慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ
Keio Associated Repository of Academic resouces

Title	Defamed by those that are ignorant in th'affaires' : reading the Privy Council document on the rumour about Christopher Marlowe
Sub Title	
Author	井出, 新(Ide, Arata)
Publisher	慶應義塾大学藝文学会
Publication year	2017
Jtitle	藝文研究 (The geibun-kenkyu : journal of arts and letters). Vol.113, No.2 (2017. 12) ,p.56- 70
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	The decay of lying? : essays in honour of professor Keiko Kawachi
Genre	Journal Article
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00072643-01130002-0056

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the KeiO Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

‘Defamed by those that are ignorant in th’affaires’: Reading the Privy Council Document on the Rumour about Christopher Marlowe

Arata IDE

Introduction: Malicious Lies on Marlowe?

In discussing the cultural practices of sixteenth-century English intellectuals, Warren Boutcher points out the possibility that their university experience strengthened ‘cultural regionalism’, and that this culture was shaped by ‘participation in social and communication networks linking country, university and court, not transcendence of localities’.[1] Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, may have enabled Christopher Marlowe to participate in such networks through the propinquity of his daily living, homophily, and political affiliations. Recently, several documents concerning college matters have shed some light on the interpersonal relationships of Marlowe who allied himself with other members of adjacent chambers and colleges, with magnates of municipal corporations, and, furthermore, with government officials at court. These documents also enable us to see how the strength of factional networks pervaded every aspect of his daily life.[2] In this respect, the record of the Privy Council’s proceedings, the summary of the minutes on 29 June 1587, is important evidence to show that the social communications he enjoyed at college propelled Marlowe to expand his political networks at court and become affiliated with some of the Privy Councillors. The purpose of this article is to examine this record as another document concerning college matters related to Marlowe who was ‘defamed’ by a groundless rumour or rather malicious lies disseminated among the college members, but actually ‘deserved to be rewarded for his faithfull dealinge’; and then to consider how and to what extent Marlowe came under the aegis of the Privy Council, particularly of Sir Francis Walsingham.

Marlowe's Patron

> Whereas it was reported that Christopher Morley was determined to have gone beyond the seas to Reames and there to remaine, their L*ordship*s thought good to certifie that he had no such intent, but that in all his acc*i*ons he had behaved him selfe orderlie and discreetelie wherebie he had done her Ma*jes*tie good service, and deserved to be rewarded for his faithfull dealinge: Their L*ordship*s request was that the rumor thereof should be allaied by all possible meanes, and that he should be furthered in the degree he was to take this next Commencem*en*t: Because it was not her Ma*jes*tes pleasure that anie one emploied as he had been in matt*e*rs touching the benefitt of his Countrie should be defamed by those that are ignorant in th'affaires he went about / [3]

The details of Marlowe's 'good service' to Elizabeth cannot be found. A. L. Rowse and A. D. Wraight attach great importance to the rumour that he went to Rheims, as is mentioned in the full summary of the Privy Council minutes, and consider that Francis Walsingham sent Marlowe to report on the goings on at the seminary.[4] However, almost all the biographers are sceptical about this assumption. Marlowe's name appears nowhere in the diary of the English college. He may have taken an alias, but it would have been almost impossible to do so and would, in addition, have entailed danger; scholars from Cambridge, as well as Samuel Kennet, Marlowe's former classmate at King's School in Canterbury, were residing there at that time.[5] There was no hiding and no lying there. Moreover, the President and staff of the seminary, who had learnt a lesson from the espionage activities of Richard Baines and other dissimulating seminarians, were on the lookout for such English spies. A Cardinal reported: 'at Rheims a wicked youth was discovered named Vane [sic], who, disguised as a student, had been sent from England, and had attempted to poison Allen and so to ruin the College. He was followed by countless imitators, who, feigning themselves Catholics, set about sowing broadcast the seeds of discord in the several Seminaries'.[6] Considering his youth and lack of expertise, it would be better to consider that Marlowe was employed for more respectable and public duties than those imposed by Walsingham upon his wily double agents.[7] In fact, using their social connections in all aspects, the Privy Councillors appointed a large number

of men of different backgrounds as messengers or letter carriers. Marlowe could have been one of these employees. The lack of documents, however, prevents a biographer from concluding where and for whom Marlowe operated, and so any account of his movements naturally has to involve a lot of guesswork.

One of the leading candidates for Marlowe's patron is Sir James Crofts. According to the summary of the minutes, the Privy Councillors who attended the meeting on 29 June 1587 were William Cecil the Treasurer, John Whitgift the Archbishop of Canterbury, Christopher Hatton the Lord Chancellor, Henry Carey the Lord Chamberlain, and James Crofts the Controller of the Household, all of whom urged the Cambridge university authorities to restore Marlowe's reputation. Austin K. Gray points out that the four of them (Burghley, Crofts, Whitgift, Hatton) were pursuing a strategy that ran counter to Walsingham's belligerent foreign policy. Crofts, who had concluded the peace with Alexander Farnese, the prince of Parma, was 'the moving spirit behind it', was steadily Pro-Spanish, and was known to be in the pay of Philip II of Spain. Gray assumes that 'inasmuch as Crofts and three of his colleagues in this policy endorsed Marlowe's claim for an M.A., it is possible that he was employed on the peace-manoeuvres with Parma and went to the Netherlands'. Walsingham, who remained critically aloof from the policy, 'did not endorse the Privy Council document'.[8]

This assumption sounds reasonable, but, examined closely, contains several flaws. For one thing, it is doubtful whether Burghley, Whitgift, and Hatton aligned themselves with Crofts's peace negotiations or coalesced into one single body against Walsingham. The situation was more complex. Burghley seems to have placed less confidence in septuagenarian Crofts than Elizabeth did. Crofts had taken the lead in the peace manoeuvres in its initial stages, but, according to Conyers Read, 'no doubt at the Queen's bidding, Burghley himself took over' and 'kept Walsingham in touch with every step in the proceedings'.[9] Moreover, Walsingham was improving relations with Burghley around that time, for Burghley had appealed to the Queen for redress of Walsingham's debt and had supported him in his attempt to win the Chancellorship of the Duchy of Lancaster, vacated following Sir Ralph Sadler's death on 30 May 1587. Whitgift owed his appointment as Privy Councillor to Burghley's influence, which had the effect of consolidating his power on the Privy Council, but his own attitude towards Crofts's policy is hazy. Hatton, whom a kinsman of Crofts

reported as being in favour of peace, was well known as one of Leicester's staunchest allies. Read concludes that, 'It does not appear that he took any active part in the negotiations'.[10]

What is more, the councillors' absence does not necessarily suggest their indifference to the agenda for the meeting, still less their evading the need to endorse it. William Brooke, Lord Cobham, who joined James Crofts and the Earl of Derby on the peace mission to Parma in 1588, was also absent from the meeting, for an unknown reason. Since Walsingham's rate of attendance was very high, given his office as the principal secretary, his failure to attend the meeting might seem quite unusual. However, he was often prevented by his infirmities from performing the duties of his office in the spring of 1587; also, in that summer he had a sudden seizure during his stay in London.[11] On 27 June, two days before the meeting, Walsingham wrote to Edward Stafford, the ambassador in France: 'I haue been of late and am yet constrayned to keepe my bed as this bearer can tell you by reason of a fever that I am fallen into'.[12] His sporadic absence around this time may be considered as sick leave. A Privy Council letter, having been authorised at a meeting, was drawn up by a clerk with the date blank to fill in later on. A day or so afterwards, the letter was submitted either by the principal secretary or a clerk to the councillors – at least six of them – for their signatures. Usually, as Michael Barraclough Pulman recounts in full, 'there were enough of them available to subscribe sufficient names, even if some of them had not been at the original meeting, and in most cases the signatures all appear to have been added at the same time'. Sometimes, however, 'the letter had to be carried around the Court from councillor to councillor until enough had been approached for the letter to be dispatched'.[13] If the purported council letter in defence of Marlowe, which is no longer extant, was sent to the Cambridge university authorities through this routine procedure, Secretary Walsingham, responsible for conducting and controlling the council, naturally would have been well informed about the matter, and not have avoided his responsibility to endorse the document.

Whether Walsingham was present or not at the meeting, Burghley seems to have been the right chair-person to propose the agenda, not because of the nature of Marlowe's employment, but because of Marlowe's status as a student of Cambridge. As the Chancellor, in theory Burghley had official authority over all the acts of the university, so that masters, fellows, and even humble scholars often made a direct appeal to Burghley in the last resort. Marlowe, faced with the threat of deprivation of his MA degree, was no exception, and

possibly took the same measures for recovery of his reputation. Burghley seems to have had no compunction in intervening in the university affairs on behalf of his favourites by way of private letters or mandates. John Palmer, a fellow of St John's College, acknowledges in his letter to Burghley 'how manie waies ffrom tyme to tyme I haue bene bound vnto your honor' with underlines:

> As namely that I was ffirst preferred to the rome of a ffellowshipp in our Colledge of St Johns, by your Lordshippes l*ette*res, and after in the diuertinge of my studies ffrom Ciuill law to diuinitie, supported againe by dispensation. And not longe since it pleased your Lordshipp to wright your letters in my behalf ffor the place of the orator in our vniuersity.[14]

Although the pressure he exerted on the university authorities was not always successful, Burghley would have been extremely influential – enough to persuade them to grant a MA to a scholar whom he considered worthy enough 'to be rewarded for his faithfull dealinge'. In this respect, as Peter Roberts suggests, the certificate for Marlowe could be regarded as 'a substitute for the landlord/parson certificate' that a non-resident student who qualified for a MA had to present to the Vice-Chancellor to show that he had 'lived soberly and studiously the course of a scholar's life' during his absence.[15]

However, what should not be overlooked is the crucial fact that Marlowe's conduct was guaranteed by the mandate of the Privy Council itself; that is, Burghley responded to Marlowe's appeal not as an internal matter within the university, but as one of the council matters that must be brought before, and shared by, the Council. This may have been due to the high importance of the certificate, and the fact that it came into immediate effect. An example from one of these extant certificates should suffice to explain its extraordinary protective power. It was drawn up by Burghley with the signatures of the several councillors on 9 October 1590. John Edge, 'a gentleman in the horse band of Sir John Pooly', offered the Council his services as a spy in the Spanish camp of the Duke of Parma 'to discover some things in the said duke's army profitable for her [majesty's] service', and requested the Council to 'allow of his offer, and to preserve his credit against such as might maliciously, or ignorantly, and for lack of knowledge of his good intent to do such good service to her

majesty, condemn or reprove him'. The Council, finding in favour of his offer, duly provided him with the certificate to declare 'his good intent', and gave their perpetual guarantee:

> And if he shall ... discover any thing worthy of knowledge, and shall perform any action laudable, and profitable for her majesty at any time, within the space of [blank] here after the date hereof, we will acquit him against any that shall accuse or reprove him for his absence from his place of service at Berghen, and for his familiarity and conversation with any of his countrymen, serving under the duke of Parma.[16]

The Council's prompt action to protect Edge's credit may shed some light on the nature of any certificate issued to Marlowe. Rowse is possibly right in pointing out that 'it needed the direct, and very exceptional, intervention of the Privy Council itself to force the university authorities to grant it'.[17] Moreover, the matter was urgent. On Thursday, 29 June, the Council approved the decision that 'he should be furthered in the degree he was to take this next Commencement', which was to take place on the following Tuesday, i.e. 4 July. Burghley would have been unable to validate the emergent motion without the mutual understanding or express intention of any other prominent councillors, such as Walsingham, who were absent from the meeting. However, Burghley brought up the matter before the board and effected his purpose without difficulty. What we can detect here is not the division, but rather the collaboration, of the Privy Council as a consultative body.

Marlowe's 'Faithful Dealing'

That Marlowe performed 'good service' under the aegis of Walsingham is also no more than a matter of conjecture. Although some biographers assert that Marlowe was truly involved in Walsingham's espionage activities during his collegiate years,[18] their assumption is only based upon a putative law of supply and demand: Walsingham being in dire need of confidential agents and Marlowe being reluctant to take holy orders. Recently, however, this assumption has become more persuasive by paying attention to Marlowe's college network, which was closely interconnected with Walsingham. The main focus has been on Nicholas

Faunt, one of Walsingham's confidential secretaries, who came from Canterbury as an alumnus of King's School to Corpus Christi College in 1573. Charles Nicholl's argument is intriguing: 'If Walsingham was looking for recruits at Cambridge in the mid-1580s, Faunt might well be involved as a talent-spotter, and his eye might well alight on this promising young scholar from his own college'.[19] In fact, as I have pointed out elsewhere, Faunt was possibly able to set up a channel of communication with a fellow of Corpus Christi College even after his employment as Walsingham's secretary.[20] Faunt's roommate during his college days was Thomas Harris, who afterwards became a college fellow and, as praelector, certified Marlowe's ability in the *supplicat* for BA degree. Faunt, if operating 'as a talent-spotter' for Walsingham at that time, could have obtained from Harris a full report of this brilliant scholar whose background was very similar to his. Marlowe thus happened to be close to Faunt, to be recruited just at the right time.

To find Walsingham's protégés in and around Corpus Christi College would make the fundamental assumptions at the basis of the Marlowe-Walsingham theory seem convincing. However, what is more important than discovering the likely candidate for Marlowe's patron, or the nature of Marlowe's service, is the fact that the Privy Council found him 'deserved to be rewarded for his faithfull dealinge'. It was against the Council's, as well as 'her Majesties', will that 'anie one emploied as he had been in matters touching the benefitt of his countrie should be defamed'. The phraseology of this document implies the councillors' adherence to the socio-political values of a hierarchical society based on lineage, in which 'faithfulness' to lords and friends was widely approved of. A reputation for 'faithfull dealinge' was the solid foundation of honour, and secured a livelihood for a servant. George Whitehead, the receiver and deputy-captain of Tynemouth, shared these traditional values when writing to his master, Henry Percy, the ninth Earl of Northumberland: 'my care shall be only to deal faithfully with your lordship, as I may answere before God as a true Christiane, and before the world as a faithful steward and true servant'.[21] Marlowe was no exception, and had to gain credibility in his patron's eyes by the impressive performance of duty so that he could be recognised as a 'true servant'. If he had been recruited by Nicholas Faunt, Walsingham's secretary, such faithfulness would have been still more necessary. In his *Discourse touching the Office of Principal Secretary of Estate* (1592), Faunt advocated 'by his experience' that 'the multitude of servantes in this kinde is hurtfull ... for if in a

principall servant to ye secretarie, secrecie and faithfulnes bee cheifly required what trust canne therebee reposed in manie, and if manie bee imploied in matters of secrecie, whoe shall thinke himself principall in trust in those thinges which are hardly to bee imparted to anie though the most faithfull in the world'.[22] Charles Nichol suggests that 'the government described Marlowe's service as "faithful dealing", but in the performance of it there must have been much deception'.[23] Yet for Marlowe, a recent graduate who was naturally seeking a good start to his professional career, it would have been almost impossible to play a double game. Robert Burton, when writing about the misery of a university student, compares the pains he endures to 'please his patron' with that of an apprentice, saying: 'If he bend his forces to some other studies, with an intent to be *à secretis* to some Nobel man, or in such a place with an Embassador, he shall finde that these persons rise like Prentises one under another, as in so many tradesmens shops, when the master is dead, the fore-man of the shop commonly steps in his place'.[24]

In this regard, the 'extraordinary' certificate to the university authorities was not only a coercive request for a MA degree, but also a demand for an official endorsement of his political conduct. This certificate enabled Marlowe to achieve credit or symbolic capital valid for a certain period of time, as we can see in the abovementioned certificate of the Privy Council, which gave John Edge a conditional guarantee: 'within the space of [blank] here after the date hereof, we will acquit him against any that shall accuse or reprove him'. The Privy Council's letter on behalf of William Harborne demonstrates its continuous concern about his self-interest. In 1593, long after the completion of his mission to Constantinople as merchant and diplomat in the 1580s, Harborne could request the Privy Council's intervention in the quarrel over his inheritance. They wrote to his adversary and requested, 'Forsomuch as the gentleman is of good desert and accompt both with her Majestie and our selves, having formerlie bin emploied in her Highnes' important services, wee have thought good to pray and require you in his behalf not to offer him anie hard measure'.[25] William Lewkner, an English merchant at Lyons who 'was employed to watch Dr. Parry and one Aldred and others, of whose proceedings I gave secret intelligence' by Walsingham, wrote to Robert Cecil in 1599 about his private matters: 'I most humbly crave her Majesty to write for me to the Margrave of "Norouborowe", whereby I may have justice of a merchant that has his safe conduct, the want whereof may be the loss of my debt of £200'.[26]

The protective power of Marlowe's certificate also seems to have remained efficacious when he was at work as a playwright; in particular when his lodging, which he was sharing with Kyd, was subject to a domiciliary search as a sequel to the scandal of xenophobic libels in May 1593. The seizure of a fragmentary copy of 'vile hereticall conceiptes' led Kyd to be arrested and tortured as a suspect with anti-alien sympathies. Under these circumstances, however, Marlowe came off with impunity. He was simply summoned before the Privy Councillors and 'commanded to give his daily attendance' at this meeting, probably as an informer.[27]

In employing this privilege of clientelism, Marlowe would inevitably tangle himself in the continuous bondage of mutual responsibility and obligation to the members of the Privy Council. This suggests that their power may have exercised mastery over 'all his acc*i*ons', including his literary activities. While Marlowe gained strong protection and support from the Council, the dynamics of patronage compelled him more or less to uphold, endorse, and promote its ideological stance. Inevitably, as we have seen with the difference in the degree of enthusiasm over the peace negotiations, there were various divisions within the Council itself arising from personal rivalries, policy disagreements, or religious differences. As Pulman points out, however, 'there is no evidence that bouts of huffiness interfered with the smooth running of the machinery of state'. Rather, a fundamental harmony can be detected as 'an extremely adult, unemotional, business-like group of people, going about their common concerns without undue fuss and without making more scenes than were strictly necessary, yet letting their ill feeling show without restraint where it existed'.[28] This fundamental alliance may be due to what Simon Adams calls 'the existence of a stable inner ring', composed of Leicester, Burleigh, Walsingham, Hatton, and the Earl of Sussex.[29] This solidarity, which continued throughout the 1570s and 1580s, seems to have been strengthened particularly in the 1580s, when the national crisis urged councillors to patch up their divisions as an emergency measure and unite against their common enemy.

This kind of unity is well illustrated in the wartime alliance between Charles Howard of Effingham and Francis Walsingham. Howard, a person of a conservative temperament and cautious of Walsingham's radical religious policy, took a political stance in concert with Burghley, which often constituted the anti-Leicester faction along with Henry Carey, the first Baron Hunsdon. However, the state of war that existed, particularly after his appointment as

Lord High Admiral in 1585, forced him into alliance with his rivals. The peace negotiations initiated by Burghley and Crofts had failed due to Parma seizing Sluys in late July 1587. By the autumn, it was widely known that the Armada was intended for the invasion of England, and few doubted that peace could no longer be maintained by the Queen's indecisive diplomacy. There were hurried preparations for war with Spain across the nation. Howard himself, being the advocate of war, 'kept in close touch with Walsingham throughout the crisis, and it was to Walsingham that he unburdened his mind when the queen's policy seemed to him to be driving the country toward disaster'.[30]

The Privy Council and Playing Companies

Factional alignment within the Privy Council is also detectable in its members' collective involvement in the control and promotion of professional playing companies against the backdrop of the national crisis and domestic disturbances in the 1580s. Let us turn our attention to the social and political climate which brought about the formation of the Queen's Men in 1583.[31] The upsurge of anti-theatre criticism on the initiative of London city magnates compelled the Privy Council, many of whom, as patrons themselves, sought to avoid disbanding troupes due to the suppression of playhouses, to tackle the problem straight away. The disaster at Paris Garden, which killed eight spectators with the collapse of scaffolding in January 1583, fired the Londoners' zeal, and the councillors were pestered with more petitions and private letters. Moreover, the illness and ensuing death of Thomas Radclyffe, the Lord Chamberlain, in June may have forced them to work as one body. Andrew Gurr astutely points out the 'tactical and committee skills' of Charles Howard, a staunch supporter of the stage and a man well versed in the Chamberlain's office, helped him establish Privy Council policy to protect professional playing companies: 'in essence his plan was a logical implementation of the Privy Council's basic idea, which was to secure playing by granting the royal protection to the one great company consisting of the best players from each of the major companies of 1583'.[32] While effectively highlighting the role of Howard, Gurr tends to underestimate that of Walsingham, saying: 'he never showed much interest in players ... and is unlikely to have been the one who initiated the idea'.[33] It seems likely, however, that, even if Walsingham had not taken the initiative, the Queen's Men could not have been organised

without his knowledge and the close cooperation with Howard.

What concerns us here is Walsingham's political judgment over the theatre's social function in promoting his nationalistic and bellicose policy. The surviving documents on the formation of the Queen's Men suggest that he seems to have realised the potential usefulness of a professional playing company around that time. In fact, it was Walsingham who instructed Edmund Tilney, the Master of the Revels, on 10 March 1583 'to choose out a companie of players for her maiestie'.[34] That Walsingham was the coordinator was possibly a matter of common knowledge, for Edmund Howes inserted an account of its formation in the 1615 edition of John Stowe's *Annales*: 'at the request of Sir *Francis Walsingham*, they were sworne the Queenes seruants, and were allowed Wages, and Liuories, as Groomes of the Chamber'.[35] E. K. Chambers considers Walsingham to have been merely a stand-in for the Lord Chamberlain, incapacitated by illness, and casts doubt upon his positive involvement. It is true that the illness of the Earl of Sussex necessitated the Council's appointing a proxy for the Lord Chamberlain. However, the Privy Council was not lacking in skilled and experienced officers, such as Howard and Carey, who had considerable managerial ability to discharge the Chamberlain's duties. McMillin and MacLean rightly ask, 'Why should Walsingham, a political opponent of Sussex's on most matters, have filled his role when it came to the appointment of Queen's Men?'[36] Moreover, when the Lord Mayor, intentionally or unintentionally, interpreted the licence given to the company 'to extend onely to holy daies and not to other weke daies', it was again Walsingham who looked after their interests, writing in a letter to the Lord Mayor that they should be allowed to play 'vpon the weke daies and worke daies at conuenient times ... (sondaies onely excepted and such other daies wherein sermons and lectures are comonly vsed)'.[37] It would be reasonable, therefore, to conclude with McMillin and MacLean that Walsingham's 'concern for the Queen's Men seems to have been more than incidental'. To Walsingham, who took the lead in devising and executing the scheme of the national defence policy, the growing theatrical business possibly seemed to have a high political value in the cause to unite and militarise the nation under the Queen's banner. London playhouses drawing thousands of spectators and the Queen's Players dressed in her livery travelling to various parts of England were worthy of championing. Their 'infectious' power over society was abundantly demonstrated not only by the anti-theatrical moralists but also by the swelling in the numbers of London playgoers.

Walsingham's crucial role in organising the Queen's Men, however, does not necessarily preclude the possibility of Howard's involvement. Rather, Walsingham aligned himself with Howard and the other councillors to achieve his political purposes. The solidarity in their desire to protect the Queen's Men is suggested in the above-mentioned letter of Walsingham to the Lord Mayor: 'I haue therefore thought good, being partlie priuie to their LLps. meaning signified in their letters, to explane more plainly their pleasures herein to your Lp'. What Walsingham tries to stress here is that the Privy Council was collectively and attentively at work on that matter under his supervision. Admittedly, the differences in the degree of enthusiasm for the stage within the Council can be detected in a letter of William Fleetwood dated 18 June 1584 saying, 'Vpon Sonndaye my Lo. sent ij Aldermen to the Court for the suppressing and pulling downe of the Theatre and Curten. All the LL. agreed therevnto, saving my Lord Chamberlen and mr. Viz-chamberlen [Howard and Carey], but we obteyned a lettre to suppresse theym all'.[38] However, this order to demolish these playhouses was never carried out. The Privy Council seems to have also taken concerted action in cunningly neglecting the city fathers' appeal. Thus, the unprecedented crisis for the nation forced Walsingham, as well as Howard, into alliance with his rivals, not only to deploy defensive troops but also to promote the growing business of mass-communication. The pressing need for political and cultural mobilisation joined them together in harmony.

CONCLUSION

Walsingham's protégés in and around Corpus Christi College possibly got Marlowe involved in the service of the Privy Council. No matter whom Marlowe's patron councillor was, or whatever the 'matters touching the benefitt of his countrie' were, Marlowe was pressed into serving this need for mobilisation at the heart of which the Privy Council was placed at that time. These circumstances prevented him from playing a double game. Obviously, in this context, the Privy Council regarded Marlowe's service so satisfactory as to think 'good to certifie ... that in all his accions he had behaved him selfe orderlie and discreetelie', and so responded to Marlowe's appeal protesting his innocence not as an intramural matter, under the control of Burghley, the university Chancellor, but as a council cause to be shared. As a consequence, they reached a general consensus to guarantee that he had been (and would

be) faithful to the Household duties. The credit or symbolic capital which the Privy Council extended to Marlowe may well have been his last resort as a form of livelihood, even when he came down to London shortly after and offered the Admiral's (i.e. Charles Howard's) Men his *Tamburlaine the Great*, possibly written during his collegiate days, though his accessibility to these resources may have compelled him more or less to be continuously sensitive to the cultural and political needs of the Privy Council.

NOTES

1 William Boutcher, 'Pilgrimage to Parnassus: local intellectual traditions, humanist education and the cultural geography of sixteenth-century England', in Y. L. Too and N. Livingstone (eds.), *Pedagogy and power: rhetorics of classical learning* (Cambridge, 1998), 124.

2 For instance, see my article 'Corpus Christi College, Cambridge in 1577: reading the social space in Sir Nicholas Bacon's college plan', *Transactions of Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, XV.2 (2013), 279-328. Also see David Mateer, 'New sightings of Christopher Marlowe in London', *Early Theatre*, 11.2 (2008), 13-38.

3 The National Archive (henceforth TNA), Privy Council 2/14, f. 381v.

4 A. L. Rowse, *Christopher Marlowe: a biography* (London, 1964), 30; A. D. Wraight, *In search of Christopher Marlowe: a pictorial biography* (London, 1965), 90.

5 For Samuel Kennet's interesting career, see William Urry, *Christopher Marlowe and Canterbury* (London, 1988), 49.

6 Henry Foley, ed. *Records of the English province of the Society of Jesus, vol. VI* (London, 1880), 7.

7 Constance Brown Kuriyama, *Christopher Marlowe: a Renaissance life* (Ithaca, 2002), 71; C. F. Tucker Brooke, *The life of Marlowe and The Tragedy of Dido Queen of Carthage*, in *The works and life of Christopher Marlowe*, ed. R. H. Case (1930; rpt. New York, 1966), 36-37.

8 Austin K. Gray, 'Observations on Christopher Marlowe, government agent', *PMLA* 43.3 (1928), 692-693. Brooke and Riggs take similar approaches to Gray. See Brooke, 34-36; David Riggs, *The world of Christopher Marlowe* (London, 2004), 180-181.

9 Conyers Read, *Lord Burghley and Queen Elizabeth*, 2 vols. (London, 1960), 2: 398.

10 Conyers Read, *Mr. Secretary Walsingham and the policy of Queen Elizabeth,* 3 vols. (1925; rpt. New York, 1978), 3: 146.

11 Read, *Walsingham*, 3: 446-447.

12 TNA, State Papers 78/17, f. 200r.

13 Michael Barraclough Pulman, *The Elizabethan Privy Council in the fifteen-seventies* (Berkeley, 1971), 162. As for the function and administration of the Privy Council, also see Penry Williams, *The later Tudors: England 1547-1603* (Oxford, 1995), 143.

14 British Library, Lansdowne 63 (95), f. 229r. (5 Nov. 1590).

15 Peter Roberts, '"The studious artizan": Christopher Marlowe, Canterbury and Cambridge', in *Christopher Marlowe and English Renaissance culture*, ed. Darryll Grantley and Peter Roberts (Aldershot, 1996), 25. David Masson points out the existence of this kind of certificate in his *The life of John Milton*, 7 vols. (Cambridge: Macmillan, 1859), 1: 120-121.

16 John Strype, *Annals of the Reformation*, 4 vols. (Oxford, 1824), 4:52-53 (no. xxx).

17 Rowse, 27.

18 For instance, Charles Nicholl, *The reckoning: the murder of Christopher Marlowe* (London, 1992), 91-101; Park Honan, *Christopher Marlowe: poet & spy* (Oxford, 2005), 143-155.

19 Nicholl, 119. See also Honan, 120 and Kuriyama, 71-72.

20 Ide, 302-310.

21 Cited by Mervyn James in his *Society, politics and culture: studies in early modern England* (Cambridge, 1986), 53.

22 Charles Hughes, ed. 'Nicholas Faunt's Discourse touching the office of Principal Secretary of Estate, & c. 1592', *English Historical Review* 20 (1905): 500-501.

23 Nicholl, *Reckoning*, 101.

24 Robert Burton, *The anatomy of melancholy*, 3 vols., ed. Thomas C. Faulkner, Nicolas K. Kiessling and Rhonda L. Blair, with an introduction by J. B. Bamborough (Oxford, 1989), 1: 309. For information on a career highly desirable to aspiring young men, see H. R. Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney and the circulation of manuscripts 1558-1640* (Oxford, 1996), 76-78.

25 John Roche Dasent, ed. *Acts of Privy Council of England: new series* (London, 1890-1907), 24: 44.

26 *Calendar of the manuscripts of the most hon. the Marquis of Salisbury, preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire*, vol. 9 (London, 1902), 157.

27 Kuriyama, 219.

28 Pulman, *Privy Council*, 50.

29 Simon Adams, *Leicester and the court: essays on Elizabethan politics* (Manchester, 2002), 18.

30 Robert W. Kenny, *Elizabeth's Admiral: the political career of Charles Howard Earl of Nottingham 1536-1624* (Baltimore, 1970), 98-101, 129.

31 Scott McMillin points out that 'the politics of their origin run through their entire repertory.' See his 'The Queen's Men and the London theatre of 1583', in *The Elizabethan Theatre X*, ed. C. E. McGee (Port Credit, 1988): 1-17.

32 Andrew Gurr, 'Privy Councilors as theatre patrons', in *Shakespeare and theatrical patronage in early modern England*, ed. Paul Whitfield White and Suzanne R. Westfall (Cambridge,

2002), 235.

33 Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespearian playing companies* (Oxford, 1996), 197.

34 E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan stage*, 4 vols. (Oxford, 1923), 2: 104.

35 John Stowe, augmented by Edmund Howes, *Annales, or a generall chronicle of England* (1615; rpt. London, 1631), 698.

36 Scott McMillin and Sally-Beth MacLean, *The Queen's Men and their plays* (Cambridge, 1998), 25.

37 Chambers, *Elizabethan stage*, 4: 296.

38 Chambers, *Elizabethan stage*, 4: 297.