THE MASSACRE AT PARIS

— Marlowe's prophesy —

Minoru SHIGETA*

When we try to appreciate *The Massacre at Paris*, we are confronted with problems of every kind and every point; its date of composition, the textual problems, and the difficulty of the appreciation of *The Massacre at Paris* resulting from the corrupt text. Its precice date of composition is unknown, but many critics agree that it belongs to the last of Marlowe's plays.[1] Especially C. F. Tucker Brooke tells us about its date of composition minutely: "The play of *The Massacre at Paris*...must have been composed between August 2, 1589, and January 30, 1593. On the first of these dates occurred the event with which the tragedy closes, the death of Henry III of France; on the latter occasion the play was performed at Henslowe's theatre by the company of the Lord Strange. Since Henslowe marks 'the tragedy of the gvyes' as a new play on January 30, 1593, it was probably composed pretty shortly before, and is therefore to be reckoned one of the latest of Marlowe's dramatic works."[2] In writing *The Massacre at Paris*, it seems, Marlowe relied heavily on contemporary accounts of the events in France. Beginning with the union of the Houses of Bourbon and Valois in the marriage of Henry of Navarre to Margaret of Valois (1572), the play proceeds to such historical events as the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre (1572), the accession of the Duke of Anjou to the Polish throne (1573), the death of Charles IX and the return of Anjou as Henry III of France (1574), the split between Henry and the Guise (1588), and ends with the murder of the Guise (1588), the assassination of Henry III and the accession of Navarre as Henry IV(1589). Thus, the play is made up of a succession of scenes, very brief for the most part, arranging a series of historical events which occurred in France during the reigns of Charles IX and Henry III. The material for the first part of the play, according to M. Poirier,[3] was supplied to Marlowe by Book X of Jean de Serres' *Commentaries*, translated into English in 1574, and by the same writer's *Life of Coligny*, translated in 1576. For the second part, from the accession of Henry III onward Marlowe seems to have drawn from a lot of argumentative pamphlets then serving as newspapers. At the same time, some pieces of information seem to have been conveyed to him by word of mouth.

In addition to the date, grave textual problems make our interpretation of the play more difficult. About the value of this text, there has been much argument among the critics. H. S. Bennett says about the text, "It is certainly one of the worst examples of garbled and mangled texts, "[4] and goes so far as to criticize sharply: "Everywhere the hand of some clumsy and insensitive agent is upon it. Scenes have been truncated in such a way that it is difficult to follow them easily or perfectly."[5] F.P. Wilson also comments: "The text is a reported text so maimed in the reporting that criticism can only guess at Marlowe's intention and achievement. Some 1,250 lines of verse are all that have survived, and some of these versions are not garbled versions but half remembered echoes from other plays with which the reporter has patched them up."[6] Taking these opinions into consideration, we are sorely perplexed in appreciating Marlowe's intention of this play. But when we turn our attention to the opinions of some

* 宇部工業高等専門学校英語教室

critics, we see the silver lining in the dark cloud. F. S. Boas gives us an important suggestion: "...the octavo of *The Massacre*, in spite of its textual corruption, preserves more of the play as it came from Marlowe's hand, and has a more important place in the canon of his works, than his editors have been willing to allow."[7] Moreover, A. L. Rowe, referring to the recent tendency, puts a conclusion to the textual problems: "I agree with the more recent tendency to regard the play as close to what Marlowe wrote than has hitherto been thought. Everyone must agree that it exhibits Marlowe's characteristic tone and temper, and has Marlovian touches throughout."[8] Thus these opinions will enable us to appreciate the dramatist's intention and meaning in the context, in spite of the corrupt text.

In addition to the disputed textual problems, *The Massacre at Paris* has encountered severe criticism from many critics. Wilbur Sanders calls the play a "nasty piece of journalistic bombast", taking advantage of "the lowest appetites of his audience."[9] On the other hand, there are some different opinions from Sander's. Judith Well, referring to the play, says that "a play which so stresses the interlocking destinies of its characters and the precise nature of their catastrophes is unlikely to have been purely sensational Protestant propaganda", and concludes his discussion of the play as follows: "If we do not observe his dramatic design with care, we will regard the play as a pot-boiler, a work which appeals to native prejudice."[10] The difference between these two opposite opinions is not easy to recognize when we examine the play itself. The evaluation of *The Massacre at Paris*, therefore, should be appreciated not by a one-sided view, but in the light of two opposite opinions. However, when we give careful consideration to Boas' opinion concerning the textual problems, we will feel like supporting Well's opinions. Moreover, we doubt whether Marlowe, who was in arms against Elizabethan orthodoxy in *Tamburlaine*, has yielded to it so readily; if Marlowe had intended only to reassure and flatter a Protestant audience, he would surely have made Navarre a stronger figure. Therefore, we are naturally led to think that Marlowe gives us the darker suggestion that Navarre, like his enemies, is a selfish and hypocritical man who cannot see his own faults. This suggestion is presented, it seems, by way of the dramatic speeches and verbal images spoken by the leading characters. By paying attention to the structure of drama and the actions of the leading characters as well as these signs of Marlowe's, we will investigate Marlowe's real intention of the play in the following chapters.

I

First of all we will consider the general features of the structure. In *The Massacre at Paris* ed. by H. S. Bennett, the play is divided into twenty-one scenes. The first nine deal with the first unity of France, symbolized by the marriage ceremony, and its disunion in the Massacre. In this first half, the Guise is very powerful, and his chief enemies except Navarre are killed: in the third scene, the Queen Mother of Navarre is poisoned, and in the fifth, the Lord High Admiral is assassinated. In scene ten, the beginning of the latter half, King Charles dies, and the throne is succeeded by his brother, Henry III. This group of scenes begins with the ceremonies of death and coronation. Apparently King Henry is a more powerful king than King Charles, and his minion, Mugeroun, wins the Dutches of Guise as his lover. Swearing revenge, the Guise has Mugeroun shot. It is a way similar to his having the Lord High Admiral shot in the first half. Here we must pay attention to the fact that Marlowe uses the same structual pattern between the first half and the second. Mugeroun's murder is the direct result for King Henry's action against the Guise and his party, and the Massacre in the first half is balanced by the cleanup of the Guise and his party in the second. The death of the Queen Mother of Navarre resembles

the promised death of Catherine, Queen Mother of France: she says, "Since the Guise is dead, I will not live."[11] Moreover, the death of King Charles, which characterizes the turning point of the play, resembles the death of his brother, King Henry, which ends the play. The union of Navarre and France in the first scene is seen again in the last, when the King of Navarre joins Henry at the siege of Paris. Thus when we examine the brief outline of the play's structure, we cannot help admitting Boas' and Rowse's suggestion that the essentials of an action are preserved and the play is close to what Marlowe wrote. It is safely be said that the play is structually a well-balanced play, but at the same time, as J. B. Steane points out,[12] it has an element of disorder beneath harmony even if harmony seems to prevail; disorder nourishes evil and evil in turn promotes chaos. For example, the play begins with an atmosphere of order and friendship, symbolized by the marriage between Navarre and the daughter of the Queen Mother. As soon as King Charles begins the first speech, the discord that lies beneath superficial harmony is heard in the queen's reference to religion, and in the king's hasty, clever "Well, madam, let that rest"(i.17). But order returns, and the party talks of rites, holy Mass, honour, and solemnity, and again order is broken by the aside spoken by the queen: "Which I'll dissolve with blood and cruelty"(i. 26). When they leave, the Guise enters and the obscure discords beneath the harmony emerge as theme. Here King Charles is worked as a puppet; bloodshed and terror produce the world for only the Guise to play an active part in. When we switch off from the opening scene to the last, we will find that all is as it was in the beginning; order is reestablished and everything is all right. Navarre's last speech casts a gloomy shadow over the order, because his speech contains "revenge", "death", "curse" and "rule" which characterize disorder and chaos. As mentioned above, the play is a well-balanced one as far as its dramatic structure is concerned, but it has always an element of disorder lurking behind the harmony, even if order seems to be established.

We will find Marlowe's another ingenious device though it has something to do with the dramatic structure and the sense of instability lurking behind the harmony which is suggested in the play; in *The Massacre at Paris,* almost all ceremonies change into violence or mix with it. When the play begins, the union and friendship achieved through the marriage between Navarre and Margaret seems to be breaking up quickly when the bride leaves her husband to hear a mass. As we have seen, in an aside the Queen Mother vows to dissolve this marriage "with blood and cruelty." When the Guise appears in the next scene, he not only arranges to poison the Queen Mother of Navarre with gloves, but also stations an assassin to shoot at the Lord High Admiral. As soon as the Admiral gives order to see the body of the Queen Mother of Navarre "honoured with just solemnity"(iii.31), the assassin hired by the Guise shoots at him. In scene fourteen, the dignified farewell between King Henry and Duke Joyeaux is overcome with the Guise's furious oaths as soon as Henry makes fun of him. Besides the above-mentioned examples, assassins mix murder with civility similar to ceremony. "What, are ye come so soon ? have at ye, sir !" (xvi.12) says the soldier who shoots Mugeroun. When the murderers assassinate the Guise, the "Third Murderer" addresses the Guise as "good my lord" (xviii. 65), and actually asks his pardon for being sent to murder him.

Another example of Marlowe's device is that the play makes the impression of great speed on us. It seems that Marlowe used this device intentionally, for such urging words as "Begone", "Away, then", "Dispatch", "Delay no time" are often seen in the statements and phrases of the leading characters. This device is most apparent in scene ten. As soon as the soul of King Charles is "fled" (x.17), his mother Catherine hastens to call Henry back from Poland, and Navarre rushes away, promising to muster up his army "speedily" (x.36). These expressions are seen in scene eight when Catherine urges

the Guise to kill the hundred Huguenots who pray in the woods: "Be gone; delay no time, sweet Guese" (viii.28). In responce to her, the Guise says, "Madam, / I go as whirlwinds rage before a storm" (viii. 29-30).

As we have seen, *The Massacre at Paris* is a well-balanced play, and Marlowe seems to have selected carefully and molded the material he gathered from the histories of contemporary France. Moreover, he invented all the possible devices to brush up the play; the devices to give an element of disorder lurking behind the harmony; to present ceremony with violence; to give the play the impression of great speed.

II

Now we have come to the most essential question. In order to realize Marlowe's real intention of the play, we have to make a thorough investigation of the actions of the leading characters; the Guise, Charles, Henry III and Navarre.

The Duke of Guise

First of all, we must examine the action and nature of the Guise, for the center of the play is the "quenchless thirst" of the Guise, and Marlowe treats, it appears, the Duke of Guise as a focus and symbol for evil in other characters. Generally speaking, political issues are exposed and discussed in response to the Guise's activity; he often brings about the political reaction on the part of other characters. Moreover, all of the soliloquies in the play are either related to or spoken by the Guise. By this device, it seems, Marlowe calls attention to the qualities of mind and character which produce tyranny.

As early as scene two, we see the Guise predict the gloomy disaster of the play.

> If ever Hymen lour'd at marriage-rites,
> And had his altars deck'd with dusky lights;
> If ever sun stain'd heaven with bloody clouds,
> And made it look with terror on the world;
> If ever day were turn'd to ugly night,
> And night made semblance of the hue of hell;
> This day, this hour, this fatal night,
> Shall fully show the furry of them all. (ii.1-8)

The atmosphere is set; tone-definders are as follows: "dusky light", "stain'd", "bloody clouds", "terror", "ugly night", "hell", "fatal night" and "fury." At this point, we will feel that there is going to be nothing light-hearted in this play. We notice "Marlowe in that thrice-repeated 'if ever' with its curious psychological suggestion of fatality."[13] In the next scene, the Guise reveals us "those deep-engender'd thoughts" (ii.34) which very soon will "burst abroad those never-dying flames / Which cannot be extinguished but by blood (ii.35-36). This long soliloquy explains his own political position as well as his motives and attitudes:

> Oft have I levell'd, and at last have learn'd

That peril is the chiefest way to happiness,
And resolution honour's fairest aim.
What glory is there in a common good,
That hangs for every peasant to achieve?
That like I best, that flies beyond my reach.
Set me to scale the high Pyramides,
And thereon set the diadem of France. (ii.37-44)

Here we will notice that the Guise resembles two Marlovian heroes, Tamburlaine and Barabas. The Guise's aspiring mind, his choice of a crown as his goal, and his absolute conviction in his destiny are the features of his character similar to Tamburlaine's. At the same time, the Guise resembles Barabas in that he enjoys evil for its own sake. But the Guise differs from Barabas in the almost abstract purity of will which places resolution above achievement. With the Guise, the end is all; for Barabas, the means are just as interesting in themselves.

My policy hath fram'd religion.
Religion! *O Diabole!*
Fie, I am asham'd however that I seem,
To think a word of such a simple sound,
Of so great matter should be made the ground! (ii.65-69)

In order to obtain his goal of kingship, the Guise supports the Catholicism because it enables him to gain foreign support from the Papacy and from Spain. Indeed religion for him is never more than the means to an end. The Guise's contempt for religion reminds us of Machiavell's "I count religion but a childish toy"[14] in the Prologue to *The Jew of Malta*. In the later scene, the Guise compares himself Caesar, as is often the case with him. Like Caesar, he is enchanted by a crown. At the same time, we can see his pride in his referring to Caesar. He scorns those who stand beneath him and when about to die grieves to fall at the hands of the hired ruffians. This very pride leads to his death in the later scene. Also in the earlier scene, the Guise declares confidently:

Then, Guise,
Since thou hast all the cards within thy hands,
To shuffle or cut, take this as surest thing,
That, right or wrong, thou deal thyself a King. (ii.88-91)

He is, as it were, "a born gambler, even ready to stake his all for the prize of the hour, to pose the absolute alternative."[15] In spite of all the cards within his hands, he fails in his quest after all. This is because he comes to resemble more and more an anti-Machiavellian. In the Prologue to *The Jew of Malta*, Machiavelli named the Guise as one of his disciples, but in *The Massacre at Paris* the Guise only shows us briefly the principal elements of the Machiavellism such as "Patience and toil, the absence of any scruple, the subordination of religion to individual ends, dissimulation and poisoning."[16] For example, this fact is clearly shown by the Guise's reaction to his wife's infidelity. The Guise is not able to kill his wife because she is pregnant. Like Tamburlaine, he wishes to inherit to his children the

kingdom he intends to obtain. But the Guise is blinded by his desire to obtain a kingdom, for if the Duchess is unfaithful, the fruit of her womb may be Mugeroun's progeny. This very blindness of his may be another reason why he is caught in Henry's trap. It is also this blindness that causes him to kill Mugeroun. Mugeroun's death leads directly to the Guise's own assassination intended by an angry Henry. In fact, even after Henry has decided upon the death of the Guise, he is very confident like Tamburlaine:

> Now sues the king for favour to the Guise,
> And all his minions stoop when I command:
> Why, this 'tis to have an army in the field.
> Now, by the holy sacrament, I swear,
> As ancient Romans o'er their captive lords,
> So will I triumph o'er this wanton king;
> And he shall follow my proud chariot's wheels. (xviii.47-53)

Ironically, in the scene immediately following this speech, the Guise is killed because of his reckless pride. In spite of the warning of the Third Murderer, the Guise declares: "Yet Caesar shall go forth. / Let mean consaits and baser men fear death: / Tut, they are peasants; I am Duke of Guise" (xviii.67-69). But at last he is keenly aware that he is not immortal, and dies defiantly, still comparing himself with Caesar.

> O, that I have not power to stay my life,
> Nor immortality to be reveng'd!
> To die by peasants, what a grief is this!
> . . . . . .
> *Vive la messe!* perish Huguenots!
> Thus Caesar did go forth, and thus he died. (xviii.79-81; 86-87)

This speech is associated with his foolish pride and blindness because the Guise underestimates his opponents and disdains the warning of a "peasant." Thus his pride and blindness interfere with his strategy, causing a disappointing conclusion.

As we have seen, the Guise tells us about himself and his aspiration in terms which remind us of both Tamburlaine and Barabas; the Guise's confidence in his own destiny and his resolute action to achieve it resemble Tamburlaine's audacious deeds. But the action itself and the quality of his plan resemble Barabas' policy. Indeed the Guise is a Machiavellian, but gradually he comes to be unable to display the Machiavellian strategy, on account of his own blindness and pride, which finally bring about his downfall. As above-mentioned, the Guise's speech and behaviour cause the various reactions among the main characters. It seems that Marlowe has structured his play so that the main characters, King Charles, King Henry and Henry of Navarre, may reflect the attitudes of the Guise. By shifting rapidly among these characters, Marlowe seems to have aimed at having us compare their various actions. Therefore, in the following chapters, we will investigate the actions and nature of other three main characters, King Charles, King Henry and Henry of Navarre.

Charles IX

In the first scene, we find Charles IX open *The Massacre at Paris* celebrating the marriage of his sister Margaret to Henry of Navarre and emphasizing love and union, order and tolerance:

> Prince of Navarre, my honourable brother,
> Prince Condé, and my good Lord Admiral,
> I wish this union and religious league,
> Knit in these hands, thus join'd in nuptial rites,
> May not dissolve till death dissolve our lives;
> And that the native sparks of princely love,
> That kindled first this motion in our hearts,
> May still be fuell'd in our progeny. (i.1-8)

The words such as "honourable", "good", "union", "religious league", "knit", "join'd", "nuptial rites" and "princely love" symbolize Charles' genuine feelings; he is anxious for the stability of France. Ironically, the stability which the king earnestly desires is threatened by the aside spoken by his mother: "Which I'll dissolve with blood and cruelty" (i.26). It seems that Charles is a weak and easily guided king. But Charles hurriedly and tactfully silences her mother: "Well Madam, let that rest" (i.17). In scene four, when Charles, the Queen Mother, the Guise, Anjou, and Dumaine plan the St. Bartholomew Massacre, Charles quietly objects to the plot. His main reason is that

> it will be noted through the world
> An action bloody and tyrannical;
> Chiefly, since under safety of our word
> They justly challenge their protection: (iv.5-8)

He continues to express his real feelings;

> Besides, my heart relents that noblemen,
> Only corrupted in religion,
> Ladies of honour, knights, and gentlemen,
> Should, for their conscience, taste such ruthless ends. (iv.8-12)

From these scenes, we will realize that religion is not a very significant problem for him, and that he objects the plot only because it will defile his reputation as a king. When he is encouraged to sanction the Massacre by his brother Anjou, the Guise and his mother, he, like a puppet, is easily overruled by them, telling them: "What you determine, I will ratify" (iv.25). At this point, he conceals himself, as it were, behind the curtain. For the man whose main objection to the plot is due to political stability and his security, it is an excellent chance to shift the responsibility on to others; even if he tacitly sanctions the Massacre, the Guise and his party will take the blame for it, while the Protestants will return favor for favor. By marriage, Navarre will no longer be a threat to his security. That is to say, he will be able to keep friendly relations between both sides, looking to his own security in the kingdom; for him, it serves two ends. Thus Charles asks advice of his powerful mother in giving his decision on an

important matter. When the plotters finish planning the Massacre, a messenger arrives to inform that the Lord High Admiral, who is one of the leaders of Huguenots and an intimate friend of Navarre's has been wounded by a musket shot and wants to see King Charles. Charles answers the messenger to "tell him I will see him straight" (iv.45), and asks for his mother's advice: "What shall we do now with the Admiral?" (iv.46). Catherine advises him to "visit the Admiral and make a show as if all were well" (iv. 48), and the Guise adds that he "will go take order" (iv.49) for the Admiral's death.

In the room in which the Admiral lies wounded in bed, we see that he dissembles very tactfully:

> I vow and swear, as I am King of France,
> To find and to reply the man with death,
> With death delay'd and torments never us'd,
> That durst presume, for hope of any gain,
> To hurt the nobleman their sovereign loves. (iv.53-57)

In reply to the Admiral's urgent appeal that the shooters "are the Guisians, / That seek to massacre our giltless lives! (iv.58-59), Charles gives him the vow of assurance. These words of Charles, however, are only clever deception, because this scene between Charles and the Admiral is the prelude to the Massacre which happens in the following scene. Judging from Charles' attitude like this, we cannot help thinking that his weakness is mere dissembling; he "is not entirely weak, in the Machiavellian sense of weakness."[17] Indeed he is apparently weak, but there is hidden toughness in his character. Thus Charles tacitly sanctions the Massacre, but he does not have direct bearing on the murders, and with it he is able to ally with Navarre against the Guise after the Massacre ended. In scene eight, when Lorraine, the Cardinal, tells the Queen Mother about Charles' rebellion: "Madam, I have heard him solemnly vow, / With the rebellious King of Navarre, / For to revenge their deaths upon us all" (viii. 34-36), the Queen Mother says, "Ay, but, my lord, let me alone for that; / For Catherine must have her will in France. As I do live, so surely shall he die" (viii.37-40). When Charles enters in scene ten complaining of a "griping pain" (x.2), supported by Henry of Navarre and Epernoun, we will think that Catherine has set about her work with a draft of poison though no immediate cause is demonstrated. In addition to Catherine's speech, there is a clue to the cause of the king's suffering. As Cole points out, most of the victims in the play die without a chance to speak more than a line, but there are two remarkable exceptions; the Queen Mother of Navarre's and Charles' speeches. The poisoned Queen Mother of Navarre has three lines to express her suffering. King Charles has more time than she. Their speeches, "crude and mechanical though they are, are used, it appears, not to present a character's attitude toward death but to imply the cause of death, poison."[18] Why does Catherine murder Charles, then? As above-mentioned, Charles is superficially weak, but he has not reacted absurdly to the political situation; when he finds political unity impossible, he sanctions a Catholic banishment of the Protestants. After he weakened the power of the Protestants, he allies with Navarre to restrain the power of the Guise. The fact is that Charles is not a easily guided king by her mother and the Guise, but he is a clever Machiavellian. Catherine kills him because she foresees his ability as a Machiavellian prince.

Henry III

The other main character developed through the relation to the Guise is Henry III. From the opening

scenes when Henry is the Duke of Anjou, he reveals himself as a shrewd and scheming politician, who "has sufficient counsel in himself / To lighten doubts, and frustrate subtle foes" (vi.6-7). In order to encourage his brother Charles to massacre the Protestants, he makes a speech which shows a Machiavellian feature:

> Though gentle winds should pity others' pains,
> Yet will the wisest note their proper griefs,
> And rather seek to scourge their enemies
> Than be themselves base subjects to the whip. (iv.13-16)

In taking part in the Massacre, he is careful enough to disguise himself, for he is conscious of his place in the line of succession to the crown, and does not want his reputation to be defiled by the slaughter. By disguising himself, he participates in the outrage, killing Ramus with his own hand and ordering the murder of the Protestant schoolmasters of Navarre and Condé. In the very scene in which the Guise betrays his true nature to Navarre, we see Henry's dissembling like Charles'. When he meets Navarre, he asserts, "I have done what I could to stay this broil" (vi.73). Navarre answers: "But yet, my lord, the report doth run, / That you were one that made this massacre" (vi.74-75). And Henry dissembles innocently, "Who, I? You are deceiv'd; I rose but now" (v.76).

Immediately after the bloody slaughter, Henry negotiates with two lords of Poland about the succession of the Polish throne. The Electors have chosen him as heir, and Henry is proud of ruling such a martial people. This rejoice shows that Henry's bloodthirsty behaviour is an essential part of his character.

On his return to the throne of France, his mother Catherine welcomes his son. Indeed his return is favourable to Catherine and the Guise as she relates to the Cardinal of Lorraine:

> His mind, you see, runs on his minions,
> And all his heaven is to delight himself;
> And, whilst he sleeps securely thus in ease,
> Thy brother Guise and we may now provide
> To plant ourselves with such authority
> As not a man may live without our leaves. (xi.46-51)

It is true Henry seems an ideal puppet for Catherine and the Guise to handle, but he is aware of the political situation of France and of the intrigue of the Guise, for he has been party to the Guidians in the past. Henry has a purpose of his own. He tells his minions that his heart will "both harbour love and majesty" (xi.17). The cutpurse incident, which follows immediately, exemplifies his determined will. His minion, Mugeroun cuts off the thief's ear, offering to exchange it for the buttons which the thief has removed from his coat. When the Guise tells the men to "take him away" (xi.34), Henry stops the Guise's men: "Hands off, good fellow; I will be his bail / For this offence.— Go, sirrah, work no more / Till this our coronation-day be past—" (xi.35-37). This incident reveals the decline of power on the part of the Guise, and that Henry and his minions are now at the center of power. We will see the Guise's declining fortune in the following scene (xii), where the Guise finds his wife writing a love letter to Mugeroun. Mugeroun, Henry's minion, may be regarded as "an extension of the royal power,"[19]

because Henry is very aware of, and seems to sanction, the love affair with the Guise's wife. Moreover, Henry publickly makes fun of the Guise. Then he allows his minion to destroy the private life of the Guise. As a natural course of event, the Guise kills Mugeroun. After Mugeroun's death, the Guise is confronted by an angry Henry who is ready for a face-to-face controversy: "I cannot brook thy haughty insolence:/ Dismiss thy camp, or else by our edict / Be thou proclaim'd a traitor throughout France" (xvi.58-60). It is clear that Henry is not willing to be easily guided as his brother was. Though the Guise tries to smooth over his quarrel with Henry, it is too late for him. Henry cooly realizes the Guise's strength within Paris, and he dismisses his council, taking emergency power into his own hand. At the same time, Henry quickly decides both on a tactical retreat and on the Guise's death, and expresses his fresh determination:

> And, Epernoun, though I seem mild and calm,
> Think not but I am tragical within.
> I'll secretly convey me unto Blois;
> For, now that Paris takes the Guise's part,
> Here is no staying for the king of France,
> Unless he mean to be betray'd and die:
> But, as I live, so sure the Guise shall die. (xvii.89-95)

Two scenes later, we see Henry lay an ambush for the Guise and have him murdered. Before the Guise is stabbed to death, Henry tells him that he will not be suspected of disloyalty, and the Guise is apparently satisfied by this deception. Here we will remember Charles' similar assurances given to the Admiral before his death. Also this time Marlowe answers our expectation.

As we have seen, Henry possesses the desire for power and the real ability that Charles lacked, as well as a genuine gift for politic deception and cunning not found in the Guise. Indeed, he is a Machiavellian and essentially selfish; like the Guise, he desires power and majesty only for his own ends rather than for the benefit of his country. Thus Henry kills the Guisians one by one. Unfortunately for Henry, Dumaine prevents the plot. In order to root up the Valois, Dumaine sends a friar, who will murder Henry for his "conscience' sake" (xxi.25), to stab him with a poisoned knife. With a kind of moral causality, Henry, like the Guise, must reap the reward of his violence and cruelty. His attempt to kill the Guisians is no more successful than the Guise's plan against the Protestants. We are not told why this Jacobin friar would consider it "meritorious" (xx.29) for him to kill a Catholic king. When he is stabbed, Henry turns the tables on his assassin by stabbing him with his own knife. Henry then vows to attack the anti-Christian papistry and sends for the English Agent in order to inform Elizabeth of the news and "give her warning of her treacherous foes" (xxi.52). Henry says to the Agent:

> These bloody hands shall tear his triple crown,
> And fire accursed Rome about his ears;
> I'll fire his crazed buildings, and enforce
> The papal towers to kiss the lowly earth.
> Navarre, give me thy hand: I here do swear
> To ruinate that wicked Church of Rome,
> That hatcheth up such bloody practices;

And here protest eternal love to thee,
And to the Queen of England specially,
Whom God hath bless'd for hating papistry. (xxi.62-71)

Here Henry expresses hatred for Rome and love for England. At this point, we will wonder why Henry, one of the leaders of the Massacre, changes suddenly into anti-Catholicism. As above mentioned, the Guise, Charles and Henry are those who regard religion as simply a political tool. Therefore, it may be said that Henry's change in religious alliance is "a mixture of political expedience and personal vengeance."[20] At the same time, we know that "Queen Elizabeth was indeed endangered by a small group of disloyal Catholic agitators whose actions alarmed both her official and her self-appointed advisers."[21] Judging from these points of view, Marlowe's introduction of Elizabeth's Agent does not intend to present "purely sensational Protestant propaganda," but to frighten the audience with the potential terror of Catholicism. However, behind his appeal to their fears lies Marlowe's suggestion that their true enemy is artful religion, and that what has been true for Catholic France may become true for Protestant England. It may also suggest that like France, England may be broken up by men seeking power under the guise of religion.

Henry of Navarre

Lastly we must investigate the actions and character of Henry of Navaree, the Protestant champion. In one reading, we will feel that Henry of Navarre is a genuinely religious man opposing the aspirations of the Guise. When the Guise and the party are plotting the Massacre, Navarre expects the devine will:

he that sits and rule above the clouds
Doth hear and see the prayers of the just,
And will revenge the blood of innocents,
That Guise hath slain by treason of his heart,
And brought by murder to their timeless ends. (i.42-46)

Moreover, Navarre relies on God for help just before the Guise is killed by hired assassins.

That wicked Guise, I fear me much will be
The ruin of that famous realm of France;
For his aspiring thoughts aim at the crown:
. . . . . .
But, if that God do prosper mine attempts,
And send us safely to arrive in France,
We'll beat him back, and drive him to his death,
That basely seeks the ruin of his realm. (xvii.22-24; 28-31)

When we hear these speeches of Navarre's, we may feel that he is an agent of God working for patriotic ends. However, if we examine his speeches in the play carefully, we will wonder if he is a really admirable character. During the Massacre, Navarre assumes an indifferent attitude and does not devise a decisive means to prevent the slaughter, allowing with a bit of protest his schoolmaster to be

killed, while he and Condé apply to Charles for protection. This behaviour gives us the impression that Navarre will be willing to form an alliance with a Catholic King of France when such an alliance is a great help to his political ends or his personal safety. His piety, it seems, is only sham or hypocrisy. Viewed from this standpoint, Marlowe's Navarre is not called a spokesman for Protestant virtue. After Charles is dead, Navarre tells about the political situation, revealing his real character:

> And now Plesché, whilst that these broils do last.
> My opportunity may serve me fit
> To steal from France, and hie me to my home,
> For here's no safety in the realm for me:
> And now that Henry is call'd from Poland,
> It is my due, by just succession;
> And therefore, as speedily as I can perform,
> I'll muster up an army secretly,
> For fear that Guise, join'd with the king of Spain,
> Might seem to cross me in mine enterprise.
> But God, that always doth defend the right,
> Will show his mercy, and preserve us still. (x.30-41)

Navarre ends his soliloquy with his usual piety to devine will, but he regards the "broils" at the court as an "opportunity" for him to steal away and muster up an army, fearing that the Guise may prevent his "enterprise." At this point, he, like Henry, is keenly aware of the political situation and of his position in the royal family. The tone definders here are "opportunity", "steal", "speedily", "secretly" and "enterprise". Such words are reminiscent of the Guise, Charles and Henry. These words clearly show that he is never an admirable and pious man. Then, what is Navarre's "enterprise"? We will remember that Navarre is the first man among the main characters to put an army in the field. So far we have seen how the Guise and King Henry use the terms of piety and ornaments of religion to disguise their personal aspirations to power. After all we are obliged to place Navarre in the same category as the Guise, Henry and Charles. At the same time, we notice that Marlowe allows Navarre to use twelve self-references in the twelve lines. As J. Well points out, "such repetitions would seem to require some effort on the writer's part."[22] The key word is "opportunity". It may be said that Marlowe emphasizes opportunistic "enterprise" in the conversation between Navarre and Pleshé. In the later scene, when we see Navarre return to help Henry against the Guise only because his adviser Bartus implies his "fit opportunity / To show your love unto the king of France" (xvii.4-5), we will be convinced that this interpretation is to the point. Moreover, there is another point which affects our interpretation of the play: indeed Navarre is apparently a pious man, but he and all the leading characters of the play talk of vengeance and promise that it will take fearful forms. Henry's dying speech has such a tendency. Navarre equally ends the play, swearing revenge:

> And then I vow so to revenge his death
> As Rome, and all those popish prelates there,
> Shall curse the time that e'er Navarre was king,
> And rul'd in France by Henry's fatal death. (xxi.110-113)

All the leading characters in this play have the law of "a stab for a stab and a massacre for a massacre."[23] When we look back at the play, we will recollect that the play divides neatly in the middle, and that in one half the massacre is done by the Guise and his party and in the latter half mostly by his opponents. In both cases, it is done in the name of religion. The last words of the play, therefore, predict that another massacre is about to begin, hidden behind the sacred name of religion. Navarre gives us an impression that he is prepared to whet his sword and "keenly slice the Catholics" (xxi.101).

III

As we have seen, *The Massacre at Paris* is indeed a well-balanced play in spite of its textual corruption; it seems that Marlowe selected and molded the material he gathered from the histories of contemporary France. At the same time, he tried to brush up the play by means of many devices; the devices to give the play an element of disorder lurking behind the apparent harmony; to present violence following ceremony; to give the play the impression of great speed. Furthermore, we notice another device of Marlowe's through the speeches of the leading characters; their speeches sometimes contain the key words which reveal their real character and aims.

At the same time, we have investigated the actions and nature of the leading characters of the play. The Guise has the quenchless thirst to the crown. He possesses all the traits characterizing Machiavellism, and Marlowe treats his Guise as a focus and symbol for evil in other characters; all of the soliloquies in the play are either related to or spoken by the Guise. This is another device by Marlowe. By shifting rapidly among the main characters, Marlowe, it appears, pays attention to the qualities of mind and character which produce tyranny. The Guise displays the Machiavellian strategy, such as "patience and toil, the absence of any scruple, the subordination of religion to individual ends, dissimulation and poisoning", but he shows anti-Machiavellian nature in the later scene, and his own blindness and pride bring about his downfall. Charles is apparently weak, but it is mere dissembling; he reacts cleverly to the political situation. He is indeed a clever Machiavellian. After all Charles is killed by Catherine because she foresees his potential ability as a Machiavellian. Henry possesses the desire for power and the real ability as well as a genuine gift for politic deception and hypocrisy not found in the Guise. Henry is a genuine Machiavellian, but, like the Guise, he must reap the reward of his violence and cruelty. Navarre is apparently a pious and admirable man, but the careful examination of his speeches reveals that his piety is dissembling or hypocrisy, so we must place him in the same category as the Guise, Henry and Charles.

Thus looking back at the play roughly, we may think at first that *The Massacre at Paris* shows a conflict between the Guise, representing the Catholics, and Navarre, representing the Protestants, and that the Protestant triumph in the play may be taken as proof of God's concern for the affairs of men. Furthermore, we may also conclude that the play finally reflects a perfectly orthodox Protestant view of the French religious wars. However, when we investigate carefully the actions of the leading characters in accordance with Well's advice, we will feel that such conclusion is not fit for this play; first of all, we cannot think that skeptical Marlowe, who was in arms against Elizabethan orthodoxy in *Tamburlaine the Great*, has yielded to it so easily. And the main characters such as the Guise, Charles, Henry and even Navarre have the quenchless thirst to the crown. All of them appeal to Machiavellian diplomacy in their own way to achieve their goal, the royal power. In order to achieve their goal, they

use all the possible means, such as dissembling and hypocrisy, etc. Furthermore, all of the main characters including Navarre talk of vengeance and promise that it will take fearful forms. We have seen the massacre was done in the name of religion. For them, therefore, religion is only a tool. So we will foresee that another massacre will begin again in the sacred name of religion when Navarre ends the play, swearing revenge.

Marlowe's plays reveal a world of human evil. For Marlowe, it appears, "evil was a vital, though destructive, force, and he looked at it not with the optimistic eyes of Shakespeare, but with the savage indignation of Swift."[24] Therefore, Henry's appeal to Queen Elizabeth in his dying speech, does not show "purely sensational Protestant propaganda", but Marlowe's suggestion that our true enemy is artful religion, and that what has been true for Catholic France may become true for England; in other words, it may suggest that England may be broken up by men seeking power under the guise of religion. After we investigate the play carefully, we will conclude that the play is not a"nasty piece of journalistic bombast", and that Marlowe is not a "brutal, chauvinistic propagandist" taking advantage of "the lowest appetites of his audience." Marlowe's real intention of the play is to give a warning to England. In a sense, *The Massacre at Paris* shows Marlowe's prophesy.

NOTES

1 Michel Poirier in *Christopher Marlowe* (London : Chatto & Windus, 1968), says, "Chronologically it belongs to the end of Marlowe's career... It contains references to the Armada, to the death of Henry III, King of France, which took place on August 2, 1589, and to that of Sixtus V, on August 17, 1590. According to Henslowe, it was performed for the first time in January 1593. From those facts one may infer that it was written some time in 1592 and that it stands last in the list of Marlowe's plays (p.100). A. L. Rowse in *Christopher Marlowe; His Life and Work* (New York: Harper & Row, 1964) explains in detail: "It was one of a group of plays performed by Stranger's men at the Rose in January and February 1593; after Marlowe's death that May, it was performed by the Admiral's men in 1594, who bought its rights from Edward Allen in 1602—so he owned it and brought it with him to the company. From a reference to 'Sixtus' bones' at the end of the play—the Pope died in 1590—it would seem that the play is not very far from that date; for, in spite of its title, its nature is that of a topical melodrama" (p.100). J. B. Steane in *Marlowe; A Critical Study* (Cambridge U. P., 1965) also says: "This is probably the last of Marlowe's plays, and in its extant form certainly the least" (p.236).

2 Introduction, *The Works of Christopher Marlowe* ed. by C. F. Tucker Brooke (Oxford U. P.,1962), p. 440.

3 Poirier, *op. cit.*, p.165.

4 Introduction, *The Jew of Malta and The Massacre at Paris,* ed. by H. S. Bennett (New York: Gordian Press, 1966), p.173.

5 *Ibid.*, p.174.

6 F. P. Wilson, *Marlowe and the Early Shakespeare* (Oxford U. P., 1951), p.87.

7 Fredericks S. Boas, *Christopher Marlowe; A Biographical and Critical Study* (Oxford U. P., 1960), p.153.

8 Rowse, *op.cit.*, p.100. Claude J. Summers and C. F. Tucker Brooke have the same opinions as Rowse. Claude J. Summers in *Christopher Marlowe and the Politics of Power* (Austria: Universität Salzburg, 1974) contends: "Yet even in its corrupted text it is a better play than most of its critics have conceded... Though the poetry is sparse, there is scarcely a scene in *The Massacre at Paris* that is not

distinctly Marlovian in tone" (p.132). C. F. Tucker Brooke, *op. cit.*, concludes of the play: "There is nothing to indicate collaboration or methodical revision. Throughout the play, to the very end, occurs lines of the most characteristically Marlovian quality, and there appears no trace of any second hand except that of the theatrical adapter" (p.441).

9 Wilbur Sanders, *The Dramatist and The Received Idea; Studies in the Plays of Marlowe and Shakespeare* (Cambridge U. P., 1968), p.20, 22. Commentary on the play amounts to almost unmitigated censure. Douglas Cole in *Suffering and Evil in the Plays of Christopher Marlowe* (Princeton: Princeton U. P., 1962) concludes of the play: It "remains inevitably a crude spectacle of sensationalistic propaganda" (p.155). Harry Levin in *The Overreacher* (Cambridge: Harvard U. P., 1952) says that, except for a few speeches by or about Guise, "*The Massacre at Paris* is a singularly crude and unpoetic potboiler..." (p.84). Michel Poirier, *op. cit.*, says that "*The Massacre at Paris* is the result of over-hasty work" and asserts that it "was written carelessly, certainly without inspiration" (p.164, 172). Paul H. Kocher in *Christopher Marlowe; A Study of His Thought, Learning, and Character* (Russell & Russell, 1962) says: "The play is journeyman's work in every particular..." (p.136).

10 Judith Well, *Christopher Marlowe; Merlin's Prophet* (Cambridge U. P., 1977), p.83, 85. W. L. Godshalk in *The Marlovian World Picture* (Hague: Mouton, 1974) comments that "*The Massacre at Paris* is not a piece of Protestant propaganda, vilifying the Guise while glorifying the King of Navarre", and, regarding the play as a piece of socio-political criticism, he asserts that "it is also carefully articulated and balanced piece of art" (p.101).

11 Bennett, *op. cit.*, xviii.162. Subsequent quotations from *The Massacre at Paris* will refer to this edition.

12 Steane, *op. cit.*, pp.243-245. This section of our discussion is heavily indebted to Steane.

13 Rowse, *op.cit.*, p.103.

14 Bennett, *op.cit., The Jew of Malta,* Prologue, 1.14.

15 Levin, *op, cit.*, p.84.

16 Poirier, *op. cit.*, p.169.

17 Godshalk, *op. cit.*, p.89. Godshalk's opinion seems to fit Kocher's advice on Machiavellism. Paul H. Kocher, *op.cit.*, says: "...the popular Machiavelism of the Elizabethan stage was very different from the Machiavelism of Machiavelli himself. He recommended observance of the moral code except where deviations were regrettably necessary for the safety of king and kingdom. He kept in view as the end of all statecraft the stability and peace of the realm rather than the selfish advantage of its prince. These books may have circulated among educated Englishmen in Italian and French versions, but not sufficiently to correct the popular misconception, which became current in England as early as the 1580's, of Machiavelli as an advocate of everything evil in statecraft... The conclusion to be stressed, then, is that almost from its inception in England Machiavelism had so wide a latitude of meaning as almost to cease to mean anything at all. Any underhanded, "atheistic" machination in politics was dubbed Machiavellian" (pp.194-195).

18 Cole, *op.cit.*, p.146.

19 Godshalk, *op.cit.*, p.95.

20 *Ibid.*, p.100.

21 Well, *op.cit.*, p.101.

22 *Ibid.*, p.90.

23 Steane, *op.cit.*, p.245.

24 Godshalk, *op.cit.*, p.223.

(昭和57年9月14日受理)