# EARLY MODERN LITERARY STUDIES

## Hero and Leander: The Making of an Author

Laetitia Sansonetti
Université Paris Ouest Nanterre la Défense
L.Sansonetti@u-paris10.fr

### 1598: a year in the afterlife of Christopher Marlowe

1598 was a key year in the afterlife of Christopher Marlowe. It was the year in which his two poetic works adapted from classical texts, *Ovid's Elegies* (bound with John Davies's *Satyres and Epigrammes*) and *Hero and Leander*, were published for the first time. The latter was a free adaptation of a legend featuring in Ovid's *Heroides* (letters XVIII and XIX) and in a piece by the poet Musaeus, whom early modern Europe thought was Orpheus's contemporary but who was in fact a fifth-century-CE grammarian. Marlowe's poem was entered in the Stationers' Register on 28 September 1593 (four months after Marlowe's death) but was not published – if it was, no copy of this first edition has survived – yet it probably circulated in manuscript form among Marlowe's friends and fellow-poets, and in 1598 it elicited not only one, but two continuations after Edward Blount had appended two Latin words, *Desunt nonnulla* ('Something is lacking'), to his edition.[1] George Chapman's continuation was published by Paul Linley, together with Marlowe's poem, just a few months after Blount's edition,[2] while Henry Petowe's sequel was published separately and quickly forgotten.[3] The editorial puzzle involving Blount and Linley was analysed by W. W. Greg in 1944, with the suggestion that it may have been the very existence (or prospect) of Chapman's

---

[1] For arguments that it was not a fragment and a synthesis of the debate down to the mid-1980s, see Marion Campbell, '"Desunt Nonnulla": The Construction of Marlowe's *Hero and Leander* as an Unfinished Poem', *English Literary History* 51: 2 (1984), 241-268.

[2] *Hero and Leander: begun by Christopher Marloe; and finished by George Chapman* (London: Paul Linley, 1598), STC (2nd ed.) 17414. Unless otherwise stated, all further quotations from the poem will refer to this edition for the text (with normalised u/v and i/j), and to *The Collected Poems of Christopher Marlowe*, ed. by Patrick Cheney and Brian J. Striar (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006) for the numbering of lines.

[3] Henry Petowe, *THE Second Part of HERO and LEANDER. Conteyning their further Fortunes* (London: Andrew Harris, 1598), STC (2nd edition) 19807.

continuation that prompted Blount to publish Marlowe's lines with an indication of their unfinished status before transferring the copyright to Linley.[4]

While Greg's intuition gives a clue as to why Blount should have wanted to publish the poem in 1598, it only shifts the problem of why 1598 should be a significant year onto Chapman and Linley. I would like to argue that in the aftermath of Marlowe's death, his contemporaries, former rivals or quondam collaborators, constructed an image of 'Marlowe' that drew on features of his suspicious death, as well as on characteristics of *Hero and Leander*, and that this construction was starting to be threatened in print. In *Palladis Tamia*, Francis Meres's review of his contemporaries published in 1598, Marlowe is praised as a 'scholar';[5] but as 'an Epicure, and an Atheist,' he is damned:

> our tragicall Poet Marlow for his Epicurisme and Athiesme had a tragicall death; you may read of this Marlow more at large in the Theatre of Gods judgments, in the 25. Chapter entreating of Epicures and Atheists.
> […] Christopher Marlow was stabd to death by a bawdy Serving-man, a rivall of his in his lewde love.[6]

Meres is referring to a book published a year earlier and ominously titled *The theatre of Gods judgements*. In this translation of Jean de Chassanion's *Histoires memorables des grans et merveilleux jugemens et punitions de Dieu*, Thomas Beard adds examples of authors who suffered God's wrathful 'judgments' for their 'atheisme and impiety,' among whom 'one of our owne nation, of fresh and late memory, called Marlin, by profession a scholler, brought up from his youth in the Universitie of Cambridge, but by practice a play-maker, and a Poet of scurrilitie'.[7] Beard's judgment is much more detrimental to Marlowe's memory than Meres's because it separates Marlowe's 'scholarship' from his poetic ability, thus making the *poet* a vice-monger.[8] I take the Blount-Linley-Chapman 1598 editorial venture to be a counter-attack against such

[4] W. W. Greg, 'The Copyright of *Hero and Leander*', *The Library* 4: 24 (1944), 165-175 (p. 166).
[5] Francis Meres, *Palladis Tamia, Wits treasury being the second part of Wits common wealth* (London: Cuthbert Burbie, 1598), STC (2nd ed.) 17834, pp. 280 and 282.
[6] Ibid, pp. 286-7.
[7] Jean de Chassanion, *The theatre of Gods judgements: or, a collection of histories out of sacred, ecclesiasticall, and prophane authours concerning the admirable judgements of God vpon the transgressours of his commandements. Translated out of French and augmented by more than three hundred examples*, translated by Thomas Beard (London: Adam Islip, 1597), STC (2nd ed.) 1659, p. 147.
[8] When Marlowe is 'arraigned' in *The Returne from Parnassus*, the judgment insists on the opposition between the poet's wit and the man's will:
> Marlowe was happy in his buskind muse,
> Alas vnhappy in his life and end.
> Pitty it is that wit so ill should dwell,
> Wit lent from heaven, but vices sent from hell.
(*Returne from Parnassus*, I.2.290-293 in James Blair Leishman [ed.], *The Three Parnassus Plays* [London: Nicholson & Watson, 1949]).

portrayals of Marlowe. In this article, I will try to show how Linley's 1598 edition of *Hero and Leander: begun by Christopher Marloe; and finished by George Chapman* can help us understand key features of Marlovian authorship, in particular the link between man, author and narrator/speaker. I will start by analysing Marlowe's dialectic of imitation in *Hero and Leander*, which involves both a reverence for authority and a tendency to submit all authorities to the brush of parody, in order to argue then that this form of reverent parody[9] is precisely the treatment that his fellow-poets apply to the poem itself in the aftermath of Marlowe's death. I will then turn to Chapman's continuation and study his construction of a joint form of authority relying on a revisionary form of reverence.

**Marlowe's authorial strategy of frustration**

Musaeus's *epyllion* was one of the first texts printed by Aldus Manutius in 1494 and it retained an aura of antiquity that made it a venerable object of imitation.[10] For Gordon Braden, 'Marlowe is closer to Mousaios than any other of the Renaissance adapters are, and he is also in many ways closer to Mousaios than he is to any of them'.[11] It is true that 'divine Musaeus' is mentioned in *Hero and Leander* as the poet who sang the tale the narrator is recounting, which locates the author/narrator of the Elizabethan poem in a lineage of inspired verse. But Musaeus's name is put between brackets, in a subordinate clause at the beginning of the description of Leander: 'Amorous Leander, beautifull and yoong, / (Whose tragedie divine Musaeus soong)' (*Hero and Leander* I.51-52). In this parenthesis, two aspects of Marlowe's strategy of authorial frustration are apparent. First, it is the narrator who mentions an illustrious predecessor, thus inviting the reader to conflate the two figures of author and narrator from the start. Second, narrative expectations are created and reinforced, since the 'tragedie' mentioned on line 52 echoes the first line of the poem ('On Hellespont guiltie of True-

---

[9] I use Thomas Greene's typology of imitative practices in the Renaissance: 'the reverent rewriting of a hallowed text;' 'eclectic or exploitative imitation, [treating] all traditions as stockpiles to be drawn upon ostensibly at random;' 'heuristic imitation' (in which some distance is taken from the original subtext); 'resistance to imitation,' in which the text entertains a dialectical relationship with its source that can lead to parody. See Thomas M. Greene, *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1982), pp. 38- 46.

[10] See Millar McLure in Marlowe, *The Poems* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd, 1968), p. xxv, and D. J. Gordon, *The Renaissance Imagination*, ed. by Stephen Orgel (Berkeley, London, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1975): 'Musaeus' *Hero and Leander* was numbered among the heroic poems' (by Scaliger in his *Poetices*) (p. 103).

[11] Gordon Braden, *The Classics and English Renaissance Poetry* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1978), p. 124. Even T.W. Baldwin, who stresses the conventionality of the text Marlowe probably used as his source, a standard Latin translation, chooses to argue: 'but finally he simply followed the trend of Musaeus'. See T. W. Baldwin, 'Marlowe's Musaeus', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 54 (1955), 478-485 (p. 485).

loves blood'). The relationship between the protagonists is ostensibly presented as ominous, with the narrator exclaiming, 'O cursed day and hower' (I.131) when he tells of their first meeting, and announcing tragic events ('unhappilye, / As after chaunced' [I.133-34]). With the authority of Musaeus as a predecessor, Marlowe's narrator can thus hint at potential developments in his own narrative.

However, the expectations created by a combination of narrative prolepsis (alluding to future events in the story) and authorial analepsis (referring to past authors of poems on the same topic) are systematically frustrated in the course of *Hero and Leander*. The three main features of Musaeus's story – the tower, the torch, and the perilous crossing of the Hellespont – are erased or displaced. First, the myth is deprived of its typical verticality when the tower is ostentatiously deprived of its inaccessibility: 'Wide open stood the doore, hee need not clime' (II.19). As for the torch, its light is substituted with 'Heroes ruddie cheeke' (II.323), indicating at the same time her desire and her shame after her first night with Leander. The young man does not drown crossing the Hellespont on a cold winter night but is drawn towards the bottom of the sea by the god Neptune, who has fallen in love with him. Neptune reluctantly lets go of his potential minion when he sees that 'under water he was almost dead' (II.170). Not only are major elements from the story subtracted, but they are substituted with equivalents deprived of tragic import. The most striking example is the 'end' of Marlowe's poem, whether it be a fragment or not. Instead of having Hero throw herself down from her tower, the narrator concludes the lovers' night of passion with a personification of Night literally hurling herself down from the sky into Hades: 'Till she o'recome with anguish, shame, and rage, / Dang'd downe to hell her loathsome carriage' (II.333-34).

Although Ovid's *Heroides* are not mentioned explicitly in the poem, they nevertheless feature as a narrative subtext whose authority is flashed at the reader before being frustratingly undermined. Marlowe would most probably have been familiar with this text from early on in his career, for these Epistles were part of the curriculum in many English schools throughout the sixteenth century.[12] The *Heroides* instantly come to mind when the narrator mentions an exchange of letters between the lovers: 'and after her a letter sent. / Which joyfull Hero answerd in such sort, / As he had hope to scale the beauteous fort' (II.14-16). But instead of establishing Ovid's *Heroides* as an authoritative source-text, the inclusion of missives actually weakens their status, for they are sent *before* the first rendezvous and (more importantly) are utterly redundant since the rendezvous has already been agreed upon – which may be why their content remains undisclosed.

---

[12] T. W. Baldwin, *William Shakspere's Small Latine and Lesse Greeke*, 2 vols (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1944), II pp. 239-40.

If Marlowe refers to the two traditional sources of his story as inadequate precedents, he does not reject Ovid's authority, but instead turns to other Ovidian works on love, namely *Amores* and *Ars Amatoria*. Probably in his Cambridge days, Marlowe had translated Ovid's *Amores*. In *Hero and Leander* he uses heroic couplets, the same verse form with which he had experimented when translating Ovid's elegiac couplets, a form not very popular in England in the 1580s, as Roma Gill informs us.[13] The choice of the couplet instead of the more widely used stanzaic structure for narrative verse serves to link Marlowe's two Ovidian adaptations, thus insisting on an Ovidian authorial stance. Such a stance is defined negatively at the opening of *Amores* by Ovid's poetic persona as the readers are told of the initial plan, which was marred by a mischievous Cupid:

> We which were Ovid's five books, now are three,
> For these before the rest preferreth he:
> If reading five thou plainst of tediousness,
> Two ta'en away, thy labour will be less:
> With Muse upreared I meant to sing of arms,
> Choosing a subject fit for fierce alarms:
> Both verses were alike till Love (men say)
> Began to smile and took one foot away.
> (Ovid, *Amores* 1.1, in Marlowe's translation).[14]

As Ovid frustrates his readers by giving them only three fifths of what he announces he has written, so Marlowe writes only part of the story his readers could expect to find. In *Amores*, an epic intent is stated only to be negated, with a shortening of meter corresponding to the shift from epic to elegiac poetry. Writing his poem in the same meter he had used to translate Ovid's elegies, Marlowe locates his poetic endeavour in the category of 'minor epics.'[15] Patrick Cheney has shown how crucial the Ovidian affirmation of a negative, or at least, paradoxical form of authority was in helping Marlowe define his own 'counterfeit profession.' He has also drawn attention to Marlowe's Ovidian ambition to 'experimen[t] with epic' in *Hero and Leander* as part of

---

[13] See *The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe*, ed. by Roma Gill (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987, reprinted 1998) p. 3.

[14] Christopher Marlowe, *All Ovids Elegies*, in John Davies and Christopher Marlowe, *Epigrammes and elegies. By J.D. and C.M.* (Middleborough, c. 1599), STC (2nd ed.) 6350.

[15] That is the title E. Story Donno has given to the collection of Early Modern poems she edited in 1963, thus avoiding using the controversial Greek term '*epyllion*' applied to English poetry. See *Elizabethan Minor Epics* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963). See also Paul W. Miller, 'The Elizabethan Minor Epic', *Studies in Philology* 55: 1 (1958), 31-38.

his strategy of building an Ovidian '*cursus*' of elegy, tragedy and epic.[16] The interplay between Ovidian models of elegy and epic (or rather, counter-epic) is particularly relevant here.

Marlowe borrows extensively from Ovid's elegiac poetry, adapting the persona Ovid had created for himself in both *Amores* and *Ars amatoria*, the resourceful *praeceptor amoris*, whose experience has made him capable of giving advice to his readers. Marlowe's narrator claims to be just such a man, generalising the lovers' experience to provide *sententiae* in his couplets, using rhyme and italics to reinforce the proverbial gnomic effect, as in the following examples: 'Relenting Heroes gentle heart was strooke / *Such force and vertue hath an amorous looke*' (I.165-166); 'He touched her hand, in touching it she trembled, / *Love deeply grounded, hardly is dissembled*' (I.183-184).

One of the most distinctive features of Marlowe's poem, namely Leander's ambiguous sexual characterisation, is also indebted to an Ovidian shift from epic, this time in *Ars Amatoria*. When the *praeceptor* in love explains how to seduce women, he refers to a lesser-known episode in the life of an epic character *par excellence*, Achilles's stay on Skyros disguised as a girl and his rape of Deidamia:

> Thus lady like he with a Lady lay,
> Till what he was her belly did bewray:
> Yet was she forc'd, so ought we to beleeve
> Not to be so inforst, how would she grieve.[17]

This anecdote illustrates a maxim about women's apparent coyness: 'They terme it force, such force comes welcome still, / That pleaseth them, they grant against their will'.[18] Having been presented as the mirror image of the Skyrean Achilles ('Some swore he was a maid in mans attire' [*Hero and Leander* I.83]), Marlowe's Leander acts after Ovid's Achilles while Hero reproduces Deidamia's yielding:

> […] Treason was in her thought,
> And cunningly to yeeld her selfe she sought.
> Seeming not woon, yet woon she was at length,
> In such warres women use but half their strength.

---

[16] Patrick Cheney, *Marlowe's Counterfeit Profession: Ovid, Spenser, Counter-Nationhood* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), pp. 222, 10, and chapter 11 on *Hero and Leander*.

[17] Ovid, *Ars Amatoria* (I.697-700) p. 30 in *De arte amandi. Or, the art of love*, translated by Thomas Heywood (London, 1625), STC (2nd ed.) 18935.7.

[18] Ibid, p. 29 in Heywood. See Cynthia Garrett, 'Sexual Consent and the Art of Love in the Early Modern English Lyric', *SEL 1500-1900* 44: 1 (2004), 37-58: 'The *Ars Amatoria* […] licensed comic rape by suggesting scenarios in which women's supposed suffering could be exposed as pleasure' (p. 38).

(*Hero and Leander* II.293-296)

Marlowe also emulates Ovid in his mythological poetry (which was Ovid's own response to Virgilian epic), asserting or suggesting interactions between his characters and classical gods: Apollo is said to have courted Hero 'for her haire' (I.6), her beauty has struck Cupid blind (I.37-38), Neptune tries to seduce Leander (II.155ff), Leander's beauty is such that wild Hippolitus would have fallen for him (I.77-78) – and that chaste Diana pines for him (I.59-60). With the additions he makes to classical mythology and the potential extra myths he lists, Marlowe's narrator seems intent on out-Oviding Ovid.

So Marlowe's model for his *epyllion* is not so much Musaeus or Ovid as himself translating and adapting Ovid. And he follows his model by submitting it to parody, as Paul Cubeta has argued: 'The signposts of Parody are everywhere: the bawdy ambiguity, the outrageous feminine rhymes, the bizarre hyperbole, and the gnomic sentiment which is often only conventional platitude or fatuous intrusion uttered solemnly as a profound insight into the psychology of young love'.[19] According to Cubeta, Marlowe's intention was 'to mock the fashionable attitudes of a whole tribe of contemporary Ovidian mythographers by turning their own weapons against them'.[20]

Cubeta has identified such features as the sign that Marlowe-the-author was playing against his own narrator, establishing an ironic distance between himself and his poetic persona within the poem: 'Marlowe's narrator, far from being his spokesman, […] is mocked at every turn'.[21] I think that parody is not only a way of mocking fellow-poets for Marlowe, it is also a way of asserting his own authority by emulating a predecessor at the same time as he parodies his style, with what I would call his reverent parody of Ovid. In deliberately having his narrator fail to be 'the new Musaeus' and try too hard to be 'the new Ovid,' Marlowe was emulating Ovid himself, whose poetic persona had introduced the turn to love poetry as evidence of his coming short of writing an epic poem after the Virgilian fashion (literally coming short, since the elegiac meter is shorter than the epic one). Patrick Cheney has argued that Marlowe used references to Ovid's works and emulated Ovid's un-Virgilian, or anti-Virgilian 'career' in his practice of 'professional rivalry' with his contemporaries, and especially Spenser, who was seen as the new Virgil.[22] The case of *Hero and Leander* allows us to see not only how such

---

[19] Paul Cubeta, 'Marlowe's Poet in *Hero and Leander*', *College English*, 26: 7 (1965), 500-505 (p. 502).
[20] Ibid, 505.
[21] Ibid, 500. Cubeta is criticising Harry Levin's interpretation of the poem; see Levin, *The Overreacher: A Study of Christopher Marlowe* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952), p. 140.
[22] Cheney, pp. 3, 14. A thorough discussion of Cheney's claim regarding Marlowe's anti-Spenserian poetics lies beyond the scope of this paper. Although I find John Huntington's reworking of Helgerson's categories, which brings together Spenser, Chapman *and* Marlowe, more convincing (see note 26 for references), I am indebted to Cheney's detailed analysis of *Hero and Leander*.

diachronic processes of imitation and synchronic strategies of rivalry meet and interact, but also how Marlowe went further than imitating Ovid with the technique of reverent parody.

**The reception of *Hero and Leander*: reverent parody**

Marlowe's subtle game of identification and distancing between author and narrator, together with the interplay of reverent and parodic imitation, is taken up by his contemporaries after his death: Marlowe is fused with his narrator and turned into a semi-fictional character to serve as an authority on love while elements of his biography seem to preside over the selection of quotations that emerge as crowd-pleasers. The process is typical of the anthologising vogue, a trend which tended to conflate author, narrator and characters in quoting from narrative poetry. Anthologising purple patches that became commonplaces was a frequent endeavour in Elizabethan England, and particularly so at the turn of the century, with the publication of John Bodenham's (or Nicholas Ling's) *Englands Helicon* and Robert Allott's *Englands Parnassus* in 1600. The allusions to and quotations from *Hero and Leander* that we find in texts from the mid-1590s belong in this vogue but differ from the construction of authorship typical of florilegia in that Marlowe's words are inserted into other poets' own works, thus both enhancing and reining in the intrusive form of authority that he represents.

When Marlowe's contemporaries allude to *Hero and Leander*, the circumstances of the man's death find their way into the appreciation of the poet's art and some of the distinctive features of Marlowe's version of the story are read in the light of his suspicious death, as if that death had provided the tragic conclusion that his poem seemed to lack. The aphoristic tendency of the poem is picked upon with the same mixture of authority and parody that Cubeta has identified in Marlowe's relation to his narrator. If Cubeta is right in affirming that Marlowe was mocking the mythographers, then at least some of them paid him a paradoxical kind of homage by turning his own weapon against him, emulating him and claiming him as one of their own while posthumously giving him a taste of his own medicine.

In his *Narcissus*, published in 1595, Thomas Edwards has his main protagonist address characters from other poems, taking up phrases from the original contexts. In the case of *Hero and Leander*, accurate quotations alternate with pseudo-quotations, testifying to the popularity of the poem as well as to Edwards's own propensity to parody:

> Welcome Leander, welcome, stand thou neere,
> Alacke poore youth, what hast thou for a pawne,

What, not a rag, where's Heroes vale of lawne?

Her buskins all of shels ysilvered ore,

What hast thou noth? then pack yonder's the doore.[23]

If the phrase 'Hero's veil of lawn' is not to be found in Marlowe's poem (*lawn* is mentioned at I.9 and II.242), 'Her buskins all of shels ysilvered ore' is Marlowe's 'Buskins of shels all silvered, used she' (I.31) adapted to fit Edwards's pentameter. Leander's 'dangling tresses' are also mentioned (*Hero and Leander* I.55; Edwards, stanza 23), which shows that the descriptions of the main protagonists had struck Marlowe's contemporaries as particularly effective. The reference to Hero's veil is made comic because this instrument of erotic seduction is demoted to the status of a mere commodity that a poor young man might want to pawn in order to get some cash. It could also refer to one of the conflicting versions of Marlowe's death, namely that the quarrel broke out over money and not because of some rivalry in 'lewd love' (as Meres would have it). A more direct allusion to Marlowe's death is to be found in the 'Envoy,' which reminds the readers that 'Amintas and Leander' (viz. Thomas Watson and Marlowe)[24] are 'gone'.[25] In a criss-cross pattern of mixing life and work, details of Marlowe's life are imported into his poem (Leander is poor) while he is referred to as a character from his story (Marlowe is Leander). Edwards's poem is typical of what happens to Marlowe and *Hero and Leander* when they are mentioned by his contemporaries. In particular, they insist on the question of money, which features at the core of Marlowe's poem as we have it with the digression on Mercury and the Fates and the explanation of why 'to this day is everie scholler poore, / Grosse gold, from them runs headlong to the boore' (II.471-2).

John Huntington has thus remarked that the quotations in *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus*, first performed in December 1597, are taken from the comments on poetry and poverty which conclude the Mercury anecdote: 'gold runs to the boore'[26] and 'Learninge and povertie will ever kiss'.[27] Quotations, money and a dead Marlowe are also prominent in Ben Jonson's mention of *Hero and Leander* in *Everyman in His Humour*, first performed in 1598. Matheo pretends he has composed an 'extempore' elegy that Lorenzo Junior recognises as having been lifted from Marlowe's poem (I.199-202), an

---

[23] Thomas Edwards, *Cephalus and Procris. Narcissus* (stanza 22), ed. by W. E. Buckey (London: Nichols and Sons, 1882), http://www.archive.org/stream/cu31924013121045# page/n117/mode/2up [accessed 30 June 2014].

[24] Watson (d. 1592) and Marlowe were imprisoned in Newgate in September 1589 on suspicion of murder; they were thus linked as much by poetry as by trouble with the law. See Eccles, Mark, 'Brief Lives: Tudor and Stuart Authors', *Studies in Philology* 79: 4 (1982), 1-135, s.v. 'Christopher Marlowe' and 'Thomas Watson'.

[25] Edwards, 'Envoy', stanza 7.

[26] *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus* (I. 63) in Leishman, citing *Hero and Leander*, I. 472.

[27] Ibid (I. 76), paraphrasing *Hero and Leander* I. 470. See John Huntington, *Ambition, Rank, and Poetry in 1590s England* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2001), p. 56.

act of thievery that he harshly criticises, exclaiming: 'A pox on him, hang him filching rogue, steale from the deade? its worse then sacriledge'.[28]

In two references shortly posterior to the two editions of 1598, the addition of Chapman's continuation seems to have been taken into consideration, although he is not referred to by name. Shakespeare's *As You Like It* (composed around 1598-1599) shares the tendency of earlier texts to turn to a dead Marlowe for maxims on love and, like Edwards's *Narcissus*, inserts him into the fictional world of pastoral: 'Dead Shepherd, now I find thy saw of might, / "Who ever loved that loved not at first sight?"' Phebe sighs.[29] An allusion to another of Marlowe's works, *The Jew of Malta* (entered in the Stationers' Register in 1594 but not printed until the seventeenth century), serves to bring to mind Marlowe's death over a sum of money (and again not because of a rivalry in 'lewd love'). Indeed, Touchstone's statement that 'When a man's verses cannot be understood, […] it strikes a man more dead than a great reckoning in a little room',[30] which echoes the 'infinite riches in a little room' from Marlowe's *Jew* (I.1.37), also evokes the fatal quarrel over money at Mistress Bull's. Once again, dead Marlowe is presented as an authority on love and associated with money troubles. The context of the two references points to a form of reverent parody in conjuring Marlowe's authority, for Phebe has fallen for Rosalind disguised as Ganymede and is therefore mistaken in her love.[31] As for Touchstone, he compares Marlowe's death with potential errors in the reception of a poem. If Touchstone's comparison is a comment on the reception of *Hero and Leander*, it could be Shakespeare's way of telling Chapman, whose continuation had just been published together with Marlowe's poem, that his interpretation was completely mistaken. The other reference to the plot of *Hero and Leander* in *As You Like It* could also be an allusion to Chapman's continuation. Rosalind, disguised as Ganymede, seeks to invalidate the traditional legend of Hero and Leander, with the tragic end that was so conspicuously missing from Marlowe's poem; she claims that Leander 'went but forth to wash him in the Hellespont and, being taken with the cramp, was drowned.' That he died because of Hero is a 'lie' told by 'foolish chroniclers'.[32]

---

[28] Ben Jonson, *Every man in his humor As it hath beene sundry times publickly acted by the right Honorable the Lord Chamberlaine his servants* (London: Walter Burre, 1601), STC (2nd ed.) 14766 (H^{r-v}). A couple of decades later, the stylistic features of the opening were mocked by Jonson for having become incomprehensible to potential audiences: 'do they know what Hellspont is? Guilty of true Loves Blood? or what Abidos is? or the other Sestos height?' See Ben Jonson, *Bartholomew Fair* in *The workes of Benjamin Jonson* (London: W. Stansby, 1616), STC (2nd ed.) 14752 (IV.8.108ff), quoting *Hero and Leander* I.1 and 4.

[29] William Shakespeare, *As You Like It* (III.5.82-3), in *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. by Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, Katharine Eisaman Maus (New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997), citing *Hero and Leander*, I.176.

[30] Shakespeare, III.3.9-12

[31] Marlowe's Leander is mistaken for Ganymede by a lascivious Neptune in *Hero and Leander*, I.155-174.

[32] Shakespeare, IV.1.86-92.

Chapman's continuation is thus linked to Marlowe's poem but while Marlowe's authority is playfully enhanced and mocked at the same time, Chapman's is negated outright.

The same mixture of authority and parody is associated with the poem in *Nashes Lenten Stuffe* (1599): 'hath anybody in Yarmouth heard of Leander and Hero, of whome divine *Musaeus* sung, and a diviner Muse than him, *Kit Marlow*?'[33] 'Divine Musaeus' is a phrase that Marlowe's narrator uses to authorise his own version (*Hero and Leander* I.52), while the metamorphoses of the lovers into a herring (Leander) and a ling (Hero) can recall Chapman's addition of the lovers' metamorphosis into thistle-warps. Even when Chapman's portion appears to be the relevant subtext of the allusion, only Marlowe is named as the author of the poem.

In the five years that had gone between Marlowe's death and the publication of *Hero and Leander*, first as Marlowe's work and shortly thereafter as a form of diachronic death-bridging collaboration between Marlowe and Chapman, the poem had become the hallmark of Marlovian authorship and served to build a complex figure of authority for the dead poet. Quoting from *Hero and Leander* prior to its first publication, or immediately after it, was a sort of game among Marlowe's contemporaries, quondam collaborators or rivals and now mourners, as Georgia Brown has shown in her perceptive analysis of the climate of literary competition in the mid-1590s.[34]

Praised by Meres and mocked by Shakespeare and Nashe, Chapman's continuation was so successful that all subsequent editions reprinted it together with Marlowe's poem until Louis Martz's 1972 edition. I would like to argue that the reasons for Chapman's success lie in his understanding of what 'Marlowe' meant to fellow late Elizabethan poets: scholarship, money (or lack thereof), stylistic brilliance, and genre and gender crossings. Marlowe had submitted the main features of his sources to a form of reverent parody in rewriting the story of Hero and Leander; in completing *Hero and Leander*, Chapman submitted the main features of Marlowe's poem to a form of reverent rewriting.

---

[33] Thomas Nashe, *Nashes Lenten stuffe containing, the description and first procreation and increase of the towne of Great Yarmouth in Norffolke: with a new play neuer played before, of the praise of the red herring* (London: N[icholas] L[ing] and C[uthbert] [Burby], 1599), STC (2nd ed.) 18370, p. 42.

[34] See Georgia Brown, 'Gender and voice in "Hero and Leander"' in *Constructing Christopher Marlowe*, ed. by J. A. Downie and J. T. Parnell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 148-163. Nicholas Ling seems to have been a central figure in this nexus: he published *Englands Parnassus*, probably had a hand in *Englands Helicon*, edited Meres's *Palladis Tamia* and published Nashe's *Lenten Stuffe* (as well as the 1595 edition of his *Pierce Pennilesse*).

**Chapman's authoritative choice of completion**

With the quotations of the poem in the aftermath of Marlowe's death, we have seen how 'Marlowe,' fused with his narrator, becomes an objectified authority, a liminal figure between life and death, fame and oblivion, almost a fiction. In asserting their rights over Marlowe's poem, its publishers or continuators subject him to a similar kind of transformation from agent into patient, from the designer of a strategy of systematic frustration into the frustrated designer of a complete poem.

By framing his edition of *Hero and Leander* with the words 'unfinished Tragedy' (Dedication to Sir Thomas Walsingham) and '*Desunt nonnulla*' (at the end), Edward Blount defined Marlowe's poem as incomplete. Supporting Blount's claims about the unfinished status of the poem was the frequent mention of Marlowe's untimely death in the references to *Hero and Leander* since 1593, as we have seen. Blount also set the tone for continuations by insisting on Marlowe's legacy, in both moral and legal terms:

> the impression of the man, that hath beene deare unto us, living an afterlife in our memory, there putteth us in mind of farther obsequies due unto the deceased. And namely of the performance of whatsoever we may judge shal make to his living credit, and to the effecting of his determinations prevented by the stroke of death. By these meditations (as by an intellectuall will) I suppose myselfe executor to the unhappily deceased author of this Poem […][35]

Dead Marlowe can live on and his reputation as a poet must be upheld in the works (albeit unfinished) published by his well-wishing friends.

Marlowe's life in death is also a key element in the two continuations. In a move similar to Blount's, Henry Petowe ascribes the current mangled state of Marlowe's *Hero and Leander* to the author's untimely death:

> This Historie of *Hero* and *Leander*, penned by that admired Poet *Marloe*: but not finished (being prevented by sodaine death:) and the same (though not abruptly, yet contrary to all menns expectation) resting like a heade seperated from the body, with this harsh sentence, *Desunt nonnulla*.[36]

---

[35] Christopher Marlowe, *Hero and Leander* (London: Edward Blount, 1598), STC (2nd ed.) 17413, Aiii^r.
[36] Henry Petowe, *The Second Part of HERO and LEANDER Conteyning their further Fortunes* (London: Andrew Harris, 1598), STC (2nd ed.) 19807, Aiii^v.

The parenthetical remark that Marlowe's poem looks unfinished not because it ends 'abruptly' (unlike, say, the 1590 Ponsonby edition of Sidney's *Arcadia*, that stopped in mid-sentence), but because it does not take the traditional story to its expected end, is particularly interesting. This distinction justifies Petowe's decision to offer not so much a continuation as a sequel, a nearly independent story with the characters' 'further fortunes.' Instead of taking his inspiration from classical sources, as Marlowe had done, Petowe turns to vernacular accounts and refers to Italian tales, thus locating his poem in a completely different context.[37]

At the outset of his own poem, Petowe forges a conceit in which he stands as Mercury to Marlowe's Apollo, praising the late poet for his peerless skills:

> *Marlo* late mortall, now fram'd all diuine,
> What soule more: happy, then that soule of thine?
> Live still in heauen thy soule, thy fame on earth,
> […]
> But *Marlo* still admired *Marlo*'s gon,
> To live with beautie in *Elyzium*,
> […]
> *Marlo* must frame to *Orpheus* melodie,
> Himnes all divine to make heaven harmonie.
> There ever live the Prince of Poetrie,
> Live with the living in eternitie.[38]

When Blount had stated that Marlowe would live an 'afterlife' in his friends' (and former patrons') memories, Petowe goes much further by granting this 'prince' everlasting life in Elysium and everlasting fame on earth. Although he speaks of 'heaven,' Petowe is careful to locate Marlowe's deification in a literary context (which the Apollonian conceit and the reference to Orpheus clearly indicate) and to make no mention of Marlowe's atheism, which would have condemned him to Christian hell. This passage also allows Petowe to distance himself from Marlowe, who cannot be equalled or rivalled, and thus cannot be imitated.

Like Petowe, Chapman refers to Marlowe's everlasting life; like Blount, he presents himself as the executor of an old friend's last will:

---

[37] On continental versions of the story, see Warren Boutcher, '"Who Taught Thee Rhetoricke to Deceive a Maid?": Christopher Marlowe's *Hero and Leander*, Juan Boscán's *Leandro*, and Renaissance Vernacular Humanism', *Comparative Literature* 52: 1 (2000), 11-52.
[38] Petowe, Bii[r-v].

> […] finde th'eternall Clime
> Of his free soule, whose livin' subject stood
> Up to the chin in the Pyerean flood,
> And drunke to me halfe this Musean storie,
> Inscribing it to deathles Memorie:
> Confer with it, and make my pledge as deepe,
> That neithers draught be consecrate to sleepe.
> Tell it how much his late desires I tender,
> (If yet it know not) […]
> (*Hero and Leander* III.188-196)

When he refers to Marlowe's life, Chapman makes him the Muses' darling (with the allusion to the Pierian spring where the Muses had their abode and the pun on 'Musean,' which can derive from 'Musaeus' or 'Muses'). As Fred Tromly has noted, he also assimilates dead Marlowe to a famous mythological figure whose punishment was to spend eternity immersed 'up to the chin' in a river whose water he could not drink to quench his thirst and near a tree whose fruits he could not pick to allay his hunger – namely, Tantalus.[39] Marlowe the master at frustration becomes the epitome of frustrated desire. In Chapman's clear but nameless reference to Marlowe (as opposed to Petowe's numerous repetitions of the poet's name), the dead friend's soul is not out of reach (as it is for Petowe, who does not claim any friendship with him); it is still connected, through memory, to the double nature of Marlowe's life, both Orphic and Tantalean. Providing a continuation to *Hero and Leander* thus appears as a legitimate operation, condoned by Marlowe's very 'soul.'

From the differences between Petowe's and Chapman's rhetorics of continuation, it is clear that the former was trying to capitalise on a fashionable topic, tagging his name onto that of a famous poet whose reputation was sulphurous enough to attract notice for Petowe's own work but from whose controversial authority Petowe had better insulate himself – which is why he failed. As for Chapman, he followed through his claim of an intimate connection with Marlowe – which is why he succeeded. For Chapman, completing meant changing perspectives, as is stated in the first line of the continuation: 'New light gives new directions' (III.1). It meant remaking the poem into everything Marlowe had playfully toyed with and rejected, making it more epic and more Greek and taking away the irony. And Chapman's great talent was to rewrite the poem in these

---

[39] Fred B. Tromly, *Playing with Desire: Christopher Marlowe and the Art of Tantalization* (Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 1998), p. 9.

'new directions' using the key features that had struck the first readers of the poem as typical of Marlowe's style.

Chapman had a vested interest in taking up a Greek story: he had just published his first translation of excerpts from Homer's *Iliad* and was trying to establish himself as an authority on how to English Greek poetry. That Chapman took the origin of the kind of poem he assumed Marlowe had written (or started to write) to be epic poetry is obvious in his choice to divide the composite poem (made of both Marlowe's part and his own) into six 'Sestiads.' The word 'Sestiad' is of course patterned after Homer's 'Iliads' (used in the plural in Chapman's own translation of *Seaven Bookes of the Iliades of Homer* published in 1598). A few years later (1616), Chapman would translate Musaeus's poem and we can see him honing his style as a translator and a poet in his continuation.[40] For instance, he tried to make the poem sound more Greek by coining 'Homeric' compound epithets such as 'His *Hero*-handled bodie, whose delight / Made him disdaine each other Epethite' (III.21-22), 'golden-fingred *India*' (III.207), 'her *Cupid* prompted spirit' (III.341), 'The other bountie-loving *Dapsilis*' (IV.237). When Marlowe had turned to Latin authorities, in particular Ovid (several works of whom he had translated or adapted, not to mention his adaptation of Virgil's *Aeneid* in his play *Dido Queen of Carthage*), Chapman affirms his knowledge of Greek sources and his capacity as a poet-translator.

What Chapman identified as the main point in need of correction in Marlowe's version of the story was that Hero and Leander's love was 'wanton' (III.11), exactly as Marlowe's death was supposed to have resulted from a rivalry in 'lewd love,' according to the account of the facts that Marlowe's friends were so keen on replacing with the 'reckoning' hypothesis. His corrections are all the more effective because they rely on features that were typical of Marlowe's poem, thus strongly linking the two parts. For instance, Chapman manages to create verbal echoes by having his narrator chide Leander in *sententiae* that are reminiscent of those Marlowe gave *his* narrator, such as '*the use of time is Fate*' (III.64), which brings to mind 'For will in us is over rulde by fate' (I.168). When Marlowe had depicted the metamorphoses used by licentious gods to seduce mortal women (I.136-156), Chapman adds an aetiological metamorphosis to the legend of Hero and Leander, transforming them into thistle-warps after their tragic deaths and legitimising this addition to the traditional story by concluding his poem on the claim that 'They were the first that ever Poet sung' (VI.293). 'They' seems to refer to the lovers-turned-birds, thus giving the impression that the metamorphosis was part of the original story, which was not the case.

---

[40] Musaeus, *The divine poem of Musaeus, First of all books*, translated by George Chapman (London: Isaac Jaggard, 1616), STC (2nd ed.) 18304.

As for digression, which stood out as a prominent narrative feature in Marlowe's poem (with the 100-line long story of Mercury, the shepherdess and the Fates), Chapman uses it in order to provide a counter-example of legitimate love. During the wedding of Mya and Alcmane, which Hero agrees to celebrate as a substitute for the wedding she longs for herself, a tale is told about a patient youth, Hymen, and his bride Eucharis (V.91-480). Chapman's Hymen offers a counterpart to Marlowe's Leander, who was a sexually ambiguous epigone of Achilles on Skyros, as we have seen. Hymen puts on female clothes to approach Eucharis and then wins her love with high deeds (rescuing her and her friends from deadly peril). The female disguise, far from indicating gender uncertainty, opens the way to the lawful union of man and woman. It is also the opportunity for Chapman to moralise some protagonists introduced by Marlowe's narrator using Marlowe's own technique of waylaying existing legends and myths. Hymen thus manages to free his beloved from a band of brigands with the help of Morpheus, who was associated in the first part of the poem with Hero's lustful dreams (I.349-50 / V.178-80). He then expresses his love thanks to Proteus the shape-shifter, who was represented together with Jupiter and his love conquests on the walls of the Temple of Venus (I.137ff / V.206ff). Chapman also uses the digression to build the image of a compassionate narrator for himself ('Whose wound because I grieve so to display / I use digressions thus t'increase the day' [V.495-496]), thus suggesting that Marlowe might have written a long digression and then stopped writing before he had led the story to its traditional ending because he could not bring himself to kill his characters. The inception of the collaborative process thus seems to date back to a period preceding Marlowe's death, with Marlowe asking Chapman to give the poem the conclusion he knew he (Marlowe) would not write.

The digression in Marlowe's poem was particularly appealing to Chapman, not only as a narrative technique that helped build a common ethos for the narrators of the two parts. The Mercury anecdote hinges around the same articulation of money and lewd love as Marlowe's own death. As we have seen, the issue of poverty caught the attention of several poets who referred to *Hero and Leander* in the mid- to late 1590s. Originating in frustrated love (Mercury promised the Fates his love in exchange for Jupiter's seat but reneged on his promise once he got what he wanted), the poverty of scholars was the conclusion of the long digression:

> That *Midas* brood shall sit in Honors chaire,
> To which the *Muses* sonnes are only heire:
> And fruitfull wits that in aspiring are,
> Shall discontent run into regions farre […] (II.475-478)

Poverty was a matter of crucial importance to Chapman, who lamented his condition as a poor poet in many prefaces and dedications,[41] including that to his continuation of the poem. In the dedication to Lady Walsingham, he utters contempt for poets who are mere '*Money-Mongers*':

> Such uncourtly and sillie dispositions as mine, whose contentment hath other objects than profit or glorie; are as glad, simply for the naked merit of vertue, to honour such as advance her, as others that are hired to commend with deepeliest politique bountie.[42]

Using the sexual traps that await the inexperienced courtier as an analogy to Leander's tragic end at the hands of the Fates, Chapman's narrator launches into a first-person singular attack on Court hypocrisy that is reminiscent of Marlowe's narrator's comment on poverty and scholarship:

> […] yet I needes must see
> Our painted fooles and cockhorse Pessantrie
> Still still usurp, with long lives, loves, and lust,
> The seates of vertue, cutting short as dust
> Her deare bought issue; ill, to worse converts,
> And tramples in the blood of all deserts. (VI.143-148)

This analogy can be seen as Chapman's own version of the 'not sex, but money' hypothesis regarding Marlowe's death put forward by his fellow-poets in their attempt to safeguard his authority. Echoing his dedication in his poem, Chapman indicates that his narrator is an adequate spokesman for his beliefs as an author, a stand that Marlowe had been careful not to take but which had been read into his poem by his contemporaries after his death, with a mixture of reverence and parody. In *Hero and Leander*, Chapman's claim to authority as an inspired interpreter of classical texts relies on his subtle use of Marlovian echoes, which he submits to reverent revision within the new context he has created.

---

[41] See, for instance, the dedication to Matthew Roydon in *Ovids banquet of sence A coronet for his mistresse philosophie, and his amorous zodiacke* (London: Richard Smith, 1595), STC (2nd ed.) 4985. In the valedictory formula of the dedication to his translation of *Hero and Leander*, Chapman defines himself as Inigo Jones' 'Ancient poor friend'; see Musaeus, *The divine poem of Musaeus, First of all books* (London: Isaac Jaggard, 1616), STC (2nd ed.) 18304, A6. See also the dedication of the *Sevean Bookes* to Essex: 'So is poore Learning the inseparable Genius of the Homericall writing I intend', *Seaven bookes of the Iliades of Homere, prince of poets, translated according to the Greeke, in judgement of his best commentaries by George Chapman Gent.* (London: John Windet, 1598), STC (2nd ed.) 13632, A3ᵛ.

[42] Christopher Marlowe and George Chapman, *Hero and Leander: begun by Christopher Marloe; and finished by George Chapman* (London: Paul Linley, 1598), STC (2nd ed.) 17414, E4ʳ.

In *Hero and Leander*, Marlowe built a paradoxical form of authority by emulating Ovid's own authorial strategy, rewriting myth and epic poetry into new forms which both claimed kinship with their originals and distance from them. Leading the readers to identify him with his over-Ovidian narrator only to frustrate their expectations, Marlowe playfully flaunted his classical erudition.

The image of Marlowe as a man and as an author that emerged after his death is a mixed one: a Cambridge 'scholar,' he was also accused of 'atheism' and 'Epicurism,' an accusation that threatened to taint his poetic output as well as his reputation. Ovid's life and works became inseparable with his exile at Tomis; Marlowe's death and his poem became inseparable with the circulation of *Hero and Leander* among his friends. Marlowe is thus made an author by fellow-poets who launch a collective rescue operation in order to save the poet and his poetry from condemnation and then oblivion. In the process, 'Marlowe' is used for marketing purposes by poets intent on affirming their own identity and authority. He becomes the symbol of a community of men linked as much by solidarity as by rivalry: quoting from *Hero and Leander* before publication means being in the know. As his sequel clearly indicates, Henry Petowe was certainly not part of that coterie, that community of poets who were reliable sources of authority on Marlowe's works, but also his life. Chapman was. It took a poet with a keen understanding of and deep sympathy for Marlowe to rewrite *Hero and Leander* the way Chapman did.