

## ***Machiavellian or Machia-Villain? Perversion of Machiavelli's Doctrines in the Jew of Malta\****

**Mikail ÖZPİRİNÇ**<sup>1</sup>  
**Assist. Prof. Dr. Öz ÖKTEM**<sup>2</sup>

### **Abstract**

Niccolo Machiavelli famously outlined the traits of an ideal ruler in his two most well-known books, *The Prince* and *Discourses*. The collection of his thoughts came to be known, and disparaged, as Machiavellianism, and remains a long-lasting area of fascination for literary and particularly dramatic output. Although Machiavelli is accepted as the founder of modern politics, his subject not limited to the area of governance, but extends into many aspects of social life, including human relations, religion and personal interest. Christopher Marlowe's translations of Machiavellian thought to the Elizabethan stage plays a huge role in the way in which Machiavelli as a Renaissance thinker evolved into the notorious figure we know today. From teacher of princes, he came, through misinterpretation and misquotation, to be known as 'the teacher of evils'. The characters created by those playwrights and which brought the name of Machiavelli such notoriety are commonly understood to be the "Machiavellian villain, stage villain or supervillain" by scholars of the Elizabethan stage. For the purpose, this essay gathers these appellations under a

---

\* Research Article - Submit Date: 15.11.2019, Acceptance Date: 26.11.2019

<sup>1</sup> *Istanbul Aydın University, İstanbul, mikailozpirinc@hotmail.co.uk*  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5729-1775>

<sup>2</sup> *Istanbul Aydın University, İstanbul, ozoktem@aydin.edu.tr*  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1222-5229>

single and new title, that of the Machia-villain, a figure who stands for solely the darkest side of Niccolo Machiavelli's dictums.

**Keywords:** *Machiavellian villain, Elizabethan Drama, Machia-villain, Barabas, Marlowe*

### **Machiavellian mi yoksa Machia-Suçlu mu? Maltalı Yahudi Kitabında Machiavelli'nin Öğretilerinin Sapıklığı**

#### **Öz**

Niccolo Machiavelli, bir yöneticinin sahip olması gerektiğini iddia ettiği prensiplerini en iyi bilinen iki kitabı, Prens ve Söylevler'inde ifade etmiştir. Düşüncelerinin bir toplamını oluşturan Makyavelizm ise gelecekte de edebiyat alanında sonsuza dek sürecek bir konu olarak kalacaktır. Modern siyasetin kurucusu olarak kabul edilmesine rağmen, eserleri sadece siyaset ile sınırlı kalmamış, toplumdan bireyler arası etkileşime, dinden kişisel çıkarların incelenmesine kadar sosyal hayatın birçok yönü ile ilgilenmiştir. Ancak, Marlow'un yanlış yorumları ve aktarımları onun diğer aydınlar, drama yazarları, okurlar ve tiyatro izleyicileri arasında kötü bir şöhrete kavuşmasına ve 'kötülerin öğretmeni' olarak bilinmesine yol açmıştır. Oyun yazarları tarafından yaratılan karakterler kitaplarda, oyunlarda, makalelerde ve dergilerde "Makyavelci kötü, tiyatro kötüsü ya da süper kötü adam" olarak adlandırılmıştır. Bu yakıştırmalar, Niccolo Machiavelli'nin sadece kötü ve karanlık tarafını ifade eden, ortaya atmış olduğum yeni bir terim, Makyavel-şeytan terimi çatısı altında toplanacaktır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** *Makyavel Kötü, Elizabeth Tiyatrosu, Makyavel-şeytan, Barabas, Marlowe*

#### **Introduction**

Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527) was an Italian politician, thinker and author. He declares his maxims for being a successful ruler in his most well-known book *The Prince* (1513). The immense influence of the text was clear from its inception, as from its earliest years it was listed in the "Index Librorum Prohibitorum" by one of the greatest European power-holders of that period, the Church. It was translated into Latin, French and finally English, more than one hundred years later in 1640 (Meyer,

1897, p. 2). Nevertheless, the influence of the text was so substantial that when *The Prince* was first translated into English, Machiavellianism – the cluster of ideas through which Machiavelli theorized his principles of politics and his perception of the operations of state and government was already a familiar notion to the Elizabethan culture of England. From his time until today, the arch-manipulating and fraudulent characters in the seminal literary and dramatic works from the period have been stigmatised as Machiavellian in their villainy. However, as Carol L. emphasizes, the perverted ideas upon which the Elizabethan villain hero is based reflect a vilification of Machiavelli's ideas (1972, pp. 1-2). This is all to say that, villain characters in the Elizabethan period were fomented in a pot that perverted the Machiavellian principles, which in turn maligned the ideas of the Italian thinker for centuries to come.

Elizabethan drama is filled with characters that fit with “the end justifies the means” motto of Machiavellianism. At the same time, the political thoughts of Machiavelli are shown as black, perverse and corrupt. What emerges is from this preoccupation, however, is in fact the centrality of Machiavellian ideas to the propaganda machine of the Tudor dynasty, where they are invariably presented as an opposite to what ought to be defined as legitimate and honourable rule. However, when we consider that Machiavelli's primary concern in providing a blueprint for the ideal prince was for the benefit of country or kingdom, these Elizabethan villains with dark personalities, to my claim, are not appropriately named as Machiavellian villains. Rather, it is this essay's central tenet that Marlowe's Barabas in *The Jew of Malta* is in fact new character type which remakes the established dramatic stereotypes of evil villains, common in medieval archetypal theatre, in combination with the Florentine's ideal figure of the prince in order to an entirely new type of dramatic character. For the purposes of this essay, we shall call this new character type *Machia-villain*.

A *Machia-villain* character differs from the so-far-accepted Machiavellian villain in that the character traits are derived from twisted interpretations of the doctrines of the Florentine and focus predominantly on the darker side of his reflections. What a *Machia-villain* is concerned with is just his own glory and interest; Machiavelli himself would never approve of such an approach. Machiavelli's prince may do evil in conducting his duties, but

the ends must justify the means and those ends are always the larger goal of his country's welfare. For the Elizabethan Machia-villains, the means are frequently evil but cannot be justified by the ends.

Marlowe's reference to Machiavelli is much more overt with the ghost of the Florentine opening the play when compared to other dramatists of that era like William Shakespeare and Thomas Kyd. Nevertheless, it is a misinterpretation of Machiavelli's ideas that characterises Barabas's actions in the play. Barabas is better understood as a *Machia-villain* type, not a true Machiavellian, as he does not exhibit any positive behaviour to the other characters in the play. While the Florentine's figure of the prince indeed poses an obligatory tyranny, it must be seen to bring an overall benefit to the people over whom the prince rules; Barabas, by contrast, exploits his subjects for the benefit of himself, and when he is done with them, they are disposable. Furthermore, it is a common point for *Machia-villains* that their villainy has no limits, not even that of family feeling. Barabas cares only for his gold and his personal interest, so much so that he does not even regret killing his own daughter.

Physical appearance is one way in which *Machia-villains* are also distinguishable from Machiavelli's princes. While Machiavelli rejects the significance of appearances, and does not describe the princely figure, drawing attention rather to the importance of actions and behaviour, Marlowe 'marks' his characters with a physical expression of their internal malevolence: Barabas is grotesque to the point of deformity. Keeping in mind that the playwrights are interested in creating entertaining characters, and have no interest in accurately representing Machiavellian ideas, however much they may draw on them, it is likely that they intend to combine the evil personalities of their heroes with physical ugliness in order to arrest the audiences' attention. In creating Barabas in a stereotypically anti-Semitic mould, Marlowe chimes with the prejudices of an English audience ready to understand the figure of the Jew as always-already marked, evil and hated, as England's history of anti-Jewish action and sentiment establishes.

Machiavelli's target readership was the princes and rulers of Europe. For this reason, probably the most distinguishing difference between

a Machiavellian villain and what this essay terms a *Machia-villain* is that the former is supposed to be a ruler, a prince or candidate to rule. However, *Machia-villain* does not have to be a member of a ruling family as in Marlowe's Barabas. Barabas does not show any trace of desiring that sort of power and leadership throughout the play. Rather, Barabas is a merchant whose initial motivation for malevolence is money, but as the play progresses, becomes more and more motivated by vengeance, bound up with his Jewish identity and his perception of the lack of justice in a society caught between the anti-Semitic Christian West and the Ottoman East. Thus the Jewish Barabas wears a *Machiavellian* mask.

### **Christopher Marlowe's Machia-Villain Character Type: Barabas**

Niccolo Machiavelli effectively draws a utopian road map for rulers about how a prince can prepare for, capture and hold on to power in the face of every eventuality. Marlowe, like his contemporaries, learnt his Machiavelli from those who defamed him. Until Greene introduced Machiavelli's name abstractly in literature in 1583, Machiavelli had been known only as an author. When considering that Greene was a student at Cambridge in 1579 and Marlowe was in the following year, we can surmise that the literati students of Cambridge were already familiar with the Florentine (Meyer, 1897, p. 25). As we have seen, Machiavelli had a bad reputation in the sixteenth century for standing in opposition to the theocentric and political teachings of the established powers. Thus, a distorted version of Machiavelli's teachings was used as the working ground for the scholars and playwrights of the Elizabethan period. Yet there was often nuance in the playwrights' use of Machiavelli: thus Christopher Marlowe used Machiavelli as a mirror on which he could reflect the hypocrisy and anti-Semitism of English society while at the same time creating an arch *Machia-villain* in the figure of Barabas. The analysis of *The Jew of Malta* set forth in this chapter continues the central argument of this thesis – that Elizabethan dramatists used a caricature of Machiavelli's doctrines when creating their *Machia-villains* which encompass only the darkest interpretations of Machiavelli's teachings. Moreover, I will also argue that these villain characters, like Barabas in this chapter, are not truly Machiavellian figures, as it is important to remember that Machiavelli was setting up a blueprint for rulers. Barabas's motivation does not fit

this blueprint, as his motivation is first only personal interest and then vengeance; Barabas is thus a false disciple of Machiavelli, and the Ghost of Machiavel a false teacher of Machiavellianism. Finally, as none of these *Machia-villains* survive to enjoy their successes, and are each met with divine justice, they are thus failed followers of Machiavellianism: were they true Machiavellians, they would survive to enjoy the fruits of their success.

Barabas is the main *Machia-villain* character - the eponymous *Jew of Malta*; however, he is not the only character in the play to display Machiavellian traits. Ferneze, the governor of Malta, conveniently and ironically misuses religion in order to manage the shifting power play on the island. That he takes credit for religious words and then abuses them also proves that Marlowe keeps track of Machiavellian principles through his characters. But in the play, Ferneze represents the true Machiavellian ruler, and Barabas is the embodiment of a *Machia-villain*. Yet Marlowe bids the ghost of Machiavel open the play with words praising him and his teachings, and makes a Jew the main character of the play so that he can profit from the anti-Semitic attitudes which thrived in Elizabethan England, and thereby create a sensational play. Yet the whole cast seems to embody Machiavellian aspects at some point in the play. Hence, hypocrisy of any kind, lust for power and money and the attitude toward removing anyone who gets in the way of another's desires are common ground for every character in the play, with the exception of Abigail.

Censorship in Elizabethan drama meant that dramatists frequently manipulated historical facts in order to design characters which did not offend the queen. Nevertheless, Marlowe utilized historical events – like the Ottoman siege of Malta, and phenomena – like the prejudicial attitude towards Jews in English society to form the backdrop of his exploration of the implications of Machiavellian behaviours. The play is also an exploration of the wider theme of self-interest, greed and avarice in the society of Elizabethan period.

Although Barabas and Machiavelli share the same idea of will to power, Machiavelli's books address an audience of would-be princes and kings, those with aspirations to govern, not those with no claim to throne or

government. In the play we see Barabas as a rich and avaricious merchant who has nothing to do with ruling Malta. This difference is significant: Machiavelli justified certain behaviours for government, not for commerce. Climbing a peak in order to secure a position of power is, for Machiavelli, what justifies a privileging of self-interest and personal desire. But on Marlowe's Malta, we have a society which has created its own *Machiavillians*, who believe that power interchangeable with financial superiority. Marlowe's play explores what happens when Machiavelli's values are transported from politics to finance.

Christopher Marlowe was born in Canterbury, a son to an ordinary shoemaker. He was born in the same year, 1564, as Shakespeare but made his name on the Elizabethan stage before him. His life story is somewhat sensational by contemporary standards: he is claimed to have served as a spy, and also not to have died but have lived undercover as the ghost writer of Shakespeare (Hoffman, 1955, p.3). His unusual way of life effected his perception of religion, politics, society and individuals down to the microcosmic level, as realized in *The Jew of Malta*.

Both Marlowe and Machiavelli were accused of atheism, and it is ironic that he studied in Cambridge with the scholarship that was granted to him by Archbishop Parker Funding on the condition that he would serve as a priest after his education (Caldwell, 1967, p.3). When he graduated, he had only six more years to live, and within those years, he wrote five more plays that are chronologically *The Jew of Malta* (1589), *Dr. Faustus* (1592), *Dido, Queen of Carthage* (1593), *The Massacre at Paris* (1593) and *Edward the Second* (1594). While Marlowe was still a student at the university, he also wrote his remarkable play *Tamburlaine the Great* (1587).

As we have argued previously, in *The Jew of Malta*, Marlowe exploits the misinterpretation of Machiavelli to create Barabas. In an attempt to create a Machiavellian character, from Janssen's perspective (1972), Marlowe closely analysed Machiavelli's advice for a prince, and spots a strong conflict between personal desire and conscience; between self-interest and morality (p.23). In so doing, Marlowe managed to form his own *Machiavillain* character, Barabas, who wears the mask of Machiavellian principles.

When we put aside that non-princely figures are not the candidate rulers and politicians for whom Machiavelli wrote his books, we can allow that these characters can be called *Machia-villain* as long as they pursue their desire for power, personal interests and money with, crucially, no thought for the public good.

In fact, Marlowe and Machiavelli share many ideas in common, including their approaches to religion. Both Marlowe and Machiavelli were castigated as atheists in their lifetimes. Machiavelli's approach to religion is always pragmatic, as he regards it as nothing more than a common point and tool for unifying people together. Marlowe, however, went further in his criticisms of religion:

Fell (not without iust desert) to that outrage and extremitie that hee denied God and his sonne Christ and not only in word blasphemed the trinitie, but also (as it is credibly reported) wrote bookies against it, affirming our Sauieur to be but a deceiuer, and Moses to be but a coniuer and seducer of the people, and the Holy Bible to be but vaine and idle stories, and all religion but deuce of pollicie. (Beard quoted by Kocher, 1946, p.40)

This quotation is taken from Thomas Beard, Marlowe's contemporary and the author of *The Theatre of God's Judgement* (1597). His Marlowean sources are still unknown, but nevertheless his accusations against Marlowe for atheism are significant indicators of the playwright's reputation (Kocher, 1946, p.29). However, to Rowse (1964), Marlowe follows a secular manner, and implies in his plays that religions are just tools that were formulated to control and manipulate weak people and societies throughout the centuries (p. 204).

Howsoever this may be, Marlowe forms his characters under the influence of the Renaissance and the development of individualism, the philosophical innovations of this period rather than following the dogmatic teachings of the Church. Therefore, Machiavelli, as a thinker of the Renaissance, is an obvious source. In his analysis of the playwright's works, Kocher (1946) asserts that in addition to the influence of Machiavelli, Marlowe also synthesizes within his characters the villains from older theatrical



conventions, like “Senecan tyrants” and the “vice” of the morality plays (p. 195). Thus, Marlowe introduces his *Machia-villain* character, Barabas to the Elizabethan stage and charts a transformation of the rascal into villainy in the context of a serious and tragic play.

In 1589, Marlowe wrote *The Jew of Malta* and it was performed on the stage in 1592 for the first time. However, two years after its stage debut, the case of Jewish doctor Lopez who attempted to poison Queen Elizabeth (Kohler, 1909, p. 10) awoke the English theatre audiences’ interest, and led the play to be performed thirty-six times until 1596. A result of the anti-Semitic fervour sparked by the affair, people established a mutual relation between the Jew doctor and Marlowe’s Jew, Barabas.

The play deals with the adventures of Barabas, who is flaming with vengeance and willing to do anything and everything in the pursuit of gold. As *The Jew of Malta* opens, the ghost of Machiavelli appears and expounds on the hypocrisy of people who deny his doctrines. He introduces his fellow, Barabas and demands that the audience to be nice to him. Barabas, a Jewish merchant, boasts about his wealth and riches, which he is soon to lose since Ferneze, the Governor of Malta, has a plan to make the island’s Jews pay the taxes levied by the invading Turks. Luckily, he is able to save half of his fortune thanks to his daughter, Abigail. Nevertheless, Barabas burns with vengeance, and leads the Governor’s son to death with the help of his slave, Ithamore. He plots to poison Abigail, the nuns who have taken over his house, and the friars. Barabas and Ithamore then break their alliance and, to keep his murders secret Barabas pays a ransom demanded as a result of the promiscuous Ithamore’s weakness towards the courtesan Bellamira, to whom he tells everything and who, in turn, tells Ferneze everything she has learned from Ithamore. Barabas is sentenced to death, but instead of a burial, the presumed corpse of Barabas is thrown outside of the city walls as an insulting punishment; however, he is still alive and decides to switch allegiances and help the Turks to capture Malta. Then Barabas makes a new deal with Ferneze in an attempt to return his former glorious days, but is thwarted in his attempts at restitution and ends up dying a painful death in a boiling cauldron, which had prepared for someone else.

The play starts with a prologue in which ghost of Machiavelli speaks about his long journey from the Alps of France to Malta, and onto the stage in England. He introduces himself:

Albeit the world think Machiavel is dead,  
Yet was his soul but flown beyond the Alps;  
And, now the Guise is dead, is come from France,  
To view this land, and frolic with his friends.  
To some perhaps my name is odious;  
But such as love me guard me from their tongues,  
And let them know that I am Machiavel,  
And weigh not men, and therefore not mens words  
Admired I am of those that hate me most. (prologue, 1-9)

It is important that the ghost of Machiavelli opens the play as it positions him as the presiding genius of the play; some critics have read this dread opening as presenting Machiavelli as a horrifying disease, coming to England from the east, Italy (Bawcutt, 1970, p. 36). Furthermore, Marlowe equates Machiavellianism with Judaism in the eyes of the audience. Machiavelli enters and cynically introduces himself on the stage and talks about the Duke of Guise who is a disreputable and hated figure since he was responsible for the St. Bartholomew's Day massacre. Marlow, through the ghost of Machiavelli, utilizes figures of utmost evil as their examples. Then, as if he already knew that the crowd hates him, he lets them know that he is Machiavel. He defends himself and his doctrines by saying that those who profess to hate him are his most ardent followers, and they are hypocrites when they deny their real feelings about him, a trait which is also, to him, a part of human nature. In addition, he does not care about what they think about him. In his reading of the play, Bawcutt argues that Marlowe chose the harshest and the most cynical way of opening in order to shock the audience and make clear from the outset of the action that Machiavelli (2018) approves the utmost extreme evil of humanity (p. 48). Marlowe's intention at the beginning of the play is that the presence of Machiavelli strikes creates terror into the heart of the theatre-goers, no matter how limited and superficial the knowledge of Machiavelli the audience has.

The ghost of Machiavelli goes onto give an example of humanity's hypocrisy by citing that it was his very principles that the Papacy adopted when they succeeded in capturing the Vatican. He adds those who did not follow him were poisoned by those who did utilize his teachings.

Though some speak openly against my books,  
Yet will they read me and thereby attain  
To Peter's chair; and when they cast me off,  
Are poisoned by my climbing followers. (prologue, 10-13)

From the hypocrisy of humanity he moves to religion: "I count religion but a childish toy, And hold there is no sin but ignorance." (Prologue, 14-15). Wearing the mask of religion marks the ultimate form of deviousness in the play and indeed is its central theme. From the lines of the prologue by the ghost Machiavel to the Governor of Malta, the approach to the religion is full of deceit and dishonesty with Machiavelli's point that religion is that it is just a tool to control other men and hide one's own interest repeated again and again in the course of the play's action. Indeed, such is the religious hypocrisy in the play and so incisive is Machiavel's desire to expose it that the character's attitude appears as not merely impious but, for an observant if hypocritical Elizabeth audience, diabolically atheistic.

Many scholars place Marlowe and his characters somewhere between atheism and deism just as they do the same for Machiavelli. According to Bawcutt (1970), the late 1580's are the years when the fame of Machiavelli began to spread not only among the authorities dealing with politics and religion but also among ordinary people who are willing to show up at the public theatres as audiences. Additionally, he hypothetically claims that Marlowe, as a savvy dramatist would have been aware of this penchant for Machiavelli among the public and wrote *The Jew of Malta* so as not to miss out on the popularity of the Florentine (p. 40).

The ghost finishes the prologue by explaining the reason why he visits England. He is before the audience to introduce a Jew who has made a fortune and whose bags are full of gold and precious stones purely by acting according to Machiavellian tenets. Barabas, Gauss (1980) says, is an example of a stereotyped Machiavelli who is egotistical, lustful and villainous (p. 14). He holds great power in his hands thanks to fraud and

force; yet, he is devastated by his destiny that he was foolish enough to think he had control of. The ghost exits by requesting that the audience to behave without prejudice towards the Jew, ignoring the fact that he is a acolyte of Machiavel.

I come not, I,  
To read a lecture here in Britanie,  
But to present the tragedy of a Jew  
Who smiles to see how full his bags are crammed,  
Which money was not got without my means.  
I crave but this. Grace him as he deserves,  
And let him not be entertained the worse  
Because he favours me. (prologue, 28-35)

Marlowe chooses Malta as the setting of the play for its geographical position in the centre of everything, a microcosm caught between Europe and the Middle East – and further to the Far East – and limited by the Mediterranean Sea (Editorial Board, 2017). The ghost of Machiavel already gives us prior knowledge about Barabas and his fortune, and he opens with the information that he has many ships carrying different products ranging from oil to wine; from silk to spice.

So that of thus much that return was made;  
And of the third part of the Persian ships  
There was the venture summed and satisfied.  
As for those Samnites and the men of Uz  
That bought my Spanish oils and wines of Greece,  
Here have I pursed their paltry silverlings. (1.1. 1-6)

Stephen Greenblatt (1973) claims that in the plays of both Marlowe and Shakespeare, the figure of the Jew was a palimpsest for the worst excesses of society and that as such they function differently from non-Jewish characters, to whom more individual agency is attributed (p. 203). For Marlowe, the figure of the Jew acts as a cipher for sinfulness, weirdness and indeed evil in his period and his society. Christians for the Elizabethan period were encouraged to be prejudiced against the Jews from a religious standpoint, and their most consistent contact with them was often in the Bible, from which sprang myths and horror stories which affirmed that they

were a cursed nation due to their role in the crucifixion of Jesus (S.A. 322). European anti-Semitism could be extremely coarse and dehumanising: thus a German wood-engraving known as *The Jewish Pig* pictures a scene in which the Jews suck the breast of a pig and eat its stool. In another painting from the same period, a group of Jews are shown as poisoning a well with the urine of a Satan, a highly popular anti-Semitic trope. In a complex manoeuvre Marlowe satirises his society's stereotyping of the Jew by using a hyperbolic illustration of Barabas's vicious misdeeds.

Marlowe's play is also an important indication of how Christian society dominated the culture and society of England and Europe at the time, and as part of that indeed suppressed the Jews. Marlowe wrote his play almost three centuries after Jews were first expelled from England, so as to criticise his society's indulgence in religious strife and ethnic tensions. He staged his Jew in a *Machia-villain* manner in a *Machia-villain* island where every character in the play, excluding Abigail, runs after money. In making Barabas a successful merchant, Marlowe taps in to the anti-Semitic consensus about the wealth of the Jews. This is done without recourse to the historical explanation that Jews were structurally excluded from specific areas of public life, such as politics and state affairs and that, barred from these professions, it was inevitable that many Jews would end up in trade, and it becomes a major source of wealth for those involved (Luther, 1543, p. 59). Abstracted from these conditions, Marlowe draws such an example of a rich Jew in front of the eyes of the audience, and intends to prove Machiavelli right about his ideas about the relationship between power and money. In the first scene, Barabas circumstantiates the sources of his wealth.

Give me the merchants of the Indian mines  
That trade in metal of the purest mold,  
The wealthy Moor, that in the eastern rocks  
Without control can pick his riches up  
And in his house heap pearl like pebblestones,  
Receive them free and sell them by the weight,  
Bags of fiery opals, sapphires, amethysts,  
Jacinths, hard topaz, grass green emeralds,  
Beauteous rubies, sparkling diamonds,  
And seldseen costly stones of so great price (1.1. 19-28)

Machiavelli (2018) warns rulers that excessive mammonization can be harmful (p. 99). Yet all goes well for Barabas, and every ship adds more money into his fortune. His eyes sparkle with joy when he says it is trouble to count this trash, meaning his money, and thus Marlowe conveys the stupendous wealth of the merchant” so that the audience understand his life and happiness depend entirely on his gold.

Although Barabas’s fortune comes from the goods that he sells Christians, religious hypocrisy rises to the surface when Barabas looks down on them. He is a Jew living in Christian Malta, but nevertheless presents himself as superior.

These are the blessings promised to the Jews,  
And herein was old Abrams happiness.  
What more may heaven do for earthly man  
Than thus to pour out plenty in their laps,  
Ripping the bowels of the earth for them,  
Making the seas their servant, and the winds  
To drive their substance with successful blasts?  
Who hateth me but for my happiness? (1.1. 105-113)

Barabas relates wealth with Jewish identity, celebrating it as a birthright and a gift from God. “Rather had I, a Jew, be hated thus, Than pitied in a Christian poverty;” (1.1. 115-117). As long as his ships carry gold for him, he does not care that people hate him and prefers to be a rich and “envied” Jew rather than a “pitied” Christian (Prologue, 27). He just desires that Christian rulers give them the “peaceful” conditions necessary to run his business (Ford, 1969, p. 167). Yet, shortly after Barabas’s braggadocious speech so the bad news of the Turks coming to Malta in order to collect their accrued taxes is related. While feigning to comfort others, Barabas takes precautions against the possible Ottoman invasion by hiding a part of his fortune and by stating in a soliloquy: as long as Turks do not touch him, his money and Abigail, his daughter, he does not pay attention about who is the ruling power on the island (1.1. 153-156). The words of Barabas are a synopsis of his egomania, in that he would be content to see the entire world burning, as long as he is alive, and in possession of first his money and then his daughter.

Ferneze, the Governor of Malta and faced with the threat of Turkish taxes declares that the Jews of the island will provide the funds that the Turks demand by leaving relinquishing half of their fortune. Only Barabas strongly objection to the situation on the basis he did not acquire his wealth easily (1.1. 98-99). This objection however ends up costing him dearly as in response *all* his money is expropriated and his house is taken from him to convert it a monastery. Ferneze's move here is specifically counselled against by Machiavel, as he warns that the ruler should not try to capture the money and belongings of his people:

No, Jew; we take particularly thine  
To save the ruin of a multitude,  
And better one want for a common good  
Than many perish for a private man. (1.1. 100-103)

From the point of view of Ferneze, a Machiavellian politician, it is a necessity to sacrifice one man for a common good. However, to Barabas, Ferneze's move is no different than theft, which is yet a great sin in Christianity, which always encourages the humble, patient and just life. This represents the hypocrisy of religion on Ferneze's side when he scoffingly preaches to Barabas about covetousness, and then abuses the religion for turning himself out to be righteous (1.1. 127-128).

Barabas cries that when Ferneze steals his children's hope, and touching his money is just equal to killing him. He yells:

And now shall move you to bereave my life.  
. .  
Why, I esteem the injury far less,  
To take the lives of miserable men  
Than be the causers of their misery.  
You have my wealth, the labor of my life,  
The comfort of mine age, my children's hope,  
And therefore never distinguish of the wrong. (1.2. 144, 147-149)

Machiavelli (2018) warns that it is a precarious move when a ruler decides on confiscating his people's possessions since it is much easier for them to bear the sorrow of their fathers' death than to be seized of their inheritance (pp. 81-82). After it is certain that Barabas will lose all that he has, he desperately pleads with his martinets to tell him whether they have an idea of killing him in their minds or not. Ferneze responds with contempt saying he never blackens his hands by spilling Jewish blood (1.2.145-146). Seemingly, Barabas saves his life but loses everything. Nevertheless, he is in such a mood that he would rather keep his gold and properties than keep his life. Thus, these are the seeds of Barabas's wrath.

Marlowe makes a remarkable comparison between two forms of religious hypocrisy displayed in the play. The first hypocrisy is that Christians of Malta do not follow the teachings of Christianity although they say they are Christians. The second hypocrisy is that although the Jews do not believe in Christianity, they often dissemble and claim to believe in order to improve a hostile situation. The latter incidence of hypocrisy is thus less sinful, and that is why Barabas asks Abigail to pretend to be a Christian until they can regain their riches. Thus, for Marlowe, the greater of these two sins of hypocrisy is the first, the one that lies to one's own self.

As good dissemble that thou never meanst  
As first mean truth and then dissemble it.  
A counterfeit profession is better  
Than unseen hypocrisy. (1.2. 300-303)

Barabas opts to abuse religion for his own purpose, a decision which he registers with the audience by saying "religion hides many mischiefs from suspicion" (1.2. 282). Moreover, advises Abigail to pretend to be a sinful creature who, keen to atone for past misdemeanours, visits the monastery which was once their house — and profess her desire to become a nun, thus enabling Barabas to reach his hidden money. Just as Machiavelli suggests that having personal virtue is not compulsory for a prince, but to seem pious is a necessity, Barabas directs Abigail in the same direction, which opens doors for a fresh start for Barabas and Abigail. "O, my girl: My gold, my fortune, my felicity, Strength my soul, death to my enemies!" (2.1. 50-52). Thus he manages to recapture the power he needs to take his revenge from Christians that steal his wealth.



As we have seen, Machiavelli routinely encourages princes to remove all obstacles standing before them by using their cunning. The sequential development of a Machiavellian character's career is thus predictable, much like his personality. In the plays which foreground a *Machia-villain* figure, they are always distinguished from other characters by way of being more intelligent, sneaky, hypocritical and blood-thirsty. Thus Boyer (1964) states:

The hero commences his tragic career out of hatred and revenge, pursues his plot by guile, but oversteps all bounds of justice and reason in the cruelty of his deeds, and finally taken in his own toils and destroyed. (p. 52)

These lines are just a simple summarization of the trajectory of a *Machia-villain* character in dramas in the Elizabethan age from the introduction of the character until his cursed end. In a similar vein, no matter whether their actions are justified, *Machia-villains* expect no approval for their upcoming evil actions. All that matters are the ends which they pursue – the distinctly un-Machiavellian ends of wealth and personal interest. Thus, after recovering his gold, thanks to his daughter, Barabas spins an elaborate web of intrigue to this achievement of this aim.

Machiavelli mentions that vengeance is necessary on the condition that it provides an advantage. He advises princes to do what they are required to do, and to avoid the extreme. Yet Barabas is not checked by such concerns. The next stop on his long journey of personal interest is Ferneze's son, Lodowick who is deeply in love with Abigail. However, Lodowick has a rival in Don Mathias who is also in love with the daughter of Barabas, which brings a perfect and doubly-profitable plan to Barabas's mind. Although Abigail has feelings for Mathias, she is asked to pretend to love both of them so that Barabas is able to take his revenge on Ferneze and, more broadly, the Christians by directly targeting the Ferneze family name. His evil plot begins with those two men, but Barabas's plot is complicated by Lodowick's being so well-known as the son of the governor, and his own notoriety on account of his previous wealth. Taking into account the prominence of both men, Barabas concludes that it is risky to kill him unless the murder is committed professionally and with duplicity. That

is the moment when Barabas realises he needs a co-conspirator. Thus Ithamore, a Turkish slave, enters the action, whose sole role is to undertake Barabas's dirty work. At their first encounter, Barabas enacts a quasi swearing of allegiance ceremony, compelling Ithamore thus:

First, be thou void of these affections:  
Compassion, love, vain hope, and heartless fear.  
Be moved at nothing. See thou pity none,  
But to thyself smile when the Christians moan. (2.3. 174-177)

It is such a mordant moment in the play that in many productions the audience is left feeling that Barabas is ventriloquizing true diabolic evil. Yet this behaviour in terms of means is fully coherent with Machiavellian doctrine: for Machiavelli, the fundamental criteria are not being good or behaving well, but knowing when to stop or to change course or strategy; knowing with whom to make an alliance or with whom not to; whom to choose to eliminate and how along the way. Barabas is faithful to those ideas in the play by making an alliance with Ithamore and inciting Don Mathias and Lodowick to murder one another.

The alliance with Ithamore is a crucial one for Barabas, as to have an ally who he can completely and unquestioningly control allows him to fully exploit his *Machia-villain* tendencies. For Ithamore, his alliance with Barabas allows him to rid himself of slave market and free himself up to perform acts of violence with pleasure. Meanwhile the scale of Barabas's vengeance escalates, as he is shown taking pride in his diabolical activity by killing sick people, who he unhappily comes across groaning under walls as he walks the area at night; going about and poisoning wells; keeping the sexton's arms so busy with digging graves and ringing dead men's knells; and serving as an usurer and filling the jails with bankrupts in a year (2.3. 179-206). Ithamore tells his own story so freely and willingly that his response resembles a competition of malignancy between the two villains. Thus the Turkish Ithamore takes delight on setting Christian villages on fire; chaining galley slaves; serving as an hostler at an inn and at nights secretly stealing travelers' chambers, and there cutting their throats; strewing powder on the marble stones where the pilgrims kneeled; and laughing a-good to see the cripples go limping home to Christendom

on stilts (3.2. 208-217). Thus, when he mentions his potential, it is obvious that the presence of Ithamore will dynamize the rest of the play. This is despite the fact that, we do not have evidence to prove whether Ithamore is telling the truth or telling tall tales to impress his new demonic master.

As Machiavelli (2018) asserts, promises are just a weapon to be used and when such a promise no longer serves its purpose, there is no wrong in breaking it, either (p. 529). Sowing discord between two young lovers, Barabas takes his second step with the help of his new ally, Ithamore. He writes a letter issuing a challenge to Don Mathias as if the letter was from Lodowick. Although Abigail is not willing to be a part of his father's plan, Barabas deceives his daughter by saying It's no sin to deceive a Christian, for they themselves already hold it a principle (2.3. 309-310). She unintentionally causes deaths of two young men in a duel which they kill one another, and in a state of remorse, she turns towards Christianity, arguing that there is no love on earth, pity in Jews, nor piety in Turks (3.3. 47-48). Losing his temper with his daughter, Barabas disinherits her and declares that Ithamore is his only heir and promises that half of his fortune will be on his service when the time comes for him to pass away. This promise serves to motivate Ithamore more, and to manipulate him around for a while since Barabas has not finished with him yet, and he still needs him to conceal the deaths of Lodowick and Don Mathias.

Marlowe depicts a world of greed and hypocrisy –the reflection of the *Machia-villains* world in which they operate where beauty and kindness –as symbolised in the figure of Abigail– cannot live on (Bawcutt, 1970, p. 48). At the peak of his cruelty, Barabas is so blind and avaricious that he still prioritises his wealth and interests even before his own daughter. All he cares about is money, in Janssen's analysis (1972), a hierarchy of value in order of priority: his fortune, himself, then his daughter, Abigail (p. 23). This valuation is made clear once Barabas is faced with a choice that leaves him stirring poison into the porridge that he prepares to kill his daughter Abigail:

And with her let it work like Borgia's wine,  
Whereof his sire, the Pope, was poisoned! (3.4. 94-95)

In his reading of the *Discourses*, Bawcutt (1970) finds that Machiavelli recommends the use of poison as a weapon, so in this way Barabas's resort to poison is in keeping with his Machiavellian traits (p. 33). Poisoning is also a very common literary device which not only enables the dispatch of characters but also communicates the assassin's duplicity (Bowers, 1937, p. 495). Poisoning often allows the perpetrator to escape blame and capture, as it works by distancing the assassin from the victim. Extraordinarily in *The Jew of Malta*, it allows for a massacre with all the nuns in the monastery being murdered the same time, a mass slaughter allowing Barabas to take revenge on his daughter for having joined the convent sincerely. Murdering quickly, leaving no trace and walking secretly away is most efficacious for Barabas. From that moment, Barabas calls Ithamore a friend, no longer a servant (3.4. 41-42).

In that period, simply being a Jew was enough for Barabas to create antipathy among the audience. Yet Marlowe compounds the way in which he plays with censure in the play by confronting the audience with scathing attacks on general hypocrisy, firstly that of the friars who are expected to lead and recommend a virtuous life, but also almost all of characters show such moral weakness that Barabas starts to emerge as merely the encapsulation of the general moral degradation of the Maltese society (Greenblatt, 1973, p. 203). Hence, in the eyes of the audience, Barabas begins to be seen as one villain among many, a moral point which acts as a leveller and allows Marlowe to question the validity of the audience's hostility towards Barabas based purely on his religious identity.

Over the course of the following forty hours, all the nuns die: yet, Abigail has a little more time to confess his father's villainy before she departs this life. Here Marlowe wants us to be a witness to the vulgarity of the friars, as Bernardine takes the opportunity to mourn the loss of Abigail chiefly on account of her sexual status: "Ay, and a virgin too; that grieves me most" (3.4. 41). Within the rules of the convent, the nuns are already expected to neither marry nor save their virginity. However, Bernardine's grief shows his duplicity and it can be inferred that he had an intention of sexually abuse Abigail later on. Moreover, the intentions of the friars are also called into questions when they fail to report Barabas and Ithamore

to the authorities on Malta, nor directly to Ferneze whose son is one of Barabas's victims; instead, they choose to go to rich Barabas. At his place, they reveal that they know he murdered Lodowick and Don Mathias. As an example of how *Machia-villainy*, Barabas cries crocodile tears and states he is ready to convert to Christianity in order to gain God's mercy. This move stuns both Bernardine and Jacomo, at which point they are drawn into a contest of hypocrisy before the audience as they battle for Barabas's spoils. Forgetting his sinful and evil actions, they think only of the endowment Barabas promises to bestow on his chosen monastery: the obvious manipulation of religion by Barabas does not seem as repellent in this setpiece as the friars' religious hypocrisy. It allows Marlowe to thus display the friars' true colours and critique the false piety and sanctimonious nature of much religious practice.

Machiavelli signifies that opportunity has a short life and a prince must make the most of it so as not to miss a chance. Not realising that the hunter becomes the hunted, Bernardine and Jacomo leave Barabas's place full of hope and full of desire for gold. Like the winds of desire that bring Turks to Malta (3.5. 3-4), the same winds bring the two friars to Barabas. The outcome is inevitable: Bernardine dies at the hands of the Turk Ithamore, and Barabas profits from the situation doubly by stating he cannot convert to such a religion in which even a priest can kill someone (4.1. 188-190) and by witnessing the murder for which Jacomo cannot go to Ferneze to report Barabas and Ithamore.

Machiavelli (2018) warns about the changeable temperament of men and states that men think little of switching allegiance and changing their masters once circumstances change. He regards people as fickle, unreliable and short-sighted creatures:

as long as you benefit them, they are entirely yours;  
they offer you their blood, their goods, their life, and their children...  
when the necessity is remote, but when it approaches,  
they revolt. (p. 81)

What this amounts to is a pragmatic view where what is best is to be aware that human nature is innately sinful and that social interactions are always-already based on common interests, and when those interests no longer converge, that same interaction will come to an end. Falsely thinking that nothing can now thwart his path to personal enrichment, another unexpected obstacle shows up for Barabas, this time from the only ally who he genuinely seems to trust; who Barabas loves as himself and who he designates his heir (4.3. 47-48); who knows every single sin of Barabas and partakes of those sins with him. Ithamore initially acts as Barabas's right hand man: if Machiavel is assumed to be the grandmaster of Barabas, — as the ghost of Machiavelli implies in the prologue — we can say that Barabas is the grandmaster of Ithamore. After a period of apprenticeship, Barabas's protegee that out to be an expert and they form an evil alliance.

As we have seen, Barabas acts the *Machia-villain* in pursuit of money, personal interest and revenge upon the Christians, whose primary sin was to seize his assets, lock, stock and barrel. Marlowe is less clear about Ithamore's motivation. Ithamore himself does speak about his past criminal actions, and we have no reason not to believe in his words as he murders Bernadine, without impunity and poisons the nuns in the monastery without remorse. He is, moreover, one among many *Machia-villains* in the play, including the friars, the courtesan and her pimp; as we have seen, with the exception of Abigail, almost every character in the play carries with them some of the characteristic features of a *Machia-villain*.

In addition to knowing Ithamore's essentially villainous nature, we also witness the ease with which Bellamira is able to seduce Ithamore with lustful words, as the words of Pilia-Borza demonstrate when he describes him as a base slave and as being "driven to a nonplus" (4.2. 16-17). In return, he will prove his *Machia-villain* spirit by starting blackmailing Barabas and demanding gold to keep his secrets. In this matter, Barabas begins his steps in a hurry by stating "Great injuries are not so soon forgot" (1.2. 209), and "I am not of the tribe of Levi, I, That can so soon forget an injury" (2.3. 18- 19). In a bid to take revenge his revenge, Barabas disguises himself as a French musician (4.4. 29) and visits Bellamira's house. Smelling the poisonous flower attached onto his hat, Ithamore,

Bellamira and her pimp are all sickened to death, but before their final demise they have time to visit Ferneze confess Barabas's part in everything (5.1. 12-14). Later, Barabas is seized, but he denies all accusations and demands a fair trial until Ithamore confesses every action. Ferneze bids his men bury the corpses but leave Barabas's dead body to fall a prey to wild animals outside of the city-walls. While it is assumed that Barabas is dead, he is only feigning death, as he has taken a potion that allows him to appear dead for a while. This allows Barabas his final and ultimate opportunity for treachery.

The proverb saying, "the enemy of my enemy is my friend" goes for Barabas. On recovering from the sleeping mixture, he again shifts allegiance and this time helps the Turks to enter the city through a secret passage known to Barabas, and enabling them to conquer Malta stealthily and easily. Ferneze is taken prisoner and Barabas is granted the reward of the governorship of Malta for his service to the Turks. However, Barabas fearful for his life and position, given the hatred that he has generated against himself, and the possibility that this hatred will end up with his death is enough for him to veer away and seek a settlement with Ferneze (5.2. 31, 37-38). Marlowe writes in the first scene ". . . Crowns come either by succession, Or urg'd by force" (1.1. 129-130). The title of governorship came to Barabas neither by succession nor by force, but instead was served on a silver platter. Machiavelli (2018) claims that ruling is very complicated for a new and inexperienced prince. He also wrote in *The Prince* that remaining on the throne is more complicated and dangerous for a new ruler (pp. 19-20). Barabas has no experience in governing, and so vulnerable to the power plays of politics he is willing to make peace with Ferneze. Marlowe reflects Machiavelli's maxims about how men are bound by the benefits by saying "And he from whom my most advantage comes from, Shall be my friend" (5.2. 113-114). The idea that men tend to search for someone who is useful to them is, as far as Machiavelli and here Marlowe are concerned, already coded in human nature. Otherwise, what is the difference from "the ass that Aesop speaketh of without getting friends and filling his bags" (5.2. 41). Barabas and Ferneze shake hands and come to an agreement for a common interest, which is freeing Malta from the Turks. When Ferneze exits, Barabas speaks in a soliloquy:

And thus far roundly goes the business.  
Thus, loving neither, will I live with both,  
Making a profit of my policy,  
And he from whom my most advantage comes  
Shall be my friend.  
This is the life we Jews are used to lead –  
And reason too, for Christians do the like. (5.2. 110-116)

In this confessional nod to the audience, we understand that Barabas has not changed and continues to go after his personal interest and fortune. Moreover, we see here too the villainy of Ferneze, the closest example perhaps of the Machiavellian villain, who is able to take decisions for the welfare of Malta, unlike Barabas whose only aims are enrichment and pure vengeance.

Feasting has been an extremely common way for playwrights to massacre their cast throughout the centuries, before and after *The Jew of Malta*. Such feasts are not just dramatic tropes however, as *The Prince* shows, referencing a feast held by the historical figure Oliverotto da Fermo and Pausanias at which they ambushed and slaughtered their guests (Machiavelli, 2018, p. 58). Machiavelli's maxim of the "end justifies the means" works one more time for all the figures mentioned here to shore-up their power and terrorize their potential foes. As part of Barabas's plan, he holds a banquet for Calymath in his own house with his army housed in a monastery which is full of gunpowder from whence none can possibly survive (5.5. 30, 33). He has carpenters prepare a special mechanism which will drop Calymath and his consorts to their death and into a boiling cauldron. Barabas gives the knife to cut the cords to Ferneze by Barabas with the purpose of gaining his trust. His reliance on Ferneze, however, proves his downfall, just as Machiavelli warns against reliance on others. Before Barabas exits, Ferneze cuts the cable and lets Barabas fall into the boiling cauldron. He cries for help in pain:

Help, help me, Christians, help.  
Oh, help me, Selim! Help me, Christians! (5.5. 68, 73)



Even at the moment of death, Barabas does not give up trying his luck. However, when he is sure that neither of them will help, he shows his true *Machia-villain* colours, and yells then dies:

Know, Governor, 'twas I that slew thy son.  
I framed the challenge that did make them meet.  
Know, Calymath, I aimed thy overthrow,  
And had I but escaped this stratagem,  
I would have brought confusion on you all,  
Damned Christian dogs, and Turkish infidels!  
But now begins the extremity of heat  
To pinch me with intolerable pangs.  
Die, life! Fly, soul! Tongue, curse thy fill, and die! (5.5. 86-94)

Ferneze misleads Calymath and blames the Jews for this massacre (5.5. 97) then states that Calymath will be kept as a prisoner until Calymath's father covers the losses of Malta. Hence, the play ends with the victory of Machiavellianism represented by Ferneze over *Machia-villainy* as represented by Barabas.

The characters in the play run after their own matters and they use what they have as their weapon. In other words, Barabas has money and insidiousness, and hence, he uses them to gain more strength. Ferneze has political power and hence, he uses it to protect his position and stay as the rich governor of Malta. The friars, Bernardine and Giacomo, have their religion and hence, they use it to make their respective monasteries the richer and stronger. The slave Ithamore is monstrous and primordially evil, and hence, he uses his nature to gain status in the society and lead a luxurious life. Even the courtesan Bellamira and her pimp, Pilia-Borza have the power of reaching everyman in Malta through her brothel, probably including statesmen and upper class members as costumers, and hence, they use their advantage make a profit and fill her purse.

However, among all the characters and as mentioned before, the play confirms that it is Ferneze who is the true embodiment of the Machiavellian statesman, who worries about the welfare of his country and hold onto the reins of power at any cost. We can say that he likes money as much as the

power to rule since he plans to protect his own pocket when he decides to collect money from only Jews. To Barabas, ruling is a common lust for all Christians not just for Ferneze; as a counter, Marlowe's Barabas and by implication all Jews in the play care about money. From the beginning to the end, Ferneze shows his indulgences in his actions. As the true Machiavellian, he violates the agreement with the Turks when he notices a sign of a new opportunity. Similarly, he renews his agreement with Barabas whom he has previously declared to be the enemy of Malta in order to regain control, again even if what he does in the play is not written in any book of religion or moral code. On the other hand, Barabas represents the true *Machia-villain* figure - the ultimate example of egoism and villainy, who wins and loses his power, then wins it back and loses it again; who goes after his vengeance and pays for it with his life. Throughout the play he also costs lives of two innocent young men, two unscrupulous friars, many innocent nuns, his traitorous slave Ithamore, two avaricious delinquents, Bellamira and Pilia-Borza, a swathe of Turkish soldiers and even his beloved daughter, beloved that is until she converts to Christianity, for which he takes ultimate revenge.

### **Conclusion**

Niccolo Machiavelli did not know the secret agenda of Cesare Borgia, Agathocles or other subjects in his *The Prince*, but he committed himself to solve the problems of Italy through his objective observation of them (Ferneyhough, 1953, 212). This is the language of a historian and political thinker, and far from the literary flourishes of the Elizabethan playwrights. Rather he wrote for the sole purpose of finding of immediate political necessity - the salvation and unification of Italy. Marlowe, however, has other concerns. Rather than write out of necessity, instead, he aims to invent characters that explore the human condition for an audience's entertainment. Hence, although he uses history as a source, alteration and invention are the part of his art – his dramatic license. In his treatment of Machiavelli, we can see that Marlowe had inherited a perception of the Florentine that bastardised and demonised his principles. This is all to say that all villainous characters in the Elizabethan period can be collected under this umbrella of Machiavellianism. The combination of these perverted character traits which ape those of the Florentine's ideal prince

creates a new character type that I have named “Machia-villain”, what elsewhere is called the Elizabethan supervillain, Machiavellian villain, or stage villain.

Although it is still not obvious that Marlowe and Shakespeare read Machiavelli first hand, they were clearly well-enough acquainted with his reputation to be able to bastardise his philosophy. Yet, to some extent, they accept some of the Florentine’s teachings and are aware of the pragmatic utility of his insights as well. Marlowe’s dramatic output emphasised that those who lack honourable qualities are doomed to lose. His exploration of Machia-villainy allows an excoriating criticism of hypocrisy, sanctimony and false professions of religion, the worst offenders of which are often priests, the government and the decisions taken by that government. An exploration of the malevolence of Barabas gives us a definitive proto-type of the Machia-villain, one of the first of its kind in that period.

### References

- Bawcutt, N. W. (1970). ‘Machiavelli and Marlowe’s *The Jew of Malta*’, *Renaissance Drama*, vol. 3, pp. 3–49.
- Berlin, Isaiah. (2013). The Originality of Machiavelli. In *Against the Current: Essays in the History of Ideas*. Princeton University Press. pp. 33-100.
- Bowers, F. Thayer. (1937). ‘The Audience and the Poisoners of Elizabethan Tragedy’, *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, Vol. 36, No. 4, pp. 491-504.
- Caldwell, William. H. (1967). ‘Marlowe’s Cosmology’, Master’s Thesis, Paper 257, University of Richmond.
- Ford, Boris. (1969). *The Age of Shakespeare*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Gauss, Christian. (1980). ‘Introduction: *The Prince*’, New York : New American Library, c1952: Mentor Books.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. (1973). *Renaissance Self-Fashioning from More to Shakespeare*, Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. (1983). *Power of Forms in the Renaissance*, US: The Book Service Ltd.

Hoffman, Calvin. (1955). *The Murder of The Man Who Was "Shakespeare"*, New York: J. Messner.

Meyer, E. (1897). *Machiavelli and the Elizabethan Drama*. New York: Burt Franklin Press.

Janssen, Carol L. (1972). 'The Machiavellian Influence Manifested in Christopher Marlowe's *Tamburlaine the Great* and *The Jew of Malta*', Master's Thesis, no 3894 [online]. Available at: <https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/3894> (Accessed: 27 February 2019)

Kocher, Paul, H. (1946). *Christopher Marlowe: A Study of His Thought, Learning, and Character*. New York: The University of North Carolina Press.

Kohler, Max, J. (1909). 'Dr. Rodrigo Lopez, Queen Elizabeth's Jewish Physician, and His Relations To America', Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society, No. 17, pp. 9-25.

Luther, Martin. (1543) On The Jews and Their Lies. Edited by Martin H. Bertram [online]. Available at [https://www.prchiz.pl/pliki/Luther\\_On\\_Jews.pdf](https://www.prchiz.pl/pliki/Luther_On_Jews.pdf) (Accessed: 16 April 2019).

Machiavelli, Niccolo. (2018). *Discourses on The First Decade of Titus Livius*. Ankara: Gece Publishing.

Machiavelli, Niccolo. (2018). *The Prince*. Translated by W.K. Marriott. Ankara: Gece Publishing.

Mansfield, Harvey C. (1981). 'Machiavelli's Political Science', *The American Political Science Review*, vol.75, no:2.

Marlowe, Christopher. (2003). *The Jew of Malta*. Edited by Ellis Havelock. New York: Dover Publications.

Rathé, C. (1965). Innocent Gentillet and The First "Anti-Machiavel". *Bibliothèque D'Humanisme Et Renaissance*, 27(1), 186-225.

Rowse, A.L. (1964). *Christopher Marlowe: A Biography*. London: Macmillan.

Wu, Tsun-wen. (2001). 'Shakespeare's Machiavellianism in Two Tetralogies: King Richard III and King Henry IV', Master's Thesis, Taiwan: National Sun Yat-Sen University.

# **ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MEDIA, CULTURE AND LITERATURE**

## **INTRODUCTION**

Istanbul Aydın University International Journal of Media, Culture and Literature is a peer-reviewed journal of the Istanbul Aydın University, Department of Foreign Languages; edited by Professors Necmiye KARATAŞ and Nur Emine KOÇ. The assistant editor is Lect. Sercan KARAKAŞ.

The journal publishes articles on literature, culture, and media and encourages global and interdisciplinary scholarship. IJMCL defines “literature” broadly to include all forms and genres and welcomes contributions from researchers, scholars and graduate and post-graduate students who study theoretical and critical topics concerning the interactions between literature, culture and media.

We publish two issues each year, in summer and in winter. Contributions will be submitted to the approval of the editorial committee following specialized peer-review. Opinions expressed in IJMCL should be considered as strictly that of the authors.

## **Submitting Articles**

All contributions should be submitted in the first instance as an e-mail attachment in Word format to [sercank@aydin.edu.tr](mailto:sercank@aydin.edu.tr)

The journal publishes articles written in English.

Centered, italicized or bold text, and any other font changes may be included but otherwise limit formatting to a minimum. Please enter text in 1.5 spacing and ensure that the pages are numbered throughout in the upper right-hand corner.

Articles should be 5000–7000 words.

While submitting the final drafts of the accepted articles, the full article (complete with title, subtitles, endnotes, author’s name, affiliation and country) must

Untitled-1.indd 61 24.06.2015 13:50:40

be accompanied by a short abstract (200-250 words) summarizing the contents of the paper. Articles should also be accompanied by up to 5-8 key words to increase the online accessibility of the article. The author's mailing address, telephone number and email address should also be provided.

### **Conditions of Submission**

By submitting to this journal, authors acknowledge and accept that articles are considered for publication on the basis that:

The article presents original work that is not being considered or reviewed by any other publication, and has not been published elsewhere in the same or a similar form;

All authors are aware of, and have consented to, the submission to the journal;

Due regard has been paid to ethical considerations relating to the work reported;

The article contains, to the best of the authors' knowledge, no unlawful statements.

Submissions are vetted for quality of written language and may be rejected on these grounds. It is recommended that any non-native English speaking authors who are not confident of their English language skills ask a native English speaker or a professional language-editing service to review their articles before submission. This is not mandatory, but it will help to ensure that the Editors and reviewers fully understand the academic content of the article.

Use of an editing service does not guarantee that your article will be accepted for publication. A decision will be made following the usual peer review process.

**Citations:** Papers should be written in concordance with the current APA Citation Style, using in-text citation and the Works Cited system, as in the examples below.

After a quote in the body of your paper, indicate the source in brackets, using the format specified below as the In-Text Citation form.

At the end of the paper, list all the works used, in alphabetical order, under the title Works Cited, using the format specified below as the Works Cited Form.

Untitled-1.indd 62 24.06.2015 13:50:40

Do not include bibliographical information in your endnotes. Use these only to develop a point incidental to your argument.

General Rules:

1. The language of the articles is English
2. If there is an institution that supports the study, the last word of the article title should be placed on (\*) and the information on the same page as the footnote should be given.
3. Manuscripts should not exceed 12.000 words including bibliography and annexes.
4. Articles should be organized according to the APA reference system. Please make sure that the references in the text are in the references

Editing of topics: All work submitted to our journal must have the following characteristics: Studies submitted as a basic spelling rule must be written in accordance with APA (6.0) style. examples and exceptions are listed below:

- Page Layout, entries must be written in a Microsoft Word program and the page metrics must be organized as follows:

Paper Size: A4 Portrait

Top Margin: 2.5 cm

Bottom Margin: 2.5 cm

Left Margin: 2.5 cm

Right Margin: 2.5 cm

Paragraph Head: 1 cm

Block Quote: Left 1 cm

Font: Times New Roman

Font Style: Normal  
Main Text Size: 11 point  
Block Quote: 9 points  
Footnote Text Size: 9 points  
Inside the Table: 9 points  
Paragraph Spacing: 6 nk Line Spacing: Single (1)

**Type of Font :**

Times New Roman style should be used. Turkish Abstract English Abstract should be in 11 pt, main text should be 10 pt. Text, Turkish-English abstract and the sources used should be justify. Text should be written using single line spacing, 1 line spacing between paragraphs should be left.

**Headlines:**

The manuscript should be composed of main headings and sub-headings.

**Main Title :**

Times New Roman character, using capital letters, bold and must be in Microsoft Word format in 14-pt format. Author name, abbreviations, author ORCID number and e-mail addresses should be written with two lines of space after the title and the name of the author should be written in 11 pt font size.

**Abstract:**

Abstract title should be written with two lines of space after Turkish keywords. Times New Roman should be in bold, 11 pt, justified, and in single word Microsoft Word format using capital letters. Should not exceed 600 words and abstract should be bold, 11 pt. and all text should be written in Microsoft Word format in Times New Roman style. Keywords in abstract should be in italic, bold type and 11 pt. At least three, maximum five key words should be written with the first letter and the other letters with small letters. In abstract, subject of the article, research method and result should be given.



**Sections:**

Section subtitles (INTRODUCTION, CONCEPTUAL FRAME, LITERATURE SCANNING, RESEARCH METHODOLOGY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSION, etc), which are formed according to the content of the article, should be all uppercase, 11 pt and bold, and they should be typed without numbering.

**Main Text:**

Subtitles should be written in 11 pt, bold and capital letters and the text should be in 11 pt., Times New Roman style in Microsoft Word format. Articles should be written in a single column, justified, and in a single space between paragraphs. The subtitle of the first section should start with a line space after the keywords and there should be no spaces in the following paragraphs. Article length must not exceed 20 pages with shapes and figures.

**Tables, Figures, Graphics and Pictures:**

If the tables, figures, graphics and pictures used in the text are not originally created by the author (s), they can be used in the text by showing “source”. Tables, figures, graphics and pictures should be placed to fit the text and the headings should be written in 11 font size and centered. Tables and graphs used in the text should be listed as Table 1., Table 2. / Chart 1., Chart 2. etc. and so on. Table numbers and titles should be written before the table. Figures, graphics and pictures of the numbers and the headers (figure, graphic and picture) then the bottom of the Figure 1., Figure 2. / Picture 1., Picture 2. etc. should be written as ordered. The first letters of the words used in the tables, figures, graphics and image titles should be initials large and the others are small.

**Conclusion:** The title should be written in bold, 11 pt, capital letters and text in 11 pt. Times New Roman style in Microsoft Word format.