ISSN (Print) : 0974-6846
Indian Journal of Science and Technology, *Vol 9(44), DOI: 10.17485/ijst/2016/v9i44/104715, November 2016* ISSN (Online) : 0974-5645

Understanding and Assessing Christopher Marlowe's Personality and Creative Activity in M. M. Morozov's and A. A. Smirnov's Works on Literary Criticism

Dmitry Nikolayevich Zhatkin* **and Anna Anatolyevna Ryabova**

Department of Translation and Methods of Translation, Penza State Technological University, Penza, Russian Federation; ivb40@yandex.ru, asnowflake@yandex.ru

Abstract

Objectives: The article sets as its aim the understanding and assessing of specifics of approaches to Christopher Marlowe's personality and creativity of the leading Soviet Shakespearean scholars of the 1930-s – 1950-s M. M. Morozov and A. A. Smirnov. It is found, particularly, in their perception of the historical chronicle "Edward II" as the top of Marlowe's dramaturgic art. **Methods:** The methodological base of the research is based on the works of classics of the Russian literary and art criticism Alexander N. Veselovsky, Alexey N. Veselovsky, V. M. Zhirmunsky, A. K. Dzhivelegov, M. P. Alekseev, A. A. Anikst, Yu. D. Levin, researches in the field of the theory and history of the Russian literary translation and Russian translated belletristic literature (A. V. Fedorov, E. G. Etkind, F. G. Ovchinnikova, A. N. Girivenko, etc.), Russian-English literary and historical and cultural relations (G. N. Boyadzhiyev, L. E. Pinsky), history of the English literature (N. I. Storozhenko, M. M. Morozov, A. A. Smirnov, R. M. Samarin, Yu. F. Shvedov, A. T. Parfyonov). In the course of the analysis cultural and historical, comparative and historical, comparative and typological, historical and typological, and biographic research methods were used. **Findings:** The reasoned establishment of the facts of Marlowe's influences in Shakespeare's creative activity, in many respects resisting to an anti-Shakespearean position of I. A. Aksenov, attributing many of Shakespeare's works to Marlowe, is called an undoubted merit of M. M. Morozov. It is noted that A. A. Smirnov as the researcher of Marlowe's creative work underwent the complex evolution from the early works, substantially relying on Marx's methodology, to the works, containing the deep analysis of the art world in Marlowe's tragedies and based on the direct work with the art text. If M. M. Morozov in the majority of his works considered Marlowe in comparison with the genius of Shakespeare, A. A. Smirnov in a number of his researches characterized the works of the English playwright as something being of undoubted independent scientific interest. While having differences in their estimates of concrete Marlowe's plays, M. M. Morozov and A. A. Smirnov were able to understand them in the context of the concrete historical era, having emphasized their humanistic and democratic inclination. **Novelty:** The study of M. M. Morozov's and A. A. Smirnov's works on literary criticism showed the importance of these authors' publications in the evolution of Shakespearean study in Russia, having refused ideas of vulgar sociologization of the past and attempts to adapt Christopher Marlowe's works into the context of the Soviet era ideology, they underlined their artistic and aesthetic value.

Keywords: A. A. Smirnov, Ch. Marlowe, Cross-cultural Communication, English Drama, Literary Criticism, Reception, M. M. Morozov, Russian-English Literature Relations, Tradition,

1. Introduction

A number of interesting judgments about Christopher Marlowe in the works of the outstanding scientist and Shakespearean scholar M. M. Morozov refer to the end of the 1930-s – 1940-s. Actually, only two of his short articles written and printed in the periodical press in 1938 "Christopher Marlowe"[1] and "Christopher Marlowe's Death"[2] are devoted to Marlowe, however attempts of the analysis of Shakespeare's predecessor's creative identity were made by the researcher in his numerous works devoted to the great playwright. It is possible to state that

* *Author for correspondence*

by the time of these works creation M. M. Morozov, being a person of mature age, had already formed his own idea of Marlowe as "the greatest of Shakespeare's predecessors"[3], and "Shakespeare's direct predecessor"[1], and "<one of the two (with Th. Kid)> of his greatest predecessors"[4], and even "Shakespeare's teacher"[1,2], and it did not undergo any significant changes. It allows us to speak about the researcher's holistic position expressed by means of a complex of judgments, complementing (and sometimes duplicating each other in different articles).

M. M. Morozov considered that Marlowe, Kid, Shakespeare's creative activity "became possible due to the break of fetters of the thousand-year obligatory medieval thinking, hiding the world of live reality from people's eyes"[4]. Assuming that Shakespeare knew Marlowe's dramas "almost by heart"[4], M. M. Morozov used this circumstance as a cause for explaining Marlowe's powerful tradition, which it is possible to see in Shakespearean works (in particular, of the early period). For example, "Titus Andronicus" perceived by the researcher as "at best <…> a student's work of Shakespeare" was, in his opinion, "a rather coarse and primitive imitation of Marlowe, partly of Thomas Kid"[4]. And even if we assume a possibility of his cooperation with Marlowe during "Titus Andronicus" creation, the level of the work, in comparison with "Tamburlaine the Great", "The Tragic Story of Doctor Faustus", "The Jew of Malta", was significantly lower: "Marlowe did not do his best here: he usually wrote more temperamentally, more brightly in this genre"[5]. In one of the early articles M. M. Morozov wrote: "<…> his <Marlowe's> hand, without any doubt, is felt in some parts of "Titus Andronicus"[1]. There the researcher also doubted Marlowe's participating in Shakespearean "Henry IV"[1].

In 1934 in the book "Shakespeare's Creative Work" A. A. Smirnov formulated a different approach to Marlowe's personality and creative activity, having considered him "the ideologist of the revolutionary (though spontaneous and anarchical) English upper merchant bourgeoisie of the end of the 16th century" and, at the same time, "the true humanist", who refused "bourgeois "plots", switched his aspiration to the sublime, reflected "in a pure form the essence of aspirations of his class without a narrow-minded and ordinary cover of his class practice"[6]. While "anarchical amoralism" and spontaneity of impulses are characteristic of Marlowe, Shakespeare overcame these beginnings – he is "a profound and mature humanist", for whom clarity and wisdom are most important[6]. However, in spite of the fact that "immeasurably fuller and deeper perception of reality" is available to Shakespeare, A. A. Smirnov, nevertheless, traditionally sees sources of his creativity in Marlowe's dramaturgic heritage. The researcher explains the absence of "the specific bourgeois and household plots"[6], and distinct preference of "concepts of the "high" tragic hero", around whom all actions in his separate plays are concentrated, and "heroic pathos of many <…> tragedies", and "statement of great tragic problems"[6] to them in Shakespeare's works due to Marlowe's tradition. A. A. Smirnov saw traditions of "The Jew of Malta" in "Richard III", "The Merchant of Venice" and "Titus Andronicus", noted that "Richard III" "in the most essential lines traces "Edward II"[6], saw "something from "Tamburlaine"[6] in "King Lear" and "Macbeth". A. A. Smirnov suggested that the tragedy "Titus Andronicus" can be "Shakespeare's remake of Marlowe's play – to such an extent its style and images remind Marlowe".[6] A. A. Smirnov expressed his more radical opinion in the letter to G. G. Shpet on March 15, 1934: "…having studied Titus Andronicus under a microscope, I resolutely incline that this play was written by Marlowe, and Shakespeare only retouched it! Earlier I had been skeptical about this hypothesis"[7].

Noting "all passion, all surplus of forces, all utopian plainness of thought and will" laid in the basis of the creativity of "the rough genius" of the English Renaissance"[6], who reflected the epoch of initial capitalization and formation of the bourgeoisie as a social class, A. A. Smirnov entered some polemic with the "bourgeois critics", calling Marlowe "the creator of the romantic drama"[6]. In spite of the fact that Marlowe's dramas "are full of courageous fiction and poetic imagination", his romanticism, according to A. A. Smirnov, in its basis is deeply realistic, in particular, "his strong characters, made of granite, are realistic, the whole ideological and psychological outline of his plays is realistic, his language and versification are realistic", and what is especially important, "his reflecting of the most ardent – deeply anarchical and immoral – aspirations of the class, that era <…>, which <…> shook inherited views"[6] is realistic. In his views of Marlowe's realism A. A. Smirnov relied on Marx's methodology, vastly quoted F. Engels's work "The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State", regarding the characteristic of the early capitalism epoch.

2. Results

According to M. M. Morozov, the main character of Shakespeare's historical chronicle "Richard II", full of unrestrained passions, "in many respects reminds violent heroes of Marlowe",[4] who in his "Edward II" brought the genre of plays on plots from the English history "to the high art perfection"[4], accented significant political tendencies. M. M. Morozov is even sure that "Edward II" is more considerable than "Richard II".[1] At the same time Shakespeare appears the innovator in relation to Marlowe: while in Marlowe's works only individuals act (for example, in "Tamburlaine the Great", where the army turns out "only a pale appendage to a titanic figure of the winner"[4]), in Shakespeare's works large people masses act (in particular, in "Henry V" the French are defeated not only by Henry, but also by all English army"[4]). If the main character's image of the historical chronicle "Richard III" created in the early years can be considered typically Marlowe's one ("a consummate "villain",[4] besides, openly speaking about his villainy), then, for example, Macbeth's image created later is more multisided, because this hero is, "in a way, the victim of surrounding influences": "The comparison of Macbeth with Richard gives an evident idea of the way passed by Shakespeare, from the image of the isolated personality, acting "independently", reminding Marlowe's heroes, to the image in interaction with the world around"[4].

M. M. Morozov recognized the necessity of "the return" to Marlowe's creative work while characterizing mature Shakespeare's plays "in the attempt of penetration into the essence of these works <…>, and for the clarification of some details"[1]. For example, he in detail comprehended the motive of "the strong personality's cult" proclaimed by Marlowe in "Tamburlaine the Great" and presented in his complete and final break in Shakespeare's "Coriolanus", which "in the very art manner in many respects reminds Marlowe",[4] and in many respects represents "that drama embodiment of titanic characters, which Marlowe started on the English Renaissance grounds.[4] Marlowe's Tamburlaine's mighty will was, according to M. M. Morozov, a creative force, whereas Shakespeare's Coriolanus's will is "a destructive force turned against him and dooming to futility his ingenious abilities, his fearless courage, his frankness and directness which do not know hypocrisy".[4] The researcher seems to see the reason of this destructiveness in the fact that, unlike Tamburlaine, setting people masses in motion, going ahead of them, Coriolanus blinded by self-love opposes himself to the people, makes the acts alien to national interests.

Shakespeare's "Romeo and Juliette" reminded M. M. Morozov another Marlowe's play – "The Jew of Malta", where "Barabas's daughter and her beloved, a young Spaniard, were the victims of hatred and hostility, reigning around them", however, for Shakespeare in this case it was important to emphasize the ancient feudal discord of two clans, whereas for Marlowe – to point to "the destructive force of gold" and to create "an image of "a machiavellist", a predator of initial capitalization"[4,8]. The spirit of "Machiavellianism" was the basic one in the work, where it penetrated not only in Barabas's image, but also images of his henchman Ithimore, the courtesan, hustling Ithimore's money, her lover Pilia-borza, monks, fighting because of gold, at last, the governor of Malta, entering a fight with Barabas: "It is the fight of two predators – rough and temperamental Barabas, in whose heart after all there is a place for passionate love to his daughter, and cold and prudent Governor, "a machiavelist" of the fox breed. In this fight "the fox won against the lion" as literary critics of that era would say"[1]. Also while analyzing the first scene of act I of "Romeo and Juliette", the researcher paid attention that "Escalus's speech was written by Shakespeare in the magnificent, solemn style, reminding Marlowe's one"[8]. Bringing "The Jew of Malta" and "Romeo and Juliette" together, M. M. Morozov noted that in both cases heroines in love were fourteen years old, pointed to some external resemblance of the two texts, but, at the same time, recognized that Shakespearean scholars of the past "had absolutely ignored" the most important thing – "signs of internal thematic similarity of Marlowe's sketch (Mathias and Abigall) and Shakespeare's developed picture (Romeo and Juliette)"[1].

Also M. M. Morozov saw echoes of Marlowe's creativity in Shakespearean "Hamlet": lines in the second scene of act II, where Hamlet remembered some play ("apparently, "Dido, Queen of Carthage", tragedy <…> by Christopher Marlowe"[5]), in which Aeneas said the monologue about the fall of Troy before Dido, were not the quote from Marlowe, but "free imitation" of his style", demonstrating that "Shakespeare appreciated Marlowe, and slightly sneered at his "fury" [8]; in the second scene of act III, where some huge guy with a wig, tearing passion in tatters, was mentioned, he meant the actor Edward Alleyn, the performer of Tamburlaine, Faustus and Barabas's roles in Marlowe's plays[8].

In the article "Read it Again, and Again…", which for the first time appeared in No. 8 of the journal "Theatre" in 1940, while analyzing the translations of Shakespearean plays made by A. D. Radlova, M. M. Morozov noted Marlowe's influence on Shakespeare, his "live" images, "reminding titanic figures of Michelangelo, strike with their force, as well as his verse strikes with its force".[9] Having inherited from Marlowe his energy and power of speech, and having developed them, Shakespeare along with it experienced also some other influences, according to the critic, swept aside by A. D. Radlova, who concentrated on Marlowe's influence: "Radlova succeeded in Marlowe's line in Shakespeare best of all. But along with it other tools of the orchestra ceased. According to Radlova's translations you will not call Shakespeare "a gentle swan of Avon". Meanwhile, this, in the broadest sense, emotional aspect has not only stylistic, but also basic, semantic value"[9]. According to the told above, of all Shakespearean translations by A. D. Radlova the critic considered the translation of "Richard III" – the play, "in which Marlowe's influence was especially bright" [9], – to be the most successful.

According to A. A. Smirnov, in "Tamburlaine the Great" Marlowe was the first, who developed the type of the heroic tragedy – "the tragedy of the strong personality, whose passions and majestic fight fill and unite all actions"[6]. The very figure of Tamburlaine is majestic, he is "a true conquistador of the 16th century", becoming the lord of kingdoms "only by force of his ambitious will and belief in his destiny", but, at the same time, he is not only a power-hungry man, but also the thinker, for whom force and knowledge of the world arrangement are indissoluble.[6] Tamburlaine, capable not to follow the gods' will, flushed with his power, appears to be some superman, what makes this image closer to the main character of another Marlowe's tragedy – Faustus, who, however, having given his soul to the devil, wishes to direct the acquired force to the practical purposes, "to the state and public construction", dreams "to make his homeland impregnable, having surrounded it with a copper wall, to create an invincible army, to establish a number of universities"[6]. According to A. A. Smirnov, Barabas's image from "The Jew of Malta" is no less titanic, but this hero is the villain, who is at war with the world by means of gold, capable of the most inconceivable crimes, up to poisoning his own daughter, and perishing in his own crafty trap. A. A. Smirnov united Tamburlaine, Faustus and Barabas in one group of images of superpeople, not broken, arrogant men, to whom he opposed the main character of the latest Marlowe's historical chronicle "Edward II" – "the weak personality, around whom there are vigorous passions"[6].

By the second half of the 1950-s A. A. Smirnov's ideas of Marlowe's creativity had undergone the essential evolution caused partly by his refusing approaches of vulgar sociologization, peculiar for literary criticism of the 1920-s – 1930-s, nevertheless, mainly, by the researcher's outlook change. Characterizing Marlowe as "the true founder of the English tragedy of the Renaissance", whose creativity is touched with "the spirit of love of freedom and deep democratism", A. A. Smirnov estimated his main works ("Tamburlaine the Great", "The Tragic Story of Doctor Faustus", "The Jew of Malta") as "tragedies of mighty persons and great passions", in the center of which there are "characters, seeking to seize everything and to learn everything, impudent antinomians and almost atheists <…>, not knowing barriers to their desires".[10,11] And only in the last historical chronicle "Edward II" Marlowe "gets free from these extremes and passes to wider and more objective characters description, to disclosure of not only rights, but also duties of the personality"[10,11], to "severe and deep criticism of what is born with the new reality, replacing the departing medieval world"[12]. As we see, in A. A. Smirnov's thinking in the last years "Edward II", which had been underestimated by him in former years, began to be perceived as a peculiar top of Marlowe's creativity.

A. A. Smirnov's understanding of Marlowe's influence on Shakespeare also became more general; it was presented by larger strokes, without correlation of concrete plays among each other, was revealed as the multidimensional and pervasive phenomenon: "Lear's, Macbeth's, Coriolanus's, Timon of Athens's titanic images have Marlowe's heroes as prototypes. Shakespeare learned the distribution of material in plays, stately tragic style, and use of the blank verse in the tragedy from Marlowe".[10,11] Seeing in Shakespeare's works features, which "can be met, for example, in Marlowe's creativity" – "richness of imagination, <…> precipitancy of action, concentration of images, energy of represented characters' passions and strong-willed tension", A. A. Smirnov accented the great playwright's ability (unlike his predecessor's) to soften the description with "the sense of measure" and to subordinate it to "the law of internal harmony".[10,11] Finally

A. A. Smirnov came to the conclusion that Marlowe as "the creator of problem dramas, huge and deep characters, master of the stately tragical style and corresponding drama tecnique" was "an initial example for Shakespeare", who in his early years studied at "Marlowe's "school", before surpassing his "teacher" and reaching in drama poetry heights, which had remained inaccessible for him"[12].

Considering Marlowe to be a member of the group of "university minds", young playwrights of low social origin, who during the epoch of the development of the new nobility, coming from the bourgeoisie and involved in new forms of managing, had an opportunity to graduate from the university and to join the world cultural values, A. A. Smirnov recognized that this group managed to transform the shapeless, chaotic English drama, lacking an ideological core, having given it the art integrity and problematical character, having seized all types of the creative skill and new technique – art of dialogue, characteristic, action development.[12]

3. Discussion

M. M. Morozov considered "the dialectic development of an image", almost unknown to Marlowe, to be Shakespeare's undoubted achievement; Marlowe's images "with all their brightness most often remain static from the beginning to the end of the play".[4] In 1947 in his article "About Dynamics of the Images Created by Shakespeare", published according to the manuscript of 1954, he gave concrete examples of the static character of Marlowe's images, reminding frescos due to their two dimensions and immovability: "Tamburlaine can exult, be angry or mourn, nevertheless, Tamburlaine at the beginning of the first part and at the end of the second one remains invariable in the essence of his character and relation to life. Such are both Marlowe's Faustus, and his Barabas"[13]. And only in the latest "Edward II" "signs of dynamism"[13], close to Shakespeare's art method, are outlined in Marlowe's images. Especially strongly they were expressed in the evolution of the main character image of Marlowe's historical chronicle, who in the final scene was "not king Edward, but the person, standing knee-deep in water in a stuffy and smelly vault of the castle"; M. M. Morozov considered this scene to be "the masterpiece of realistic art"[1].

Another peculiarity of Shakespearean creativity (in comparison with his predecessor's works) was, according to M. M. Morozov, an amazing variety of words[5]. In many respects this variety arose due to Shakespeare's attention to the simplest phenomena of everyday life, national language. As Proof M. M. Morozov gave Charles Spurgeon's calculations, according to which the ratio between everyday life images and "scientific" images from the sphere of religion, mythology, law, etc. makes 7 : 1 in Shakespeare's works, whereas 380: 210 or, maximum, 2 : 1 in Marlowe's.[5] At the same time the plenty of place names in "Tamburlaine the Great" seemed to be unusual; it suggested some strengthened attention to Tamburlaine's magnificent rhetoric, nevertheless, it did not allow a possibility of priority of his monologues in comparison with narrow-minded stories of the seafarers, who came back home[5]. Noting frequent transitions of Shakespeare's impulsive speech into pathetic one, the critic, nevertheless, recognized his great restraint in comparison with Marlowe's descriptions[5].

In his works M. M. Morozov presented Marlowe as "the titan of the scene", "the founder of realistic drama in the era "of capitalism dawn"[1,2], "the ingenious poet and freethinker"[2], "the father of the English drama"[14], who hadn't managed to realize his creative potential fully. He considered the tragedy "Tamburlaine the Great" to be "the grandiose epic <…> about life, wars and death"[14], it put forward the motive of mortal life glorification, presented an image of the passionate freethinker, fantastic athlete, putting captured Asian tsars into his chariot, striving to infinite knowledge and perpetual motion. The researcher thought the social origin of "fiery Tamburlaine" to be especially significant; he was the Scythian shepherd, winning tsars, leading the people similar to him, people with the plebeian past, who, uniting, became a great army. Democratizing Tamburlaine's image (historical Tamburlaine was the representative of a noble family), Marlowe aimed at ordinary viewers, filling the English theater, correlated his violent hero to heroes of the national epos, reflected in his face "the rush of the young public forces, stepping on the past strongholds"[1].

"The Tragic Story of Doctor Faustus" with the hero's pronounced aspiration to conquer nature forces, at any cost to find "learning's golden gifts", opening a way to personal enrichment and power, what was typical of the Renaissance era, contained, according to M. M. Morozov, an element of "science fiction" ("he <Faustus> dreams <…> to change the Rhine current, to build a bridge across the Atlantic Ocean, to merge Europe and

Africa into the uniform continent by means of grandiose constructions")[1]. It is characteristic for Marlowe's tragedy to accentuate the person's superiority over the spirit-world, to desire to show hell as a psychological state (what absolutely contradicts church canons), to disclose a peculiar triplicity of the image of Faustus, who first is eager for knowledge, then receiving a key to "the nature treasury" and stating joy of mortal life, at last, suffering and perishing. Growing pessimism in the final of "The Tragic Story of Doctor Faustus" is caused, according to M. M. Morozov, by understanding that the incident is not a divine punishment, but the result of "the tragedy of bourgeois humanity": "The lonely, isolated human personality feels weakness. On boundless personal freedom, on "infinite knowledge", which, as it appeared, the person had to receive after the break of ancient feudal relations and crash of the ideology shaped by centuries of feudalism, new capitalist relations and new "morals" again imposed fetters, the weight of which was even more perceptible"[1].

Considering the historical chronicle "Edward II" to be "his <Marlowe's> best play in vivacity of human portraits created by him" [14], M. M. Morozov saw in it accusation of the weak-willed, dissolute monarch, and the court "parasites" surrounding him[1,2] emphasized with a detailed portrayal of a number of characters up to the creation of the finished portraits of Edward II, Mortimer, Gaveston, Isabella. Being "distant from basic denial of absolutism"[1], Marlowe finished the tragedy with the suppression of the feudal mutiny and celebration of the new monarch, what, however, according to M. M. Morozov, by no means reduced its art value. Among advantages of Marlowe's works M. M. Morozov mentioned "the scope of imagination, powerful pressure of forces as if hardly to be constrained"[14], "grandness <…> of art concepts, <…> bright images of people, courageous and resolute, <…> a powerful verse <…>, and, at the same time, simplicity and availability of style" [2], in total promoting the creation of works of high art value. In his opinion, Marlowe (along with Robert Green) can be recognized as one of "the teachers" of the playwright Thomas Dekker, in whose early play "A Pleasant Comedy of Old Fortunatus" (about 1600) the influence of "The Tragic Story of Doctor Faustus" by Marlowe is notable; however, this play "is absolutely deprived of Marlowe's wide philosophical concepts", its idea "is excessively primitive"[15].

M. M. Morozov was forced to recognize some lack of adequate translations of Marlowe's works into the Russian language, from their total number he picked out only the translation of "The Tragic Story of Doctor Faustus" by K. D. Balmont which also did not disclose advantages of the original: "The translation of "Faustus" by Balmont does not convey Marlowe's realistic and vigorous style. In higher education institutions, where the author of these lines had to read and talk about Marlowe, our youth always admired "Faustus" in the original. But where students do not know English, "Faustus" in translation always causes some disappointment"[1]. For this reason M. M. Morozov considered the active address of the new era masters of literary translation to Marlowe's creativity, almost unknown to the Russian readers, to be necessary[2].

In the last years A. A. Smirnov accurately differentiated two periods of Marlowe's creativity – early ("Tamburlaine the Great", "The Tragic Story of Doctor Faustus"), when in the center of his creativity there was "power of the person, free from fetters of any authorities and prejudices, knowing only one mortal, real life, trusting his own forces and directing to the world gain"[12], and late ("Edward II", "The Massacre at Paris"), when Marlowe succeeded to come to the way of "broader reflection of life processes and conflicts, deepening realism, taking a big step aside Shakespeare's mature works, which appeared a little later"[12]; the researcher considered "The Jew of Malta" to be a transitional work between the periods; in it the image of the superman was presented in the negative aspect. In early works the author's aspiration "to learn everything and to seize everything" was distinctly reflected"; it is peculiar to the early Renaissance with its refusal of moral restrictions, utopian belief in a possibility of the society reorganization by means of "only human mind and powerful will forces"[12]. However, "the initial capitalization, finding its reflection <…> in <…> impetuous and deeply asocial individualism, egocentrism, more and more clearly showed him the animal teeth"[12], what led to the fact that Marlowe doubted his dream, realized illusiveness of a positive ideal, was disappointed in "strong personalities". The final stage of Marlowe's evolution, according to A. A. Smirnov, was "the systematic disclosure of the characters, who were developing under the influence of circumstances and characters interaction", being followed by the natural change of the style (transition from hyperbolism and rhetorical pathos of former tragedies to simple and clear human images and details), refusal of both glorification, and pathetic exposure of "strong

characters", creation of multidimensional portraits of the heroes shown in all their complexity and mobility, "with necessary distinctions and nuances", evident preference of "the concrete, native English soil" in comparison with a legendary exotic situation, and also the choice of urgent political problems close to realism[12].

Due to his indestructible belief in his own mission, awareness of the true human greatness, distant from external stateliness, Tamburlaine achieves his goals, and, according to A. A. Smirnov, does not become "a rough power-hungry man", but bears "the spirit of freedom and education, though does not speak about them directly", and only shows them with his actions, destroying books of the priests, dulling minds of fellow citizens, releasing prisoners from dungeons, daring to be rather generous and noble than cruel. A little unusually A. A. Smirnov treats Tamburlaine's outlook, recognizing him nearly atheistic, constantly looking for support in scientific knowledge: "He does not deny the god and sometimes tells about him, but for him he is only an image, in essence he, as well as the author of the tragedy, is an atheist. Tamburlaine appreciates science, and he willingly speaks – without any relation to the action of the tragedy and to the identity of his historical prototype – about human mind, which "is arranged so that will not calm down, until it gets into the nature of things and all mysteries of the universe" [12].

"The Tragic Story of Doctor Faustus", like "Tamburlaine the Great", is understood by A. A. Smirnov as "the anthem to the real world, and, at the same time, to human individualism".[12] The deviations from the text of the German national book made by Marlowe were caused by democratization of public moods, strengthening of attention to care of the people benefit, not only of private interests, but also of the country interests; in this regard Faustus dreams "by means of treasures, which will be brought by spirits obedient to him, <…> to develop the industry, to dress students, like rich noblemen, in silk and velvet"[12]. Marlowe's image of Faustus is absolutely deprived of the clownish features, peculiar for his image prototype from the national book, presented as "a giant of thought and aspiration"[12], who does not lack, however, human weakness, fearing claws of the devil. But also this weakness, as well as Barabas's evil intention from "The Jew of Malta", does not weaken sounding of the problem of the strong personality, the most important one for Marlowe in his early years, with inclination of metaphors, comparisons and parallels of the description "to dazzling, grandiose, pathetic phenomena", – "heroes of these tragedies are similar to granite blocks, indestructible and not knowing changes"[12]. In "The Massacre at Paris", the work "in many respects remarkable, but obviously awkward"[12], A. A. Smirnov especially noted the description of the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day and image of Duke of Guise, standing out against its background, a fanatical and ambitious person.

In "Edward II", which received the highest estimates of A. A. Smirnov, the difficult search of smaller evil, while choosing between the unworthy king and selfish, self-interested feudal lords, who dethroned him for personal, but not people, and not national interests, was highlighted as the main problem. Borrowing historical material from "The chronicle of England, Scotland and Ireland" by Raphael Holinshed, Marlowe practically did not deviate from its text, having introduced only some characters and having shifted only some actions, however from the recent historical science viewpoint "The Chronicle", by which the playwright was guided, was not reliable. It reflected, according to the fair remark of A. A. Smirnov, only "the opinion <…> of the century", willingly accepted by Marlowe, seeking "for exposure of both feudal lords, and feudal monarchy for the sake of humanistic ideals", wishing to present truthfully outlined images of people, "changing before our eyes, passing through difficulties, experiencing originally human destiny, defined by them"[12].

The epoch of titans is succeeded by the epoch of "strong people with great and passionate feelings", who, on the one hand, fight with each other, on the other hand, act as the whole. In this regard A. A. Smirnov considers it necessary to give the detailed characteristic not so much of Edward II, "a king-hedonist", dissolute and weak person inclined to magnificent entertainment and delight, but more of many his feudal lords – Mortimer Junior and Gaveston, people of the epoch of "initial capitalization"[12], different in their internal essence and aspirations, but, at the same time, uniform in their negative perception by the author of the tragedy. Gaveston, personifying "the latest aristocratic culture of the Renaissance, which is already touched by disintegration and decomposition"[12], loves the king because of the benefits received through it, and, therefore, in his feeling there is neither tragic element, nor original greatness; the image, "not deprived of taste and external grace", is formed by means of the speech characteristic, unusual for Marlowe in his early years:

"Gaveston's free familiarity with the king is expressively opposed to his impudence of the rough favourite with all others, and, in particular, to offensively trite treatment of the queen"[12]. Mortimer Junior, whose internal qualities remind Barabas's ones to the researcher, revolts against Gaveston and the king not for the sake of the country benefit, not because of hurt feeling and searches of justice, but being moved only by thirst of power, luxury, pleasure. Seeking for achievement of objectives, he is expressly dry, imperious, deprived of affection (though fleeting), tough, and in some scenes (in particular, in the scene of double treachery) even immoral: "In his image all "Renaissance" dies away, he is only "the person of initial capitalization". <…> In the course of the action of the play Mortimer gets up in his whole beast height"[12].

Among other characters of Marlowe's historical chronicle A. A. Smirnov marked out the queen, originally a gentle, patient sufferer, then an absolutely regenerated, callous woman, capable of lie, perfidy, and cruelty. If the queen's regeneration is real, then Mortimer's exasperation is "a removal of a comely mask", which initially covered a heartless, ruthless character. Perhaps, only one metamorphosis had a conditionally "positive" character – the change of the image of Edward II, "who grew wise with sufferings, understood a lot, gained spirit firmness, cleared his feelings and thoughts", but, in A. A. Smirnov's understanding, it was only "an agonal enlightenment, sad and bringing to nothing"[12]. However, Marlowe managed to overcome moods of total pessimism, to create the drama, "full of advanced thoughts, bright, expressive scenes, and true tragic poetry", to express belief in forces and possibilities of the person, hope for the future, in what he was helped by less prominent, but, nevertheless, bright images of heroes – the king's stepbrother, confused, obedient and helpless, but, at the same time, honest and noble, Count Kent, the young prince (subsequently king Edward III), capable "to lead the country to the bright future", finally, the people, who "are actively not shown anywhere in the play, but felt as its background, as the hidden ruler of the destiny of history"[12].

Evaluating A. D. Radlova's translation of "Edward II" avariciously, A. A. Smirnov mentioned her masterful reading of the Latin quote "Quem dies vidit venies superbum, / Hunc dies vidit fugiens jacentum" from Seneca's tragedy "Thyestes" in the sixth scene of act IV – "…who is omnipotent in the morning, / Powerless in the evening", criticized the translator for the fact that she had refused interpreting the Latin expressions "Edwardum occidere nolite timere, bonum est" and "Edwardum occidere nolite, timere bonum est", cardinally changing the sense with a shift of a punctuation mark, and offered his own interpretation, a little free, but quite correlated to the poetic original – "Eduard's death. The delay is not necessary!" and "Eduard's death is not necessary. Delay!"[16] According to the researcher, a special merit of the translator was the mitigation of some inconsistencies of the original (especially in the fifth and sixth scenes of act V in the description of the feather-bed, skewer, etc.) caused both by some carelessness of Marlowe, and negligence of his first copyists and publishers[16].

4. Conclusions

The approaches to Marlowe's creative activity in the works of the leading Russian Shakespearean scholars of the 1930-s – 1950-s M. M. Morozov and A. A. Smirnov are in many respects close, what is seen, particularly, in their perception of the historical chronicle "Edward II" as the top of Marlowe's dramaturgic art, their aspiration to find in the plays some social component caused by the epoch of developing capitalism, and also some democratic inclination connected with condemning of any forms of suppression of a person, with strengthening of a role of the people in social processes.

The accurate and reasoned establishment of the facts of Marlowe's influences in Shakespeare's creative activity, in many respects resisting to an anti-Shakespearean position of I. A. Aksenov, attributing many of Shakespeare's works to Marlowe, became an undoubted merit of M. M. Morozov. Unlike M. M. Morozov, whose ideas of Marlowe are rather static, A. A. Smirnov as the researcher of works of the English playwright underwent the complex evolution from the early works, considerably relying on Marx's methodology, to the works, containing the profound analysis of the art world in Marlowe's tragedies (in particular, "Edward II"). If M. M. Morozov in the majority of his works (excluding the two small articles of popular-scientific character in the native periodical press) considered Marlowe in comparison with the great talent of Shakespeare, A. A. Smirnov in a number of his researches (and most of all – in the article "Christopher Marlowe and His Historical Drama "Edward II") characterized the works of the English playwright as something self-integral, being of undoubted independent scientific

interest. Probably, A. A. Smirnov's position was close to M. M. Morozov's one, who encouraged translating Marlowe into the Russian language more actively, indicating the total absence of successful readings of his works by native translators, however, in printing works he was limited with his appreciation of A. D. Radlova's translation of "Edward II", which, at the same time, was cardinally processed by him, while preparing it for the publication.

5. Acknowledgement

The research has been carried out within the project 2232 "Interdisciplinary social and humanist research in the context of innovative development and international connections" in the basic part of the state quota of the RF Department of Education and Science.

6. References

1. Morozov MM. Christopher Marlowe. Literary Critic. 1938; 5:114–22.
2. Morozov MM. Christopher Marlowe's Death. Art and Life. 1938; 6:40–1.
3. Morozov MM. Shekspeare's theatre. Buromskaya-Morozova EM (Comp.), Belza SI, editor. Moscow: All-Russian Theatrical Society; 1984. p. 86, 138.
4. Morozov MM. Shakespeare. In: History of English Literature: In 3 vols. Moscow-Leningrad: USSR Academy of Sciences Publishing House. 1945; 1:2, 7–71.
5. Morozov MM. Shakespeare's language and style. From history of english realism. Anisimov II, editor. Moscow: USSR Academy of Sciences Publishing House; 1941. p. 5–56.
6. Smirnov AA. Shakespeare's creative activity. Leningrad: M. Gorky Leningrad State Bolshoi Drama Theater Publishing House; 1934.
7. Shchedrina TG. (Ed., comp., int., com., rec.) Gustav Shpet and Shakespeare's Circle. Letters, Documents, Translaions. Moscow-St.Petersburg: Petrogliph; 2013.
8. Morozov MM. Comments to Shakespeare's plays. Moscow: All-Russian Theatrical Society; 1941.
9. Morozov MM. Shakespeare, Burns, Shaw… Shvedov YuF. (Int. and comp.). Moscow: Iskusstvo; 1967.
10. Smirnov AA. William Shakespeare. In: Smirnov AA, Anikst AA, editors. Shakespeare W. A Complete Set of Works: In 8 vols. Moscow: Iskusstvo. 1957; 1:7–83.
11. Smirnov AA. Shakespeare. Leningrad-Moscow: Iskusstvo; 1963.
12. Smirnov AA. Christopher Marlowe and his historical drama Edward II. In: Marlowe Ch. Edward the Second: A Tragedy in Five Acts. Trans. by A.D.Radlova. Moscow: Iskusstvo; 1957. p. 3–16.
13. Morozov MM. Selected articles and translations. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya Literatura; 1954.
14. Morozov MM. Shakespeare (1564–1616). 2nd ed. Moscow: Molodaya Gvardiya; 1956.
15. Morozov MM. Dekker – Heywood – Deloney. In: History of English Literature: In 3 vols. Moscow-Leningrad: USSR Academy of Sciences Publishing House. 1945; 1(2):99–110.
16. Smirnov AA. Edward II. Notes. In: Marlowe Ch. Edward the Second: A Tragedy in Five Acts. Trans. by Radlova AD. Moscow: Iskusstvo. 1957. p. 191–9.