

THE JEW OF MALTA AND THE MYTH OF THE MACHIAVELLIAN KNAVE

By P.P. GRECH

SEVERAL critics have commented on the prevailing influence of Machiavelli on the Elizabethan World. In 1927, for instance, Wyndham Lewis, affirmed that: 'Machiavelli was at the back of every Tudor mind,'¹ whilst H.S. Bennett maintained that, '...Machiavelli is so omnipresent and important a constituent of Elizabethan drama.'² Very few scholars seek to minimize the influence of Machiavelli on the Elizabethan mind. E.M.W. Tillyard in 1948, however, argued that: '...his (Marlowe's) basic doctrines lie outside the main sixteenth century interests.'³ But this is not the only conflict. A subject of a prolonged controversy has been the introduction of the Machiavellian Legend into England. Since Meyer published his famous dissertation on *Machiavelli and the Elizabethan Drama*, in 1897,⁴ several important monographs and books have been written on the subject. The issue does not seem very clear as yet. Undue importance has been attached to Innocent Gentillet's French Book, popularly known as *Contre-Machiavel*, published in 1576. For a long time it has been considered the grand arsenal, from which most of the Elizabethans, according to the suggestion of Meyer, derived their knowledge of Machiavelli. Repeated attempts have subsequently been made to dispose of the alleged influence of Gentillet's book as merely one of many anti-Machiavellian documents. Yet, until quite recently, critics were pleased to cling on to Meyer's original suggestion.

This is not the whole picture. The distortions of the true Machiavellian doctrine have been attributed mainly to three causes – ignorance of the works of Machiavelli, the misconceptions propagated by Gentillet and the more recent plea, the inability of the Elizabethans to understand Machiavelli's works. The three suggestions seem to me unfounded, as I hope to show.

Marlowe was the first English dramatist who introduced Machiavelli on the Elizabethan stage *in propria persona*. Through the prologue of *The*

¹ See Wyndham Lewis, *The Lion and the Fox*, N.Y. 1927, p. 64.

² See Bennett H.S., Edn. *The Jew of Malta and The Massacre at Paris*, Methuen & Co., Introduction p. 12.

³ See Tillyard E.M.W., *Shakespeare's History Plays*, London, 1948, p. 21.

⁴ See Meyer Edward, *Machiavelli and the Elizabethan Drama*, Weimar, 1897.

Jew of Malta, Machiavelli with great pomp, ushers in his disciple Barabas and begs the audience to grace him despite his Machiavellian villainies. The Machiavellian influence on Marlowe's works is particularly and most remarkably evident in *The Jew of Malta*. Mario Praz declared:

The two plays which gave birth to the type of the Machiavellian knave on the English stage are *The Jew of Malta* and Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy*.⁵

We are only concerned here with *The Jew of Malta*

No doubt, Marlowe shows great familiarity with the Machiavellian Legend, which he used as a vital source of his plays, especially of *The Jew of Malta*. That Marlowe exhibits in his works a more intimate knowledge of the popular misconception of Machiavelli than his true teachings is, I think, true. But is this due to ignorance of the real doctrine of Machiavelli? In trying to trace the origin, nature and development of the popular Machiavelli Legend, I hope I shall have adequately answered this interesting question.

None of Machiavelli's more famous books was published during his lifetime, but all his works were freely circulated in manuscript form even after his death in 1527. During the lifetime of Machiavelli, Francesco Guicciardini wrote *Considerazioni sui discorsi del Machiavelli*. In one chapter, Guicciardini opposes Machiavelli's appraisal of fraud as an essential factor in the rise of low-born men to power:

*Quanto alla fraude puo essere disputibile se sia sempre buono instrumento di pervenire alla grandezza.*⁶

The first publication of *Il Principe* and *I Discorsi* was undertaken by the Pope's own printer, Blado, in Rome, in 1531 and 1532 respectively, whilst independent editions of the same works were simultaneously issued in Florence. The year 1540 saw the first publication of a collected edition of Machiavelli's works. The Pope's *imprimatur* indicates, that no controversy on Machiavelli's works had as yet arisen. Besides, Machiavelli was highly esteemed in his lifetime and this is clearly attested by such men as Soderini, Vettori, Clement VII and several others.⁷

Towards the late 1530's a growing reaction against Machiavelli's doctrine was firmly gaining ground. Monarchs who were only too glad to set

⁵ Praz Mario, *Machiavelli and the Elizabethans*, Proceedings of the British Academy, XIV, 1928, p. 49-97; same Lecture is contained in *The Flaming Heart*, N.Y., 1958, pp. 109-144.

⁶ Quoted by Freyer Grattan, 'The Reputation of Machiavelli' in *Hermathena*, Vol. LVI, Nov. 1940, pp. 148-167.

⁷ *Ibid.*

themselves up as absolute rulers or to assert their superiority over the Church, found in Machiavelli's teaching the sanction which they needed. Such a fairly new concept of kingship could not but arouse fierce antagonism from several quarters. Curiously enough, the earliest extant violent attack on Machiavelli seems to have come from an Englishman, Cardinal Reginald Pole.⁸

Pole's interest in Machiavelli apparently was stimulated by Cromwell's recommendation about the year 1527, to read a famous book by an Italian, 'a very acute modem.'⁹ In his treatise *Apologia ad Carolum V*, published in 1539, Pole averred that with great eagerness he sought this book which, according to him, eventually turned out to be *Il Principe*. He confessed that he had read it with great care and soon proceeded to lash out at it, in the most bitter terms, associating Machiavelli's name with the devil and Cromwell's with both.¹⁰ We do not know, for sure, whether Cromwell actually recommended Machiavelli's *Il Principe* or Castiglione's *Il Cortegiano* or whether he was really in earnest at all. But whatever it was, Pole stated that he had read *Il Principe* and Cromwell's persistent advice to Henry VIII to make his will the law and set himself an absolute monarch regardless of any theological repercussions, was indeed identical with the maxims advocated in *Il Principe*.¹¹ With his wide travelling in Italy, Cromwell had ample opportunity of reading Machiavelli's works in manuscript form, but even if he did not, his concept of monarchy would hardly have been different.

Machiavelli's aim was the unification of Italy and the establishment of a sound, orderly government. He was alarmed by the chaotic conditions obtaining in Italy and the bitter rivalries, hatred and strife existing between different principalities. Indeed an iron hand was needed. To achieve this unity a Prince ought not to shun any policy. He regarded the Church as a most powerful enemy in his scheme of things. He therefore preached the entire segregation of politics from religion. Unlike the great medieval thinkers, like St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas, Dante, William of Occam, John of Salisbury and others, who were moralists and concerned with what should be, Machiavelli, who was completely amoral, was solely concerned with what was. Irving Ribner pointed out:

Machiavelli's great contribution to political thought lay in his divorce

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid: See also, Einstein Lewis: *The Italian Renaissance in England*, 1st pub. N.Y., 1902, p. 292.

¹⁰ See Pole Reginald: *Apologia ad Carolum V*, in *Epistolarum Reginaldi Poli*, Vol. I., Brescia, 1744, pp. 137-152.

¹¹ See *Letters and Papers*, Henry VIII, Vol. VII, p. 1554.

from it of all consideration of sentiment, morality or Christian ethics.¹²

Lord Acton had also suggested this same idea earlier on:

The essence of Machiavelli's method is the removal from the realm of political science of all questions of sentiment and morality. His one consideration was of politics as a logical science of cause and effect which could only be adequately understood if moral considerations were left out of the question.¹³

This was Machiavelli's target and this was Pole's fear – the complete secularisation of Politics and the State in a still predominantly theological age. Attempts to discover new forms for the medieval ideal of a united Christendom which was rapidly disintegrating and on which the pope's supremacy depended, were seriously endangered and soon shattered by Machiavelli's precepts. In 1540, Pole again declared:

Machiavelli had already poisoned England and would poison all Christendom.

He earnestly hoped that his works would be suppressed.¹⁴ His diatribe was soon followed by others, notable among these we find those of Caterino Politi, Bishop Osortio and Possevino.¹⁵ A similar outcry was eventually raised in France by Gentillet:

Machiavelli by his doctrine and documents, hath changed the good and antient governments of France, into a kind of Florentine Government, whereupon we see with our eyes, the total ruine of all France.¹⁶

Ascham's impression of Machiavelli is not less unfavourable. In 1551, in fact, he fulminated against Machiavelli, whom he associated with paganism and opportunism.¹⁷ Machiavelli has already become a bug-bear and his name is bandied about with epithets like 'devilish', 'pagan' and 'opportunist'. As a result of these repeated, violent attacks on Machiavelli's doctrine, the Roman Inquisition decided to place his works on the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* in 1559. What this meant actually, was, that all

¹² See Ribner Irving, *The Significance of Gentillet's Contre-Machiavel*, H L Q, Vol. X., 1949, pp. 153-157; See also: Villari Pasquale: *Life and Times of Nicolo Machiavelli*, trans. from Italian by Linda Villari, London, 1898, II, pp. 185-233.

¹³ Lord Acton, Introduction to N. Machiavelli's *Il Principe*, Edn., L. Arthur Burd, Oxford, 1891, pp. 16-17.

¹⁴ See Raab Felix, *The English Face of Machiavelli*, London, 1964, p. 32.

¹⁵ See Villari Pasquale, *Life and Times of Nicolo Machiavelli*, trans. Linda Villari, op. cit. II, pp. 185-233.

¹⁶ Quoted by Bakeless J., I, op. cit. p. 349.

¹⁷ See Ascham R. quoted by Raab Felix, op. cit. p. 33.

new editions of Machiavelli's works were suspended in all the lands under the control of the Inquisition. In England, at least, there seems to have been no positive prohibition on reading Machiavelli's works, though their printing was henceforward considered illicit. In spite of these bans however, copies of earlier editions of Machiavelli's works, had already circulated far and wide and therefore a copy of his works was not presumably very hard to obtain by those who were really interested.¹⁸ But among the many detractors, Machiavelli had also a few defenders and adherents. Morison who rose to eminence after serving as a member in Pole's household at Padua, had recourse to Machiavelli's maxims when he took up Henry VIII's cudgels and rebutted Cocklaeus' attack on divorce and royal supremacy. His most remarkable piece of writing is perhaps *A remedy for Sedition*, which appears to be drenched in Machiavellian doctrine.¹⁹ Another Italianate Englishman who sympathised with Machiavelli, was William Thomas, who, on his return from Italy in 1549 was soon appointed Clerk to the Privy Council and eventually, political tutor to the young king Edward. He lost no time in trying to inculcate in the mind of the young king maxims from *I Discorsi*.²⁰

If further evidence is needed to prove the growing popularity of Machiavelli's works in pre-Elizabethan times, we may refer to Charles V's sanctioning of a Spanish translation of *Il Principe* in the early fifties despite the suspicious view which the Inquisition was already taking of Machiavelli's works. A French translation of *Il Principe*, dedicated to the powerful Scottish nobleman, Prince James Hamilton, was also published in 1553. With the accession of Elizabeth Machiavellian doctrine was finding richer and more fertile soil. The growing, fierce, religious quarrels which had been raging for some time, strongly aided the perpetuation and popularity of Machiavelli's doctrine. With little or no restraint Catholics and Protestants labelled each other as Machiavellians.²¹ Indeed, Machiavelli was more and more being used as a symbol for all that was hateful, immoral, monstrous and evil. In 1954, J.C. Maxwell stated:

... the Machiavellian legend had made considerable progress nearly a

¹⁸ See Freyer Grattan, *op. cit.* pp. 148-167.

¹⁹ See *A Remedy for Sedition*, London, 1536, Edn. Cox, E.M. London, 1933.

²⁰ See Raab F., *op. cit.* p. 42.

²¹ See Hull James, *The Unmasking of the Politique Atheiste*, London, 1602, sig. A4, D4, and E3v. — a protestant treatise. Also: *A confutation of the Apologie* etc. Antwerp, 1565, Anonymous, p. 134v — Catholic. Such instances of how Machiavelli was being used as a weapon in the politico-religious quarrels of the time could be multiplied by reference to Horrocks, *Machiavelli in Tudor Political Opinion & Discussion*, unpub. D. Litt., Thesis, Lon. 1908.

quarter of a century before Gentillet's book.²²

Machiavelli stood in the popular Elizabethan mind as an inhuman monster, an advocate of all evil and a devil disguised in human form. They needed no misrepresentation or misconception of his works such as that of the French Huguenot Innocent Gentillet in 1576, to visualize him as a Politic Villain.

Since the publication of Edward Meyer's famous analysis on the Machiavellian influence in Elizabethan drama (1897), however, it has become customary among literary historians to attribute the 'Machiavel' of the Elizabethan stage to false impressions and distortions of Machiavelli's true political thought. These perversions were, according to these critics, disseminated in England by Innocent Gentillet's vituperative attack on Machiavelli's doctrine.²³ This biting censure was first published in 1576 in France, and although it was probably translated in English by S. Patricke in the following year, the English version did not appear in print before 1602.²⁴ To attribute such a powerful force and influence in Elizabethan England to a foreign polemical document is undoubtedly very strange, to say the least.

Mario Praz, in his British Academy Lecture in 1928, sought to mitigate Gentillet's alleged influence by pointing out that the Machiavelli Legend was popular in Europe even before the appearance of Gentillet's book, commonly known as *Contre-Machiavel*. He maintained that *Contre-Machiavel* was just one of the many anti-Machiavellian expressions.²⁵ Hans Beck in 1935, went a step further and attributed the Elizabethan misunderstanding of Machiavelli to historical and sociological influences rather than to *Contre-Machiavel*.²⁶ But despite the earnestness with which these and other critics sought to minimise the importance attached to Gentillet in the creation of the new Machiavellian stage villain, writers like Nadja Kempner,²⁷ Thomas Hugh Jameson,²⁸ Jean Robertson,²⁹ James Emerson

²² See Maxwell J.C., *Notes and Queries*, New Series, I, 4 (April 1954) p. 141.

²³ See Ribner Irving, 'The Significance of Gentillet's *Contre-Machiavel*', op. cit. pp. 153-157.

²⁴ See Raab F., op. cit. p. 56.

²⁵ See Praz M., *Machiavelli and the Elizabethans*, op. cit. pp. 49-97.

²⁶ See Hans Beck, *Machiavellismus in der Englischen Renaissance*, Duisburg, 1953, pp. 5-7.

²⁷ See Kempner Nadja, *Raleghs Slaattheoretische Schrifte, Die Einfubrung des Machiavellismus in England*, Leipsig, 1928, pp. 23-25.

²⁸ See Jameson T.H., 'The Machiavellism of Gabriel Harvey', PMLA, LVI, 1941, pp. 645-656.

²⁹ See Robertson J., 'Nicholas Breton and the Uncasing of Machevils Instructions to his Sonne' *HLQ*, IV, 1940-1941, 477.

Phillips,³⁰ Wyndham Lewis,³¹ and Arnold Weissberger,³² still clung to Meyer's original view. The modern tendency, on the whole, however, disapproves of Meyer's suggestion. Gentillet's contribution however, had its significance too. It helped to strengthen the already existent popular legend and is perhaps the earliest extant treatise which associated Machiavelli with a real political event – the Massacre of Saint Bartholomew in 1572.

Within fifty years from the publication of *Il Principe* and *I Discorsi*, Machiavelli had become in England a household word.³³ Greene formed a proper noun out of his name which symbolised anything that was immoral and evil. Soon dramatists like Kyd and Marlowe got hold of him and introduced him as a new stage villain which caught on for many years.³⁴ There is no doubt that this new type of villain simultaneously horrified and entertained Elizabethan audiences for quite a long time.

That the Elizabethans read Machiavelli can perhaps be illustrated by the great demand for his works. To begin with, there were the illicit Italian editions published in England by John Wolfe under false imprints, during the eighties – *I Discorsi* and *Il Principe* in 1584, with the imprint of Palermo; *Arte Della Guerra* with no date and same imprint, *Istorie Fiorentine* 1587, issued under the imprint of Piacenza and *L'Asino d'Oro*, published in 1588, with Roma as its imprint.³⁵ To these editions must be added the English translation of *The Art of War* in 1563, 1573, 1588 by Peter Whitehorne, who dedicated his work to Queen Elizabeth, and Thomas Bedingfield's English translation of *The History of Florence* in 1595. The earliest extant published translations of *I Discorsi* and *Il Principe* in English are those of Edward Dacres, dated 1636 and 1640 respectively. However both Hardin Craig and Napoleone Orsini were able to establish that *I Discorsi* and *Il Principe* had been widely circulated in English before 1600, and that copies of these translations are still preserved at the British Museum, The Queen's College Library, Oxford and at the

³⁰ See Phillips J.E., *The state in Shakespeare's Greek and Roman Plays*, N.Y., 1940, pp. 31 ff.

³¹ See Wyndham Lewis, op. cit. p. 71.

³² See Wemsberger L.A., 'Machiavelli and Tudor England', *P. S. Q.*, XLII, 1927, 589 ff.

³³ See D'Andrea A., 'Studies on Machiavelli and his Reputation in the Sixteenth Century' in *Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, Edn. Hunt, Klibansky and Laboursky, London Univ. Vol. V, 1961, pp. 234-235.

³⁴ See Praz M. op. cit. pp. 49-97.

³⁵ See Gerber A., 'All of the Five Fictitious Italian Editions of Writings of Machiavelli and Three of Those of Pietro Aretino', Printed by John Wolfe of London, 1584-1588 *MLM* xxii 1907, pp. 2-6, 129-135.

Library of Mr. Jules Furthman of Los Angeles.³⁶ Ribner remarked:

All of these manuscripts were evidently widely circulated and together with the surreptitious Italian editions published at great personal risk by John Wolfe, attest to the great popularity which Machiavelli's works themselves enjoyed and to the great eagerness with which they were sought.³⁷

Versions of Machiavelli's works were scattered in great profusion, in Italian, English, Latin and Spanish. This must have made it quite possible for the interested sixteenth century Englishman to pick up some copy of Machiavelli's works either at home or when he travelled abroad. Indeed such a variety and multiplicity of the Florentine Secretary's works published in their original in various editions as well as their rendering in different languages in manuscript or printed form, not to mention the cost and trouble involved, must undoubtedly point to the tremendous popularity of their author and the great avidity with which people yearned to read him.

The stage Machiavelli has been burdened with crimes, horrors and vices entirely unwarranted by the original works of the author. These are most flagrant distortions, but they are neither the result of any Elizabethan unawareness of the true Machiavelli nor the alleged influence of Gentillet's diatribe. The reason for this perversion has been summed up by Raab:

The Tudor horror of Machiavelli even in its most grotesque form (the stage version) was not a distortion due to ignorance or the (non-existent) popularity of Gentillet, it was the horror of a generation which saw its traditional *Weltanschauung* seriously and validly challenged.³⁸

Besides, a state figure as such, has an independent vitality and life of its own, completely detached from its origins. The new stage-Machiavel in fact, embodied other popular traditions such as traits from the Senecan villain hero as well as qualities derived from the vice or the devil-incarnate of the native tradition.

The term 'villain' in actual fact, had originated from the feudal expression 'villein' which normally stood for a peasant or a low, base fellow. Soon this term was transferred from a social to a moral setting and thence to the theatre. The role which the villain persistently played before the introduction of the Machiavellian knave, had been somewhat akin to the motiveless malignity of the Vice of the Native morality tradition. The

³⁶ See Ribner Irving, op. cit. pp. 153-157.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ See Raab F., op. cit. p. 69.

Vice figure, in reality, represented an allegorised abstraction, as a tempting mischief-maker who symbolised a single or a multiplicity of Vices. As the drama began to be more and more secularised in tone and subject matter, particularly after the second half of the sixteenth century, the Vice figure gradually, but steadily, began to assume human form, even, if initially, highly unrealistic. With his roaring, thundering, plotting, murdering, revengeful and fraudulent villain hero, Seneca invaded the early Elizabethan Stage through the Elite drama, and gave the already existent native Vice figure, all the vigour, substance and vitality that it really needed. Seneca's influence in the portrayal of this type of villain can be seen for instance in *Gorboduc* (1561) and *Cambeses* (1569) not to mention the presentation of his own 'Villain heroes' in plays like *Thyestes* and *Medea*. We have also to remember that ten classical plays, nine of which written by Seneca, were translated in English in the early 1560's and undoubtedly both these translations as well as their performance must have greatly influenced the dramatic development of the knave of the popular stage. The Senecan and native influence on the development of the Elizabethan Villain hero has been very adequately and thoroughly treated by Boyer,³⁹ Praz,⁴⁰ and Bevington.⁴¹

Ribner concluded thus:

The stage-Machiavel thus grew out of three elements: the Elizabethan inability to understand Machiavelli's method, which was aided by attacks upon it from the Church, the Senecan 'villain hero' and the devil incarnate tradition of the native English drama.⁴²

Among the many horrible sins with which the Machiavellian stock figure had been saddled we find the following three most prominent and persistent – his underhand stratagems or 'policie', his atheism or irreligiousness and his dissimulation. The reason why the Elizabethans found in Machiavelli such a convenient term of abuse is perhaps, best supplied to us by an anonymous *Treatise of Treasons Against Queen Elizabeth and the Crown of England* dated 1572, extracts from which are worth quoting:

'.....the hazard of turning one of the most principal and ancient monarchs of Christendome, from a most Christian government into a machiavellian state... And that is it, that I call a Machiavellian state

³⁹ See Boyer C.V., *The Villain as Hero in Elizabethan Tragedy*, N.Y., 1964, 1st printed in 1914.

⁴⁰ See Praz M., *op. cit.* pp. 49-97.

⁴¹ See Bevington D.M., *From Mankind to Marlowe*, Cambridge 1962.

⁴² See Ribner I., *op. cit.* pp. 153-157.

and Regiment, where Religion is put behind in the second or last place, where the civil Policie, I meane, is preferred before it, and not limited by any rules of Religion, but the Religion framed to serve the time and policy when both by word and example of the Rulers, the ruled are taught with every change of Prince to change also the face of their faith and Religion, where in appearance and show only, a Religion is pretended, now one, now another, they force not greatly which, so that at hart there be none at all, where neither by hope nor fear of ought after this life, men are restrained from all manner of vice, nor moved to any vertue what so ever, but where it is free to slander, to belie, to forswear, to accuse, to corrupt, to oppresse, to robbe, to murder, and to commit every other outrage, never so barbarous (that promiseth to advance the Present Policie in hand) without scruple, fear, or conscience of hell or heaven, of God or Diuel... and where no restraint nor allurement is left in the hart of man, to bridle him from evil, nor to invite him to good, but for the vain fame only and fear of lay lawes, that reach no further then to this body and life, that I cal a Machiavellian state and Governace.⁴³

There is strong, intemal evidence in Marlowe's plays, not only that he was acutely aware of the popular Machiavelli Legend, but also that he apparently delighted to portray his major characters according to distorted or true Machiavellian precepts.

There is, for instance, Tamburlaine's persistent extolling of the Machiavellian concept of *virtù*. His character and aspirations are in reality a vivid personification of this concept. Like Machiavelli, Tamburlaine is not concerned with morals or ethics, his sole aim is, 'the sweet fruition of an earthy crown,' and in the pursuit of a soaring ambition, Tamburlaine quite unscrupulously violates both human and moral bounds. In *Edward II*, Isabel is depicted as an example of a perfect dissembler. In public she professes love, loyalty and zeal to her husband and great interest in the welfare of the country, whereas in private, she is constantly and unwaveringly aiding and sharpening her paramour's Machiavellian schemes. Edward too, adopts a true Machiavellian principle, when the realisation dawns upon him that it is his weakness and inefficiency of government which secured his downfall:

...yet how have I transgrest
Unless it be with too much clemencie.⁴⁴

⁴³ Quoted by Raab F., op. cit. p. 60.

⁴⁴ See *Edward II, The Works*, op. cit. 2109-2110.

In the portrayal of the Duke of Guise, Marlowe must have found another splendid exponent of popular Machiavellianism. He too is a perfect dissembler, who uses religion as a stalking-horse, and the target which he constantly and unscrupulously aims at is the Crown of France. But it is really in *The Jew of Malta*, particularly in the portrayal of Barabas, Femeze and the slave Ithamore, that we find Marlowe's knowledge of the Machiavelli Legend exploited to the full.

Machiavel makes his first appearance on the Elizabethan Stage, and utters a Prologue in which he announces his disciple Barabas and asks the audience to welcome him. Generally speaking, the Machiavellian maxims enunciated in the Prologue do not really reflect the true Machiavelli. Several scholars, including Kocher and Bakeless⁴⁵ maintained that Marlowe based the Prologue on Gabriel Harvey's *Epigramma in Effigiem Machiavelli*. D'Andrea holds an entirely different view.⁴⁶ Whatever it was we should be very wary of assuming either Marlowe's ignorance of the true Machiavelli or any enslavement to Harvey's poem.

We need hardly doubt that books like *Il Principe* and *I Discorsi*, so popular then, would have offered a great attraction and temptation to Marlowe. Distortions from the true Machiavelli that we find in the Prologue to *The Jew of Malta* and elsewhere in Marlowe's works, as for instance:

though some speak openly against my bookes;
Yet will they reade me, and thereby attaine
To Peters chayre: And, when they cast me off,
Are poyson'd by my climbing followers.⁴⁷

or

I count religion but a childish Toy,
And hold there is no sinne but Ignorance,⁴⁸

are partly due to commonplace Elizabethan pleasantries, partly to the popular Machiavelli Legend, but more emphatically to Marlowe's own propensities and beliefs. However maxims like:

might first made kings
and
... a strong built citadel,
Commands much more than letters can import⁴⁹

⁴⁵ See Kocher P.H., op. cit. p. 195 and Bakeless J., op. cit. p. 350.

⁴⁶ See D'Andrea A., op. cit. pp. 214-248.

⁴⁷ *The Jew of Malta, The Works*, op. cit. 10-13.

⁴⁸ Ibid: 14-15.

⁴⁹ Ibid: 20, 22-23.

are almost certainly derived from Machiavelli, even if slightly modified.⁵⁰

Just as the Duke of Guise and the mighty Tamburlaine exemplify the Machiavellian thirst for power at all cost, in a similar manner Barabas typifies the Machiavellian intrigue, and crafty 'Policie', a term associated with the Machiavellian 'politic-villain', is mentioned at least thirteen times in *The Jew of Malta* and it is very effective in setting the right tone and atmosphere of the entire drama. Whilst no single line in *The Jew of Malta* can be said with certainty to have come directly either from *Il Principe* or *I Discorsi* or for that matter, direct from Gentillet, it cannot equally be gainsaid that the play, apart from the Prologue, is steeped in the popular legend of Machiavelli who was saddled with all manner of crimes like poisoning, murdering, plotting, dissembling, hypocrisy, greed and egoism, all of which are exemplified in *The Jew of Malta*.

To begin with, the Christians are represented, using religion as mere 'policy' with the common Elizabethan connotation of 'hypocritical self-seeking'. From the outset, they are depicted as avaricious, perjurious and hypocritical. They wrong Barabas by supposedly confiscating all his property to pay their tribute to the Turks to honour the truce which they should never have undertaken. They even quote biblical tags to cloak and justify their wrongs, to which Barabas with biting sarcasm replies:

Is theft the ground of your religion?
or again,
What? bring you Scripture to confirm your wrongs?
Preach me not out of my possessions.⁵¹

In his scathing parody of Christians, Barabas reveals an intense disparity between their professions and deeds. They quite unceremoniously break the league (which was considered a very serious slip then as now among the league of nations) on the notorious principle that it is no sin to break faith with infidels, though they never paid back to the Jew the property confiscated. We can easily sense Barabas's delight in exposing their villainies:

For I can see no *fruits* in all their faith
But malice, falsehood and excessive pride
Which me thinks fits not their profession⁵²

The word 'fruits', in the first line is very significant from the point of view of Christians. It vividly recalls and was probably meant to recall

⁵⁰ See D'Andrea A., op. cit. p. 225-227.

⁵¹ See *The Jew of Malta, The Works*, op. cit. 328, 343-344.

⁵² Ibid: 154-156.

Christ's biblical advice to his apostles how to recognise their followers:

By their fruits, you will know them⁵³

Barabas too misses no opportunity of lashing at Christian hypocrisy:

I, policy? that's their profession
And not simplicity as they suggest⁵⁴

A strong appeal to *Cupiditas* is noticeable not only on the part of the Jewish and Turkish societies, but also among Christians. This greed for instance, is revealed with bitter sarcasm in the Friars' most ridiculous attempt to secure Barabas's property when the latter was constrained to assume readiness for repentance and conversion. Their excessive greed rendered them unaware of the trap which the wily Barabas laid for them and in which they irretrievably found themselves engulfed. Love of *Lucre* is admirably summed up in the Basso's reply to the Governor's question:

Gov: What wind drives you thus into Malta rhode?

Basso: The wind that bloweth all the world besides,
Desire of Gold.⁵⁵

This love of wealth is also vividly demonstrated at the opening of the play, in Barabas's first soliloquy:

Bags of fiery Opals, Sapphires, Amatists,
Iacints, Hard Topas, Grasse-greene Emeralds,
Beauteous Rubyes, sparkling Diamonds,
And seildsene costly stones of so great price
As one of them indifferently rated,
And of a Carrect of this quantity,
May serve in peril of calamity,
To ransome great Kings from captivity.
This is the ware wherin consists my wealth.⁵⁶

Douglas Cole considers *The Jew of Malta* as a play which owes its structural unity and cohesion to the theme of *Cupiditas* – the desire of gold.⁵⁷

The friars and nuns who are sworn to celibacy are depicted as no less avaricious and lecherous and their prayers are ridiculed by Barabas:

⁵³ Matthew, Chap. 7 verse 16.

⁵⁴ See *The Jew of Malta, The Works*, 393-394.

⁵⁵ Ibid: 1421-1423.

⁵⁶ Ibid: 60-68.

⁵⁷ See: Cole Douglas, *Suffering and Evil in the Plays of Christopher Marlowe*, Princeton, 1962, p. 123.

And yet I know the prayers of those nuns
 And holy friars, having money for their pains
 Are wondrous, and indeed do no man good.⁵⁸

In breaking the sad news to her father that the house in which he had part of his treasures hidden had been confiscated and turned into a nunnery, Abigail describes the aim of the confiscation thus:

To make a nunnery, where none, but their own sect,
 Must enter in, men generally barr'd.⁵⁹

We cannot miss here the innuendoes in the words 'sect' and 'men generally barr'd', Barabas's similar retort to Lodowick:

And made my house a place for Nuns, most chast⁶⁰

is followed by his undisguised 'aside' about the fickleness of nuns, who: '...doe a while increase and multiply'.⁶¹ The earlier reference to 'Nuns most chast', has become fully charged with biting sarcasm, at the same time Barabas's comment about the nuns who do, 'increase and multiply', echoes a biblical warning.⁶² The irony of it all, lies in the fact that whereas God exhorted Adam and Eve to 'increase and multiply' Marlowe with his peculiar sardonic twist, applied this same exhortation through Barabas to the nuns who are ostensibly swom to chastity.⁶³

Abigail greeted Friar Iacomo, on seeking admittance into the nunnery, with the following sarcastic salutation: 'you happy virgins' guide' and immediately we notice the hollowness with which both Friar Iacomo and the Abbess so readily and peremptorily accepted the pretended penitence, atonement and mortification of Abigail. Ithamore's question to Abigail: '...have not the Nuns fine sport with the Fryars now and then?' is loaded with meaning in Friar Bamadine's confession. The dying Abigail appeals to the Friar:

Convert my father that he may be sav'd
 And witness that I die a Christian,⁶⁴

and Friar Jacomo regrettably breaks out:

⁵⁸ See *The Jew of Malta, The Works*, op. cit. 843-845.

⁵⁹ Ibid: 491-492.

⁶⁰ Ibid: 840.

⁶¹ Ibid: 857.

⁶² See Genesis, Chap. I, verse 28.

⁶³ To get an idea of the depraved morals of the Religious Orders in Tudor England, we should read: Knowles David, *The Religious Orders in England*, Vol. III, Cambridge, 1959.

I, and a virgin too; that grieves me most.⁶⁵

Such sly digs however, must have stimulated burst of laughter and applause, rather than condemnation, on the part of the audience. Bevington summed up the Friars' characters thus:

The two friars are presented as greedy and unscrupulous in their desire for gold. They are also lecherous, and have mistresses within the walls of the convent.⁶⁶

Marlowe appears to have set out to depict the Christian society as not less Machiavellian in certain respects than Barabas himself. But it is Barabas who is the villain hero. He embarks upon a succession of murderous schemes and crafty dealings until finally, he overreaches himself.

The drama shows Marlowe more interested in portraying villainous, treacherous, hypocritical Machiavellian knaves, than in following true historical accounts, too closely. The emphasis unmistakably lies in exposing the deceitful and revengeful schemes of his protagonist, who stops at nothing to achieve his selfish ends. This is of course in keeping with Barabas's advice to Ithamore, his 'second-self':

First, be then voyd of these affections,
Compassion, love, vaine, hope and hartlesse feare,
Be mov'd at nothing, see thou pittie none
But to thy selfe smile, when the Christians moane.⁶⁷

In presenting the Turks as temporarily victorious over the Christian Community in Malta as they were in Gozo and Tripoli during the Siege of 1551, Marlowe makes some departure from history. Apart from other consideration, the Christian defeat in Malta though unwarranted by true historical events, was necessary to enable Barabas's Machiavellian policies to secure the highest position on the island. Thus Barabas could adequately avenge the wrongs inflicted upon him by the Christians, who towards the end, planned to make him pay dearly for his past misdeeds. But his stratagem (drinking a sleeping potion to be considered dead) enabled him to effect a narrow escape, though Marlowe did not allow him to enjoy long the success of his revenge resulting from his betrayal of Malta to the Turks and his appointment as governor of the island, in recognition for the services he rendered to the Turks.

⁶⁴ *The Jew of Malta* 1254-1255.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*: 1493-1496; 1497.

⁶⁶ See Bevington D.M., *From Mankind to Marlowe*, Cambridge, 1962, p. 23.

⁶⁷ See *The Jew of Malta, The Works*, op. cit. 934-237.

The intrigues in which a Machiavellian knave involves himself, will inevitably and finally bring about his downfall. Thus Barabas in attempting to betray the island back to the Christian Community in return for a hundred thousand pounds, finds himself fatally entrapped in the stratagem which he had prepared for Calymath and his Bassoes. In his dying speech he is still crying vengeance and avers that he means to bring confusion on both 'the Christian dogs and Turkish infidels'. The Machiavellian knave does not boast long of his boggling policies:

... why, is not this
 A kingly kinde of trade to purchase Townes
 By treachery, and sell'em by deceit?
 Now tell me, worldlings, undemeath the sunne,
 If greater falshood ever his bin done.⁶⁸

Such a triumphant outburst, sung in the spell of his ascendancy is soon changed to the bitter cry which he utters from the boiling cauldron:

But now begins the extremity of heat
 To pinch me with intolerable pangs:
 Dye life, flye soule, tongue curse thy fill and dye.⁶⁹

The heroic role in which, we view Barabas in the early stages of the play, suffering the wrongs inflicted upon him by 'Christian hypocrisy', is soon turned into a truly revengeful one. Barabas gradually reveals himself as an iniquitous Machiavellian knave. Without much ado, he announces his villainous schemes and stratagems, in his famous soliloquy, after Job's comforters had deserted him:

See the simplicities of these base slaves
 Who, for the villaines have no wit themselves
 Think me to be a senselesse lump of clay
 That will with every water wash to dirt!
 No! Barabas is born to better chance
 And fram'd of finer mould than common men
 That measure naught but by the present time,
 A reaching thought will search his deepest wits⁷⁰

Soon Barabas starts his series of revenges. His first victims are the Governor's son and Matthias who are both in love with his daughter and between whom he devises a counterfeit challenge in which they both

⁶⁸ Ibid: 2329-2333.

⁶⁹ Ibid: 2371-2373.

⁷⁰ Ibid: 448-455.

perish. This is followed by poisoning a whole nunnery, including his daughter Abigail, and causes the death of two Friars, one of whom he strangles with the help of Ithamore, his slave. He then proceeds to poison Ithamore, Pilia Borza and Bellamira with a 'nosegay' and to escape the penalty for his misdeeds, he drinks a sleeping potion. Immediately he betrays Malta to the Turks, in return for which, they appoint him governor of the Island.

Even when he is dying, Barabas boasts of his wickedness, and avers that he had intended the destruction of both sides:

And, had I but escap'd this stratagem
I would have brought confusion on you all
Damn'd Christians, dogges and Turkish Infidels.⁷¹

Strewn throughout the play we find some vivid reflections of the true Machiavellian doctrine. Barabas counsels his daughter:

Be rul'd by me, for in extremitie
We ought to make bar of no policie.⁷²

or again Barabas on being appointed governor exclaims:

Thus hast thou gotten, by thy policie
No simple place, no small authority
.
And since by wrong thou got'st authority
Maintaine it bravely by firme policy.⁷³

These and similar remarks could be compared with maxims expounded in the seventeenth chapter of *Il Principe*, where Machiavelli is discussing whether it is better for a prince to be loved or feared. In both *Il Principe* and *I Discorsi* Machiavelli exhorts the prince to be just by preference, but vicious and cruel if the need arises. Another direct reminiscence of the main theme of Chapter II of *Il Principe* is contained in Barabas's remark:

And crowns come either by succession
Or urg'd by force: and nothing violent
Oft have I heard tell, can be permanent.⁷⁴

This is also clearly reflected in Calymath's readiness to accept the

⁷¹ Ibid: 2367-2370.
⁷² Ibid: 507-508.
⁷³ Ibid: 2128-2148.
⁷⁴ Ibid: 169-171.

suggested respite on the basis that:

... 'tis more Kingly to obtaine by peace
Then to enforce conditions by constraint.⁷⁵

Like 'Policie', 'dissembling' is another key-word in *The Jew of Malta*. It is a disguise assumed by Christians and Jews alike. Barabas often tells the audience in his 'asides' that he is going to assume the role of dissembler. To encourage Abigail's dissimulation and at the same time strike at religious hypocrisy, Barabas tells her:

I Daughter, for religion
Hides many mischiefs from suspition.⁷⁶

From his knowledge of Christians, Barabas regards religion merely as a cloak for crime.

Ego-centric love explicitly or implicitly pervades the characterisation of Marlowe's heroes. Gentillet actually attributed an unfair emphasis to this aspect of Machiavelli's doctrine. *The Jew of Malta* is saturated with touches of this unruly passion, which is principally embodied in the character of Barabas. Whatever he does, says or deliberates, clearly reveals his self-edification and gratification. His motto *Ego mihi met sum semper proximus* is actually a garbled quotation derived from the *Andria* of Terence.⁷⁷ It is even more forcefully expressed in:

For so I live, perish may all the world.⁷⁸

As a great misanthropist, the Jew's considerations are bounded by love of himself, his gold and his profits. Even his sole daughter he was prepared not only to disinherit and disown, but also to cause her untimely death by poisoning. The Jew's and Ithamore's frank confession of their villainies, though somewhat conventional, reveals their true nature and it also shows the quintessence of what the Elizabethans heard or dreamt of Italianate villainies with which Machiavelli's name was generally coupled. In discussing the various ways of poisoning in the sixteenth century, Bowers remarked:

It is true that the Elizabethans unanimously regarded Italy with horror as the land of poisoners. Nashe called it (1592) 'the Apothecary shop of poyson for all Nations.'⁷⁹

⁷⁵ Ibid: 254-255.

⁷⁶ Ibid: 519-520.

⁷⁷ Terence had actually stated: 'Proximus sum egomet mihi', See *Andria*, IV, i, 12.

⁷⁸ See *The Jew of Malta, The Works*, op. cit. 2282.

⁷⁹ See Bowers F.T., *The Audience and The Poisoners of Elizabethan Tragedy*, *JEGP*, Vol. XXXVI, 1937, pp.491-504.

Bowers also quoted Thomas Adams who in 1614 stated:

If we should gather sinners to their particular
Centres we would appoint.....
Poysoning to Italie.⁸⁰

Nashe accused English travellers of bringing the art of poisoning from Italy and warned Englishmen to beware of poison put:

...into a man's dish, his drinke, his apparell, his ringes, his stirrups,
his nosegay.⁸¹

The devious intrigues of Machiavellian 'policie' appear in most of Marlowe's plays. The Duke of Guise, the evil favourites of Edward II, the young Mortimer, Isabel and the barons all undertake to carry out their sinister schemes ruthlessly and unscrupulously, and this the Elizabethans commonly referred to as 'policie', or Machiavellism. Such devilish intrigues are also most emphatically revealed in Barabas's character, which is summed up by Cole thus:

Into the character of Barabas Marlowe has poured all the vilest ingredients from the bugbears of contemporary popular imagination fusing the infidel Jew with the ruthless Machiavellian and animating the mixture with the spirit of the Morality Vice.⁸²

Many more examples could be cited to prove Marlowe's intimate knowledge of the Machiavelli Legend. Most of these, admittedly are perversions of the true Machiavellian doctrine. But to argue on the premise of these false impressions that Marlowe did not read the true Machiavelli but derived his knowledge of the Florentine Secretary and his works from Gentillet's *Contre-Machiavel* is in my opinion to misunderstand the true Marlovian approach. Indeed we have to remember, that from what we have seen of Marlowe's use of the Machiavelli Legend, it seems it must have appealed to him on the double count of repulsion and attraction.

Even more untenable seems to me Kocher's suggestion that the Machiavellian influence on Marlowe is a minor one. In order to minimize the importance of such an influence on Marlowe, Kocher argued that the villainous traits of his heroes are generally determined by the sources, and in the case of Barabas by the Senecan, native and semitic traditions.⁸³

⁸⁰ Quoted by Bowers F.T., *ibid.*

⁸¹ Nashe T., *The Unfortunate Traveller, The Works*, Edn. Mc Kerrow R.B., London, 1910, p. 301.

⁸² See Cole Douglas, *op. cit.* p. 142.

⁸³ See Kocher P.H., *op. cit.* p. 201.

Whilst I have already expressed concurrence with the prevalence of the Senecan and Native influence on Marlowe, I strongly disagree with the view that the sources determined the portrayal of Marlowe's villain heroes. If the sources, in fact had any influence on the character of Marlowe's villain heroes, what, one might well ask, determined Marlowe's choice of such sources? Marlowe never enslaves himself to any source, in fact he seems characteristically disinclined to follow even the major sources too closely. He created his own heroes and animated them with his own vitality and ambition. Critics have, in fact, suggested that some of his heroes are self-projections.

When we acquaint ourselves with the available biographical evidence on Marlowe, we shall no longer remain unduly surprised to realise why all the major characters of his plays symbolise or expound a complexity of unorthodox views. Even his apprenticeship work *The Tragedy of Dido*, hints at the homo-sexual theme and the theory of 'absolutism'. We have to bear in mind that quite often these and similar heterodox tenets are not solicited by the sources and when they are, they have been highly elaborated upon.

Tamburlaine represents a symbol of an ambitious unorthodoxy. He strives hard to achieve the sweet fruition of an earthly rather than a heavenly crown. He even hints at invading Heaven after his worldly conquest. In extolling the Machiavellian concept of *virtù*, he is deliberately rejecting the medieval ideal of communal achievement. Tamburlaine emphasises that gentility is the reward of one's virtuous deeds and not an accident of birth. Both his military conquests and achievement reflect the theory of absolute rule. Marlowe's impatience with Christian orthodoxy is perhaps best revealed in *The Jew of Malta* as we have already seen, and *Dr. Faustus*. Faustus rejects divinity with great arrogance and flippancy and takes up, instead, necromancy. He secures his soul's damnation in return for twenty-four years of forbidden magic power to enable him to leap beyond human bounds. Dr. Faustus seems to me a protest against religious dogmas and impositions aimed at clamping down on man's freedom. Marlowe is reported by Baines to have preached that religion was originally designed to keep men in subjection and awe, that Moses was a juggler and Christ an impostor.⁶⁴ In *The Massacre at Paris*, Catholic religion is merely used as a pretext to attain, by Machiavellian tactics, the crown of France. Even here we notice some occasional homosexual touches. In *Edward II*, the theme of homosexuality is given more prominence. In fact, Marlowe is attributing Edward's downfall to his weak-

⁶⁴ See 'Richard Baines on Marlowe', quoted by C.F. Tucker Brooke in *Marlowe, The Life and Dido*, op. cit. pp.98-100.

ness and effeminacy, a defect which runs counter to the theory of absolutism which he constantly expounded.

Both the works and the extant biographical evidence point to a man of strong heterodox beliefs, which he was very fond of propagating, generally under a thin disguise. Kocher in referring to the components and ingredients of Marlowe's works had this to say:

Any given play is a series of compromises between Marlowe's subjectivity and the sources of the story he is using...he had liberty after the plot had been selected to mould it according to his conviction. Therefore the mere fact that an idea or theme of the play is to be found in the sources is by no means conclusive against its having a subjective element also. The test must always be its generality of use, its outstanding eloquence of statement and its congruity with other ideas presumptively or certainly Marlowe's.⁸⁵

With his strong unorthodox beliefs, Marlowe was most peculiarly disposed to interest himself in and to read Machiavelli's works. The difficulty of laying his hands on a copy of the Florentine Secretary's works should not have been serious especially in his case. However the only available external evidence which hints at Marlowe's reading of Machiavelli's works comes from a letter which Gabriel Harvey wrote to Spenser in 1579, where, *inter alia* he stated:

And I warrant you sum good fellowes amongst us begin nowe to be prettely well acuaynted with a certayne parlous byoke callid as I remember me, 'Il Principe' di Noccolo Machiavelli, and I can peradventure name you an odd crewe or tooe that are as cuninge in his 'Discorsi'...in his *Historia Fiorentina*, and in his *Dialogues della Arte della Guerra* tooe and in certayne gallant Turkish Discourses tooe... as University men were wont to be in their parva logicalia and Magna Moralia and Physicalia of both sorts: *verbum intelligenti sat*.⁸⁶

A very significant point emerges from this letter and that is that Machiavelli's works were widely and eagerly read at Cambridge. It is not possible that Marlowe joined the 'odd crewe' after entering Cambridge in 1580 as an undergraduate? That Marlowe shows great familiarity with the popular legend of Machiavelli as well as with Turkish wars, which is, incidentally, another subject alleged in Harvey's letter to have been keenly read at Cambridge, cannot be denied. Edward Meyer made bolder

⁸⁵ See Kocher P.H., op. cit. p.6.

⁸⁶ See Letter by Harvey to Spenser (1579) in *The Works of Gabriel Harvey*, Edn. Grossart, A.B., 1884, Vol. I, p. 138.

suggestions when he remarked:

...it may be stated as an absolute certainty that had 'The Prince' never been written, Marlowe's three great heroes would not have been drawn with such gigantic strokes.⁸⁷

In 1875, Broune recorded Richard Harvey's attribution of the Elizabethan freethinking, of which Marlowe seemed thoroughly imbued, to three well known Italian writers:

Richard Harvey, in his 'Discourse of the Lambe of God', London, 1590, a work written expressly against the Elizabethan freethinkers, attributes the atheistical tendencies of the age to the three famous Italians – Pomponatius, Aretine and Machiavelli – Pomponatius on account of his famous book, 'De Immortalitate Animae', which, according to Harvey, was thought to have converted Leo X; Aretine, whom some call, 'divine' but who is 'the porter of Plutoes divinitie' and the 'grandsire' of all Martinish courtiership', in consequence of his 'horrible and damnable book of the "Three Impostors"'; Machiavelli is 'that secretary of hell as well as of Florence'.⁸⁸

That there was close social, commercial and intellectual intercourse between Italy and England in the sixteenth century, perhaps more than in any other age, is amply demonstrated by Lewis Einstein's famous book, *The Italian Renaissance in England*.⁸⁹ Bakeless, in stressing the possibility that Marlowe read *Il Principe*, remarked:

In the intellectual circles which he frequented – which had at one time included Giordano Bruno – there must have been several men who interested themselves in Italian circles; and in any case Elizabethan England was rapidly becoming so Italianate that it was hard for any mind to escape contagion.⁹⁰

Complimentary references to Italianate gentlemen in England were counterbalanced by derogatory remarks on the English 'Italianato', who was considered a devil incarnate. In a notable passage in the *Groatsworth of Wit*, the jealous contemporary Robert Greene, attributed Marlowe's atheism to Machiavelli:

Is it pestilent Machiavelian policie that thou hast studied? O peevish

⁸⁷ See Meyer E., op. cit. pp. 33-34.

⁸⁸ See Broune C.E., 'Christopher Marlowe and Machiavelli' in *Notes and Queries*, Aug. 21, 1875, pp. 141-142.

⁸⁹ See Einstein Lewis, op. cit.

⁹⁰ See Bakeless J., I, op. cit. p. 349.

follicie... The brother of this dyabolicall atheisme is dead, and in his life had never the felicitie he aymed at, but, as he beganne in craft, lived in feare, and ended in dispaire. (We may remark here that this is more or less, how Greene ended his life). Quam inscrutabilia sunt Dei iudicia! This murderer of many brethren had his conscience seared like Cayne; this betrayer of him that gave his life for him, inherited the portion of Judas, this aposlata perished as ill as Julian, and wilt thou, my friend, be his disciple?⁹¹

Among the books available at the Chapter Library of Canterbury Cathedral, in Marlowe's life time, Doctor Urry, the archivist of the City of Canterbury, listed the following, which he maintained Marlowe had used:

Two Volumes of Holinshed's Chronicles,
Ovid,
Fortescue's 'Foreste',
Tindal's Translation of the Bible 1571,
Book of Common Prayer 1552,
T. More's Miscellany 1556,
Munster's Cosmography,
Philip Lonicerus: 'Chronicorium Turicicorum tomi duo,
The Works of Machiavelli.⁹²

On the basis of the above, we could better argue that Marlowe read Machiavelli's works than that he did not. His propensities and beliefs, the biographical evidence available and his works provide us with strong indications, that Marlowe acquainted himself not only with diatribes against Machiavelli, including Gentillet's, but that he also read his works, which he used as an important source and influence in composing his works, particularly *The Jew of Malta*. In summing up Machiavelli's influence in *The Jew of Malta*, Wilson remarked:

... he (Machiavelli) is a presiding genius over Jew and Christian alike.⁹³

The Machiavellian influence in *The Jew of Malta* is predominant. It prevails in the portrayal of Christian, Jew and Turk, who represented the three great religions of the world. In addition to this, we have also noted the strong Semitic, Senecan and Native influence on Marlowe, particularly in *The Jew of Malta*. No other Marlovian character better than Barabas embodies and combines so many traits from all these various influences. The fusion seems complete.

⁹¹ See Greene R., *Groatsworth of Wit*, 1592, Edn. Grossart A.B., XII, pp. 141-142.

⁹² See Wraight A.D., and Virginia F.S., op. cit. Preface by Dr. W. Urry, p. 42.

⁹³ See Wilson F.P., op. cit. p. 62.