse; oh thou most mercifull, when I flie
unto thy mercie, and beseech thee by all the means
I can, by these the holie names of thy-sonne; to
wit A and O and all his names, grant me thy vertue
and powre, that I may be able to cite before me,
thy spirits which were throwne downe from heaven
that they may speake with me, & dispatch by & by
without delaie, & with a good will, without the
hurt of my bodie, soule, or goods.52

Such use of God's name, however, was actually powerless to
bind or constrain the devil.53 Furthermore, it was regarded
officially by the church as blasphemy.54 The purposes of
Satan were therefore served both by making the conjurer
sin, and by having his enemy, God, blasphemed.

Conjuration in the name of God was sometimes called
"white magic," and purported not to be sinful. But the
church did not take note of such a distinction, and appar¬
tenly neither did Marlowe.55 The conjuration which Faustus
uses is frankly a worship and invocation of the devil.

The process of locating the widely scattered sources
of the details of this conjuration makes a fascinating and
complex study.56 For the purposes at hand, however, it may
suffice to compare Marlowe's conjuration, which is almost
a summary of the conjuration material current at the time,
with another summary on the same topic, that of King James
in his Daemonology57.
King James's discussion begins with an outline of the "four principal parts" of conjuration, which "are contained in such books, which I call the Devil's Schoole:
The persons of the conjurers; the action of their conjurations, the words and rites used to that effect; and the spirits that are conjured." As to the first of these parts, the person of the conjurers, Marlowe gives in the conversation of Faustus and his two friends the qualifications for a conjurer:

He that is grounded in Astrologie,
Inricht with tongues, well seen in minerals,
Hath all the principles Magick doth require. (ll. 167-169)

King James elaborates on the other three parts of conjuring, saying, "Thee principal things cannot well in that errand be wanted: holy-water and some present of a living thing unto him." Faustus has "prayed and sacrificed" to the devil, and in the Latin used in his address, announces that he is sprinkling holy water. King James continues:

"there are likewise certaine seasons, dayes and houres, that they observe in this purpose." Faustus chants:

Now that the gloomy shadow of the earth,
Longing to view Orion's dismal look,
Leaps from the antarctic world unto the skie,
And dimnes the welkin with her pitchy breath:
Faustus, begin thine incantations. (ll. 235-239)

King James next gives account of the words and signs used in the conjuration:

These things being all readie, and prepared, circles are made triangular, quadrangular, round, double or single, according to the
forme of apparition that they crave. But to speake of the diverse formes of the circles, of the innumerable characters and crosses that are within and without, and out-through the same, of the divers formes of apparitiones, that that craftie spirit illudes them with, I remit it to over-mani© that have busied their heads in describing of the same.

Faustus explains that:

Within this circle is Jehovahs name, Forward and backward anagrammatis'd The breviate names of holy Saints, Figures of every adjunct to the heavens, And characters of signes and erring starres. (11, 242-246)

The final part, according to James, comes:

When the conjured spirit appeares, which will not be while after manie circumstances, long praizers and much muttring and murmuring of the conjurers, . . . if they have missed one jote of all their rites; or if any of their feete once slyd over the circle through terror of his feareful apparition, he payes himselfe at that time in his owne hande, of that due debt which they ought him, and otherwise would have delayed longer to have payed him: I meane hee carries them with him bodie and soule.

Faustus complains at the delay in getting results from his conjuring, "Quid to moraris?" And when Mephastropolis does appear, he is in the form of such a terrible dragon, that Faustus has him leave and return as a friar:

I charge thee to return and change they shape; Thou art too ugly to attend on me. Go, and return an old Franciscan frier; That holy shape becomes a devil best. (11, 259-261)

Though the magician was in danger enough of being carried away by the devil simply from trying to follow the formula of conjuration under the strain of dealing with a superior mind and frightful apparition, the Devil was "glad to move them to a plaine and square dealing with him."58
that is, a pact. It is this that Mephistophilis urges on his second meeting with Faustus. Mephistophilis insists on a formal agreement, though Faustus points out that he has already endangered his soul by conjuring:

Mephistophilis: I shall wait on Faustus whilst he lives, so he will buy my service with his soul.
Faustus: Already Faustus hath hazarded that for thee.
Mephistophilis: But, Faustus, thou must bequeath it solemnly and write a deed of gift with thine own blood, for that security craves great Lucifer. If thou deny it, I will back to hell. (ll. 463-469)

Of the several kinds of agreements which could be made with the devil, some were more limited than others.

Reginald Scot says of those bound by such pacts:

Sometimes their homage with their oath and bargain is received for a certain term of years; sometimes for ever. Sometimes it consisteth in the denial of the whole faith, sometimes in part. The first is, when the soul is absolutely yielded to the devil and hell fire; the other is, when they have but bargained to observe certain ceremonies and statutes of the church; ... and this is done either by oath, protestation of words, or by obligation in writing sometimes sealed with wax, sometimes signed with blood, sometimes by kissing the devil's bare buttocks. 59

The pact which Faustus makes is by this standard in every point the most extreme and binding, for he swears in blood to yield himself completely to the devil, concluding:

I, John Faustus of Wittenberg, Doctor, by these presents do give both body and soul to Lucifer, Prince of the East, and his minister Mephistophilis, and furthermore grant unto them, that 24 years being expired, the articles above written inviolate, full power to fetch or carry the said John Faustus body and soul, flesh, blood, or goods, into their habitation wheresoever. (ll. 532-542)
The requests which Faustus makes of Mephistophilis as the other side of the bargain are likewise to be found in witchcraft lore as services which a magician could expect of a devil. King James, speaking of such compacts, says:

The effect of their contract consists in two thinges; in formes and effectes, by formes, I meanes in what shape or fashion he shall come unto them, when they call upon him. And by effectes, I understand, in what special sorts of services he bindes himselfe to be subject unto them . . . For as to the formes, to some of the baser sorte of them he oblihes himselfe to appeare at their calling upon him, by such a proper name which he shewes unto them, either in likenes of a dog, a Catte, an Ape, or such-like other beast; or else to anwser by a voyce onlie. The effects are to anwser to such demands, as concerns curing of diseases . . . to teach them artes and sciences, . . . to carry them newes from anio parte of the Worlds, which the agilitie of a Spirit may easilie performe; to reveale to them the secretes of anio persons, so being they bee once spoken.

The pact of Faustus makes these stipulations clear, though they are not outlined in detail because of the variety of power which Faustus is to have:

Secondly, that Mephistophilis shall be his servant, and at his command.
Thirdly, that Mephistophilis shall do for him, and bring him whatsoever.
Fourthly, that hee shall be in his chamber or house invisible.
Lastly, that he shall appear to the said John Faustus, at all times, in what forme or shape soever he please.

The first part of Dr. Faustus is marked by the expressions of Faustus' ambition, and what he expects his devils to be able to do for him. Many of these achievements seem
not to be merely the work of Marlowe's aspiring imagination, but rather to be traditionally attributable to the power of devils. A thorough catalog of the names of devils and their respective abilities is offered by Reginald Scot, which parallels in many cases the feats expected by Faustus, who says:

Shall I make spirits fetch me what I please? Resolve me of all ambiguities, Perform what desperate enterprise I will? Ile have them flye to India for gold, Ransack the Ocean for orient pearle, And search all corners of the new found world For pleasant fruited and princely delicats: Ile have them reade mee strange philosophie, And tell the secrets of all forraigne kings

In Scot's list, there are many that can perform these things:

Gomory a strong and a mightie duke ... answereth well and truelie of things present, past, and to come, and of treasure hid, and where it lieth. Vapula is a great duke and a strong, he is seeen like a lion with grifrons wings, he maketh a man subtill and wonderfull in handicrafts, philosophies, and in sciences contained in bookea. Mugraer . . teacheth philosophie absolutelle.

Perhaps the devils' most important attraction for Faustus was their knowledge of secrets and of nature. He asks Mephistophilis for books containing this knowledge, and books are used by Mephistophilis to tempt him when he begins to waver toward repentance. As soon as the pact is made, Mephistophilis begins:

MEPH: Hold, take this booke, peruse it thorowly, The iterating of these lines brings golde
The framing of this circle on the ground,
Brings whirlwindes, tempests, thunder and lightning.
Pronounce this thrice devoutly to thy selfe,
And men in armour shal appeare to thee,
Ready to execute what thou desirast.
FAUST: Thankes Mephistophiles, yet faine would I
have a booke wherein I might beholde al spels and
incantations, that I might raise up spirits when
I please.
MEPH: Here they are in this books.
FAUST: Now would I have a booke where I might see
al characters and planets of the heavens, that I
might knowe their motions and dispositions.
MEPH: Heree they are too.
FAUST: Nay let me have one book more, and then
I have done, wherein I might see al plants, herbes
and trees that grow upon the earth.
MEPH: Here they be.                                       (11. 591-609)

Later, Mephistophiles gives Faustus a book whereby he can
change himself into any shape he desires, and delivers a
long lecture on astronomy. Each of these subjects repre-
sents an area traditionally ascribed to one or another of
the devils:

Berith turneth all metals into gold. 64 Vepar 
. . . bringeth to pass that the sea shalbe round
and stormie; . . . 59 Halphas sendeth men of warre
to place appointed; . . . 66 Amy maketh one mar-
velous in astrologie, and in all the liberall
sciences; . . . 67 Decarabia knoweth the force of
herbes and stones; Andrealphus transformeth a
man into the likenes of a bird. 68

Faustus asks Mephistophiles for a wife, but the devil
can only give him another devil for a wife. He promises
Faustus, however, that he may have any woman he desires
for a concubine. This too is within the power of the
devils, for they could "procure the love of any woman." 69

Marlowe makes use of the device of the books to show
the extent to which Faustus is obeyed by Mephistophiles.
Because of the limitations of the drama and of reality, he is unable to dramatize the more lavish accomplishments which Faustus has projected. Consequently the scenes in which magic is illustrated have often been considered petty and anticlimactieal. The antics of Faustus and Mephistophilis as they annoy the Pope, confuse the horse course, and do tricks for the emperor, have often been regarded as weaknesses in an otherwise powerful and serious play. However that may be, such antics are noted by the writers on witchcraft as predictable behavior for magicians. Certainly the ability to move quickly from place to place through the air, and appear invisible, as in the play before the Pope, is well chronicled. Scot asserts the alleged power of Asmodeus to make magicians move invisible, and King James maintains that it is possible for a spirit to move a solid body through the air. King James likewise cites the very instance of procuring dainties for princes as an example of the tricks of magicians, saying that the devil "will make them to please Princes, by faire banquets and dainty dishes, carried in short space fra the farthest part of the world." One request which Faustus makes of the devil, apparently in an attempt to avoid the physical pain of the damned, is to become a devil. The first clause in his contract is "that Faustus may be a spirit in forme and substance" (1. 528). This seems to have meant that Faustus wished to
become a devil, for a spirit was a bodiless substance, characteristic only of angels, whether good or bad. 73

We see the motive for this request in the earlier surprise of Faustus when he learns that the devils, who torture others, are themselves susceptible to pain. 74 This request to become a devil is a holdover from the Faustbook which was Marlowe's source. Yet apparently Marlowe does not intend to make the question one of the significant elements in the play, for while we might be tempted to attribute the eventual damnation of Faustus to the fact that he was a devil, thereby eliminating any real spiritual conflict from the point of the contract, Marlowe is careful to make light of it. In one of the conversations of Faustus with his good and evil angels, for example, appears the following passage:

EVIL AN: Thou art a spirit, God cannot pitty thee.
FAUST: Who buzzeth in mine eares I am a spirite?
Be I a divel, yet God may pitty me,
I God wil pitty me, if I repent. (11. 624-627)

A similar instance in which Marlowe minimizes the technicalities of witchcraft latent in his source is that of the appearance of Helen of Troy as a succubus. This is quite obvious in the source, for she has a "wonderful child" by Faustus, which disappears upon his death. Yet in Marlowe's version, the only indication is in the words of Faustus as he kisses her:

Her lips suckes forth my soule, see where it flies:
Come Helen, come give mee my soule againe.
Here wil I dwel, for heaven be in these lips,
And all is drosse that is not Helena ... (11. 1331-4)
Though this element could have been made an important part of the plot, with Helen a principal agent of Faustus's damnation, Marlowe has played it down to maintain the suspense over the fate of Faustus to the last minute.

Marlowe's use of witchcraft material as machinery in *Dr. Faustus*, as for instance, in his treatment of the motives and methods of Faustus's conjuration, the characterization of Mephostophilis, and the accomplishments of Faustus through his spirits, indicates that he was familiar with this body of information, and able to employ it to illuminate and substantiate his story. Nor does he deviate from orthodoxy in his use of the witchcraft traditions. The powers and limitations of both Faustus and his devil are within the realm of popular belief. Yet Marlowe is able to manipulate this material, and subordinate it to his dramatic purposes. The examples given above, of the request of Faustus to become a devil, and of the role of Helen of Troy as a succubus, are good illustrations of this point. Mephostophilis is perhaps the most obvious example of Marlowe's ability to use devil lore as background and detail, without letting it constrain his own forceful and original conception of character. Mephostophilis is quite thoroughly a devil; his motives and limitations are clear, he is determined to trap Faustus, Yet he is a personality as well, whose reactions are often almost sympathetic in contrast with the egotism of Faustus.
Marlowe is in complete control of his material. He can employ it to authenticate his story, and to elaborate the conjuration scene. To some extent, he uses it in characterization and action, for much of the conversation between Faustus and Mephistophilis hinges on problems in demonology, as when they discuss hell or the nature of suffering. Yet Dr. Faustus is not an abstract exercise in theology, but a drama. Marlowe has carefully selected witchcraft material from the Faustbook and other sources, and manipulated it with his typical genius to dramatic effect.
CHAPTER III

Damnation

The questions which are usually raised about the damnation of Faustus have to do with why he did not repent, why his good angel was not able to save him, why, when he seemed to repent, he was not saved. The answer to most of these may be given in terms of the craftiness of the devil, and the weakness of Faustus. It is worthwhile, however, to examine the patterns of sin and repentance in popular theology for parallels to the actions and attitudes of Faustus. The approach will be to determine whether there are any elements or stipulations not obvious to the modern reader which may have had bearing on his damnation.

The first point which may be established is that Faustus was himself responsible for his downfall, and cannot be considered merely the victim of the devil. The devil was alert, and as soon as a man wanted to go about an evil business, was ready to set him forward, to see that he had no hindrances. For instance, Mephostophilis is ready to respond to conjuration when he sees Faustus putting himself in peril. Yet for all his strength and power, the devil had no influence over a man without his consent. No enemy could hurt a man, spiritually, but through his own agency. Satan could do no harm, unless
a man's corruption betrayed him. Temptations could not touch a man, without his own yielding. Though the devil was the tempter, inspiring evil and drawing it forth into action, not all evil was directly attributable to him. Though the devil was the original agent of man's depravity, men were themselves capable of evil desires and motivations without diabolical suggestion.

The role of Mephistophilis as tempter is complex, for though he is determined to trap Faustus, saying "What will I not do to obtaine his soule?" (1. 505), he is subtle. His answers to the questions of Faustus are honest. He does not try to deceive, but only passes over difficult topics as quickly as possible. In one instance, he asks Faustus to stop talking about hell for the "terror struck" to his "fainting soul." Later, when Faustus is about to make his bargain, he asks the spirit if devils suffer pain, and is answered shortly:

As great as have the humane soules of men:
But tell me Faustus, shal I have thyn soule,
And I will be thy slave, and waite on thee,
And give thee more than thou hast wit to ask.

(11, 476-480)

This is a very skillful reply, for Faustus did not at that time believe human souls were subject to suffering after death at all.

Even the offer to be the slave of Faustus is characteristic of the restrained nature of the temptation, and indeed the words foreshadow the element of the inability
of the mind of Faustus or of any man to do justice to the possibilities of limitless power. Nevertheless, Mephistophelis firmly urges Faustus to a pact, and begins his service by fetching fire to melt the congealed blood for signing the contract. Later in the play, he invents diversions to keep Faustus's mind from repentance, as for instance, the show of the Seven Deadly Sins.

But it may also be said that Faustus is his own tempter, for in the beginning of the play, he makes his own resolution to sin, and by the end of the play, is begging Mephistophelis for a paramour to "extinguish cleanes:

These thoughts that do dissuade me from my vow, / and keep mine oath I made to Lucifer" (ll. 1323-1325).

Faustus is not unaware of the fact that he has been in some sense tempted by the devil. Before he makes his pact, he questions Mephistophelis about Lucifer, asking "the reason he tempts us thus" (ll. 473). But if Faustus was aware of being tempted, he had even less excuse for giving in, for there was available to the Christian much good advice on escaping the devil and resisting temptation. It was held that those weakest in faith were those most often molested by the devil, and those who thought of him most, the ones who were likely to see him. Six good preventives against the devil were faith, prayer, a righteous life, repentance, the word of God, and providence. Except for providence, Faustus had all of these means at his
own command, yet he made use of none of them.

To avoid temptation, a man was to learn to know God as well as he could. When temptation did come, he was to fix his mind on Christ and His salvation, knowing that there was a "brother in heaven which hath overcome the Devil." We see the devil urging Faustus to the contrary of this advice when he begins to repent:

We come to tell thee thou dost injure us.  
Thou talkst of Christ, contrary to thy promise:  
Thou shouldst not thinke of God, thinke of the devil,  
And of his dame too.  

(11. 703-706)

Faustus answers him, promising to destroy the very means by which we know he might be saved:

Faustus vows never to looke to heaven,  
Never to name God, or to pray to him,  
To burne his Scriptures, slay his Ministers,  
And make my spirites pull his churches downe.  

(11. 708-711)

Many of the blasphemous or daring ideas about religion expressed by Faustus, perhaps the same "monstrous opinions" which Marlowe himself is reputed to have held, were known in Elizabethan popular theology as temptations straight from the devil, and much care was taken to refute them. The general pattern of treatises on this theme was to present a number of theological arguments, likely traps for the sinner, and then to explain at length their fallacy. Many of these errors are precisely the ones into which Faustus falls. For example, the general system which he uses to establish a rationale for his sin is logic or
reason. His syllogism from theology is that all men sin, that the wages of sin is death, so all die, an argument which he holds sufficient to excuse him from further dealings with religion. Bishop Hall, in his comforting treatise *Satan's Fiery Darts Quenched: or Temptations Repelled. For the Help, Comfort, and Preservation of Weak Christians in These Dangerous Times of Error and Seduction*, gives the traditional version of this foolish argument:

Art thou so sottish to suffer thy understanding to be captivated to divine authority, proposing unto thee things contrary to sense and reason? ... Be thou no other than thy selfe, a man; and follow the light and guidance of that which makes thee so, right reason.

This was precisely the mistake made by Faustus, though the pious knew that faith was higher than reason. As Thomas Nashe put it:

The outwande Atheist with these thinges that proceede from his mouth, defilethrys harts.
He establisbeth reason as his God, and will not be perswaded that God (the true God) is, except he make him privie to all the secreties of his beginning and government.

Faustus's reason produced the syllogism which leads him to a position of fatalism, and he says "What doctrine call you this, Che sera, sera, / What wil be, shall be? Divinity adieu" (ll. 75-76). He sends theology back to God in a phrase, for he has convinced himself that his fate is sealed, that it matters not what he does. Again, he parallels a "fiery dart" of Satan, which presents the
argument in terms of predestination:

Thou maist live as thou listeth, thy destiny is irreversible; if thou be predestined to life, thy sins cannot damn thee, for God's election remaineth certain; if thou be ordained to damnation, all thy good endeavors cannot save thee; Please thy self on earth, thou canst not alter what is done in heaven. 10

Faustus has clasped the negative side of this error.

Two more of the "fiery darts" combine into a significant step in the self-delusion which leads Faustus to sin. The first of these argues against a future life:

It is but for a while that thou hast to live; and when thou art gone, all the world is gone with thee; Improve thy life to thy best contentment; Take thy pleasure whilst thou maiest. 11

The second further develops this point of view:

In how vain and causeless awe art thou held of dangers threatened to thy soul, and horrors of punishment after this life; whereas these are nothing but politic bugs to affright simple and credulous men? Sin freely, Man, and fear nothing; take full scope to thy pleasures, after this life there is nothing; the soul dies together with the body, as in brute creatures, there is no further reckoning to be made. 12

The same error is held up for ridicule in Barclay's Ship of Fools, as found in the man "that to scripture wyll not gyve credence . . . but by abusyon / Lyvyth as a best of coon-science cruell / As save this worlde were neyther heven nor hell." 13

Faustus had persuaded himself that it was both reasonable and safe to sin, by believing first fatalistically, that it would make no difference, and secondly, that there
was no afterlife, or at least no punishment after death. He says to Mephistophilis, speaking of himself:

The word damnation terrifies not him,
For he confounds hell in Elysium,
His ghost be with the old Philosophers. (ll. 294-296)

Later, scoffing at his devil, he says, "Come, I think a fable," and:

Thinkst thou that Faustus is so fond, to imagine,
That after this life there is any paine?
Tush, these are trifles and more old wives tales. (ll. 565-567)

Though we cannot determine how widely such ideas were held in Marlowe's day, we can see that they received occasional attention from the pulpit. Hugh Latimer noted in one sermon, for example, that:

There is a saying that ther be a great manye in Englande that saye there is no soule, that beleve not in the immortality of mans soule, that thinke it is not eternal, but like a dogges soule, that thinke there is neyther heaven nor hell. 

The habit of curiously speculating upon the nature of hell, and interpreting it according to some unorthodox point of view, as suggested by Faustus's words "his ghost be with the old philosophers," was evidently not uncommon, especially among those who laid claim to learning. In Thomas Nashe's Pierce Penilesse His Supplication to the Devil, Pierce asks:

Whether (as some phantasticall refyners of philosophie will needes persuade us) hell is nothing but error, and that none but fooles and Idiotes and Machanical men, that have no learning, shall be damned.
His spirit answers him with candour:

Poets and Philosophers, that take a pride in
inventing new opinions, have sought to renowne
their wittes by hunting after strange conceits
of heaven and hell; ... We, that to our terror
and griefe do know their dotage by our sufferings,
rejoyce to thinke how these sillie flyes playes
with the fire that must burne them. 15

This answer echoes the reassurances with which Mephistophilis
meets Faustus's doubts of the reality of hell:

Aye, thinke so still, till experience change thy minde,

But Faustus, I am an instance to prove the contrary,
For I am damnd, and am now in hell. (11. 560, 568-569)

Elsewhere, Nashe specifically singles out those who
"confound hell in Elizium" as examples of error, calling
them "a number that fetch the Articles of their Beleefe
out of Aristotle, and thinke of heaven and hell as the
Heathen Philosophers." 16

Even among the orthodox, there was question as to the
nature of life after death, usually based on the seeming
contradiction of scriptural references to "resurrection of
the body" and the traditional belief in the immortality of
the soul, which had to be deduced from scripture. 17 There
was also qualification with respect to the immortality of
the soul itself, for the soul of man could not be immortal
in the same way that God was immortal. 18 The doubts of
Faustus were far removed from this kind of theologizing,
but they reflected problems which were interesting to the
Elizethians. And, from the care which was taken to
discredit similar doubts, we can see that though the opinions of Faustus were clearly recognized as errors, they were serious and tempting traps even for the faithful.

Another aspect of the sin of Faustus is the fact that his position with respect to the devil was considered a form of blasphemy. In the first place, it was a direct infringement of the first commandment, "thou shalt have no other gods before Him." Full obedience to this commandment meant not only acknowledging the existence of God as supreme, but acknowledging all his attributes, as creator, preserver, sustainer, "eternal, righteous, true, holy, happy, merciful, mighty, most excellent, and chief of all." Furthermore, it meant acknowledging one's own existence to be completely dependent upon God as the source of good. To turn elsewhere, as Faustus does, for help and happiness, was to deny God His proper attributes and to apply them to an inferior good.

Edmond Bonner, listing those who break the first commandment, says:

They must here have a room, that do use witchcraft, necromancy, enchantment, or any other such lyke ungodly or superstitious trade; . . . and without doubt such witches, conjurers, enchanters and all such like, do worke by the operation and syde of the devill, and unto him for the attaining of their wicked enterprisies, they do service, & honor, of which abomination we are warned and expressly commaunded to take hede and flye from . . . It is written "Turne ye not to them, which do use magicall artes, or worke of the devill." For without all doubte, most grevously do they offende agaynst the honour of God, who having in their baptism professed to renounce the devyll
and all his workes, do yet nevertheless make secrete pacts & covenants with the devil or do use any maner of conjurations, to rayse up by devylls for treasure, or any other thing hid or lost, or for any maner of cause, whatsoever it be; for all such comitit so high offense & treason to God, and there can be no greater. For they yelde the honor dewe unto God, to the Devill, Goddes enemy.  

Even to fear or stand more in awe of devils than of God was to set them up as idols. We are reminded here of the attitude of Faustus, for after making the pact, though he fears the wrath of God, his efforts to repent are always halted by his fear of what the devil will do to him if he defects. For instance, toward the end of the play, when "hell strives with grace for conquest," Mephistophilis threatens:

Thou traitor Faustus, I arrest thy soule  
For disobedience to my soveraigne Lord,  
Revolt, or Ile in piece-meale teare thy flesh.  
(11. 1304-1306)  

And Faustus, with more concern for the devils than for God, relents and reaffirms in blood his vow to Lucifer.  

Yet the blasphemy of Faustus goes even further. In mockery of the respect due to God, Faustus sacrifices to the devil, making an overt travesty of worship, saying:

The God /Faustus/ serves is /his/ own appetite  
Wherein is fixed the love of Belzebub.  
To him I'll build an alter and a church  
And offer lukewarm blood of newborn babes. (11. 443-446)  

During the time of the law, God had been worshipped in this sacrificial manner, and from the heathen the devil had extracted the same service. Thus it was doubly sinful when
practiced by one who had been baptised a Christian, for it was not only homage to the devil but a direct affront to God.

The use of God's name in conjuration as an attempt to bind the devil was another form of blasphemy. The devil deliberately encouraged this practice, sometimes acting as if it were effectual, giving in on small matters, for the greater triumph of having the name of God vilely blasphemed. Addressing the deity for such purposes was a serious violation of the third commandment, that the name of God was not to be taken in vain. Henry Bullinger said:

Let us not use, nay, rather abuse, the name or word of God in conjuring, juggling, or sorcery; for in these things the name of God is most of all abused. Moreover, we do disgrace the name of the Lord our God, when we call not upon his name, but turn ourselves rather to I know not what sort of gods, to man's skill and succour, to things forbidden, to idols, and conjurers.

Faustus, who in conjuring says "Yield to the triune power of Jehovah!" is clearly guilty here.

One point which may be overlooked by the modern reader of Dr. Faustus is the precedent in popular theology for considering the story of Faustus as the fall of a great man. Humility was an important virtue, and popular theology encouraged the ordinary person to respect the man who was great in politics, religion, or learning. But corresponding to this respect and awe of the great, there was a belief that the greater the capacity for good
one had, the greater the capacity for evil. For instance, it was practically an aphorism that "the best thing corrupted is the worst." Furthermore, it was thought that a man of great stature and therefore many advantages had much less excuse for sinning than the ordinary man had, and so was more reprehensible when he fell. George Gascoigne, in his *Droome of Doomes Day*, says:

The enormitie of sinnes (on the behalfe of the sinner) is noted by the superioiritie of him that sinneth . . . That which should be to a simple man but a smal trespass: is accounted in such a parsonage a huge and haynous offence and sinne.

More applicable to Dr. Faustus, whose excellence was in learning, is another of Gascoigne's distinctions:

The degree of sin is noted on the behalfe of the science and knowledge of hym that sinneth, whose faulte is so muche the more greevous alwayes than the faultes of hys equalles, the greater that his gains or profit in knowledge hath ben, since Christ protesteth saying. The servant which knoweth his masters will and doth it not, shall be beaten with many stripes. As the Apostle James doeth also testifie saying: it is a sinne to him that knoweth good, and doeth it not. For as Peter the Apostle sayth: it were better not to know the way of righteousnes, than to goo backward from it, after knowledge of it.

It was also believed that a man who possessed excessive talent or virtue possessed vices equally excessive. Most men were average, but the outstanding man had vices to match his virtues. Great wits, for instance, were susceptible to great errors. So it was with Dr. Faustus, who "in the plot of scholarism excell'd all," but descended to the other end of his virtue, by "falling to a
devlish exercise" (l. 24).

It was thought that none did more mischief to the church than those who were excellent in wit and learning. For a man of learning who was deficient in spiritual matters could be a harmful influence by wrongly using the power which learning afforded him. The knowledge a man possessed was not as important as his state of grace.29 We see this judgement reflected in the prologue, with respect to Dr. Faustus, the man of learning who prefers magic "above his chiefest blisse" (l. 27), that is, above his salvation.

There is a close relation between the sin of Faustus and his position as a man of great learning, for both his sin and his learning brought him near the same kind of danger. Whether he was exalted by his great learning, or puffed up by pride, ambition, and curiosity, he was high, close to heaven. According to Elizabethan popular theology, the closer one was to heaven, however raised there, the closer one was to the violences of it.30 The danger to a man who was not only exalted but prideful as well was especially great. For however high a man could climb in pride, nothing was more inevitable than eventual downfall. A typical admonition to avoid pride in one's estate illustrates this point:

Oh fools, forgetfull of what ye are, of what ye shall be! goe on to wonder at your poor miserable glory and greatness: ye are but lift up for a fall: your height is not so sure as your ruin;
ruine to the dust, yea to hell. 31

Pride was dangerous not only because it was accounted a serious offense by God, but also because it was of such a nature that it blinded man to his danger. As John Bodenham put it:

Nothing there is that heaven can worse abide,
Amongst men's deeds, than arrogance & pride . . .
Proud thoughts, that greatest matters take in hand,
Falls soonest, where they safest think to stand. 32

The pattern of the quest for knowledge was similar to the pattern of pride. In one sense, knowledge was heavenly, from God, a divine light. It was said, "As men by folly differ from the Gods, Even so by knowledge come they nearest them." 33 But it was believed that while knowledge could bring a man closer to God, it could also stand in the way of his salvation. Cornelius Agrippa said:

It is an auncient, and almoste an agreable and common opinion, of al the Philosophers, that oftentimes, they may be reckned among the fellowship of the Gods . . . Notwithstanding I, being persuaded with other kinde of reasons, am of opinion, that there can chaunce to the life and salvation of our soules nothing more hurtful and pestilent than these artes and sciences. 34

For though knowledge was pleasing and attractive to the mind of man, it was ultimately inscrutable, and like a flame, dangerous if approached too nearly. Bishop Hall, for instance, compares the situation to a moth coming too close to a candle, and then goes on to moralize:

Thus doe those bold and busie spirits who will needs draw too near unto that inaccessible light, and look into things too wonderful for them: So long do they hover about the secret
Counsels of the Almighty, till the wings of their presumptuous conceits be scorched, and their daring Curiosity hath paid them with everlasting destruction.  

This figure is similar to Marlowe's famous image of Faustus, when, "swolen with cunning, of a selfe conceit, His waxen wings did mount above his reach, and melting heavens conspirde his overthrow" (ll. 20-22).

Marlowe's use of both cunning and conceit as elements of Faustus's presumption is typical of the predictable connection between learning and pride. According to Elizabethan popular theology, intellectual arrogance was reprehensible, but frequently characteristic of men of learning. To be puffed up with the conceit of knowledge was not a surprising thing, for knowledge was recognized as being in itself of a swelling nature. In this, it was similar to pride, for pride was "a puft up mind, a swolne desire, / That by vaine-glory seeketh to aspire." A man puffed up with knowledge showed the same symptoms as a man puffed up with pride.

But pride and knowledge were linked theoretically as well as practically. Both were ultimately from heaven, for knowledge was of God, and pride of an angel of God; both were born in heaven, and as they aspired, strove illegally toward it. The fall of Lucifer from heaven because of pride was considered a parallel to the fall of man because of tasting of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.
This knowledge was sometimes interpreted in an academic sense, so that the punishment of the pride of Lucifer, hell, could be compared to the punishment of Adam for seizing forbidden knowledge, and pride, knowledge, and punishment, be taken together as part of the same equation for the woes of mankind. 38

Alexander Barclay in the satirical *Ship of Fools* gives several examples of the intellectual manifestation of pride. In considering fools that stand well in their own conceit, he speaks of those who "host them selfe of theyr wysdome / And thynke them selfe to have preemynence / Above all other that ar in Christendome." 39 The punishment of pride is in line with the generally recognized pattern of excesses:

This is of pryde rewarde at the last ende
A thynge of the hyest thus nedes moste desconde
Presumptuous pryde hath ever a shamefull ende . . . 40

There was likewise a connection between pride and devils because of the story of Lucifer, who for his pride was thrown from heaven. Almost every discussion of pride includes this history. George Gascoigne's treatment of it in his *Droome of Doomes Day* is perhaps representative:

O pryde, hateful & unable to be borne of any man. Amongst all vices, thou alwayes arte both first and last. For all kinde of sinne (if thou come in the way) is committed. And all kynde of sinne (if thou step a side out of the waye) is omitted. As it is wrytten: the beginninge of all sinne is pryde. The first begotten death. For this in the beginning of all thinges, dyd rayse up the creature against his creator. An Angell against God. But immediately and without delay, it threw him downe againe. Because he continewed
not in the truth, it threw him down again from innocence, into sinne, from delights, into miseries, and from the bright heaven, into a thick mystic ayre.  

The story of the fall as told to Faustus by Mephistophilis is also a typical version. Faustus asks Mephistophilis how Lucifer became Prince of Devils, and Mephistophilis answers, "Oh by aspiring pride and insolence, for which God threw him from the face of heaven" (ll. 303-304).  

But not only was the devil the originator of pride, he was from then on to be identified with all pride, wherever it occurred. Thomas Nashe says, "I my selfe have no enemy but Pryde, which is the Summum genus of sinne, & may wel be a convertible name with the divell, for the divell is nought but pryde, and pryde is an absolute divell." Even pride in man was directly related to the devil, for when a man evidenced pride, it showed he belonged to the devil. Hugh Latimer says:

Wherefore amongst other vices, beware of pride and stoutnes: for what was the cause that Lucifer being the fayrest Angell in heaven, was made the most horrible devil, and cast downe from heaven into hell; Pride onely was the cause thereof. Therefore saint Augustine hath a pretty saying: . . . When soever thou seest a proud manne, doubt not but hee is the sonne of the devill.  

There were various ways to play upon the connection between devils and pride, for while humility could make angels of men, pride could make devils of angels and devils of men. Such ideas add a complexity of overtones to the sin of Faustus. Not only was he a prideful man, he sold
his soul to the devil. Not only did he sell his soul to
the devil, he asked to become a devil, though in one sense
he already was one. The irony of some of the references of
Mephistophilis to Lucifer can be more fully appreciated in
the light of such concepts. He promises that if Faustus
will sell his soul, he will be as "great as Lucifer" (1. 484).
But the greatness is left unqualified, whether power, know-
ledge, sin, or pride. An examination of Marlowe's frequent
use of the words "devilish" and "heavenly" would reveal
the same kind of irony.

Pride and ambition led Faustus to his fatal pact.
Popular theology held that it was a natural step from
pride, first of the seven deadly sins, to other varieties
of sin. It was believed that no man could stand alone,
exist or resist sin without God. But the sin of the pride-
ful man was precisely that he thought he could get along
without God. When he made the assumption that he had no
need for God, he declined God's interest in him. Only
as a man was humble would God help him. Standing thus
alone, the prideful man was completely without defense
against the assaults of the devil, who was always working
in the hearts of men to blind them to the truth, and to
puff them up with pride, to their destruction.

One of the most common manifestations of pride, one
which was in its effects very similar to it, was ambition.
Pride could be defined as "an inordinate love of one's own
advancement & proper excellency, of which do ryse bostyns, ostentation, Hypocrisie, Scysmes, & such like.\textsuperscript{47} Ambition was a desire to rise higher and higher, instilled by the devil, especially in those possessing honor or position.\textsuperscript{48} It was an insatiable greediness of glory, "an unreasonable desire to enjoy honores, estates, and great places."\textsuperscript{49}

Ambition was to be found on two levels, one, with princes, rulers, or heads of state, and the other, as in the case of Faustus, in private citizens. Though it was no sin to desire the honor due to one, desiring more honor than one ought, "and by unlawful means, is ambitious and carried away with a perturbation of intemperance."\textsuperscript{50} This point of view is explained by La Primaudaye in The French Academy:

> It appeareth sufficiently unto us how pernicious this vice of ambition is in the souls of great men, and worthy of perpetuall blame. And although the matter be not of so great weight, when they that follow this vicious passion are but mean men and of small account, yet we are to know, that all they depart far from duty and honesty, who, for the obtaining of glory and renown, shew themselves inflamed and desirous to excell others in all those things which they ought to have common together for the mutuall aide and comfort of every one. Onely we must seake, without pride and envy, after excellency and preferment in that which is vertuous, and profitable for humane society, contenting our selves notwithstanding with that, which we are able to performe, and so we shall never be blamed; but justly may we be condemned, if we undertake that which is above our strength.\textsuperscript{51}

The opening speech of Faustus shows how the wrong kind of ambition is working in him. Speaking of medicine, he says:
Faustus is not satisfied with his own capacities, but desires even greater power.

We see the pattern of ambition working, too, as Faustus first asks only success in medicine, but having achieved that, has no satisfaction. To quote La Primaudaye again:

Ambition never suffereth those that have once received her as a guest, to enjoy their present estate quietly, but maketh them alwaies emptie of goods and full of hope. It causeth them to contemne that which they have gotten by great paines and travel, and which not long before they desired verie earnestly, by reason of their new imagination and conceits of greater matters, which they continually barke forth, but never have their mindes satisfied and contented. 

Ambition was serious, dangerous, and reprehensible, a poison which was "the cause of the perishying of many a man." 

But though the sin of Faustus seems to fall well within these generally recognized categories of evil, there is one sin he could have committed which would account completely for his failure to repent and be saved. This is the sin against the Holy Ghost. The synoptic gospels contain a curious injunction that:

Every sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto
men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come.  

It has been suggested that Faustus committed the sin against the Holy Ghost, an idea which, if proven to be true, could neatly clear up the problem of his damnation. Certainly his activities as a magician might bear this kind of interpretation from the point of view of such authorities as King James:

The sin against the holie Ghost hath two branches: The one a falling backe from the whole service of God, and a refusall of all his preceptes. The other is the doing of the first with knowledge, knowing that they doe wrong against their own conscience, and the testimonie of the holie Spirit, having once had a tast of the sweetness of Gods mercies. Now in the first of these two, all sortes of Necromancers, Enchanters or Witches, are comprehended: but in the last, non but such as erreth with this knowledge that I have spoken of . . . the error of Magicians and Necromancers proceeds of the greater knowledge, and so drawes nearer to the sin against the holy Ghost.

This judgment is based on one of the orthodox interpretations, that to blaspheme against the Holy Ghost was to speak against or inveigh against the work of the Holy Spirit, knowing it to be the truth, the revelation of God. Blasphemy could be committed by the ignorant, the unenlightened, and be forgiven, but blasphemy committed by one who was not ignorant of the truth was the sin against the Holy Ghost, and could not be forgiven.

But apparently this interpretation of the sin against
the Holy Ghost was not universally accepted, for there is no small disagreement in popular theology as to its meaning. Thomas Nashe's view, in *Christ's Tears Over Jerusalem*, for instance, is not at all compatible with King James's opinion, though it is perhaps even more applicable to Faustus: "What is the sinne against the holy Ghost, (which Augustine conclueth to be nothing but Desperatio morientis, to give up a mans soule in despayre,) but a speciall branch of discontent?"59 In fact, the question of the sin against the Holy Ghost was so much a puzzle, that it was feared by many that they were damned because they had committed it unawares, without knowing what it was or when they had done it. This problem could even prey on the mind so that it brought on melancholy, hence efforts in the treatises on melancholy to dissuade people from worrying about having committed it.60

Sermons were also preached about the question, Hugh Latimer, for instance, speaking against those who on this account considered it futile to confess their sins, advised that anyone who asked forgiveness would be saved, and went so far as to say that the sin against the Holy Ghost was nothing but to continue in sin to the end of one's days, without asking forgiveness.61 This interpretation could apply to Faustus, but it postulates a sin not complete until death, that is, damnation not because of an act committed, but because of a refusal of salvation at the last. As Latimer says, it could not be judged until after
death, so from this point of view, the real question which is central to the drama, why Faustus refuses salvation, or why it is not granted to him, is still unanswered. Nor is there sufficient reference or specific pattern within the play itself to warrant emphasizing this sin as important to a reading of *Dr. Faustus*.

In considering why Faustus is finally damned, it may be well to examine the specific references in the play to repentance and salvation, and to try to interpret them in the light of popular theology. One of the ways repentance is brought into the play is through the good and evil angels. The evil angel tries to convince Faustus that his sin is too great to be forgiven, while the good angel assures him of God's mercy. The Old Man, likewise, tries to encourage Faustus to repent. Throughout the play, Faustus expresses his intention to repent before the end, saying:

> Be I a devil, yet God may pitty me,
> I God will pitty me, if I repent; (ll. 625-628)

and

> Tush, Christ did call the thiefe upon the Crosse,
> Then rest thee Faustus quiet in conceit. (ll. 1147-8)

The assurance of Faustus that he could be saved at the last minute is a reflection of Elizabethan belief in deathbed repentance. Ideally, repentance was not the work of a day or of an hour, but of a whole lifetime of confession and endeavor. Yet it was held that God had the power to save a man and change his heart in the twinkling of an eye,
and that if a man died of two strokes of an axe, for instance, he could be saved between the blows. Though one was never to despair of salvation for fear one had waited too late to repent, still it was considered very poor practice to put off repentance to the end, presuming too much upon the gentleness and mercy of God. Faustus, when tormented by fears of damnation, repeatedly defers doing anything to save himself.

Here and there in the play, Faustus does actually seem to repent, but his repentance is always followed by disbelief in its efficacy. After speaking with the Old Man, for instance, he says:

I do repent, and yet I do dispaire:
Hell strives with grace for conquest in my breast.

(11. 1301-2)

There are many possible explanations in Elizabethan popular theology as to why such repentance did not work. In the first place, there was motive. What turned men to repent was fear of God, but there were two kinds of fear of God, one, a fear which grew out of a sincere love of and desire to please Him, the other, an insincere fear which was a servile dread of punishment. Throughout the play, the motive of Faustus is not to leave off his evil doing and live a godly life, but simply to escape damnation. He asks "What shall I do to shun the snares of death?" (1. 1303)

Lack of proper motive is also probably part of the reason Faustus puts off his repentance until the last
moment, for true repentance meant leaving off sin, and endeavoring to commit it no more, a step which Faustus does not seem willing to take. He likewise fails to meet several other qualifications of true repentance. For instance, a penitent had to be truly sorry for his sins. Not only was it necessary to acknowledge sin, but also to be sincerely grieved and contrite for it. We notice with Faustus, however, that never, when he repents, does he show sorrow about anything but being damned, never does he lament the enormity of his transgression, but says simply "I repent." Only in his very last words does he seem to acknowledge a real connection between his acts and repentance, and the tardiness and desperation of the admission only emphasizes the superficiality of his previous repentance. Just before he is carried out through the hell gate, he says "Ile burne my bookes" (1. 1477).

Faustus also fails to show true faith in the saving power of God. It was held that no matter how sorry one was for sin, without faith in God's forgiveness, salvation was impossible. The classic example of this error was Judas, who was considered the archetype of false repentance. Judas confessed his sin, and with much sorrow returned the money to the priests, but because he did not turn to Christ with confidence in his mercy, all his sorrow was in vain.

Furthermore, it was essential to remember that salvation depended directly upon divine mercy, and could not be
bought by one's merits, nor lost by one's sin, however great. 71 Faustus, confessing his sin to the scholars, is quite convinced that his sin had exceeded God's mercy. He says that he has "A surffet of deadly sinne that hath damned both body and soule." The scholars tell him, "Yet Faustus, looke up to heaven, remember gods mercies are infinite."

And Faustus answers, "But Faustus offence can nerer be pardoned. The serpent that tempted Eve may be saved, but not Faustus" (ll. 1371-2). He is convinced also that it is too late to be pardoned, that had he started earlier, or had he had more time, he could have been saved, but that he has waited too late. In his final soliloquy, he begs that his final hour be "a yeere, a moneth, a weeke, a naturall day."

The scholars, too, seem to fear with Faustus that it is too late for them to help him, though they say that had he told them, they could have had "divines" pray for him. Popular theology taught that it was proper and efficacious to pray for others, both private friends and public figures, for both spiritual and physical welfare. A person in trouble or danger was encouraged to consult with pastors and ministers for help, guidance, and prayer, and if a man was seen to be in danger who did not ask for help, it was the responsibility of spiritual brethren to warn him and aid him. 73 A good example of the power of prayer against possession by the devil can be found in the story given
above of the devil who at the prayers of Martin Luther
threw his written pact in at the window, thus relinquishing
his claim on a young man. 74

The refusal of Faustus to believe in the possibility
of his being saved bears interpretation in terms of one
more important idea in Elizabethan popular theology, despair.
Despair was considered a type of religious melancholy, "a
sickness of the soul without any hope or expectation of
amendment." 75 Its symptoms were often similar to those of
melancholy, with the exception that melancholy was thought
to be a physical disorder, while despair was strictly
spiritual. 76 One proceeded from the humours, the other,
from the mind's affliction. Despair was caused by, among
other things, the devil, meditation, "solitariness and
contemplations of God's judgements." 77 Warnings are often
found in sermons against worrying about God's judgments
to the point of despair. 78 It was thought that a group
particularly susceptible to this disorder were those "whose
vocation consisted in studie of hard pointes of learning." 79
This was because their studies often took the place of a
ture knowledge of scripture, which was the best defence
against despair.

The scholars suspected that Faustus had fallen into a
"suffet," or into "some sickness by being over solitary." They
apparently thought he was afflicted with physical
melancholy, for they offered to call physicians for him.
Only as he insisted he was damned did they look upon his malady as despair, and urge him to faith in God's mercies. They believed that even in the face of his obligation to the devil, even in spite of his despair, there was hope. Burton, in his *Anatomy of Melancholy*, expresses similar hope for the despairing:

Experience teacheth us, that though many die obstinate and wilful in this malady, yet multitudes again are able to resist and overcome, seek for help, and find comfort, are taken efacula Eribi, from the chops of Hell, and out of the Devil's paws, though they have by obligation given themselves to him.

Faustus proceeds, however, in his final soliloquy, in the pattern of the despairing, being convinced he is damned, and threatened and tormented by devils. A typical statement of the symptoms of the despairing underlines the predictability of his attitude:

In their extremity [they] think they hear and see visions, outcries, confer with Devils, that they are tormented, possessed, and in hell fire, already damned, quite forsaken of God, they have no sense or feeling of mercy, or grace, hope of salvation, their sentence of condemnation is already past.

Though the whole final speech should be read for the full impact of the despair, perhaps two lines will summarize Faustus's conviction:

The starres moove stil, time runs, the clocke wil strike
The devil wil come, and Faustus must be damned.

(11. 1429-30)
EPILOGUE

The approach to Dr. Faustus taken in this thesis has obvious limitations. As it is based exclusively upon popular theology, a small part of the evidence for Elizabethan intellectual history, no far reaching assertions could be made about the Elizabethan mind, much less about the thoughts and opinions of Marlowe himself. The method has been simply, to see what ideas found in popular theology are to be found in the play, and what their meaning in popular theology may indicate about possible meanings in the play.

Such an approach means directing attention not to the play itself, but to the configurations of history. Because many ideas in Elizabethan popular theology reflect on or apply to parts of the play, but seldom to the play as a whole, parts have had to be considered as parts, rather than as they stand in relation to the rest of the play.

Faithfulness to the multiplicity of thought and opinion which is the background for the play in popular theology demands conscientious awareness of the complexity of evidence. Yet many critics have not been able to resist interpreting the play as a whole to fit some single historical ideograph which parallels it. Lily B. Campbell,
for instance, noting that Marlowe maintains tension with suspense over the fate of Faustus's soul, attributes the dramatic structure to the influence of the "case of conscience," a popular device focusing attention on problems of conscience or morality by telling case histories.¹ Miss Campbell acutely suggests that the drama of Faustus's struggle lies in his wavering between hope and despair, but her historical evidence is extremely selective, (she considers the "case of conscience" more significant than the morality tradition), and she persists in reading Dr. Faustus as a case of conscience rather than as a play.

A similar but less harmless example of misuse of historical information is to be found in an article by J. T. McCullen, "Dr. Faustus and Renaissance Learning."² He does not attempt to stretch the play on the rack of an historical ideograph, but rather to force a new interpretation by wrenching history. He means to prove that Faustus was not a learned man at all, but a "shallow mind," whose tragedy arose from "culpable ignorance." Carelessly equating knowledge with wisdom, he quotes with no sense of the complexity of the material at hand. He judges Faustus only by the opinions of such writers as Cornelius Agrippa and Fulke Greville, who, as pointed out in so basic a study as Paul Kocher's Science and Religion in Elizabethan England,³ represent a very specialized point of view. Mr. McCullen's interpretation is based on the assumption that "Renaissance
writers" were intellectually identical.

Such critics who attempt to give an entire interpretation of a play such as Faustus strictly on the basis of historical evidence usually take a slanted view of history and an inadequate view of literature. For history itself is so complex as seldom to present a definitive point of view from which to approach a work of art, and a play such as Marlowe's is not often so unilateral as fully to be accounted for by such treatment. One of the purposes of this thesis has been to suggest the complexity of historical material which may be taken to underlie the play, even in the single field of popular theology. The network of supplementary and overlapping ideas examined may serve as a deterrent to oversimplification.

Though care must be taken to avoid letting the awareness of historical analogues overshadow the play itself, it is also true that a critic who wishes to view the play as a whole, with parts in relation to each other, must have adequate historical background, not only to keep his discussion from being uninformed and to add richness to his interpretation, but because historical analogues often suggest and alter our view of relationships within the play. It would be too extensive a task to show how all the material in this thesis may serve criticism in this way, but perhaps a few examples will be indicative of possible applications.

Harry Levin in The Overreacher, a perceptive study in
spite of the fact that its only acknowledged purpose is to emphasize Marlowe's psychological biography, asserts that Faustus committed the unpardonable sin against the Holy Ghost. He recognizes that this sin is of such a nature that it commands the reading of the whole play if Faustus committed it; and he does read Faustus as damned from start to finish. Had he been willing, however, to show what interpretation of the sin against the Holy Ghost he is stipulating, or at what point or by what action in the play Faustus committed it, his reading would have been richer and more impressive. For according to the various views to be found in Elizabethan popular theology, Faustus might have committed this sin when he used the name of God in conjuring, when he denied God by giving himself to the devil, when he refused to repent, or when he despaired of salvation. The instant at which this sin is committed would have to be read as the turning point of the dramatic action.

Another suggestion of Levin's which might have been more meaningful if made in the light of historical information is his suggestion that the coordinates of the vertical scale of the drama are heaven and hell. This is true in a sense, yet an examination of the ideas set forth by Mephastophilis about hell, as understood in Elizabethan popular theology, indicate an even more clearly defined pattern which may be followed throughout the play.
It is fairly obvious that the concept of heaven is one of the principal coordinates. Words abound which draw the attention upward: "heavenly," "aspiring," "leaps," "mounts," "draws up," "divine," "celestial," and the many references to astronomy. Heaven represents everything for which Faustus strives, the heaven of the Christian God, the heaven he desires as he "tries his braines to gaine a diety," the Primus Mobile to which he is whirled in a chariot at the height of his power as a magician, the height which he attains in his pride, and which he fails to attain in his sin.

But there is no corresponding reference in the play to hell as a localized conception. Never is hell referred to as being under, or away, or in any direction. At the end of the play, Lucifer does not fetch Faustus down or off, but simply "quick to hell." Hell gapes, not as a hole, but as a mouth.

The opinions of Mephastophelis about hell tend to reinforce this pattern, for he clearly says, "Why this is hell nor am I out of it" (l. 312), going on to explain a concept of spiritual suffering which many readers since have taken to be the total meaning of his announcement. Elizabethan popular theology evidences an understanding of this idea not simply as a notion of spiritual suffering, but in a quite physical sense, that hell literally accompanied devils wherever they went. Later, Mephastophelis explains
that:

Hell hath no limits, nor is circumscribed
In one self place, for where we are is hell
And where hell is there must we ever be. (ll. 553-555)

Faustus, who "confounds hell in Elizium," seizes on the idea
that Mephistophilis is "now in hell," and accepts it as a
state not different from the one he is in:

Nay, and this be hell I'll willingly be damned,
What, walking, disputing, etcetera? (ll. 569-570)

Mephistophilis insists on the reality of hell, but not on
a locale for it other than "under the heavens" (l. 549).

In other words, the conception seems to be of heaven as
a particular point to be attained, under which earth, hell,
and all else are indiscriminately located. Two more
quotations may further illustrate this idea. When Mephas-
tophilis tells what will happen at the end of the world,
he says, with no emphasis on the earth as a middle ground,
that:

When all the world dissolves
And every creature shall be purified,
All places shall be hell that is not heaven. (ll. 556-558)

The futurity of the statement points up the role of heaven
as the object of desire, and all else, that which falls
short of it. Faustus, in his famous paean to Helen,
expresses the same idea, that heaven is unique, set apart
from everything else:

Here will I dwell, for heaven's in these lips
And all is dross that is not Helena. (ll. 1333-4)

The particular appropriateness of the famous Icarus
image comes to mind here, for its coordinates are simply heaven and all that is beneath it. Icarus strives upward, toward heaven, and falls, not below where he was, but back where he was, to perish. The frequent occurrence of the verbs "fly" and "fall" in the play is noteworthy in this respect, as is the fact that no reference is made in the play to a fall from anywhere but an unnatural height. Faustus, "excelling all . . . in heavenly matters of theology, . . . swollen with cunning, of a self-conceit, . . . falls to a devilish exercise" (ll. 16-23). Lucifer and his spirits are thrown from the face of heaven. In the final soliloquy, Faustus wants to become one with earth, so his soul may rise, or be drawn up as mist to a cloud, or fall from the cloud down to ocean, (as with Icarus) never to be found. He says "I'll leap up to my God!" and then "Who pulls me down" (l. 1431).

Many of the ideas discussed above might be taken to inform this interpretation: pride and learning as lofty and liable to fall, hell not localized, despair the belief that one is already in hell. Such a supplement to Mr. Levin's reading would be clearly allowed for and even suggested by the concepts of Elizabethan popular theology. This example may perhaps be indicative of the application and significance of the material presented in this thesis.
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