

MARK JAMES RICHARD SCOTT

‘That’s hard’: Christopher Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus* and the Trauma of Reprobation

Christopher Marlowe’s Doctor Faustus is generally treated as a soteriological riddle: is Faustus damned, and if so, when, and why? This essay argues that such approaches miss the overwhelming emphasis (in both surviving versions of the play) on Faustus’s reprobation. Faustus, instead of presenting a puzzle waiting to be solved, is better appreciated as an incomparable portrait of the experience of reprobate living. Even more, via its textual and performance history, Faustus sheds light on the collective and collaborative practices of real Renaissance actors and theatregoers coming to terms with the post-Reformation religious trauma they shared with the lonely doctor.

Certaine Players at Exeter, acting upon the stage the tragical storie of Dr Faustus the Conjuror; as a certaine number of Devils kept everie one his circle there, and as Faustus was busie in his magicall invocations, on a sudden they were all dasht, every one harkning other in the eare, for they were all perswaded, there was one devell too many amongst them; and so after a little pause desired the people to pardon them, they could go no further with this matter; the people also understanding the thing as it was, every man hastened to be first out of doores. The players (as I heard it) contrarye to their custome spending the night in reading and in prayer got them out of town the next morning.¹

Stories recalling extra devils materializing at early modern productions of Christopher Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus* were long regarded as amounting to little more than ‘a curious *mythos*’ from a more superstitious age.² Recently critics have taken these episodes more seriously, citing them as evidence, alternately, of theatregoers’ ‘acceptance of real demonic presence’ in the world,³ or of Marlowe’s distortion of ‘the distinction between theatre and magic.’⁴ Little attention,

Mark Scott (mark.scott@berkeley.edu) is a graduate student in the English department at the University of California, Berkeley.

however, has been paid to the strangest aspect of the performance at Exeter: those who were first 'dasht' by the sudden appearance of 'one devell too many amongst them' were not the spectators but the actors. We might expect overexcited and overanxious spectators to get carried away by their imaginative involvement in the drama,⁵ or reasonably conclude that such moments speak to the actor's 'ability to blur the boundary between seeming and being'.⁶ At Exeter, however, what we are dealing with is not so much a blurred 'boundary between seeming and being', stage and auditorium, but the absence of any boundary whatsoever as actors and spectators collectively experienced a demonic vision. How are we to account for the phenomenal popularity of a play which possessed such powerful potential to terrorize all those involved in its production?

For much of its history *Faustus* was regarded as a straightforwardly admonitory tale, the cautionary story of a man-turned-magician whose 'cavalier rejection of theology'⁷ and wilful rebellion against God seals his eternal damnation. Critics now generally view Faustus more sympathetically as a man plunged into 'the throes of psychic torment'⁸ by the soteriological anxieties unleashed by the Reformation. According to the Calvinist thinking on double predestination which dominated late Elizabethan England, the individual's place in heaven or hell had already been assigned at the beginning of time by an inscrutable and intractable God. A person was powerless to change their fate but in theory it was possible to discern signs in the self which indicated one's election or reprobation, leading individuals to engage in relentless and painful self-scrutiny. Critics have long found in Marlowe's God a deity 'cast in an uncompromisingly Calvinist mould',⁹ with James Simpson voicing the emerging consensus that the play operates 'wholly within the dynamic logic of Calvinist despair'.¹⁰

In spite of widespread agreement that Faustus inhabits a Calvinist universe, few critics have explored the possibility that Faustus simply *is* reprobate, he always has been, and there is nothing he can do about it.¹¹ Instead, most remain intent on treating the play as a puzzle, playing a cat-and-mouse game attempting to answer the same old questions: 'why is Faustus damned, and when exactly does his fate become irrevocable?'¹² Perhaps Faustus goes to hell because he has sex with the spirit of Helen;¹³ perhaps he seals his fate the moment he considers signing a pact with the devil;¹⁴ or perhaps the sin of despair is that 'which delivers him to damnation'.¹⁵ Even critics who refuse to solve Faustus's soteriological puzzle, insisting that his 'salvation ... is ultimately ambiguous', remain primarily concerned with the conundrum of *why* Faustus turns away from God.¹⁶

Faustus offers no such riddle to solve. Instead, Marlowe is at pains throughout the play to portray Faustus's experience of reprobation via his suffering one of its

surest symptoms: sensory confusion. Always-already-reprobate, Faustus is unable to see or hear with the accuracy of the elect and is therefore simply not permitted to understand the word of God. Rather than asking 'when' or 'why' is Faustus damned, I argue that the play invites us to consider Faustus's predicament in phenomenological terms: 'what does it *feel like* to be reprobate?'

Here the textual history of the play poses a potential problem: *Faustus* survives in two versions, each of which seemingly possesses its own distinct theology. Leah Marcus argues that the 1604 A-text presents Faustus's doom in strictly predestinarian terms while the 1616 B-text is 'less committedly Calvinist'. To be sure, the B-text contains revisions suggesting that Faustus's predetermined damnation is *not* certain and that salvation remains open to him *if* he repents. Nevertheless, contrary to Marcus's conclusion that the two versions are 'profoundly different',¹⁷ I contend that the B-text's seemingly anti-predestinarian revisions are nullified and Faustus's reprobation re-emphasized via the amplification of the role of the stage devils. Even more than in the A-text, the devils control Faustus from the start. Their apparent omnipotence is perfectly in keeping with Calvin's understanding of the experience of reprobation — further proof of the B-text's theological continuities with the A-text. In spite of their textual differences, then, both versions document what it feels like to be reprobate.

Moreover, I argue that *Faustus* potentially triggered such feelings amongst its original spectators by immersing them in the same sensory confusion endured by its tormented hero. While critics have considered the psychological impact *Faustus* might have had on its spectators — for example in provoking their soteriological anxieties¹⁸ — I draw on modern trauma theories¹⁹ to provide a more systematic account of the larger cultural work the play performed for spectators and actors alike adjusting to the strictures of Calvinism. As Scott Lucas explains, 'Psychological trauma occurs when the perceived implications of an unexpected, emotionally charged occurrence violently contradict and call into question the fundamental beliefs by which those conflicted habitually interpret and interact with the world'.²⁰ Historians and literary critics view the Protestant Reformation as just such a 'traumatic' historical event,²¹ 'one that would have an afterlife beyond the generation who experienced the frequently violent cultural transformation'²² and impacted the individual as well as 'the collective self'.²³

In this essay, I argue that *Faustus* is best understood as both a document of and vehicle for the cultural working through of the collective religious trauma experienced by English early modern people. In light of the 'repetition compulsion' at the heart of post-traumatic experience,²⁴ I assert that the play's repetitive — or *traumatic* — structure invites us to consider the play as a whole as a post-traumatic

product[ion].²⁵ Repetition characterizes the play's performance history too, with *Faustus* holding the stage — being repeated — for decades. Indeed, the audience's insatiable appetite for Marlowe's play demanded yet another repetition — the B-text — which, for all its superficial departures from the original, is ultimately just the same play, again.

I offer an explanation for the audience's intense demand (even need) for *Faustus* by turning to Dominick LaCapra's theorization of 'acting out' and 'working through'²⁶ as overlapping post-traumatic coping mechanisms and suggesting that the play worked to provide a therapeutic theatrical experience for actors and spectators alike.²⁷ Recognizing the therapeutic potential of early modern stagings of *Faustus* invites further consideration of the collective and collaborative dimensions of the shift from Catholicism to (Calvinist) Protestantism. Given the fundamental Protestant emphasis on the individual's relationship with God, such a shift has generally been understood primarily in private, individualistic terms. Unlike the lonely Faustus, however — 'the man that in his study sits' (A.Prologue.28)²⁸ — early modern theatregoers and practitioners were afforded, via Marlowe's play, the chance to process their trauma together.

At the beginning of the play, Faustus returns to the source of his religious trauma. Fittingly, this is also a return 'to the primal scene of the Protestant Reformation, the scene of private reading, through which the individual sought to understand God's demands'.²⁹ Faustus undoubtedly *wants* to achieve such understanding. Dispensing with one discipline after another — Aristotle's 'logic', Galen's 'physic', and Justinian's 'law' — he initially claims to find refuge in the Christianity he has been trained to revere: 'When all is done, divinity is best' (A.1.1.37). And yet as Faustus turns the pages of Jerome's bible he is violently repelled by the harsh message he uncovers:

[*He reads.*] *Stipendium peccati mors est.* Ha!
Stipendium, etc.

The reward of sin is death. That's hard.

[*He reads.*] *Si peccasse negamus, fallimur*
Et nulla est in nobis veritas.

If we say that we have no sin,

We deceive ourselves, and there's no truth in us.

Why then belike we must sin,

And so consequently die.

Ay, we must die an everlasting death.

What doctrine call you this, *Che serà, serà*,
 What will be, shall be? Divinity, adieu!

(39–50)

Traditionally these lines have been taken as evidence of Faustus's 'wilful self-delusion'³⁰ and deliberate 'distortion' of scripture³¹ as he 'truncates and thereby misreads the verse'.³² The biblical passages cited by Faustus do appear incomplete. The full verse from Romans 6:23 reads 'For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord'. In the second citation Faustus likewise omits the soothing concession that 'If we acknowledge our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and cleanse us from all unrighteousness'.³³

Critics have scratched their heads about Faustus's 'puzzling textual incompetence',³⁴ finding his 'inability to read properly ... absurd'.³⁵ After all, even before the play begins the Chorus identifies Faustus as a star at the university, 'Excelling all whose sweet delight disputes / In heavenly matters of theology' (A.Prologue.18–19). From the outset the audience is given the clear impression that if *anyone* can comprehend the doctrinal intricacies of Reformation theology — let alone simply read a couple of bible verses — it is Faustus. Yet Faustus's apparently illogical illiteracy makes perfect sense if we accept that he is reprobate, for what characterized those predestined to damnation above all was their inability to comprehend God: the eyes of the 'minde' remain 'shutte', Calvin insisted, 'unlesse the Lorde open them'.³⁶ If anything, the contradiction between Faustus's celebrated intellect and his many moments of 'manifest stupidity'³⁷ over the course of the play simply makes his reprobation all the more apparent.

Faustus's pained reaction to his reading ('That's hard') results in a feeling of helplessness (*'Che serà, serà'*) with profound resonance for the play's original spectators: 'Many found the central tenets of reformed theology, especially the Calvinism that dominated late Elizabethan and early Jacobean England, to be a challenge rather than a comfort'.³⁸ Recognizing that Faustus and the audience share the same post-Reformation trauma goes some way towards redressing the tendency amongst critics to view Faustus as an 'overreacher'³⁹ who in his rebellion against God is decidedly 'other'⁴⁰ to spectators. Such readings miss what David Bevington describes as the 'representational quality' Faustus inherits from one of his theatrical ancestors, the Everyman figure of medieval morality plays.⁴¹ Faustus is certainly an 'overreacher', but he is also like Everyman, a figure through which spectators may contemplate their own spiritual destinies. As Kristen Poole points out, 'If, in the mysteries of a predestinarian world, even the most pious member of the audience could be among the reprobate, then Faustus could be an Everyman

after all, commanding the audience's sympathies and self-identification'.⁴² More precisely, Faustus is an inverted Everyman, a notion oft-hinted at by critics emphasizing Marlowe's ironizing approach to the morality tradition.⁴³ The 'goal' of the original *Everyman* play was 'not only to show that death comes to everyone but also what one must do' to prepare for it.⁴⁴ Conversely, Faustus's experience of paralyzing helplessness — his religious trauma — stems from the fact that in his Calvinist universe *nothing can be done*. Everyman had free will, but Faustus cannot choose; Everyman could be saved, but Faustus must be damned.

Faustus's helplessness is intensified by his suffering from what was perhaps the clearest indication of an individual's reprobate status: sensory confusion. Damned from the get-go, Faustus lacks the rational powers of perception he needs to come to know his God. As Matthew Milner explains, amongst Calvinists the key difference between the elect and the reprobate 'was perceptive': while the saved and the damned inhabited the same phenomenal universe and 'experienced the same physical sensations, the reprobate were blind to their promissory content'.⁴⁵ Elizabethan theologians lamented the plight of the reprobate masses who 'heare, and not understand ... see, and not perceyve'.⁴⁶ Excluded absolutely from the divinely-bestowed grace which is required to perceive the truth of God, the reprobate were left with only a 'generall and confused' awareness of their maker.⁴⁷

Marlowe depicts the reprobate's experience of sensory confusion primarily through Faustus's interactions over the course of the play with a pair of Angels, one Good, the other Evil. Each of these scenes follows a similar pattern, with Faustus oblivious to much of the dialogue, pouncing on any word or idea he can identify:

GOOD ANGEL Sweet Faustus, think of heaven and heavenly things.

EVIL ANGEL No Faustus, think of honour and wealth.

Exeunt Angels.

FAUSTUS Of wealth?

Why, the seigniory of Emden shall be mine. (A.2.1.20–3)

Faustus behaves as if the only word he has heard in the exchange is 'wealth'. When the Angels next appear Faustus again has difficulty hearing them: 'Who buzzeth in mine ears I am a spirit?' (A.2.3.14). Just before he signs his devilish pact he sees — and then unsees — a dire warning appears on his body:

But what is this inscription on mine arm?

Homo, fuge! Whither should I fly?

If unto God, he'll throw thee down to hell.—

My senses are deceived; here's nothing writ.—
 I see it plain. Here in this place is writ
Homo, fuge!

(A.2.1.76–81)

Faustus's sensory confusion ('My senses are deceived') — and hence his reprobation — is thus rendered fully explicit.

The extent of Faustus's sensory confusion and his estrangement from God is intensified in the B-text, helping to maintain theological continuity between the two texts despite the later version's apparently more recuperative Anglican tendencies. Many critics argue that Faustus meets a different eschatological end depending on which version is staged.⁴⁸ There are certainly textual differences suggesting that an audience watching the B-text would have been invited to at least hope that Faustus's salvation is still within his own power. For example, the B-text's version of the Old Man's speech in act 5 is radically altered. Gone is the Calvinist vitriol condemning the 'stench' of Faustus's 'vile and loathsome' soul (A.5.1.42–3), replaced instead by a defence of the 'harshness' of doctrine:

It may be this my exhortation
 Seems harsh and all unpleasant. Let it not,
 For, gentle son, I speak it not in wrath
 Or envy of thee, but in tender love
 And pity of thy future misery

(B.5.1.45–9)

Such Catholicizing Anglican 'tenderness' suggests that the B-text retreats from the A-text's critique of the 'hardness' of Calvinist doctrine. Yet in responding to the Old Man with yet another non sequitur ('Where art thou, Faustus?' [52]), Faustus makes it clear that he is just as sensorially confused — just as reprobate — in the B-text as he is in the A-text. Furthermore, the lines containing Faustus's indictment of the 'unpleasantness' of Calvinism are missing completely from the B-text.⁴⁹ Thus, in erasing *any* explicit explanation for Faustus's rejection of theology, the B-text actually works to heighten the audience's impression of his utter helplessness: his decision appears as random and arbitrary as God's own separation of the wheat from the chaff.

Above all, the B-text compensates for its seemingly antipredestinarian revisions by emphasizing Faustus's isolation from God and corresponding proximity to the devils. In both versions of the play the contrast between God's deafness and Lucifer's responsiveness to prayer makes a powerful statement in performance. Faustus's prayers to God and/or Christ consistently fall on deaf ears; conversely, his supplications always achieve a response from hell. One such moment comes as

Faustus, having been bombarded with the conflicting injunctions of the Angels, calls out in desperation for divine assistance: 'Ah, Christ, my Saviour, / Seek to save distressed Faustus' soul!' (A.2.3.82–3). Immediately a pack of devils invades the stage, with Lucifer announcing that 'Christ cannot save thy soul' and chastising Faustus because he 'talk'st of Christ' (84, 91). For Faustus getting the attention of the devil is easy, but God fails to answer back.

Even more than the A-text, the B-text deprives Faustus of access to God, leaving him alone with the devils. Indeed, the B-text as a whole works to supplant the notion of God's omnipotence with that of the devils. Faustus begins by rejecting a cruel Calvinist God in the A-text, yet here he is silent on the matter. The B-text's staging from the outset suggests that the devils are directing events as they unfold. When Faustus first performs magic in the A-text he is alone onstage. In the B-text, however, the ominous sound of '*Thunder*' precedes his entrance: '*Enter Lucifer and four Devils [above]*' (B.1.3.0 sd). From its inception, Faustus's sorcery in the B-text hangs under the shadow of diabolical powers watching events unfold and guiding Faustus's actions. Towards the end of the B-text Mephistopheles confesses that

'Twas I that, when thou wert i'the way to heaven,
 Dammed up thy passage. When thou took'st the book
 To view the Scriptures, then I turned the leaves
 And led thine eye. (5.2.98–101)

This pivotal admission — with no equivalent in the A-text — remains orthodox Calvinist soteriology: Faustus cannot read properly because he is reprobate. Yet Mephistopheles's claim enacts an important shift in emphasis: God's domination over the soteriological sifting of the human race is transferred to the devil. Faustus may have been a learned theologian, already 'i'the way to heaven', but Mephistopheles apparently possesses the power to effect his 'damnation' ('Dammed' here implying an act of blocking with an obvious play on the sense of 'damned', to suffer eternal punishment in hell). God's elective prerogative, his power over the decision regarding who to save and who to abandon, has been usurped by the devil and his crew.

The dramatic impact of this diabolical usurpation is intensified throughout the B-text by its departures from the A-text's simpler staging. When the devils entered '*above*' in the B-text they occupied a stage space which according to the symbolic tripartite structure of early modern theatres represented the heavens (the main stage being the human world and the trapdoor hell).⁵⁰ By the end of the play the devils' positioning in the heavens is unequivocal. Hurling inexorably

towards his inevitable doom, Faustus frantically attempts once again to communicate with his God:

O, I'll leap up to my God! Who pulls me down?
 See, see where Christ's blood streams in the firmament!
 One drop would save my soul, half a drop. Ah, my Christ!
 Ah, rend not my heart for naming of my Christ!
 Yet will I call on him. O, spare me, Lucifer!
 Where is it now? 'Tis gone; and see where God
 Stretcheth out his arm and bends his ireful brows! (A.5.2.77–83)

O, I'll leap up to heaven! Who pulls me down?
 One drop of blood will save me. O, my Christ!
 Rend not my heart for naming of my Christ!
 Yet will I call on him. O, spare me, Lucifer!
 Where is it now? 'Tis gone;
 And see, a threat'ning arm, an angry brow. (B.5.2.150–5)

In the A-text Faustus is alone onstage and his failed attempt to 'leap up to ... God' presents itself as an internalized psychological struggle. In the B-text, however, the fact that the 'heaven' he attempts to reach is occupied at that exact moment by a group of soul-thirsty demons suggests that there is no God to 'leap up to'. Similarly, where in the A-text Faustus's abrupt mid-line switch from 'calling on' Christ to fear of Lucifer could be read as a failure of devotional attention, with Lucifer onstage in the B-text (no doubt silently threatening Faustus) the audience is again given an overwhelming sense of the devil's omnipotence.

Most devastating is the B-text's near-complete erasure of God, as Faustus attempts to leap up not to 'God' but rather 'heaven' — a heaven not only occupied by demons but also surely tainted by the equivocal use of the adjective 'heavenly' throughout the play.⁵¹ No longer is 'God' the one who 'Stretcheth out his arm and bends his ireful brows'; 'a free-floating 'threat'ning arm, and angry brow' could just as easily prompt a gesture from Lucifer as suggest an image of the vengeful deity in absentia. As Marcus points out, the B-text's erasure of 'God' may well be attributed to a 1606 edict prohibiting the profanation of His name on the English stage.⁵² Yet in many ways this edict itself may be read as an epiphenomenon of the historical processes unleashed by the Reformation which Marlowe's play explores. Clifford Leach reminds us that after the eradication of traditional Catholic penitential systems 'the terms of God's promise had now rather to be guessed at, were no longer set forth in plain terms by a church whose head was Christ's own vicar.

God and his angels were in heaven, afar off; prayers ... had a long way to go'. Crucially, however, although 'prayers' to God had a long way to go, the earthly realm was not completely bereft of supernatural forces: 'the saints might no longer be there, but the devils abounded'.⁵³

Faustus reproduces the experience of being abandoned by God and left with the devils for spectators. They, like Faustus, are now deprived of encounters with divinity (at least in theatres). Critics have recognized Marlowe's creation, in *Faustus*, of 'the conditions for collective contemplation of a universal anxiety over damnation'.⁵⁴ Yet to be appreciated, however, is the extent to which both the text of the play and its conditions of performance immerse spectators in the experience of the confused reprobate who might 'hear' the dialogue but not 'understand' it, 'see' the stage but not fully 'perceyve' the action represented. Ruth Lunney argues that 'What the audience sees in the angel scenes as stable and transparent — angelic figures, angelic voices — [Faustus] sees as confusing and arbitrary'.⁵⁵ But we cannot assume that what the play's spectators heard or saw was 'stable and transparent'. On the contrary, in the 'acoustically aggressive'⁵⁶ amphitheatres housing performances of *Faustus* many lines of dialogue were likely lost on even the most diligent spectator.⁵⁷ The play was equally capable of producing ocular anxieties.⁵⁸ When Faustus sees the inscription on his arm did spectators see it too? Probably not. Similarly, when the Old Man attempts to persuade Faustus to abandon magic, he 'see[s] an angel hovers o'er [Faustus's] head' (A.5.1.54). The Old Man is clearly intended to be a foil to Faustus in being unambiguously amongst the elect. In all likelihood, however, the Old Man's vision was available only to his eyes; there is no stage direction in either text indicating that any 'angel' appeared. If the elect Old Man saw an angel, but the audience did not, surely some spectators were led to question the security of their own position in the sensory hierarchy. What else, the audience might worry, are they not seeing or hearing?

By inflaming spectators' anxieties concerning their own sensory confusion, *Faustus* encourages them to engage in the kind of soteriological self-scrutiny — the searching for signs of one's election or reprobation — which contributes to Faustus's psychological disintegration at the end of the play. This epistemology of salvation became a focus of religious energies in the period. In his *Anatomy of Melancholy*, Robert Burton provides a visceral description of the psychic stress endured by a population forever in the throes of soteriological scrutiny, whose attempts to discover their fate 'so rent, tear and wound men's consciences, that they are almost mad, and at their wits' end'.⁵⁹

At the same time that *Faustus* provokes the urge to self-scrutiny the play also highlights — and creates the conditions for — the practice of searching for signs

of election or reprobation in others. During one of the play's comic scenes, a knight sceptical of Faustus's powers responds sarcastically to the doctor's admission that he can only raise spirits and not bodies: 'now there's a *sign of grace* in you, when you will confess the truth' (A.4.1.51–2, my emphasis). Paul Stegner notes that although Calvinists continually insisted upon the inscrutability of God's will this did not prevent the laity endlessly debating about whom among them was saved and whom was damned.⁶⁰ Spectators with a proclivity for searching for signs of election or reprobation in others could have had a field day in the theatre. Such spaces cultivated what Lars Engle terms 'a community of mutual regard'⁶¹ where, as Kent Cartwright explains, playgoers are 'physically present to each other' and 'recognize their own and others' reactions'.⁶² Early modern theatres were potential hotbeds of thievery, prostitution, and violence bringing in a range of characters whose lewd and lascivious behaviour might have marked them as damned in the eyes of their fellow spectators.

The soteriological scrutiny to which Faustus is subjected — both by himself and those around him — is integral to his final breakdown as he cracks under the pressure of attempting to locate his position on the dichotomous Manichean axis of salvation. From the moment of his first conjuration in the B-text, watched over by the devils, Faustus's transgressions are a spectacle for the damned. In this play, watching itself is a diabolical pastime. This impression is heightened at the beginning of the scene of Faustus's ultimate demise. Lucifer enters with the other devils and announces that they have come 'To view the subjects of our monarchy'; Beelzebub chimes in, relishing his opportunity 'to mark him how he doth demean himself'; and finally Mephistopheles, anticipating Faustus's arrival onstage with Wagner, charges the others to 'See where they come' (B.5.2.2–19). Simon Shepherd argues that 'the audience's privileged seeing is complicated because they watch with the devils' and 'are situated in parallel with them':⁶³ Faustus is a spectacle of suffering for devils and spectators alike. No longer simply experiencing the sensory confusion of the living reprobate, the play's spectator-devils now find themselves sitting amongst the damned in a theatre of hell.

Hence Mephistopheles's famous assertion — 'this is hell, nor am I out of it' (A.1.3.78) — encompasses both the notion of hell as internal psychological condition and the theatre's function as a material diabolical space. The association between hell and the theatres was common amongst Elizabethan antitheatricalists who believed that simply 'sitting among a group of degenerate sinners' at a play could 'jeopardize salvation'.⁶⁴ Anthony Munday lambasted those who by frequenting the playhouses 'have turned ... their soules to the state of everlasting damnation'. Munday further insisted upon the *collaborative* dimension of

the theatre's diabolism: 'Onlie the filthines of plaies, and spectacles is such, as maketh both the actors and beholders giltie alike ... For while they saie nought, but gladlie looke on, they al by sight and assent be actors'.⁶⁵ Certainly in the case of *Faustus*, the play's paying spectators, as much as its paid actors, engage in the diabolical act of looking which culminates in Faustus's final breakdown.

Faustus's 'sensory dramaturgy'⁶⁶ finally transports the play's spectators to the very bowels of hell. Jonathan Harris notes that *Macbeth* contains several stage directions calling for the use of gunpowder, the sulphurous odour of which 'was a stinking sign of diabolical activity' in medieval and early modern England.⁶⁷ Furthermore, as Harris points out, the Reformation had resulted in the banning of incense and the beginning of 'a new olfactory universe in which sweet smells no longer suggested the presence of the divine'.⁶⁸

after the Reformation, all that remained for the nose in religious representation was the foulness of the diabolical. Thus, the stench of the play's squibs might have prompted association with the scent of Catholic churches not because they smelled alike but because they had, in a prior olfactory episteme, presumed each other.⁶⁹

Faustus relies heavily on the use of gunpowder: the devils rarely appear without a corresponding burst of fireworks. By the end of the performance, then, the audience would have been almost suffocated by the smell of sulphur (not to mention the stench of sweat, booze, and the full gamut of bodily fluids which permeated theatres).⁷⁰ Thus while Michael Keefer argues that the B-text's augmentation of the play's spectacular elements allows spectators to watch more 'securely' and 'safely' than the psychologically-introspective A-text,⁷¹ I argue that both versions possess the potential to trigger spiritual angst in their audiences. When the Old Man in the A-text condemns the 'stench' of Faustus's soul, spectators surrounded by the stench emanating from audience and stage alike were pushed to worry about their own soteriological fates. Participating in Faustus's damnation via their devilish looking, spectators also got a taste of damnation themselves, enveloped by the smell of hell in a theatre (and a world) abandoned by the consoling scent of God.

Why would Elizabethan spectators risk the fate of their immortal souls in attending performances of *Faustus* (and, in the case of many individuals, do so repeatedly given the play's box-office longevity)? I argue that Marlowe's play functioned as a vehicle for a collective coming to terms with the post-Reformation religious trauma bonding Faustus and early modern English theatregoers together. As already noted, critics have recognized the usefulness of trauma theories in

understanding the psychological upheavals occasioned by the Reformation. Faustus's anguish, meanwhile, has been described in terms of psychoanalytical trauma theory by Mathew Martin who argues that the doctor is undone by the trauma 'of God's silence'.⁷² Faustus's suffering could alternatively be conceptualized in terms of post-traumatic stress disorder and its symptoms.⁷³ Over the course of the play he experiences hallucinations⁷⁴ and impairment in cognitive processing and sensory perception, while his obsessive use of the second and third person in self-address suggests that he suffers from a high level of personal dissociation.⁷⁵ At the broadest level, Faustus is paralyzed by the 'helplessness [which] constitutes the essential insult of trauma'⁷⁶ in medical, psychiatric, and psychoanalytical accounts of the phenomenon.

Helplessness, then, is a defining characteristic shared by reprobation and trauma, along with symptoms such as sensory confusion and hallucinations. Moreover, the causeless, atemporal logic of reprobation is strikingly similar to Dori Laub's description of traumatic temporality: 'The traumatic event, though real, took place outside the parameters of "normal" reality, such as causality, sequence, place and time. The trauma is thus an event that has no beginning, no ending, no before, no during and no after'.⁷⁷ So far my paper has implicitly suggested that Faustus is traumatized by his experience of reprobation and the helpless confusion it engenders in the living damned. However, the fact that the symptoms of trauma and the symptoms of reprobation are so similar begs the question: is Faustus *really* reprobate, or is he simply experiencing post-traumatic symptoms, which *look like* the signs of reprobation? By traumatizing early modern Europeans,⁷⁸ did Calvinism — which ultimately aimed at saving souls — ironically risk convincing hordes of people that they were damned?

For my present argument, Laub's account of traumatic temporality sheds light on the traumatic structure of *Faustus* and the traumatic dimensions of its textual and performance history. Trauma's uncanny temporality — atemporal stasis simultaneous with endless repetition and return — is the play's governing structural principle. As Fletcher observes, Faustus's 'perspective never actually evolves' and he 'ends the play as he begins it, vacillating' between hope and despair.⁷⁹ The main action of the play meanwhile is characterized by compulsive repetition, with Faustus's recurring spiritual vacillations and reprobate confusions interspersed with scenes recounting the repetitive petty pranks he performs alongside Mephistopheles. That *Faustus* is a play of two halves, tragic and comic, is a longstanding critical assumption. Yet Fletcher argues that the 'comic portions do not represent a different impulse than that at work' in the tragic; rather, they represent Faustus's

further 'attempt[s] at avoidance'.⁸⁰ For Fletcher, then, even the two generic strands of *Faustus* essentially just repeat one another.

So too, I argue, the B-text ultimately emerges as a repetition of the A-text, one which reveals the traumatic dimension of the play's textual and performance history. Early modern audiences wanted more of *Faustus*, and theatrical producers responded with an updated version which remains remarkably consistent with the Marlovian original, true to theological letter and to dramaturgical spirit. These eager spectators were thus active collaborators in the ongoing public repetitions of *Faustus*; the play, an enduring megahit, came to be an 'evolving theatrical event'.⁸¹ Like *Faustus*, theatregoers could not resist compulsively returning to the source of their culture's shared religious trauma.

What did they find when they got there? LaCapra's description of post-traumatic acting out points towards one way in which *Faustus* might have been experienced by its Elizabethan actors and spectators: 'one is haunted or possessed by the past and performatively caught up in the compulsive repetition of traumatic scenes — scenes in which the past returns and the future is blocked or fatalistically caught up in a melancholic feedback loop'.⁸² Abortive performances of *Faustus* like the one at Exeter are indicative of the play's potential to simply re-traumatize those participating in its staging, with actors and spectators triggered by the fictional drama into reliving their own moments of spiritual anguish or terror.⁸³ The fact that in such instances the show *did not go on* resonates with LaCapra's depiction of traumatic temporality wherein 'the future is blocked'. At such times actors and spectators alike engaged in a collective acting out of their trauma, a repetition without resolution, ultimately (by leaving the performances unfinished) reproducing the dead-end stasis of traumatic temporality.

But if *Faustus* served only to re-traumatize actors and spectators — if they could never even make it through to the end of the play — the show's run would surely have been short-lived. I suggest that much of the play's appeal resided in its being a vehicle for a collective working through of post-Reformation trauma. LaCapra explains how 'processes of working through' can 'counteract' the re-traumatizing 'force of acting out'.⁸⁴ Since the working through of trauma depends upon its eventual mastery via its symbolic repetition,⁸⁵ the practice of theatre (which is, at root, the practice of repetition) possesses unique therapeutic value for trauma sufferers. Performances of *Faustus* functioned (at least potentially) as theatrical group therapy sessions as actors and spectators experienced *Faustus*'s reprobation and painful soteriological self-scrutiny along with him. For some, this must have been a transformative and rehabilitative experience. Bear in mind that even though they were unable to finish the show, the Exeter players, 'contrarye to their

custome', abstained from their usual debaucheries that night in favour of 'reading' and 'prayer'.⁸⁶

In this essay I have highlighted two ways in which *Faustus* might have been experienced by early modern actors and spectators — either as part of a re-traumatizing acting out or a therapeutic working through — but of course such possibilities were endless. The people who went to plays sought satisfaction of a variety of needs and desires. In the case of *Faustus*, we find that plays could be therapeutic as well as recreational. I have argued that critics who approach Marlowe's play as a puzzle, a soteriological riddle waiting to be solved, miss the overwhelming emphasis (in both texts) on Faustus's reprobation. Perhaps this widespread oversight is indicative of an understandable critical resistance to the logic of predestination: if Faustus 'just is' damned, rendering questions of motivation and culpability irrelevant, what remains to be said? But moving beyond the distracting 'when's' and 'why's' of Faustus's damnation allows us to appreciate the play anew as an incomparable document of religious trauma in post-Reformation England. *Faustus* provides, via its fictional protagonist, a vivid portrait of reprobate living and religious trauma. Even more, through its textual and performance history, *Faustus* sheds light on the collective and collaborative practices of real Renaissance theatregoers coming to terms with the religious trauma they shared with the lonely doctor. Beyond simply exposing or critiquing the trauma unleashed by strict Calvinism, Marlowe's play became — for the hordes of people who saw and played in it over the decades — an element of their own coming to terms with their culture's enduring religious trauma. That such a coming to terms could take place in amphitheatres housing hundreds (sometimes thousands) of people in turn demands further attention to the public and communal dimensions of England's adjustment to Calvinist Protestantism, an adjustment figured all too often as private and individual. Marlowe's *Faustus*, long renowned for its devastating depiction of one man's spiritual despair and loneliness, ultimately created conditions enabling an experience of spiritual togetherness.

Notes

This article could never have been written without the tireless support and incomparable insight of Jacqueline Tombs. I would also like to thank David Marno and the anonymous reviewers at *Early Theatre* for their incisive and encouraging feedback on earlier drafts.

- 1 E.K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, 4 vols (Oxford, 1923), 3.424.
- 2 Ibid, 423.
- 3 Kristen Poole, 'The Devil's in the Archive: "Doctor Faustus" and Ovidian Physics', *Renaissance Drama* ns 35 (2006), 196, <https://doi.org/10.1086/rd.35.41917447>.
- 4 Andrew Sofer, 'How to Do Things with Demons: Conjuring Performatives in "Doctor Faustus"', *Theatre Journal* 61.1 (2009), 2, <https://doi.org/10.1353/tj.0.0154>.
- 5 See Michael Goldman, 'Marlowe and the Histrionics of Ravishment', in *Two Renaissance Mythmakers: Christopher Marlowe and Ben Jonson*, ed. Alvin Kernan (Baltimore, 1977), 40.
- 6 Sofer, 'Demons', 7.
- 7 William Hamlin, 'Casting Doubt in Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*', *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 41.2 (2001), 263, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1556188>. For similarly condemnatory accounts see Judith Weil, *Christopher Marlowe: Merlin's Prophet* (Cambridge, 1977), 72; Susan Snyder, 'Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* as an Inverted Saint's Life', *Studies in Philology* 63.4 (1966), 569, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4173538>.
- 8 Leah Marcus, *Unediting the Renaissance: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Milton* (London, 1996), 51.
- 9 Pauline Honderich, 'John Calvin and *Doctor Faustus*', *The Modern Language Review* 68.1 (1973), 9, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3726198>.
- 10 James Simpson, *Permanent Revolution: The Reformation and the Illiberal Roots of Liberalism* (London, 2019), 240.
- 11 An exception is Alan Sinfield, who suggests that Faustus is indeed reprobate but that the play excoriates the unfeeling God who condemns him. Alan Sinfield, *Literature in Protestant England 1560–1660* (London, 1983), 120. Jonathan Dollimore similarly reproaches the cruelty of Calvin's 'remote and inscrutable deity'; Jonathan Dollimore, *Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology and Power in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries* (Basingstoke, 1984), 114. While I agree that *Faustus* critiques the psychologically devastating severity of Calvinism, my interest lies less in a moralistic approach (simply taking Faustus's side over God's) than in what the play tells us about the lived experience of reprobation.

- 12 David Webb, ‘Damnation in “Doctor Faustus”: Theological Strip-tease and the Histrionic Hero’, *Critical Survey* 11.1 (1999), 31, <https://doi.org/10.3167/001115799782484004>. Webb distinctively argues that the issue remains decidedly unclear, the play seeking instead to unsettle spectators by flaunting a variety of ‘possibilities which might lead to irrevocable damnation’ (45). Nevertheless, his portrayal of Marlowe ‘teasing’ spectators by inviting them to guess again and again when Faustus damns himself (31) continues to treat the play in riddle-like fashion. Poole similarly sees *Faustus* as characterized by ‘Theological contradictions’ and ‘doctrinal ambiguities’ with the ‘question of repentance’ being ‘presented in a way that seems almost designed to torment audiences with half-answered questions’. Kristen Poole, ‘*Doctor Faustus* and Reformation Theology’, in *Early Modern English Drama: A Critical Companion*, ed. Patrick Cheney, Andrew Hadfield, and Garrett Sullivan (Oxford, 2006), 103.
- 13 W.W. Greg, ‘The Damnation of Faustus’, in *Macmillan Casebook: Doctor Faustus*, ed. J. Jump (London, 1969), 86–8.
- 14 James Smith, ‘Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus*’, in *Macmillan Casebook: Doctor Faustus*, ed. J. Jump (London, 1969), 53–4.
- 15 Helen Gardner, ‘The Theme of Damnation in *Doctor Faustus*’, in *Macmillan Casebook: Doctor Faustus*, ed. J. Jump (London, 1969), 81–3.
- 16 Jay Zysk, *Shadow and Substance: Eucharistic Controversy and English Drama Across the Reformation Divide* (Notre Dame, 2017), 151.
- 17 Leah Marcus, ‘Textual Indeterminacy and Ideological Difference: The Case of *Doctor Faustus*’, *Renaissance Drama* 20 (1989), 3, <https://doi.org/10.1086/rd.20.41917246>.
- 18 See James Kearney, who suggests that ‘Marlowe thrills his audience with the specter of damnation’; James Kearney, *The Incarnate Text: Imagining the Book in Reformation England* (Philadelphia, 2009), 177.
- 19 The plural form recognizes that there remains ‘no firm definition for *trauma*’; Cathy Caruth, *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History* (Baltimore, 1996), 117. Much like early modern English Protestantism — which comprised a vast domain of competing discourses — the umbrella term ‘trauma theory’ denotes various approaches ranging from psychoanalytical to neurobiological. I adopt an eclectic approach, highlighting those aspects of traumatic experience most salient to *Faustus*’s text and performance history.
- 20 Scott Lucas, ‘Coping with Providentialism: Trauma, Identity, and the Failure of the English Reformation’, in *Images of Matter: Essays on British Literature of the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, ed. Yvonne Bruce (Newark, 2002), 258. See also I. McCann and Laurie Pearlman, *Psychological Trauma and the Adult Survivor* (New York, 1990), 58.

- 21 David Cressy, *Birth, Marriage, and Death: Ritual, Religion, and the Life-Cycle in Tudor and Stuart England* (Oxford, 1997), 477.
- 22 Thomas Anderson, *Performing Early Modern Trauma from Shakespeare to Milton* (Aldershot, 2006), 21.
- 23 Steven Mullaney, *The Reformation of Emotions in the Age of Shakespeare* (Chicago, 2015), 87. See also Patricia Cahill, *Unto the Breach: Martial Formations, Historical Trauma, and the Early Modern Stage* (Oxford, 2008); Joseph Campana, *The Pain of Reformation: Spenser, Vulnerability, and the Ethics of Masculinity* (New York, 2012).
- 24 Caruth, *Unclaimed Experience*, 2.
- 25 While I am not seeking to diagnose the playwright's trauma, I certainly agree with G.K. Hunter's characterization of Marlowe as a 'God-haunted atheist'; G.K. Hunter, 'The Theology of Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta*', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 27 (1964), 240, <https://doi.org/10.2307/750518>.
- 26 Dominick LaCapra, *Writing History, Writing Trauma* (London, 2001).
- 27 E. Kaplan suggests that although 'Trauma can never be "healed" ... its pain may be worked through in the process of its being "translated" via art'; E. Kaplan, *Trauma Culture: The Politics of Terror and Loss in Media and Literature* (London, 2005), 19.
- 28 Quotations from *Doctor Faustus A- and B-texts (1604, 1616)*, ed. David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen (Manchester, 1993), cited parenthetically by act, scene, and line number. Where there are noteworthy differences between the two texts, these are discussed; otherwise, quotations from the A-text are used as representative of both versions.
- 29 Mathew Martin, *Tragedy and Trauma in the Plays of Christopher Marlowe* (Farnham, 2015), 148.
- 30 King-Kok Cheung, 'The Dialectic of Despair in *Doctor Faustus*', in *'A Poet and a filthy Play-maker': New Essays on Christopher Marlowe*, ed. Kenneth Friedenreich, Roma Gill, and Constance Kuriyama (New York, 1988), 194.
- 31 Margaret O'Brien, 'Christian Belief in *Doctor Faustus*', *English Literature History* 37.1 (1970), 3, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2872271>.
- 32 Kearney, *Incarinate Text*, 154.
- 33 1 John 1:8–9.
- 34 Katherine Eggert, *Disknowledge: Literature, Alchemy, and the End of Humanism in Renaissance England* (Philadelphia, 2015), 139.
- 35 Kearney, *Incarinate Text*, 164. Peter Holbrook suggests that Faustus 'does grasp what is at stake' in his rejection of theology but does not care because he believes that 'the highest good is earthly experience'; Peter Holbrook, *English Renaissance Tragedy* (London, 2015), 110.

- 36 John Calvin, *The Institution of Christian Religion*, Thomas Norton (trans.), 4 vols (London: 1561; STC: 4415), *Early English Books Online (EEBO)*, 2.16r.
- 37 Eggert, *Disknowledge*, 136.
- 38 Adrian Streete, *Protestantism and Drama in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2009), 11.
- 39 Harry Levin, *Christopher Marlowe: the Overreacher* (Cambridge, MA, 1952), 1.
- 40 Emily Bartels, *Spectacles of Strangeness: Imperialism, Alienation, and Marlowe* (Philadelphia, 1993), 114.
- 41 David Bevington, *From 'Mankind' to Marlowe: Growth of Structure in the Popular Drama of Tudor England* (Cambridge, MA, 1962), 261. Rather than claiming that Faustus is an Everyman figure, Bevington suggests that he is both a 'specific' individual and the embodiment of a 'representative human predicament'. See also Robert Potter, *The English Morality Play: Origins, History, and Influence of a Dramatic Tradition* (London, 1975), 125–9.
- 42 Poole, 'Reformation Theology', 106.
- 43 Catherine Belsey highlights the 'ironic reversal of the morality tradition' whereby 'Faustus summons his own destroyer'; Catherine Belsey, *The Subject of Tragedy: Identity and difference in Renaissance Drama* (London, 1985), 43. See also John Stachniewski, *The Persecutory Imagination: English Puritanism and the Literature of Religious Despair* (Oxford, 1991), 300.
- 44 Katherine Little, 'What is *Everyman*?', *Renaissance Drama* 46.1 (2018), 5, <https://doi.org/10.1086/697173>.
- 45 Matthew Milner, *The Senses and the English Reformation* (Burlington, VT, 2011), 229.
- 46 Thomas Becon, *A New Postil Conteynyng Most Godly and Learned Sermons Upon All the Soday Gospelles* (London, 1566; STC: 1736), *EEBO*, 167r-168v.
- 47 John Deacon and John Walker, *Dialogical Discourses of Spirits and Devils Declaring Their Proper Essence, Natures, Dispositions, and Operations, Their Possessions and Dispossessiones* (London, 1601; STC: 6439), *EEBO*, 14.
- 48 Where Jay Zysk finds 'evidence for Faustus's possible salvation' in the B-text (Jay Zysk, 'The Last Temptation of Faustus: Contested Rites and Eucharistic Representation in *Doctor Faustus*', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 43.2 [2013], 357, <https://doi.org/10.1215/10829636-2081996>), Marcus argues conversely that the A-text is the version that 'leaves open ... the (admittedly faint) possibility of salvation' (Marcus, *Unediting*, 51).
- 49 See A.1.1.108–11.
- 50 Tiffany Stern, *Making Shakespeare: From Stage to Page* (London, 2004), 25.

- 51 For example, when the Good Angel instructs Faustus to ‘think of ... heavenly things’, spectators surely recall Faustus’s branding of magic as ‘heavenly’ (A.1.3.28) and are yet to hear his encomium on the beauty of the spirit of ‘heavenly Helen’ (5.1.85). Ian McAdam thus argues that the play ‘communicates through its imagery and rhetoric a seemingly subversive but rigorously consistent conflation of heaven and hell’; Ian McAdam, *Magic and Masculinity in Early Modern English Drama* (Pittsburgh, 2009), 55.
- 52 Marcus, ‘Textual Indeterminacy’, 26n12. The Act to Restrain Abuses of Players was ‘For the preuenting and auoyding of the great abuse of the holy Name of God in Stage-playes’. Quoted from the printed statutes of 1605–6 (London, 1606; STC: 9502), *EEBO*, H5a.
- 53 Clifford Leech, *Christopher Marlowe: Poet for the Stage* (New York, 1986), 85.
- 54 Brian Walsh, ‘Marlowe and the Elizabethan Theatre Audience’, in *Christopher Marlowe in Context*, ed. Emily C. Bartels and Emma Smith (Cambridge, 2013), 75.
- 55 Ruth Lunney, *Marlowe and the Popular Tradition: Innovation in the English Drama before 1595* (Manchester, 2002), 149.
- 56 Hristomir A. Stanev, *Sensory Experience and the Metropolis on the Jacobean Stage* (Burlington, 2002), 47. Stanev provides a comprehensive catalogue of potential sources of sensory confusion and distraction in theatres (44–54).
- 57 In a 2018 production of *Faustus*, director Paulette Randall had the Angels speak many of their lines simultaneously, thus compounding the difficulty (for both Faustus and spectators) of hearing their advice. Christopher Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus*, Paulette Randall (director), *Shakespeare’s Globe*, 1 December 2018, Sam Wanamaker Playhouse, London.
- 58 Erika Lin argues that *Faustus* foregrounds ‘uncertainty about the act of seeing’ but does not link such ‘uncertainty’ to reprobate experience; Erika Lin, *Shakespeare and the Materiality of Performance* (New York, 2012), 124.
- 59 Robert Burton, *The Anatomy of Melancholy* (Oxford, 1638; STC: 4163), *EEBO*, 698.
- 60 Paul Stegner, “‘Try what repentance can’: *Hamlet*, Confession, and the Extraction of Interiority’, *Shakespeare Studies* 35 (2007), 110, https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137558619_4.
- 61 Lars Engle, “‘I am that I am’: Shakespeare’s Sonnets and the Economy of Shame’, in *Shakespeare’s Sonnets: Critical Essays*, ed. James Schiffer (London, 1999), 191.
- 62 Kent Cartwright, *Shakespearean Tragedy and Its Double: The Rhythms of Audience Response* (University Park, PA, 1991), 25.
- 63 Simon Shepherd, *Marlowe and the Politics of Elizabethan Theatre* (Hemel Hempstead, 1986), 138.

- 64 Ramie Targoff, 'The Performance of Prayer: Sincerity and Theatricality in Early Modern England', *Representations* 60 (1997), 54, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2928805>.
- 65 A. Munday, *A Second and Third Blast of Retrait from Plaies and Theatres* (London, 1580; STC: 21677), EEBO, 93 and 3.
- 66 Stanev, *Sensory Experience*, 1.
- 67 Jonathan Harris, 'The Smell of *Macbeth*', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 58.4 (2007), 475, <https://doi.org/10.1353/shq.2007.0062>.
- 68 Ibid, 483.
- 69 Ibid, 484.
- 70 On the variety of 'unprepossessing odors' assaulting early modern theatregoers see Stanev, *Sensory Experience*, 49–50.
- 71 Michael Keefer, 'Verbal Magic and the Problem of the A and B Texts of *Doctor Faustus*', *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 82.3 (1983), 335, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27709192>.
- 72 Martin, *Tragedy and Trauma*, 155.
- 73 See J.P. Wilson, 'PTSD and Complex PTSD: Symptoms, Syndromes, and Diagnoses', in *Assessing Psychological Trauma and PTSD*, ed. J.P. Wilson and T.M. Keane (New York, 2004), 7–44.
- 74 On the 'hallucinatory quality of Faustus's visions', see Johannes Birringer, 'Between Body and Language: "Writing" the Damnation of Faustus', *Theatre Journal* 36.3 (1984), 354, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3206951>.
- 75 See Juan Prieto-Pablos, "'What art thou Faustus?'" Self-reference and Strategies of Identification in Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*', *English Studies* 74.1 (2008), 83, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00138389308598842>.
- 76 Judith Herman, *Trauma and Recovery* (New York, 1992), 41.
- 77 Dori Laub, 'Bearing Witness, or the Vicissitudes of Listening', in *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History*, ed. Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub, (New York, 1992), 68.
- 78 See Peter Cunich, 'The Ex-Religious in Post-Dissolution Society: Symptoms of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder', in *The Religious Orders in Pre-Reformation England*, ed. James Clark (Suffolk, 2002), 227–38.
- 79 Angus Fletcher, "'Doctor Faustus" and the Lutheran Aesthetic', *English Literary Renaissance* 35.2 (2005), 199, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6757.2005.00057.x>.
- 80 Ibid, 203.
- 81 Sofer, 'Demons', 10.
- 82 LaCapra, *Writing History*, 21.
- 83 Theatre continues to act as a vehicle for the post-traumatic acting out of its practitioners and consumers. Tavia Nyong'o recounts 'a performance of a student production

of *We Are Proud to Present ...* in which the actor playing Actor 2/Black Man was triggered by the climax of the play — which calls for two white characters to lynch him — and ran offstage'; Tavia Nyong'o, 'Does Staging Historical Trauma Re-Enact It?', in *Thinking Through Theatre and Performance*, ed. Maaïke Bleeker, Adrian Kear, Joe Kelleher, and Heike Roms (London, 2019), 200.

84 LaCapra, *Writing History*, 22.

85 Ibid.

86 While acting out *may* simply result in a static re-experiencing of the primal trauma, it 'may' also 'be a prerequisite of working through'. Ibid, 67.