CHAPTER 1

Marlowe's Early Books:
1 Contention and a 'Marlowe Effect'

PETER KIRWAN[1]

The First Part of the Contention – by which I mean the play published in quarto in 1594, 1600 and

1619, as distinguished from the play *2 Henry VI* first published in the Shakespeare Folio of 1623 –

may seem an unusual focus in a collection concerned with Marlowe. However, this play has

longstanding claims to be Marlovian.[2] By the early twentieth century, most critics concurred that

both this play and *The True Tragedy of Richard, Duke of York* were (collaboratively or solely) by

Marlowe. R. Grant White argued they were written by 'Marlowe, Greene and Shakspere (and

perhaps Peele) together, not improbably as co-laborers', and that Shakespeare redrafted them as *2*

and *3 Henry VI* (Furnivall, iii-iv). F.J. Furnivall agreed that the first common passage between *1*

Contention and *2 Henry VI* is 'plainly Marlowe. The exaggeration and the strain are far more like him

than Shakspere' (vi). Jane Lee believed the *Contention* plays were by Marlowe and Greene, and

perhaps also Peele. She argued that 'to Shakspere, working together with Marlowe, was due the

revision of the old plays and their transformation into *Henry VI., Parts 2 and 3*' (Tyler, iii-iv). Thomas

Tyler announced confidently:

> We now need have no difficulty in admitting that Marlowe assisted Shakspere further in the
> development of the Second and Third Parts of *Henry VI.* out of the *Contention* and the *True*
> *Tragedy* […] But it may be said that the traces of Marlowe's hand are, at any rate, less
> conspicuous in the Third Part of *Henry VI.* than in the Second, where, at the commencement

[2] As this book went into production, the New Oxford Shakespeare announced that it would be attributing all three *Henry VI* plays to Marlowe in collaboration with Shakespeare and others. (Dayla Alberge, 'Christopher Marlowe credited as one of Shakespeare's co-writers', *Guardian* 23 October 2016). This essay has not had time to review the new edition's findings, but its results accord with many of the earlier studies summarised here.

of Act IV., some very remarkable lines occur, which are not to be found in the *Contention*. (xvii)

C. F. Tucker Brooke developed this in the most systematic study yet, arguing that Marlowe was the sole author of the *Contention* plays and that Shakespeare managed the revision into *Henry VI*: 'That Marlowe was responsible for much or all of the best poetry in the *Contention* and *The True Tragedy* has been at least vaguely accepted by all writers on the subject for many years' (1912, 148).

It was the separate studies of Peter Alexander (1921) and Madeleine Doran (1928) that reversed the overwhelming consensus in favour of Marlowe's authorship and, more importantly, reversed the priority of the texts. Alexander's theory that *1 Contention* and *True Tragedy* were memorial reconstructions had the dual effect of recasting *1 Contention* as a corrupt, rather than earlier, version of *2 Henry VI*, and of removing the need for authorial agency in the process of revision. Yet the theory that *1 Contention* is a memorial reconstruction should not prohibit discussion of Marlowe's involvement. Based on the Folio texts, contemporary attribution scholars such as Thomas Merriam (2002), Hugh Craig and Arthur F. Kinney (2009), and Gary Taylor and John Nance (2015) all argue that Marlowe is an authorial presence in *Henry VI*. Most focus on *Part 1*, but Craig and Kinney argue also that the Jack Cade scenes of *Part 2* match Marlowe's linguistic profile. Their observations are complemented by those of P.J. Vincent (2001) who uses distinctions between 'O' and 'Oh' in the Folio to argue that a different author is present in Act 4. Craig and Kinney use primary component analysis of lexical and function words to demonstrate close linguistic correspondence with Marlowe's word choices, but also at a literary level align Cade (and Joan la Pucelle) with Marlovian over-reachers such as Faustus and Tamburlaine.[3] Where the Cade scenes are usually compared according to authorial divisions with the later depictions of riots in *Julius Caesar*, *Sir Thomas More* and *Coriolanus*, Craig and Kinney show not only that the scene has little in common

---

[3] Most precisely, Craig and Kinney demonstrate that features of *2 Henry VI* adhere more closely to Marlowe than to a corpus of non-Marlowe, and to Marlowe than Shakespeare, especially in the later sections of the play (i. e., the Jack Cade scene) (2009, 72).

linguistically with these scenes, but also suggest that the Shakespearean focus overlooks the more chronologically immediate connections with Marlowe's work.

Even those critics who deny that Marlowe collaborated on the *Henry VI* plays do not deny the overwhelming linguistic influence of *Tamburlaine*. The attribution projects of Thomas Merriam and Brian Vickers both acknowledge that there are more shared collocations of language between *Tamburlaine* and plays such as *Edward III* and *1 Henry VI* than with any other play or author of the period. The difference instead is one of interpretation: Merriam rejects Vickers's argument that the presence of these collocations indicate a broad influence on the flurry of drama that followed *Tamburlaine*, arguing that they in fact indicate shared authorship (Merriam 2009). Either way, Marlowe's words are substantially present in the *Henry VI* plays.

The Craig-Kinney tests set a high (and well-reviewed) standard for attribution scholars, although their implications for *2 Henry VI* have drawn less attention than their arguments for Shakespeare's involvement in *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Arden of Faversham*.[4] The present volume offers a suitable occasion to consider what implications Marlowe's partial authorship of *2 Henry VI* may have for Marlowe studies. Craig and Kinney's study does not consider *1 Contention*, an understandable omission given the consensus that *1 Contention* is an adapted (or corrupt) version of the Folio play. Yet despite the frequent dismissal of the play as a memorial reconstruction, this was a more thoroughgoing and considered adaptation than the term would usually imply. Both Steven Urkowitz (1988) and Laurie Maguire (1996) have demonstrated the weakness of the memorial reconstruction case for this play, which rests primarily on the historical errors in York's description of his claim to the crown (*1 Contention*, C4^{r-v}), for which false memory is a less plausible explanation than textual error.[5] Scott McMillin (1972a) proposes a different kind of reconstruction by

---

[4] The fullest review is that of Egan (2011, 314-28), and the most comprehensive negative review of Craig and Kinney's methodology (Vickers, 2011) has in its turn been countered by Jackson (2014, 40-59).

[5] The compositional relationship of *1 Contention* and *2 Henry VI* is not germane to my argument in this chapter, but the specific question of York's account of his lineage is worth

demonstrating the theatrical coherence of the changes to the text, which he argues was a revised version for performance by Pembroke's Men, a narrative accepted by the Oxford Shakespeare. Where the earlier twentieth-century critics agreed that *1 Contention* was a coherent text of a Marlowe play later revised into Shakespeare's *2 Henry VI*, current scholarship suggests it may be a coherent text of a Marlowe-Shakespeare collaboration, adapted for a particular playing company.

Martin Wiggins (2013) offers a persuasive redating of the Marlowe canon that leaves a substantial gap between *The Jew of Malta* (1589) and *Edward II* (1592). Wiggins suggests that Marlowe may have written other plays and poems in this period now either lost or not 'securely identified' as his (2013, 13).[6] The longstanding arguments for Marlowe's involvement in the *Contention* plays fit exactly into the gap he creates, and he notes (without pursuing the implication) that Marlowe was at this time 'drawing on the original two-part version of *Henry VI*' in creating *Edward II* for Pembroke's Men (*ibid*). *1 Contention* fits into this significant lacuna in Marlowe's chronology. The play appeared in 1594 alongside the first major expansion of Marlowe's print canon in *Edward II* and *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, as well as several plays generally considered to respond to the success of *Tamburlaine* including *Selimus, Orlando Furioso* and *The Battle of Alcazar*.[7] Even if Craig and Kinney are not correct that *2 Henry VI* (and thus *1 Contention*) was co-written by Marlowe, *1 Contention* still participated in the apparent vogue for serial historical dramas featuring

---

addressing. *1 Contention* makes York's ancestor Edmund Langley the second, rather than the fifth, son and thus renders the subsequent account of his mother's rights superfluous. This explanation is accepted unquestioningly by Wiggins (#888). Wells and Taylor argue that 'Once having established that part of Q is clearly a report, it is natural to suppose that the rest of the text – which is open to alternative explanations – is also a report' (175) making clear the significance of this piece of evidence. My issue, following Urkowitz, is that in neither text does York make his claim through Langley. The focus of critics on the *historical* mistake leads them to miss the internal coherence of the text. The claim in Q is consistent apart from the error of repeating Lionel's daughters as Langley's, which is not explicable as memorial error.

[6] For a discussion of Marlowe attributions and lost plays, see the chapter in this volume by Matthew Steggle.

[7] Essays in this volume follow Hailey in assigning the date of 1596 to the quarto of *The Massacre at Paris*.

overreaching antiheroes that followed the example of the *Tamburlaines* the year after Marlowe himself died. *1 Contention* thus intersects with a number of Marlovian contexts, and may provide a suitable subject for consideration of what qualifies as 'Marlovian'.

Leah Marcus has made steps towards consideration of a broader understanding of 'Marlowe' than straightforward authorship in her idea of a 'Marlowe effect'. She hypothesises that, for early modern audiences, 'watching "Marlowe" meant watching a theatrical event balanced on the nervous razor edge between transcendent heroism and dangerous blasphemy – transgression not only against God but also against cherished national goals and institutions' (1996, 42). The 'Marlowe effect' so expressed turns Marlowe from an authorial presence into a reception effect; the imagined audience who encounters writing in a heroically transgressive mode encounters 'Marlowe'. More recently, Marcus has applied her term to Marlowe's printed texts, arguing that Marlowe's printers 'devised mechanisms designed to revive some of the frisson that had accompanied early printing by associating Marlowe's printed texts with the transgressive world of plays in performance and with their divine – or demonic – capacity for performative speech' (2013, 16). Marcus's evidence for this print version of her 'Marlowe effect' is, however, limited. She suggests that the images and blackletter of *Tamburlaine the Great* (1590) performed the play as a kind of devotional manual, and that the Latin inscription on the last page of *Faustus* connects the termination of Faustus's life with the completion of the physical book.[8] These examples are far from suggestive of a sustained print strategy to induce in readers of Marlowe's playbooks experiences of transgression. But I am interested in the implications of Marcus's argument: that part of the legacy of *Tamburlaine* was to embed interpretive possibility and theatrical possibility at the level of *mise-en-page*.

It is something of a truism that many Jacobean and Caroline dramatists took interest in the presentation of their playbooks. Holger Schott Syme, re-evaluating Jonson and Marston's

---

[8] For a more nuanced and sustained discussion of blackletter, see Lesser (2006).

relationship to the theatre, argues that 'together with their printers and publishers, they used the page's specific signifying systems to recreate a set of effects characteristic of the stage' (2008, 144). Fewer critics have acknowledged similar effects in the presentation of earlier Elizabethan playbooks, no doubt in part because of the greater number of anonymous and, in Marlowe's case, posthumous publications. But earlier playbooks need to be part of this conversation. J. Gavin Paul argues that the paratexts of *Tamburlaine the Great* aimed 'to retain the vitality so essential to the play's success at the Rose, while also explicitly distinguishing the play as printed from the play as performed' (2014, 47), and Claire Bourne demonstrates that printers made use of typographical strategies 'to render dramatic form and its effects legible in print - to make texts steeped in the idea of performance (even if not written expressly for performance) not only intelligible as reading matter but also recognizable as *plays*' (2014, 413).[9] Marcus's interrogation of typographical performance as a specifically *Marlovian* phenomenon is underdeveloped. However, in this chapter I extend her implications to see if a 'Marlowe effect' as a phenomenon of printed texts has value for a playbook that sits on the fringes of Marlowe scholarship.

1 Contention on the page

1 Contention demonstrates a concern to recreate theatrical effects from the first scene. In *2 Henry VI* Gloucester reads out a letter:

> [*Glo.*] Item, *That the dutchy of Aniou and the County of Main, shall be released and deliuered to the King her father.*
>
> *King.* Vnkle, how now? (sig. m2ᵛ).

In *1 Contention*, by contrast, the text reads

> [*Humphrey.*] *Item.* It is further agreed between them, that the Dutches of *An-ioy* and of *Maine*, shall be released and deliuered ouer to the King her fa.
>
> Duke *Humphrey* lets it fall.

---

[9] See also the chapter by Claire M. L. Bourne in this volume.

Commented [RK2]: This citation is from the FF? are all subsequent ones from 2H6 also FF, or a modern ed [i.e., Knowles]; our "house" one is the Norton, 3rd ed; could you use that instead of Knowles, or is Knowles special for some reason?

Commented [RK3R2]: I'm worse as bibliographical scholar than you could ever be. I'm punting these citations over to Kirk.

Commented [P4R2]: I have to confess to being a very bad/ambivalent bibliographical scholar here. Quite simply, I didn't know what citation conventions you were using for FF, so I've somewhat eclectically gone with whatever is on the page – sometimes that's a sig, sometimes a page ref, but it's always to FF. I'm happy to take instruction on how you'd like me to standardise this.

Kin. How now vnkle, whats the matter that you stay so soddenly. (sig. A2ᵛ)

There are three key differences here, all of which happen at a slightly different textual register. The most obvious is the stage direction, which editors of *2 Henry VI* regularly import into the Folio text. More subtle is the performance implied by Henry's response. The Folio's 'How now' may mean nothing more than that Gloucester has stopped speaking; the response in the quarto not only reacts to the stage direction, but also offers symptoms (Humphrey's abruptness and stillness) and a diagnosis (there is something the matter). But I am more interested in the 'fa'. In the Folio, Humphrey completes a full clause before he pauses; it is not until four lines later, when Humphrey tells the king he 'can reade no further', that he acknowledges there is anything more to the letter. *1 Contention*, by contrast, breaks off part way through a word. The moment of arrest is made doubly sudden by the physical act of dropping the letter and the aural effect of the aborted delivery of 'father', in the midst of speaking which Gloucester 'stay[s] so sodenly'. The combined effect of explicit stage direction, implicit stage direction and broken text performs a moment of extraordinary abruptness within a formal ceremonial scene, exaggerated (perhaps coincidentally) by its appearance at the bottom of the quarto page, leaving Gloucester's action and the King's reaction bound together and surrounded by white space (Fig 1).

Elsewhere in this sequence the text of *1 Contention* evokes more precisely the material conditions of the scene. Following Humphrey's cessation of reading, the King instructs Winchester to read on, and Winchester begins by re-reading the same section of the letter that Humphrey has just read. In *2 Henry VI*, they compare thus:

> [Gloucester] Item, *That the Dutchy of Aniou, and the County of Main, shall be released and deliuered to the King her father.*
> […] ————————————————————— [Fig. 1]
> [Winchester] Item, *It is further agreed betweene them, That the Dutchesse of Aniou and Maine, shall be released and deliuered ouer to the King her Father,* (sig. m2ᵛ).

In *1 Contention*:

> [Gloucester] *Item.* It is further agreed between them, that the Dutches of *An-ioy* and of *Maine*, shall be released and deliuered ouer to the King her fa.
>
> [...]
>
> [Winchester] *Item*, It is further agreed betweene them, that the Duches of *Anioy* and of *Mayne*, shall be released and deliue-red ouer to the King her father, (sig. A2ᵛ)

Setting aside spelling differences, the Cardinal's reading in the Folio differs in ten words from that of Humphrey. One might explain this through character; perhaps Humphrey's disturbance led him to skip words; perhaps Winchester is adding his own emphasis (although the italics indicate typographically that Winchester is indeed reading). However, Winchester's added words in *2 Henry VI* anticipate those in *1 Contention*, where Winchester follows Gloucester to the syllable. This precision of repetition is more appropriate to a scene of formal reportage. Gloucester becomes unable to participate in the formal performance owing to his personal conflict with the words he has to deliver; Winchester's easy recital is symptomatic of his *realpolitik* and lack of conscience. In this section, in fact, it is *2 Henry VI* rather than *1 Contention* that exhibits the classic symptoms of memorial reconstruction; Winchester repeats the substance of a previous speech but not the precise words, ignoring the material conditions of reading that *1 Contention* prioritises.

The use of typography to emphasise moments of performance pervades *1 Contention*. Warwick's pained punning on Maine is a case in point:

> *Salisbury.* Then lets make hast away,
> And looke vnto the maine.
> *Warwick.* Vnto the maine?
> Oh Father, *Maine* is lost,
> That *Maine*, which by maine force Warwicke did winne (*2 Henry VI*, sig. m3ʳ)
>
> *Sals.* Come sonnes away and looke vnto the maine.
> VV*ar.* Vnto the *Maine*, Oh father *Maine* is lost,
> Which VV*arwicke* by maine force did win from *France* (*1 Contention*, sig. A4ʳ)

Here, the performative difference rests on the italicisation of Maine. Warwick in *2 Henry VI* has a more hesitant start, repeating back Salisbury's phrase before turning to the loss of Maine. *1*

8

Contention, by contrast, visually acknowledges the pun one instance earlier, transforming the repetition of Salisbury's comment into a graphical image of the English encroaching on the town. The visual performance places emphasis on that word, identifying it clearly as the key link in Warwick's thought.

Visual stress is also placed on the naming of the conjurer employed by Eleanor. In *2 Henry VI* the character is consistently 'Hume', most obviously in order to distinguish him from the text's use of 'Hum' as the speech prefix for Humphrey of Gloucester. He first enters in a cramped marginal direction at the bottom of sig. m3ᵛ, '*Enter Hume.*'. By contrast, *1 Contention* consistently calls the character Sir John Hum, and his entrance at the top of sig. B1ᵛ is centred and surrounded by white space, giving the visual impression of a significant new entry. The speech prefix is consistently '*Sir Iohn*'. As Ronald Knowles points out, 'John was Hume's first name in the chronicles, which spell the surname either "Hum" or "hun". Only Foxe uses the form found here' (1999, 170). The presentation of the character in *1 Contention* not only makes his first entrance more prominent and distinguishes his speech prefix from that of Humphrey's, but also adheres more closely to the chronicles. Further, it allows for emphatic internal rhyme at the beginning of his soliloquy, 'Now sir *Iohn Hum*, No words but mum' (sig. B1ᵛ), a rhyming possibility only hinted at in *2 Henry VI*.

The typographical performance with most interpretive significance occurs during the fulfilment of Hume's prophecy that Suffolk will die by water. *1 Contention* and *2 Henry VI* differ significantly in the establishing stage directions:

> *Enter Lieutenant, Suffolke, and others.* (*2 Henry VI*, sig. n4ʳ137)
>
> Alarmes within, and the chambers be discharged, like as it were a fight at sea. And then enter the Captaine of the ship and the Maister, and the Maisters Mate, & the Duke of Suf-folke disguised, and others with him, and Water Whick-more. (*1 Contention*, sig. F1ᵛ)

The Folio is clearly insufficient here, lacking a named entry for Suffolk's killer. By contrast, *1 Contention* evokes the visual presence of Water from the start, anticipating Suffolk's fate for the reader. 'Water' is spelled as such throughout, allowing some interesting juxtaposition of text.

Commented [P5]: FF, page ref.

Formatted: Not Highlight

> [*Cap.*] This other, the Maisters mate shall haue,
> And Water Whickmore thou shalt haue this man,
> And let them paie their ransomes ere they pass.
> *Suffolke.* Water!   He starteth.
> *Water.* How now, what doest feare me ?
> Thou shalt haue better cause anon.
> *Suf.* It is thy name affrights me, not thy selfe.
> I do remember well, a cunning Wyssard told me,
> That by Water I should die … (*1 Contention*, sig. F2ʳ)

Further down the page, Water's speech prefixes begin with *VV*. The compositors use the italicised

'*W*' very rarely, never more than once on a page, making its appearance visually distinctive.[10] George

Walton Williams suggests that substitutions of '*VV*' and 'W' are 'common in the quarto and are

without significance' (42-3). Against Williams, I observe that italic *W* is most frequently used at

moments of introduction, for the first speech prefix on a page or in significant stage directions,

suggesting that the compositors at least attempted to use their limited resource prominently. Here,

the word 'Water' surrounds Suffolk, both on his right and directly underneath and above him,

creating a typographical approximation of drowning (Fig. 2).

---

[10] I agree with Williams (1958) that the compositors only had three pieces of italicised 'W'. All three appear on sig. E2ᵛ, though some are reused on the outer and inner forme of sheets E and H. In total, there are 54 instances of italicised *VV* and 18 of *W*. Of these eighteen, only two appear in dialogue, and the remainder are split evenly between stage directions and speech prefixes. Comparison with Creede's other dramatic publications of this period suggests little need for this piece. *Selimus* (1594) has only one *W* and one *VV, Menaecmi* (1595) has two *VV* and one *W*; *Locrine* (1595) has five *VV* and no *W*. Yet *The Pedlar's Prophecy* (1595) has only two instances, both spelled *W*, and *A Looking Glass for London* (1594) is printed in black letter.

The word 'Water' in *2 Henry VI*, by contrast, does not appear until the thirty-fifth line, in Suffolk's dialogue. The character is referred to as 'Walter' or 'Gualtier' apart from briefly towards the scene's close, and his speech prefix is *Whit.* or *Wal.* 'Water' appears fourteen times in the *1 Contention* scene but only three times in *2 Henry VI*. The overwhelming impression is that whoever constructed the speech prefixes for the Folio does not entirely get the joke, whereas the compositors of *1 Contention* wield water constantly and oppressively, swamping Suffolk in the twisted joke of the conjurors and visualising the fulfilment of the prophecy for the reader.

1 Contention is saturated with loaded typographical choices, exemplifying the ways in which early printers 'exploited the resources of the material book in subtle, ingenious ways in order to replicate, or at least gesture towards, the thrilling, transgressive "Marlowe effect" that had captivated audiences in the theatre' (Marcus 2014, 24). Whether these choices are deliberate or accidental, the quarto of *1 Contention* textualises its performance in ways that show interpretive literacy, making this an unusually performative playbook.

1 Contention and the stage

The typographical features of the book I have discussed so far create a readerly performance that exists solely within the material book. The stage directions of *1 Contention*, by contrast, directly implicate the theatre. Editors of *2 Henry VI* regularly plunder *1 Contention* for its stage directions, which are consistently fuller than those in the Folio, on the assumption that they originate either in authorial or theatrical agency and can usefully supplement the Folio text. These complex stage directions bear little resemblance to those elsewhere in the early Shakespeare canon, and I turn to these now to see if they may also contribute to the 'Marlowe effect'.

1 Contention uses several strategies in both dialogue and stage directions to create a 'now'-ness to the printed play that does not characterise *2 Henry VI*. These strategies include the more

even distribution of explicit stage directions around dialogue, the use of positional language for

implicit stage directions within dialogue, and the sequential organisation of actions within long stage

directions. These all combine to create an effect of linear presentism, evoking action and

spatialisation as it occurs onstage. The existence of two different versions of the play makes these

strategies clearer, as in the conjuring scene. I begin with the distribution of stage directions around

dialogue in *1 Contention*:

> **Enter *Elnor*, with sir *Iohn Hum, Roger Bullenbrooke a* Coniurer, and *Margery Ioudaine* a Witch.**
> [four lines of dialogue]
> **She goes vp to the Tower.**
> [eight lines]
> **She lies downe vpon her face.**
> **Bullenbrooke makes a circle.**
> [seven lines]
> **It thunders and lightens, and then the spirit riseth vp.**
> [ten lines]
> **He sinkes downe agine.**
>
> [seven lines]
>
> **Enter the Duke of *Yorke*, and the Duke of *Buckingham*, and others**. (sig. B4ᵛ-C1ʳ)

Compare *2 Henry VI*:

> *Enter the Witch, the two Priests, and Bullingbrooke.*
> [nine lines]
> *Exit Hume.*
> [two lines]
> *Enter Elianor aloft.*
> [ten lines]
> *Here doe the Ceremonies belonging, and make the Circle, Bullingbrooke or Southwell reads,* Coniuro te, &c. *It Thunders and Lightens terribly: then the Spirit riseth.*
> [seventeen lines]
> *Thunder and Lightning. Exit Spirit.*
> *Enter the Duke of Yorke and the Duke of Buckingham with their Guard, and breake in.* (sig. M5ʳ125)

Commented [RK6]: Again, what is this? FF/Knowles (Norton?)

Commented [P7R6]: FF on-page ref.

While the text of *2 Henry VI* offers more instruction for spectacle, it clusters its action. *1 Contention*

experiences the prostration and drawing of circles in linear order as the scene progresses, whereas *2*

Henry VI isolates its conjuring action in a single arrow-shaped, italicised block. *2 Henry VI* creates the

space for a performance of physical conjuring which will later be granted specificity ('*the ceremonies*

belonging […] *Bullingbroke or Southwell*'), *1 Contention* not only provides the specificity but also embeds the physical actions at appropriate points that allow these actions to propel the scene.

The physical propulsion by action is exaggerated further in this scene in the emphatic use of 'here' as positional index, for which there is no equivalent in *2 Henry VI*:

> **Here** *sir Iohn*, take this scrole of paper **here**…
> I will stand vpon this Tower **here**…
> And frame a Cirkle **here** vpon the earth… (sig. B4^v)

Both texts have the conjurers describe the action that they will undertake, but *1 Contention* has an extra dimension of spatial organisation in the implied gestures of 'here', scripting the stage action verbally as well as in stage directions. The play repeatedly uses 'here' as a sign of possessiveness and immediacy; another key distinction occurs at sig. D1^v, where Margaret tells Henry to 'Take vp the staffe, for **here** it ought to stand', as opposed to the 'there' of *2 Henry VI*. 'Here' in this play draws attention to the speaker and to the world they create around themselves, emphasising the presentism of the performance preserved by *1 Contention*.

A much more distinctive aspect of the presentness of *1 Contention* is the organisation of stage entries using 'then'. No fewer than twelve substantial sets of stage directions are organised sequentially thus, of which I provide two representative examples.

> Enter to the Parlament.
> Enter two Heralds before, **then** the Duke of Buckingham, and the
> Duke of Suffolke, and **then** the Duke of Yorke, and the Cardi-
> nall of VVinchester, and **then** the King and the Queene, and **then**
> the Earle of Salisbury, and the Earle of VVarwicke. (sig. D3^{r-v})

> **Then** the Curtaines being drawne, Duke *Humphrey* is discouered
> in his bed, and two men lying on his brest and smothering him
> in his bed. And **then** enter the Duke of *Suffolke* to them.
> …
> *Suffolke*. **Then** draw the Curtaines againe and get you gone,
> And you shall haue your firme reward anon.
> *Exet* murtherers.

Commented [RK8]: Is the hyphen supposed to be superscript too?

Commented [P9R8]: I honestly don't know, but would love to know the answer! I think it looks a bit weird to have a non superscript hyphen between two superscript letters, but would that be more correct?

Commented [RK10]: I'm leaving this to Kirk!!

> **Then** enter the King and Queene, the Duke of *Buckingham*, and
> the Duke of *Somerset*, and the Cardinall. (sig. E2^r)[11]

2 Henry VI has only three comparable instances, clustered in Act 4 (the section, incidentally, that Craig and Kinney attribute to Marlowe), and the structure is almost entirely absent from early Shakespeare plays with the notable exception of *The True Tragedy of Richard, Duke of York*, which has five instances.[12] 'Then' in these instances, like 'here', represents textually the immediacy of linear and sequential action. It acts as a form of punctuation, finishing the previous action and beginning the next. This is particularly important in processional entries, where it indicates a priority of organisation of entry that imagines the audience's eyes moving in turn to each new entrant. But it also gives individual moments time to linger and finish: the smothering happens, and *then* Suffolk enters; the murderers exit, *then* the nobles enter. The sequencing draws attention to the significant stage moment and then moves to the next, creating a textual equivalent to temporal spectatorship.

'Here' as a positional index is too pervasive a strategy among early modern plays to make any argument for its distinctive usage, albeit it distinguishes *1 Contention* from *2 Henry VI*. 'Then' in sequential stage directions, however, is very unusual, especially in this frequency. If Scott McMillin is correct that *1 Contention* represents a performative reconstruction of the play for Pembroke's Men, then it is worth asking if this is a feature of the playing company's practice. 1594-5 saw the publication of at least four plays performed by Pembroke's Men: *Titus Andronicus* (printed by John Danter for Edward White and Thomas Millington), *The Taming of a Shrew* (Peter Short for Cuthbert Burby), *Edward II* (Robert Robinson for William Jones) and *The True Tragedy of Richard, Duke of York* (Peter Short for Thomas Millington), to which most critics confidently add *1 Contention* (Thomas

---

[11] Other examples occur at sig. C1^r, sig. D1^r, sig. E3^v, sig. E4^r, sig. F1^v, sig. F4^v, sig. G1^v, sig. H2^r, sig. H3^r, sig. H3^v.

[12] Comparing Shakespeare plays written and/or printed before 1600, 'then' appears twice in *1 Henry VI*, not at all in *3 Henry VI*, once or twice in three other history plays, and three times in *Titus Andronicus.*

Creede for Thomas Millington).[13] This is, perhaps not coincidentally, the entire extant corpus of plays

known to have belonged to Pembroke's Men.[14]

The emergence in print in 1594-5 of what remains of Pembroke's Men's repertory coincides

with the dates traditionally linked with the company's financial collapse and dissolution. That

coincidence could imply that these playbooks do represent texts previously owned by the company

and now sold off, although recent scholars have plausibly demolished older narratives of the

company's dissolution at this point (Syme, 2012). All the playbooks are of unclear textual

provenance and authorship, with the exception of *Edward II*, which is usually attributed to Marlowe

alone. The publication of these playbooks by different printing shops suggests that any similarities in

the presentation of stage directions should derive from the underlying copy, whether that copy

originated in author or company. In support of this theory, Scott McMillin argues that the quartos

consistently present versions of the plays that can be performed by fifteen players (1972a), and

there is some correlation in stage directions. *Edward II* and *The Taming of a Shrew*, for instance,

both carry instances where descriptive stage directions replace speech prefixes when indicating an

unusual delivery: '*Edward kneeles, and saith.*' (sig. G1^r), '*The king rageth.*' (sig. I3^v); '*Ferando* speaks

to the olde man' (sig. E4^v), 'Then *Slie* speakes' (sig. F2^r). In other respects the texts diverge; *Edward

II*, for instance, inconsistently lapses into Latin for certain stage directions, and its directions are

---

[13] I depend here on title page attributions. For recent analysis of ~~The three companies listed on~~ the title page of *Titus Andronicus* ~~seem to be at odds with t~~in relation to the 'ne' next to 'titus & ondronicus' in Henslowe's diary for 23 January 1593/4, see Manley and MacLean ~~, but I agree with Lawrence Manley and Sally-Beth MacLean that the 'ne' need only refer to a first performance at the Rose, and need not be an argument against the earlier Derby's and Pembroke's Men having owned the play~~ (2014, 109~~106-10~~). Manley and MacLean argue that the revisions made between *2 Henry VI* and *1 Contention* reflect the play's transition from Strange's Men to Pembroke's (2014, 301-13).

[14] Andrew Gurr (1996, 276) adds the lost 'The Isle of Dogs' and Shakespeare's *Richard III*. Gurr gives no explanation for why he adds the latter, which he does not discuss elsewhere. The *Lost Plays Database* further records 'Hardicanute', 'Friar Spendleton', 'Bourbon', 'Black Joan', 'Sturgflatery', 'Branhowite', and 'Alice Pierce' as plays once belonging to the company ('Category: Pembroke's', *Lost Plays Database*, 7 February 2015). Knutson (2016) offers a full account of scholars' speculative attributions to the company.

much less full than those of the other four plays. Nonetheless, the playbooks devote much space to practical stage directions, from indications of costume colouring in *A Shrew* to a sustained level of specificity regarding the placement of props in *Titus*. However, in the matter of sequential stage directions there is no clear consistency. *The True Tragedy* has five instances of 'then' in sequential stage directions and *Titus* three (predominantly in the opening scene), which are the highest levels of occurrence I have found in the period, and might suggest something about Pembroke's Men's practice. In contrast, *A Shrew* has just two (both in the framing narrative) and *Edward II* only one, and no play approaches the twelve in *1 Contention*. The 'then' strategy is, then, difficult to attribute. It recurs in three plays performed by Pembroke's Men and usually seated within the Shakespeare canon, yet all in plays of disputed provenance and without consistency. It certainly does not pervade the other extant Pembroke's plays to anything like the same extent as it does *1 Contention*, and the surviving repertory is too small to form general conclusions.

Whether or not the use of sequential stage directions is indicative of Pembroke's Men's practice, however, the play that offers the most striking precedent for them is *Tamburlaine the Great*, which has several comparable instances:

> Enter to the Battle, & **after** the battell, enter Cosroe wounded, Theridamas, Tamburlaine, Techelles, Vsumcasane, with others (sig. C1ʳ)

> Baiazeth flies, and he pursues him.
> The battell short, and they enter,
> Baiazeth is ouercome. (sig. D1ʳ)

> Two Moores drawing Baia-zeth in his cage, and his wife **following** him. (sig. D3ᵛ)

> They sound to the battaile.
> And Tamburlaine enioyes the victory, **after** Arabia enters wounded. (sig. E8ʳ)

> Enter the kings of Trebisond and Soria, one bringing a sword, & another a scepter: **Next** Natolia and Ierusalem with the Emperiall crowne: **After** Calapine, and **after** him other lords: Orcanes and Ierusalem crowne him, and the other giue him the sceptre. (sig. G8ᵛ)

While not consistent, the 1590 edition recurrently evokes time and priority in its stage directions, although uses 'after' and 'next' rather than 'then'. In the example on sig. D1ʳ, the lineation of the stage direction contributes further to the sequencing of actions. While the stage directions of

16

Tamburlaine the Great are often imprecise and narrative, describing actions such as 'is ouercome' or 'enioyes the victory' without practical detail, the incipient conventions here show an interest in temporal arrangement, particularly the organisation of fight scenes and processional entries. It is these uses that are followed thoroughly by *1 Contention* (and to a lesser extent by the other Pembroke's plays).

The evocation of time is further emphasised in the 1590 edition by the repeated use of 'here' as positional index; a few of the many examples will suffice.

Lie **here**, ye weedes that I disdain to wear. (sig. A7^r)

Here will I hide it in this simple hole. (sig. B6^r)

Sit **here** upon this royal chair of state. (sig. C7^v)

Here at Damascus will I make the point. (sig. D8^r)

Here will I set vp her stature. (sig. G8^v)

The word is given further power in Zabina's '**Here**, **here**, **here**' (sig. E6^v) before she brains herself, stressing the sense of personal presence that pervades the play even at moments of destruction. While 'here' in this context is hardly unique to Marlowe, *Tamburlaine* utilises it as an assertive speech act in keeping with the self-possession of the title character. It aligns word and gesture, speaker and place, allowing the speaker on a bare stage to articulate the nature of the thing or location that is 'here' while also drawing attention to the role of the speaker-as-creator; 'Behold me **here** diuine zenocrate' (sig. G8^r). Tamburlaine's insistence on his own 'here'-ness is endemic to the play's themes, the epitome of his high astounding terms that allow him to remake the world in his own image. In combination with the sequential stage directions, the text of *Tamburlaine the Great* enacts a present-ness that repeatedly insists on the appropriated 'here' of the stage and on the sequence of actions that follow on 'then' from one another. It is this sense of immediate presence, establishing bodies on a stage and ordering their progression, that evokes the theatrical in print form

17

and that also characterises *1 Contention*, the two plays repeatedly conjuring for readers the experiential linearity of stage performance.

Conclusion

I do not advance these observations connecting *1 Contention* and *Tamburlaine the Great* as evidence of shared authorship. *1 Contention* does not exhibit any incontrovertibly 'Marlovian' features that would identify this text as Marlowe's. Nor, for that matter, are its distinctive typographical features shared with other plays printed by Thomas Creede or first performed by Pembroke's Men. *1 Contention* is interesting for the apparent specificity of its typographical evocation of performance, typifying the idiosyncratic 'active experimentation' in playtext design that Bourne sees as characteristic of early printed playbooks (2014, 415). Yet perhaps 'Marlovian' is as unhelpful as 'Shakespearean' as an adjective used to describe anything meaningfully specific to either author. The 'Marlowe effect', as proposed by Marcus, is too vague a term to argue either that performative typography is unique to Marlowe or that there are specific phenomena that occur in his playbooks. This chapter, however, has demonstrated that the oft-overlooked quarto text of *1 Contention* – which may well be a collaborative Marlowe play, and which certainly falls under the sphere of influence created by the *Tamburlaine* plays – textualises performance for the reader in a way that lends itself to interpretive significance, and that these patterns may well indicate a broader resonance for a 'Marlowe effect'. The textual performance of the experiential linearity of stage performance in *1 Contention* takes its cue from the audacious assertion of presence that characterises *Tamburlaine the Great*.

The status of *1 Contention* in the murky margins of textual, repertory and attribution studies should not preclude it from study as either a Marlovian or a Shakespearean text, especially as, in Urkowitz's words, the text holds 'an untapped wealth of data about the Elizabethan theater [and] about plays in the process of composition and performance' (1988, 255). This chapter has continued that process of unpacking. The Shakespearean editorial tradition has treated the play as raw

18

material for supplementation of *2 Henry VI* for the best part of a century, but as a performative

reconstruction of a Pembroke's Men's play, its explicit and implicit stagings of action as rendered in

the 1594 text merit close attention as evidence of the interwoven semiosis of form and content on

the page. As D.F. McKenzie argues, 'The book itself is an expressive means. To the eye its pages offer

an aggregation of meanings both verbal and typographic for translation to the ear; but we must

learn to see that its shape in the hand also speaks to us from the past' (2002, 200). *1 Contention*

associates its printed text inextricably with the play in performance and its capacity for performative

speech; this is the 'effect' of the book, be it Marlowe or no.

Works Cited

Alexander, Peter 1929. *Shakespeare's "Henry VI" and "Richard III"*. Cambridge University Press.

Bourne, Claire M.L. 2014. 'Dramatic PIlcrows', *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*
108.4: 413-452.

Brooke, C.F. Tucker Brooke 1912. *The Authorship of the Second and Third Parts of 'King Henry VI'*.
New Haven: Yale University Press.

Craig, Hugh, and Arthur F. Kinney (eds.) 2009. *Shakespeare, Computers, and the Mystery of
Authorship*. Cambridge University Press.

Egan, Gabriel 2011. 'Shakespeare: Editions and Textual Studies', *Years Work in English Studies* 90:
297-363.

Furnivall, F.J. 1889. 'Forewords' in Charles Praetorius (ed.), *The First Part of The Contention. The First
Quarto. 1594*. London, iii-xxviii.

Gurr, Andrew 1996. *The Shakespearian Playing Companies*. Oxford University Press.

Commented [RK13]: See reformatting in separate attachment

Commented [P14R13]: Done

Hailey, R. Carter 2011. 'The Publication Date of Marlowe's *Massacre at Paris*, with a Note on the
      Collier Leaf', *Marlowe Studies* 1: 25-40.

Jackson, MacDonald P. 2014. *Determining the Shakespeare Canon: Arden of Faversham & A Lover's
      Complaint*. Oxford University Press.

Knowles, Ronald (ed.) 1999. *King Henry VI Part II.* London: Thomas Nelson and Sons.

Knutson, Roslyn L. 2001. 'Pembroke's Men in 1592-3, Their Repertory and Touring Schedule', *Early
      Theatre* 4: 129-38.

Knutson, Roslyn L. 2010. 'What's So Special about 1594?', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 61.4: 449-67.

Knutson, Roslyn L. 2016. '*Edward II* in Repertory' in Kirk Melnikoff (ed.), *Edward II: A Critical Reader*.
      Bloomsbury, TS.

Lesser, Zachary 2006. 'Typographic Nostalgia: Playreading, Popularity, and the Meaning of
      Blackletter' in Marta Straznicky (ed.), *The Book of the Play: Playwrights, Stationers, and
      Readers in Early Modern England*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press

Maguire, Laurie E. 1996. *Shakespearean Suspect Texts: The 'Bad' Quartos and Their Contexts*.
      Cambridge University Press.

Manley, Lawrence, and Sally-Beth Maclean 2014. *Lord Strange's Men and Their Plays*. New Haven:
      Yale University Press.

Marcus, Leah S. 1996. *Unediting the Renaissance: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Milton*. London:
      Routledge.

Marcus, Leah S. 2013. 'Marlowe's Magic Books: The Material Text' in Emily C. Martels and Emma
      Smith (eds.), *Christopher Marlowe in Context*. Cambridge University Press, 15-26.

McKenzie, D.F. 'Typography and Meaning: The Case of William Congreve' in *Making Meaning: "Printers of the Mind" and Other Essays*, eds Peter D. McDonald and Michael F. Suarez, S.J. (Amherst and Boston, U of Massachusetts P, 2002), 198-236.

McMillin, Scott 1972. 'Casting for Pembroke's Men: The *Henry VI* Quartos and *The Taming of a Shrew*,' *Shakespeare Quarterly* 23.2 : 141-59.

Merriam, Thomas 2002. 'Faustian Joan', *Notes and Queries* 247/49: 218-20.

Merriam, Thomas 2009. 'Marlowe versus Kyd as Author of *Edward III* I.i, III and V,' *Notes and Queries* 56.4: 549-51.

Paul, J. Gavin 2014. *Shakespeare and the Imprints of Performance*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Syme, Holger Schott 2008. 'Unediting the Margin: Jonson, Marston, and the Theatrical Page', *ELR* 38.1: 142-71.

Syme, Holger Schott 2010. 'The Meaning of Success: Stories of 1594 and its Aftermath', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 61.4: 490-525.

Syme, Holger Schott 2012. 'Three's Company: Alternative Histories of London Theatres in the 1590s', *Shakespeare Survey* 65: 269-89.

Tyler, Thomas 1891. 'Introduction' in Charles Praetorius (ed.), *The True Tragedy. The First Quarto. 1595.* London, iii-xviii.

Urkowitz, Steven 1988. '"If I Mistake in Those Foundations Which I Build Upon": Peter Alexander's Textual Analysis of *Henry VI Parts 2 and 3*', *English Literary Renaissance* 18: 230-56.

Vickers, Brian 2011. 'Shakespeare and Authorship Studies in the Twenty-First Century', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 62: 106-42.

Vincent, P.J. 2001. 'Unsolved Mysteries in *Henry VI, Part Two*,' *Notes and Queries* 246/48: 270-4.

Wells, Stanley, and Gary Taylor, with John Jowett and William Montgomery 1987. *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Wiggins, Martin 2013a. *British Drama 1533-1642: A Catalogue, Volume III: 1590-1597*. Oxford University Press.

Wiggins, Martin 2013b. 'Marlowe's Chronology and Canon' in Emily C. Bartels and Emma Smith (eds.), *Christopher Marlowe in Context*. Cambridge University Press, 7-14.

Williams, George Walton 1958. 'Setting by Formes in Quarto Print', *Studies in Bibliography* 11: 39-53.