ГУЛИСТОН ДАВЛАТ УНИВЕРСИТЕТИ

Инглиз тили ва адабиёти кафедраси

Comparison of Goethe's and Christopher Marlowe's tragedy "Doctor Faustus"

Mamatkulova Gulhayo

CONTENTS

Introduction

The spiritual change and enhancement of mankind is possible only through literature. It is the guardian of culture and traditions. Literature familiarizes us to new worlds of ideas and novel inner experience. As the President of our republic said: “Literature, the art of words for a long period has been considered as an expresser of people’s soul expresser of truth and fairness”[1]. We acquaint ourselves with books and literature of all ages and times and enjoy the literary essence in these works. Marlowe’s Dr. Faustus and Goethe’s Faust can be regarded as an example of above mentioned qualities of literature.

This qualification work is devoted to compare and contrast Christopher Marlowe's Doctor Faustus and Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's Faust, using biographical and historical information to show external influences on each work.
When the Renaissance came to northern Europe, Faust was made into a symbol of free thought, anti-clericalism, and opposition to Church dogma. The first important literary treatment of the legend was that of the English dramatist, Christopher Marlowe.

Marlowe's Tragical History of Doctor Faustus (1588, now usually referred to as Doctor Faustus) was the forerunner of all later English tragedies and had a revolutionary effect on the development of dramatic art. It is still renowned for its exciting theatricality, its beautiful blank verse, and its moving portrayal of a human soul in despair because he cannot accept God and so is condemned to damnation.

Marlowe used the English translation of the 1587 Faust-Book as his main source, but transformed the legendary magician into a figure of tragic stature and made his story a powerful expression of the main issues of Elizabethan thought. As in the earlier versions, Marlowe's Faustus signs a pact with the devil which consigns his soul to hell in return for 24 years of unlimited power and pleasure. Up to the moment of his death, however, this Faustus is free to resist his seduction by the forces of evil, despite having signed the pact. In the final scenes Faustus

[1] Каримов И.А. Юксак маънавият енгилмас куч. – Т., Маънавият. 2010. – 165 б.

becomes terrified by the thought of his impending damnation and desperately wants to save himself, but his faith in God's merciful love is not strong enough and he cannot repent. After a painful struggle with himself, Faustus is carried off by the devil at the end of the play.

In addition to the difference in the fate of the protagonist, Marlowe's drama varies from Goethe's in other significant ways. At the outset Faustus does not invoke the devil because of moral or philosophical alienation, as does Faust, but only from a crass desire for power, and in his adventures afterward there is little effort made to explore the many kinds of human experience and ways to personal fulfillment that are examined in Goethe's poem. Both characters are torn by conflicts within their own souls, but Faustus is trying to believe in God, while Faust seeks a way to believe in himself. Finally, the theology and morality of Marlowe's play is that of traditional Christianity. In Faust Goethe tends to use orthodox religion only as a source of imagery. He tells his story in the context of an abstract pantheistic religious system and a fluid moral code that gives precedence to motives and circumstances rather than deeds as such.

Topicality of the research. This theme has always been an important one in western literature, but it has gained in urgency during our own century. Each generation must explore anew the problems of human estrangement and fulfillment — the best way to begin such a search is to see what the past has to offer. Goethe's and Marlowe’s vision may not provide the perfect answer, but they have been source of inspiration to many readers for more than a hundred years and reflects the thoughts and experiences of the most active and gifted minds of England and Germany. That makes the research topical.

The aim of the research is to compare and contrast Christopher Marlowe's Doctor Faustus and Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's Faust, using biographical and historical information to show external influences on each work

The following **tasks of the research** were set before the research:

- to study Faustian theme in European Literature

- to study The Reformation context of the original Faust legend
- to study other Faust figures in Western Europe Literature
- to study Christopher Marlowe's and Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's literary activity.
- to analyze Marlowe's Doctor Faustus and Goethe's Faust
- to investigate human spirituality in Goethe's Faust and Marlowe's Dr.Faustus
- to investigate the puritan ethic in Marlowe's Dr. Faustus and Goethe's Faust

Scientific scrutiny of the research. In doing the research the works of Western and Eastern scientists and literary critics were main source of our research. Among the most valuable and prominent works we may consider Lunney Ruth's book: "Marlowe and the Popular Tradition: Innovation in the English Drama before 1595" where the author wrote about the important role of Marlowe in contributing to drama. Robertson John George's "A History of German Literature" is one of the scientific research works where we can find lots of valuable information on the history of German literature as well as on Goethe and his role in not only German literature but also in world literature.

Novelty of the research is in studying the Faustian theme in the western literature and thoroughly analysis of the two dramas. New information in plot similarities and contrast is given in the work

Objects of the research are Christopher Marlowe's "Doctor Faustus" and Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's "Faust".

Subject of the research is Faustian theme in the Western European Literature.

Scientific value of the research is scientific comparison of Marlowe's and Goethe's tragedies.

The Structure of the paper. Compositional structure of my work consists of four major parts – Introduction, Main part, Conclusion, and Bibliography. The brief content of each part is to be presented for your attention. Introduction gives

some brief characteristics of the work, its aims and goals, problems and value. The main part is divided into two chapters. Each chapter reveals the concrete problem. The qualification work contains the bibliography, which mentions the list of literature used in the frame of our work.

Methods of Investigation. During writing our work we used methods of literature analysis, descriptive, comparative methods and the translational method in working with the literature.

Chapter I. The Image of Faust in Literature

1.1. Faustian theme in European Literature

The Faust motif provides an opportunity to explore the spectrum of attitudes among Christians towards science and technology by placing them into a historic context. Depending on one's understanding of the relationship of God and the world, the accomplishments of a Leonardo, a Paracelsus, a Faust, an Oppenheimer, or some future scientist, credited with the "production" of the first successfully cloned human being, can be interpreted as divine or diabolic in origin. The example of Faust is used to demonstrate that the Christian assessment of the scientific enterprise is closely correlated to the level of doctrinaire dualism informing the particular version of Christianity that inspires the assessment. I will show that contrary to what seems intuitively obvious, Faust's damnation originated not in medieval times but in early modern northern Europe, reflecting a dualistic obsession with human sinfulness more characteristic of Reformation Germany than of Renaissance Italy. Encouraged by hellfire-and- brimstone preachers, the common folk saw demons, devils, and witches in every dark corner while Humanist scholars sought to recapture the brilliant past of the Greeks and the Romans. Goethe's interpretation represents a return to earlier versions of the story while some continue to accuse contemporary Faustians of Satanic connections for seeking forbidden knowledge and daring to play God by manipulating the stuff of life.

These were two opposed interpretations of the Faustian theme in 16th century Europe. Consider the diametrically opposed ways Leonardo da Vinci and his younger contemporary Georg (subsequently called Johann) Faust were assessed by their respective biographers after their deaths. Both were viewed as possessing gifts and powers that far exceeded the abilities of ordinary mortals. The source of those unique gifts and powers, however, was seen as God in the case of Leonardo, and Satan in the case of Faust.

The Italian Giorgio Vasari (1511-1574) considered Leonardo (1452-1519) uniquely favored by God: “The greatest gifts are often seen, in the course of nature, rained by celestial influences on human creatures; and sometimes, in supernatural fashion, beauty, grace, and talent are united beyond measure in one single person, in a manner that to whatever such an one turns his attention, his every action is so divine, that, surpassing all other men, it makes itself clearly known as a thing bestowed by God (as it is), and not acquired by human art[1]. Vasari originally wrote his the “Life of Leonardo Da Vinci: Painter and Sculptor of Florence” in 1550, some three decades after Leonardo had died and Luther had started the Reformation north of the Alps. A revised edition was published in1567.

On the other hand, the German Faust was accused by his biographers of owing his gifts not to God but to the devil. The difference, I believe, can at least be partially traced to the radically different world-views found in Catholic Renaissance Italy and Protestant Reformation Germany. Along similar lines, historian Crane Brinton distinguished between what he called “spare” humanists in northern Europe and “exuberant” humanists in the South[2]. Despite the “Holy Office” and official condemnation of nascent science by the Magisterium, Renaissance artists and thinkers tended to focus on the Incarnation as sign of God’s presence in the world while Lutherans and other Protestants tended to focus on original sin as a sign of Satan’s power in the world. Both of these perspectives had been present from the beginning of Christianity but became more extreme and polarized during the Reformation period.

Incarnational thinking inspired theologians of the High Middle Ages, such as Thomas Aquinas, and especially the humanists of the Italian Renaissance. St. Thomas, for example, saw no conflict between reason and faith, and spent his life attempting to help others make sense of Catholic doctrines and justify those doctrines in terms of the cultural paradigms and conceptual vocabulary of his era

[1] www.fordham.edu/
[2] Brinton Crane. The Shaping of Modern Thought. – Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. 1993. – p. 35.

(in which Christians and Muslims had begun to exchange ideas) which included the understanding of Greek philosophers (especially Aristotle) filtered through the lens of Arabic thought. Thomas believed in an orderly cosmos whose structure reflected the rationality of God's mind. Human beings, as created in the image of God, were naturally endowed with an intellect capable of making moral judgments which intuitively manifested rational norms. He also argued that we could know aspects of divine nature by observing the world. This principle is called "analogia entis" – analogy of being.

1.2. The Reformation context of the original Faust legend

The Faust legend first crystallized in the sixteenth century, an era of exploding scientific knowledge, polarization of good and evil, shifting paradigms, the fragmentation of Christian unity, the dying of the medieval world, and geometrically escalating uncertainty. Yeats sings of the falcon no longer hearing the falconer early in the twentieth century, but it is five centuries earlier that the chasm had first opened.

In late fourteenth century Prague, Jan Hus (1372/73-1415) discovered the writings of the English reformer John Wycliffe who argued, among other things, that an evil authority ceases to be a legitimate authority. In 1401 Hus began to teach philosophy at Charles University, lecturing on Aristotle and Wycliff's theology. Hus was later appointed the rector of Bethlehem Chapel, where he preached in Czech rather than Latin and in his homilies attacked the feudal lords for exploiting the people, and the Church for what he considered un-Christlike greed and clerical immorality. This was the period of the so-called Great Schism of three popes reigning simultaneously, and in 1412, Pope John XXIII, one of the popes, placed Prague under interdict because of Hus' heretical teachings. Hus traveled to Germany to defend himself at the Council of Constance (1414-1418), a synod called primarily to bring an end to the schism involving popes Gregory XII, Benedict XIII, and John XXIII. Eventually all three popes were deposed or

resigned and Martin V was elected in 1417. However, before the schism had been settled, Hus – who had been promised safe conduct – was arrested, condemned of heresy, and burned at the stake on July 6, 1415 (I visited the place of his execution about 15 years ago. It was covered with gifts of flowers.). While the stable foundations of Christianity seemed to crumble, Copernicus (1473-1543) was challenging the common-sense earth-centered Aristotelian-Ptolemaic cosmology, and the earth was demoted from its cherished central position, adding to confusion and uncertainty (Nicolas of Cusa's earlier similar teachings had not been publicized). Good Christians (such as the popes and Martin Luther [1483-1546]), considered Copernicus a heretic and a fool, but change was in the air, and natural philosophy came to be viewed both as threat and promise.

The brilliant alchemist and physician Theophrastus Bombastus von Hohenheim, born Philippus Aureolus, and eventually known as Paracelsus (1493-1541) attempted to apply scientific principles to medicine and what we now call pharmacology. From a pragmatic perspective, Macchiavelli (1469-1527) invented the field of political science as he turned cunning deceit and mass manipulation into a legitimate means for attaining political success. In the early 16th century the Reformers North of the Alps succeeded in focusing theological attention on human corruption and original sin. Alchemists, herbalists, necromancers, and astrologers were laying the foundations for the sciences of chemistry, biology, physics, and astronomy, at exactly the time when their activities would become suspect first among Protestants and then among Catholics who did not wish to appear less pious than the heretics. Encouraged by hell-fire-and-brimstone preachers, the common folk saw demons, devils, and witches in every dark corner while Humanist scholars sought to recapture the brilliant past of the Greeks and the Romans. The authoritative text on witches and witch hunts, the "Malleus Maleficarum" (1486) went through twenty-nine editions during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. While the term would not be used for three hundred years, the plague of alienation was turning into a rapidly spreading epidemic.

The earliest record we have of the historical Faust's existence is a letter Johannes Trithemius of Sponheim (1462-1516) wrote on 20. August 1507 to the court mathematician-astrologer Johann Wirdung of Hassfurt. Trithemius called Faust a glib con-man and drifter who beguiled a gullible public for glory and profit and should be whipped for blasphemy. Since he mentioned that Franz von Sickingen had recommended Faust for a teaching position in Kreuznach[1] we assume that Faust was at least 25 and probably around 30 years old at the time. No exploits by Faust were mentioned by his contemporaries after 1539. Within a couple of decades folk tales about his life began to circulate and the Faust character became a collage of numerous historical and legendary personalities. The character became the focus of the 16th century equivalent of contemporary urban legends that circulate through the Internet. Several fragmentary manuscripts exist. The first printed version is Johann Spies' 1587 Faust Book.

A comparison of the Faust Buchwith earlier stories of scholars who sought privileged knowledge and control over nature by entering a pact with the devil indicates that the notion of sending such individuals to hell played a subordinate role in medieval thought, but started to run amok during the Reformation. Gerald Strauss points out that the printer-publisher Johann Spies belonged to a rigorously conservative branch of Lutheranism that was violently opposed not only to Catholics but both Calvinists and Melanchthon's moderate reformers[2]. Except for the Faust book, Spies published only sermons, tomes on theology and law, and spiritual advice. Strauss argues that the Faust Book was no “potboiler to bring in money for printing more low-profit theology and jurisprudence,” bur Spies' “instrument in his beleaguered fellow Lutherans' reformist assault on folk occultism . . .”, of course, dressed up with mass appeal.

[1] Palmer Philip Mason and Robert Pattison More. The Sources of the Faust Tradition from Simon Magus to Lessing. – New York, Oxford University Press. 1996. – pp. 82-86.
[2] Strauss Gerald. How to Read a Volksbuch: the Faust Book of 1567. Peter Boerner and Sidney Johnson, eds. Faust through Four Centuries: Retrospect and Analysis. – Tübingen, Niemeyer. 1999. – pp. 32-33.

The Reformation plunged Northern and Western Europe into a period of intense preoccupation with Satan, a preoccupation that Strauss argues did not begin with the masses but represents a deliberate attempt by the educated to manipulate public opinion. The devil's craze was spread to the people by preachers, popular stories, the Inquisition, and witch trials and spawned an entirely new genre of writing, the immensely popular Teufelsbücher (devil's books). Strauss notes that focusing on the devil's pervasive presence in the world had practical advantages to would-be culture shapers. Seeing Satan lurking beneath the most trivial, everyday choices allowed "early modern opinion makers to brand every infraction as, literally, devilish." Polarizing reality into simple blacks and whites would help eradicate "the sprawling network of cunning folk, spell-casters, and fortune-tellers" of what amounted to "an alternative religion, and to bond them firmly to the elite-determined obligation of church, court, doctrine, parish, law book, and catechism"[1].

Strauss fails to acknowledge an essential historic factor, however. Until the Reformation, most of what he calls "alternative religion" had been tacitly integrated into popular Catholicism, and medieval Faust prototypes are generally saved despite a pact with the devil, as I will discuss more fully in the following section of this essay. In this perspective, the "happy ending" of Goethe's Faust represents a rejection of the Protestant emphasis on original sin and Paternal Wrath in favor of the Catholic emphasis on original blessedness and Maternal Love. Eliza Marian Butler notes concerning the ending of Goethe's Faust: "Happily for Faust and for Goethe there were many precedents for the eleventh-hour salvation of repentant black magicians. There was Cyprian, there was Theophilus, There was Pope Sylvester II, there was Militarius, there was Robert the Devil, there was Roger Bacon. And now at long last Doctor Faustus joined this happy band of sinners; and he joined them naturally and logically under the Catholic dispensation

[1] Strauss Gerald. How to Read a Volksbuch: the Faust Book of 1567. Peter Boerner and Sidney Johnson, eds. Faust through Four Centuries: Retrospect and Analysis. – Tübingen, Niemeyer. 1999. – p. 32

under which they had all obtained pardon and grace, whereas he had been damned under the Lutheran persuasion… But it was not only because of the great opportunities for poetry and grace offered by Catholic angeology that the last scene in the poem took place where and how it did. It was because the Faust legend went down fighting, defying even Goethe to revoke its decrees on its own religious ground. He gave ground gracefully and reverted to an older and more merciful tradition, transforming the utter spiritual defeat of a mortally misguided man into grace abounding for the striving soul of humanity."[1]

Karl Theens, citing Alexander Tille, makes a similar point when he distinguishes between the portrayal of the Faust character on the stages of Southern Catholic Germany and of the Lutheran North. In Catholic regions, apart from cosmetic changes, such as having Mephistophiles not appear in a monk's habit and leaving out Faust's visit to a venal Pope at his Vatican palace, there is the far more significant shift toward at least the genuine possibility of salvation. Theens argues that Calderón's (1600-1681) drama with its Catholic vision became the catalyst for Faust's salvation. I suspect that Calderón's play is merely a symptom of the persistence of the pre-Reformation spirit that had produced Butler's above-mentioned "happy band of sinners" who had all obtained pardon and grace under the Catholic dispensation. Theens also points to 17th and 18th century versions of the puppet play in Catholic areas in which Faust seems to keep the upper hand over the devil by insisting that Mephistophiles make a crucifix. When the devil finds it impossible to attach the inscription "I.N.R.I." Faust has the chance to escape the pact's conditions.

1.3. Other Faust figures in Western Europe Literature

The Spies book describes Faust as a man who wants to explore the heights and depths of heaven and earth, and decides to conjure up the devil to help him. Thus he acquires a familiar, Mephostophiles, who promises to answer all of Faust's

[1] Butler Eliza Marian. The Fortunes of Faust. London, Cambridge University Press. 2002. p 265

questions and fulfill all his desires for twenty-four years in exchange for his soul. Faust signs the contract in blood, and proceeds to crisscross the land as traveling philosopher, physician, surgeon, lecturer, entertainer, magician, astronomer, astrologer, clairvoyant, and so forth. Mephostophiles takes him on several major excursions--all across Europe, beyond the clouds to the stars, and through hell. The demon answers Faust's questions concerning the origin and destiny of the universe and helps him perform such feats as building a castle in the mountains, flying, re-attaching severed body parts, growing flowers and grapes in mid winter, and siring a son with Helen of Troy. Toward the end of the twenty-four years, Faust appoints his apprentice, Wagner, as his heir, and, on the final day of his life, accompanies a group of students to aninn in the vicinity of Wittenberg where the devil tears him to pieces and leaves the horribly mutilated corpse, limbs still twitching, on the dung heap.

There are many legends of satanic pacts that may be forerunners to the Faust story. We will recount only three in some detail, to provide the flavor of these legends. The first man on record to enter a pact with the devil in the Christian era was the servant of Senator Proterius of Caesarea who engaged Satan's help in order to gain his master's comely daughter in marriage. According to the fourth century legend, his soul was saved through the prayer of St. Basil.

Possibly the most famous of all ancient progenitors of Faust is Theophilus who was said to have entered a pact with the devil because of thwarted ambition. He, too, escaped Satan's claws.

According to legend, Theophilus administered the episcopal church of Adana in Cilicia during the 6th century. When the bishop died, he was offered the position but turned the offer down because he did not feel qualified. The next bishop fired Theophilus. In order to get his old position back, Theophilus entered a pact with the devil and publicly renounced allegiance to Jesus and the Virgin. The machinations worked, and he was reinstated. He turned into an arrogant, cold, and obnoxious boss. After a while herecognized his error and repented. He fasted and

prayed for forty days and nights. Mary took pity on him, and eventually even Jesus forgave him. Mary retrieved Theophylus' I.O.U. from Satan, and put it in Theophilus' lap as he slept. When he awoke, he loudly proclaimed his guilt, and praised the Virgin for her loving assistance. He died peacefully three days later. There are countless versions of this legend, particularly after Paulus Diaconus of Naples translated the story into the lingua franca--Latin. One of the most important renderings is that of Hrotswitha of Gandersheim in the tenth century. By the fifteenth century, the legend had spawned miracle plays across Europe, in France, the Netherlands, and in northern Germany. After the 16th century it disappeared, swallowed up by the Reformation and the more recent Faust legend.

Finally, there is the French Benedictine monk Gerbert (ca. 955-1003), a brilliant mathematician, musician, and astronomer, who reached prominence as Pope Sylvester II. Gerbert had studied in Spain, introduced Arabic mathematics and the abacus to Christian Europe, and was considered a powerful magician. In a 13th century manuscript his encounter with the devil is reported to include the following promise by Satan Aye, he said, if you yield to us, see, we will make sure that no one is more learned than.

Until we began to research this topic, we had accepted the superficially appealing interpretation that Faust's damnation was a function of medieval thinking while Lessing's and Goethe's salvation of Faust reflects post-Enlightenment respect for humanism and rationality. Anyone who reads surveys of German literature can find countless statements to the effect that Gotthold Ephraim Lessing (1729-1781) in the 18th century was the first to “save Faust.” Reality is far more complex. Most of those depicted as having entered a pact with the devil are ultimately saved rather than damned. In addition, the pact with the devil is related not only or even primarily to gratification of physical desires. Instead, humans seek access to “secret” knowledge through the devil, and generally that knowledge falls into the category we now would consider scientific.

These legends show that people's view of the devil (and science) during the Middle Ages was inconsistent. Theoretically, invoking the Lord in the process of calling up Satan was considered a sin. On the other hand, it was common knowledge that demons could be called forth in the name of God. If the ritual was performed properly, they would have to do the conjurer's bidding. After all, light was more powerful than darkness, and to bind the devil or his servants in Jesus' name could even be interpreted as an act of faith. Hence, there seemed no reason not to make use of Satan's special powers temporarily, for a few months or even several years, as long as one made sure to repent or recant in time. It was a gamble, but one with reasonably good odds. God's grace was considered unlimited, and there were insurance policies ranging from intercessionary prayers to special masses and indulgences! In this view, Faust's damnation was not as much a function of the medieval mindset as the result of the breakup of the Christian world that emphasized sinfulness and encouraged polarization of reality into stark black and white extremes.

Late medieval traditions evolved the human archetype whose dissatisfaction with the limitations of life leads to a pact with the devil in order to use demonic powers for advancing the spectrum of earthly existence from erotic passion and physical comfort to scientific knowledge and philosophic wisdom. As Helmut Wiemken notes in his introduction to a 1961 edition of the chap books of Dr. Faustus and Wagner, “the idea of a pact with the devil could never have arisen in a context other than the Christian understanding of life after death” with the devil, God's adversary and Lord of hell who had crystallized during the Middle Ages out of Jewish conceptions of Lucifer, mingled with northern images of personified darkness and evil. By the time of Luther, the devil was sufficiently “real” that the Reformer threw an inkwell at him! The reformers had certainly forced the devil out of the closet.

Christopher Marlowe (1564-1593), a man who had himself been accused of atheism, was fascinated by the Faust theme. He was a member of a group of young

writers, the “University Wits,” who left the sheltered academic environment in order to live by their wits--and pens. Ian Watt calls them “restless, Bohemian, unsatisfied, and scornful--angry young men who found no satisfactory vocational position, and who . . . (except for one) died young”[1].

In many ways the character of Faust paralleled Marlowe's. His Faust is a symbol of humanity face to face with the terrible possibilities of a future no longer grounded in medieval assurances. His Faust is eternally damned for simply being a man in search of himself. He, too, is a physician, and a good physician, but his art does not suffice. His prescriptions may have saved entire cities from the plague, but can still neither give eternal life nor raise the dead: “You art still but Faustus and a man” -finite, limited man, yet capable of rational thought. That reason, however, drives him to despair. He reads “the reward of sin is death” in Scripture, but also that anyone claiming to be sinless is a liar, a sinner. Either way, it seems, we are already condemned to spiritual death, so why not sin exquisitely? He consciously chooses to become his own God: “A sound magician is a demi-god”. Like the Faust of the Spies book, he travels to space:

Doctor Faustus is a tragic figure, destroyed by the very impulse that constitutes his genius. Marlowe's God is a petty tyrant, small and spiteful, who resents having to watch Faust-Adam eat of the tree of knowledge once again, egged on by the eternal serpent in the form of the “Bad Angel.” Faust cries out, “O Christ, my Savior, my Savior, Help to save distressèd Faustus' soul.” But instead of Christ, the unholy trinity of Lucifer, Belzebub (Beelzenbub), and Mephistophilis enter, and Lucifer informs him, “Christ cannot save thy soul, for he is just”. Faust's doom is far less his own doing than the result of divine jealousy. Faust's acknowledgment that “I gave them [Lucifer and Mephistophilis] my soul for my cunning”, leads to his last words: “Ugly hell, gape not! Come not, Lucifer! I'll burn

[1] Watt Ian. Faust as Myth of Modern Individualism. Faust through Four Centuries: Retrospect and Analysis. – Niemeyer, 2001. – p. 44.

my books! Ah, Mephistophilis!"; emphasis mine) Thus, he makes his exit right into the gaping jaws of a mystery-play hell mouth.

Marlowe's Faust is a tortured man, like Pascal aware of the abyss between the infinite and the finite, but unlike Pascal, not sustained by faith. Necromancy becomes his key to selfactualization. Part of him desperately wants to believe while another part is equally devoted to atheistic materialism. He vacillates between assurance and uncertainty, arrogance and anxiety. In many ways he is a contemporary "existential" hero, called upon to choose himself again and again. He has wagered eternal life in an attempt to gain knowledge of the mysteries of the universe, but instead, his demonic servant-master only offers sense gratification.

Calderón de la Barca. The legend of Cyprian inspired Calderón's El mágico prodigoso. The connection with Faust is deliberate, since Calderón had originally intended to call his heroine Faustina. When the action begins, Cyprian is a virtuous pagan in search of the truth. The devil cleverly deceives him by telling him part of the truth but not all of the truth. The play has a double message. On the surface it appears to demonstrate the dangers of seeking knowledge and love, since both can lead us astray. The search for knowledge ends with uncertainty as we confront illusion, and the Platonic inspiration of Love through beauty is equally transient. The devil conjures up Justina's image for Cyprian, only to have her lovely form turn into a corpse. On the other hand, Justina was originally born from a dead mother and herself represents the mystery of life springing from death. The devil tempts Cyprian with Justina in order to trick him into signing the contract. In the end it is the devil who is tricked, because Justina becomes Cyprian's path toward the knowledge of Christ. I am tempted to cite Goethe out of chronological sequence: Calderón's devil seems "part of that power that wants to create evil and must create good"! Cyprian finds Shafer Faust salvation precisely because he questioned, doubted, used his mind. After Cyprian and Justina have suffered

martyrdom, the devil is the one who must clear their name and announce publicly that both have gloriously ascended to heaven.[1]

Gotthold Ephraim Lessing. For Gotthold Ephraim Lessing (1729-1781), Faust represented enlightened humanity while transcending the narrow confines of cold rationalism. In his famous seventeenth Literaturbrief (1759) he includes a Faust fragment, "Faust and the Seven Spirits," and elaborates on the Faust theme, pointing out how fond the German people are of "their" Faust and arguing forcefully that God could not possibly have provided humanity with a passion for knowledge, the most noble of instincts, merely to cause him eternal misery. Lessing's God is the God of the Enlightenment, no longer a tribal tyrant or a feudal lord, but insteadthe ultimate law-giver of the orderly Newtonian world. Unfortunately Lessing's Faust was never completed. Nevertheless, the intent is clear: Faust would be saved in the end[2].

Johann Wolfgang v. Goethe. Johann Wolfgang v. Goethe (1749-1832) spent most of his long life giving shape to his Faust, his vision of and for humanity. Again, but more powerfully so, Faust is motivated by the passion to know, to comprehend the inner working of the cosmos. Like his forerunners, he is frustrated by the limitations inherent in all finite pursuits, even (or particularly) those involving learning. For Goethe this striving is not a sin, neither the hubris of the Greeks nor the pride of St. Paul. It is that which constitutes the essential human character, that which makes human beings human. Like Hegel, Goethe realizes that humanity must have eaten of the tree of knowledge to attain full human status. Faust is a true hero. He is in control. He knows himself and his potential. He determines the terms of the contract, and he is certain that the pact is one he can keep. If he should fail to abide by its conditions, he deserves to go to hell. Genuine knowledge proceeds along a path of negation, criticism. Mephistopheles is symbolic of negation, not God's enemy, but rather "part of the power that eternally

[1] Brown Jane K. The Prosperous Wonder Worker: Faust in the Renaissance." Faust through Four Centuries: Retrospect and Analysis. – Niemeyer. 1999 – p. 57-58.
[2] Bates Paul. Faust: Sources, Works, Criticism. – New York, Harcourt. 1999. – p. 80.

wills the evil and must create the good". The "forever nay-saying spirit" (1338), encourages human inquiry, action, progress. While Faust curses scholarship, glory, beauty, possessions, love, hope, faith, etc., he never actually curses God. "The good human being in his dark striving is always conscious of the just path". Mephistopheles is duped by his limited understanding of Faust. He thinks of the pact in traditional terms and agrees to the conditions without realizing that Faust chose the terms of the contract with utmost care.

> If I should ever rest contentedly on an idler's bed
> Then I be done for right then and there!
> If you can ever deceive me by your flattery
> into being pleased with myself,
> If you can ever trick me with physical delights,
> then this be my final day!
> That is my wager!
> If to the moment I should say:
> Remain! You are so fair!
> Then you may put me into chains,
> Then I shall gladly be doomed! (1699-1702)

Faust uses Mephistopheles for his purposes. He knows that he cannot be beguiled by him, that in order to become himself, to realize himself, he must pass through the stages of sense experience as well as those of understanding. As in Hegel's Phenomenology, and possibly anticipating Teilhard de Chardin's movement from Alpha to Omega, the action of the drama rises in an expanding spiral, tracing human evolution from the immanent, immediate, individual consciousness through the emergent social horizons of the human community to an ultimate merging with the absolute spirit, God.

Part One of "Faust" takes place in the small world of individuals relating to other individuals while coming to terms with instincts and passions. Faust learns and develops, but the cost is high--Gretchen, her brother, mother and newborn

child, all dead. Part Two takes place in the large world of political intrigue, war, economics, scientific and technological development andsocial activism. The European present merges with the Greek past in the symbolic marriage of Faust and Helena. Nature and Spirit fuse and from their union springs Euphorion, brilliant son of Faust and Helena who like Icarus (and Marlowe's Doctor Faustus) falls to his death from the dizzy heights. Prophetically, Goethe introduces lemures (robots?) and homunculus (the result of genetic engineering?). He seems to have an intuitive awareness of the terrible potential of technology wedded to fanaticism without a heart. Philemon and Baucis, symbols of innocence and simplicity are the final victims of Faust's "self-actualization"--killed by the heartless, mechanical wheels of "progress." Still, in the end, Faust prevails. He is at once saved and saves himself in a double movement of descending grace and ascending striving by wedding love for humanity to scientific rationality. When the moment of satisfaction finally arrives, it is a moment of altruistic concern, of a vision of a future world populated by a free people engaged in fruitful labor, realizing themselves.

1.4. A contemporary Faust in popular fiction

With Andrew Greeley's (1928-) "Angel Firewe" return almost full circle to the kind of literature represented by the popular Faust books of the 16th and 17th centuries, and even farther back to the early legends of the Catholic tradition that tended to blend the spheres of ordinary people, angels, and saints, all within the context of a particular historic moment. Like the Spies book, "Angel Fire" tricks readers into pondering serious issues while being entertained (though Spies' "entertainment" was the sadistic joy some people feel at the other guy's misfortune). In many ways, the future of humankind depends on the moral and intellectual courage of those who affect the minds of the young (and not so young) at home, in the classroom, from the pulpit, through books, films, and television. We have already seen what happens when single-minded doctrinal rigidity is

allowed to split God's creation into a cosmic war zone. The term self-fulfilling prophecy applies not only to individuals but to humanity as a whole. If we abandon hope, we shall indeed find ourselves in Dante's icy pit of nuclear winter and frozen hearts. If we dare hope, on the other hand, if we don't allow ourselves to be paralyzed either by fear of the devil or by cynical spectatorship, there is no reason why the world of the future cannot be inhabited by people who use technology for the good of the earth and humanity--men and women who have made what Sean Desmond of Andrew Greeley's Angel Fire, calls the “small leap toward more cooperation between peoples and nations,” adding, “Otherwise we won't be around for the next really big leap”.

Like the Spies book, almost exactly 400 years earlier, Greeley's 1988 novel is a sermon in story form, but with a message almost diametrically opposed to that of the solemn, pious, conservative Lutheran. Greeley's message is one of a God whose grace works through nature, science, surprise, and creative play; a God who accepts the world and wants us to accept it. The book jacket hints at the difference: “Pursued by a very real and present danger into a Europe still haunted by specters of pure evil, Sean Desmond will question his own sanity and his deepest beliefs, as he experiences what cannot be rationalized away as anything other than a powerful, radiant, transcendent love . . . one that will test Sean Desmond too long afraid of the human and divine fires within himself.” Father Greeley, the Catholic priest, is clearly intent on having his readers focus on the sacramentality of the world, including the potential for good of science. In fact, Greeley's Satanic figures all represent aspects of rigidity--religious and/or ideological dogmatism and dualism. They are evil precisely because they are not open to transformation.

Professor Sean S. Desmond, an evolutionary biologist and a Nobel laureate, is a Faustian blend of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin and Teilhard’s severe critic Stephen J. Gould. In his fictional evolutionary theories, Sean fuses the “punctuated equilibrium” of the latter with the former's quantum jumps of consciousness fueled by love. Love, according to both Teilhard and Greeley, is the primal, universal

psychic energy. Angel Fireis a modern Faustian bestseller with a twist: Sean's other-worldly companion is not a demon but the archangel Gabriel in feminine form, Dr. Gabriella Light, who turns out to be the grieving widow of the unfairly deposed Lucifer. It is a story that reworks the medieval themes within the context of the very cutting edge of contemporary natural science, and does so from an openly Catholic perspective with deliberate forays into theological speculation. Like their ancestors, this contemporary Faust and his powerful assistant travel and teach. Much of the journeying is done by air. Sean is almost murdered by a Christian fanatic who accuses Sean of being possessed by Satan (83) and in an earlier age would have applauded the Spies volume. Like the sixteenth century progenitor, Ms. Light is a whiz at conjuring up delicious meals and unlimited amounts of money. Sean and Gaby do a great deal of talking; their latter day disputations revolve around current hypotheses of quantum physics and ultimate reality.

Through Gabriella, Greeley suggests to us that we take life too seriously and need to learn to be more playful. “'One of the more difficult aspects of working on this planet is that your species is disinclined to play, even as much as its limitations permit. It is a specially burdensome trait' – she jabbed her finger at him – ‘in creatures like you who have strong play propensities'”[1].

She describes herself and her race as “messengers, secret agents, overseers, . . . explorers of beauty and goodness, companions on pilgrimage, . . .”. The purpose of angels is to enjoy, observe, and sustain patterns of beauty and goodness. “'We could not live,'“ she adds, “and I mean that literally, unless we did so. We are beauty hungry creatures'”. Angels are not limited to the speed of light. Their communication is over distance and instantaneous. Toward the end of the book Gabriella reveals herself as mistress of the most fundamental powers of nature, significantly for the Faust connection near the city of Leipzig, by now a standard haunt of Faust characters. She transforms herself into a nuclear reaction, “From the

[1] Greeley Andrew M. Angel Fire. – New York, Warner Books. 1998 – p. 220.

absolute center of the haunted castle, a broad pillar of white light leaped into the sky, up and down, several times, dazzling, swirling, implacable light, glowing like molten plasma and turning the night into a blinding daylight. . . . Angel fire! Seraph fire! . . . A seraph, a being on fire with love, and now with love driven by anger. There was a mighty explosion, a fireball like a hydrogen bomb, brighter than a thousand suns". Gaby had destroyed the "Evil Magician's" empire, a Nazi-like scientific institute where scientific research was in the service of planned destruction. In a sense, "Good Faust" archetypes, Sean and Gaby annihilate (at least for the moment) "Evil Faust" archetypes, Dr. Helmstadt ("Helmet City") and his assistant, Frau Lutz. Good and Evil, however, are not defined in terms of not-seeking-knowledge versus seeking-knowledge. Good and Evil are functions of acceptance/refusal of God's Grace (Gaby) and benevolence/brutality of the quest's motivation.

1.5. A Faust by any other name.

Who or what is Faust, the flesh-and-blood 16th century individual turned protean protagonist of legend and story? Is he the abominable necromancer-astrologer-charlatan-quack of one imagination or the admirable scientist-astronomer-philosopher-physician of another? Is he both or is he neither? How did he come to develop into the archetypical figure of western civilization, an evolving compound of Prometheus, Job, Pythagoras, Hippocrates, Simon Magus, Cyprian, Theophilus, Gerbert, Abelard, Nostrodamus, Leonardo, Johann/Georg Faust, Faustus Socinus, Kepler, Paracelsus, Marlowe, Prospero, Newton, Frankenstein, Goethe, Darwin, Marie Curie, Einstein, Oppenheimer, Watson-Crick, Teilhard – all past and present Faust incarnations, some historic figures and other legendary – waiting to be braided into those yet to be born/created. Faust figures will appear periodically as long as human beings continue to question, strive, seek, think, doubt, and challenge authority. No wonder that physics Nobel laureate Stephen

Weinberg refers to himself as “Faust playing with his pentagrams before Mephistopheles arrives.”[1]

As generic type, however, Faust is still very much part of popular culture, even if most contemporary American students don’t recognize the name. We continue to be intrigued by the Faust character as representative of the search for the “good life,” the morality of knowledge, and the religious implications of natural science and technology. This fascination is enhanced by developments in physics and biology--the harnessing-unleashing of nuclear power, the decoding of DNA and the emergent nanotechnology--the very foundations of matter and life, coupled with the information technology revolution and questions concerning the nature of time. According to Wilson Knight, the Faust legend was one of the master myths of Renaissance Europe, and it is also closely related to the Prometheus myth which links Faust both to fire, the divine gift that granted humans mastery over nature, and to origins of human life itself.

As contemporaries concerned with understanding the dynamics of the relationship of the scientific and religious communities we need to understand that the Satan-sniffing mentality is still with us, firmly ensconced in religious extremism that can be found in many guises and contexts. It lies at the basis of the blanket opposition to fetal tissue research and other reproductive technologies, sweeping denunciation of video games, acclaim for creation “science,” censorship of libraries and textbooks, and so forth. A few years ago a woman I had never met sent me a copy of “Awake” and a handwritten note addressed to “Dear Friend” in which she informs me that “Jehovah God is going to destroy the wicked.” In the context of the magazine, the “wicked” are a strange amalgam of rock fans and scientists. The magazine sports a garish cover depicting the black magic of heavy metal and rap music. The anonymous author of the lead article tells the story of a young man who found his Christian life endangered by “a steady diet of heavy

[1] Weinberg Steven. Dreams of a Final Theory: The Search for the Fundamental Laws of Nature. – New York, Pantheon. 1992. – p. 5.

metal and rap". The words sound much like the four hundred year old description of young Faust's corruption in the Spies book. Another article is called "Working 20th-Century 'Magic'" and deals with the role of science and technology in the present world.

The author (again anonymous) cites Einstein's much quoted comment about humankind drifting toward "unparalleled catastrophe" in the wake of the "unleashed power of the atom" without corresponding changes in our "mode of thinking".

In a review of Michael Crichton's Prey, one of Crichton's series of popular novels that seek to warn the world of the dangers of technology, Freeman Dyson cites John Milton's 1644 argument for freedom of the press in support of his own "libertarian" position concerning the issue. Dyson is critical not only of Crichton but the position proposed by the Bill Joy, co-founder and chief scientist at Sun Microsystems, who argued in Wired Magazine that "Our most powerful 21st-century technologies – robotics, genetic engineering, and nanotech – are threatening to make humans an endangered species" and called for a moratorium on such research. Dyson, on the other hand, considers it appropriate to assume "that risks are unavoidable, that no possible course of action or inaction will eliminate risks, and that a prudent course of action must be based on a balancing of risks against benefits and costs. In particular, when any prohibition of dangerous science and technology is contemplated, one of the costs that must be considered is the cost to human freedom." Dyson concludes: "What Milton declared unacceptable was prior censorship, prohibiting books from ever seeing the light of day. Next, Milton comes to the heart of the matter, the difficulty of regulating 'things, uncertainly and yet equally working to good and to evil."[1]

[1] www.nybooks.com

Chapter II. Comparison of Marlowe's Doctor Faustus and Goethe's Faust.

2.1. Doctor Faustus in Marlowe

With his Tragical History of Doctor Faustus Christopher Marlowe resurrected a genre that had been long absent from the English theater. Mystery cycles used biblical characters and situations to relay biblical lessons to a mostly illiterate audience. These performances were staged during holy days. The men of the town would assume different roles in the show and act on moveable stages that were wheeled around the village. The holiday determined the subject of the performance. Each group of performers would perform the same scene throughout the day beginning early in the morning, and after every performance they would move off down the road and perform for a new audience that had just watched a different group perform. Sometimes these skits would form a sequence that would tell a long biblical story with each set of performers depicting a different part of that story.

Later, the morality play would replace the mystery cycle. Morality plays related allegorical, non-biblical stories that were meant to instruct the audience on how to live their lives. They were not limited to canonical texts but were based on theological ideas, and biblical figures were replaced with other more general characters representing such concepts as ambition, vice, and charity. Churches used paid actors instead of the townspeople and clergymen who performed in the mystery cycles, and the plays took place on one stationary stage rather than on moving stages throughout town.

The most popular morality plays depicted the interaction between the "everyman" character, and a specific sin or sometimes the more general character "Vice".[1] Just as in the mystery cycle tradition, the morality play contained didactic elements, the purpose of which was to instruct the audience about the evils of sin

[1] Cole Douglas. Suffering and Evil in the Plays of Christopher Marlowe. – Princeton, Princeton UP. 1962. – p. 241

and the path to righteousness. The everyman figure was either damned through his sin or saved by his repentance[1]. The consequences of sin were explained to the audience more often by means of monologues spoken directly to the audience explaining what the character had done wrong and what would happen as a result of that sin rather than by acting out a plot with a complex narrative sequence of cause and effect.[2]

The morality play was popular in the fifteenth century but had fallen out of favor in the years before Marlowe reexamined the genre. The influences from that tradition on Marlowe's Doctor Faustus are clear: "The supernatural context of Faustus' tragedy, and the central importance of theological concepts of evil and suffering within that context, distinguish it from all other tragedies of the time, and suggest a relationship to the English morality play"[3]. However, the everyman of the morality play becomes an exceptional man in the character of Faustus.

Morality plays used a character embodying a particular sin in order to push the everyman towards that particular sin. The character might be named for the sin, like Avarice or Pride, but could also be named Vice and represent all of the temptations that one could fall into. After facing temptation it was necessary for the everyman to deliberate over his fate with Good and Evil Angels that would try to convince him of what to do. The everyman character, however, was not fully developed. He remained generic; indeed, he had to in order to be able to represent all of the audience members.

In The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus, Marlowe used the motifs of the morality play, but he gave Doctor Faustus an Elizabethan complexity. Realistic human emotions motivate this new substitute for the everyman, and the plot is more developed than that of a morality play. Unlike in a morality play, Faustus' sin now comes from within him. What in a morality play would be depicted as an

---

[1] Lunney Ruth. Marlowe and the Popular Tradition: Innovation in the English Drama before 1595. - Manchester, Manchester UP. 2002. – p 33.
[2] Cole Douglas. Suffering and Evil in the Plays of Christopher Marlowe. – Princeton, Princeton UP. 1992. – p. 241
[3] Cole Douglas. Suffering and Evil in the Plays of Christopher Marlowe. – Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1992. – p. 231

external demon, Faustus now possesses as a part of his character. In morality plays the everyman was not distinguished by any extraordinary abilities or ambitions. The figure of Faustus, on the other hand, is: “Excelling all, whose sweet delight disputes / In heavenly matters of theology”[1]. Faustus is no longer generic, but is defined by his ability and ambition. His striving results in imprudent actions and ultimately damns him[2]. It damns him precisely because the demon is no longer an outside force, but an internal sin for which Faustus is responsible but for which he does not, or cannot, repent. Why he cannot repent is central to his character and the reason why he is damned.

What modern thinkers would consider to be “striving” or “ambition” was depicted as the vice of great pride or “self-conceit” in the character of Faustus, making the connection between the Renaissance play and the earlier morality plays clear: “Till, swollen with cunning, of a self-conceit, / His waxen wings did mount above his reach, / And melting heaves conspired his overthrow”[3]. Here Faustus is explicitly linked to Icarus, a character from Greek mythology famous for his overreaching as he attempts to fly with wax wings. However, he flies too close to the sun and his wings melt. Icarus dies because he strives for something beyond his human limitations. Before the reader is introduced to Faustus, therefore, Marlowe has already established the danger of striving.

Pride was one of the seven deadly sins, and so having the pride to assume that his striving would be fruitful damns Faustus because Marlowe was working from the perspective that man cannot achieve anything worthwhile without God. Despair is the ultimate sin because it prevents the despairing person from seeking forgiveness: “It is a religious despair of salvation, seen as springing from the primordial guilt of Pride but sufficiently recurrent in the play to justify our regarding it as Faustus’ main transgression”.

---

[1] www.gutenberg.org. Marlowe Christopher. The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus. Prologue 18-19.
[2] Cole Douglas. Suffering and Evil in the Plays of Christopher Marlowe. – Princeton, Princeton UP. 1992. – p. 232
[3] www.gutenberg.org. Marlowe Christopher. The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus. Prologue 20-22.

The concept of pride as a sin that leads to despair did not begin with Marlowe. Marlowe would have studied “cases of conscience” at Cambridge’s Corpus Christi College. The “case of conscience” described an historical or fictional character’s struggles with moral and theological issues and was prevalent in Calvinist and Puritan literature. The “case of conscience” detailing the life of Spira, a 16th century Italian who went through many of the same developmental steps as Faustus, was widely known and John Calvin wrote a preface to it. Spira was quoted to have said: “I feel my heart hardened that I cannot believe or hope inanything … of the mercy of God. This parallels what Faustus says to the Evil Angel: “My heart’s so hardened I cannot repent!”. Some accounts of his life have Spira meeting with an old man who urged him to turn to Christ shortly before his death, however the Old Man’s entreaties were unsuccessful and Spira subsequently attempted suicide and died twenty days later. This scene is reminiscent of the scene between Faustus and the Old Man that occurs near the end of Doctor Faustus where Faustus is given one last opportunity to repent. Rather than listening to the Old Man’s pleas Faustus continues in his despair. At the time Marlowe was writing, Spira represented the consequences of despair, and such stories could have influenced Marlowe and led him to connect the concept of striving and despair.

Faustus is initially driven away from God by his pride and later by his despair. Arieh Sachs argues that the Reformation and specifically Calvinist theology led to a greater emphasis on the idea that man could not achieve anything worthwhile outside of the grace of God.[1] The idea of man’s dependence on God for accomplishment binds the longing for achievement to pride and helps to explain why some Renaissance literature reacted against the bourgeoning humanistic spirit. This has led Robert Ornstein to accuse Marlowe of being an anti-humanist. Doctor Faustus, as with many of Marlowe’s other dramas, is built upon the limitations of mankind, and the danger that comes from attempting to exceed those limitations.

[1] Sach Arieh. The Religious Despair of Doctor Faustus. The Journal of English and Germanic Philology 26 Apr. 2012. – p. 626

Though this might sound unfamiliar to post-Enlightenment readers, it concurred with the popular opinion at the time.

Marlowe wrote Doctor Faustus after the humanist movement had been established. Marlowe's work was still being published in black-letter printing in 1631, almost 40 years after the playwright's death. Black-letter typeface had been the standard until the early 16th century when roman type became more fashionable. Works intended for a more intellectual audience were printed in roman typeface and cheaper works intended for the middle and lower classes, like Psalters and collections of ballads, were printed with black-letter printing. This indicates that many uneducated people enjoyed the ideas presented in Faustus, including its critique of striving. Marlowe's play became popular in theaters in part due to the special effects that were used with Mephastophilis' magic. However, the play had enduring popularity with the middle and lower classes in printed form. This indicates that the themes of the play resonated with the people who bought the cheaply printed copies of the play. They enjoyed reading about Faustus as he was punished for his striving[1]. After the Chorus recites the Prologue, Scene 1 begins with Faustus alone in his study, looking through his books. He has received a doctorate and studied logic in Aristotle, but he is disappointed because he has only learned how to debate. He then studies philosophy, and then moves on to medicine, law, and theology. He has pursued each of the fields of study before the play begins and has just come to the study of religion as the play opens. He could have found contentment in any of the individual fields that he looks into, but he wanted something more than what the field could offer.

This becomes most clear in his study of medicine. He has learned to heal the sick, but he only delays their inevitable deaths: "Yet thou art still but Faustus, and a man. / Couldst though make men live eternally, / Or, being dead, raise them to life again". He has mastered human medicine but strives for more.

[1] Sach Arieh. The Religious Despair of Doctor Faustus. The Journal of English and Germanic Philology 26 Apr. 2012. – p. 634

Doctor Faustus mocks God from the very beginning of the play. He begins his first scene by shouting blasphemies into an Elizabethan world bloodied by religious persecution:

> The reward of sin is death? That's hard.
> … 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 calls you this? Che sera', sera'
> What will be, shall be! Divinity, adieu![1]

He bids "adieu!" to divinity before his first monologue is over after having decided that, because he cannot help butsin, he is already damned. When reading Romans 6.23, his first conscious decision is to read the first half ("The reward of sin is death") but to discontinue his reading before finishing the entire verse ("but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord"). He bases his initial despair and his fall on this intentionally faulty premise. He chooses not to acknowledge the rest of the verse and the responsibility that that would leave him with. He excuses his desire to strive by indicating that his damnation is guaranteed whether or not he strives.

Faustus acts on his pride by putting aside "the thought of the inconceivable future" and he later "cringes before his self-imposed destiny". His ambition comes into conflict with his religious belief system and he must make a choice before the play can begin in earnest. He needs to determine the value that striving holds for him and weigh that idea against the value of his eternal soul. He could choose to accept the whole verse of Romans and his salvation, but he does not. By making this choice he is not damned by outside forces but he damns himself. Ignoring the second half of the verse excuses his ambition by freeing him from guilt. It does not

[1] www.gutenberg.org. Marlowe Christopher. The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus. 1.40-48.

absolve him of sin, but it makes any additional sin inconsequential because his fate is already determined. The decision to ignore the consequences of his actions removes any moral restrictions from his striving.

The consequences of Faustus' striving are made clear by the Good and Evil Angels that appear after Faustus decides to turn to the occult. The angels are reminiscent of a Christian morality play and are Marlowe's own addition to the story told in the Faust Book of 1592 upon which the play Doctor Faustuswas based (Fehrenbach) (Thoms). They initially appear to be autonomous beings and perhaps actual angels, and yet they introduce no new information to the story, but rather attempt to pull Faustus towards righteousness or towards evil. The Good Angel represents the common wisdom and speaks for the frustrated audience. Faustus has just concluded his long monologue. He reads first from the Vulgate and determines that he is damned no matter what he does. Then he opens "necromantic books" and calls them "heavenly". He has just proven his confusion and the Good Angel now seeks to differentiate between the Bible and the magical tomes he consults. The Good Angel wants Faustus to complete the verse from Romans that he stopped reading. Faustus knows that the Good Angel makes logical points, and that the words "necromantic" and "heavenly" cannot describe the same book, so here the Good Angel expresses Faustus' conscience:

O Faustus lay that damned book aside,
And Gaze not on it, lest it tempt thy soul,
And heap God's heavy wrath upon thy head:
Read, read the Scriptures; that is blasphemy.[1]

Here Faustus hears a clear directive that would save his soul. The Good Angel specifically refutes Faustus' assertion that the magic book is heavenly by calling it "that damned book". The Good Angel represents what the rational and logical mind of Faustus would have understood if he had not chosen to ignore the scripture.

[1] www.gutenberg.org. Marlowe Christopher. The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus. 1.70-73.

The Evil Angel speaks second, and echoes what Faustus has contemplated in his monologue:

Go forward, Faustus, in that famous art,

Wherein all nature's treasury is contained;

Be thou on earth as Jove is in the sky,

Lord and commander of these elements.

The Evil Angel refers to the fact that Faustus sees one that delves into the occult as a "studious artisan", making his work "that famous art". Faustus has also coveted the wealth of knowledge contained within that art, the "treasury" mentioned by the Evil Angel. Faustus had said that the occult would bring him an "omnipotence" that the scholarly Faustus would have seen as a treasure. Furthermore, the second half of the Evil Angel's dialogue echoes lines that Faustus had said previously, "A sound magician is a mighty god./ Here Faustus, try thy brains to gain a deity". The Evil Angel powerfully presents Faustus' ambition to him and reinforces what Faustus already intends to do. In the same way that the Evil Angel refers to Jove rather than the Christian God, Faustus refers to "a mighty god" which assumes one god out of many. When the Evil angel says that Faust can: "Be thou on earth as Jove is in the sky," this tempts Faustus with the sin of Adam and Lucifer. Faustus has echoed that sentiment throughout the play so this idea is not the Evil Angel's. The dialogue between the angels is not the advice of spiritual beings as it would have been in a morality play, but it represents the choice that the free mortal Faustus has to make. He councils himself on the one hand against taking his heresy further, but he is driven on the other hand to seek out greater power and mastery, and it is this side of his mind that wins out.

Faustus decides to replace theology with the study of the occult because he wants to achieve without God. Human pride and ambition lead him into the occult before Mephastophilis ever arrives. The illusion of Mephastophilis' servility will enslave Faustus himself. Faustus summons Mephastophilis by name. Since the Evil Angel has only repeated back to Faustus what hehas already uttered in his

monologue, Faustus, knowingly and imprudently, takes on a great evil himself. Since he makes the mistake of believing that he must suffer for all eternity under any circumstances, then this new sin makes no difference.

After Faustus summons Mephastophilis, he once again exhibits his own pride by asking the frightening and demonic Mephastophilis to change into the shape of a Franciscan Friar. Faustus' sees his own power manifested in the fact that he is obeyed by the demon. The idea of a man instructing a satanic figure to take on a disguise, and especially one that represents the Church, differs from the conventional view of Satan as a trickster. The trickster Satan usually appears in disguise in order to gain access to a victim. For instance, in the Faerie Queen the evil sorcerer Archimago, a satanic figure in the story, assumes various shapes when he encounters the Redcross Knight. However, rather than portraying the demon as a shape shifter and master of lies, Marlowe alters this trope. The disguise that Mephastophilis takes on is another manifestation of Faustus' consent to be deceived. Faustus uses his free will to relinquish his power throughout the story and is ultimately defeated because of it. This is reminiscent of Faustus refusing to read the second half of the Romans verse. However, it allows Faustus to strive without feeling responsible for the damage he does to his soul.

Over the course of the story Faustus's pride and reluctance to accept responsibility develop into despair. From the moment Faustus draws his own blood to take the demonic oath his days are numbered. He reads the bargain to Mephastophilis:

> First, that Faustus may be a spirit in form and substance.
>
> Secondly, that Mephastophilis shall be his servant and at his command.
>
> Thirdly, that Mephastophilis shall do for him, and bring him whatsoever.
>
> Fourthly, that he shall be in his chamber or house invisible.
>
> Lastly, that he shall appear to the said John Faustus as at all times, in what form or shape soever he please.
>
> I, John Faustus of Wittenberg, doctor, by these presents, do give both

Body and soul to Lucifer, Prince of the East, and his minister Mephastophilis;

And furthermore grant unto them that, for four and twenty years

Being expired, the articles above-written inviolate, full power to fetch

Or carry the said John Faustus, body and soul, flesh, blood, or goods,

Into their habitation wheresoever[1].

Despite the binding tone of the contract it can still be broken by God because the play takes place in a world understood through the "fundamental Christian outlook which prevailed in the western world from the decline of Roman secularism to the disintegration of the dogmatic tradition"[2]. Furthermore, if God could not break the contract then Mephastophilis would have no reason to continue to try and corrupt Faustus. However, the contract cannot mention God's power because it is written by Mephastophilis and throughout the play Mephastophilis shows that he is incapable of attributing anything to God. This indicates that Faustus could still find salvation through the grace of God but he is hard hearted. That will later lead to the despair that will prevent him from reaching heaven.

As twenty-four years elapse Faustus rejects opportunities to repent and be saved. He has always been able to ask for God's help and reclaim complete control. Ending his striving and acknowledging his human limitations will save his immortal soul. If it were not possible for him to be saved, then Mephastophilis would not be threatened whenever Faustus nears salvation. However, he does not recognize the signs that repentance and salvation are possible. His despair blinds him. Shortly after he makes his bargain with Mephastophilis he expresses the idea that "hell's a fable". He takes the evidence of hell, Mephastophilis' existence, and decides instead to embrace ignorance. This unwillingness to accept the reality of his fate, and to come to terms with what he has agreed to, is another example of his imprudence. He has the power and freedom to acknowledge the truth, heis even

[1] www.gutenberg.org. Marlowe Christopher. The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus. 5.96-109.

[2] Sach Arieh. The Religious Despair of Doctor Faustus. The Journal of English and Germanic Philology 26 Apr. 2012. – p. 627

urged to by Mephastophilis, but he decides to ignore reality by denying the existence of hell, and Mephastophilis responds by saying: “Ay, think so still, till experience change thy mind,” coming close to warning Faustus. Faustus desperately clings to his denial: “Why? Thinks though then that Faustus shall be damned?” Less than twenty lines earlier Faustus promised his soul to Satan and now he refuses to acknowledge that he will be damned. Faustus does not want to accept the cost of his striving.

Later, Faustus asks Mephastophilis to tell him of the heavens. Faustus does not ponder heaven and the theological facts pertinent to his fate. He uses the word heaven in the plural and wants to know about the astronomical reality of the sky. When he says “When I behold the heavens, then I repent,” he does not mean that he will repent when he beholds the biblical heaven. Instead he means that he will repent when he beholds “the heavens” as in the astronomical place. This in itself would not provide him evidence of his position in relation to God and Lucifer. His relationship to the heavens only tells him about where he is compared to the earth: it is willful imprudence. However, even if he did have evidence of the existence of heaven, it could do nothing for his faith. If a demon cannot convince him of hell’s reality, then nothing can convince him of heaven’s.

Furthermore, he cannot see heaven, but only the stars in the sky, and he does not make an attempt to pray and communicate with heaven in the same way he tries to understand the skies, or even in the way that he summoned Mephastophilis. Mephastophilis however understands that Faustus’ sin comes through his pride and subsequent despair. When Faustus even comes close to repentance and salvation Mephastophilis reminds him of his desire to strive by elevating his status as a human and at the same time degrading heaven. “[Heaven] was made for man, therefore man is more excellent”. However, Mephastophilis does not realize just how highly Faustus estimates his own abilities. Faustus reasons that, as a man, he

can achieve heaven: “If it were made for man, ‘twas made for me: / I will renounce this magic, and repent”[1].

Mephastophilis is threatened as Faustus begins to think of heaven as a possibility. This threat of possible repentance causes the Good and Evil Angels to reappear to Faustus. The Evil Angel reminds Faustus that according to the first condition of the deal he made “Faustus may be a spirit, in form and substance” and so he argues that Faustus is therefore not able to reach heaven. Faustus believes in the power of a human man to accomplish all things through striving. He sees Mephastophilis as an assistant, but he strives as a human. The Evil Angel cannot deny his great ability to strive so instead he denies Faustus’ humanity. Mephastophilis appeals to Faustus’ first sin of pride when Mephastophilis says that man is more excellent than heaven. The Evil Angel refers to the deeply rooted and fatal sin of despair when he says “Ay, but Faustus never shall repent” and in that brief scene keeps Faustus on the path to damnation, leading Faustus to say “My heart’s so hard ened, I cannot repent!”

Earlier Faustus had refused to read the second half Romans 6.23, “but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our lord,” because he wanted to live in easy ignorance (5.194). After Mephastophilis refuses to acknowledge how the world was created, and by whom, Faustus becomes irritated and tells Mephastophilis to go to hell, the hell that Faustus claims not to believe in. As usual, the Good and Evil Angels come to him in his time of crisis but Mephastophilis, who is bound to Faustus’ command but not bound to obey the meaning behind the command, comes back from hell and brings Lucifer to assist him. Lucifer in turn, parades the seven deadly sins before Faustus in an effort to convince Faustus to continue his wicked life.

The suspense of Doctor Faustusresults from Faustus being offered opportunities to repent, drawing closer to salvation, and then at the last moment

[1] www.gutenberg.org. Marlowe Christopher. The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus. 5.185-186.

rejecting it. After having chosen damnation twenty-four years before, Faustus pays for his despair.

Despite the pleas of the Old Man near the end, Faustus is not saved. His death is not a murder by Lucifer and Mephastophilis. It isa suicide. Mephastophilis even gives Faustus a dagger as the latter sits talking to the Old Man who understands that the only hope for Faustus' salvation is repentance. Faustus finally sees something of the problem that he faces and yet is too near death to further delude himself: "I do repent and yet I do despair". In his final monologue, it is clear that Faustus knows what will happen to him, and what could stop it. But his despair has lasted so long that his false feeling of powerlessness, and distrust in God, prevents him from attaining salvation:

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![1]

Faust cannot decide whether to call upon God or Lucifer in his last moments. He goes back and forth several times because his despair overwhelms him. After cursing his parents Faustus corrects himself: "No, Faustus, curse thyself, curse Lucifer," and finally sees his own culpability. Unfortunately for him, it is too late and after a life of striving he is dragged into hell. The last line of the play underscores the cost of striving. Faustus is damned because he used his life "to
practice more than heavenly power permits".

2.2. Faust in Goethe

In Marlowe, striving leads to despair and damnation. Faustus, as a human, is not worthy of the knowledge and power that he craves, because human beings

[1] www.gutenberg.org. Marlowe Christopher. The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus. – 12.69-73

cannot achieve without God. In Goethe's Faust, striving leads away from the despair of stagnation and is even mandated by God. In the two hundred years separating Marlowe and Goethe, Faust climbs from hell to heaven.

The two plays have similar scenes that introduce the two Faust characters. Each one carries on a monologue in his chamber listing his failed pursuits and ambitions. Marlowe's Faustus ends the play torn apart by demons and dragged into the pit of hell. However, in Goethe's rendition, the Eternal Feminine guides Faust into heaven. Faust's striving intensifies throughout the play until he reaches perfection on his path to paradise. The years separating Goethe's and Marlowe's Faust stories took Europe through the Renaissance and the Enlightenment, two eras that glorified human striving. It seems then that the journey of Faust followed the journey of Western thought.

Marlowe's impulse away from human ambition and striving would not have agreed with Goethe's post-Enlightenment worldview. The early German Enlightenment philosopher Gottfried Wilhelm Leibnitz introduced a powerful optimism into philosophical thought. He saw this as the "best of all possible worlds" and posited that the world was created by a benevolent God.[1] Immanuel Kant followed him and defined the Enlightenment in his essay "What is the Enlightenment," in which he exhorted individuals to think for themselves. Kant's description of the Enlightenment stresses self-motivation: „Aufklärung ist der Ausgang des Menschen aus seiner selbstverschuldeten Unmündigkeit" (Enlightenment is the emergence of humanity from its self imposed tutelage) (Kant). He helped shape the world view that called for independent knowledge revealed through human effort. He saw rational thought as leading toward truth and moral rectitude. Though Faust falls far short of Kant's moral standards, his striving towardgreater experience and understanding classifies him as a figure influenced by Kant's view of the Enlightenment. Kant and Leibnitz shared the view that the

[1] Robertson John George. A History of German Literature. Ed. Dorothy Reich. Edinburgh: Blackwood, 1997. – p. 212

world was perfectible though human efforts. In this context, striving is not a sin but the only path toward perfection.

It is important to note that the pre-Goethe Faust stories that punished striving diminished in popularity following the Enlightenment. In 1683 Johann Georg Neumann wrote in his Disquisitio Historica prior de Fausto Praestigatorethat he could not see why Faust was "worth making so much fuss about".[1] Why should a frustrated scholar in his study lament his limitations? Although the Faust story remained a staple of German entertainment, turning up in puppet shows for example, it fell out of favor with critics, who regarded it as an archaic symbol of quaint and fantastical medieval superstitions. Rational critics did not agree with the relationship between human striving and the influence of creatures of the underworld. This association was too critical of humanity's efforts. The world was moving into agreement with Faust as he strove for more. He could no longer be damned.

The influential German literary critic Johann Christoph Gottsched died when Goethe was seventeen years old. Gottsched championed a strictly rationalist movement in German literature that rigidly adhered to the neoclassical example of the French Golden Age dramas of Corneille and Racine. He tried to impose rationality on literature and wanted to remove literature's supernatural elements. In this he was extremely influential, and authors across Germany followed his recommendations on language and methods of storytelling. Gottsched decried Faust as a fairy tale and wrote that it only appealed to the mob.[2] The Faust story had fallen so far in esteem that it was relegated to children's puppet theaters, and this is how Goethe first came into contact with the story.

However, the Faust story had some supporters among the newer generation of German authors. The dramatist and essayist Gotthold Ephraim Lessing disagreed with Gottsched's rationalizing of German literature and his rejection of

[1] Mason Eudo Colecestra. Goethe's Faust; Its Genesis and Purport. – Berkeley, University of California. 2001. – p. 6

[2] Mason Eudo Colecestra. Goethe's Faust; Its Genesis and Purport. – Berkeley, University of California. 2001. – p. 6

the Faust story. Indeed, in response to an influential Leipzig literary journal that claimed that no one could deny the great improvement that Gottsched had produced in German theater, Lessing confidently claimed that he mustbe that very "no one".[1]

In this response, Letter Concerning the newest Literature, 17, Lessing decried the too realistic and constrained tendency of modern German literature under the influence of Gottsched.[2] He argued that German literature should crawl out of the shadow of French literature and look to the English model instead. In contrast to Gottsched's love of French Golden Age drama, he praised Shakespeare who was Marlowe's contemporary. At the end of the letter Lessing suggests that the English and German traditions should come together and that Germans should produce a new Faust story. Lessing even wrote a humorous fragment of the Faust story in 1759, when Goethe was only ten years old, with the hope that a great German poet would come along and take up the work. The fragment, Faust and the Seven Ghosts, shows Faust having a conversation with seven demons he has summoned to do his bidding. He tries to determine which of them is the fastest and they all give him riddle-like answers describing their speed. The final demon says that he is as quick as the passage from good to evil. Faust determines that that last demon is the swiftest. This fragment and Lessing's letter opened up the idea of rediscovering the Faust story after Enlightenment critics had belittled its mystical elements. Lessing also helped draw attention to the role of English theater by praising Shakespeare's work.[3] Goethe would later take the Faust story from its place in the repertoire of English drama and return it to its home country.

Johann Gottfried Herder was an influential literary critic and theorist in the 18th century. He helped initiate the Sturm und Drang movement and greatly influenced the young Goethe when he met him in Strassburg in 1770.[4] Herder

[1] Lessing Gotthold. Array the Age of Goethe. – Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company. 1999. – p. 24
[2] Lessing Gotthold. Array the Age of Goethe. – Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company. 1999. – p. 25
[3] Lessing Gotthold. Array the Age of Goethe. – Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company. 1999. – p. 26
[4] Robertson. John George. A History of German Literature. – Edinburgh, Blackwood, 2003. – p 276.

described the young Goethe as a man with “much feeling and at times too much feeling.” He educated Goethe on the importance of Shakespeare and inspired the poet’s interest in the tradition of English literature and the Bible. Herder shared the optimism of Leibnitz and argued that every culture has a fertile literary history, not just France and Greece: “Herder proclaimed that great literature cannot be imitative, but must reflect the particular psychology of the milieu in which it is produced”. German literature could also draw upon its own literary models, he said, and could turn something from its past into a great modern work of art. Thinkers like Herder delved into the possibilities of humanity’s potential and this sheds light on the optimism that distinguishes Goethe’s Faust story from its predecessors. Since humanity has great potential, then Faust has great potential, and as long as he strives toward fulfilling it, he is doing God’s will.

Goethe’s life reflected the striving that Faust exemplified. Goethe popularized the Sturm und Drang movement in 1771 when he wrote his drama Götz von Berlichingen. He wrote it less than a year after he began to learn from Herder, the theoretical father behind the movement. The Sturm und Drang tradition also informed his first international best seller, Sorrows of Young Werther, published in 1774. After that work Goethe moved on. Instead of finding contentment with his international best seller he continued to develop his literary style after he moved to Weimar. Faust, the work that he would continue working on throughout the rest of his life, found its first form in “Urfaust” written between 1772 and 1775 and thus squarely within Goethe’s youthful Sturm und Drang period. This was the first instance of the Gretchen figure in any telling of the Faust story. It does not touch on Faust’s salvation or damnation, and does not emphasize striving in the same way that his more developed Faust did. Gretchen dies at the end of the “Urfaust” but her salvation is not guaranteed.

After moving to Weimar at the request of Duke Karl August in 1775, Goethe filled many administrative positions in the small court. A friendship with Charlotte

von Stein, seven years older than Goethe and married to a Weimar Baron, changed his life, as she introduced the importance of Mäßigung, or moderation, to the young poet. His developing classical interests led him to travel to Italy where he fell in love with classical architecture and poetic form. On his return to Germany he introduced a new classicism into German literature, defined by restrained characters that seek the good rather than fulfillment of personal desires.

Under the influence of Goethe and his friend and collaborator, Friedrich Schiller, the court of Weimar became a haven for artists and new literary development. The two poets defined themselves by their constant striving toward improvement, and it was Schiller that encouraged Goethe to take up his work on Faust again.

Faust, part II ends with Faust completing a public works project. This Faust character therefore fulfills the classical ideal by working for the good of others and moderating his personal desires. It was published fifty-seven years after the Urfaust was written since Goethe would stop work on the project for years at a time. The Urfaust itself was not published until 1886. After working on a fragment in 1790, Goethe did not resume work in earnest until 1797 at the urging of Schiller. Faust, Part I was published in 1806, a year after the death of his friend. However, the larger story would not see its end for thirty-five years. Goethe completed the much more restrained and structurally diffuse Faust, Part II in 1832 the year before he died, and it was published after his death. In the end Faust's young lover from Part I, Gretchen, intercedes on Faust's behalf after his soul has perfected itself through his striving.

The dual nature of Faust is vital to the understanding of his character. In the character's first scene he describes to his assistant Wagner how he and his father gave false hope of a cure to plague victims, and how ashamed he is of that failure: now he rejects God and religion. In Van der Laan's essay on Faust's divided self,

he argues that Faust cannot act morally due to the conflicted nature of his soul.[1] Faust himself cries out that

Two souls, alas, are dwelling in my breast,
And either would be severed from its brother,
The one holds fast with joyous earthy lust
Onto the world of man with organs clinging
The other soars impassioned from the dust
To realms of lofty forebears winging.[2]

His conflicted dual nature drives his character onward. This nature is both natural and divine, human and more. The constant internal conflict makes Faust's actions morally ambiguous: "because of his inner division, his loss of unity and integrity, Faust becomes morally inert", but it drives him to strive.

Goethe even adds God as a character to articulate the importance of striving. The "Prologue in Heaven" does not appear in Marlowe's work. However, the German puppet plays that Goethe witnessed in his youth, and that were indirectly influenced by the popularity of Marlowe's drama, featured a parallel scene, a Prologue in Hell, which was a comedic backdrop fixated on Faust's eventual damnation. Goethe instead moved his prologue to heaven and modeled it on the book of Job.

Goethe's "Prologue in Heaven" elevates the themes in the work to universal significance. Before we ever meet the Faust character, it is clear that he is not just a man, but a symbol for the best of humanity. Modeled on the book of Job, the prologue has Mephistopheles and God discussing the fate of a human being. Mephistopheles makes a bargain with God that he can lead Faust astray and take his soul. God has nothing against Mephistopheles' attempts: after all, as God says, "man errs the while he strives".[3] It is clear that, for God, this striving is what

[1] Van der Lann J.M. Faust's Divided Self and Moral Inertia. – Monatshefte, 1999. – p. 455.
[2] Goethe Johann Wolfgang. Faust. Trans. Walter Arndt. – London, Norton. 2001. – Part I 2.1112-1117

[3] Goethe Johann Wolfgang. Faust. Trans. Walter Arndt. – London, Norton. 2001. – Part I Prologue 317.

makes a man human and gives him the possibility of redemption: “Soon I shall guile him so his spirit clears”. The man’s actions determine how his soul will fare eternally, but the prologue allows us to enter the story with an optimism that was lacking in Marlowe’s account.

Both Goethe’s story and its biblical model feature an everyman character meant to represent humanity. In the Bible this role is taken by Job, a man respected by God for his devout nature. In Faust this everyman role falls to Faust, a man respected by God for his striving, even as God recognizes his failings. In both the Bible and Faust I the Lord first mentions the everyman character to the demon. To further indicate Faust’s favored status under God, God refers to him as “Knecht” meaning servant, the same descriptor that God applies to Job in Luther’s 1545 translation of the Bible.

However, the exchange between God and the demon plays out differently in Faust than it does in the Bible. In Faust the Lord asks if Mephistopheles knows Faust, then Mephistopheles describes Faust as “the Docor” before the Lord corrects him by saying “My servant!”. The Lord does not see Faust in terms of his human occupation but in relationship to the divine. Though Mephistopheles means to degrade Faust and distance Faust from God in his description of Faust as a doctor, Mephistopheles also implies that Faust is a man seeking high ideals with all of his being.[1]

Both of these descriptors illustrate Faust’s conflicted nature. The Lord sees Faust as a loyal servant. This makes Mephistopheles uncomfortable and he mocks Faust for his striving. Thus, very early in the play, Goethe has established the ultimate good and ultimate evil. The Lord then says that he trusts that Faust will develop through his striving and come through his confusion to become a productive member of society. Mephistopheles and the Lord strike a deal. The Lord bets that Faust will strive for as long as he has life. Faust will err but he must continue striving.

[1] Davidson Thomas. The Philosophy of Goethe's Faust. – New York, Haskell House. 1969. – p. 8

The events of the “Prologue in Heaven” establish striving as the primary good that can come through human effort, and the primary virtue that God believes that Faust possesses. However, in his conversation with Mephistopheles the Lord says that Faust will soon prefer uninterrupted rest. This hints at the despair that Faust will experience in the first scene and will prove to be the first great challenge faced by Faust.

In fact, Faust nears despair twice before the arrival of Mephistopheles. The small dark study that Faust is in as he begins to study magic starkly contrasts with the heavenly light of the prologue. He has lived in academia for a decade, but he doubts whether he has accomplished anything worthwhile. After years of striving, he does not feel that he knows any more than he did initially or that he has done any real and tangible good for humanity. The occult could provide what Faust is looking for, and he decides to try magic. This is where the roots of Faust’s strivings make themselves clear. He does not want to devote himself to academic learning; otherwise he would not have dabbled in magic in the hope of self-fulfillment. Relinquishing scholarship proves his devotion to the act of striving. After dabbling in various subjects of medieval learning and achieving a doctorate, Faust has tried to use academics to answer life’s questions, but it has failed him. Then, after despairing of his studies, he decides to move on. If he had remained devoted to an activity that failed him he would have changed his loyalty from the pursuit of striving itself to the pursuit of academics and thus given up his chance to continue moving forward in his development. This mirrors Goethe’s transition as he moved between literary genres and styles and took up various scientific pursuits.

Faust escapes into nature by summoning the Earth Spirit to calm his confused heart.[1] The Earth Spirit is an original addition to Faust story and appears in the Urfaust, so this confrontation between Faust and the world had long held

[1] Davidson Thomas. The Philosophy of Goethe's Faust. – New York, Haskell House. 1969. – p. 11

significance for Goethe. When Faust claims to be its equal, the Earth Spirit rejects him and belittles humanity. However, Faust continues striving.

Faust's student, Wagner, comes and reminds Faust of how empty the pursuit of rational learning is if it is devoid of meaning. Then he leaves and Faust is left alone. Wagner with his dry and circumscribed goals, could represent Gottsched, a man diametrically opposed to Goethe's ideas. An anecdote tells that when the young Goethe went to visit Gottsched, the older writer was wearing his dressing gown, and Wagner does the same when he meets with Faust. Wagner seeks to know the world, but does not ask himself why he is seeking this. He does not question his methods, but represents a human will that is as different from Faust as Goethe was from Gottsched. Wager stagnates happily while Faust grows restless.

Faust seems to have saved himself from despair by summoning the Earth Spirit, but the Earth Spirit devalues him. Wagner's shallow, hopeful mind distracts Faust from his despair, but only temporarily. Faust needs a master to help him on his journey. At this point in Doctor Faustus Marlowe depicts Faustus as summoning Mephastophilis. However, Goethe does not. Faust groans under his load. He fulfills the Lord's prediction and tires of his struggle. Faust contemplates suicide by poison, but it is not the act of an exhausted man, but the act of a man with no other options. His dual nature can no longer bear the inaction of his academic life. The internal conflict that should drive him forward had become too much for Faust to handle: the conflict has driven him into bitter inactivity. However, the very fact that his soul has two warring aspects saves him from his earthly despair and allows him to continue striving. Easter hymns interrupt his solitary contemplation and draw him back into society. The Easter hymns signify a rebirth for the despairing Faust and as his lips near the poison bowl he hears the words "Christ is risen" sung by a choir of angels.

Faust has already given up his study of theology but at this point he picks up and opens his Bible. His Bible has not been translated into German, as befits a play set before the Reformation, but the untranslated Bible could also be seen as

reinforcing the fact that the play occurs in a pre-Enlightenment world. Faust's questioning is therefore out of place in his society. He reads the book of John and actively takes control of the Bible as he translates the opening lines into "In the beginning was the deed." It seems as though Faust is attempting to wrest power away from God by using his active translation to weaken the Lord's words, but it is another symptom of Faust's confused striving that God treasures. Unlike in Marlowe, even this outrageous example of striving is condoned by God. Faust strives against the complicated universe of worldly knowledge and limited understanding of God. He struggles to quantify the world before him by himself. Goethe's Faust does not in fact summon Mephistopheles as Marlowe's Doctor Faustus did. Instead, Mephistopheles follows Faust home in the form of a poodle.

Though he does not know it, Faust is already in the presence of Mephistopheles as he opens the Bible, but Mephistopheles cannot leave because he is trapped by the open pentagram on the floor. As the play continues, Mephistopheles means to bring Faust contentment in order to put an end to his striving, but he actually expands the sphere of Faust's experience and opens up a new series of challenges for Faust to struggle against. God had set Faust apart through his struggles against ignorance. Mephistopheles takes him from the small world into the large, and as Faust's powers and abilities expand, so do the challenges that he must face. However, the different situations that he encounters are never a match for his passion for striving.

With the help of Mephistopheles Faust can strive in new and greater ways. He now seeks entertainment and love. On Walpurgis Night Faust becomes lost in the underworld of witchcraft and magical spells. This forces Faust to look for some way to ground himself again. Faust's academic study had aged him beyond his years, but the witch returns his youth to him. Rather than providing him with contentment, his newfound youth gives him more opportunities to expand his experience to something beyond that which he had been able to attain before. Rather than taking his youth as a wish granted, and another step towards

contentment, Faust uses his youth as a tool to strive with. Giving him what he wanted has altered, but not ended, his striving. This is partly because his goal is in the struggle itself rather than the attainment of a material good. Mephistopheles cannot understand this. Everything Faust attains becomes another step on the path that has no end, and it frustrates Mephistopheles. Faust's youth gives him years of further striving and allows him to approach Gretchen.

Gretchen represents the "gute Seele," an utterly pure character archetype from the classical aesthetic theories of Goethe and Schiller. When Faust looks into the mirror and sees the image of Gretchen, he does not see his own mortal perfection in the way that a non-magical mirror would present it. Instead the mirror holds a new challenge. Once again he is presented with his opposite and something new to strive against. Faust's entire career works as a part of a binary system. He needs contrast in order to face something worthy of his struggle. He had felt two conflicted souls inside of him, and now that his abilities are greater his twisted soul meets a near perfect soul.

Faust strives with the Enlightenment spirit. He nears despair but finds new sources of hope or conflict that propel him onward. However, Mephistopheles, the creature that negates, ironically helps Faust strive for greater things. Faust is able to reach farther, and in Marlowe's worldview Faust would have fallen all the further because of his greater striving. In Goethe's play, Faust does not extend beyond the limits of the human being, but stretches those boundaries and reexamines what the human is capable of. Man gains power through Goethe's Faust, and the German folk tradition is brought into the Classical Era.

2.3. Human Spirituality in Goethe's Faust and Marlowe's Dr.Faustus

The Faust legend, in which an academic desperate to gain knowledge and power sells his soul to the Devil, is one which has (re-)emerged at various times of religious and philosophical upheaval, from the formation of the Christian Church to the Reformation and the Romantic movement. This chapter will compare the

interpretations of human spirituality as presented in the plays of Marlowe and Goethe, *Dr. Faustus* and *Faust*, which, while based on the same character, use him to express very different attitudes regarding human spirituality. Close examination suggests that Marlowe's play is ultimately orthodox in its portrayal of the punishment of man for pride and despair, through its use of the conventions of Morality Plays, its use of traditional symbols, such as witchcraft and devils, and its emphasis on the power of the individual will which ultimately damns Faustus. Goethe's text, on the other hand, while still playing with the theme of the individual will, saves the protagonist, suggesting an alternate spiritual vision where the striving of the individual justifies redemption. This rejection of a classical Christian paradigm is emphasized in *Faust* through Goethe's criticism of other entrenched institutions, such as the monarchy, and the introduction of figures from classical mythology. While one play represents traditional religious attitudes, another transcends them.

The tale of Faust has always been more than simply a story: as a symbol of human pride the scholar who 'o'rreaches' religious boundaries in the desire for super-human knowledge has attained mythical status in the subconscious of Western European civilization. The story can be seen as a parable expressing the limitations of humanity in its relationship with God, thus re-enforcing 'standard' religious assumptions. Alternately, it could be used to question the very tenets of a religious paradigm. While there are versions of a Faust story reaching back to the early sixteenth century, it is today most associated with the plays "Doctor Faustus" (1592) by Christopher Marlowe and "Faust" (1808/1832) by Johann Goethe. These two works illustrate how the same story can be used to demonstrate two contrasting philosophies: thoroughly different attitudes towards the Christian religion are portrayed through a tale that is ultimately religious in nature. Whereas Marlowe follows the original Faust story closely, creating a work which remains critical of human pride and ambition, Goethe's play, with its conclusion differing significantly from that of the original tale, ultimately operates on an entirely new

series of assumptions regarding human spirituality. Not only do these two works show us how human perceptions of traditional religious positions have shifted over time, through the changing views (or changing degrees of artistic freedom) of key artists of their era, but also how founding myths of humanity can be adapted to new intellectual movements.

The story of a man selling his soul to the devil has a relatively long history in the Christian European tradition. Characters such as Simon Magus[1], Theophilis of Syracuse, St. Cyprian and number of men known as ‘Faust’ all contributed to the image of the striving academic playing farcical tricks using demonic power. Appearing in Germany in 1548 at roughly the same time as the Reformation, the original “Faustbuch” was essentially used as propaganda for new Protestant ideas. There is evidence that many early Protestants thought the theatre an excellent way of promoting religious values among the uneducated population; the combination of the story and the theatre would have appealed to Protestant authorities as a means to promote religious ideology. Indeed, the “Faustbuch” was Marlowe’s main source when he wrote his play. Given the duality of the work— both as potentially blasphemous in its engagement with some of the more complex aspects of Christianity and as a warning of the most dire order—it is not surprising that this is a story associated historically with times of religious upheaval and grand paradigmatic shifts.

The traditional Faustus story is an example of purely orthodox Christian theology. It acts as a warning to those who would “practice more than heavenly power permits." Some critics, such as Nicholas Brooke, have argued that Marlowe's play, despite its adherence to a traditional Christian storyline, is in fact religiously subversive through its portrayal of man’s struggle for freedom of belief and will against what Brockbank calls a ‘hostile moral order’. This view is re-enforced by the mysterious lack of God’s presence at the end of the play where Faustus is damned with seemingly no recourse to the power or grace of heaven.

[1] Brockbank, J. P. Marlowe: Dr. Faustus. – London, Edward Arnold Ltd. 1992

Further examples are found when Faustus cries out that he sees where God/ Stretcheth out his arm and bends his ireful brows!' and earlier when Faustus calls out 'Ah, Christ, my Saviour, Seek to save distressed Faustus' soul' but only Lucifer, Mephistopheles ad Beelzebub appear." Thus God either does not want to save Faustus, rendering him malevolent, or God cannot save him, rendering him feeble.

The form of the play itself, however, closely follows that of the traditional medieval morality plays. The presence of figures such as the Good Angel and Bad Angel were typical of this genre; they provide the audience with an indication of the gravity of the situation Faustus' soul is in, as well as reminding them of the position they should be taking as, at least nominally, 'good Christians'. The majority of Marlowe's original audience would have taken the presence of these angels at face value, just as they would have assumed the veracity of the existence of devils, witches and other supernatural beings. Even if we assume that the angels represent purely an internal struggle within Faustus's soul, the play is hardly heterodox in showing man to be divided. The portrayal of the angels themselves is serious and lacking in the irony that would have allowed them to become anti-religious symbols. Through the speech of the Angels, the connection between knowledge and power is established early on, and the Evil Angels' speech makes us think of the falls of both Lucifer (who sought power, to 'be as Jove') and Adam (who ate from the tree of knowledge without God's consent). The connection between Faust and his two fallen predecessors is made explicit through an early dialogue between Mephistopheles and Faustus when Mephistopheles tells Faustus that 'By aspiring pride and insolence' God threw Lucifer from heaven and speaks to him of his torment in 'being deprived of everlasting bliss.' This contradicts the argument that what we are witnessing is the unjust punishment of man for his own heroic ambitions put forward by some critics[1]. By presenting his tale in the morality play tradition, Marlowe instead apparently aligns himself with the

[1] Tydeman William. Doctor Faustus: Text and Performance. – London, Macmillon Publishers. 1994.

Church. This lack of repentance is indeed suggestive of a personal heterodoxy, and yet it is still punished. Unlike traditional morality plays, “Dr. Faustus” does not provide a sober assessment of his mistaken actions and a reasoned recantation of a misspent life” — Marlowe's play is darker in that it never gives Faustus the capacity to repent. Marlowe finally gives us a play showing the perils of disbelief, a story which feels more appropriate for a time when traditional attitudes towards religion and the order of the world were being increasingly questioned.

It is perhaps for this reason that while a traditional morality play might portray the results of a life marked by one or more of the seven sins, in this play these, on their own, are not portrayed as serious threats. Instead, a sin far more serious is portrayed: that of despair in God. Faustus' despair, based on an incomplete reading of the scriptures is already present from the very beginning of the play in his first soliloquy. Faustus, reading selections from the Bible reads that ‘The reward of sin is death’ and ‘If we say that we have no sin/ We deceive ourselves’. He not only notes ‘That’s hard’ but assumes from reading these passages that ‘what will be, shall be’, rejecting the possibility of one’s actions influencing the hope of salvation. While moments of doubt are considered acceptable (one thinks of Jesus’ cry ‘My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?’) the danger of despair, essentially a state of perpetual doubt, is that it will lead to a rejection of faith in God, which is indeed what happens to Faustus. His despair is clear when he says to himself ‘Now, Faustus, must thou needs be damned, /And canst thou not be saved. What boots it then to think of God or Heaven? ... Despair in God and trust in Beelzebub...To God? He loves thee not. This analysis renders the issue of Faustus’s pride less important, though it is clearly linked to his spiritual state. By portraying the devil as one who promotes despair by playing on the natural doubt of man, Marlowe goes further than the original Faust story, where pride alone is the prime cause for Faust’s damnation.

The use of traditional Christian symbols throughout his play is important: the devil is shown to be a trickster, and wholly evil. Other examples of traditional

symbols include the portrayal of witches, necromancy and Walpurgis Night, as well as Faustus' involvement in the sin of demonality (with a succubus in the form of Helen of Troy, who herself was seen as a 'sign and omen of doom' in the sixteenth century). All of these elements would have served not only as sensational entertainment for the audience but to further identify Faustus' surroundings with evil rather than with freedom and knowledge.[1] By tapping into the realm of symbols familiar to his audience, Marlowe exposes his character to their judgment even without this character's actions being taken into account. The fact that the author decided to include symbols such as these also suggests that for his audience, the metaphysical struggles of the play were very real. As Patrick Healy notes, 'Faustus' debating proposition to Mephistopheles that 'I think Hell's a fable would have seemed either chillingly naive or comically preposterous... and would almost have had no persuasiveness with contemporary audience' and the scenes of his torture and final damnation 'cater to conventional notions of God's retribution for a life of sin. The message re-enforced by all of Faustus' accomplishments is that the bargain was not advantageous. Was the procurement of grapes (which remind the audience of fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil) for a duchess in Scene 12 worth the torment Faustus so obviously experiences at the end of the play?

It has been suggested that the play portrays a Calvinistic, deterministic view of salvation[11]. This suggests the portrayal of a critical view of religion: Faustus' sins have been placed in him by God and thus Faustus is correct to refuse to repent, as he would be damned regardless. If we take this view, Faustus actions in the final scene are heroic in that by consciously choosing to be damned Faustus is a hero of free will as he is determining his fate and refusing to be ruled by it. However, in the text we see, in addition to references to a harsh god which would indicate a Calvinist perspective, numerous allusions to the view of God as merciful and

[1] Redner Harry. In the Beginning was the Deed: Reflections on the Passage of Faust. – Berkely, University of California Press. 1998. – p. 194

compassionate. In fact, it seems that this Renaissance play emphasizes the power of free will over that of fate— not detracting from the omnipotence of God but re-enforcing the moral duty of man. The play places far too much emphasis on the idea of the Will (with its connotations of freewill and self-will) for the Calvinistic interpretation to be convincing. Not only does Faustus refer to himself in the third person continuously throughout the play, emphasizing the 'will of Faustus', he specifically demands that 'Mephistopheles must always be obedient to my will'; later Faustus specifically says that 'I give it [his soul] thee'. There are multiple examples where divine intervention gives Faustus the time to reflect on his actions, indicating that the responsibility for actual choice lies with man.

One major example occurs when Faustus' blood ceases to flow at the moment that he means to sign his contract in blood in Scene 5, a protest by what Faustus calls his 'unwilling' blood. These references outnumber those to a Calvinistic paradigm, which only ever come from Faust and Mephistopheles, hardly the most reliable characters in the play.

Faustus, as portrayed by Marlowe, is thus perhaps not a 'noble character' undone by fate or by despair, despite the original full title of the play. Throughout we see him avoiding responsibility, as when he protests to his fellow scholars in Scene 14 that he would have repented but for the actions of the devil (an excuse that appears weak following the horrific death of the Old Man at the hands of the devils in Scene 13 at the request of Faustus himself) and using his newfound powers for trivial matters, such as cheating a Horse-Courser in Scene 12, despite initially showing a desire for grandeur. We are further encouraged to see Faustus as ridiculous through the actions of three other characters in the play, Wagner, Raffe and Robin. Their imperious demands serve as satirical commentary on the main action of the play, which it parallels neatly. Thus the audience reads the message that only fools sell their soul to the devil. The constant interruptions of the more 'serious' plot by these scenes of comedy break up the overall mood of the play, and, combined with Faustus' clear lack of positive attributes, prevent us from

truly seeing the play as the tragedy of man's failed defiance against god, making us think instead of the story of an unwise and misguided man.

We thus see in Marlowe an ultimately orthodox reflection on the story of Faustus at the height of the renaissance. In the play written by Goethe, on the other hand, we have a more revolutionary and iconoclastic play. Not only does Goethe's play criticize the foundations of the Christian faith and play on its paradoxes, rejecting organized religion, it ultimately transcends the Christian paradigm altogether.

Goethe's play can be seen as subversive from the first scene. The play opens initially with a prelude on the stage, where the characters of the director, playwright and clown can be seen to represent, if only loosely, God, Faust and Mephistopheles. If we accept this interpretation, our sympathies for the characters to come is already affected: if we see the poet—representing Faust— as tiresome and the clown, whose calls for entertainment resonate with the crowd, as amusing, then the prelude has worked in already hinting to us that the play will not follow religious dogma in the way that Marlowe's *Faustus* did.

The scene immediately following the prelude is the Prologue in Heaven, a key scene in understanding the religious attitude of the text. By placing the competition for souls between God and devil in the form of a bet, Goethe portrays these figures almost as two gambling friends. This impression is strengthened by their manner of address to each other and the casual tone of the conversation. When God offers Faustus as the 'bait' there are clear parallels to the scene in the book of Job, which raises questions about the existence of evil and the true nature of God's omni-benevolence. By allowing the devil to tempt Faust, God risks damning a soul we will later see to be already 'vulnerable' in its quest for knowledge. Throughout the play there are references to this vulnerability; it is striking that a man who supposedly serves God, even 'in confusion, knows as much about necromancy and demonic process as Faust does. This knowledge is displayed in his first interaction with Mephistopheles in Scene 6. By presenting evil as the result not of a force

diametrically opposed to God (i.e. the devil) but as an occurrence which exists with the collusion of God, Goethe asks us to question basic religious beliefs.

Throughout the work, good and evil often seem to be intermingled and confused: as Mephistopheles says, he is ‘Part of that Power which would/ Do evil constantly, and constantly does good. This is exemplified by the passage in which Faust tells the story of a plague which occurred in his youth; he and his father worked to save the people of the town, but ‘With those hell-sirups as our remedies, / We, worse than any plague, raged far and wide.’ It thus becomes difficult to tell the difference between helpful and harmful actions. It could even be suggested that the symbol of the father and son healing the population, but with negligible results, is a reflection of the actions of God and Jesus in the world as they could be perceived and judged by an outside force. This intermingling is a direct challenge to a worldview where the concepts of good and evil are clearly defined and in opposition—i.e. a traditional Christian paradigm. The threat of damnation never becomes the pressing issue that it is in Marlowe’s play. Whereas in “Dr. Faustus” significant space is dedicated to Faustus’ torment in what is a very brief play,

Goethe’s Faust never expresses the abject terror of hell that Marlowe’s does so frequently. We see therefore that the matter of ‘goodness’ has nothing to do with salvation. This is shown in the farcical way both in which the wager and the ‘robbing’ of Faust’s soul by heaven are treated, in contrast to the seriousness with which Faustus takes his covenant with the devil. In Goethe’s *Faust,* for example, the devil is mocked as a ‘poor pedant’ for requesting that the wager be written down, in an almost hysterical speech.

Throughout most of the play Mephistopheles gains our sympathy far more than Faust does. At the same time, we have a hard time taking the devil seriously as a representative of supreme evil—if this is our distillation of evil, then it does not seem to be such a threatening concept after all![1] Faust himself says, not only in a stunning display of arrogance, but in a presentation of the modem man’s

[1] Goethe. Faust. Part One. – Oxford, Oxford University Press. 1997. p. 34.

contempt for metaphysical beings, “Poor devil! What can you offer to me? /A mind like yours, how can it comprehend/ A human spirit’s high activity?’ It is in fact the devil who is shocked by Faust’s desires for Gretchen and who urges him to wait in his pursuit. His relationship with Faust is much more casual than that between Mephistopheles and Faustus. In addition, he appears to have a more thorough understanding of humankind within the context of the play than the heavenly beings, shown in his assessment that man is “Ridiculous as ever, as in his first days... beastlier than a beast... He pokes his notes in all he filth he finds, alas.’ This can be applied to Faust himself, for example, given his insatiable curiosity and way in which he treats other human beings. Throughout this scene, the devil is made more sympathetic and amusing than God or the angels, reflecting the clown in the Prelude. This change in the presentation of the devil affects the relationship between Faust and the devil: whereas in Marlowe’s play the devil frequently had to threaten Faust to remain loyal to him here we see man and the devil closer to being friends. This works to distract both Faust and the audience from the idea of damnation, showing that this isn’t really what Goethe himself is truly concerned with either.

Goethe’s lack of concern about traditional Christian attitudes is also indicated by his decision to transform Wagner, Faust’s pretentious and foolish servant, into the voice of traditional morality. The audience is not likely to take anything said by him seriously, and his solemn pronouncements on faith are just as likely to be laughed off as heeded. Another key point comes when Faust pronounces that ‘The spirit speaks! I see how it must read,/ And boldly write ‘In the beginning was the Deed’ in contrast to the original line from the Bible in which it is the Word which is ‘In the beginning. This could be interpreted to mean that what is essential is not that which is said (the laws of religion, which among other things would condemn him to hell) but that which actually happens (in reality he is spared this fate). This belies all three Abrahamic religions, which place emphasis on their respective holy books as either the word of god or of those divinely inspired. In addition, with its

new emphasis on action, the changed line could be seen as reference to the heroic striving which Goethe's work explores.

Goethe's purpose is further illustrated when he goes on to question all forms of traditional and entrenched authority, not just religious ones. In the play he criticizes classical establishments such as universities, the monarchy and churches. For example, the harsh religiosity of society condemns Gretchen for sleeping with Faust before marriage, whereas from the text it is clear that she has the author's sympathy—her tale is not told savagely, but in a manner which expresses outrage at the narrow-minded, shame-filled morality being taught in churches. As well as criticizing clerical institutions,

Goethe uses Mephistopheles to reveal flaws in the contemporary education system in Scene 7[1]. This near-constant mockery of established authority, from university professors to the Holy Roman Empire, sets the tone for the work overall. In a work of this nature, it seems impossible that the religious beliefs themselves should be accepted without question.

Further evidence of Goethe's attitude towards Christianity is his introduction of classical deities alongside Christian religious figures, especially throughout Part Two.

Their introduction and placement alongside God and the devil as equally powerful and valid shows a broader world view than traditional religious beliefs and contrasts starkly with the confidence in these beliefs demonstrated in Marlowe's play. Goethe chooses to finish his work not with the Christian image of salvation but with a paean to the mysterious 'Eternal Womanhood'. Despite the emphasis in some branches of Christianity on the role of the Virgin Mary, this other female figure appears to have greater ties to the classical or pagan religions explored throughout Part Two of the play.

[1] Throughout Scene 7 of *Faust: Part One* Mephistopheles mocks the system of learning presented in universities, especially to the Student who arrives hoping to gain knowledge. Source: Goethe. Faust. Part One. – Oxford, Oxford University Press. 1997. – pp. 56-61.

The second volume both begins and ends with feminine, non-Christian figures, in contrast to the triumvirate of males (God, the devil and Faust) who represent the Christian worldview. In both the beginning and end these feminine characters bring sleep or healing, again in contrast to the three males. This emphasis on the pagan and feminine throughout Book Two shows less of a critique than a simple dismissal of traditional Christianity.

However, this play is more complicated to have as its theological goal simply a refutation of the existing religious order. At the same time as recognizing that according to traditional Christianity Faust should not have been saved, the reader wonders why Goethe himself wanted to save his character. Redner suggests that it is the striving quality, evident in his search for power and knowledge beyond the human scope, of Faust that redeems him in the eyes of the author; this would fit with Goethe's classicist, humanist position. In *Faust: Part Two,* an Angel specifically says that 'He who strives and lives to strive/ Can earn redemption still.' Luke has suggested in his introduction to his translation that Goethe abandons entirely the Christian paradigm in order to express a new spirituality based on the very characteristic that damns him in the eyes of Christianity: dissatisfaction with the world as it is. Faust as a character is in fact redeemed by his dissatisfaction with the world and his resulting continuous striving for the perfection of the individual will. One striking example of Faust's human ambition to override and conquer Nature occurs in Scene 14 of *Faust: Part Two* when, speaking to Mephistopheles, he says that 'Never/ have I felt such great strength for bold endeavor...I'll ban the lordly sea, I'll curb its force,/I'll set new limits to that watery plain...This is my will after bemoaning that the waves are 'Breaker upon breaker, all their power upheaved/ And then withdrawn, not a thing achieved !/I watch dismayed, almost despairingly,/this useless elemental energy! (in contrast to human energy, which has a direction and purpose)'

From these two examples, we can see that the myth of Faust can be used in a variety of ways. Marlowe's interpretation is more clearly in line with the orthodox

views held by the Church and the population at the time, and in accordance with the propagators of the original story. In contrast, Goethe's play, while using the same basic framework, abandons this ostensibly pious interpretation and instead uses it to put forward a celebration of man's ability to look at the world critically and to engage in a continual process of renewal and improvement, allowing for the ultimate transcendence of the religious dogma expressed by the earlier play. It is interesting that the same story can be used for such diverse purposes; such founding myths of our culture, and their development over time as popular attitudes change, may be one method of measuring these changes. In looking at the changing attitude towards religion, and at the extent of the traditional religious paradigm, the story of Faust, serves as a unique cultural barometer, as these two different interpretations of the tale show.

2.4. The Puritan Ethic in Marlowe's Dr. Faustus and Goethe's Faust

One of the common misconceptions about Marlowe is that he is irreligious and that he expresses this in the criticism he directs against the religious figures he depicts in his plays. However, Marlowe used his religious teachings at the university to provide a framework for his play The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus. The play is the tragedy of a "typical man of the Renaissance, as an explorer and adventurer, as a superman craving for extraordinary power, wealth, enjoyment, and worldly eminence."[1]

The play opens with Faustus discussing and rejecting the disciplines he has studied and mastered: logic, medicine, law, and theology, for magic by which he hopes he could "gain a deity". However, he states half-truths as the basis of his refusal. For instance, he quotes parts of two important Biblical texts as a basis for his subsequent arguments and actions. "The reward of sin is death", he declares, omitting, "but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord". He continues with, "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves,

[1] http://www.bartleby.com/60/204.html

and there is no truth in us". Again he omits a consoling promise: "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness". Elizabethan spectators would have been able to complete his quotations and thereby to discern his sophistry, thus corrupting the use of reason to undermine the basis of his faith.

True to this medieval sophistry, Faustus refuses the salutary parts of medicine and the social benefits of law, because neither science lends itself to the fulfilment of his impossible aspirations. His attitude towards ordinary studies amounts to scorn for common humanity, including its needs and potentialities. Burdened with this attitude, he fails to understand himself as an ordinary man and sloughs off his social responsibilities and sympathies: "These metaphysics of magicians,/ And necromantic books are heavenly!/…A sound magician is a mighty god./ Here Faustus, try thy brains to gain a deity."[1] Faustus is a false logician.

Clarence Green further argues that by rejecting these disciplines, and choosing "metaphysics of magicians," Faustus is doing more than rejecting old and honored disciplines in favor of one that is not only untried but also damned. He is choosing atomistic willfulness instead of organized control, anarchy instead of order, despair instead of blessedness. For his rejection of divinity and logic is a rejection of the hypotheses, deductions, and conclusions on which the world had hitherto been based for the Elizabethans.[2]

But the play is not completely a Renaissance drama as it contains medieval elements. Faustus is aided by Valdes and Cornelius, two German magicians, and succeeds in conjuring the devil to appear to him. The presence of the devil is a medieval element in the play. Yet his trial of magical arts again exposes his false assumptions about the mastery of knowledge. Praising the virtues of magic, he proclaims arrogantly, "Now,

[1] www.gutenberg.org. Marlowe Christopher. The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus. 1, 49-50, 62-63
[2] http://www.jstor.org/stable/40399769

Faustus, thou art conjuror laureat,/ That canst command great Mephistophilis." Mephistophilis does come, but in answer to the question, "Did not my conjuring speeches raise thee?", he replies: "That was the cause, but yet per accidens;/ For, when we hear one rack the name of God,/ Abjure the Scriptures and his Saviour Christ,/ We fly, in hope to get his glorious soul".

This situation is ironic. Any man can blaspheme and thereby exchange obedience to God for subservience to devils, though he possesses no magic whatever. This part of the action symbolizes a deep spiritual truth, for the devil, in the insubstantial guise of evil and temptation, will accompany any man who abjures the Holy Trinity.

This is not the only disappointment Faustus is to face in his journey with the devil. Soon after he pledges his soul to the devil, he realizes that he is deceived: "O thou art deceived!" The devil Mephistophilis argues with Faustus with the same logic the latter used to reject the disciplines he used to study. But the arguments lead to an affirmation of the existence of God Faustus denies and he attempts to repent which leads to yet another disappointment:

Faustus

Ah Christ my Saviour, seek to save

Distressed Faustus' soul.

Enter Lucifer, Belzebub and Mephistopheles

Lucifer

Christ cannot save thy soul, for he is just.

There's none but I have interest in the same.[1]

The real issue here is between repentance and despair. It is the sin of despair which causes the catastrophe. His despair of salvation leads him here to the opposite and complementary state of mind, sinful complacency.

Faustus alternates between repentance and despair because, Joseph T. McCullen argues, "It is not his pact with Lucifer that constitutes his

[1] www.gutenberg.org. Marlowe Christopher. The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus. 5,257-260

unpardonable sin, and, though he has already thought of despair, there is nothing inescapable about the hold it as yet exerts upon him; hence the exciting rhythm of his alternating moods which establish and maintain the pattern of his inner tragedy."[1]

The arch devil decides to entertain Faustus by showing him the seven deadly sin "of their several names and/ dispositions". This is clearly an element drawn from medieval morality. Marlowe retains much of the coarse humour and clownish episodes of the Faustbuch. This association of tragedy and buffoonery remained an inherent part of the Faust dramas and puppet plays that were popular for two centuries. Faustus after the climactic appearance of Lucifer is never seen arguing again except briefly to the Duchess of Vanholt. He gives himself up to a life of "all voluptuousness" and, like a skilled circus-performer, succeeds in all his tricks, and the dominant strain sustained throughout this section of the play is one of practical joking. While there is no doubt that the play is contrived around a more or less traditional morality vision – Faustus is damned – the play's moral structure is constantly being displaced by comic incidents, such as Faustus's faking dismemberment in the horse-courser scenes, for instance, confuses and deflects the horror of his possible dismemberment by the devils. The latter becomes potentially as much a parodic burlesque of the former as vice versa. Whether these are Marlowe's or another dramatist's is unsolvable but they remain an integral part of the play.

In the last day of his life on earth, Faustus confesses his crimes to his friends, the three scholars. The old man enters and holdsthe key to Faustus's salvation: "Ah Doctor Faustus, that I might prevail/ To guide thy steps unto the way of life,/ By which sweet path thou may'st attain the goal/ That shall conduct thee to celestial rest."

Faustus, however, fails to respond to the Old Man's plea, and asks him to leave him alone "to ponder on my sins." As soon as the Old Man leaves,

[1] McCullen Joseph T. Dr Faustus and Renaissance Learning. – London, 2005. – p. 35

and Mephistopheles returns and threatens Faustus, Faustus regresses to his servitude to the devil:

Mephistopheles

Thou traitor, Faustus: I arrest thy soul

For disobedience to my sovereign lord.

Revolt, or I'll in piecemeal tear thy flesh.

Faustus

Sweet Mephastophilis, entreat thy lord

To pardon my unjust presumption;

And with my blood again I will confirm

My former vow I made to Lucifer.

* * *

Torment, sweet friend, that base and crooked age

That durst dissuade me from thy Lucifer,

With greatest torments that our hell affords.[1]

The Old Man symbolizes the integrated social result of faith in primary hypotheses. Christ and God symbolize the primary hypotheses themselves. The decrepitude of the Old Man –"that base and crooked age" – reflects Faustus's poor opinion of the chances of survival of the society for which the Old Man stands. Therefore, Faustus does not appeal to the Old Man's Christ but to his own individualist, scapegoat Christ.

In order to keep his pledge to the devil, Faustus asks Mephistopheles to bring him "That heavenly Helen which I saw of late". Helen's is that essentially destructive beauty which has "burnt the topless towers of Ilium"; the "immortality" she provides with her kiss is the absolute antithesis of all truth, morality, and religion.[2] When Faustus says: "Her lips sucks forth my soul, see where it flies!/ Come Helen, come, give me my soul again./ Here will I dwell,

[1] www.gutenberg.org. Marlowe Christopher. The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus. 12, 57-63, 66-68

[2] Sach Arieh. The Religious Despair of Doctor Faustus. The Journal of English and Germanic Philology 26 Apr. 2012. – p. 642

for heaven be in these lips, /And all is dross that is not Helena!", Faustus speaks of heaven, yet we know that it is really hell he speaks about, though unaware. He asks that Helen make him "immortal with a kiss," but in reality he is asking for the coup de grace that will irrevocably damn him. Helen is a devil in female guise, a succuba, and Faustus, in receiving her "immortal kiss," "commits the sin of demoniality".

The Old Man aptly describes Faustus as a "miserable man" because, "though a real heaven is 'all about him where to choose,' he seeks it rather in a phantasm". He also spends his last hour in prospection of damnation and phantasms of salvation which cannot be realized because he lacks the faith and trust in God necessary to achieve them. He is constitutionally incapable of hearing both sides of faith's paradox; he can hear only the premise of Sin, not the conclusion of Redemption:

> Faustus
>
> But Faustus' offence can ne'er be pardoned! The serpent that tempted Eve may be saved, but not Faustus. …
>
> 3 scholar
>
> Yet Faustus, call on God.
>
> Faustus
>
> On God, whom Faustus hath abjured? On God, whom Faustus hath blasphemed? Ah my God –I would weep, but the devil draws in my tears![1]

McCloskey argues that Faustus cannot repent because of the sin of despair. It is his own Medusa, his Gorgon of Despair, lurking within the dark alleys of his ambition and pride which has changed his heart into stone and made him unable to repent and ask forgiveness. Faustus cannot see God as the merciful and benevolent creator and giver of life, but rather a vengeful deity bent on punishing him:

> see where God

[1] www.gutenberg.org. Marlowe Christopher. The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus. 13, 15-16, 27-30

Stretcheth out his arm, and bends his ireful brows!

Mountains and hills, come, come and fall on me,

And hide me from the heavy wrath of God. ...

My God, my God, look not so fierce on me![1]

The last soliloquy reverses the first. The proud scholar who had fretted at the restrictions imposed by the human condition and longed for the immortality of a god now seeks to avoid an eternity of damnation. Like a trapped animal he lashes out against the mesh he has woven for himself, and becomes more entangled. To be physically absorbed, to be 'a creature wanting soul', 'some brutish beast', even, at the last, to be no more than 'little water drops' – this is the final hope of the pride of Wittenberg.[2] The play ends with Faustus dragged to hell alive by devils.

The fact that what is arguably Marlowe's most important work survives only in questionable form, the A Text (1604) and the B Text (1616), need not, though, be such a loss to literature as it first appears, because it can in fact guide us to uncovering some of the play's meanings and resonances. In the first place, what stands out in both texts is the general shape and conception of the play. Goethe said of Doctor Faustus "How greatly it is all planned!", and that is indeed perhaps the most striking aspect of the play: the story has a simplicity that is quite astonishing in its starkness.

Goethe's magnum opus Faustis written in intervals between other works over a period of more than fifty years. It reflects the evolution of Goethe's own thinking and character, from youth to age. The two parts that comprise the complete drama, Faust: A Tragedy, are as dissimilar as the influences under which they were written, the first being romantic, the second classical in form and content.

[1] www.gutenberg.org. Marlowe Christopher. The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus. 13, 76-77; 112
[2] Roma Gill. Introduction in Christopher Marlowe Dr Faustus. – London, A & C Black. 2002. – p. 17-18.

Restless endeavor, incessant striving from lower spheres of life to higher ones, from the sensuous to the spiritual, from enjoyment to work, from creed to deed, from self to humanity is the moving thought of Goethe's completed drama. The keynote is struck in the "Prologue in Heaven." Faust, so we hear, the daring idealist, the servant of God, is to be tempted by Mephistopheles, the despiser of reason, the materialistic scoffer. But we also hear, and we hear it from God's own lips, that the tempter will not succeed. God allows the devil free play, because he knows that he will frustrate his own ends. Faust will be led astray but he will not abandon his higher aspirations; through aberration and sin he will find the true way toward which his inner nature instinctively guides him.

The first four scenes of the human drama, a unified sequence spanning one night and two days, show how the impatient, frustrated idealist is induced to enter into an association with the "spirit of negation," that is destined to cast its shadow over the rest of his earthly life.[1] Like Marlowe's Faustus, Faust is revealed in Act One, Scene One, sitting in his study lamenting the time he spent studying philosophy, jurisprudence, medicine, and theology:

Ah! Now I've done Philosophy,
I've finished Law and Medicine
And sadly even Theology:
Taken fierce pains, fromend to end.
Now here I am, a fool for sure!
No wiser than I was before:
Master, Doctor's what they call me
And I've been ten years, already,
Crosswise, arcing, to and fro,
Leading my students by the nose,
And see that we can know -nothing!

[1] http://www.jstor.org/stable/40399769

It almost sets my heart burning.[1]

Faust is interested primarily in his emotions, and his narrow gothic room, emblem of his dry intellectual world, offers no space for them to overflow.

In the next scene Faust walks around with Wagner. A dog follows Faust as the latter returns to his study. Faust begins reading and arguing when suddenly the dog grows into a fearful shape. Faust traps the spirit so that it does not harm him. Faust also manages to make the spirit reveal itself. It is Mephistopheles in the shape of a travelling scholar.

The first interchange establishes Faust as master of the situation. Assuming a condescending tone, he displays active curiosity without a trace of nervousness:

Faust

What meaning to these riddling words applies?

Mephistopheles

I am the spirit, ever, that denies!

And rightly so: since everything created,

In turn deserves to be annihilated:

Better if nothing came to be.

So all that you call Sin, you see,

Destruction, in short, what you've meant

By Evil is my true element.

Faust

You call yourself a part, yet seem complete to me? He listens to the riddling answers, the boasts and tantrums of his visitor with grave concern and mild amusement. To the spirit of negation he opposes his deep, positive reverence for the eternal mysteries of Nature's creative workings. The professor even lectures the devil on the folly of his impotent negativism and admonishes him to mend his ways. To his surprise, Faust discovers that the devil has allowed

[1] www.gutenberg.org. Marlowe Christopher. The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus. 354-365

himself to be caught in a trap. The handling of this all but incredible situation (against the background of the folk image of the devil as an essentially stupid fellow, easily tricked) shows a most ingenious interplay of chance and design: The poodle, evidently bent on no more than a bit of preliminary reconnoitering, has been forced to show his hand prematurely. Faust's self-confidence is heightened by the discovery that he has the visitor in his power. When his prodding questions bring out the fact that demons who invade the human realm are governed by strict rules of behavior, it is Faust who takes the initiative in broaching the idea of a pact, and it is Mephistopheles, caught off guard, who has to resort to a delaying action: “So you still have laws in Hell, in fact? / That’s good, since it allows a pact,/ And one with you gentlemen truly binds?” Eventually Mephistopheles, apparently resigned to the situation, puts his captor to sleep by a ruse and makes his escape. Faust awakens in a state of redoubled frustration.

The next day, Mephistopheles returns and agrees to be Faust’s slave on condition that “I’ll be your servant here, and I’ll/ Not stop or rest, at your decree:/ When we’re together, on the other side,/ You’ll do the same for me.” Mephistopheles would serve Faust until the latter says:

And quickly!

When, to the Moment then, I say:

‘Ah, stay a while! You are so lovely!

Then you can grasp me: then you may,

Then, to my ruin, I’ll go gladly!

The next scene is a deliberate anticlimax. A flying carpet can do no better than to take the two to Auerbach’s Tavern in Leipzig, because Mephistopheles wants to take Faust “First of all, I had to bring you here,/ Where cheerful friends sup together,” of some happy-go-lucky drinking cronies. There Mephistopheles amuses himself, but not Faust: he remains distant; and later he says, “I’d like to leave here now.” The next scene, “Witch’s Kitchen,” is comic in a

more macabre way; it serves the important dramatic purpose of giving Faust back his youth, as thirty from his fifty years are taken away. Faust is disgusted, and says "I'm in the dark, the hag babbles with fever." but the witch's conjuration works, and Mephistopheles promises Faust a splendid sexual rejuvenation, saying, "With that drink in your body, well then,/All women will look to you like Helen." replying to what Faust says, "Let me look quickly in the glass, once more!/ How lovely that woman's form, I descried!", after he sees Helen in the mirror.[1]

In this scene, Faust asks why he needs to work through witches, Mephistopheles answers saying: "It's true the Devil taught it:\The Devil can't make it though." The devil cannot operate alone, but needs to do so through human conduits because his real object is the human mind.

Mephistopheles answers to Faust's scorn saying:

Faust (To Mephistopheles.)
Tell me, now, what's happening?
These wild gestures, crazy things,
All of this tasteless trickery,
Is known, and hateful enough to me.
Mephistopheles
A farce! You should be laughing:
Don't be such a serious fellow!
This hocus-pocus she, the doctor's, making,
So you'll be aided by the juice to follow.[2]

The witch's incantations and gestures do not cause the potion's magical effect. What they do is make her believe that they cause this effect to her satisfaction. They induce in her the belief that signs can do things, and this belief is necessary and sufficient for the devil to achieve his purpose, which is to make it appear to human beings that signs are performative, by performing their

[1] Ian Watt. Myths of Modern Individualism. – Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 1996. – p. 197
[2] www.gutenberg.org. Marlowe Christopher. The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus. 2531-9

alleged effects himself. (This is similar to Faustus's confession before the Emperor that he cannot bring "the true substantial bodies" and that he can bring grapes for the Duchess "by means of a swift spirit that I have" noting that while Mephistopheles in Faustis clear about it, his counterpart in Faustus does not, and Faustus, the false logician, does not realize that he does not have any real powers until well-nigh his end.)

Brown argues that mirrors are common images of subjectivity; yet this magic mirror reflects not the self, but the vision projected by that self. Here is an explicit image of Faust projecting his vision of ideal beauty – or of the Ideal per se –onto something outside of himself; and the something onto which he projects it is a framed image. All that follows, namely the Gretchen tragedy, is effectively transformed into a play within the play. Now the fact that Gretchen is the mirror onto which Faust continues to project his own vision reflects not only his subjectivity but also his creativity. Thus Gretchen disappears as an individual in the plethora of emotions and ideals Faust projects onto her; her tragedy is that she does not really exist in the face of Faust's subjectivity.[1]

Part One of Faust ends with the scene of the attempted rescue, an overwhelming finale. The personality of the wretched girl in the prison cell is completely shattered, but every fractured piece suggests the one-time perfection now irretrievably destroyed. Instinctively she senses the sinister aura of her one-time lover, who is supposedly comes to her rescue, and shrinks from his touch: "Let me alone! No, no force!/ Don't grip me so murderously, oh,/ I've done all else to please you so."

In a final flash of lucidity she throws herself upon the merciful judgment of God, and a voice from the Beyond proclaims her salvation,[2] while Faustus leaves with Mephistopheles whose remark "She is judged!" is revoked by the same voice proclaiming her salvation with "She is saved!" Part one ends with the

[1] Ian Watt. Myths of Modern Individualism. – Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 1996. – p. 94
[2] Weigand Hermann J. Goethe's Faust an Introduction for Students and Teachers of General Literature. – p. 467-486. http://www.jstor.org/stable/402865

Gretchen episode which was the first stage of Faust's career in the world of man outside the confining walls of the study. For Faust, the pure love of Gretchen will be forever imbedded in his memory as the deepest spiritual blessing vouchsafed to him by a kindly Providence, and as the ineradicable reminder of his darkest hour. When he finally departs from the earthly stage the intercession of Gretchen will weigh the scales in the achievement of his redemption.

One significant alteration of the classical Faust myth, and a point of departure from Faustus, is that the bond is changed into a bet by Goethe. As a text that encompasses the different epistemologies, philosophies, and cultural changes of Europe then, the shift from pact to bet thus advances the idealist critique of the possibilities and dangers of the now virtually complete secularization of European culture: the grounding of identity exclusively in the self on the one hand allows Faust the full development of his inherent capacities, but on the other hand leaves him to seek a basis for a knowledge of the non-self and for a morality grounded outside of the self.

The second part of Faust deals with Faust’s recovery of Helen, his marriage to her, the birth and death of their son, and his land reclamation project which occupies him till his death. Brown argues that Faust II repeats structures and episodes from Faust I, but simultaneously broadens them as it unfolds their implications. The simplest way to recognize the analogies to Part I is to think of Part II as consisting of two parts: Acts I–III deal with Faust’s recovery of Helen, his subsequent ‘marriage’ to her, and the birth and death of their son Euphorion; in Acts IV and V Faust returns to modern Germany and engages in the land reclamation schemes in which he completes his career. As Part I divides into the tragedy of the scholar (in which Faust renounces words for deeds) and the Gretchen tragedy, so Part II divides (symmetrically, we note) into the Helen tragedy and the tragedy of the man of deeds who finds his way back at the very end to the power of the master’s word “The master’s word alone declares what’s right.” However, Part II is more epic in its scale and “[i]nstead of a forward

movement focused upon the outcome of Faust's association with the forces of Evil, the scenes are crowded with pageantry and spectacles in many of which Faust's presence is unobserved or he is off stage altogether…[while t]he time … ranges over half a century."

Scene One depicts Faust asleep with a host of elves singing to him. He wakes up and adopts, under the influence of the glory of the new day, a new approach to life in which the "barren quest of the absolute is renounced in favor of the more profitable pursuit of exploring the infinite variety of the world of phenomena." The next scene moves to the Emperor's palace. The emperor requests that Faust conjures Helenand Paris. The outcome of this, already begun in Part I in the ""Witch's Kitchen" when Faust sees Helen in the mirror, is his marriage to Helen and the birth of their son, Euphorion. Euphorion dies jumping from a cliff to try his wings, like Icarus. Helen slips from Faust back to the underworld to rejoin her son, and Faust moves on to a more sublime quest, the welfare of humanity through his land reclamation project.

If Acts One to Three were focused upon the experience of beauty –the aesthetic sphere – as a momentous enrichment of Faust's(and mankind's) expanding development, Act Four introduces a new theme to engage man's restless imagination. It is the challenge of the physical environment, the will to understand and control the forces of nature. It is man's will to power in the face of the inert or hostile elements.

But Faust's project is marred by Faust's rash command to Mephistopheles to buy a small cottage in the middle of Fausts's project owned by an old couple who refuse to relinquish their abode. Mephistopheles's cronies barge into the house and the couple dies. Faust is unpleased: "Were you deaf to what I said?\ I wanted them moved, not dead.\This mindless, and savage blow,\Earns my curse: share it, and go!" Faust says, after dismissing Mephistopheles and his cronies: "Quickly said, too quickly done, I fear!" (11382) Hermann J. Weigand argues that this is a sign for Faust's repentance, a fact

emphasized by the fact that Faust does not use magic to dismiss Care ("Faust (First angered, then composed, addressing himself.) Take care: of magic spells show not a trace.) What he says in his last soliloquy in Act Five, Scene Five: "The master's word alone declares what's right."

The final two scenes depict Faust's death, burial and salvation. Weigand aptly summarizes the action leading to Faust's death in the following:

On this last night of his life, Faust has again been carried away by an excess of impatience to the perpetration of a highhanded act of injustice that resulted in destruction and murder. He has subsequently repented of this abuse of his power. Then, when assailed by the spectral demon of Anxiety [or Care], he had, in the nick of time, remembered to check his impatience. The hypnotic crooning had prompted him to pass his life in review and, in full acknowledgment of early decisions irretrievably made, he had deeply repented of his cardinal sin of impatience that led to his all embracing curse and his involvement with the powers of darkness. In this he had successfully countered the Demon's assault, but the victory that left his personality whole has left its mark on his body. The curtain now rises on the scene of Faust's death.

Although Goethe's Faust does not trouble himself with the ramifications of his acts and the "fate of his soul" like Marlowe's Faustus, and does not "waste his energies in morbid brooding over an act that cannot be undone", Goethe's Faust is saved and carried away to Heaven through the intervention of Gretchen. Angels chant the divine precepts of Faust's salvation:

He's escaped, this noble member
Of the spirit world, from evil,
Whoever strives, in his endeavour,
We can rescue from the devil.
And if he has Love within,
Granted from above,

The sacred crowd will meet him,

With welcome, and with love.

Faust is propelled by love and longing for restoration, thus by the lack of and the need for a complement. It is from activity that he is saved - from the frenzy of a life of loneliness and longing, confusedly underway toward joy. Joy cannot be found close at hand or at once, which is why the Lord greets Mephistopheles as provocateur at the play's beginning. The goal is rest, ecstasis, release-love and death. But love is a gift and cannot be earned, whether through striving or in any other way. In Faust love is a female donation, embodied in the transfigured Gretchen, who intercedes on Faust's behalf.[1]

But love is not the only reason behind Faust's salvation. Activity is another. Ian Watt argues that the earlier Faust tradition stood for the idea of the Fall having occurred because man yielded to the temptation to eat of the fruit of forbidden knowledge of good and evil. But according to the Romantics and Goethe a secular salvation is apparently available for anyone who keeps active and keeps on looking. The order and plenitude which had in previous centuries been ascribed to the Great Chain of Being is now, in the usual Romantic style, being sought only in the individual's personal life; there are no fixed virtues and vices, no fixed standards. The only operative principle of value is endless motion, a quality it shares with not only the Protestant ethic, but with modern physics as well. Faust, despite the fact that he loses the bet, as he views the land reclamation project as his greatest achievements, he is saved because he repents, he is active, a keynote struck in the "Prologue in Heaven".

Marlowe's Faustus is written along the same Protestant lines. Genevieve Guenther argues that Marlow used the then popular "Protestant anxiety about salvation and popular desire for entertainment converged to produce historically contingent aesthetic effects." Arieh Sachs argues that

[1] Ellis Dye. Love and Death in Goethe. – New York, Camden House. 2004 – p. 58

Faustus is offered salvation and is damned to hell on Protestant terms. Sachs says:

The Old Man's appearance is quite enlightening, from our point of view, for he is a man of superior knowledge. His sermon, which follows the conventional extreme Protestant line in that it dwells on human depravity in order to show that only Grace can wash sin away, produces the opposite effect in Faustus and underlines what one increasingly comes to consider Faustus' predetermined reprobation. Faustus is not thrown by the sermon into "temporal despair" … , a conviction of sin that is an essential first step towards repentance, but into "final despair," a conviction of sin so great that it precludes all belief in Mercy, hence all belief in God's power.[1]

Faustus can be saved only if God has chosen to save him, and he must therefore hope that God has indeed chosen to save him. Faustus's reaction is "damn'd are thou, Faustus, damn;d; despair and die!/ Hell calls for right. ..." He is constitutionally incapable of hearing both sides of faith's paradox; he can hear only the premise of Sin, not the conclusion of Redemption.

[1] Sach Arieh. The Religious Despair of Doctor Faustus. The Journal of English and Germanic Philology 26 Apr. 2012. – p. 640.

Conclusion

In the research paper we examined the differences and similarities between Christopher Marlowe's Doctor Faustus and Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's Faust caused by the opinions of religion and morality in both the authors and the societies they were a part of. Through a close examination of both texts, as well as references to biographical information of the authors, we showed how Marlowe's atheism and Goethe's complex philosophy of spirituality and morality created two distinct texts portraying the significance of Faust or Dr. Faustus's choices and fate.

Before comparing Doctor Faustus and Faust directly, both works were examined individually to provide a context for my argument. With Doctor Faustus, we highlighted the role of Marlowe's religious beliefs and the commonly held superstitions and values in England at the time played in the writing of the play.

The contrast between the messages of both authors centers on the messages in both works, as well as their intended use: while Doctor Faustus was written for popular entertainment, Faust is more of a commentary. The ambiguous fate of Faustus and Faust is also examined: while Doctor Faustus centers on an arbitrary judgment based on claims of faith alone, Faust emphasizes the importance of actual virtue over blind claims of faith. The differences in Faustus and Faust's hesitations to make their pacts with the devil also differ, with Faustus fearing damnation and Faust questioning the importance or possibility of damnation. The influence of superstition and common acceptance of religion in Doctor Faustus are contrasted with the skepticism present in Faust throughout each work, with the former demonstrating Marlowe's criticism of religion while the latter questions the nature of religion itself. Finally, both works are compared to the English Faust book: the lack of influence from either author provides a source to compare how each author used the same basic story to send vastly different messages.

While the analysis of Dr. Faustus is mainly focused on the text and performance of the work, it lacks concrete biographical information on Marlowe and how his beliefs impacted the play. In contrast, we examined the text of

Goethe's Faust with solid biographical information; unlike Marlowe, our understanding of Goethe's life is less based on speculation. While historical information is also used to provide context, it is not as prominent as with Dr. Faustus. As Goethe's Faust was not necessarily intended to be performed, there are few examples of segments included purely for entertainment or significant stage directions; this absence contrasts with Dr. Faustus, but is not examined beyond that.

The two authors have overlapping versions of the famous Faust legend. Both of the main characters are men that seek to overreach their human capabilities in gaining access to more knowledge. However, there are key differences in the plot of each version, which demonstrates the intended purpose of each version or, the impact each of them would have on the audience.

Marlowe's version of Doctor Faustus has plot similarities to Goethe's Faust, which we have been focusing on. However, Marlowe's version involves the presence of a Good Angel and Bad Angel at crucial moments in the text. They are both present when Faust considers the pursuit of magic, they appear again when Faust signs over his life to the Devil, and at the end of the play when Faustus is about dragged to hell. With the Good Angels presence, there are much more opportunities in the play for Faust to repent and choose God over evil. In addition, the purpose of Marlowe's Dr. Faustus is relatively straightforward- it serves as a lesson to the audience about the consequences of trying to surpass the limits of human ability.

Goethe's Faust on the other hand is more complex than Marlowe's version. One of the key differences in his play is the opening scene with the wager between God and Mephistopheles. It sets the stage for Faust to make his own decisions when he is tempted/influenced by Mephistopheles- he has no outside interference or guidance that encourages him to make the right decision. Also, unlike Dr. Faustus in Marlowe's play who does magic and harms multiple people under Mephistopheles influence, Faust's deal with Mephistopheles only harms one other

person: Gretchen. Gretchen's downfall caused by Faust's pursuit of her love demonstrates the negative impact his deal had just as well as Dr. Faustus doing harm to multiple people in Marlowe's version. Lastly, what makes Goethe's version of the Faust legend so complex is Gretchen's action of drowning her illegitimate child. This component of the play involves questioning her morality and instills a reaction within the audiences and readers.

Despite all the differences between Marlowe, the playwright, and Goethe, the poet, playwright, and philosopher, both have written their own versions of the Faust myth on Protestant lines. One main difference is obvious: while Marlowe condemns Faustus to warn theatre goers of the evils of magic and use the widespread interest in Witchcraft at that time to popularize his play, Goethe saves his Faust because he toiled until the end of his days for the good of humanity.

The List of used Literature

1. Каримов И.А. Юксак маънавият енгилмас куч. – Т., Маънавият. 2010. – 165 б.
2. Бақоева Л., Муратова Э.Д. Англия адабиёти тарихи. - Тошкент, 2006. – 155 б.
3. Лейтес Н.С. От Фауста до наших дней. – Москва, Просвещение. 1991. – стр. 11-34.
4. Холбеков М., Тожиев Х. Британия адабиёти тарихи. – Жиззах, 2010. – 67 б.
5. Andrew S. The Short Oxford History of English Literature. – Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1998. – p. 150
6. Brockbank J. P. Marlowe: Dr. Faustus. – London, Edward Arnold Ltd. 1992. – p. 75.
7. Cole Douglas. Suffering and Evil in the Plays of Christopher Marlowe. – Princeton, Princeton UP. 1992. – p. 241
8. Constantine David. Introduction to Faust: The First Part of the Tragedy in Faust. – London, Penguin Books. 2005. – pp. 5-9.
9. Davidson Thomas. The Philosophy of Goethe's Faust. – New York, Haskell House. 1999. – p. 8
10. Deats Sara Munson. Doctor Faustus: A Critical Guide. – London, Continuum. 2010. – p. 168.
11. Ellis Dye. Love and Death in Goethe. – New York, Camden House. 2004 – p. 58
12. Empson William. Faustus and the Censor: The English Faust-Book and Marlowe’s Dr. Faustus. – Oxford, Basil Blackwell. 1997. – p. 16-27
13. Ferber M. A Dictionary of Literary Symbols. – Cambridge, Cambridge Univ. Press. 2007. – 274 p.

14. Goethe Johann Wolfgang. Faust. Trans. Walter Arndt. – London, Norton. 2001.
15. Greenblatt and Meyer Howard Abrams. The Norton Anthology of English Literature. – New York, W. W. Norton. 2006. – p. 227.
16. Heller Otto. Faust and Faustus: A Study of Goethe's Relation to Marlowe. – New York, Cooper Square Publishers. 2002. – p. 155.
17. Ian Watt. Myths of Modern Individualism. – Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 1996 – p. 197
18. Lessing Gotthold. Array the Age of Goethe. – Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company. 1999. – p. 24-26.
19. Lunney Ruth. Marlowe and the Popular Tradition: Innovation in the English Drama before 1595. – Manchester, Manchester UP. 2002. – p 33.
20. Mason Eudo Colecestra. Goethe's Faust; Its Genesis and Purport. – Berkeley, University of California. 2001. – p. 6
21. McAlindon T. Doctor Faustus: Divine in Show. – New York, Twayne. 1994. – p. 38
22. McCullen Joseph T. Dr Faustus and Renaissance Learning. – London, 2005. – p. 35
23. Parker John. The Aesthetics of Antichrist: From Christian Drama to Christopher Marlowe. – Ithaca, Cornell UP. 2007. – p.228.
24. Redner Harry. In the Beginning was the Deed: Reflections on the Passage of Faust. – Berkely, University of California Press. 1992. – p. 96.
25. Robertson John George. A History of German Literature. – Edinburgh, Blackwood. 1997. – p. 212-276
26. Roma Gill. Introduction in Christopher Marlowe Dr Faustus. – London, A & C Black. 2002. – p. 17-18.
27. Sach Arieh. The Religious Despair of Doctor Faustus. The Journal of English and Germanic Philology 26 Apr. 2012.
28. Simkin Stevie. Marlowe: The Plays. – New York, Palgrave. 2001. – p. 106.

29. Tydeman William. Doctor Faustus: Text and Performance. – London, Macmillon Publishers. 1994. – p. 203.
30. Van der Lann J.M. Faust's Divided Self and Moral Inertia. – Monatshefte, 1999. – p. 452-62.
31. www.gutenberg.org. Marlowe Christopher. The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus.
32. http://www.bartleby.com/60/204.html
33. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40399769
34. http://www.poetryintranslation.com/PITBR/German/Fausthome.htm