

## **I. King Solomon, Gender and Empire in *Doctor Faustus*: An Introduction**

Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* is interpreted as a play dramatizing the tension between Renaissance and Christian value. The dissertation, however, marks a point of departure by focusing on issues associated with King Solomon, gender, and empire in *Doctor Faustus*. It highlights the allegorical representation of King Solomon and the Queen of Sheba as figures for England's Protestant Queen even as the play identifies Faustus with the negative side of Solomon. It is also hypothesized that Marlowe's manipulation of the traditional iconographic of King Solomon and the Queen of Sheba produces a play which offers a version of Solomon directly in conflict with the version preferred by the Elizabethan court, a Solomon whose colonialism exposes him as culpably effeminate ruler and implicates him in demonic activities that threaten the divine order.

English drama and the Renaissance relate the same thing. At this time, Europe was animated by a new spirit and fresh ideas. The wonderful Renaissance Movement kicked the slumbering continent into energy. The Muses bore the torch of new knowledge to all parts of Europe. This revival of learning brought in its train a passionate zeal for the classical literature of Greece and Rome. It had its influence on the English stage too. The Miracles, Mysteries, and the Moralities were driven out by a new type of drama which took its rise in Oxford and Cambridge, and derived its inspiration from Greece and Rome. English dramas came to be written on the classical model; of these all *Gorboduc* was the most striking example. It was based on the tragedies of the illustrious Seneca, and it contained all the traits of the Greek drama- the Chorus, the three Unities, and the division of the dramatic action into five parts. Many plays belong to this period of infancy of the English stage e.g. *Ralph Roister Doister*, a comedy by Nicholas Udall; *Gorboduc or Ferrex and Porrex*, a tragedy; and *Damon and Pythias* a tragic-comedy by Richard Edwards.

The Renaissance contained with the Reformation, tended produce the Romantic drama. To this drama, therefore, we should now turn. The Romantic drama was a product of the Elizabethan age. The English dramatists, after a few experiments, on the classical drama were followed in two ways; a dignified form and a luxuriant expression. The treatment of the English drama grew to be romantic rather than classical. The three unities of time, place, and action were not observed, so that an English play of this period could cover an indefinite period of time, the action could move from place to place, and subsidiary plots or by-plots could exist side by side with the main plot. Thus in King Lear, Othello and other plays we notice sub-plots running along with the main thread of the story. Renaissance, which literally means rebirth or re-awakening, is the name of a Europe-wide movement which closes the trammels and conventions of the medieval age, and makes for liberation in all aspects of life and culture.

Though the influence of the spirit of the Renaissance the writers of the latter half of the age of Elizabeth- in poetry, drama, and prose romances and novels, that influence can be seen working with particular force on Marlowe and his fellows who together are called the university wits. Of them again, the writings of Marlowe are the most prominent embodiment of the spirit of the renaissance. Generally speaking, Marlowe himself is the spirit of Renaissance incarnate. A reckless Bohemian in life, a daring atheist setting not much value on moral worth but all value on the Machiavellian virtue living a life of imagination rather than thought, full of gaiety, full of the zest for life, Marlowe is the typical product of the Renaissance. In the conception of the central characters of his dramas, he is impelled for the sake of power, unlimited wealth, again, for the sake of power. Aspirations, unbounded desires of love for the pleasures of the senses, infinite longings for beauty rather than for truth these are the characteristics of the imaginative life which glittered before his eyes in that great age of daring adventures. On the aesthetic side, love

of physical beauty mentioned above goes in his hand in hand with love of the beauty of harmony; the high astounding terms of his blank verse, the thrills and echoes of his phrases, the resounding roll of his declamations, the surfeit of mythological allusions- all these run into excess; but the excesses only point to the essential ambition of reading beyond the narrow and the limited into the infinity of achievement, which is the noblest gift of the Renaissance.

When Princess Cecelia of Sweden visited England in 1585, the Westminster School performed a play before Queen Elizabeth and her guest in honor of the visit. Although the play, *Sapientia Solomonis*, surveys the entire life of Solomon, it seems to have been chosen for the occasion, in particular, because of its representation of the visit of the queen of Sheba to Solomon. From Constantine to the Emperor Charles V, royal propaganda had developed the iconography of Solomon as a godly ruler, and the play clearly intends a Solomonic compliment to Elizabeth. As Ruth Blackhurn has noted:

The prologue and epilogue make the compliment explicit by ascribing to Elizabeth particular Solomonic acts; Solomon's choice between the two mothers who claim the same child, for example, becomes Elizabeth's choice of the true religion, also figured as the building of Solomon's temple. (206)

The comparison of Elizabeth with Solomon raises the question of feminine rule. It justifies Elizabeth's greatness in terms of her likeness to a male ruler. The queen of Sheba episode makes possible a timely compliment to Elizabeth's guest, Cecilia that is qualified by her depiction as female ruler.

A contemporary description of her visit suggests the typological significance of the play with reference to Cecilia, who improves on "the Queen of Saba . . . for that (enflamed with tone of Wisdom), She trailed in comparison a short journey to vary the Court of

Solomon, these to enjoy the presence of so wise a King” (208). The comment, like the play, compliments Cecilia, but it also compliments Elizabeth in a way that defines the relationship between the two. According to I Kings 10, the queen of Sheba’s visit was originated in accounts of Solomon’s greatness. Having heard of his wisdom and wealth, she comes to see for herself. Though she arrives doubting, after meeting Solomon and observing his court and kingdom, she acknowledges his superiority; as verse five puts it, “These was no more spirit in her” (210). In part, at least, Cecilia’s feminine greatness proceeds from her acknowledgement of Elizabeth’s superior, and apparently masculine, greatness.

The queen of Sheba’s submission signifies a relationship not merely personal but also national and international. After testing Solomon’s wisdom, she offers him tribute in the form of an “An hundred and twenty talents of gold, and of spices very great store, and precious stones” (I Kings 10: 10). The performance of the scene before Queen Elizabeth and Princess Cecilia implies, therefore, that Cecilia’s visit pays a figurative tribute, suggesting Sweden’s recognition of England’s political and mercantile leadership. The biblical source treats the Queen of Sheba’s visit as a representative example of Solomon’s influence; this the play also indicates England’s prominence among nations other than Sweden. Since the queen of Sheba’s submission to Solomon came to be understood in the Tudor period as a pre-figuration of the English reformation, the play further implies Elizabeth’s religious leadership for the Protestant nations of Europe. Traditionally the queen of Sheba’s submission to Solomon had been interpreted as prefiguring the submission of the Church to Christ, another relationship defined with reference to gender. In this tradition the church, identified as the bride of Christ, surrenders to the authority of the masculine Christ. Under Henry VIII, interpreters began to locate this aspect of the typology more specifically in the reformation, the King, as Christ’s vice rent, governed

and protected the national Church. Elizabeth inherited the role of godly ruler. Because of the queen's reputation for godly wisdom, then, as for magnificent wealth, Elizabeth's England, like Solomon's Jerusalem, becomes the destination of pilgrimages and the center of international influence.

The iconographic tradition indicates on extent for this influence reaching beyond Europe. In the biblical account the queen of Sheba's visit comes in the middle of detailed descriptions of Solomon's trade relations with Ophir. The verses just before she is introduced in I Kings apart that Solomon's ships brought back from Ophir. "four hundred and twenty talents" of gold (9: 27- 8) Other verses in the narrative describe additional imports brought by these ships, and the verses immediately following the account of the queen's departure further describe Solomon's trade wealth and foreign influence. These features of the story also inform the play performed before the two royal women. The hope of discovering Ophir provided a serious motive for New World exploration for some; typologically associates "the English discoveries in the new World with Solomon's discoveries" (307). English voyagers were the "Navie of Solomon, gathering gold from Ophir" (301). Stephen Greenblatt records the interesting claim that "[t]he discoverer of these islands named them to be those Isles from whence Solomon fetched Gold to Adorne the Temple at Jerusalem, might be the more desirous to go and inhabit the same" (345). The same appeal worked on English desires. Renaissance hopefuls utilized these elements of the Solomon trope to justify and encourage English efforts to establish trade dominance over European rivals in the competition for gold and other products of the New World. In the biblical context as it was understood in Elizabethan England, then the queen of Sheba represents Solomon's tributary nations. The representation genders the exploitation of new World resources in a manner consistent with the accounts of Hakluyt and numerous others who regularly feminize territories to be controlled or colonized and regard such colonizing

efforts as masculine. The play's depiction of Elizabeth as Solomon, therefore, in addition to justifying her reign as both godly and acceptable because masculine, implicitly supports her pursuit of masculine colonial goals, figuring them as a divinity sanctioned renewal of Solomonic empire.

As John N. King observer, however, the queen of Sheba's appearance in *Sapientia Solomonis*, like the appearance of Solomon, offers meaning on multiple levels. King cites several contemporary sources, including Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*, which compared Queen Elizabeth not with Solomon, but with the queen of Sheba. In the final scene of *Henry VIII*, a section probably actually written by John Fletcher, Thomas Cranmer prophesies that the infant Elizabeth will be "a pattern to all princes living with her" and

Saba [i.e., the queen of Sheba] was never  
More covetous of wisdom and fair virtue  
Than this pure soul shall be. (20)

On the basis of such examples, King concludes that *Sapientia Solomonis* "dramatized both Solomon and the Arabian queen as figures for England's Protestant queen" (211). King explains the gender ambiguity in this dual identification as a reflection of "Elizabeth's anomalous position as a female ruler" (366). Like comparisons with Solomon, comparisons of Elizabeth with the queen of Sheba characterize her as a godly monarch; in the case of these comparisons, Solomon represents Christ, and the Queen of Sheba's (or Elizabeth's) godliness appears in her submission. More obviously at stake in the latter comparisons, however, is the question of feminine rule. Applied to Elizabeth, the queen of Sheba's example validates female authority.

Christopher Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* identifies Faustus with this negative Solomon, and Marlowe explicitly associates Solomon's negative characteristics with his imperialism. Reversing the Solomonic vision of empire associated with Elizabethan

expansion, Marlowe offers a Solomonic figure whose character and actions critically subvert the propaganda of colonial enterprise. The play suggests, in other words, that instead of confirm an appropriately masculine rule, colonialism offers a demonic temptation that eventually emasculates rulership. It indicates, furthermore, that the threat offered by the colonized demonic other may be more significant than the promise of wealth that fuels the colonizing vision.

Michael Hattaway has demonstrated a connection between Faustus and Solomon in his study. *The Theology of Marlowe's doctor Faustus*. Hattaway notices that Marlowe's "plays work in large part by irony, by invoking traditional ideas or icons and using them as formative principles of meaning" (45). For *Doctor Faustus*, Marlowe uses the traditional Solomonic iconography. As "evidence that connects Faustus directly with Solomon, "Hattaway mentions the early modern recognition of Solomon as a magician, Faustus's request for a book "where in I might see at plants, herbs and trees that grow upon the earth" (I Kings 4:33), and Mephistopheles' offer "to bring Faustus a courtesan as wise as Saba- the queen of Sheba" (63).

Two additional points, not noticed by Hattaway, confirm his identification of Faustus with Solomon. First, Faustus's initial attempt to conjure begins specifically with manipulation of the Tetragrammaton, the name of God. In a sermon passage derived from Jan Van Der Driesche (Drusius), who's Tertagrammation (1604) rehearses traditional motions that would have been available to Marlow, John Donne explains the connection between Solomon and the Tetragrammaton:

This is that name, in the virtue and use whereof, these Calumniators of our Saviours miracles doe say, that he did his miracles, according to a direction, and schedule, for the trace and right pronouncing of the name, which Solomon in his time had made, and Christ in his time had found, and

by which, say they, any other man might have done those miracles, if he had had *Solomon's* directions for the right sounding of this time, Jehovah.

(208)

In other words, Solomon was popularly recognized as the ancient expert on the use of use Tetragrammaton in conjuring. Faustus follows Solomon's example. In his first attempt to conjure after he has sacrificed to "devils," he writes, "Within this circle . . . Jehovah's name, / Forward and backward anagrammatized" (I. iii. 8-10; I iii, 8-10).

In addition, Faustus explicitly offers to build a place of worship for a demonic pagan deity. He extends the application of Solomon's *Vanities* theme from Ecclesiastes to thoughts of God and heaven, choosing rather to honor Beelzebub than vainly to trust in God:

FAUSTUS: Away with such vain fancies and despair!

Despair in God and trust in Beelzebub

The god thou servest is thine own appetite,

Wherein is fixed the love of Beelzebub.

To him I'll build an altar and a church,

And offer lukewarm blood of new born babes. (4-5)

The pagan deity more frequently associated with child sacrifice is Moloch, one of the demons/ deities for whom Solomon built altars; "Then did Solomon build on high place for Chemosh, the abomination of Moab, in the hill that is before Jerusalem, and for Moloch, the abomination of the Children of Ammon" (I Kings II: 7). Faustus's determination again recalls Solomon's sin. It also incidentally, identifies the sin of both men with epicurean self indulgence. Faustus here admits to himself, "The god thou servest is thine own appetite," aligning himself with "the enemies of the cross of Christ" in Philippians 3:18-9, "Whose God is their belly." In a 1635 sermon on gluttony, John Hales



uses, as an example of devotion to the belly, “Solomon, the most politick and wisest man that even was,” who nevertheless, “prostitutes his learning, wit, wisdom, and all, to that base and sordid appetite (39).

In this context, Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus* has been widely studied from different perspectives. The present study, however, will attempt to study the play from new historical perspectives to show the relationship between the issues associated with King Solomon, gender, and empire in *Doctor Faustus*. In order to facilitate the textual analysis, the present study will adopt new historicism as its methodology. This study will seek to prove that King Solomon as a culpably effeminate ruler and implicates him in demonic activities that threaten the divine order.

## **II. New Historicism: The Mode of the Gendering of Colonization**

New Historicism, since the early 1980s, has been the accepted mane for a mode of literary study that its proponents oppose to the formalism they attribute both to the New Criticism and to the critical deconstruction that followed it. In place of dealing with a text in isolation from its historical context, new historicists attend primarily to the historical and cultural conditions of its production, its meanings, its effects, and also of its literary critical interpretations and evaluations. This is not simply a return to an earlier kind or literary scholarship, for the views and practices of the new historicists differ markedly from those of earlier scholars who had adverted to social and intellectual history as a background against which to set a work of literature as an independent entity, or had viewed literature as a reflection of the worldview characteristic of a period. Instead, now historicists conceive of a literary text as situated within the totality of the institutions, social practices, and discourses that constitute the culture of a particular time and place, and with which the literary text interacts as both a product and a producer of cultural energies and codes.

What is most distinctive in this mode of historical study is mainly the result of concepts and practices of literary analysis and interpretation that have been assimilated from various recent post structural theorists. Especially prominent are: the views of the revisionist Marxist thinker Louis Althusser that ideology manifests itself in different ways in the discourse of each of the semi-autonomous institutions of an era including literature and also that ideology operates covertly to form and position the users of language as the subjects in a discourse, in a way that in fact subjects them- that is, subordinates them- to the interests of the ruling classes; Michel Foucault's view that the discourse of an era, instead of reflection pre-existing entities and orders, brings into being the concepts, oppositions and hierarchies of which it speaks, that these elements are both products and

propagators of power, or social forces, and that as a result, the particular discursive formations of an era determine what is at the time accounted knowledge and truth, as well as what is considered to be humanly normal as against what is considered to be criminal, or insane, or sexually deviant; recent developments in cultural anthropology, especially Clifford Geertz' view that a culture is constituted by distinctive sets of signifying systems, and his use of what he calls thick descriptions – the close analysis, or reading, of a particular social production or event so as to recover the meanings it has for the people involved in it, as well as to discover, within the overall cultural system, the network of conventions codes, and modes of thinking with which the particular item is implicated, and which invest the item with those meanings.

The concepts, themes, and procedures of new historicist criticism took shape in the late 1970s and early 1980s, most prominently in writings by scholars of the English renaissance. They directed their attention especially to literary forms such as the pastoral and masque, and alone all drama; emphasized the role in shaping a text of social and economic conditions such as literary patronage, censorship, and control of access to printing; analyzed texts as discursive sites which enacted and reproduced the interests and power of the Tudor monarchy; but were alert to detect within such texts the voices of the oppressed, the marginalized, and the dispossessed. At almost the same time students of the English Romantic period developed parallel conceptions of the intertextuality of literature and history, and similar views that the representations in literary texts are not reflectors of reality but concretized forms of ideology. Historicists of Romantic literature, however, in distinction from most Renaissance historicists, often name their critical procedures political readings of literary text-readings in which they stress quasi-Freudian mechanisms such as suppression, displacement, and substitution by which, they assert, a writer's political ideology inevitably disguises, or entirely elides into silence and absence, the

circumstances and contradiction of, contemporary history. The primary aim of a political reader of a literary text is to undo these ideological disguises and suppressions in order to uncover its subtext of historical and political conflicts and oppressions which are the text's true, although covert or unmentioned, subject matter.

In the course of the 1980s, the characteristic viewpoints and practices of new historicism spread rapidly to all periods of literary study, and were increasingly represented, described, and debated in conferences, books, and periodical essays. The interpretive procedures of this critical mode have interacted with the earlier concern of feminist critics, who stressed the role of male power structures in forming dominant ideological and cultural constructs. New historicist procedures also have parallels in the critics of African-American and other ethnic literatures, who stress the role of culture-formations dominated by white Europeans in suppressing, marginalizing, or distorting the achievements of non-white and non-European people. In the 1990s, various forms of new historicism, and related types of criticism that stress the embeddedness of literature in historical circumstances, replaced deconstruction as the reigning mode of avant-garde critical theory and practice.

Stephen Greenblatt inaugurated the currency of the label new historicism in his Introduction to a special issue of *Genre*, Vol. 15(1982). He prefers, however, to call his own critical enterprise cultural poetics, in order to highlight his concern with literature and the arts as integral with other social practices that, in their complex interactions, make up the general culture of an era. Greenblatt's essay entitled "Invisible Bullets" in *Shakespearean Negotiations* (1998) serves to exemplify the interpretive procedures of the leading exponent of this mode of criticism, who usually inaugurates a commentary on a work of literature with an unexpected historical anecdote or with a luminous interpretive detail in a marginal literary text, or in a non-literary text. In this essay, Greenblatt begins

by reading a selection from Thomas Harriot's *A Brief and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia*, written in 1588, as a representative discourse of the English colonizers of America which, without its authors awareness, serves to confirm "the Machiavellian hypothesis of the origin of princely power in force and fraud" but nonetheless draws its "audience irresistibly toward the celebration of that power" (105).

Greenblatt also asserts that Harriot tests the English power structure that he asserts by recording in his *Report* the counter-voices of the Native Americans who are being appropriated and oppressed by that power. Greenblatt, then, identifies parallel mode, power-discourse and counter-discourse in the dialogues in Shakespeare's *Tempest* between Prospero the imperialist appropriator and Caliban, the expropriated native of his land, and goes on to find similar discursive configurations in the text of Shakespeare's *Henry IV, I and II*, and *Henry V*. In Greenblatt's reading, the dialogue and events of the *Henry* plays reveal the degree to which princely power is based on predation, calculation, deceit, and hypocrisy; at the same time, the plays do not scruple to record the dissonant and subversive voices of Falstaff and various other representatives of Elizabethan subcultures. These counter-establishment discourses in Shakespeare's plays, however, in fact are so managed as to maneuver their audience to accept and even glorify the power structure to which that audience is itself subordinated. Greenblatt applies to these plays a conceptual pattern, the subversion- containment dialectic, which have been a central concern of new historicist critics of Renaissance literature. The thesis is that, in order to sustain its power, any durable political and cultural order not only to some degree allows, but actively fosters subversive elements and forces, yet, in such a way as more effectively to contain such challenges to the existing order.

Foucault had established such a conception by his claim that, under a dominating regimen of truth, all attempts at opposition to power cannot help but be complicit with

it. This view of the general triumph of containment over the forces of subversion has been criticized as pessimistic and quietist by the group of new historicists known as cultural materialists, who insist on the capacity of subversive ideas and practices—including those manifested in their own critical writings—to effect drastic social changes.

In the similar manner, organizing the concept of gendering of colonization, Annette Kolodny's *"The Lay of the Land"* enriches the history of new historicism. The title of this book will remind geographers of *The Making of the Broads* (J. M. Lambert and others; Royal Geographical Society Research Memoir No.3, 1960). But Kolodny's pun is deliberate. In her view, American attitudes toward the treatment of environments have been shaped by a pervasive metaphor: the land as woman. The landscapes of other countries, to be sure, are often viewed as feminine; but persistent images of an America "experienced as at once Mother and Virgin, with all the confusions possible in between," engendered a conflict stills unresolved by American males. Walter Raleigh's Guiana, with "maidenhead never sacked, turned, nor wrought," and Thomas Moston's New England, "a faire virgin, longing to be sped, / And meete her lover in a Naptiall bed," seem incongruous alongside John Hammond's Maryland, "twice [. . .] deflowered by her own inhabitants, stript, shorne, and made deformed." Kolodny's characterization of American ambivalence conveys both the focus and the flavor of her book. Lowenthal asserts: implicit in the metaphor of the land-as-woman was both the regressive pull of maternal containment and the reductive invitation to sexual assertion: if the Mother demands passivity, and threatens regression, the Virgin apparently invites sexual assertion and awaits impregnation [. . .] The American literary imagination found itself forced to choose between a landscape that at once promised total gratification in return for passive and even filial responses and yet, also, apparently tempted, even invited, the more active responses of impregnation, alteration, and possession. (108)

American was caught between passive admiration for the beauties of nature and the need to turn nature to use. “The sense of guilt aroused by the conflict between the impulse to see nature as beautiful and the desire to dominate it[. . .] is still a central concern within the American psyche”(109).

These themes Kolodny traces through the work of Philip Freneau, Hector St John de Crevecœur, John Audulson, James Fenimore Cooper, William Gilmore Simms, and William Faulkner- all males. Their protagonists tend to reject their own sexuality, like Cooper’s Natty Bumppo, who turns his back on matrimony to live with Mother Earth. “Our continuing fascination with the lone male in the wilderness, and our literary heritage of essentially adolescent, pre sexual pastoral heroes, suggest that we have yet to come up with a satisfying model for mature masculinity” (110).

As long as the frontier endured, virgin lands held out sexual as well as other promises. “The initial discovery of the continent, combined with its apparently limitless terrain, provided Americans with [. . .] almost three hundred years during which to believe that infantile fantasies were about to become adult realities” (120). But the closing of the frontier left Americans bereft of landscapes on which to project their pastoral paradise, and “the frustration of the pastoral impulse was finally expressed through anger- anger at the land that had seemed to promise and then defeat men’s longings” (135).

Kolodny’s “growing distress at what we have done to our continent’ was the initial impetus for her research. Her suggested solution is based on Benjamin Lee Whorf’s view that words shape arts; we can reform environmental behavior by developing a more mature language of environmental interaction. He says: “Our survival may depend on our ability to escape the verbal patterns that have bound us either to fear of being engulfed by our physical environment, or to the opposite attitude of aggression and conquest” (140). To stop “turning America the Beautiful into America the Raped, [...] we need a radically

new symbolic mode for relating to the fairest, fruitfulness, and pleasantest [land] of all the worlde” (147).

Those hypotheses, alike audacious and simplistic, depend largely on assumptions borrowed from psychohistory and on a heavy-handed application of Freudian concepts. They are unconvincing both because Kolodny's interpretation of sexual metaphors is so literal and a historical – to consider Jefferson's former erotic simply because *Notes on Virginia* envisages the "immensity of land courting the industry of the husbandman" strains credulity- and because such metaphors are too common to account for an American environmental personality, as distinct, say from that of other newly settled lands (150).

Even where psychoanalytic jargon does not burden the another's style, lack of clarity often bewilders: "Freneau, of course, was only the first of many who failed to locate an appropriate and enduring pastoral landscape in the New World; but while later dreamers came up against the brick walls of politics or industrial progress, Freneau, in the eighteenth century, was also forced to joust with language" (153). Some infelicities make it hard to take Kolodny's proposition seriously:

But such speculations are only the beginning: the more we understand how we use language and, conversely, how (in some sense) language uses us, the stronger the possibility becomes that we may actually begin to choose more beneficial patterns for labeling and experiencing that mysterious realm of phenomena outside ourselves and, hopefully, with that better or chances for survival amid phenomena that, after all, we know only through the intercession of our brains encodings. (155)

Can anyone truly concerned about the importance of words write that? This is the question of gendering of colonization. These defects notwithstanding, *The Lay of the Land* is an exciting and important book.



Our characteristic attitudes toward land and landscape, environment and resources do make sense in Kolodny's framework. The Americans do feel intense guilt for the rape of their land. Our retreat to nature is an escape from the ties of society, family, maturity. Reflecting this view David Lowenthal asserts:

Infantile and pre-sexual as he is, Natty Bumppo, remains in many ways, an embodiment of the American Dream. A pastoral landscape still seems to beckon to us, calling us into state parks and our children to summer camps, urging us to withdraw from the current and go back to an initial moment of perfect peace, absolute harmony, and freedom from want, tithing a feminine and wholly gratifying natural world. (160)

Kolodny has drawn attention to a little explored, if not unrecognized facet of American relationships with land. Those interested in pursuing her hypothesis further will want to cast a wider net, to quarry the social and literary archives of the frontier, and to examine the environmental attitudes of those Americans Kolodny chooses deliberately to exclude from scrutiny; women themselves.

Just as Kolodny's book *The Lay of the Land* delivers the concept of gendering of colonization from new historicist perspective, in the same manner, John N. King's *Tudor Royal Iconography: Literature and Art in an Age of Religions Crisis* focuses on the notion of iconography. At one time scholars liked to note that the Tudors rarely spoke of the divinity of their kingships-they took it too much for granted-and wisely lift any full-dress, scholarly exposition on the subject to their pedantic successor, James I. John King and Elizabeth Pomeroy would argue that the historians have been looking in the wrong place. The Tudors, far from down playing the godliness of their rule, trumpeted their alliance with the deity at every occasion, but they did so visually through pageantry, painting, and

book illustrations. The trick, the authors maintain, is to know what to look for and how to translate what you see.

Of the two books, *King's Tudor Royal Iconography* is the most ambitious and useful to the historian. He insists on continuity as well as change in the symbol and images that the Tudors used in their well-staged propaganda campaign to rear the legitimacy of their rule on their subjects' hearts and to proclaim their special status as the recipients and disseminators of God's word revealed in Scripture. With the partial exception of official royal portraits designed to be copied and hung in the long galleries of noble and gentry' houses, the imagery and symbolic motifs used were neither classical nor Italian Renaissance but Biblical, late medieval, protestant and solidly English in origins King argues that the historicism must think in terms of the cult of the entire Tudor dynasty, stemming initially from Henry VII, exaggerated and transformed as a consequence of the Reformation under Henry VIII, further expanded by both Edward and Mary, and attaining its ultimate literary and visual forms under Elizabeth.

Hans Holbein's rendering of the title page of the Coverdale Bible in 1535, which displays Henry VIII as the godly ruler, set the standard for all future representations of Edward and Elizabeth as theocratic sovereigns. Henry sits enthroned, supported by the figures of David and Moses, who denote the Biblical ideal of divinely ordained monarchy. He holds the sword of majesty and the book of God in his hands as he administers divine truth to church and state. King asserts that Holbein used a far older tradition of dynastic self-praise than Henry's newly acquired title of Supreme Head of the Church: he drew particularly on Henry VII's efforts to model his public image on Old Testament personalities and to represent himself as the apotheosis sent to end a generation of civil discord.

The pictorial evidence drawn largely from woodcut illustrations, is impressive and convincing, demonstrating how intensely serious the government was about the break with Rome and its battle against the papal antichrist, and how concerned Henry VIII himself was to play the role of the new David and evangelical prince. Both monarch and counsel were determined to saturate all levels of society with iconographic imagery displaying Henry's divine authority. The evidence can be found in every variety of visual art form, extending from the frontispiece of the Great Bible to the embossed and iconographically decorated covers of diminutive prayer books carried by ladies of fashion from their girdles.

The most revealing set of woodcuts analyzed by King are those found in the various editions of John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, in which late medieval themes, such as the Adoration of the Magi, are inverted and rouse as visual satires in the war between the Tudor crown and the papal tiara. The woodcuts start with the spiritual and temporal power- and then illustrate growing papal pretensions, picturing Pope Alexander treading on the neck Emperor Frederick Barbarossa, Emperor Henry IV's humiliation at Canossa, and King John's surrender of his English crown to Innocent III. In later volumes and editions divine rectification of this perverse and tyrannical situation is revealed. The 1563 edition presents Elizabeth as the true Constantine ruling as she shined, the pope at her feet and the keys of his Episcopal authority broken; and the 1570 edition portrays Henry VIII in his spiritual and temporal majesty, the pope sprawled before him. Not even the most illiterate subject could miss the message of Tudor divinity and triumph.

With Mary and Elizabeth English artists had to adjust to the unprecedented presence of queen regnant on the throne and to justify their divine right to rule over men. Both ladies were praised as incarnations of the Virgin Mary, although in Elizabeth's case Protestant apologists inverted the Marian logical formulas or disguised their references to the Queen of heaven. Elizabeth and Mary were presented as sovereigns who embodied

truth, the daughters of time, and under Elizabeth the celebration of her birthday on September 7<sup>th</sup> replaced the Feast of the Nativity of the Virgin the following day.

When King reaches Gloriana's reign, he begins to overlap Elizabeth Pomeroy's reading the Portraits of Queen Elizabeth, and the differences in their approaches become manifest. King is interested in iconography in all its polemical and popular aspects; his materials range from the elaborate state portraits of the queen to the primitive woodcut illustrations found in Thomas Bentley's *The Monument of Matrons* (1582), a collection of prayers, meditations, and ethical advice written by and designed for women, in which representations of the queen loom large. In contrast, Pomeroy limits her study to twelve official paintings of the sovereign. Whereas King ignores the icon as an art form, never explaining the peculiarly stiff, mannequin quality of most woodcut figures, devoid shadows or movement Pomeroy offers not so much an iconographic as an artistic interpretation of Gloriana's image. The difference is between a David and a Seurat; the one realistic, detailed and panoramic, yet withal a trifle clumsy in style; the other intimate, impressionistic, and a delight to read, but not overly useful to the historian seeking to understand the mentality of the age. King is the historian of ideas: art as icons stamped with political and religious meaning: Pomeroy is the interpreter of shapes and shadows and the inner life and vitality that is trapped within the prison of a portrait.

Nowhere is the contrast as stark as in their handling of Elizabeth's first portrait, "the picture of the ladye Elizabeth her grace with a booke in her hande..." (165).

Pomeroy is content to place the sitting somewhere between 1542 and 1547 and never mentions the artist. She insists the painting is not a public document but a family portrait, a brief and intimate glimpse into the life of school girl momentarily interrupted in her humanistic studies, her finger marking the page; a segment of life "neither generated by action nor intended to inspire action" (p.5). Of the young girl's clothing, she observes only

its restrained simplicity, and warns her readers that the bushel of pearls and fantastic wardrobe worthy of queen are still decades ahead; for now “the ties of family affection and loyalty are primary” (p.5). King is for more categorical. The portrait was done in 1546, probably by William Scrots; it bears a close relationship to contemporary woodcuts representing “the princess as a bookish Protestant saint” (p. 211). The portrait was commissioned as a match to go along with a companion picture of young Prince Edward; and, he suggests, the book she holds, which is the focal point of the picture, is the New Testament- not of her classical education- and the volume sitting upon a lectern in the background is the Holy Bible. The message he thinks is clear: the portrait, at least in part, is a public icon: “The prominent inclusion of an open folio Bible in court portraits at this time tends to identify English royalty with a commitment to dissemination the Scriptures in the vernacular and to continuing the progress of religious reform” (p.211).

Pomeroy’s method is essentially visual. She raises but never quite answers the thorny question of physical verisimilitudes, which of necessity has been corrupted and overlaid by iconography. “What did the queen really look like under the gorgeous but deceitful façade of flattery, vanity and convention” (P.31)? Her purpose is to heighten our appreciation of Elizabeth above the caustic eighteenth-century response- Christ, what a fright- to those stiff and bejeweled caricatures of social and political status. Now that monarchy has relinquished its magic, the twentieth century has lost the art of icon reading and can no longer sense the presence of majesty; but it can, argues Pomeroy, do what a fright- to those stiff and bejeweled caricatures of social and political status. Now that monarchy has relinquished its magic, the twentieth century has lost the art of icon reading and can no longer sense the presence of majesty; but it can, argues Pomeroy, do what no Elizabethan could approach her portraits as works of art, wedding the reality of the queen’s dignity and authority to each another kind of reality, the inner personality and the

outer physiognomy. But there is, as Pomeroy senses, a danger an inescapable fallacy- in artificially joining for comparison and interpretation twelve magnificent portraits that were in fact produced piecemeal over a lifetime with long intervals between each sitting. Only for the twentieth century do they exist simultaneously; no sixteenth- century contemporary ever viewed the sovereign's features as a developmental series, let alone thought of comparing his Armanda with her Siena or Ditchley portraits. The orthodox historian finds this kind of anachronistic juggling troublesome, because the whole invariable ends up being larger than the sum of its parts. By paralleling literature and art, by applying overly elaborate art and literary theories, by insisting on a structuralistic perspective of the queen's images, and by bringing together in a single volume her portraits in brilliant color, Pomeroy certainly enhances the viewer's appreciation of an art form; but, one suspects she may have also distorted and obscured historical reality. In a sense, it is a pity that Pomeroy and King did not have each other to draw upon; the one for historical and polemical iconographic depth, the other for the human and artistic touch. As it stands, only the reader has the benefit of both, and together the two volumes, display beyond dispute the strenuous and highly effective efforts that the Tudors made to cultivate and advertise their divinity.

In an oft-quoted phrase, Louis Montrose described the new historicism as "a reciprocal concern with the historicity of text and the textuality of history" (207). That is, history is conceived to be not a set of fixed, objective facts but, like the literature with which it interacts, a text that itself needs to be interpreted,. Any text, on the other hand, is conceived as a discourse which although it may seem to present, or reflect, an external reality, in fact consists of what are called representations- that is, verbal formations which are the ideological products or cultural constructs of the historical condition specific to an era. Many historicists claim that these cultural and ideological representations in texts

serve mainly to reproduce, confirm, and propagate the complex power structures of domination and subordination which characterize a given society including the concept of gendering of colonization.

Despite their common perspective on literary writings as mutually implicative with all other components of a culture, we find considerable diversity and disagreements among individual exponents of the new historicism. The following proposals, however, occur frequently in their writings, sometimes in an extreme and sometimes in a qualified form. All of them are formulated in position to views that, according to new historicists, were central ideological constructs in traditional literary criticism. A number of historicists assign the formative period of most such constructs the early era of capitalism in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: (1) Literature does not occupy a trans-historical aesthetic realm which is independent of the economic, social, and political conditions specific to an era, nor is literature subject to timeless criteria of artistic value. (2) History is not a homogeneous and stable pattern of facts and events which serve as the background to the literature of an era, or which literature can be said simply to reflect, or which can be adverted to as the material conditions that in a unilateral way, determine the particularities of a literary text. (3) The humanistic concept of an essential human nature that is common to the author of a literary work, the characters within the work, and the audience the author writes for, is another of the widely held ideological illusions that, according to many new historicists, were generated primarily by a capitalist culture. (4) Like the authors who produce literary text, their readers are subjects who are constructed and positioned by the conditions and ideological formations of their own era

New historicists acknowledge that they themselves, like all authors, are subjectivities that has been shaped and informed by the circumstances and discourses special to their era, hence that their own critical writings in great part construct, rather

than discover ready-made, the textual meanings they describe and the literary and cultural histories they narrate. To mitigate the risk that they will unquestioningly appropriate texts that were written in the past, they stress that the course of history between the past and present is not coherent, but exhibits discontinuities, breaks, and ruptures; by doing so, they hope to distance and estrange an earlier text and so sharpen their ability to detect its differences from their present ideological assumptions. Some historicists present their readings of texts written in the past as negotiations between past and present. In this two-way relationship, the features of a cultural product, which are identifiable only relative to their differences from the historicist's subject-position, in return make possible some degree of insight into the forces and configurations of power—especially with respect to class, gender, race and ethnicity—that prevail in the historicist's present culture and serve to shape the historicist's own ideology and interpretations. Among class, gender, race, and ethnicity, gendering of colonization comes under the domain of gender according to the critics of gender and its subclasses.

This research focuses mainly on the concept of gendering of colonization in a new historicist mode to analyze the drama *Doctor Faustus* by Marlowe. For this fulfillment, many concepts and ideas related to new historicism have been analyzed so as to meet the requirements of the above mentioned text. Thus, the ultimate focus is on new historicist mode of reading.



### III. Deflating Elizabeth's Solomonic Desire for Imperial Power: Reading Marlowe's

#### *Doctor Faustus*

Faustus's sinful worship, like Solomon's, is aggravated and complicated by a sinfully inordinate desire, not merely for a consort, but specifically for a wife. The Bible does not blame Solomon for being polygamous, but because he is uxorious. It was Solomon's wives, we are told, who "turned away his heart after other gods" (I Kings 11:4). After signing away his soul, Faustus's first demand of Mephistopheles is "let me have a wife... for I am wanton and lascivious and can not live without a wife (II.i.140-1; II.i.142-7). Faustus's request does not make sense in terms of his rebellion against God, but it does not make sense in terms of his rebellion against God, but it does make sense in the context of his other similarities to Solomon.

Mephistopheles tries to put off Faustus's request for a wife three times.

First, offering him an obvious succubus, then, offering him any woman he wants, and finally, offering him a book which accomplishes a change of subject. At first glance, the examples Mephistopheles gives with his second offer seems an oddly varied list. He promises Faustus saying:

MEPH: Marriage is but a ceremonial toy;  
She whom thine eye shall like, thy heart shall have,  
Be she as chaste as was Penelope,  
As wise as Saba, or as beautiful  
As was bright Lucifer before his fall.  
( II.i.154-9)

Why would the demon offer Faustus women either wise or chaste? Such an offer seems counterproductive from a hellish point of view as marriage would be. And how can his

first two examples are juxtaposed with Lucifer? The answer involves variations on the story of the queen Sheba's visit to Solomon and on the story of Penelope.

In a recent study of folkloric accretions to the biblical story of the queen of Sheba's visit to King Solomon, Jacob Lassner has traced two major developments that may be relevant for Marlowe's allusion to Sheba. It is impossible to find direct evidence of Marlowe's familiarity with these traditions, but his well-known interest in esoterica makes the possibility at least plausible. Lassner summarizes the two developments in his introduction. "By the Middle Ages, the main focus of the queen's visit had shifted from international to sexual politics and from diplomatic relations to the more complicated relations between men and women. All these facets of the tradition recall issues relevant for Elizabeth's reign. The first development redefined "the queen's joust with Solomon . . . as a dangerous attempt to subvert time-honored rules of gender" (208). The second development, a reaction to the first, "transmuted the historic queen of Sheba, a clever and politically astute sovereign, into a demonic force seeking to dissolve all boundaries of gender" (210). The gender issue raised by these traditions is of course, suggestive for a play written under the reign of a woman by a man whose words reveal a strong interest in gender issues. Even more striking is the identification of the queen of Sheba as demonic force. Those complementary traditions represent the queen's interrogation of Solomon as an attempt to subvert his power.

Both Lassner and Lou H. Silberman describe the particular association of the queen with Lilith. Lassner summarizes:

Solomon's queen of Sheba was . . . equated in midrashic and later Jewish mystical literature with the prototypical Lilith, Adam's original wife, who according to legend preceded the creation of Eve. But this first wife . . .

effused to recognize her husband's status and held out for sexual equality if not dominance. (310)

The queen and Lilith, that is, resemble each other in testing or even trying to usurp male authority. According to this tradition, Lassner continues, it was only a step from defying her husband to defying God: "boldly pronouncing the ineffable name of God [i.e., conjuring with the tetragrammaton], she abandoned the earth and threatened to harm newborn infants" (211). Her defiant use of the ineffable name is interesting, in light of its association with Solomon. More directly pertinent for Mephistopheles reference to Saba, however, is a corresponding development noted by Silberman, the identification of the composite figure as a succubus:

In Jewish legend [Lilith] becomes, because of the assonance of her name with a Hebrew word for night, *lajil*, a night demon, a succubus . . . In the Middle Ages, particularly in the writings of the cabbalists, this . . . figure was identified with the queen of Sheba. (84)

Mephistopheles is not sincerely offering Faustus wise women; instead, with more careful subtlety than he had managed in his first attempt, he is offering another succubus. According to the legends, Solomon had intercourse with the succubus queen of Sheba, somewhat anachronistically begetting Nebuchadnezzar, who later would lead Israel into captivity. The legends thus concretize the association between Solomon's lust and the fall of his empire.

The same deceptive ambiguity that seems to lie behind Mephistopheles's allusion to the queen of Sheba is also discernible in his reference to Penelope. Although Penelope is best known as the chaste wife of Odysseus, another story identifies her as the mother of the libidinous god Pan. In yet another version, Penelope causes her husband to kill his son by another woman. Parthesius, who records the story, sees the event "as a punishment for

his incontinence and lack of moderation” (306). That is, Penelope, like the demonic queen of Sheba, acts as the instrument of punishment for an incontinent male. If Marlowe had these stories in mind, his Penelope is also succubus-like, and Mephistopheles’ offer to Faustus makes much more sense as a temptation.

As a number of critics have recognized, Faustus finally gives in to Mephistopheles’ offer when he is confronted with Helen. Like the other women whose appearance, at least, the demon offers to Faustus, Helen is traditionally an ambiguous figure. Faustus himself ironically identifies her as another succubus when he says:

FAUST: Sweet Helen, make me immortal with a kiss:

Her lips suck forth my soul. See where it flies!

Come, Helen, come, give me my soul again.

Here will I dwell, for heaven is in these lips,

Are all is dress that is not Helena. (V.i.93-7)

As Hattaway explains, a witch was thought to pass on his familiar to someone else in a kiss before he could die. The kiss also brings us to Solomon. According to Nicolas J. Perella, Marlowe’s kiss is the most famous of all instances of the Neo-Platonist idea that was widely available, for example, in Sir Thomas Hoby’s 1560 translation of Castiglione’s *Book of the Courtier*. He says:

A kisse may be saide to be rather a coupling together of the soul, than the

soul, than of the booke, because it hath such force in [the soul], that it

draweth her unto it, and (as it were) separateth her from the bodie . . . And

therefore Plato the devine lover saith, that in kissing, his soule came as forre

as his lippes to depart out of the bodie. (89)

Faustus represents the negative side of Solomon; for him the kiss, rather than enabling knowledge, acts as a surrender of the beholding of heavenly beauty which is the knowledge of God. Other echoes of the Song of Solomon in the description of Helen indicates that Marlowe deliberately parodies the spiritualized reading of the Song, favoring a tradition that regarded the Song as a record of Solomon's profane loves.

Faustus's similarities with Solomon extend to his imperial aspirations. Although the chorus in the prologue to the play denies that the play concerns itself with "sporting in the dalliance of love/ In courts of kings where state is overturned" (A Prologue. 3-4; B Prologue. 3-4), the play reveals an interest, at least incidentally, with both. Faustus's state is overturned, if not as a direct result of his dalliance of love, at least as an accompaniment to it. In addition, the association of empire with Faustus tends to subvert the invocation of Solomon's example as a justification for imperialism in early modern Europe. It is an indirect reminder that Solomon destroyed his empire by worshipping idols, or as Marlowe's contemporaries would have understood it, by consorting with demons.

Hattaway has shown that in the opening scene of the play, Faustus re-enacts the Solomonic skepticism of Ecclesiastes. As Hattaway points out, "some commentators read Ecclesiastes as a plea for the wise folly of Christ . . . and some as a testimony of repentance, and a stronger faith"(206). These interpretations, however, indicate the preferences of the interpreters; are possible, and the Bible is silent concerning Solomon's fate. Faustus embodies a darker possibility, that Solomon's renounces such wisdom as he has- in logic, physic, and divinity – in favor of imperial power:

FAUST: O, what a world of profit and delight,  
 Of power, of honor, of omnipotence  
 All things that move between the quiet poles  
 Shall be at my command, Emperors and kings,

Are but obeyed in their several provinces,  
 Nor can they raise the wind or rend the clouds,  
 But his dominion that exceeds in this  
 Stretcheth as far as doth the mind the mind of man. (I.

i. 51-59)

Instead of seeking knowledge, Faustus chooses to surrender all knowledge which does not contribute to his material gain. His long period's efforts and intelligent become vain in front of the material objects. His scholarship, knowledge, familiarity etc. become pale in front of the material achievement. He plans to "make spirits fetch me what I please," and "Perform what desperate enterprise I will" to achieve for him a world- wide control over both goods and knowledge:

FAUST: I'll have them thy to India for gold  
 Ransack the ocean for orient pearl,  
 And search all corners of the new-found world  
 For pleasant fruits and princely delicates  
 I'll have them read me strange philosophy,  
 And tell the secrets of all foreign kings. (I .i. 80-5)

After Faustus has decided to study necromantic books, there arouses a conflict in his mind. The conflict continues till the end and it is this that makes Faustus a mean kind of persona. In the next speech, Valdes promises Faustus that the spirits

VALD: Form Venice shall . . . drag huge argosies,  
 And from America the golden fleece,  
 That yearly stuffs old Philip's treasury.  
 If learned Faustus will be resolute. (I. i. 127-32)

And after his first interview with Mephistopheles, Faustus,

By him I'll be great emperor of the world

And make a bridge though the moving our

To pass the ocean with a band of men,

I'll join the hills that bind the Afric shore

And make that land continent to Spain,

And both contributory to my crown

The emperor shall not live but by my leave. (I. iii. 104-10)

Faustus himself begins to think on highly reputed person after granting his soul to Mephistopheles for 24years. For him, that period was for long span of time. He also thinks of being the grand emperor of the world .i starts pondering several possible and impossible activities like flying in the air trough space and crossing the ocean with a group of followers, joints the hills that surround the African shores. He starts thinking that neither the Holy Roman emperor nor any ruler of Germany will be able to live and rule without his permission. Here, Faustus over ambitious nature has been highly developed. When Faustus meets the king and begins to show his magical power accepted after entrusting his soul to the devil. When the Faustus actually meets the emperor, however, he lets him live and treats him courteously. The meeting occurs after Faustus's magical world tour, when his ability to answer difficult questions has made him famous both at home and abroad. The Chorus explains that His neighbors "put forth questions of astrology," Which Faustus answered with such learned skill, as they admired and wondered at his wit. Now is his fame spread forth in every land? (A iv Chorus 9-12)

When they all met in a conference, they discussed about his experience, related to his long journey across the earth and through the air and asked him various questions on

Astrology. Faustus answered all the questions so soundly that all his friends praised him a lot wondering at his wisdom and scholarship. His name and fame reached every corner of the world. Then, many noblemen called him. The Chorus's fame which caused the queen of Sheba to visit him; of Solomon's fame which caused the queen of Sheba to visit him; the emperor, Charles V, similarly hears of Faustus's fame. It is Faustus, however, who visits the emperor, and not the other way, around. The emperor condones Faustus's conjuring, though he has heard that Faustus "has a familiar spirit" (IV. I. 4), and he gives Faustus "a bounteous reward" (IV. i. 91) at end of his visit. His support of Faustus suggests something unholy about his Holy Roman Empire, despite its name; the emperor thus becomes – well, Faustian.

In a recent study of Marlowe's responses to imperialism, Emily Carroll Bartels notices that his plays, though they "consciously emphasize the main characters' distinguishing types {i.e. their otherness}," nevertheless "place them in contexts in which they are more like than unlike those who share their stage" (106). Marlowe's juxtaposition of Faustus with Charles V is a case in point. Faustus's practice of black magic makes him dangerously other. At the same time, he is curiously like the emperor whose example set the pattern for European (including English) imperialistic attitudes. As Roy Strong has shown, much of the imperial iconography used by the Tudor and Stuart monarchs, including the figure of Solomon, initiated iconography, used in the pageantry of the imperial court of Charles V. The play, however, associates this iconography with Faustus. By aligning an imperialist Faustus with a Faustian Emperor Marlowe brings into question the approved use of the iconography in support of empire.

Marlowe directly confronts this imperialistic iconography in his depiction of amounts to a pageant for the emperor, the apparent visit of Alexander and paramour. Strikingly, Faustus admits that he can only put on a show for emperor. "It is not in my



ability”, he says, “to present before your eyes the true substantial bodies of those two deceased princes” (IV. I. 43-5). But a show, or spectacle, to use the emperor’s own word, is exactly what he wants. He had prefaced his request by telling Faustus that he has often worried privately.

FAUST: About the honor of mine ancestors  
 How they had won by prowess such exploits,  
 Got such riches, subdued so many Kingdoms  
 As we that do succeed, or they that shall  
 Hereafter possess our throne shall,  
 I fear me, never attain to that degree  
 Of high renown and great authority. (iv.i.19-25)

The emperor mentions, in particular, “Alexander the Great,/ Chief spectacle of the world’s pre-eminence” (IV. i. 26-7). He goes on explicitly to ask that Faustus shows him Alexander with “his beauteous paramour, / Both in their right shapes, gesture, and attire” (IV. i. 35-6). His request, however, does not express simple curiosity. Rather, as his confession indicates, the sight of Alexander has something to do with his own sense of honor; to experience this spectacle will somehow confirm his greatness. In other words, it will do something very similar to what the appearance of Alexander- along with Solomon- did in pageants actually presented before the real Emperor Charles V.

By making Faustus the director of a pageant depicting traditional imperial iconographical system, he suggests, at least, that to compare a contemporary monarch with Alexander is delusory, if not actually demonic. Faustus explains to the emperor that although he can not produce the real thing “such spirits as can lively resemble Alexander and his paramour, shall appear . . . in that manner that they best lived in, in their most

flourishing estate” (IV. i. 48-50). The parts he directs will be well acted. Faustus knows that appearance without reality will be enough; he is sure, he says, that spectacle alone “shall sufficiently content your imperial majesty” (IV. i. 51). His confidence appears to be well founded. The emperor chooses delusion, even after Faustus’s confession; he expresses certainty that “these are no spirits, but the true substantial bodies of those two diseased princes” (A IV. i. 65-6). Tellingly, he accepts the delusion which his own wishes supply, and which Faustus encourages, as fully as Faustus himself accepts the self-delusion encouraged by Mephistopheles. After the pageantry ends, the emperor rewards Faustus for his compliments. In doing so, he again implicates himself by indicating that he shares Faustus’s flawed imperial vision.

A second reference to Saba late in the play rings together the play’s Solomonic and imperial themes. In this case, the play refers to the realm rather than to its queen, and Faustus appears as the ruler of a Solomonic and simultaneously demonic empire.

When Faustus meets the duke and duchess of Vanholt, he asks what craving the pregnant duchess is experiencing. She expresses a desire for ripe grapes although it is the dead time of winter, and Faustus has Mephistopheles fetch grapes for her. Faustus explains that when it is winter in the northern hemisphere, it is summer in the southern, “as in India, Saba, and farther countries in the East” (IV.ii.22-3). The explanation suggests that Faustus, in effect, rules in these realms, and the allusion to the Solomonic detail suggests dominion like Solomon’s, extending over demons as well as over distant lands. The imported winter grapes also suggest the epicurean extravagance we have already seen associated with Solomon. Furthermore, the duchess’s assurance to Faustus, “I will not hide from you the thing my heart desires” (IV.ii. 8-9), may be meant to recall the biblical comment that “King Solomon gave unto the queen of Sheba all her desire, whatsoever she asked” (I Kings 10:13). The verse was often interpreted sexually; it is the only biblical

basis for the tradition that Solomon impregnated the queen of Sheba. Such an allusion would invest the scene with sexual tension; Faustus and the duchess flirting, by means of double entendre, in front of her husband, the duke's charge to his wife that she " must well reward this learned man" (IV. ii. 30) making him an unwitting pander; the " dish of ripe grapes" serving as an aphrodisiac; and so on.

Faustus, then, as epicurean Voluptuary, as magician, as aspiring emperor and as idolater, fulfills the type of the negative Solomon with whom Marlowe explicitly associates him by linking him with the queen of Sheba. His questionable pursuit of Solomonic goals traditionally regarded as desirable undermines their traditional significance as a justification for colonial activity. Marlowe's manipulation of the traditional iconography produces a play which offers a version of Solomon directly in conflict with the version preferred by the Elizabeth court, a Solomon whose colonialism exposes him as a culpably effeminate ruler and implicates him in demonic activities that threaten the divine order. The play simultaneously offers a corresponding version of the queen of Sheba as a threat to natural masculine rule. Though nothing in the play requires an association of either Solomon or the queen of Sheba with Queen Elizabeth, *Doctor Faustus* allows for either. In other words, it will admit an understanding of Elizabeth's Solomonic desire for imperial power which finds such desire culpable and, at the same time, an understanding of her feminine rule which finds it, like the queen of Sheba's politically threatening.

Regarding this theme of the play, several evidences can be brought in light by comparing Elizabeth with queen of Sheba and Faustus with Solomon. In many places the themes of imperial power have been stated with strong views deflating Elizabeth's Solomonic Desire for Imperial power which is already stated above. The same theme can be mould into the theme that Faustus is the tempter. Throughout act I, it is Faustus as –

Tempter who speaks to another Faustus ( or another facet of himself) who, at least implicitly – in that he needs another person to give him courage- seems to be reticent about taking decisions which are not devoid of physical and / or moral dangers. This occurs in Faustus’s invocation of Mephistophilis in I. iii; and, more clearly perhaps, at the beginning of the play, when Faustus debates about his future progress:

FAUST: Settle thy studies, Faustus, and begin

To sound the depth of that thou wilt profess;

Having commenced, be a divine in show,

Yet level at the end of every art,

And live and die in Aristotle’s works.

Sweet Analytics, ‘tis thou has ravished me:

Bene’ disserve est finis logices.

Is to dispute well logic’s chiefest end?

Affords this art no greater miracle?

Then read no more, thou has attained that end;

A greater subject fitteth Faustus’ wit. (I.i.1-11)

Due to the nature of the debate, there is an abundance of directive formulas through which the speaker appeals to himself to take a course of action which will change his present state Faustus also uses the second person to refer to this state (Yet art thou still but Faustus, and a man, line 23), so that a certain degree of separation is established between the speaking Faustus, who is not, or does not want to be just a man, and the listening Faustus who is, in principle, an ordinary- even if a studious- man.

This is not meant that there are two Faustuses, strictly speaking, but the division of Faustus's personality into two halves may be methodologically convenient, especially in terms of Character audience identification:

FAUST: These metaphysics of magicians,  
 And necromantic books are heavenly;  
 Lines, circles, signs, letters and characters!  
 Ay, these are those that Faustus most desires.  
 O what a world of profit and delight,  
 Of power, of honour, of omnipotence,  
 Is promised to the studious artizan!  
 All things that move between the quiet poles  
 Shall be at my command; emperors and kings,  
 Are but obeyed in their several provinces,  
 Nor can they raise the wind, or rend the clouds;  
 But his dominion that exceeds in this,  
 Stretcheth as far as doth the mind of man:  
 A sound magician is mighty god;  
 Here Fasutus, try thy brains to gain a deity. (I.i.48-62)

The tempting Faustus, marked by his ambition and his desire, will be the source of tragic terror; the one that provokes admiration and the recognition of the flaw at virtually the same time. The tempted, reticent-to-be changed Faustus will be the source of tragic pity by becoming the victim of the practices of his other self.

The ordinary Faustus will be possessed by the more ambitious Faustus. The direct result of this dominance is the shifting to the first person once his reticence has been

apparently put aside at the end of the debate. The first person thus becomes the expression of the resolution of the struggling duality in the Character's personality, either because of the triumph of the dominating 'I' or because of the emergence of the dominated or victimized 'I'.

Indicating the Elizabeth / Sheba / Solomon relationship John N. King observes, however, the queen of Sheba's appearance in *Sapientia Solomonis*, like the appearance of Solomon, offers meaning on multiple levels. King cites several contemporary sources, including Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*, which compared Queen Elizabeth, not with Solomon, but with the queen of Sheba. In the final scene of *Henry VIII*, a section probably actually written by John Fletcher Thomas Cranmec prophesies that the infant Elizabeth will be "a pattern to all princes living with her" and promises that

Saba [i.e., the queen of Sheba] was never  
More covetous of wisdom and fair virtue  
Than this pure soul shall be. (I.ii.2-3)

On the basis of such examples, King concludes that *Sapientia Solomonis* "dramatized both Solomon and the Arabian queen as figures for England's protestant queen" (208). King explains the gender ambiguity in this dual identification as a reflection of "Elizabeth's anomalous position as female ruler" (201). Like comparisons with Solomon, comparisons of Elizabeth, the queen of Sheba characterize her as a godly monarch; in the case of these comparisons, Solomon represents Christ, and the queen of Sheba's (or Elizabeth's) godliness appears in her submission. More obviously at stake in the latter comparisons however, is the question of feminine rule. Applied to Elizabeth, the queen of Sheba's example validates female authority.

Elizabeth's position as a female monarch clearly concerns Thomas Holland, whose sermon commemorating Elizabeth's coronation day elaborately retells the story of the

queen of Sheba as part of an apology for Elizabeth's rule. Holland never quite manages to address directly the question of a woman's fitness to rule. Instead he dwells on the legitimacy of female learning and on the acceptance of women as well as men into the kingdom of god. Holland takes as his text Matthew 12:42. Jesus' warning to the Jews that "The Queene of the South shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for shee came from the utmost partes of the earth, to heare the wisdom of Solomon: and beholde, a greater than Solomon is here" (II.i.4-5, II .i. 1-4).

Christopher Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* identifies Faustus with this negative Solomon, and Marlowe explicitly associates Solomon's negative characteristics with his imperialism. Reversing the Solomonic vision of empire associated with Elizabethan expansion, Marlowe offers a Solomonic figure whose character and actions critically subvert the propaganda of colonial enterprise. The play suggests, in other words, that instead of confirming an appropriately masculine rule, colonialism offers a demonic temptation that eventually emasculates ruler ship. It indicated, furthermore, that the threat offered by the colonized demonic other may be more significant than the promise of wealth that fuels the colonizing vision.

In addition, Faustus explicitly offers to build a place of worship for a demonic pagan deity. He extends the application of Solomonic pagan deity. He extends the application of Solomon's *Vanitas* theme from Ecclesiastes to thoughts of God and heaven, choosing rather to honor Beelzebub than vainly to trust in God:

FAUST: Away with such vain fancies and despair!

Despair in god and trust in Beelzebub

The god thou servest is thine own appetite,

Wherein is fixed the love of Beelzebub.

To him I'll build an altar and a church,

And offer lukewarm blood of new-born babes. (II.i.4-5, II .i.

11-4)

The pagan deity more frequently associated with child sacrifice is Moloch, one of the demons/ deities for whom Solomon built altars: “Then did Solomon build a high place for Chemosh, the abomination of Moab, in the hill that is before Jerusalem, and for Moloch, the abomination again recalls Solomon’s sin. It also, incidentally, identifies the sin of both men with epicurean self-indulgence. Faustus here admits to himself, “The God thou servest is thine own appetite,” aligning himself with “the enemies of the cross of Christ” in Philippians 3:18-9, “Whose God is then belly.” In a 1665 sermon on gluttony, John Hales uses, as an example of devotion to the belly, “*Solomon*, the most politick and wisest man that ever was,” who nevertheless, “prostitutes his learning wit, wisdom, and all, to that base and sordid appetite”. Thus, Marlowe’s Doctor Faustus is involved in deflating Elizabeth’s Solomonic desire for imperial power.



#### IV. Conclusion

The interpretation of Marlow's *Doctor Faustus* as a play dramatizing the tension between Renaissance and Christian values has gained very deep critical analysis in the history of drama. To put forward this view, this dissertation marks point of departure by focusing on issues associated with King Solomon, gender and empire. It highlights the allegorical representation of King Solomon and the Queen of Sheba as figure for England's Protestant Queen even as the play identifies with the negative side of Solomon.

In the same manner it is hypothesized that Marlowe's manipulation of the traditional iconographic of King Solomon and the Queen of Sheba produces a play which offers a version of Solomon directly in conflict with the version preferred by the Elizabethan court. A Solomon, whose colonialism exposes him as a culpably effeminate ruler and implicates him in demonic activities that threaten the divine order, Christopher Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* identifies Faustus with negative side of Solomon, and Marlowe explicitly associates Solomon's negative characteristics with his imperialism. Reversing the Solomonic vision of empire associated with Elizabethan expansion, Marlowe offers a Solomonic figure whose characters and actions critically subvert the propaganda of Colonial enterprise. The play suggests, in other words, that instead of confirming an appropriately masculine rule, colonialism offers a demonic temptation that eventually emasculates ruler ship. It indicates, furthermore, that the threat offered by the colonized demonic other may be more significant than the promise of wealth that fuels the colonizing vision.

The play simultaneously offers a corresponding version of the queen of Sheba as a threat to natural masculine rule. Though nothing in the play requires an association of either Solomon or the queen of Sheba with Queen Elizabeth, *Doctor Faustus*, allows for either. In other words, it will admit an understanding of Elizabeth's Solomonic desire for

imperial power with finds such desire culpably and, at the same time, an understanding of her feminine rule which finds it, like the queen of Sheba's politically threatening.

Marlowe directly confronts this imperialistic iconography in his depiction of what amounts to pageant for the emperor, the apparent visit of Alexander and Paramour. Strikingly, Faustus admits that he can only put on a show for the emperor. Thus, as his confession indicates, the right of Alexander has something to do with his own sense of honor; to experience this spectacle will somehow confirm his greatness. In other words, it will do something very similar to what the appearance of Alexander- along with Solomon- did in pageants actually presented before the real Emperor Charles V.

By making Faustus the director of a pageant depicting traditional imperial iconographical system, he suggests, at least, that to compare a contemporary monarch with Alexander is delusory, if not actually demonic. Faustus knows that appearance without reality will be enough; he is sure, he says, that spectacle alone "Shall sufficiently content your imperial majesty" (A iv. i. 51). His confidence appears to be well founded. The emperor chooses delusion, even after Faustus's confession; he expresses certainty that "these are no spirits but the true substantial bodies of those two deceased princes" (A iv. i. 65-6). Tellingly, he accepts the delusion which his own wishes supply, and Faustus encourages, as fully as Faustus himself accepts the self-delusion encouraged by Mephistopheles. After the pageantry ends, the emperor rewards Faustus for his compliments. On doing so, he again implicates him self by indicating that he shows Faustus's flawed imperial vision.

In this context, Marlowe's Doctor Faustus has been widely studied from different perspectives. The present study, however, has attempted to study the play from new historical perspectives to show the relationship between the issues associated with King Solomon, gender, and empire. In order to facilitate the textual analysis, the present study

has adopted new historicism as its methodology. At last, this study has proved that King Solomon can be seen as a culpably effeminate ruler and implicates him in demonic activities that threaten the divine order.

### Works Cited

- Abram, M. H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 7<sup>th</sup> ed. USA: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1993.
- Adams, Hazard. *Critical Theory since Plato*. New York: HBJC, 1992.
- Derrida Jacques. "Differance." *Intellectual History Reader*. Ed. Pandey, Beerendra. Kathmandu: MKPD, 2005. 669-700.
- Fletcher, Angus. "Doctor Faustus and the English Literary Renaissance." *Lutheran Aesthetic*. Vol. 35. London: Oxford, 1889. 187-209.
- Fletcher, John and Thomas Cranmer. *Readings into the Doctor Faustus*. Oxford: Oxford, 1992.
- Frey Leonard H. "Antithetical Balance in the Opening and Close of Doctor Faustus." *Modern Language Quarterly*. 24(1991): 350-65.
- Greenblatt, Stephen and Giles Gunn. "The Modern Language Association of America." *Redrawing the Boundaries*. New York: Routledge, 1992. 392-418.
- Keefer, Michael. "The Case of Doctor Faustus." *History and the Canon*. Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1987. 498-523.
- King, John. "Literature and Art in the Age of Religious Crisis." *Tudor Royal Iconography*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1989. 289-324.
- Kolodny, Annette. "Metaphor as Experience and History in American Life and Letters." *The Lay of the Land*. Ed. Harlowe Bennet. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina P, 1975. 28-57.
- Marlowe, Christopher. *Doctor Faustus*. Ed. Dr. S. Sen. New Delhi: Unique Publishers, 1984.
- - -. "The Tragic History of Dr. Faustus." *Longman Anthology of British Literature*. Vol. II. Ed. David Darmsonch, London: Longman, 2003. 1002 -1098.
- McAlindon, T. "The Ironic Vision: Diction and Theme in Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*." *The Review of English Literature. New Series*. 32.126(May 1981): 129-141.

Park, Honan. *Christopher Marlowe: Poet and Spy*. London: Oxford UP, 2005.

Prieto-Pablos, Juan. "Dr. *Faustus* and Literature." *English Studies*. 74.1(Feb 1993): 77-102.

Richard, Halpern. *Marlowe's Theatre of Night: Doctor Faustus and Capital*. New York: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.

Streete, Adrian. "Consummatum EST: Calvinist Exegesis, Mimesis and *Doctor Faustus*." *Literature and Theology*. 15.2(June 2001): 141-57.

Wessman, Christopher. "I'll Play Diana: Christopher Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* and the Actaeon Complex." *English Studies*. London. 82.5(2001): 401-419.