

2012

The Massacre at Paris and the rhetoric of Anglo-French politics in the 1590s

Hayley Coble
Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Coble, Hayley, "The Massacre at Paris and the rhetoric of Anglo-French politics in the 1590s" (2012). *Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 12299.
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd/12299>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

***The Massacre at Paris* and the rhetoric of Anglo-French politics in the 1590s**

by

Hayley Coble

A thesis submitted to the graduate faculty

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Major: English (Literature)

Program of Study Committee:

Linda Shenk, Major Professor

Michael Mendelson

Kathy Hickok

Iowa State University

Ames, Iowa

2012

Copyright © Hayley Coble, 2012. All rights reserved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	iii
CHAPTER ONE. INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER TWO. "IN HONOUR OF OUR GOD AND COUNTRY'S GOOD": NAVARRE AS A NEO-STOIC KING AND THE CONTEMPORARY ANGLO- FRENCH DIPLOMACY OF REASON	15
CHAPTER THREE. "I DAILY WIN WITH WORDS": GUISE'S RHETORICAL CONTROL AND THE POLITICS OF PERFORMANCE	54
CHAPTER FOUR. "ARGUMENTUM TESTIMONII EST INARTIFICIALE": THE RELIGIO-POLITICAL LANGUAGE IN THE RAMUS SCENE	101
CHAPTER FIVE. CONCLUSION	136
WORKS CITED	141
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	146

For Kit Marlowe.

CHAPTER ONE. INTRODUCTION

When Christopher Marlowe penned *The Massacre at Paris*, England had recently sent her sons and supplies to aid the Protestant rebellion in France, tying the consciousness of her people to the wars on the continent. As quartos covering the French wars flooded the printers and tales of Henri IV's bravery became increasingly sensationalized, Marlowe's play undoubtedly captivated his audience. The play generated much revenue in its early performances and was resurrected several times before the turn of the century due to a prolonged interest in current events in France. When the French wars came to stalemate in late 1592, Henri IV found himself endlessly pressured by the Catholic League to convert to Catholicism as a solution to the constant religion-based civil wars that had plagued France for half a century. As Henri increasingly looked as though he might capitulate, England nervously awaited the conclusion to the wars. Because this current crisis in Anglo-French relations was at the forefront of English minds, aspects of political stress naturally weave throughout the play. An examination of *The Massacre at Paris* reveals much about English attitudes towards the wars in France, from Protestant propaganda to the veneration of Henri IV.

A recent rise in interest in literature's role in transnational politics creates a wonderful opportunity for studying *The Massacre at Paris*. The play is steeped in references to the political atmosphere of the mid to late 1580s and early 1590s, particularly in correlation with Anglo-French diplomacy. More than any other surviving play of the period, *The Massacre* directly addresses current events in France. However, little scholarship has addressed the play in terms of its relation to transnational politics; most often it is dismissed as little more

than Protestant propaganda. My thesis will show that even though the play does maintain a propagandistic bent, Marlowe utilized the rhetoric of Anglo-French diplomacy in order to make a statement on current political affairs.

Because of dramatic works' ability to retain their role as unreal, plays could often comment on transnational policies and political moves made by the government without worrying about the consequences. Marlowe's knowledge of transnational political affairs during his lifetime was extensive, as he is often considered to have been a spy in Sir Francis Walsingham's intelligence operation to protect Elizabeth I. Because the play spans a great length of time, from the wedding of Navarre and Marguerite de Valois and the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre in 1572 to Henri III's assassination in 1589, Marlowe is able to comment on past events as well as on current ones and provide possible solutions to the increasingly strained relationship between England and the French Protestant forces.

Marlowe's *Massacre*, though it acts partially as a history play, is heavily influenced by the political turmoil in contemporary France and England's involvement in the warfare. Due to her own national interest in a Protestant France, England had supported Henri de Navarre, the appointed leader of the Protestant cause and renowned Neo-Stoic, throughout the mid to late 1580s. After Henri's succession in 1589 France remained predominately Catholic, and the king found himself unable even to enter Paris. Elizabeth supported the Protestant Henri IV's monarchy to solidify an alliance against the forces of Catholic Spain by sending money and troops, making the French king akin to a Protestant hero in England. Nevertheless, tensions were high between the two countries, particularly during the probable time of Marlowe's composition of *The Massacre* and its subsequent early performances due

to the pressure put on Henri from the Catholic League to convert. Elizabeth however was only interested in supporting Henri's causes as long as he was willing to help defend England from Spain, and she feared that Henri would abandon England in exchange for Spanish support. How the crisis would conclude was a major concern to Elizabeth and her people, and this anxiety becomes implicit in the play.

In my thesis, I will discuss Marlowe's use of rhetorical styles and strategies that reflect the political turmoil of the French Civil Wars as well as the contemporary problems in Anglo-French affairs. Often the words that characters use and the ways in which they use them reflect not only their political ideologies but their religious ones, and sometimes their educational views as well. I will be examining three different spheres of Anglo-French politics in the late 1580s and early 90s to show their representation throughout *The Massacre at Paris*: the shared political rhetoric between Henri IV and Elizabeth I in the form of Neo-Stoicism, the politics of performance through the character of the staged Duc de Guise, and the political rhetoric of education in relation to the Sorbonne and Ramistic logic. Through this approach, I will illustrate how Marlowe's play not only critiques the events of the long French Civil Wars and the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre itself, but how it reflects the current political situation between Protestant England and war-torn France and offers possible solutions to the rising tension between the two nations through various philosophies depicted in these political spheres. By analyzing Marlowe's use of rhetoric, I will show how religio-political lines are drawn in the play in order to coincide with the contemporary political milieu.

Literature Review

Much of the scholarship written about *The Massacre at Paris* has been harsh, viewing the play as little more than propaganda. Marlowe's *Massacre*, however, while it has been dismissed by many, has also been suggested by some critics to have particular strengths. Bruce Ambler Nicholson's dissertation *Marlowe's Mighty Massacre* views the play as one worthy of equal status to the rest of the Marlowe canon. Throughout the work, Nicholson claims that Marlowe uses satire to critique both Protestants and Catholics. Nicholson defends this claim by showing the often seemingly equivocating personality of Navarre as well as Marlowe's ambiguous portrayal of Guise. "Dido, Queen of Carthage and *The Massacre at Paris*" by Sara Munson Deats from *The Cambridge Companion to Christopher Marlowe* also gives a broad overview of scholarship on the play and evaluates *The Massacre* as important for students and scholars of Marlowe. In her article, Deats suggests an approach used in Renaissance pedagogy of arguing on multiple sides of a question in order to situate the play in an interesting new light. This kind of rhetorical evaluation of the play highlights its strengths, and adds depth to the characters of Navarre, Guise, and Anjou (later Henri III).

In my thesis, I will take the broader historical lens of the civil wars in France and apply it directly to Marlowe's play. Knowledge of the political milieu in which Marlowe composed the play is important to our understanding of *The Massacre*; the play's commentary on contemporary real-life heroes and villains suggests that Marlowe had a very clear concept in mind when developing his characters. Although there has been criticism on Marlowe's sources for *The Massacre at Paris*, nothing has been written thus far on how the drama itself goes about emulating the political atmosphere of the French Civil Wars in terms

of foreign policy. My thesis will establish the connections between the diplomacy implemented by Elizabeth in her discourse with France in correlation with the rhetoric used in the play.

The play acts as propaganda in many respects, but it is rather artfully rendered propaganda. Rhetorical strategies utilized by characters like Henri de Navarre exemplify the legends that the characters had become and cast their personalities as either good or bad depending on how they use language. The way in which Marlowe utilizes those words to allude to pedagogical and philosophical approaches practiced by Catholics and Protestants during the French Civil Wars suggests a definite plan for the development of the characters and the plot. Marlowe's use of rhetorical devices and common stereotypes of historical characters make *The Massacre at Paris* a play that would have enjoyed much success with an Elizabethan audience well-versed in the political turmoil of the time.

The Massacre at Paris has had its share of scholarly attention regarding the suggestion of sodomy in the court of Henri III. Since sodomy was a crime often associated with political transgression, the language of politics is deeply embedded in the characters of Henri III and his *mignons*, and is often compared with the relationship between Gaveston and Edward in *Edward II*. The recent article by Jeffrey Rufo, "Marlowe's Minions: Sodomitical Politics in *Edward II* and *The Massacre at Paris*" is a fair example of the type of work often done on Henri III's politics; because these articles focus primarily on homoeroticism in the political sphere, Henri III is often compared with Marlowe's Edward II. Much critical discussion has centered on *Edward II* for the same reasons. The play is inherently political, and therefore makes for good conversation on the concept of monarchy. Likewise, *The*

Massacre is a play political by nature, especially in regards to the personal relationships between characters. *Dr. Faustus* has also been read from a political perspective. Like *The Massacre*, *Faustus* brings religion to the forefront, and many critics have viewed the play as religiously subversive. Just as many have commented on the play's nature as being either pro or anti-Protestant; although there is significant anti-Catholic imagery, *Faustus* portrays a dislike for Protestantism as well. The same religious problem plays a major role in *The Massacre at Paris*, but connections made by scholars between the French politics in *The Massacre at Paris* and contemporary English interests in France are rare and have thus far been only examined from a historical perspective as opposed to a political one.

One character who has garnered some attention in scholarship on the play in terms of politics is Catherine de Medici. The Queen Mother of France plays a significant role in furthering Guise's villainous plans in *The Massacre* by giving him money and even vowing to slay her own children if they get in the way of the Catholic cause. In her article "The Woman in Black: The Image of Catherine de Medici from Marlowe to *Queen Margot*," Elaine Kruse posits that Marlowe purposefully paints Catherine as the "black queen" in order to subtly praise Elizabeth. Kruse also acknowledges that the very opposite could be true as well, however; Marlowe's dark portrayal of Catherine could also be damaging to Elizabeth, who often portrayed herself as mother of her country, having no heirs of her own. Katherine Crawford's article "Catherine de Médicis and the Performance of Political Motherhood" addresses Catherine's use of political power in a historical sense. In her sketch of Catherine, Crawford shows how the Queen Mother manipulated the politics of her country through emphasis of her role as mother and widow. Catherine wielded considerable power for a long

time in France, and as she is depicted this way in Marlowe's play and forms a seemingly fine link with Elizabeth, her character in *The Massacre at Paris* has been the subject of recent focus.

With the exception of the focus on the implications of Henri III's sexuality and Catherine's role as a woman in power, not much research has been done on *The Massacre at Paris* in combination with sixteenth-century France beyond source hunting. Paul H. Kocher's 1947 article "Contemporary Pamphlet Backgrounds for Marlowe's *The Massacre at Paris*" provides an example of the criticism most often applied to Marlowe's sources for the play: an analysis of the news pamphlets circulating at the time to see where Marlowe obtained his information. Though Kocher's analysis primarily emphasizes the propagandistic nature of the play in conjunction with the anti-League pamphlets circulating at the time, the data he provides is valuable and has been cited by many critics since.

Other seminal articles on *The Massacre* focus on the religious division in the play. Julia Briggs' "Marlowe's *Massacre at Paris*: A Reconsideration" addresses the negative portrayal of not only the Catholics in the play but also the Protestants. Because she approaches the play from this viewpoint, Briggs finds fault with Kocher's approach and claims that his perspective of *The Massacre* as simply anti-Catholic propaganda limited his evaluation of Marlowe's sources. In defense, Briggs cites some possible League pamphlets that Marlowe may have utilized in his writing while also giving Kocher the credit for citing the anti-League pamphlets. Briggs argues that the death of the Guise is a heroic one, intended to make the audience feel less sure of the evil of the Catholic League if not outright sympathetic.

Kocher's and Briggs' research on Marlowe's sources for *The Massacre* sparked significant interest in those sources as a whole and inspired more thorough work on the news pamphlets in late Elizabethan England. More recently, Paul J. Voss' *Elizabethan News Pamphlets: Shakespeare, Spenser, Marlowe & the Birth of Journalism* delved deeper into the influence of the news pamphlets on the views of the people of England. Voss shows that not only were the pamphlets propagandistic, but they helped shape national identity in the 1580s and 90s. Lisa Ferraro Parmelee's *Good News from Fraunce: French Anti-League Propaganda in Late Elizabethan England* also addresses the proliferation of the news pamphlets and their effect on the thoughts of the English people, including the question of censorship. Both texts expand on ideas put forth by Kocher; where Kocher showed the sources that Marlowe most likely used, Voss and Parmelee go more in depth as to the background of those sources and the war out of which they arose. Though Voss does write about *The Massacre at Paris* in his book, his approach is more historical than mine will be. My goal in writing this thesis is to utilize the method of combining the literary and political in the way that Voss and Parmelee do, but to do so from the perspective of Marlowe's play. I will utilize *The Massacre at Paris* as a literary text that showcases the religious and political tensions depicted in the news pamphlets in an approach that is grounded in literary criticism as opposed to history.

Background knowledge of the politics of France is just as important to analysis of Marlowe's use of the French civil wars as England's involvement and shared Protestant philosophies. Nancy Lyman Roelker's *One King, One Faith: The Parlement of Paris and the Religious Reformations of the Sixteenth Century* gives extensive background on the major

political players in sixteenth century France such as the Parlement, the Sorbonne, and the Catholic League, and their influence on the political atmosphere. The St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre as well as the tensions over Henri IV's succession are not issues that arose out of nothing; the laws that the Sorbonne along with the Parlement put into action in the 40s helped to cement the divide between Catholics and Protestants, ultimately culminating in civil war. Operating more in a historical vein, Mark Greengrass' *France in the Age of Henri IV: The Struggle for Stability* gives a more broad account of the wars as a whole instead of focusing on the internal affairs of the bigwigs of Paris. Greengrass endeavors to show all aspects of the wars, including France's alliances and relationships with other countries. Because of the book's focus on Henri IV's reign, Greengrass does not dwell on French politics before Henri's succession, but rather comments more on the alliance with England from a French perspective as well as the influence on France from Protestant countries like Switzerland and Germany.

Religion and philosophy also inform much of the play. J.H.M. Salmon's *Renaissance and Revolt: Essays in the Intellectual and Social History of Early Modern France* addresses how Ciceronian style lost its allure in France during the late sixteenth century due to increased interest in the stoic style of Tacitus. Although on the surface these changes were philosophical, they had ramifications in the religious and political spheres in France as well. In his article "The Martyrdom of Ramus in Marlowe's *The Massacre at Paris*" John Ronald Glenn also addresses the religious problem in the play, focusing on the murder of Ramus in Scene IX. Glenn makes his argument by giving a condensed biography of the historical Peter Ramus and showing how Ramus and Guise's different actions and reactions cast them as a

martyr and a tyrant respectively. Because the French Civil Wars arose out of religious tension, acknowledgement of this anxiety is important to keep in mind when reading the play.

A focus on transnational studies has recently begun to blossom in literary criticism, largely due perhaps to an increased interest in interdisciplinary approaches. Transnational study, particularly in the political sphere, has only recently been applied to the early modern period, but some critical work has been written. Though it does not offer any criticism on *The Massacre*, Robert Henke and Eric Nicholson's *Transnational Exchange in Early Modern Theater* incorporates several approaches of transnational studies, such as *Commedia dell'Arte* influence on the English theater and analysis of performances in foreign lands. *Shakespeare, Marlowe and the Politics of France* by Richard Hillman raises questions about some of the political concerns contemporary to Marlowe and Shakespeare in correlation with France, such as that of who Elizabeth would choose as her successor. Another book that sheds light on English participation in the French wars as well as the foreign policy that Elizabeth implemented in the 1580s and 90s is Linda Shenk's book *Learned Queen: The Image of Elizabeth I in Politics and Poetry*. Shenk devotes time to Elizabeth's use of Neo-Stoic philosophy and rhetoric in the queen's diplomatic relations with France and addresses some of the great fears of late sixteenth-century England. Early modern transnational studies is a relatively new discipline and has not yet been applied in depth to *The Massacre at Paris*. Marlowe's play—with its clear focus on Anglo-French politics—provides an ideal venue for merging of these recent scholarly interests with an attention to performance.

Description of Chapters

This introduction provides an overview of the criticism on *The Massacre at Paris*, particularly in terms of transnational politics. Likewise, I have shown how Marlowe treats the play not only as a history play, but also as a commentary on the current political situation between England and France. Although Henri I, Duc de Guise was dead by the time of the play's production, King Henri IV (formerly King of Navarre) remained at the forefront of English consciousness as Elizabeth I sent troops to aid the French king in his attempt to gain control of his fractured nation. *The Massacre at Paris* depicts in its characters' rhetorical approaches and its chronicling of history many of the problems that caused the French Civil Wars in the first place. At the same time, however, Marlowe presents within the play possible ameliorations to the contemporary Anglo-French political struggle, often in the same places that initially raised the problems.

In the first chapter, I will focus on the political sphere of philosophy and monarchy by looking at the character of Navarre in *The Massacre at Paris*, whom Marlowe depicts as a Neo-Stoic. Throughout the play, Navarre embodies the philosophy of Neo-Stoicism in his dramatic presentation; he is calm and rational, always in the defensive position in warfare, and always relying on God for protection. The few times Navarre is emotional his reactions are negative ones, promoting the idea that rationality is the best course. Navarre's characterization parallels him sharply with Guise, whose rhetoric is emotional by contrast. Also, in Scene IX Guise kills Navarre's tutors, who more than likely would have been teaching him these rational philosophies, connecting education to politics. Marlowe's

portrayal of Navarre as a relatively flat character is accurate; because of his belief in rationalism, Navarre would never be overtly emotional in his speaking.

Many contemporary parallels can be drawn to Navarre's character too. Historically, Navarre (later Henri IV) was a Neo-Stoic, becoming known after his succession as a "King of Reason." Elizabeth I had also been in support of Neo-Stoicism throughout the 1580s and 90s. As such, this philosophy provided yet another opportunity to build an alliance between England and France not determined by religion. Because of the positive nature of Navarre's stoic self in the play versus the negative portrayal of his emotional side, Marlowe clearly endorses a political rhetoric grounded in reason. In his careful rendering of Navarre, Marlowe is able to promote England's diplomacy with France while simultaneously avoiding a perceived attack on Henri IV.

My second chapter will deal with Navarre's antithesis, the Duc de Guise, and the sphere of performance politics. Guise is a strange character on the stage; though he is horribly villainous, he is far more dramatically compelling than Navarre because of his use of emotional rhetoric. Though Guise seems the typical Marlovian protagonist he is not a tragic character. My focus for this chapter will center upon Guise and the concept of control. In the early parts of the play, Guise's soliloquies demonstrate his control over language in their tightness and use of rhetorical devices. He also exerts control over other characters; Catherine de Medici and Charles IX are his two most obvious puppets, and Guise's power hungry wiles plague the thoughts of Navarre constantly. Even in his treatment of the people he kills, Guise is concerned with dominance, forcibly lowering the bodies of his victims by throwing them down. As the play progresses, however, Guise begins to lose his control. In

Scene XV, Guise discovers his wife's infidelity, and his control over his rhetoric and the other characters significantly lessens.

This loss of control shows that Guise is not intended as a character with whom the audience will sympathize, and an early modern audience would recognize Guise's use of emotional rhetoric to ill ends as a corruption of Cicero's oratory. The fact that the play is billed as *The Massacre at Paris with the Death of the Guise* as opposed to containing any reference to tragedy also sets the play up as essentially a public execution, where Elizabethan audiences can come to watch the great enemy of Henri IV fall. As such, the play is exactly the kind of propaganda that would have been allowed by the Master of Revels, as it does nothing to make the king of France, who was quickly becoming a national hero even in England, look bad while making his rhetorical and historical nemesis seem worse. Nevertheless, the Guise is just likeable enough that were an Elizabethan audience inclined to think positively of the Catholic cause, the villain's personality may have been perceived quite differently. In this way, Marlowe takes the same approach with *The Massacre at Paris* that he does in all of his plays; the lines between good and bad, Protestant and Catholic become blurred, and the most dramatically compelling character in the play becomes a hero at the same time as he becomes a scapegoat.

The last chapter of my thesis focuses on *The Massacre* in relation to the political sphere of education. I use Scene IX of the play in which the French philosopher and logician Peter Ramus, infamous for his arguments against Aristotle, is murdered by the Guise and his followers in order to illustrate Marlowe's use of education as politics as well as a possible argument for tolerance. Because of the extended civil wars that had plagued France for half a

century and the pressure that the Catholic League was putting on Henri IV to convert, religious tolerance was a major concern in contemporary England. I begin with the proposal that the language of education in sixteenth century France is politically and religiously coded and use Guise's rhetoric in the logic debate to show adherence to traditional, Catholic systems of education promoted by the Sorbonne.

As Guise and Ramus are divided amongst very polemic lines, Ramus as a martyred Protestant looks very sympathetic against staunchly traditional Guise, especially to a Protestant Elizabethan audience deeply suspicious of Catholics. Ramus' half of the debate reflects several positive characteristics in the form of his nationalism, his adherence to his beliefs, and his willingness to compromise. Likewise, Ramus' friendship with his fellow scholar Taleus, a Catholic, provides an example of successful religious tolerance through education, an idea promoted by Elizabeth I as well as several other great minds of the time. As my analysis of the logic debate will show, education plays a significant role in developing religious and political background. Therefore, education is capable of acting as a point of consensus between Catholics and Protestants, provided the institutions involved are willing to accept the schools of philosophy that both sides promote.

**CHAPTER TWO. "IN HONOUR OF OUR GOD AND COUNTRY'S GOOD":
 NAVARRE AS A NEO-STOIC KING AND THE CONTEMPORARY ANGLO-
 FRENCH DIPLOMACY OF REASON**

During Christopher Marlowe's composition of *The Massacre at Paris*, England was engaged alongside the French Huguenots in the midst of the bloody and long-lived wars of religion. Desperate to keep Catholic Spain from gaining a foothold in the Low Countries and amassing power on the continent, Elizabeth I had formed an alliance with French Protestant leader Henri de Navarre, later King Henri IV, on religious grounds that was later strengthened by a focus on Neo-Stoic philosophy. Neo-Stoic rhetoric became integral to the alliance in the 1580s and 1590s as reliance on reason made it possible for Protestant France and England to continue diplomatic conversations concerning religion without incorporating emotional attachments, overly emotional religious fervor having resulted in events like the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre. In the play, Marlowe applies rhetorical strategies utilized by the historical French Protestant king Henri IV to characterize his rendition of Navarre as a Neo-Stoic king¹. With the aid of Phillippe du Plessis-Mornay, Henri IV made the Neo-Stoic philosophy of reliance on God his policy in the mid 1580s in an attempt to introduce the same ideas into his own war-torn country that had sealed his alliance with England. Because this alternative approach to religious discourse could circumvent violence, it worked well as a domestic policy in a country ravaged by war. The Navarre of the play echoes the Neo-Stoicism of Henri IV, showing Marlowe's subtle support for the diplomatic policies currently in place between England and France.

¹ Throughout this chapter, when referencing the historical French king I will use the name Henri IV. When referring to Marlowe's character in *The Massacre*, I will use the name Navarre, as it is the one Marlowe maintains throughout the play.

Marlowe's Navarre in *The Massacre* reflects his real-life counterpart as he often calls on God's aid and uses plain, unadorned speech. Navarre is not infallible, however. At times his Stoic rhetoric breaks down and he delves into a more emotional style. These instances never reflect well on the king, as he resorts to this emotional rhetoric when he is in despair or feeling particularly vengeful. Because of his characteristic rhetoric, Navarre has often been read as either boring or no better than his nemesis, the cruel and violent Guise. Paul H. Kocher even posits that "Navarre is Marlowe's worst failure in the entire play," claiming the king is "the merest patchwork of Protestant commonplaces" and that he "has no character" (316). When Navarre's rhetoric is perceived through the lens of Neo-Stoic philosophy, however, it mirrors the diplomatic strategies put into place by his real-life counterpart who would ultimately bring peace to war-ravaged and religion-splintered France.

Neo-Stoic rhetoric was important to the Anglo-French political scheme of the 1580s and 1590s, as Elizabeth I and Henri IV had both espoused reason-based rhetoric in their shared diplomacy for years. Though the rhetoric of Neo-Stoicism still had its basis in religion having arisen out of Christian countries, its focus on prudence and providence allowed it to transcend sectarian disagreements, putting the emphasis on God instead of on man's interpretations. Through a marriage of prudence and providence Neo-Stoicism encouraged men to focus on God's will instead of their own, allowing them to place their trust in their deity as opposed to in their swords. Constancy was also a major proponent on Neo-Stoicism and encouraged men and monarchs to keep true to their word. When the Catholic League began to apply pressure on Henri in 1591 to convert as a peaceable solution to the long civil wars, England tried to maintain her alliance with the Huguenots through adherence to the

philosophies that had joined them together before the current crisis, lest Henri's constancy falter in terms of religion. England needed to find a way to keep France from joining forces with Catholic Spain should Henri IV convert, as the Catholic empire would have loved to crush the Protestant island. By promoting Neo-Stoic rhetoric, Marlowe endorses his own country's diplomatic policy with the Huguenots while taking care not to mar the reputation of Henri IV, who had quickly become a Protestant hero due to a boom in journalism fueled by the French wars. Prayers in the form of ballads and special commissions encouraged the populace of England to pray for Henri IV's success, and news quartos that depicted the valor of the French king in battle were highly circulated (Voss 43).

Marlowe's play capitalizes on the contemporary surge of English interest in France, and with good effect; the play was immensely popular, and "the £3 14s taken at its first performance was the highest of the season, and compares well with the average takings of £1 14s" (Bennett 3:169). Often Marlowe exercises artistic license in *The Massacre*, skewing timelines to incorporate certain characters' presences as well as to cover large swaths of time. Though Marlowe's play becomes propagandistic at times, blackening the personalities of such characters as Catherine de Medici, scholars who criticize this element of the text fail to note Marlowe's ability to create a space for a Neo-Stoic compromise by emphasizing the binary of Catholic and Protestant. Conciliation came in the form of *politique*, a religio-political concept favored by Catholic moderates that supported the dominance of a single religion in exchange for a unified country (Parmelee 97). Because *politique* developed as a result of transcendence of sectarian politics, it would ultimately make possible the Neo-Stoic Henri IV's ascension to the throne.

In the play, Marlowe represents Navarre as a Neo-Stoic Protestant. Before the battle in the play that stands in for countless skirmishes in reality, Navarre tells his friends that "the Guise, the Pope, and King of Spain" are resolved to destroy them, aligning them against the Catholic League (xvi.4). The link to Neo-Stoicism occurs a few lines later when Navarre justifies the battle using Neo-Stoic rhetoric, saying that "you know our quarrel is no more/
But to defend their strange inventions/ Which they will put to use with sword and fire" (xvi.7-9). As I will show in more detail later, this speech is highly important to the characterization of Navarre as the Neo-Stoic leader of the Protestant forces, who would allow for his enemies to worship in peace if only they would not act against the Huguenots. In this way, Navarre acts in opposition to the violent Catholic Guise, whom Marlowe portrays as a man savvy in his use of emotional rhetoric through flowery phrases and by allowing him tight control of rhetorical conventions. Marlowe endorses a reason-based philosophy by contrast to a reckless one by creating an association in the audience's mind of emotional style with ill means.

While Navarre and Guise stand against one another, they do not stand alone. Aligned with them are several of the men's friends; Navarre commands the allegiance of Pleshè, Condy, and Bartus, while Guise is supported by his brothers the Cardinal of Lorraine and Dumaine. The Duke of Anjou, later King Henry, sides with Guise for the first half of the play but ultimately supports Navarre. Through his changing of allegiances in an attempt to create peace, King Henry mirrors the approach of his older brother Charles IX, killed by his mother for his eventual support of Navarre. King Henry's shifting alliances also parallel the potential conversion of Henri IV as a prudent means to peace-keeping. Throughout this chapter, I will

often attempt to differentiate between the characters and their historical counterparts by retaining the spelling utilized by Marlowe and historians respectively: Pleshé/ du Plessis-Mornay; Condy/ Condé; Anjoy/ Anjou; Joyeux/ Joyeuse. I do, however, realize that various editors spell the names differently, and so I will differentiate more clearly when necessary to distinguish the actual personages from the characters in the play.

With so many characters, the plot of the play becomes convoluted, and not without reason; to include the characters to the degree in which they participate in the work Marlowe had to dramatically condense the timeline. The play begins with a vast array of characters, but the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre for which the piece is named occurs early, and more minor characters quickly fade into the background except in their relation to Navarre and Guise. Though the massacre scenes contain the most physical action, the climax of the play for Navarre's character occurs with the death of Charles IX. At this time Navarre becomes an outlaw pursued by the Catholic King Henry. Controlled by his mother and Guise, King Henry keeps Navarre running for his life through most of the play's second half. Marlowe's depiction of Navarre's rebellion occurs only in his dramatization of the king's speeches before the battle at Coutras.

By showing Navarre's reaction to the various deaths that occur in the play and his approach to battle, Marlowe develops the king's personality as a Neo-Stoic while illustrating the philosophy's importance to Navarre's political character. In Marlowe's bloodiest play words become as important as weaponry. Navarre and Guise never meet on the battlefield in *The Massacre at Paris*, but they square off in a battle of rhetoric and philosophy that lets the audience decide the winner. The play, violent in both action and language, creates an ideal

space for the reason of Neo-Stoicism to manifest. With their Protestant hero likely to capitulate to the enemy's demands, a call for trust in God and in a diplomacy that transcends sectarian fanaticism was what Marlowe's Elizabethan audience needed to hear.

Though Navarre's goodness or lack thereof has long been a subject of debate in academic circles, Marlowe's portrayal of young king in *The Massacre at Paris* reflects the anxiety of the English people at the time of the play's composition. In his treatment of Navarre Marlowe endorses his country's reliance on Neo-Stoic principles and his use of rhetoric as a characterization device circumvents any hint of criticism of the French king. Using the dichotomy of Neo-Stoic and emotional rhetoric, Marlowe makes Navarre a somewhat ambiguous character and allows for the anxiousness on the audience's part concerning Henri's likely conversion.

Navarre as Neo-Stoic

Marlowe's Navarre reflects the new Stoic movement's focus on reason and acceptance of God's will in his rhetoric. Unfortunately, it becomes easy to dismiss Navarre as a poorly constructed character because of his Stoicism; the philosophy does not come across well dramatically because of its focus on unadorned speech versus flowery rhetoric like that employed by Guise. Without considering the Stoicism that Marlowe endorses by portraying Henri de Navarre this way, the young king's character comes across as bland. Marlowe's reasons for rendering Navarre plain are necessary, however. By making his Protestant hero a Neo-Stoic, Marlowe invites his English Protestant audience to identify with him against the Guise using the same approach to dealing with Catholicism employed by Elizabeth I. Though Guise remains easy to hate, a focus on the rhetoric shifts the attention from the

Protestant/Catholic dichotomy in favor of that of rational/irrational. Also, many of the tactics that Navarre uses were put into practice by his historical counterpart. By surrendering to God's plan, Navarre shows strength in passivity and the ability to confront what changes may come with reason, a philosophy that allowed Henri IV to restore his nation after the religious wars. Marlowe's portrayal of Navarre is necessarily unembellished to solidify the audience's perception of the king as a Neo-Stoic.

To establish Navarre as a rational person in congruence with his historical counterpart, Marlowe often has him employ the Neo-Stoic rhetoric of reliance on God in scenes where other characters die. For instance, when King Charles IX says that he is dying, Navarre tells him "Comfort yourself, my Lord, and have no doubt/ But God will sure restore you to your health" (xiii.6-7). Navarre's words are calm, asking Charles to take comfort and trust in God. By telling the king that there is "no doubt," Navarre clearly asserts his unwavering faith in God's love of the French crown and people (xiii.6). As the historical Navarre was known through the news quartos for putting trust in God during trying times, this scene stays true to what Marlowe's audience would know of the king's character.

Navarre's reaction to Charles' death also characterizes him as a Neo-Stoic devoted to reason. While Charles' funeral is underway and Henry (Anjou) is on his way to Paris to be crowned, Navarre "steal[s] from France and hie me to my home/ For here's no safety in the realm for me" (xiii.32-33). Navarre does not mourn Charles, more concerned with the political consequences of the king's death. Though the crown should descend to Navarre, it goes to Anjou instead. Anjou, Charles' younger brother, is a Catholic; Navarre risks his life by staying in Paris. This thought process is in character with Navarre's Neo-Stoicism. As

mourning Charles would require showing an excess of emotion, Navarre instead takes the rational route and plans his next steps with Pleshé. The historical Pleshé, Phillipe du Plessis-Mornay, historically popularized the concept of Henri IV as a King of Reason in a pamphlet defending the young Navarre from the accusations of the Catholic league (Crouzet 86²).

Also, he spent much time in England publishing books in support of Henri, including "To the most excellent Prince Henry King of Navarre, Prince and Sovereign Lord of Bearne & Peere and Chief Prince of the blood royall of Fraunce," which heavily endorsed the young ruler as God's chosen monarch in France, despite that he had not yet been made heir apparent (Voss 103-104). Pleshé's presence as Navarre's close advisor in this scene supports the king's Stoicism, as the ambassador helped to establish Henri as a Neo-Stoic fit for an absolute monarchy.

Before their exit, Navarre tells Pleshé his plans to raise an army to defend the Huguenots from Guise in a way that facilitates the attention of a Protestant English audience. Navarre says "But God that always doth defend the right/ Will show his mercy and preserve us still" (xiii.40-41). This moment marks the second time within the scene that Navarre calls upon God's protection. Clearly, Marlowe considers it extremely important that his audience be able to identify with the view of Henri de Navarre as a man who puts his faith in God, a view of the king that was also hard-pressed by the news quartos. One quarto that describes Henri IV's unlikely victory over the Duke du Mayenne calls the success "a miraculous worke of God" (A Discourse and True Recitall). Navarre's claim that God will "defend the right" endorses the English belief that Protestantism truly is the correct interpretation of Christianity

² I refer to the version of Crouzet's article from *From Valois to Bourbon: Dynasty, State and Society in Early Modern France* translated from French by Judith K. Proud.

(xiii.40). Henri IV's attempt to suppress religious severance in favor of unity in his own country mirrored the policy adopted by Elizabeth, who had through lenience given the Catholics in her country no reason for insurgence (Doran, *Religion* 51-52). Still, England had been united under a Protestant Queen for longer than Marlowe had been alive, and snippets of this pro-Protestant rhetoric appear constantly throughout the play. Placement of notions of faith and Protestant favor next to each other allows Marlowe to get his audience's blood boiling while priming them to support Navarre's Stoic ideas. Marlowe's reiteration of the concept within the scene shows that absolute trust in God's will is a major proponent of Navarre's characterization, along with his calmness in the face of turmoil.

Navarre's reaction to King Henry's death is likewise characterized by maintained composure, a necessary quality in a potential ruler. As Navarre is the heir apparent, Marlowe's depiction of the Huguenot leader in this scene shows the young Stoic king as deserving of the crown. Ever calm, Navarre, upon discovering that the king is hurt immediately calls for a surgeon after once again asking God for his mercy. At every opportunity Navarre insists that the king will live, arguing with the surgeon and trying to reassure King Henry. When the king quickly perishes, the knife discovered to have been poisoned by the friar who stabbed him, Navarre calmly gives the order to "take up the body of the King,/ That we may see it honourably interr'd" (xxiv.106-7). Navarre is the voice of reason again during the panic over the king's attack. Though Epernoun, the king's favorite, is there with him, Navarre comforts the dying man the most. Despite Navarre's plea, God chooses not to save King Henry; nevertheless Navarre remains calm. Even when he orders

the body interred it is with grim composure. Navarre accepts his fate as the new king without question, putting his faith in God's will.

The reliance on God that Marlowe emphasizes in the play was a necessary proponent to Henri IV's political strategy during the wars of religion. In the 1580s and 1590s, Henri IV relied on a doctrine of reason as a platform for his political reception. His adoption of Neo-Stoicism as policy was aided by the efforts of his friend and advisor, du Plessis-Mornay, who wrote a document³ designed to gain the Protestant king publicity as a leader who transcended partisan religio-politics (Crouzet 86). When the Catholic League came into power under the machinations of the Guise brothers, Navarre distanced himself from the old traditions not only by his religion, but by employing rhetorical and philosophical structures that differed from those used by his enemies. By taking advantage of propaganda to fix himself in the minds of the French people as a reasonable leader with their best interests at heart, Henri could win over a nation through his inspiration of Stoic Huguenots and Catholic *politiques* (Shenk 125). He would tie this application of prudence and reason to reliance on and resignation to God's will, which allowed him to maintain the political clout that he accumulated using Neo-Stoicism as a diplomatic policy. In order to classify Navarre as a Neo-Stoic as well as a candidate for the throne trying to win the hearts of a war-torn people, Marlowe has the young king display these qualities through his speeches in the play.

The character Navarre's employment of Henri IV's Neo-Stoic publicity becomes most clear on the battlefield. During the time of Marlowe's composition of *The Massacre*, England's interests lay in making sure that she had the support of the Protestant factions in

³ *Declaration du Roy de Navarre sur les calomnies publiées contre luy es Protestations de ceux de la Ligue qui se sont eslevez en ce Royaume.*

France. When Henri IV succeeded Henri III in 1589, he was unable to enter Paris because of opposition from the Guises and the Catholic League, and the young king instead found himself fighting skirmishes all over the French countryside. Though Henri IV's entire military campaign and skill on the battlefield is encapsulated in the scene before the battle of Coutras within the play, these moments are more than sufficient to establish the Protestant leader as a benevolent general concerned primarily with the safety of his people and the glory of his God. Contemporary quartos like John Eliot's *Survey of France* described Henri as "the most heroicall and magnanimous Kinge... the most victorious and invincible warrior that ever unsheathed sword for a kingdom," blending his military victories with his reputation for magnanimity (A3-4). After he and the Protestant rebels have slain the Duke Joyeux, Navarre devotes his military victory to God and reinforces what the English people already knew of him. "Thus God, we see, doth ever guide the right,/ To make his glory great upon the earth," Navarre says to Bartus and his train (xviii.3-4). Because of the religious nature of the wars occurring in France, it is politically necessary that the Huguenots be able to claim that God is on their side, and Navarre uses this moment of victory to vouch that the Protestant side is indeed the right one. Adhering to a common theme in news propaganda, the recent Huguenot victory ensures that God is on the side of the Huguenots and endorses their rebellion from Catholicism.

Though Henry IV's adherence to Neo-Stoicism as a policy had philosophic ramifications, rhetoric employed in the latter half of the sixteenth century also shifted to a more reason-based approach that could be applied to diplomatic situations in the contemporary religio-political climate. Neo-Stoic rhetoric's increased popularity occurred

simultaneously with the rise of Protestantism in France. Cicero had long been the established orator for emulation because of his focus on *decorum* and eloquence. Though Cicero was by no means forceful in his endorsement of emotional rhetoric, citing it as something to be used with caution, he always argued for the utmost eloquence in a rhetor. Both Catholics and Protestants often used Ciceronian style in order to further their causes, and some, like the French philosopher Montaigne, even sought to combine Cicero with Senecan Stoicism (49). By the end of the century, however, Tacitus had become the popular rhetorician to imitate. Simultaneously, a focus on Seneca was on the rise in England; this shared interest in Stoicism paved the way for the Neo-Stoic diplomacy between Henri IV and Elizabeth I. J.H.M. Salmon posits that "in the new climate of absolutism Cicero, *pater eloquentiae*, yielded place to Tacitus, *pater prudentiae*" (27). In this way, the torch of philosophical and rhetorical strategy passed from the *pater eloquentiae*, or father of eloquence, to the *pater prudentiae*, or father of reason. As some found Cicero to be too ambitious and the Stoicism of Tacitus seemed increasingly fit to an absolutist monarchy that would not allow for two major religions, the *pater prudentiae* won the minds of the heavily religion-divided French. Neo-Stoicism became an obvious policy for Henri IV to adopt because of his ally Elizabeth I's like observance of reason-based rhetoric and the edition of Seneca's *Libri duo de clementia* written by John Calvin, whom the young king highly admired.

Though Neo-Stoicism emphasized reason as a means of transcending the violence that often occurred as a result of the polarization of Protestants and Catholics, it simultaneously made it impossible for the two religions to coexist. If Ciceronian style called for exemplary use of emotional rhetoric, Neo-Stoicism stood firmly against it, a contrast

made stark by Marlowe's depiction of Navarre. Tacitus argued against the tyranny he saw in the Roman Empire, but the focus on prudence above all eventually came to promote an absolutist monarchy under a Stoic ruler. Prudence became the rallying cry of the Neo-Stoics; Salmon cites Pierre Charron, one of Montaigne's disciples, as saying that prudence had become "the general queen, superintendent, and guide of all the other virtues" (51). Because of the amplification of some rather striking similarities between the approach of Tacitus and that of Machiavelli, prudence also became an argument for monarchical absolutism as well as a belief that only one religion could prevail within a state. The Stoic virtue of constancy also contributed to the absolutist cause, as it commended the idea of a strong monarchy while deemphasizing sectarianism. France would be either a Catholic nation or a Protestant one, but if Henri IV could find a way to elevate himself above the religion dispute by stressing prudence and constancy, he could convince the French people that he was the best candidate for an absolutist monarchy.

The character Navarre emphasizes the concept of religious absolutism in France in his speeches at Coutras. When he speaks to his men, Navarre endeavors to show that not only does he have God on his side, but that He does not support the Guise. After Bartus interjects his hopes that King Henry will end his attacks against the Huguenots, Navarre says "But God, we know, will always put them down/ That lift themselves against the perfect truth,/ Which I'll maintain so long as life doth last" (xviii.12-14). Throughout the play Navarre makes the remark, and Marlowe the characterization, that Guise is using religion to mask his real intention: ascension to the French throne. Not only is Guise "against the perfect truth" of Protestantism as a Catholic, but he is "lifting himself" in his ambition to secure the throne

(xviii.13). The historical Catherine de Medici also shared this opinion, fearing that Guise would use his control of the League army to try and take the crown (Frieda 354-355).

Forming a sharp contrast between Navarre and Guise, these lines mark another moment in which Marlowe shows the anxiety that Henri IV's possible conversion caused for the English. By having Navarre say that he will "maintain" his Protestantism "so long as life doth last," Marlowe caters to the fears of his Elizabethan audience, who expected the French king to convert at any time, but also bolsters the hope that England maintained for a continued alliance (xviii.14). Simultaneously, Navarre's reference to his constancy reiterates his position as a potential monarch with the ability to rise above religious disputes. That the Huguenots have just defeated Joyeux in battle and not Guise becomes a moot point; in Navarre's eyes, and in keeping with the polarized nature of the two religious sects in the play, Guise has become synonymous with intolerance and Catholic dominion. By putting the war into God's hands, Navarre negates any vengeful feelings on his own part and adheres to his Neo-Stoic creed, which Marlowe uses to bolster the faith of his anxious English audience.

At the same time, paralleling Navarre with Guise intimates Henri IV's dedication to the honorable stance of direct interaction with his enemy. Though Joyeuse was the general sent to meet Navarre in the field, the young king wanted to fight Guise. When the messenger tells Navarre that Joyeux is on his way the king replies

I would the Guise in his stead might have come
 But he doth lurk within his drowsy couch
 And makes his footstool on security;
 So he be safe, he cares not what becomes
 Of King or country—no, not for them both (xvi.39-43).

Though Navarre assumes Guise's reticence to fight comes from his desire to protect himself, Guise's larger political standing is at stake as well. At the start of his political career as a Neo-Stoic, Henri IV's friend and spokesman du Plessis-Mornay begged permission from Henry III to allow the two enemies to fight a duel in order that they might settle the question of which religion should dominate (Crouzet 86). By dueling, the two men would decide the fate of the kingdom "without further suffering to the Orders and Estates of [the] Kingdom, and without involving a domestic or foreign army, which could only lead to the ruin of the common people" (86). Not only would the battle be fought without risking unnecessary casualties, but in the Neo-Stoic tradition, it would leave the end result in God's hands. Guise of course refused, unwilling to give Navarre the honor of becoming either a divinely appointed monarch or a martyr. Nevertheless, the Stoic philosophy that made Navarre willing to sacrifice himself for the French people went far towards earning him the respect of his fellow countrymen.

Navarre's second speech in Marlowe's dramatization of the eve of Coutras reinforces the young king's desire to find a solution to the civil wars that will keep the casualties low. In this speech Navarre does not claim righteousness as he did previously, but instead laments the tragedy of the long civil wars, stating "How many noble men have lost their lives/ In prosecution of these cruel arms/ Is ruth and almost death to call to mind" (xviii.9-11). By having Navarre express this "ruth," or a matter for sorrow or regret, Marlowe grounds him in reason (xviii.11). Navarre is upset that violence is the medium through which French Catholics and Protestants must negotiate but sees no alternative, his offer of a duel having

been refused. This line establishes Navarre as a king who cares about the people of France, and would see a ceasefire for their sake.

Navarre's mourning of the dead lost in battle also mirrors a line spoken by Charles IX right before the massacre occurs. Catherine urges Charles to set into motion the massacre of the Huguenots, to which the king replies

...My heart relents that noble men,
 Only corrupted in religion,
 Ladies of honour, knights, and gentlemen,
 Should for their conscience taste such ruthless ends (iv.9-12).

That Charles' sentiment is repeated by Navarre before the battle at Coutras shows a resignation to violence on both sides of the fighting, a response made more poignant by the shared rhetorical use of "ruth" (xviii.11) and "ruthless" (iv.12). Though "ruth" becomes associated with a Protestant regret for the deaths occurring in the wars and "ruthless" with the behavior of the Catholic zealots who participated in the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre, these rhetorical instances show that both Charles and Navarre regret the violence occurring between their countrymen. This instance of shared rhetoric is important because of the influence of Neo-Stoicism on French diplomacy later in the century. The rise of Neo-Stoicism brought not only reason to the religio-political atmosphere in France, but also a shared language that facilitated better understanding, creating an increased chance of success for the *politique*. At the time depicted in Marlowe's play, however, no peaceful end is in sight due to the fact that neither religion has triumphed. Because of the desire for an absolutist monarchy as a result of the shift to Stoic philosophy, only one religion can reign supreme in

France, be it Catholicism or Protestantism. Should these events come to pass the religious-political situation in France would come to mirror England's, with one religion predominant and the other subdued to the point of silence. One side must capitulate, and as both believe to be doing God's will, neither feels as though they can yield.

The goal of a single reigning religion in France also helps Navarre justify the bloody fighting on behalf of the Huguenots. Before Coutras, Navarre tells Pleshé and Bartus that

...Sith in a quarrel just and right
 We undertake to manage these our wars
 Against the proud disturbers of the faith—
 I mean the Guise, the Pope, and King of Spain,
 Who set themselves to tread us under foot
 And rent our true religion from this land (xvi.1-6).

The Huguenot's "quarrel" is "just and right" (xvi.1), considering that the Guise, the Pope, and Spain want to "rend our true religion from this land" (xvi.6). Navarre continues his speech seemingly in an aside, which editor H.J. Oliver renders in parentheses: "(But for you know our quarrel is no more/ But to defend their strange inventions/ Which they will put us to with sword and fire)" (xvi.7-9). Here Navarre states plainly that the Huguenots are only acting in self defense in the war. By using the same word "quarrel" both in the opening line and the parenthetical defense, Marlowe links the two phrases so that "to defend" (xvi.8) becomes "just and right" (xvi.1). Marlowe's representation is quite true to real events; Henri IV fought defensively after his much smaller army was chased by Joyeuse. Also, Knecht notes that preceding the start of the battle, the Protestant soldiers "offered up prayers to the Almighty

and sang the 118th Psalm," which adheres nicely to Marlowe's Navarre's giving the glory to God (229). In this way, the Neo-Stoic tenet of reliance on God's providence becomes associated with the English perspective that the Protestant cause is the one that should succeed. And God may have indeed been on their side; though Navarre and his men were outnumbered they carried the day, killing Joyeuse in the battle.

Henri IV's success in battle was a major proponent in helping him secure a position as a candidate to the throne. Not only was Henri admired for his prowess on the battlefield, he also utilized a focus on defense and mercy as a tactic while leader of the rebel forces and after he became king. Often vastly outnumbered by his enemies and forced to keep on the move, Henri IV was usually on the defensive as he tried to unite France. Because of his valor in battle and kind treatment of soldiers, Henri IV became known as a particularly benevolent military leader (Knecht 248). One English quarto translated from French stresses that Henri IV would "rather win his rebellious people by *mercie* then (sic) by *rigour* (Concerning the Yeelding). By emphasizing his kindness, the young king established himself as the providential king that Tacitus' Stoicism had come to require.

Henri's benevolence translates to Navarre's character as well. In his speech before Coutras, Navarre addresses his love of his countrymen while reinforcing his reliance on God. "We must with resolute minds resolve to fight," Navarre tells his men, "In honour of our God and country's good" (xvi.10-11). Not only does Navarre want to succeed on behalf of his religion, his focus on the "country's good" suggests that peace in France is a high priority for him (xvi.11). Henri often went into battle alongside his men, released prisoners without ransom, and stopped his men from pillaging as his opponents were his own countrymen.

Mark Greengrass argues that Henri's approach was a wise one due to the political implications in his own country; "in order to gain the psychological advantage from his military endeavors," he says, "he had to demonstrate magnanimity" (75). For Henri IV to be successful he had to conquer the hearts of the French as well as their armies. By eschewing benevolence on the field of battle, Henri IV furthered his reliability as a Neo-Stoic and built his reputation as a kind commander.

When Marlowe composed *The Massacre*, Henri IV's reputation as a benevolent and prudent leader had extended beyond France into England due to a strong interest in the success of the Huguenots and a rise in journalism. In hopes that Henri would be able to take control of his country and make Protestantism the official religion, Elizabeth I had been supplying the Huguenot leader with money and troops since the mid-1580s. Because of England's religio-political interest in their neighbors on the continent, the French wars were a hot topic in Marlowe's home country, and the playwright's depiction of Henri IV on the battlefield would hold particular interest due to the English people's own fears of war. Paul J. Voss claims that "for many Elizabethans, civil war existed as a real threat to domestic security and tranquility;" France had become an example of what could happen at home should England not find a way to resolve certain problems (7). With Elizabeth's lack of an heir and reluctance to marry, the question of succession caused the English no end of anxiety. Likewise, Catholic schemes like the Babington Plot to assassinate Elizabeth and put Mary Queen of Scots on the throne served as a reminder that religious tension still bubbled under the surface of their own country. These concerns combined with the large number of English

sons sent to support Henri IV resulted in English popular interest becoming centered on the events of the French Wars.

Because of the great amount of troops and money put towards furthering her interests on the continent, the wars in France were largely responsible for the takeoff of the news industry in early modern England. Although news had been printed in England before, it was not a commodity; during Marlowe's composition of *The Massacre*, however, "the ongoing struggles in France in the early 1590s, complete with the participation of thousands of English soldiers, both created the enormous interest and indirectly supplied the product to satisfy that interest" (27). Business boomed in the form of news and propaganda. News quartos were small and written in common, straightforward language in order to appeal to a wider audience (Voss 79). Also, the printing press made it possible for greater access due to proliferation (81). As it was so easy to obtain news quartos their audience was large, comprised of everyone from the lower classes to the nobility (81). Even Lord Burghley, trusted advisor to the Queen, surreptitiously published propaganda during the scare from the Spanish Armada (Woodfield 25-29). News pamphlets propagandistic and otherwise experienced a surge in popularity because of their mass production and wide availability.

Widespread, too, was the public fascination with Henri IV. The French king rapidly reached legendary proportions in England, and his bravery and kindness were among the traits most commonly highlighted in the quartos (105). John Wolfe, one of the more popular printers, even circulated quartos about the Protestant king containing woodcuts of St. George slaying a dragon. That a correlation arose between Henri IV and the patron saint of England is indicative of the Huguenot leader's celebrity status on the island (Voss 88-98). England's

alliance with France was rare enough considering the long history of enmity between them (Doran, Foreign Policy 1); this high praise of a French king illustrates the importance of England's ties of consciousness to France. Because of Henri's fame, Marlowe had to be careful when incorporating the king into his play lest he risk his own reputation by damaging that of the Huguenot leader's. Reiterating the concept of Navarre as a benevolent figure who only causes pain and death when he has no choice reinforces what Marlowe's audience would have known of Henri IV and wins their hearts as well.

The final scene examines Navarre's role as a gracious general and a Stoic. King Henry apologizes to Navarre for the war and offers him "all the honours and affections/ That ever I vouchsaf'd my dearest friends" (xxiv.7-8). Although his glories on the battlefield are great, Navarre declines, saying "It is enough if that Navarre may be/ Esteemed faithful to the King of France,/ Whose service he may still command till death" (xxiv.9-11). Because of his Protestant allegiances, Navarre remains in great danger, and King Henry himself has been criticized by the Catholic League and deemed a heretic. Both men are outcasts; yoking himself so closely to the king will do Navarre little good, and may in fact hurt his reputation. Henri III was criticized for showing favor to his *mignons*, who were often cited as sexual partners of the king as a way to slander his name in a time when sodomy retained serious political implications. The king's sexual practices aside, the French did not appreciate Henri III's elevation of these friends through political advancement. By refusing the king's offer, Navarre distances himself just enough to make sure that he is never considered to be one of Henry's *mignons*; his alliance with King Henry is strictly military. Navarre exemplifies prudence in his response to King Henry's offers. Through his careful approach to the

situation, Navarre is able to gain the help of the king's military strength while maintaining his autonomy.

Marlowe's emphasis on the Neo-Stoic prudence that Navarre utilizes in his rhetoric relates to England as well as to the French wars. To protect her interests on the continent, England had become heavily engaged in supporting Henri IV. Because Seneca's Stoic influence in England coincided with Tacitus' rise in France, Neo-Stoicism arose as a clear diplomatic strategy between the two nations. With Spain continually trying to control the Low Countries, England needed the French Huguenots to provide a buffer zone along the border. The threat from Spain was like cause for worry for the French Protestants; the Netherlands would provide a perfect foothold for the Catholic empire to gain access to both France and England and therefore could not be risked. The safety of the Protestant religion was paramount.

At times, however, Henri's interest wavered from the Spanish Parma's attempts to take the Low Countries, causing tension between him and Elizabeth. Frustrated by Henri's lack of attention to the Channel coast, in 1591 Elizabeth pulled the Earl of Essex and his company from France and refused help when Henri's close advisor du Plessis-Mornay was sent to ask for more aid (Parmelee 19). As Henri IV increasingly considered conversion to Catholicism as a way to unify his kingdom in the early 1590s, England's nervousness escalated. Neo-Stoicism provided the perfect answer to these political problems because it transcended the violence that often accompanied religious politics. If Henri IV could unite the French people by encouraging them to think beyond religious differences and do so as a Protestant, then England would have a powerful ally on the continent against Catholic Spain.

If Henri became a Catholic, however, England's nearness to the two countries could become dangerous. As concern mounted in England, it became absolutely necessary that Elizabeth rely on the Neo-Stoic philosophy she had used in the past as foreign policy to help cement her alliance with Henri IV. In light of this tension, Marlowe's representation of Henri de Navarre as a Neo-Stoic and heavy endorsement of this rhetoric and philosophy becomes politically motivated. Marlowe must endorse his country's diplomatic policy while taking care to not damage the reputation of the French king upon who so much depended.

Navarre as an Emotional Rhetor

Although Marlowe is careful not to mar Henri IV's reputation in his depiction of Navarre, his plans for the character go further than simply defining him as a Protestant hero. Marlowe also wants to espouse Neo-Stoicism as an exemplary philosophy and rhetorical form, and as such he allows the character of Navarre to become considerably weakened when he succumbs to his emotions. Because of their *pathos*, Navarre's more overwrought speeches are his most dramatically compelling, however, and it becomes easy to read Navarre's embellished orations as Marlowe condoning the violence his character suggests in these weaker moments. Julia Briggs addresses the negative reading of Navarre, saying "it is tempting to interpret him as yet another political operator, exploiting religious fervor to bring him one step nearer the crown, in the manner of the Guise" (272-3). To establish Navarre and Guise as opposing forces however, Marlowe must juxtapose them. One way to do so is by creating parallels between them. Whereas Guise always falls back on emotional rhetoric, Navarre only does so when under some kind of pressure like the death of his mother or the eve of battle. By allowing Navarre these moments to falter, Marlowe emphasizes the king's

humanity while still endorsing the principles of Neo-Stoicism put in place by Elizabeth.

Also, this treatment of Navarre lends him an ambiguity that allows Marlowe to illustrate the fears in England concerning the king's imminent conversion without openly criticizing Henri IV in a way that would get him censored or punished.

Marlowe shows Navarre giving into his emotions several times to demonstrate how detrimental this technique is to the Huguenot leader. One such moment occurs when Navarre's zealous Protestant mother dies from smelling poisoned gloves sent to her by Guise. When the Old Queen dies, Navarre cries

My mother poisoned here before my face!
 O gracious God, what times are these?
 O grant, sweet God, my days may end with hers,
 That I with her may die and live again (iii.21-24)

Although Marlowe depicts Navarre as calm during the deaths of Charles IX and King Henry, here he begins to despair. Navarre's use of anaphora, or repetition of the first word of a line, in the "O"s of his implorations to God show heightened emotion; Navarre grieves and begs here unlike anywhere else in the play (iii.22-3). "What times are these?" is a question equally as dramatic (iii.22). Navarre not only grieves for his mother, but goes so far as to ask God to take him as well. By asking for his death, the king is careless. Navarre, along with Admiral Coligny, is the leader of the Huguenots. He has a grand purpose to fulfill, and he will become the Henri IV who will lead the Huguenot army to war against the Catholic League. Though seeing his mother murdered is horrific, Navarre is thoughtless in his quickness to despair. The Admiral and Condé, his supporters, are with him, and it is irresponsible for a leader to

crumble in front of his followers. Crouzet posits that Henri IV even became associated with Hercules, evoking images of Godhood as "the king embodies life and the principle of life, Reason" (94). Because so much rides on his adherence to Neo-Stoicism and reason, Navarre's despair is not only irrational but also potentially damaging politically. Despite his grief, the murder of Navarre's mother is an act of war; now is not the time for mourning, but for action.

The historical Navarre's mother, Jeanne d'Albret was a deeply devoted Protestant who adhered to her faith despite her husband's indecisiveness about which sect to support. While plotting her murder, Guise describes the Old Queen as "that huge blemish in our eye/ That makes these upstart heresies in France" (ii.22). When Antoine de Bourbon died, Henri came in line to the throne of Navarre, and converted to Protestantism under the urgings of his mother (Frieda 167). The young Henri was introduced to the Huguenot leaders through the Queen as well (195). Both of these facts could be construed as d'Albret creating "upstart heresies," or even her giving birth to Henri IV (ii.22). Because the young Henri de Navarre was in line for the succession should Charles IX die, Catherine de Medici had a great interest in the alliance of d'Albret and her son. When asked to use her influence to calm her fellow Protestants, however, d'Albret told the Queen Mother "Madame, if I had my son and all the kingdoms in the world within my hands, I would rather cast them to the bottom of the sea than lose my salvation" (161), creating a "blemish" in the talks of order (ii.21). Though Marlowe's scene relies mostly on Navarre's anguish over his mother's death and does not dwell on her religious beliefs, Navarre's inability to deal with his mother's murder in a Stoic fashion may echo fears from England concerning his likely conversion to Catholicism. Marlowe spends substantial time making a correlation between Neo-Stoicism and

Protestantism because of England's interests in a French Protestant king. However, Navarre's quick capitulation to his emotions and readiness to despair, a mortal sin in both religions, suggests just how quickly the English feared that Henri would convert under pressure.

Navarre's reaction to his mother's death in the play is made to look even worse by his reliance on his new wife, the daughter of Catherine de Medici. Immediately following his outburst, Queen Margaret tells him

Let not this heavy chance, my dearest Lord,
 (For whose effects my soul is massacred)
 Infect thy gracious breast with fresh supply
 To aggravate our sudden misery (iii.25-28).

Margaret describes her soul as "massacred" for her Lord's sake, creating a preview of the brutal slaying of the Huguenots that is to come shortly (iii.26). Clearly, she is aggrieved over these horrible circumstances just as her husband is, yet she asks him to not allow it to "infect thy gracious breast" and make the situation worse than it has already become (iii.27). Though Navarre is supposed to be the Neo-Stoic king, here he falters, forcing Margaret to be the strong one. Though Margaret is his wife, the young king still capitulates to a woman who has been a Catholic her entire life, providing another nod to England's fear that Henri would turn to conversion in desperation. Navarre gives into his emotions and is ready to surrender everything, and his wife, a Valois and a potential enemy, must pull him to his feet using the calm rhetoric he fails to employ.

Navarre becomes exceedingly emotional again in response to battle before Coutras. Early in the scene Navarre claims that he and his fellow Huguenots are victims of oppression.

However, when Navarre hears Bartus' statement about showing his skill in battle and right to the throne, the renowned Neo-Stoic slips back into emotional rhetoric, picking up on Bartus' "bloody" style (xvi.16). Navarre tells Bartus "the power of vengeance now encamps itself/ Upon the haughty mountains of my breast" (xvi.20-21). The word "encamp" creates an appropriate military analogy considering the king's current position on the field of battle (xvi.20). Nevertheless, Navarre's words here are troubling. He refers specifically to the "power of vengeance" (xvi.20) as though revenge lends the vengeful a kind of superiority; the feel of supremacy continues in the next line when the king refers to his breast as "haughty" (xvi.21). By having Navarre speak these words, Marlowe has the king betray himself as it is the Protestant leader who deigns himself "haughty" (xvi.21). Clearly Navarre knows himself well enough to see these chinks in his own armor. However, he makes no effort to correct himself, continuing in a bloody rhetoric.

If the proceeding lines betray a dark side of the king's character, the speech does not improve as it progresses. Navarre calls upon a dark power in "the power of vengeance" (xvi.20), using uncharacteristically vivid imagery to personify it as a power who

Plays with her gory colours of revenge,
Whom I respect as leaves of boasting green
That change their colour when the winter comes,
When I shall vaunt as victor in revenge (xvi.20-5).

Though Oliver dismisses the repetition of "revenge" as poor reporting, that Navarre has become primarily concerned with vengeance is clear from this passage (xvi.23, 25). Navarre's interest in this power's "gory colours of revenge" shows that the king desires a

particularly bloody vengeance (xvi.22). Gory colors are reminiscent of dark colors, blacks and reds and the colors of death. By contrast, however, Navarre sees these colors as "leaves of boasting green/ That change their colors when the winter comes," suggesting life and youth (xvi.23-4). However, this life is not positive but conceited; it is a "boasting green" (xvi.23) that calls to mind the "haughty mountains" of the earlier lines (xvi.21). Navarre does not view the colors of battle as the colors of destruction, but rather sees in them pride and life. With the coming of the winter, or the bad news that Guise is trying to keep him from the crown, Navarre's green colors of youthful innocence wither and die. He is ready to take his revenge and make Guise suffer.

Success on Navarre's part to defeat Guise will only be partly successful if he allows his emotions to command him. By saying "I shall vaunt as victor in revenge" Navarre acknowledges that his only victory will be in vengeance (xvi.25). Though he can adequately defend his people and eradicate the threatening Guise, as a Neo-Stoic, Navarre should not view vengeance as a victory. The word "vaunt" is yet another tie to the boasting haughtiness Navarre displays earlier (xvi.25). Navarre must exert control over his emotions or he will have already lost. If Navarre cannot manage his lust for vengeance, he risks undoing the political reputation he has developed as a tolerant and benevolent king and leader. He must reign in his emotions or he will find himself victor of nothing.

Navarre is weakened substantially as well before his victory in becoming king of France. When King Henry dies in the last scene of the play, the audience catches another glimpse of Navarre's bad side. Despite the vengeful cries coming from Epernoun and Bartus, Navarre remains calm and rational throughout Henry's long death, though he weeps for the

King. The final lines, however, show a shadow of the same Navarre who swore vengeance at Coutras. After Navarre gives the order for the King's body to be interred, he tells the men onstage as well as the audience

And then I vow for 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 (xxiv.108-111)!

Here Navarre does not state, but emotionally "vows," revenge again in nearly as bloody terms as before and seems deadly serious in his dramatic threat to the Catholics (xxiv.108).

This speech is cruel and bloody in stark contrast to Navarre's oft used Stoic rhetoric.

Repeating the word "death," Navarre emphasizes where his thoughts lie (xxiv.108, 111).

Navarre shows no hint of the benevolent general here, only a determination to make his and King Henry's enemies suffer. Also, Navarre does not appeal to God's aid in this speech as he often does elsewhere, separating it strongly from his reason-based rhetoric at Coutras and accentuating Marlowe's parallel of Navarre and Guise. As so often happens when Navarre resorts to overly emotional rhetoric, the effect is not good; the speech provides a chilling end to an already gruesome play. Navarre in these final moments almost mirrors his enemy Guise, and his speech is matching in vengefulness to any uttered by his nemesis.

Navarre and Guise

Throughout the play, Navarre is constantly pitted against Guise in terms of rhetorical strategy. Guise's rhetoric brims with emotion, allowing his deliverance of some of the finest speeches in the play. By contrast, Navarre's rhetoric is Stoic with the exception of those

moments in which his emotions get the better of him. Although they act consistently as foils to one another throughout *The Massacre*, in certain moments Marlowe brings the two rivals close in ways that allow them either to emphasize their differences or make them indistinguishable. Andrew M. Kirk also notes Navarre's similarity to Guise in terms of rhetoric, saying that his speech "casts doubt on his role as either passive Christian or as dynamic leader, indicating instability in the self underlying both roles" (94). By highlighting Navarre as an ambiguous character, Marlowe reflects English anxiety over Navarre's conversion decision. In the murder of Navarre's teachers by Guise, the rousing of Navarre's vengeance by Bartus, and the similarities of Navarre's final speech with Guise's first, Marlowe presents the two men in relation to each other in ways that help to cement Navarre's character while endorsing the Neo-Stoic rhetoric he tries so hard to pursue.

Guise and Navarre were in opposition to one another as much in real life as they are in Marlowe's play, and Marlowe's characterizations of their rhetoric matches their historical counterparts' approaches to the French wars. Several scenes of the play addressed above depict Navarre as a Neo-Stoic in various ways and act in conjunction with his religious views as a Protestant and Calvinist who links prudence with providence in his political personality. Likewise, Guise's overdramatic and emotionally charged language links him with the English Protestant perspective of the Catholic League: that of the forceful and ruthlessly violent zealot. Reflecting both the interests of the mob and the government, the English news quartos depicted the English soldiers and French Huguenots as valiant and magnanimous, while every vile deed done by the Catholic League was recorded in grisly detail. Parmelee discusses the printing of pamphlets "anti-League, anti-Guise, anti-Jesuit, anti-papal and anti-

Spanish" that fueled opinions "against nearly every source of England's anxiety and hatred in a dangerous time" (31). The flood of news reports and propaganda centered around proceedings on the continent provided plenty of material for a young poet and playwright like Marlowe and made the French wars the subject of much anxiety and excitement. As Paul H. Kocher's early work on *The Massacre* shows⁴, Marlowe utilized many of the anti-League documents as sources for the play, and the polemic nature of many of the pamphlets contributed to the more polarized aspects of the work.

Navarre and Guise's approaches to the religious aspect of the wars are reflected in their speech and actions in the play. While Guise refuses to reconcile in his orchestration of the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre, Navarre adopts a different approach through his kindness on the battlefield. Although no question existed that there could be only one primary religion in France, Henri IV often showed a willingness to forgive the French Catholics their part in the war should he become king, a tactic not employed by the merciless Guise. Crouzet puts forth that Stoicism may have been the active idea behind this conciliation; many moderate Catholics, the *politiques*, were frightened of the power wielded by the Guise and the League, and were willing to help anyone who was against them (85). Of course, in the play Guise's exuberant approach is reflected in his embellished rhetoric, making him the more dramatically compelling of the two characters. Navarre's more prudent rhetoric makes him less interesting than his opponent from a dramatic perspective, but helps to highlight Marlowe's endorsement of reason over violence.

⁴ See Paul H. Kocher's "Contemporary Pamphlet Backgrounds for Marlowe's *The Massacre at Paris Part I*". *Modern Language Quarterly* 8.2 (1947):151-74. *EBSCOhost*. Web. 3 December 2011, and "Part II". *Modern Language Quarterly* 8.3 (1947): 309-319. *EBSCOhost*. Web. 3 December 2011.

The scene in which Guise orders Navarre's teachers to be killed connects the men in terms of philosophy and estimation of one another. Guise has murdered the Huguenot leader's mother; however this scene is the first time in the play where Guise actively threatens someone in a close position to Navarre in front of the young king. Nonetheless, the threatened individuals are teachers of the young Navarre, a note made particularly interesting by Marlowe's stressed alignment of different schools of philosophy and rhetoric with the Catholic League and the Huguenots. When Navarre and Condy leave the stage, Guise tells Navarre's schoolmasters "Come, sirs,/ I'll whip you to death with my poniard's point" (ix.78-9). Guise's words here illustrate his regular use of rhetoric; instead of simply being blunt as Navarre might, Guise throws in a twisted joke. Having just murdered the Protestant philosopher and logician Peter Ramus, who had also broken from tradition in his teachings, Guise has spent a whole scene mocking a teacher by reference to his profession. Here Guise employs the same strategy with the schoolmasters. Oliver says that by saying he will "whip" them (ix.79), Guise plays on the image of a schoolmaster whipping his students (Marlowe 120). Since the placement of a joke into a moment as grave as a murder is inappropriate to Stoicism, the line defines Guise as an emotional rhetor and sets him apart from Navarre. The killing of Navarre's tutors is also symbolic; because of the rhetorical battle being fought between Navarre and Guise throughout the play, Guise's slaughter of the men who have been teaching Navarre the Neo-Stoic principles he has been using as armor suggests that Guise is a man who will stop at nothing to ensure his own victory.

Because of Guise's ambition and complete intolerance of others, it seems strange that he allows Navarre and Condy to leave without making an attempt to harm them. Oliver lends

some clarification to the act; one of Marlowe's sources⁵ claims that "Navarre and Condé were spared at the time of the Massacre because they were young and it was thought that they could be persuaded, or forced, to become Catholics" (Marlowe 120). Also, it has been suggested that they perhaps joined in a Catholic mass to save themselves (120). Oliver says that the lack of an attack on Navarre and Condé implies that Guise would not touch Navarre, however Guise often dismisses the young king in his speeches and does not seem to consider him a worthwhile foe (120). Also, Briggs claims that by placing Navarre with his tutors in this scene, Marlowe refers indirectly to the king's youth (273). Guise's lack of concern for Navarre's survival suggests that at this point he does not think the young king an enemy worth his worry.

Guise's ruthlessness in ambition is easily paralleled with Navarre's vengeance speeches at Coutras and at the play's close. Until Bartus riles him before the battle with Joyeux, Navarre has been content to continue in his long practiced Neo-Stoicism, making his characteristic claims of God's mercy and righteousness as reasons for the Huguenots' success. When Bartus mentions Navarre's claim to the throne and Guise's attempts to take control of it, however, Navarre becomes angry. He tells the messenger who has come to inform them of the approaching army "I would the Guise in [Joyeux'] stead might have come" (xvi.39), and claims that Guise "cares not what becomes/ Of King or country—no, not for them both" so long as he protects himself (xvi.42-3). By having Navarre comment on Guise's desire for the throne so closely after his own right to succession has been mentioned, Marlowe juxtaposes the two characters as potential successors to the crown. Marlowe's focus on this dimension of Navarre and Guise's relationship on the eve of battle lends yet another parallel to the already

⁵ Varamund.

closely configured characters. Navarre and Guise have a common goal, though their means of achieving it differ.

Showing that Navarre and Guise share the goal of ultimately ascending the throne also lends ambiguity to Navarre's character, an unsettling lack of distinction that comes forth plainly in the king's last speech. Guise is dead and King Henry has passed the crown to Navarre; the young Protestant has won the fight for kingship. Nevertheless Navarre is vengeful, spurred by Henry's murder, and his bloody rhetoric leaves the audience to wonder if his succession is a good thing. Instead of vowing to use his newfound power to unite his country, he "vow[s] for to revenge [Henry's] death" by taking on Rome (xxiv.108). This approach will more likely enhance division than unify. Henri IV's fate was unsure at the time that Marlowe composed the play. Though the English hoped that he would remain true to his Protestant faith, the League applied substantial pressure to get him to end the wars through conversion. Navarre's final lines in the play leave the audience with an ending that is not what they were expecting, and certainly not what they hoped by their utilization of emotional, warlike rhetoric as opposed to the rhetoric of peace. In his campaign to win the hearts and minds of the French people, Henri IV was often reported to have promised sanctuary to the Catholics, and here he smoothly breaks that vow, much in the way that England feared he would break his vow to maintain his religious beliefs in the face of opposition.

Guise's analogous speech occurs early in his first scene of the play. Though Guise's emotional rhetoric sharply contrasts Navarre's Neo-Stoicism, this particular speech provides damning parallels for Navarre's ascension speech through shared discussion of Catholic

forces. Guise longs to "scale the high Pyramides,/ And thereon set the diadem of France" (ii.40-1), and plans to do so with "a largess from the Pope,/ A pension and a dispensation too" (ii.59-60). He also mentions that

Paris hath full five hundred colleges,
As monasteries, priories, abbeys, and halls,
Wherein are thirty thousand able men,
Besides a thousand sturdy student Catholics,
And more—of my knowledge, in one cloister keeps
Five hundred fat Franciscan friars and priests

that he can utilize "to bring the will of our desires to end" (ii.77-84). Guise's rhetoric here is typically overblown; when discussing the Catholics at his disposal he takes ten lines to say what Navarre will say in two. Since Guise dies at the end of the play, Navarre cannot take his revenge on him; however, he can punish the French Catholics who served the Guise as well as the "popish prelates" in Rome who funded the Catholic leader, the titles of whom are listed in Guise's extensive soliloquy (xxiv.109). As both leaders make mention of succession alongside employment or punishment of Catholic forces, they become almost conflated.

Marlowe often makes the effort to show how Protestants and Catholics have much in common as a way to suggest that peace can be found. However in doing so, Marlowe also depicts the fear of many English that the differences between the religions were not stark enough to keep Henri IV from seeking that peace in the form of conversion. By having Navarre and Guise use the same kinds of violent rhetoric in their speeches on succession,

Navarre is made to look once again like his enemy Guise even as his speech stays sparse, and employment of religion in their schemes becomes necessity.

Guise's speech also proves the accuracy of Navarre's estimation at Coutras that the Catholic leader is manipulating religion to his own ends. In his soliloquy, Guise says

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.62-6).

Here Guise admits to his manipulation of religion, calling it a devil in a particularly dramatic flourish. Guise wants to sit on the throne of France, and the civil wars on religion provide him the perfect opportunity to gain the power to do so. Also, he has vowed to manipulate king and country in order to get what he wants. Navarre, by contrast, only wants the best for his country throughout the play, always acting in support of the current king except when those in power actively attempt to harm him and not portraying any intent to punish the Catholics so much as to promote peace. In his final speech, however, any pretense of a peaceful resolution on religious grounds has vanished. Navarre is ready to make the Catholics suffer for the assassination of King Henry. Perhaps his wariness of Guise is well-founded; though they are cast as opposites in rhetoric as well as in religion, when Navarre resorts to emotional rhetoric he and Guise start to look astoundingly alike.

Though the two characters share many similarities, one of the ways in which they contrast sharply is in their estimation of one another. Navarre's assessment of Guise's

intentions is fairly consistent with his enemy's character throughout the play; however, Guise makes mistakes in his evaluation of Navarre. While Navarre does not ever underestimate his enemy, Guise is often dismissive of Navarre. In his soliloquy in Scene II, Guise muses

Navarre, Navarre—'tis but a nook of France,
 Sufficient yet for such a petty King
 That, with a rabblement of his heretics,
 Blinds Europe's eyes and troubleth our estate:
 Him will we-- *Pointing to his sword.*
 But first let's follow those in France
 That hinder our possession to the crown (ii.88-94).

These lines are the only ones in his seventy-four line soliloquy that Guise deigns to give to the young king who will become his religio-political and rhetorical rival. Considering that Navarre will prove a hurdle in his plans to ascend the throne, Guise's dismissal of him here is coincidental. His embellished rhetoric dwarfs that of the young king's, lending him a false sense of security. Using metonymy, Guise conflates Navarre with the "nook of France" that he rules (ii.88), suggesting that his religio-political power is comparable to the size of the state of the small province and determines him the "petty" leader of a "rabblement of... heretics" (ii.89-90). Guise acknowledges Navarre as a minor annoyance, as he "blinds Europe's eyes and troubleth our estate" (ii.91), but ultimately he chooses to focus his attention on "those in France/ That hinder our possession to the crown" (ii.93-4). Not only does Guise not think Navarre has any claim to the throne of France, he does not even consider him a threat. Navarre and Guise never meet in battle in Marlowe's play; in fact, they do not see one another after the murder of Navarre's tutors. Neither is Navarre the one to kill

Guise and end the Catholic leader's manipulation of the King for his own profit.

Nevertheless, his military victories in the field like that against Joyeux and his eventual ascent into King Henry's confidence proves that Guise has underestimated the "petty" king of Navarre (ii.89).

The dismissal of the young Navarre by his enemies is significant in terms of Henri IV's Neo-Stoic approach to relying on providence. While Guise is busy considering him a mere annoyance, Navarre is able to raise an army, and will eventually gain an ally in England in the mid 1580s. Thanks to du Plessis-Mornay's brilliant public relations work on behalf of the Huguenot leader, Henri IV would be able to convince a large number of the French people that he was intended to be king. Crouzet describes the effect that Henri IV's success on the battlefield coupled with his endorsement of Neo-Stoicism had on his fellow countrymen, saying that "the aim of the prevailing polemic is to persuade [the French] of the validity of the theory of a royalty of Reason: they must obey God whose revealed will is destiny or providence " (91). Because of the benevolence he showed to his enemies in battle and his professed tolerance for Catholics in lieu of the end of the wars, Henri IV already had much of the populace on his side. Navarre's continued survival despite the ferocity of his enemies is yet another way that Marlowe furthers the concept that Henri has the divine right to rule as the King of France.

Henri IV would prove to be the king that France desperately needed: one who would unify the people once again under a single religion. In June 1593, Henri converted to Catholicism, proving all of England's worst fears true a mere month after Marlowe's violent death. Marlowe's character Navarre relies heavily on the Neo-Stoic principles that allowed

his real life counterpart to win the hearts of the French people and established him as a viable future king. At times, however, Marlowe also allows Navarre to stumble; like any ruler, he is not infallible. In contrast to his Catholic nemesis Guise, however, Navarre becomes a mouthpiece for Protestant England as well as Neo-Stoicism. His last speech, as vengeful and bloody as it is, is simultaneously unembellished and straightforward, signaling that the reason-based rhetoric of the Stoics will ultimately triumph over that of the emotional and violent Guise. After Henri's conversion, Elizabeth I would find a new diplomatic rhetoric in her translation of Boethius, and the language of love would come to be of more importance than that of reason (Shenk 141-158). The rhetoric of reason was the primary diplomatic language employed by the queen and Henri IV during the French wars, however, and Marlowe's *Massacre* adheres to and condones this policy in his portrayal of Navarre.

Navarre's characterization as a Neo-Stoic king comes partially from Marlowe's juxtaposition of the young king with the emotive and dangerous Duc de Guise. The Duc, though a villainous character, is arguably the star of the show, though in what respect and to what end is suspect. Throughout the play, Guise often uses his brand of warlike rhetoric to control those around him, and his downfall is preceded by his loss of this control. In this chapter, I have characterized Guise as an emotional rhetor in contrast with the Stoic Navarre. In examining Guise's use of this emotional rhetoric of control, it becomes clear that Guise, like Navarre, is an ambiguous character. Marlowe's Catholic duke is simultaneously a villain and a hero who raises in his own narrative control questions concerning the control of Elizabethan politics on the stage.

CHAPTER THREE. "...I DAILY WIN WITH WORDS:" GUISE'S RHETORICAL CONTROL AND THE POLITICS OF PERFORMANCE

Charismatic and controlling in his cruelty, Marlowe's Duc de Guise is easily the most fascinating character in *The Massacre at Paris*. The dramatically compelling nature of this charming villain has caused critics much consternation. Wilbur Sanders opposes Guise's role as too strong, claiming that in the confined space of the play "virtue cannot be other than colourless—it is defined by its passivity in the hands of vice—and vice, consequently, usurps the stage" (35). That Navarre's goodness is apparent only next to the cruelty of Guise is a criticism scholars have had of the play since Sanders' reading. Likewise, Paul H. Kocher finds Marlowe's portrayal of Guise overwhelming, claiming that the character loses all semblance of humanity and maintains too great of a presence in the play (*Francois* 367). These readings certainly cause alarm. What are we to make of a character whose treachery is so appealing, or whose cruel machinations are allowed to dominate the play? It seems unlikely that the play would be allowed to be performed if it showed so much support for the leader of the French Catholic cause considering the substantial support that Elizabeth I had shown for Henri IV and his band of Huguenot rebels.

The answer may then lie in re-envisioning Marlowe's Guise. Though scholars like Julia Briggs have viewed Guise as a sort of anti-hero, suggesting that Guise's dramatic death has "the specific intention of swinging our sympathies away from Henry and towards the Guise and the murdered Cardinal, his brother" to even the score between the two warring factions, it may be that actually the tyrant is meant to be despised (265). Throughout the play, Marlowe gives the audience clues as to how to interpret the wily leader of the Catholic

League, particularly in his reliance on emotional rhetoric and his inexorable loss of control. Both these character flaws result in the villain's ultimate fall from grace and help establish Guise as a character that the audience should not love, but rather love to hate.

Because Guise's performance onstage is such a contentious debate in scholarship, this chapter will address his role along the lines of politics of performance. Strict rules concerned politically sensitive material in early modern England and Marlowe would not have put such a charismatic character on stage without creating boundaries for him, especially when casting Guise as the great villain of the past fifty years of French history. I will address these performance politics from the perspective of Guise as a character as well as from a more holistic historical perspective using close rhetorical analysis. In seeking to show the strategies that Marlowe uses to keep his villain under control, I will focus closely on rhetorical devices that Guise uses in his attempts to control the other characters as well as the rhetorical choices they make in their efforts to escape the League leader's control. Guise's control of emotional rhetoric in the play is never quite as good as it should be, and he falls rapidly from the eloquence he possesses at the beginning. By looking at Guise's control, or lack thereof, in his rhetoric, the persuasiveness afforded to him by his mastery of *pathos* is undermined. Guise's rhetorical control and mastery of the rhetoric of others is strong in the beginning of the play but plummets rapidly, and when his words fail, he draws his sword, establishing himself as a tyrant and winning no hearts. Although Guise is by far the most charismatic character in the play, he is not admirable. Marlowe's characterization of Guise argues against sympathy for the villain. Guise's rhetoric, while emotionally rousing and passionate, is used for ill means, an end argued against by rhetoricians since Aristotle.

Traditionally, criticism has been appalled and enthralled at Guise, not knowing what to make of Marlowe's seeming favor towards his villain. Andrew M. Kirk emphasizes Guise's dramatic compellation as opposed to the play's hero Navarre, calling the young king "passive" and pointing out that "Navarre must emulate Guise" to gain any kind of foothold in chaotic France (84). Although Navarre has a smattering of good speeches, Guise is awarded the greatest soliloquy of the play, both in length and in quality. Also, his ability to fit so neatly into the niche of the typical Marlovian protagonist makes us want to consider him more of an anti-hero than a villain. Guise is ambitious to a fault, plummeting from the top of Fortune's wheel like Faustus and Tamburlaine. Also like these other famous characters, Guise's name is on the title page of the play, yet he differs from the aforementioned theatrical predecessors in ways that are not always taken into account.

Like Faustus and Tamburlaine, Guise is a charismatic tyrant. His character was most likely acted by Edward Alleyn, the actor employed by the Lord Admiral's Men famous for his performances of Marlowe's ambitious protagonists (Wraight 381). Though Alleyn's portrayal would invite an emotional connection between audience and villain, that connection is more negative than positive in the case of *The Massacre*. Marlowe's other protagonists are tragic heroes. Although they have their faults, the audience is touched by Faustus' thirst for knowledge, by Tamburlaine's rise to power, and by Aeneas' dedication to Troy. Likewise, an audience feels deeply for the wrongs done to Barabas and Edward II. Guise, on the other hand, does little to excite sympathy at any point in the play. His likening of himself to Caesar allows him to emulate the stubbornness and arrogance of the Roman general and serves as a testament to Guise's own pride, and he lacks any semblance of the honor possessed by the

just as ruthless Tamburlaine. When a character like Guise is on the stage, he becomes a vessel for the audience's hatred and frustration. From this perspective, Guise's name on the title page takes on a whole new meaning. Marlowe's other plays are named for their protagonists, like *The Tragical History of the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus* and *Tamburlaine the Great*, emphasizing the tragic character. This play's title places the focus elsewhere, however; instead of being named *The Duke of Guise* the play is called *The Massacre at Paris: With the Death of the Duke of Guise*, focusing on Guise's death and suggesting that the real purpose of Guise's bombastic performance is so that the audience can be rewarded with a public execution of the leader of the Catholic League.

Some knowledge of the play's performance and its reception is also of necessity to the argument against a reading of Guise as a sympathetic character. The Queen's Master of Revels screened all plays before their production, and a play seen to support the Catholic League would be too subversive to allow. Plays that were seditious in any way were not permitted, and the Puritan preacher John Stubbes had lately had his hand cut off for critiquing the Queen's choice of romantic partners in writing (Hillman 117). In addition, the play's popularity should convince any of the opinion that Guise is supposed to be a sympathetic character of their error. The largest grossing play of the season in early 1593, *The Massacre* was hungrily devoured by a Protestant audience fed on anti-League propaganda and French war stories celebrating the Huguenot cause.

Guise's Struggle for Self-Control

The previous chapter established Guise as Navarre's rhetorical opposite. Guise relies on emotional rhetoric to instill fear in his followers while Navarre adheres to the Neo-Stoic

principles that he endorsed as his public persona as well as his personal philosophy. If Navarre's Stoicism establishes him as the hero, then Guise's emotional technique makes him all the more villainous. As Cicero, Quintilian, and Aristotle all warned, *pathos* is a powerful weapon in the hands of an evil man who knows how to use it, and a neutral power such as that of emotional rhetoric can be used to horrible ends. Marlowe's Guise, as we will see in the next chapter, is familiar with the principles of rhetoric established by the ancient Greeks and Romans. This familiarity with rhetorical strategy allows Guise to exercise a profound amount of control over his speech, and often the speech of other characters as well. Guise's introductory scene contains two speeches indicative of his control of language. Both are soliloquies, allowing Marlowe to establish his villain's control of rhetoric away from the other characters.

Guise's first speech brims with the high rhetorical style, intended to sway an audience by playing on their emotions. Carefully placed rhetorical devices appeal to *pathos* while emphasizing the meticulousness with which Guise plans his speeches. Guise's approach, despite being rhetorically tight, would not appear good to an Elizabethan audience. As rhetorical principles were stressed in grammar schools as well as in the universities, few members of Marlowe's audience would fail to recognize Guise's use of emotional rhetoric to ill ends. Guise's manipulation of rhetoric is an attempt to control through fear, a use of *pathos* that ancient teachers of rhetoric warned against. Alone on stage having refused to attend the marriage of Navarre and Margaret, Guise announces:

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 turned to ugly night,
 And night made semblance of the hue of hell;
 This day, this hour, this fatal night,
 Shall fully show the fury of them all (ii.1-8).

In the first six lines, Guise utilizes the construction of anaphora, or the repetition of the first word of a line, reiterating "If ever... And" (ii.1-6). Anaphora is often used in speeches and manifestos to build tension and rile an audience. In this case, Guise uses anaphora to create anxiety in the audience for the revelation of his dastardly deeds. Guise uses anaphora again when he reveals the time that his plans will come to fruition: "This day, this hour, this fatal night" (ii.7). Guise's anaphora drives into the mind of the audience his plans to make those aiming for peace suffer immediately and proclaims him as someone opposed to peace between religious factions. On this particular night, Guise will formulate plans akin to the horrible happenings that he mentioned in the earlier anaphora.

The night is also emphasized by Guise's use of climax, or the ladder figure. This rhetorical device joins two lines of verse together by linking the same word at the end of the first line and the beginning of the second. The figure of the ladder is pertinent to Guise because of his relentless ambition and desire to climb to great heights. Though its primary function is emphasis, typically climax is a rhetorical device used in love songs and bawdy jokes, creating a pun on the name. Guise uses the device here to emphasize the word "night," reiterating through inversion his focus on darkness and his own plans to turn Paris' day into night. "If ever day were turn'd to ugly night,/ And night made semblance of the hue of hell"

Guise says in his last anaphoric construction, making these lines the most important since the opening couplet (ii.5-6). Love and hate are powerful emotions, and with this slight climactic manipulation, Guise takes a positive figure, "day," and concludes with the negative image of "hell" (ii.5-6). Like the reference to Hymen in the first line, this line conjures religious imagery in the use of the word "hell," although this line specifically appeals to a frightening Christian image. Because Guise will stake his wages on the success of the Catholic faith and his ability to control others through fear, this reference to a Christian divine punishment is well placed. Guise takes responsibility for causing this hell, and Marlowe sets up his character as a man who believes that he not only has the right to judge, but to condemn as well.

Guise also uses descriptive adjectives to make clear his fury at the wedding that sought to put an end to the violence in France. Through this elaborate language, Guise fully relates the extent of his anger and resentment. In an archaic term for a frown, Hymen lours in disapproval that matches that of Guise instead of smiling upon the wedding as the god of marriage traditionally would. Guise betrays his opinion of himself by having a god mimic his own emotions, emphasizing the power he wishes he could exercise. The lights on the altar are "dusky" as opposed to bright, creating images of darkness and shadows (ii.2). These images cast a foreboding feel over the wedding. Guise's well-executed control of this descriptive language seems to foretell that the peace sought through the wedding cannot last. Likewise, "bloody clouds" (ii.3), "ugly night" (ii.5), and "hue of hell" all evoke feelings of death and fear (ii.6). For Guise, the marriage of Navarre and Margaret is not a happy union. Guise's goals lie in dominance and peace is the last thing he wants. What should be a joyous

occasion is dark and ugly to Guise and the emotionally charged language that he uses reflects his feelings and promises a grim future.

Guise's speech stirs the emotions through its performative aspect, emphasized by the verse form he uses. Guise speaks in verse as opposed to prose, implying a higher station and a higher opinion of himself. Opening with a couplet, Guise commands his audience's attention. "If ever Hymen lour'd at marriage rites/ And had his altars deck'd with dusky lights," he begins (ii.1-2). Because of their rhymed endings, couplets are highly conspicuous to the audience, arresting attention with repeated sounds. Couplets also, because of their finality, suggest a strong control of the language. Often couplets will signify the end of a scene, and also mark the significance of the character that gets the last word. Guise's couplets differ, though, because of their location at the beginning of the scene. Not only are these the first lines of his speech, but they are the first lines that Guise speaks in the entire play. Immediately he has control of his rhetoric; the form is tight and in perfect iambic pentameter⁶. By beginning with the couplet, Guise emphasizes his control of the rhetorical situation. As this speech is a soliloquy, no one is onstage to challenge him.

Though the next two lines remain in iambic pentameter they are not couplets, allowing the severity of the speech to slacken a bit. This immediate low point after the high one of the couplet mimics Guise's extreme emotional reactions. The tight verse form returns in the last four lines, however, with the form as abab with "hell" as a slant rhyme. Though the form is looser than that of the couplet from the first two lines, Guise's grasp of the verse form is still strong. The slightly off-scheme ending allows for conversation where a typical rhyme

⁶ According to H.J. Oliver, Guise's speeches seem to be the least altered in the reconstruction. "The quality of the verse (and of the reporting) seems to improve when Guise begins to speak" (Marlowe 98).

would not, however. As soon as the speech is completed, Guise calls for his apothecary, and this slant rhyme leaves an opening for the other man to speak. The dramatic rhetorical approach makes it clear that Guise is in control, however. Guise clearly knows how to manipulate verse and as a result, this speech forms a great introduction to a man who is obsessed with control even as he waxes poetic with his word choice.

Guise's soliloquy that occurs several lines later is his longest and most effective statement in the play and grounds his rhetorical control while emphasizing the League leader's faith in his masculinity as a commanding force. Much like the couplet in the first speech, Marlowe inverts the typical order for his archvillain by putting his most emotionally stirring speech in his first scene and paving the way for his fall. Guise is detailed in his nefarious plans and consistent in his rhetorical control, and the sheer length of the soliloquy mirrors his arrogance. He begins:

Now, Guise, begins those deep-engender'd thoughts
 To burst abroad those never-dying flames
 Which cannot be extinguis'd but by blood.
 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 (ii.31-36)

Guise immediately addresses himself, speaking in third person as if he were royalty. As he will reveal, the throne is his main goal. Although Guise switches to the first person later, this third person opening gives him a presumptuousness that will carry throughout the speech and the rest of the play. Guise's choice of words conveys his emotional yearning for the throne

and makes clear his disinterest in everyone and everything else. He references deep-seated desires, though he has not quite admitted to his lust for the crown yet, claiming that they are "never-dying flames/ Which cannot be extinguish'd but by blood" (ii.32-33). Relying on his favorite approach of manipulation through fear, Guise claims here that bloodshed is the only way to satisfy his wants. His bloody rhetoric also threatens that he has used violent means in the past. Guise forms a rhetorical link between "engender'd," or brought about by the male parent specifically, and violence, implying that his thoughts of violence are inextricably tied to his view of masculinity (ii.31). This sentiment is echoed in Guise's warrior-like assessment that "peril is the chiefest way to happiness/ And resolution honour's fairest aim" (ii.35-36). Not only will Guise gladly shed blood to obtain his goals, he would be willing to risk himself and perhaps die for them, too. This emotional rhetoric, though pretty and inspiring, is thoughtless. Guise is a great leader of the Catholic League. If he dies, the figurehead of a powerful faction dies with him. A leader's responsibility to stay alive for his cause's sake was a common theme in contemporary politics. When the recently crowned Henri IV rode into battle alongside his men, Elizabeth I scolded him for his negligence. This view was more in tandem with the Neo-Stoic principles that these monarchs shared, however, a political viewpoint that Guise cannot agree with (Shenk 138-139). Dying in battle will lend his name glory, and the emotional fulfillment of his ambition is the only thing Guise worries about. This rash negligence on Guise's part will help facilitate his downfall.

Towards the end of the speech, Guise once again refers to himself in third person, this time in direct reference to the crown and his control of it. "Then, Guise," he says, "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.85-87). The image of having all the cards in one's hands is one of control; with the right cards, the player is unbeatable. Not only does Guise hold the cards, he holds the ability to shuffle and cut the deck as well, giving him control over who gets the other cards. The pun on the word "cut" also brings back images of Guise's indifference towards committing violence to achieve his ends (ii.86). His willingness to deal "right or wrong" to ensure that his cards win him the crown suggests that he will do anything to gain his victory, whether that means following the rules or breaking them (ii.87). These lines, as well as the introductory ones, showcase Guise's unquenchable ambition and give a glimpse into his longing to succeed.

Guise's rhetoric in the section following the opening lines of the speech emphasizes his ambition and links him to other Marlovian characters like Faustus and Tamburlaine. That glory is Guise's primary goal, and one that he is willing to die for, is made evident in these lines:

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,
 I'll either rend it with my nails to naught
 Or mount the top with my aspiring wings,
 Although my downfall be the deepest hell (ii.37-44).

Guise is clearly uninterested in anything common or lowly, and he relies on the rhetoric of class distinction to separate himself from "peasants"(ii.38). Class superiority is a strategy that

Guise will employ several times in attempts to subdue his enemies, verbally reminding them of his high position. "That like I best which flies beyond my reach" is a line that could come straight from *Doctor Faustus*, helping to establish Guise as a Marlovian protagonist (ii.39). Much like *Faustus*, this passage brims with emotional tension. Guise encapsulates many emotions and sins in this section, addressing envy, pride, and avarice. However, the passage from an audience's perspective seems more like foreshadowing, and Guise's acknowledgement of his fall will surely bring it about.

Though his ambition is reminiscent of other of Marlowe's characters, Guise differs from his predecessors in that his thirst for glory is almost suicidal. Guise will gladly go to hell to get the crown, but if he cannot have it he will make sure it is destroyed. This approach differs greatly from anything Neo-Stoic; unlike Henri IV, Guise is not interested in tolerance or the *politique*. Marlowe illustrates an ugly side of intolerance here as Guise alludes to totalitarianism. Instead of promoting tolerance under an absolutest monarchy like Henri wanted, Guise wants to not just subdue his opponents but destroy them. Unlike many of Marlowe's other protagonists, Guise does not seek glory because he wants it for himself, rather, he is a destructive force, glorying in crushing the dreams of others. In a grim allusion to Lucifer, Guise attempts to control those around him, starting with the people who sit in the positions he desires for himself.

For Guise to gain the heights he longs for, he must have the ability to manage the perceptions of others. Guise's obsession with rhetorical control returns in full force in the next several lines, as manipulating how others view him in comparison with the King and Queen Mother is imperative to his success. More than half of the lines begin with the

construction "For this;" once again Guise uses anaphora to stress his willingness to do anything for the crown (ii.45-59). Guise begins this part saying:

For this, I wake, when others think I sleep;
 For this, I wait, that scorns attendance else;
 For this, my quenchless thirst whereon I build
 Hath often pleaded kindred to the King (ii.45-48).

Here Guise discusses his ability to control others in relation to "this," ambition. Anaphora emphasizes his ambition as Guise shows his passion for his goal. Guise suggests that his skill at manipulation can fool others into dismissing him while he continues his plans. Also, he directly references his position as nobility and as a member of the court in these few lines. H.J. Oliver reads "attendance" as "probably in the sense (O.E.D. 4) of 'waiting the leisure, convenience, or decision of a superior" (Marlowe 100). If Marlowe intends this meaning, then Guise does not waste his time awaiting approval from his superiors, including the king. Also, Guise says that the "quenchless thirst" of his ambition "Hath often pleaded kindred to the King" (ii.47-48). Not only does Guise not take orders from Charles, he seeks to manipulate him by establishing an emotional connection in the form of kinship. Parleying with royalty allows Guise to control the various monarchs in the play so they serve his interests.

Though Guise does not seem to care either way for the success of the current monarchy or the Catholic League alongside his lust for the crown, his status as a Catholic and as the League's leader lends him control that he may not have otherwise because of the

emotional attachments of the French people to religion. For Guise, religion is a rhetorical means to an ambitious end:

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.62-66)

For Guise, religion is little more than a trifle; he even goes so far as to name it "simple" and devilish (ii.65). This perspective of Guise was not uncommon in England; one quarto states that the Guises "haue disguised their ambition with many faire pretenses," some of which include "1. the rooting out of heresie. 2. The nomination of a Catholike successour to the crowne. [and] 3. The reestablishment of the church in her awncient liberties" (Anon. Contra-Guise 17). His statement "I am asham'd, however that I seem" shows his awareness of his pride but is no apology, as immediately after Guise says that religion is too crude a vessel to be worthy of supporting his plans (ii.64). Guise is not sorry for his manipulation of religion, but he betrays here his control of the subject and his own rhetoric by showing a glimpse of just how contrived his statements and actions are. Everything in this speech, from the bombast to the overly-emotional exclamations ("*O Diabole!*"), is planned and insincere (ii.63).

Guise's proclamations of his ability to manipulate with religion include the Catholics both in Paris and in other countries. In a rhetorical link to the previous section, Guise

continues here with the "For this" anaphora. In reference to the money and affluence he controls, Guise says

For this, from Spain the stately Catholics
Sends Indian gold to coin me French ecues;
For this, have I a largess from the Pope,
A pension and a dispensation too (ii.57-60)

Perhaps the most important words in these several lines are those that refer to Guise himself. Once again Guise's main boast is his ability to control others, and here those others are Spanish Catholics and the Pope. Guise says that the Spanish Catholics send gold to "coin *me* French ecues" in particular, and "*I* have a largess from the Pope" (ii.58-59, emphasis mine). By emphasizing himself, Guise calls attention to his manipulation of religion to achieve his goals. The like syllable of "pen" in "pension" and "dispensation" also serves to lump these two words together so that they are almost indistinguishable, making them just two items more in a long list of gifts that Guise has secured for himself through his control of other Catholics. Guise also discusses his control of French Catholics. Using asyndeton, a list-like device that allows for no pause with conjunction between items and lends a rushed feel to the text, Guise addresses the Catholic orders he has at his command. The resulting list records the Catholic students, friars, priests, and more at Guise's disposal if only he should want them, and he is ready to use religion as a way to control whenever and wherever he needs to. These listing techniques serve to emphasize Guise's extensive political power and the reach of his rhetorical control.

Of course, Guise's ability to control others only extends as far as his emotional rhetoric is effective. Guise is certainly skilled in his control of *pathos*, making his greatest enemy Navarre the Neo-Stoic. In the last chapter, I addressed Guise's dismissal of Navarre in his soliloquy. This dismissal, though refusing to acknowledge Navarre as a potential threat, still attempts to exert some control over the Huguenot leader, especially in the words that Guise does not say. After dismissing Navarre as a "petty King" and the Huguenots as "a rabblement of heretics (ii.89-90), Guise says "Him will we—" alongside the stage direction *Pointing to his sword* (ii.92). By dismissing Navarre, Guise limits the king's power in his own perception. Guise also recognizes a need for alternative means when dealing with Navarre, however. Because Guise's emotional rhetoric is unreliable against the Neo-Stoicism of Navarre, he may not be able to control the king with words the way he does Charles, Catherine, and the Catholics at his disposal. Instead Guise indicates that Navarre will die by the sword by pointing to the weapon, a gesture for which he speaks no words. Stephen Schillinger notes that when Guise murders Ramus, he "los[es] the philosophical argument in winning the physical battle," a principle that applies to the League leader just as well in this instance (4). By gesturing at his sword, Guise tells the audience that he will win by violence what he cannot win by rhetoric, an approach he will resort to increasingly throughout the play as his control begins to falter.

Though he may later meet his match in Navarre as far as control of rhetoric, Guise's employment of *pathos*-evoking rhetorical strategies help him maintain a certain level of power over his words. These lines in particular demonstrate a strong amount of rhetorical control:

For this, this head, this heart, this hand and sword,
 Contrives, imagines, and fully executes
 Matters of import, aim'd at by many,
 Yet understood by none (ii.49-52).

Within the first line alone Guise employs several rhetorical techniques. The beginning "For this" continues with the anaphora that Guise has used throughout the soliloquy, and the pattern continues throughout the line: "*this* head, *this* heart, *this* hand and sword" (ii.49, emphasis mine). This repetition places emphasis on the word "this", as Guise's reiteration is not only anaphoric, it also places "this" as the unstressed syllable in the iambic pentameter (ii.49). Placement of "this" as the unstressed syllable emphasizes the alliteration of "head," "heart," and "hand and sword" (ii.49). All are parts of Guise's body, which he has dedicated to his cause, with the exception of the sword which is nevertheless tied inextricably with the hand. Through the use of these rhetorical devices, the end result is a man whose mortal life is entangled in his ambition, and who stands always armed with his sword.

As with his naming of the Catholics he controls, Guise once again employs the list-like asyndeton to emphasize extent, this time in regards to his dedication. By not allowing a pause between the listed items, Marlowe cues the actor and the audience that Guise is becoming excited. The words "Contrives, imagines, and fully executes/ Matters of import, aim'd at by many/ Yet understood by none" flow quickly, conveying this excitement while relaying an image of Guise as fast-paced in developing and executing his plans (ii.50). This excitement transfers to the audience as well, building tension with the pace. In these lines Guise stresses his arrogance, claiming only he understands his plans. Alone on stage, Guise assures the audience of his control and that he can manipulate those not present.

Guise also goes to great lengths to emphasize his ambition and build fear and tension in the audience. The following lines are once again linked with the climax form, connecting them together to achieve this effect:

For this, hath heaven engender'd me of earth;
 For this, this earth sustains my body's weight,
 And with this weight I'll counterpoise a crown
 Or with seditions weary all the world" (ii.53-56).

The ladder in these lines connects the words "earth" and "weight," with "heaven" and "crown" on either side. By linking these ideas, Guise imparts that he is a man concerned with earthly glory, as his weight is tied to the earth. Guise may have ties to heaven, but he wants to assume earthly power and "counterpoise a crown/ Or with seditions weary all the world" (ii.55-56). If he "counterpoises" a crown, Guise will use his weight, or his influence, to tip the scales in his favor (ii.55). People are pawns to Guise, merely puppets to help him achieve his goal. If that goal cannot be achieved, Guise will take his frustrations out on the country and world where he resides. The word "seditions" implies that he is willing to betray his king and country if he must (ii.56). This particularly political moment distances Guise from those in power, who are Catholic. Religion is truly nothing more than a ploy to gain him support; Guise wants only to see himself succeed and will abandon his political control to do so if he must.

Guise's determination to control does not just extend to other people, however, he also plans to change whatever he needs to about himself in order to succeed. Kirk also mentions this characteristic of Guise, claiming that Guise "shape[s] history even as he shapes

himself," molding himself into the tyrant he must become to achieve his ends (84). Much like Faustus' entreaties to the devil to keep him from repentance, Guise's final lines of his soliloquy discuss the dark emotions he will cultivate to ensure his rise to power:

As Caesar to his soldiers, so say I:
 Those that hate me will I learn to loathe.
 Give me a look that, when I bend the brows,
 Pale death may walk in furrows of my face;
 A hand that with a grasp may gripe the world;
 An ear to hear what my detractors say (ii.95-100).

Guise begins this last portion of his speech as Caesar, a persona he will take on throughout the play. As Caesar was a military man and a tyrant who overthrew the Roman Republic so that he might rule, the persona is an apt choice for Guise, who hopes to find himself in the same position. Also pertinent, however, is Caesar's death, which foreshadows Guise's demise; the Roman general was brutally murdered by people he considered allies and thought he controlled. The next several lines depict the changes Guise will make to himself to help exert control over those he would manipulate, but unlike his enemy Navarre's Stoic providence, Guise's rule is highly emotional. Perhaps the most Machiavellian moment in the speech, Guise makes clear here that he will rule by fear, not by love. He wants "an ear to hear what my detractors say," presumably so that he can punish them if what they say is not to his liking (ii.100). All of these elements of "look," "hand," and "ear" once again use body imagery to emphasize Guise's physical control and its earthly nature. They are also a rhetorical device called synecdoche, which emphasizes the part for the whole. The look, the

hand, and the ear are not just anyone's, they represent Guise, and they once again represent his ability to exercise every part of his body in his control of others.

Guise's physical self is not enough to maintain the control that he wants, however; for that he requires the trappings of a king. Along with the physical components he asks for "A royal seat, a scepter, and a crown;/ That those which do behold, they may become/ As men that stand and gaze against the sun" (ii.101-103). Here Guise repeats his desire to become king and to wield the resulting power that comes with such a position. His reference to blinding brightness links him back to Lucifer, the light-bearer and brightest of the angels. Though he has the control of *pathos* to allow him to rule by fear those who he is close to, Guise cannot manage the whole of France unless he has the throne. With his emotional control of fear and the authority afforded by a seat of political power, there will be no end to Guise's control of the French people. They will be blinded and unable to move, and Guise's control of them will be complete.

Perhaps Guise should have ended his thought here. Considering rhyme scheme again, the lines "That those which do behold, they may become/ As men that stand and gaze against the sun" make a very nice rhyming couplet, perfect for ending a scene (ii.102-103). Given Guise's seeming fixation with rhetorical control, it seems likely that the soliloquy would end on such a strong note, but instead it ends with the lines "The plot is laid, and things shall come to pass/ Where resolution strives for victory" (ii.104-105). These last two lines do not rhyme at all, though the iambic pentameter is maintained. Although they seem odd considering Guise's penchant for tight control of his lines, the fact that the seventy-four line soliloquy does not end on the couplet but rather extends past it forecasts Guise's downfall.

Guise cannot let well enough alone. He must always strive further, even when it may result in his death, as in his near-suicidal speech on aspiration. In these last two lines, Marlowe emphasizes one of Guise's greatest character flaws- his inability to quit while he is ahead. Like Lucifer, he is not content to burn the brightest but must play God himself. Though Guise has maintained rhetorical control in these opening speeches he has shown that he has just enough weakness to be undermined, and the control he has on stage alone does not always translate to his relationship with others. Like his hero Caesar, Guise's ambition is great, and his fall will be great as well.

Guise's Attempts to Control Others

Guise demonstrates in his soliloquies at the opening of the play his mastery of the art of rhetorical control and believes that he has the power to control the speech and actions of others through manipulation of his rhetoric in discourse. Although this belief proves true in some cases, like in his interactions with the Queen Mother, in others Guise's control of other characters fails. When this failure occurs, the end result is often violent as Guise will usually either kill the other character or, more often, order someone else to kill him or her. For all his rhetorical bombast, when forced to interact with other characters Guise most often resorts to physical means of control, as his rhetoric is not as strong as he believes. In all instances of power struggle with others Guise resorts to a lowering technique, whether that occurs in lowering himself to manipulate or lowering the other characters to subjugate, both verbally as well as physically. This forceful subjection is tyrannical, as Guise physically silences those who would speak against his fearful rhetoric.

Guise boasts of his control over the king and Queen Mother early in his big soliloquy, where his descriptions of the monarchy go unchallenged. Often Guise will set up his enemies in preparation to tear them down by naming their attributes, and by rendering Charles as juvenile and destructive, Guise can exercise control over him and place himself in a position of power:

The gentle King, whose pleasure uncontroll'd
 Weak'neth his body and will waste his realm,
 If I repair not what he ruins:
 Him, as a child, I daily win with words,
 So that for proof he barely bears the name;
 I execute, and he sustains the blame (ii.67-72).

Here Charles IX is described as gentle, weak, and child-like, pliant in Guise's hands. The king's pleasures are "uncontroll'd," allowing for Guise to assume the authority that the King cannot (ii.67). Because Guise appoints himself as public representative for the king he is allowed to control the public opinion of Charles. "I execute, and he sustains the blame" Guise says, claiming the skill to alter public perception so that Charles is the one who looks bad (ii.72). As head of his country, Charles is responsible for the safety and perception of his kingdom. However, Charles IX took the throne at the age of ten, while his mother, Catherine de Medici, ruled as regent (Crawford 658). The king has always relied on others to establish his power, making Guise's attempts to control him all too easy. Guise's manipulations render the king's title meaningless and create an opening for Guise to reign in his stead.

Not only does Guise control Charles IX, he exercises power over the Queen Mother as well. Determined to keep her children on the throne after the death of her husband, Catherine de Medici was the true ruler behind her sons Henri II and Charles IX, and she also monitored Henri III (King Henry of *The Massacre*) into the latter years of his reign. Though historically she opposed the Guises because of their ruthless actions and Henri de Guise's very real desire for the throne, Marlowe includes her as one of Guise's puppets in the play to better establish the extent of his villain's machinations and emphasize his usurpation of the king's power (Frieda 354-355). Immediately after his address of Charles, Guise claims

The Mother Queen works wonders for my sake
 And in my love entombs the hope of France,
 Rifling the bowels of her treasury,
 To supply my wants and necessity (ii.73-76).

Marlowe's Catherine empties the coffers of France to fund Guise's enterprises, and Guise claims that she does so "for my sake" and "in my love" (ii.73-74). Although it seems elsewhere that the Queen Mother supports Guise because she wants the Catholics to triumph, here Guise allows no such concession. Catherine has been hoodwinked by Guise; Guise's subtle exploitations have won over the Queen Mother, and nothing else. Randall Martin remarks on Guise and Catherine's odd relationship, noting that Guise has managed to manipulate the one character historically considered Machiavellian due to her family's connections to the philosopher. "Being apparently unable to distance herself from emotional involvement, she [Catherine] lacks a meaningful self-determining capacity," Martin claims, positing particularly the Queen Mother's emotional rousing by Guise (80). Guise's control of the Queen Mother allows him to enjoy significant political power. His exploitation of this

powerful woman and her weak and easily manipulated son is significant in terms of Guise's rhetorical emphasis on masculinity. Parallels are easily drawn between Catherine and Elizabeth, and Guise's usurpation of the Queen Mother's power could serve as a warning to steer clear of unsavory advisors during the contemporary political turmoil. When Guise controls the Queen Mother, he controls the realm.

Guise's ability to manipulate others is often determined by that character's ability to maintain their own rhetorical command as well as their own influence. For this reason, Guise is easily able to manipulate characters like King Charles, Catherine the Queen Mother, and the young Duke of Anjou (later King Henry), who willingly give up rhetorical control to others. Despite their high status, none of these characters wield much authority themselves but hand over their power to Guise. Early in the play, these characters plan the massacre with Guise, joined by Dumaine and Cossin, who have no lines in the extant version of the play. Charles laments that the Protestants should die because of their religion and Anjou encourages him not to be too soft lest the Huguenots fight back (iv.10-12). Guise is quick to agree, saying:

Methinks, my Lord, Anjou hath well advis'd
 Your Highness to consider of the thing,
 And rather choose to seek your country's good
 Than pity or relieve these upstart heretics (iv.17-20).

Encouraging war between Catholic and Protestant factions is necessary to Guise's plans because war will weaken the state and provide him the opportunity to overtake it. England was familiar with this opinion of the Guise family's plan; as one pamphlet states, "the more

the fame did growe vpon the people, the better occasion they should one day haue to vse it for a means of their innouations, having withal gotten both the forces and authoritie into their hands, whereas they might gayne credit and power amongst men" (du Plessis-Mornay, *An advertisement* 4). Though Guise has made clear in his early soliloquy that he does not think highly of Charles, he is selective in his choice of words to the king, referring to him as "my Lord" and "Your Highness" (iv.17-18). By approaching Charles with these titles Guise seemingly lowers himself to the king, like he does with Anjou by deferring to his suggestion. Guise remains in control of the situation, however, even as he pretends to defer to Catherine's sons. Though Anjou made the suggestion to show no mercy to the Huguenots, he says exactly what Guise would have him say, allowing Guise to manage the massacre without appearing to do so. Guise's subtle manipulations prove successful; Charles immediately defers to his mother and Guise. Instead of making decisions himself Charles lets his advisors rule in his stead and between Guise and the Queen Mother, only one opinion really matters.

Guise's complete control over Catherine becomes evident in her next line, when she tells Charles "Thanks to my princely son. Then tell me, Guise, / What order will you set down for the massacre?" (iv.26-27). Here Catherine exercises her own power over her son, calling him "princely" instead of reinforcing his position as king, and throughout the play she shows that she considers herself to be the true ruler of France. Catherine's power is not as substantial as she thinks, however, as she immediately defers to Guise. "What order will you set down for the massacre?" she asks him, the word "order" implying that Guise will not only plan the massacre, but actively issue the command to begin it (iv.27). Though Catherine has some level of control over Charles' actions, she does so clearly at Guise's behest. This scene

illustrates that Guise has established control over those in the positions he covets. Both royal characters long to shift the decisions, and perhaps the blame resulting from them, onto other people. In doing so, however, they surrender their own rhetorical power. By playing humble but still elegantly managing his rhetoric, Guise has made himself the logical choice for the voice of the monarchy.

Other characters Guise encounters are less likely to concede to him, however. Though Guise uses the technique of humbling himself when catering to the egos of those above him, when he encounters characters that threaten his control in some way, he often responds with different lowering mechanisms such as physical abuse. Even in his soliloquy when no one is vying for his control of the stage, Guise chooses to point to his sword as opposed to speaking about Navarre, and this reliance on physical violence becomes apparent in Guise's approach to dealing with his enemies. Guise gives the order for most of the murders committed in the play, using his control of rhetoric to have others do his dirty work for him. For instance, Guise orders the deaths of the Admiral and Ramus, as well as orchestrates the massacre. Guise is not afraid to dirty his own hands when he needs to, however. Even though Guise as a nobleman would not have participated in the actual massacre, Marlowe has him do so in the play, promoting the concept of the villain as a violent character (Glenn 372). Guise murders Loreine as well as Navarre's tutors. Though sometimes his role is that of the commander as opposed to the assassin, Guise loves to control the physical violence done to others.

One way in which Guise controls his enemies is through commands to physically lower them. Often when Guise kills someone or has them killed, he gives a command to have

the victim's body subdued in some way. For instance, when Guise orders the death of the Admiral, this exchange occurs between him and Gonzago, who performed the deed:

Guise. Gonzago, what, is he dead?

Gon. Ay, my Lord.

Guise. Then throw him down (v.30-32)

[The body of the Admiral is thrown down.]

By having the Admiral's body thrown to the ground Guise, who remains standing, places himself in a position of dominance to his enemy. Shortly thereafter, Guise says to the corpse "The Duke of Guise stamps on thy lifeless bulk!" placing the Admiral even more below him than before (v.41). This brutal display seems a bit exaggerated as the Admiral is dead, but as Guise's rhetoric is always highly emotional, his actions are consistent with his character. Several scenes later when Guise converses with the Queen Mother about executing the Huguenots who often travel to the forest to pray he will have the Admiral's body lowered once again. The corpse has been hung in a tree, and when Catherine complains about the smell, Guise orders that the body be removed and "throw[n]... in some ditch" (xi.18). By using the phrase "some ditch" instead of being specific, Guise shows his disinterest in the body of his foe. The Admiral is not the only character to physically fall at the hands of Guise, either; when Loreine is murdered, Guise orders his body thrown in a ditch as well. Though the other characters are dead and cannot possibly stand up to Guise or defend themselves, the League leader insists on having them physically subjugated to him, often even placed below ground (in a ditch). Guise's incessant lowering of the bodies of his enemies reinforces Marlowe's characterization of a man who will force control when he feels his authority is questioned.

Physical lowering is not the only kind of subjection that Guise forces on others, however. When he finds his authority threatened, Guise will also often resort to verbal abuse and name calling to cut down his enemies. After the Admiral is killed, Guise speaks to the body, saying "base Shatillian and degenerate... The Duke of Guise stamps on thy lifeless bulk!" (v.38,41). Though "Shatillian" refers to Chatillon, a place name as well as the family name of the Admiral (Marlowe 112), the terms "base" and "degenerate" directly place him below Guise (v.38). Guise's vocalization of the physical abuse he causes to the Admiral's body subdues the corpse more. Even though the Admiral cannot hear the Guise or feel his abuse, Guise's followers can. Guise's abuse of the Admiral's body is more to deal the man's memory humiliation and is primarily for the benefit of Guise's followers. This excess of emotion instills fear in others, Guise's favorite mode of control.

Guise also uses mockery to take down the Huguenots he dispatches, highlighting his lack of *decorum* and bullying with his words. When Guise kills Loreine, he says

Guise. – Sirrah,

Are you a preacher of these heresies?

Lor. I am a preacher of the word of God;

And thou a traitor to thy soul and Him.

Guise. 'Dearly beloved brother'—thus 'tis written. (vii.1-5)

He stabs him.

Guise begins by calling Loreine "Sirrah," an address used often towards servants and those of a lower class (vii.1). This term is one that Guise is particularly fond of, loving to hold his title over his victims. Not only does Guise insult the man's vocation, he also insults his religion,

calling Protestant doctrines "heresies" (vii.2). When Loreine argues back, defending his religion and calling Guise "thou," reserved typically for either close friends or inferiors, Guise responds with scathing mockery. "Dearly beloved brother'—thus 'tis written," he says, imitating the kind of introduction that Loreine would use in his own sermons as a Protestant preacher (vii.5). Guise does not consider Loreine his brother at all, though, as he runs him through as soon as the words leave his mouth. By utilizing the rhetoric that a preacher would use, Guise turns Loreine's religious views into a sham even as he ends the preacher's life.

Guise continues his lowering of his victims through words when he murders Ramus. As with Loreine, Guise refers to Ramus as "sirrah," insulting the philosopher by emphasizing his lower rank (ix.37). Guise and Ramus enter into a rhetorical scuffle over logic, which I will address at length in the next chapter, during which Guise alternates between "thou"-ing and "you"-ing Ramus, depending on whether he wants to emphasize the scholar's lower status or sharpen his accusations against him (ix.24-37). As Stephen Schillinger notes, Ramus trumps Guise in the debate, the League leader so caught up in his emotions that he cannot follow the rules of rhetoric he knows so well (4-5). After Ramus gives his defense, Guise insults him again, asking Anjoy "Why suffer you that peasant to declaim?" (ix.53). Anjoy takes the cue from Guise and joins in the taunting, saying "Ne'er was there collier's son so full of pride" (ix.55). By drawing attention to Ramus' rank as a "peasant" and a "collier's son," his attackers both prevent him from speaking and verbally cut him down. Using verbal abuse, Guise renders Ramus as less threatening, and his followers begin to emulate him. Whether the violence is verbal or physical, Guise succeeds through cruelty when his rhetoric fails due to timing or to his own inadequacy.

Guise's Loss of Control

Guise's inability to effectively control the rhetoric of others using his own grasp of rhetorical concepts will cause his downfall. Though Guise is less effective in the massacre scenes than in his opening soliloquies, he maintains some level of control even if through violent, physical means. However, Guise is, as Potter points out, a "pivotal" character, and he cannot continue his stranglehold on the French crown (72). Guise's fall from the top of Fortune's Wheel begins when he learns of his wife's affair. Because of her lover Mugeroun's status as one of King Henry's *mignons* word spreads quickly, and Guise is undermined by his inability to exercise control over his own household. Betrayed by his wife, Guise loses the respect of those he used to command and his end is swift.

The scene in which Guise's authority is undermined by his wife's infidelity marks the beginning of his fall, as the woman who is supposedly his closest companion destabilizes his control through her crafty rhetoric. As this scene follows the coronation of King Henry (formerly Anjoy), whom Guise believes he can control as easily as he did his older brother Charles, it packs a devastating blow. Acknowledging her powerful husband's authority over her speech, the Duchess claims that "Guise usurps it [her heart] 'cause I am his wife" (xv.3). The word "usurps" directly relates to Guise's political aspirations and refers to his crude manner of taking what he wants (xv.3). Because her husband exercises such power over her, the Duchess must find a way to contact her lover Murgeroun, as she would "find some means to speak with him/ But cannot, and therefore am enforc'd to write" (xv.5-6). The Duchess uses written rhetoric to get around her husband's spoken commands.

When Guise enters the scene, he asks his wife to speak the name of the person to whom she is writing and she refuses, claiming that only a woman should know her heart's secrets (xv.19). By asserting that only a woman can know the secrets that she writes, the Duchess undermines her husband's perception of masculinity established with his discussion of his "deep-engender'd thoughts" in his soliloquy in an attempt to give her feminine self some means of control (ii.31). She also limits her rhetorical audience, refusing to allow Guise to view the letter because he is a man. However, the audience knows that the Duchess is lying; the words she composes are for a man. The Duchess attempts to limit her husband's control of her rhetoric both by excluding him based on his gender and writing the words instead of speaking them. However, she is undermined in both cases. Guise sees the letter which the Duchess cannot make say other than what is written and which proves that she lied to him about her audience.

Guise's reaction to his wife's treachery is typically overwrought. When she is discovered the Duchess asks for Guise's pardon, deferring to his control. Her capitulation provides Guise with an opening to indulge in one of his characteristic bombastic speeches. Though Guise's speeches are always fraught with emotion, certain words that he uses in this particular speech suggest a genuine feeling of betrayal. He begins:

Thou trothless and unjust, what lines are these?
 Am I grown old, or is thy lust grown young,
 Or hath my love been so obscur'd in thee
 That others needs to comment on my text? (xv.23-26).

Guise's words in these opening lines bear many references to rhetoric and writing. Even before he comments on the damning letter, Guise labels his wife "trothless and unjust," naming her and defining her by the act she has committed (xv.23). He then addresses the "lines" that the Duchess has written, though he will not specify what they are (xv.23). That Guise is vague here provides insight to the degree of his anxiety as his rhetoric begins to break down; he is usually very specific in his descriptive adjectives. Also, Guise refers to the Duchess as "my text" (xv.26). Although editor H.J. Oliver reads the line to mean that the Duchess seeks another because Guise is not sufficient, like a text, another reading also exists (Marlowe 133). The concept of text as female is one that is as common to literature as the figure of the inspirational Muse or the feminine nomenclature of ships. When a woman is synonymous with a text, she becomes something that men can write on and manipulate, just as she becomes inspirational like in the form of the Muse. Though these instances seem harsh, Guise seems much less anxious to place blame in this speech than elsewhere in the play. In the second line, Guise uses the word "grown" to imply gradual distancing, and his repetition of the word suggests that he does not know whether to blame the Duchess or himself (xv.24). By saying that his love is "obscur'd" in her he suggests that his wife is blind to his love, which likewise seems to exonerate her rather than accuse her (xv.25). Guise seems truly upset in this moment, and unwilling to believe what he sees. As a result his speech begins to falter.

Guise's revelation of his wife's pregnancy enhances the magnitude of her betrayal while challenging the control he derives from his masculinity. Anguished and furious, Guise tells the Duchess vehemently, "*Mort dieu*, were't not the fruit within thy womb,/ Of whose

increase I set some longing hope,/ This wrathful hand should strike thee to the heart! (xv.31-33). "*Mort dieu*," or "by the death of God," is a particularly violent oath, and precedes Guise's announcement that were the Duchess not pregnant he would murder her (xv.31-32). The Duchess' pregnant state also challenges Guise's control in that she maintains a control of her physical condition in which he cannot share. In contemporary England, pregnant women were thought to pass on their sins to their children, often through their breast milk (Chamberlain 74). If the Duchess has betrayed Guise, then the child she is carrying might too. Also, a possibility exists that the child may not be Guise's offspring, though neither he nor the Duchess mentions it. If Guise is not the father of the child, his masculinity, which he believes gives him some degree of power, is at stake. Because he can control neither of these possibilities, the Duchess' pregnancy becomes a means of subverting Guise's control as a result of her infidelity.

Guise refers to other means of rhetorical subversion that his wife employs as well, claiming that "from the very first/ Her eyes and looks sow'd seeds of perjury" (xv.37-38). Unable to speak directly to him, the Duchess used her body language and eye movements to convey her love to Mugeroun and escape Guise's control of her rhetoric. Also, the reference to sowing seeds provides another generative image that reminds the reader of the Duchess' pregnancy and its implications for Guise. Though Guise can prevent his wife from speaking, he cannot manipulate her actions. His speech ends with the threat that "he to whom these lines should go" will suffer for them (xv.39). Because Guise will not harm his pregnant wife he will take out his frustration on her lover. Guise's rhetorical control has been not only

challenged by his wife but successfully subverted, and though he will default to his usual back up plan of physical violence, he will never quite regain his previous oratorical power.

Where all other opponents have failed to stand up to Guise, the Duchess has succeeded. In her letter-writing and in her body language she has rhetorically circumvented his control, and her unfaithfulness has dealt a blow to him that pierces his rhetorical armor in a way no one else could. The effect is immediate. Guise next appears in King Henry's court, where the king has just handed control of the army over to Joyeux. Though Marlowe does not make clear if Guise has somehow been demoted in favor of Joyeux, Guise's loss of favor in the eyes of the king and his court is clear. King Henry mocks him, saying:

So kindly, cousin of Guise, you and your wife

Do both salute our lovely minions.

He makes horns at the Guise.

Remember you the letter, gentle sir,

Which your wife writ to my dear minion,

And her chosen friend? (xvii.10-14).

The sway that Guise held over King Henry (formerly Anjoy) earlier in the play is completely dissolved. Clearly the king has become aware of the interest of Guise's wife in his *mignon*, and the king has just revealed this information not only to Guise but to Epernoun and a room full of advisors or courtiers present at court. King Henry's pointed references to Guise's wife and choice of "gentle sir," as address are mocking and cruel (xvii.13). Also, the king's physical action of making horns at the Guise trumps him rhetorically. King Henry makes clear to everyone in the room what his references to the Duchess mean, whereas without the

gesture, the mocking may not have been understood as a reference to cuckoldry. In his mockery King Henry has humiliated Guise in front of the entire court, allowing the respect that the League leader has demanded throughout the play to start to dwindle.

Guise's response to the mockery is hostile, as expected from this rhetorically violent and passionate character. Though his authority has been undermined by the king's disrespect, Guise scrambles to hold his ground, saying:

If all the proudest kings in Christendom
Should bear me such derision, they should
Know how I scorn'd them and their mocks.
...And here, by all the saints in heaven, I swear
That villain for whom I bear this deep disgrace,
Even for your words that have incens'd me so,
Shall buy that strumpet's favor with his blood,
Whether he have dishonoured me or no! (xvii.18-27).

Guise attempts to stand up for himself by putting down King Henry, saying that the king's jests do not bother him and once again employing his verbal lowering technique with his "scorn" (xvii.20). These are brave words considering King Henry is no longer the young duke that Guise found so easy to manipulate. Here Guise uses no polite language like he used when controlling Charles; his inability to bow to the right people shows that his emotions are getting the better of his rhetoric. Characteristically, Guise also swears to do violence to those who have insulted him in some way. He claims that he will kill Mugeroun whether the affair happened or not, just because of the words that King Henry has used against him. In being so

careless and immature, King Henry has placed his *mignon's* life in danger; Guise, as words are clearly not serving him well in the situation, will resort to violence instead.

Guise's Fall: Mirrored Rhetoric

Instead of murdering Mureroun himself, Guise chooses to reassert his rhetorical power and command someone else to do the deed. Because of the personal nature of the betrayal, it seems odd that Guise would bring in a soldier to end Mureroun's life, especially as he must spread the word even further to do so. That he hires someone to commit the murder shows his desperation. The soldier's speech before the murder emphasizes Guise's loss of control in the latter half of the play. Through informality and ill-use of rhetoric Marlowe uses the soldier to mock his villain. An odd, list-like approach to detailing Mugeroun's betrayal often punctuated by side-comments from the soldier himself, the speech is almost humorous in this crucial moment. The soldier's speech is entirely in prose, which normally denotes a more informal speech, often given by a lower-class character. That the speech is intended as prose is verified as this page is the only part of *The Massacre* still extant, estimated by R. Carter Hailey to be from 1589. The soldier begins:

Sir, to you, sir, that dares make the Duke a cuckold, and use a counterfeit key to his privy-chamber door; and although you take out nothing but your own, yet you put in that which displeaseth him, and so forestall his market, and set up your standing where you should not; and whereas he is your landlord, you will take upon you to be his, and till the ground that he himself should occupy, which is his own free land—if it be not too free; there's

the question. And though I come not to take possession
 (as I would I might), yet I mean to keep you out—which
 I will, if this gear hold. What, are you come so soon? Have
 at ye, sir!

Enter Mugeroun. The Soldier shoots at him and kills him (xix.1-12).

The soldier's speech is a long and convoluted ramble, but no one is onstage to hear it. Mugeroun's stage directions are written into the text, implying that Marlowe intended for the *mignon* to enter after the soldier's speech. As Marlowe does not always include stage directions, this deliberate entrance is important. More than simply having Mugeroun miss the entire speech detailing what crimes he has committed, by having him offstage while the speech is delivered, Marlowe gives his ill-spoken soldier a soliloquy. With the exception of Guise, no other character has had a soliloquy up until this point; Navarre, when he speaks, always has an audience. The soldier's speech makes a mockery of Guise's grandiose soliloquies by creating an association between the villain and the low-class peasantry he so hates.

The soldier also attempts to utilize the same kind of emotionally riveting imagery and fanciful rhetorical devices Guise employs in his soliloquies, but instead of being effective it falls flat. Nonsensical and messy, the speech contains several botched images and many vulgar jokes, such as "you take out nothing but your own, yet you put in that which displeaseth him [Guise]" (xix.3-4). Like Guise's speeches, the soldier's speech employs many images but few work well, the clearest ones being highly inappropriate and largely disrespectful to his employer. Also, his attempts at mimicking Guise's rhetorical control fail; the high style of his oratory does not match the low style of his subject matter. The sentences

are punctuated with polysyndeton, or the placing of a repeated conjunction between phrases in order to slow the tempo of a line. The soldier accomplishes this trope through the use of the word "and": "and al-/though you take out nothing but your own..." (xix.2-3), "and so forestall his market..." (xix.4), etc. Simultaneously, most of these "and"s occur after semi-colons or, in the case of the last one, a period, making them candidates for anaphora, one of Guise's most favored rhetorical devices. Not only has the play moved away from Guise in terms of focus, other characters are beginning to make a mockery of him. Guise could not have picked a worse character to speak for him at this important moment.

More rhetorical failure on Guise's part is showcased immediately after Mugeroun's murder, again in conjunction with his relationship to King Henry. Guise has assembled an army when he was not assigned to, and King Henry fears not unreasonably that Guise will try to take the throne. "Why, I am no traitor to the crown of France:/ What I have done, 'tis for the Gospel sake," Guise argues, supplying the king with the word "traitor," which Henry never specifically calls him, proving that treachery is on his mind (xix.21-22). Epernoun, Henry's *mignon* and trusted advisor, picks up on Guise's rhetoric, however, and twists his words back at him:

Nay, for the Pope's sake, and thine own benefit.

What peer in France but thou, aspiring Guise,

Durst be in arms without the King's consent?

I challenge thee for treason in the cause (xix.23-26).

By using some of the same words that Guise has just employed, Epernoun assumes control over the League leader's rhetoric. Not only does he play on the word "sake" (xix.23),

Epernoun also makes mention of the word treason, cementing it in the minds of Guise and the king. He also defines Guise as "aspiring," a word that Guise has used to describe himself from the beginning of the play, and talks down to him by calling him "thou" (xix.24). Naming Guise in this way flaunts his authority, allowing Epernoun the same power Guise has used in verbally abusing his own victims.

Guise's response falls flat based on his lessened control over King Henry, a result of his mockery in the court. Though Henry remains a puppet king, Guise's old position as advisor has been assumed by Epernoun, who allows the king some rhetorical control.

Guise. Ah, base Epernoun, were not His Highness here,

Thou shouldst perceive the Duke of Guise is mov'd.

K. Henry. Be patient, Guise, and threat not Epernoun,

Lest thou perceive the King of France be mov'd. (xix.27-30).

Once again, Guise tries his old trick of lowering through name-calling by saying Epernoun is "base" and calling him "thou" (xix.27-28). He also juxtaposes this term with "His Highness," elevating King Henry in the subservient manner that he used to control Charles in the early part of the play (xix.27). However, King Henry responds with his own display of rhetorical control. Scolding, he tells Guise to "Be patient," and uses the villain's exact words of "perceive" and "mov'd" to emphasize his own rhetorical power (xix.29-30). Though this technique of borrowing language is not the strongest of rhetorical defenses, the king stands up for himself against the charismatic Guise and shows he will not be controlled by fear.

Nevertheless, King Henry's attempts at rhetorical control are all inspired by Epernoun's lead, who has replaced Guise as advisor. Epernoun uses the same politeness

technique that Guise has practiced throughout the play, deferring to the king in order to gain control of him and emphasizing Guise's loss of favor. After Guise has left to dissemble his army as he knows he cannot win this round, Epernoun tells King Henry to beware the League leader's wiles:

But trust him not, my Lord, for had Your Highness
 Seen with what pomp he enter'd Paris,
 And how the citizens with gifts and shows
 Did entertain him
 And promised to be at his command—
 Nay, they fear'd not to speak in the streets
 That the Guise durst stand in arms against the King,
 For not effecting of his Holiness' will (xix.67-74).

From the line "had Your Highness/Seen" it becomes clear that King Henry has not seen the events that his advisor describes, meaning that Epernoun, should he want to, can manipulate the story in any way he chooses (xix.67-68). As Paris was the seat of the Catholic League, it does not seem unlikely that the citizens would be supportive of Guise, but Epernoun's estimation of Guise's entrance into Paris suggests the League leader has lost none of his rhetorical power. As Epernoun's adoption of Guise's strategies and rhetoric shows, however, the villain does not command the same rhetorical force that he did previously. Epernoun, ironically, has assumed his place.

King Henry, having not "seen," is still reliant on his advisor, though, and from Epernoun's description, Guise still has the ability to control the rhetoric of others though he may have lost that power over Henry (xix.68). The common citizens of Paris would not have

been present at Guise's humiliation at court, of course, and are not necessarily privy to the scandal. Epernoun claims that they "promised to be at [Guise's] command/ Nay, they feared not to speak in the streets/ That the Guise durst stand in arms against the King" (xix.72-74). By promising to be commanded by Guise, the crowd surrenders their rhetorical power to the League leader, much in the way that Charles did in the early parts of the play. This surrender gives Guise command of the mob of Paris, a dangerous power to wield; many tragedies depict the ill outcomes of mob rule. Also, they "fear'd not to speak in the streets," implies that Guise once again maintains power over the speech of others through the fear his rhetoric inspires (xix.73). Though King Henry may have learned to ignore Guise's rhetoric at the interception of Epernoun, the majority of Paris has not, and King Henry will find himself in a precarious position if he does not deal with the problem.

Epernoun, for better or worse, has assumed the position of advisor to the king that Guise held in the first part of the play, and his control is also more suggestive than blatant. After telling King Henry of Guise's entrance into the city, Epernoun tells the king "My Lord, I think, for safety of your royal person,/ It would be good the Guise were made away,/ And so to quite Your Grace of all suspect" (xix.82-84). According to Oliver, Marlowe is the first person to suggest Epernoun as the cause of Guise's murder (Marlowe 144). The subtlety with which Epernoun makes the suggestion mirrors Guise's manipulations when dealing with the king. Instead of being straightforward, Epernoun uses phrases like "It would be good," and "made away," which though vague, carry negative undertones (xix.83). The idea of clearing the king's name "of all suspect" has ties to Guise's soliloquy, in which he allows Charles to take the blame for his actions (xix.84). Also, this tactic reminds the audience of the royal

family's delegation of responsibility, and therefore blame, to other characters. Marlowe's subtlety with Epernoun's approach both makes King Henry a weak character and provides another opportunity to mock Guise, as his own tactics are used against him.

When Guise comes next to King Henry's court, he comes to be murdered, though he does not know it yet and the king's subtle rhetoric does not betray it. The pleasantries exchanged by Guise and King Henry seem forced, but Guise, hearing only what he wants to hear, reads Henry's politeness incorrectly:

So; 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...
 ...As ancient Romans over their captive lords,
 So will I triumph over this wanton king,
 And he shall follow my proud chariot's wheels (xxi.47-54).

Guise misreads King Henry's terse politeness as kindness, when in reality the King has summoned him with plans to have him killed. When Guise references his control of King Henry's minions, he does so because Epernoun opened the door for him when he called for a page. Oliver claims that this unlikely happening should have alerted Guise to the fact that something was wrong; the king's trusted advisor would not be doubling as a page (Marlowe 147). However, Epernoun's apparent submission and the king's fawning ensure that Guise will not pay attention when he leaves the court, convinced of his control. Once again, Guise brings back the Roman imagery from his soliloquy, viewing himself as Caesar and as the sole ruler of an empire. Guise's words of "captive" (xxi.52), "wanton" (xxi.53), and "follow"

suggest that he assumes the king's obedience to him (xxi.54). Having not been onstage when Epernoun so subtly manipulated the king's hand, Guise does not realize the limits of his control. His ambition remains unquenchable, however, and by playing to his inflated ego, King Henry and Epernoun ensure Guise's fall.

At this time, a murderer enters the room and tries to warn Guise from going forward to his death. "Good my Lord, go not forth," the murderer urges Guise, seemingly one of the Parisians who supports him (xxi.65-66). Guise, however, does not listen, and proceeds with rhetorical bombast primed by King Henry and Epernoun's treatment:

Yet Caesar shall go forth.

Let mean conceits and baser men fear death:

Tut, they are peasants; I am Duke of Guise;

And princes with their looks engender fear (xxi.67-70).

Once again, Guise invokes Caesar as someone he wishes to emulate. As Guise wants to "engender fear," his example of Caesar is apt as the Roman commander wanted sole rule of the state (xxi.70). However, Caesar did not have any male heirs of his own and was killed brutally by the people he thought he controlled, and Guise's mention of him here is eerily prescient. Again, Guise tries to separate himself from everyone else, calling them "peasants" while "I am Duke of Guise," emphasizing his rank (xxi.69). The full title of the play, however, is *The Massacre at Paris with the Death of the Duke of Guise*, and Guise's first mentioning of his full title gives the cue for his death-knell.

When Guise is stabbed, he says "O, I have my death's wound! Give me leave to speak," insisting on having the concession he lent to so few of his own victims (xxi.75).

Interestingly, the Second Murderer tells him "Then pray to God, and ask forgiveness of the King," an attempt to control the rhetoric of the most subtle manipulator of *pathos* in the play (xxi.76-77). The Second Murderer's in-prose demands do not have the rhetorical power of Guise's verse, however; even his request to be given a chance to speak remains in iambic pentameter if the "O" at the beginning is omitted (xxi.75). In response, Guise gives one last emotionally rousing and self-important speech.

Guise's response to the Second Murderer's attempt to control his speech is a testament to his pride, but also to his mastery of *pathos*. With his last words, he says:

Trouble me not, I ne'er offended Him,
 Nor will I ask forgiveness of the King.
 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! (xxi.81).

Guise refuses to ask forgiveness, claiming he has no argument with God, and will not ask for the king's pardon. Though the capitalization of "Him" is the editor's choice, Oliver believes that distinguishing God from the king renders Guise as haughtier (Marlowe 150). Guise seems more angry than grief-stricken, and he feels no remorse. That he is to die at the hands of common thugs causes him more anxiety than the fact that he is to die at all.

In this last speech, Guise also realizes his limitations. "O that I have not power to stay my life," Guise complains (xxi.79). Because Guise's power lies in his ability to control through rhetoric, he is rendered helpless by those who use physical violence against him. Words cannot change his fate, and in a moment he will be silenced forever. With his last

breaths Guise issues all of the orders he can, attempting to control with his words even though their recipients cannot hear him:

Ah, Sixtus, be reveng'd upon the King;
 Phillip and Parma, I am slain for you!
 Pope, excommunicate, Philip depose
 The wicked branch of curs'd Valois his line!
Vive la messe! Perish Huguenots!
 Thus Caesar did go forth, and thus he died (xxi.82-87).

Guise's faith in his abilities to control the Pope and Spain reemerge here, as he calls for them to destroy King Henry. Oddly, Guise's last exclamations address religion; "*Vive la messe!* Perish Huguenots!" he cries in an uncharacteristic display of loyalty to Catholicism (xxi.86). Though Guise claims throughout the play that religion is only a way to ensure his success, he falls back on his Catholic roots here. Perhaps he wants to ensure the success of his religion if he cannot achieve his goals, or perhaps, Faustus-like, he defaults to these sentiments because his reliance on them as an excuse has become natural. Though he may have reestablished some of his credit by paying homage to his religious beliefs, Guise ultimately proves unsympathetic. The line "Thus Caesar did go forth, and thus he died" shows Guise at his arrogant best, once again evoking the image of the fallen tyrant (xxi.87). Though he has maintained his poetic form to the end, Guise's orders will not be fulfilled by those who cannot hear them. Guise dies, silenced by the sword like so many of his own victims.

Though Guise's rhetoric is tightly controlled when no one else is onstage, he struggles to maintain control of other characters when interacting with them. When his rhetorical

control fails, he petulantly resorts to physical violence, bypassing rational argument for brute strength. Guise maintains strict control of his rhetorical strategies, but other characters develop rhetorical confidence after noting his inability to exert rhetorical control over his wife and ultimately undermine him. Although Guise dies with as great flair as he arrives on stage, the play proceeds without him, and his death is quickly overshadowed by Navarre's ascent to the throne. Critics like Kocher and Sanders need not be concerned that Marlowe's portrayal of Guise is too sympathetic; Guise is a charismatic and exciting character, but he is not Marlowe's hero. Marlowe's subtle rhetorical manipulations throughout the play ensure that his audience cannot misconstrue Guise as a heroic character while simultaneously making sure that the Master of Revels could not either.

Marlowe rigorously controls Guise's rhetoric, both making sure that he stays within the confines of his villainy as well as allowing him to control that small space. Though he uses many elaborate rhetorical devices and emotional language, Guise's rhetoric is not without substance. In the Ramus scene of *The Massacre*, Guise's knowledge of rhetorical strategy and failure to comply with rhetorical tradition come to the forefront as he engages in his toughest rhetorical encounter in the play. Although Navarre and King Henry ultimately thwart Guise, Ramus is the only character with whom Guise engages man to man in a rhetorical battle. The logic debate that provides the site of the skirmish exists not only to better solidify Guise as a rhetor whose style does not always match his substance. By having the Catholic League leader and the Protestant philosopher match rhetorical wits, Marlowe addresses education's ties to the religio-political atmosphere of the mid to late 1500s and

suggests its properties as an ameliorative through a wildcard character named Taleus, a stand-in for the moderate Catholic *politique*.

CHAPTER FOUR. "ARGUMENTUM TESTIMONII EST INARTIFICIALE": THE RELIGIO-POLITICAL LANGUAGE OF EDUCATION IN THE RAMUS SCENE

The Ramus scene (Scene IX) of Christopher Marlowe's *The Massacre at Paris* employs labeling of Catholic and Protestant philosophical and educational views through the educational rhetoric exercised by the play's charismatic villain Guise and the unconventional logician Peter Ramus. In the scene, Guise and Ramus enter into a debate that on the surface addresses logic and pedagogy but simultaneously mirrors their religious and political views. Educational rhetoric in the early modern period was religiously and politically coded; the differences between Catholics and Protestants went beyond ideology towards philosophy, and as such the teaching of logic and dialectic often reflected the religious views of its scholars and students. Likewise, the rhetoric of education employed by Guise and Ramus in *The Massacre at Paris* reflects the debater's religious and political views through scholarly dogmatism and open-mindedness respectively.

Because Protestantism sought to set itself apart from the traditional Catholicism, Protestant teachers like Peter Ramus became associated with the move from traditionalism in the universities. Not unlike the Protestant separation from Catholicism, Ramus broke from the long-held convention of strict adherence to Aristotelian logic founded in the *Organon*. By contrast, conservative scholars held onto previously established teaching traditions and disdained any change in the curriculum. Any these scholars found lacking in respect to the ancients, whether it was in the tone of the writing or in claims that they were wrong, were scorned. This conventional viewpoint was endorsed by older Catholic institutions, most notably by the Department of Theology at the Sorbonne in Paris. Its influence gained the

Sorbonne the last word in terms of curriculum as well as political power. In Scene IX's logic debate, Marlowe adapts the rhetoric of education and logic to align Guise with Catholicism and through Guise's interaction with other characters, links Catholicism and traditionalism with tyranny. By contrast, Ramus is linked to Protestantism because of his new approach, and his friendship with the Catholic Taleus suggests education as a way to circumvent religious violence through tolerance.

The Ramus scene of *The Massacre at Paris* has always been troubling to critics. Paul H. Kocher, whose seminal articles on Marlowe's use of Protestant propaganda as source material have been vastly influential, dismisses the logic debate as distracting from the bloody action of the massacre scenes in one of his source studies⁷. Likewise, one of Marlowe's most well-known biographers, John Bakeless, describes the debate between Guise and Ramus as a "quite unnecessary discussion of philosophy while the murder is in progress" in his two-volume book on the playwright's life and works (II.82). Though it seems strange for Marlowe to pause the play in the midst of a massacre so his characters can bandy about philosophy, some critics have found the dispute worthwhile. David Galloway suggests that the argument acts as "an intellectual counterpart of the physical struggle going on outside Ramus's house" (147), and John Ronald Glenn argues that Guise is characterized through his forceful maneuvering of the other characters in the scene. Also, Stephen Schillinger's analysis of Guise's rhetoric describes the logic debate as proof of the villain's perpetual struggle to maintain control and inability to correctly wield rhetorical power. Following in the latter tradition, I will show how the rhetoric that Marlowe has Guise utilize in his half of

⁷ Kocher, Paul H. "François Hotman and Marlowe's *The Massacre at Paris*." *PMLA*. 56.2 (1941): 349-368. *JSTOR*. Web. 12 January 2012.

the debate characterizes the villain as a Catholic, but also a traditionalist and a bully, attributes that will follow Guise throughout the play. Likewise, I will show how Marlowe's depiction of Ramus' actions and relationship with Taleus suggest education and tolerance as a means to rise above the religious panic that could arise should Henri IV convert to Catholicism.

As the French wars of religion came to stalemate and the Catholic League pressured Henri IV to convert to stop the fighting, England searched for ways to maintain an alliance with France should the king do as the League demanded. France and England's shared political language of Neo-Stoicism endorsed reason and prudence, making its continuance necessary. Neo-Stoicism focused on God's providence, encouraging its followers to think beyond their personal concerns in favor of divine will. Because emotions are so easily riled in discussions of religion, a reason-based approach kept the conversation composed. The philosophy transcended sectarian disagreements in exchange for a greater focus on tolerance, preferring unity to fractured in-fighting. Marlowe endorses this Stoic rhetoric throughout the play in the character of Navarre, but in this scene, the playwright offers other suggestions for a continued friendship between the two political allies. With Henri IV leaning towards conversion, religious tolerance would likewise become a necessary tool for sustaining an alliance with France. England desperately needed her friends on the continent to help defend her from Spain, but she also needed to have a strong core and her people's faith as a nation to withstand the forces against her. In Ramus' loyalty to France and his willingness to rise above religious difference, he embodies both these necessities. By contrast, Guise represents the Catholic tyranny that England feared from Spain.

The scene begins with Ramus' Catholic housemate Taleus bursting into the scholar's study to warn him that Guise and his posse have come to murder them both. Seemingly undisturbed, Ramus refuses to leave as he has done nothing wrong, and asks Taleus "Wherefore should I fly" (ix.6)? This question marks the first of many times in the scene that Ramus will stand up to Guise, who abuses the scholar in order to assert his dominance. When Guise arrives he gives Anjoy the order to dispatch Ramus, who asks to be told his crime. The response is a diatribe from Guise in the form of a logical statement that Guise does not choose to let Ramus answer. Resisting Guise's efforts to cut him off, Ramus speaks, and Guise's cold dismissal of Ramus as he orders him killed is one of the more chilling moments in the play. The scene does not end with the scholar's death and the audience is given no catharsis, instead being immediately forced to witness the murder of Navarre's scholars at Guise's cruel machinations. However, the lines of sympathy have been effectively drawn, as well as those that mark the division of Guise and the Protestant characters in the play.

Marlowe's play has often been described as propaganda due to its polarization of Catholics and Protestants, and it could easily be read as such. Ramus' scene in particular draws the lines very clearly as to with whom the audience's sympathies are supposed to lie. As the leader of the Catholic cause, Guise is made out to be a bully, bending his cronies to his will and having Ramus executed when he refuses to comply. This show of brute force occurs in the midst of a bloody massacre against the French Huguenots, lead by Guise himself. Ramus, representing the Protestants, is brave in the face of danger and loyal to his country, and does not despair as he stands up to Guise despite the swords pointed at his throat. As a result, he is brutally murdered, making him a martyr and forcefully aligning the

audience with the Protestant cause. Ramus' friendship with Taleus, however, is indicative of the religious tolerance England will have to employ if she is to maintain peaceful relations with France.

The Influence of the Sorbonne as a Catholic Institution

Despite the message of tolerance embedded within the scene, Marlowe clearly divides Guise and Ramus along straight lines, with Guise aligned with Catholicism and Ramus with Protestantism. To see how the language in the logic debate mirrors religion and politics, an understanding of the political position of the educational institutions in France in the 1500s is necessary. Ramus refers to the theology department of the University of Paris as “blockish Sorbonnists,” implying that the institution is staunchly traditional (ix.50). This implication is true; the Sorbonne was a university resolute in its adherence to Catholicism and the curriculum standards associated with Catholic schools. In 1542 the theology department created a list of books to be banned, and a year later released “articles of the faith” that endorsed traditional Catholic doctrine and declared beliefs not in line with those endorsed by the University of Paris as wrong (Roelker 209). The university wielded a substantial amount of political power as a result of its renown and compliance with the state religion, and potentially influenced the church as well (Roelker 210). Armed with a list of banned books and an adherence to a traditionalist system, the university was able to control what its students learned as well as help define heresy in mid-sixteenth century Paris.

The Sorbonne maintained great sway in religious matters, and scholastic traditionalism came to be associated with the Catholic university as well. In the realm of rhetoric, the principles of which Guise employs in his argument against Ramus, Cicero was

the tradition, as Tacitus had not gained the foothold that he would have later in the century. Cicero fully endorsed the use of emotional rhetoric to persuade one's audience, and his willingness to utilize *pathos* separated him starkly from the reason-based rhetoric of the Stoics. Because Stoicism was a philosophy utilized by the Huguenots in their political endeavors, Guise's eagerness to emphasize emotion in this scene further aligns him with the Sorbonne because of its traditional view of rhetoric.

Guise's loyalty to traditional forms of logic also allies him with the Sorbonne. Just as Cicero had become the authority in rhetoric, so Aristotle had the most influence in logic. Ramus was often criticized by followers of Aristotle because of his dismissal of the philosopher early in his career and his differing approach to the study of logic and dialectic. Sporting a dislike of ancient rhetorical practices, Ramus sought to modify the subject to make it more conducive to teaching. He split rhetoric into several categories to make them easier to teach to students. Also, Ramistic focus was more on efficiency than the traditional oratory, and was not necessarily concerned with civic duty. Though Ramus' thought his work helpful, French Catholics viewed his reevaluation of Aristotle's work as akin to heresy. Ramus' frustration with tradition did not begin and end with Aristotle, however, and scholars of his own day did not escape his ire. According to Émile Bréhier, Ramus spoke out against adherence to confusing traditionalist ways in his *Advertissements sur la reformation de l'Université du Paris au Roy* (246), hence, his arguments against "the blockish Sorbonnists," the University of Paris' theology faculty (Marlowe 118), who "attribute as much unto their works / As to the service of the eternal God" (ix.50-51). By having Ramus target the Sorbonne in particular, Marlowe links education explicitly with religious politics.

While Catholic universities like the Sorbonne remained dedicated to Aristotle's teachings, Ramus' approach to logic took root in strongly Protestant areas of Europe, including Germany and England. His works' prevalence in Protestant countries is coincidental considering that Ramus' break from tradition closely resembles the religious position of Protestantism. While he continued to rely on the same basic ideas in his logical work that ancient authors like Aristotle had established, he nevertheless took his logic in a new direction in an attempt to make the concepts more accessible to a larger range of people, much like Protestantism did for Christianity. Marlowe employs this likeness in the logic debate in order to more strongly associate Ramus and his innovative logic with Protestantism and Guise with the conservative scholasticism of the Sorbonne and Catholicism.

Guise as a Mouthpiece for Catholicism

With the political and religious alliances of the Sorbonne in mind, Guise's reaction to Ramus' unconventional logic, at first seemingly irrational, becomes more practical. The institution continued to teach the values and beliefs that Guise would cite as correct while also providing support to the Catholic cause. Because Marlowe presents Ramus as a Protestant scholar who opposes the Sorbonne, the university becomes an embodiment of Catholicism to the reader and audience. Guise is our representative of Catholicism in the Ramus scene, therefore he naturally becomes an ally of the Sorbonne. As the university's champion, Guise is not only a supporter of Catholicism and a conventional curriculum but is also tyrannical in his following of tradition. Like the Sorbonne in their Protestant witch-hunts, Guise destroys those who disagree with him.

In the vein of his institutional counterpart, Guise faithfully adheres to tradition in his half of the logic debate. Marlowe gives him a scathing tone; like many followers of tradition, he is appalled by the suggestion that a newer and different approach may be better, and he strongly opposes Ramus' methods. The first half of his argument illuminates the tenets of that tradition: Ciceronian depth of knowledge, loyalty to customary Aristotelian logic, a refusal to tamper with the rendering of old texts, and an absolute distrust of any and all educational links to Martin Luther and Protestantism.

Guise begins his portion of the debate in reference to those faults of Ramus' most often cited by his detractors. Because this part of his argument lacks any kind of specificity and speaks generally about the philosopher, the connections between Guise's rhetorical style and the unquestioning adherence to tradition that Guise's case embodies are clear. Guise's portion of the logic debate begins shortly after he has given the order to have Ramus killed. Ramus asks "O good my Lord, wherein hath Ramus been so offensive?" (ix.23), to which Guise responds with "Marry, sir, in having a smack in all/ And yet didst never sound anything to the depth. (ix.24-26). Here Guise accuses Ramus of experimenting with all kinds of knowledge but never contributing much to the understanding of any of it. Duhamel states that although Ramus was "mainly interested in the exoteric (grammar, rhetoric, dialectic)," he delved frequently into mathematics, and published a *Scholarum physicarum* and a *Scholarum metaphysicarum*, or the "school of physic" and "school of metaphysics" (165). Indeed, Ramus was a dabbler, and his suggested changes to curriculum fell across many areas of academia; he "proposed the establishment of chairs in mathematics, botany, anatomy, pharmacology, and the teaching of Hebrew and Greek" (Kusukawa 165). Ramus' dabbling in

several areas of the academy does not seem to be the cause of Guise's grievances, however. Rather, the problem seems to lie more in the line "And yet didst never sound anything to the depth" (ix.24-25). Early modern scholars would not have been discouraged, of course, from taking an interest in many subjects; our term "Renaissance man" comes from this particular era. However, a shallow interest in several subjects promotes a problem, particularly in terms of upholding tradition.

If the influence of Cicero on Renaissance education is any indication, Guise's reasons for despising Ramus' dabbling should make themselves clear through early modern academia's interest in a holistic rhetoric. Education in the Renaissance was concerned with imitation of the classical authors, Cicero especially. Inspired by Cicero, Thomas Wilson, a famous Renaissance rhetorician, said that the orator must have the ability to "speake fully of all those questions... such as are thought apte for the tongue to set forward" (Wilson 1). Although the Renaissance orator was unlike his classical counterpart in that he operated on a private as well as public level, the belief that he must be well-learned in all about which he would speak remained an important tenet of early modern rhetorical practice. Ramus' writing on many subjects would raise questions among scholars, particularly from Catholic traditionalists like Guise and the theologians at the Sorbonne, as they would doubt his knowledge of his subject. Any alternative route to teaching or declaiming that did not follow in the tradition of Cicero and Quintilian was often viewed as lesser as well as unconventional.

Along with being distrusted for his dabbling in many subjects, Ramus' most obvious break in tradition was his severance from Aristotle. In his argument, Guise immediately goes

from complaining of Ramus' experimentations to citing his master's thesis and most scorned opinion, saying "Was it not thou that scoff'dst the *Organon* / And said it was a heap of vanities?" (ix.26-27). By attacking the philosopher's dismissal of Aristotelian logic, Guise reinforces his position as a traditionalist. Aristotle's logic was taught in the schools of the day much for the same reasons as Cicero's rhetoric; the belief persisted that practicing logic in the way of the ancients was every bit as good, if not better, than devising something new.

His attack on Ramus for breaking from Aristotelian tradition is perhaps the most damning part of the first half of Guise's case as a result of his blind adherence to tradition and refusal to compromise. Making an argument that Ramus' methods are somehow flawed because they do not match up with the classical system, Guise simply repeats the same argument often made by the Protestant philosopher's detractors without giving any reasons why classical logic and rhetoric are superior (Howell 282). Schillinger says that "such a hasty dismissal of Ramus is not quite a reasonable contemporary stance. For such a bold position to be deemed legitimate it would need a more elaborate rationale than is provided" (3). Despite his inherent defense of traditional education, Guise completely ignores the tenets of Cicero's rhetoric. Because it only dwells on his criticism of the philosopher and not Ramus' reasons for pursuing his methods, Guise's argument shows that he is not interested in his opponent's reasoning but is merely regurgitating the same complaint that Catholic institutions like the Sorbonne had with the philosopher. He will save some face later when he attacks Ramus more directly, but Marlowe does his best characterization of Guise as an unthinking conformist in these lines. Since the Sorbonne was the institution that Ramus appalled with his writing of his master's thesis as a student there, his condemnation of the scholar along

these lines once again aligns Guise with the old university. There seems to be no reason for Guise to hate Ramus' approach so much beyond the fact that it is not the same approach as was put to use by Aristotle.

Like his break from Aristotle's logic, Ramus' method of organization falls under attack by Guise. Here Guise finally begins to specify as to why he dislikes the scholar's approach to logic. This offensive on the philosopher's technique comes in the lines following the commentary on Aristotle, clarifying the differences between the two philosophers: "He that will be a flat dichotomist / And seen in nothing but epitomes / Is in your judgment thought a learned man" (ix.28-30). Ramus not only divided the arts into exoteric and esoteric, but also converted Aristotle's and others' works to a form that he felt could be more easily understood, claiming that Aristotle had ignored his own principles and become muddled in his writing. Guise comments on this use of "epitomes," which Oliver defines in his notes on *The Massacre* as "summaries, abridgements, or, in modern jargon, 'digests,'" suggesting that Ramus' breaking down of what was originally written by the philosopher is a sort of travesty, made no less heinous by the fact that Aristotle had already categorized his own work (117). This opinion was held by many Catholic universities, as reverence for Aristotle had lapsed over from the medieval universities, and to consider his work "confus'd" was a profanation (ix.45). Nevertheless, as a teacher Ramus considered it his duty to help his students understand the material they were to learn by complicating it as little as possible, and by reorganizing Aristotle in a way that made more sense, he considered that he was making the work more digestible for those students working with it. Ramus' approach was change, but it was change the philosopher thought for the better.

Guise as Ciceronian Rhetorician

Guise and traditionalists like him in no way approved of Ramus' changes to the teaching of logic and dialectic, however, and the second half of Guise's argument attacks the philosopher directly in a way that the first half does not. Whereas the first part of Guise's argument is too broad to help his character, Marlowe uses this second part of the argument to mold Guise into a formidable enemy. By narrowing his discussion to Ramus' approaches and referencing specific postulates put forth by the philosopher, Guise displays his knowledge of Ramistic logic, proving his understanding of his enemy's approach and strengthening his *ethos*. Also, Guise's attempts at undoing Ramus' methods through his own syllogism demonstrates his grasp of rhetorical theory and shared language. Guise has gone from a mouthy yes-man for the Sorbonne and Catholicism to a well-read polemicist, and he unleashes his full wrath on Ramus in these last several lines.

Guise begins the second part of his speech by referencing the influence that Ramus' works had elsewhere in Europe. Unlike Guise, not everyone in Renaissance Europe disliked the work of the French logician; some even appreciated the changes that he made to the curriculum in a manner that Guise and other conservatives would find threatening. Guise's statement "And he, forsooth, must go and preach in Germany / Excepting against doctors' actions⁸" is a reference to the sabbatical that Ramus took in Germany and Switzerland between 1568 and 1570, during which time he did a teaching circuit (ix.31-32). Despite the dislike he felt from Catholics in his own country, Ramus' logic had "strong appeal" in

⁸ Oliver infers that Dyce's interpretation of the word "actions" as "axioms" "may be right, but comes close to tautology in view of the subsequent lines" (Marlowe, 117). This claim may be in reference to Guise's syllogism, as judgments made as a result of a syllogism in Ramistic logic are called "axioms" (Duhamel 169)

Germany (Bréhier 247). Protestantism and Martin Luther had become inextricably linked with Germany in the minds of Parisian Catholics; the Sorbonne had banned Luther's works and, jointly with Parlement⁹, conducted searches under the radar to root out potential heretics. As the home of Luther, Germany was more open to Protestantism and the changes it heralded. Likewise, Geneva, Switzerland was the residence of John Calvin, who formed the Protestant offshoot of Calvinism, and Guillaume Farel, a Calvinist reformer (Knecht 48). Despite his celebrity status elsewhere, Ramus returned home to France after his lecture circuit, even as Paris became an increasingly perilous place for him to live. One complaint that Guise cannot make against the philosopher is of a lack of loyalty to his own country and people. His return in spite of the accolades he received elsewhere and the danger in which it put his life is testament to his devotion to France.

His loyalty to France aside, Ramus' foray into Germany and Switzerland remained just cause for worry for Catholics like Guise because of the countries' association with Protestantism. In the 1540s and 50s, Geneva became the center of a reckonable force of Protestants. After Luther's death, Calvin became the undisputed head of the Protestant movement, and he passed away only four years before Ramus' travels to Switzerland. R.J. Knecht describes what he calls "the threat from Geneva" in terms of Protestant influence in France: "People flocked to Geneva from every direction and later returned to their own countries to preach his [Calvin's] doctrine" (50). As Marlowe's representative of the Catholic faith and tradition in this scene of the play, Guise would have plenty of reasons to worry about Ramus' travels into Germany and Switzerland due to the strong Protestant presence there. His words reveal this fear; as he accuses Ramus of going to "preach" in Germany,

⁹ I use the French spelling here, as Roelker does.

despite that the philosopher's real goal was to teach (ix.31). With so many converts traveling abroad in order to return to their homes and preach Calvin's doctrine, French Catholics feared that travelers, particularly conspicuous ones like Ramus, would return to preach in France. Not only was this distrust of travelers to and from Germany and Switzerland threatening to those who would adhere to the Catholic faith, it raised concerns about social order as the Department of Theology at the Sorbonne censored an increasing number of books and an escalating number of accused heretics burned at the stake. Ramus' foray into Germany would distress Parisian Catholics as the philosopher wielded an incredible amount of influence there and in other Protestant countries like England.

At the time of the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre, Elizabeth I had not started supporting the Protestant King of Navarre in earnest, choosing to avoid the religious issue when trying to secure an alliance with France. Nevertheless, Marlowe's own country certainly enters into the equation when discussing the shift from Aristotelian to Ramistic logic. Roger Ascham, Elizabeth's tutor, was never convinced by Ramus' work; nevertheless, the scholar enjoyed eminence on the island, particularly at Cambridge, where Marlowe attended university. All university graduates would have been familiar with Ramus' teachings. Though his influence was stronger at Cambridge than at Oxford, which remained traditional, a large percentage of university educated England was educated under his approach and as such probably agreed with it (Ashworth 228-29). As England's power grew, the Protestant nation would prove to be a formidable enemy to the French Catholic cause. Elizabeth would ultimately side with Henri III's successor, the Protestant Henri IV, and send money and troops to aid him in his attempts to claim the French throne. Although the

massacre had occurred nearly twenty years before Marlowe finished composing the play, the murder of a philosopher so celebrated in their country who also happened to be a Protestant would pull on the heartstrings of an English audience. Ramus may have focused his efforts on the continent, but his influence stretched far, and often to enemies of Guise's cause.

Ramus' interest in traveling abroad was always motivated more by pedagogy than religion, however, and this concern becomes clear in his shifting use of language. At some point during Ramus' tenure in Germany and Switzerland, he switched to use of the vulgar French language. Bréhier says that it was while he was in Germany that "Ramus clearly recognized and called attention to the exigency of clarity that characterized his era and that led him to forsake the schools and write in the vulgar language" (247). Writing in the vernacular French language shows a strong loyalty to his country as well as marks another break with the traditional system, as conventional universities taught in Latin or Greek. Most of Ramus' publications were in Latin, but his *Dialectique*, which dealt with the art of logic and is the likely candidate for the work that causes Guise so much anxiety, was composed in the vulgar French¹⁰. This change not only is a sharp division from the traditional university and the oft used language of the Catholic Church, but another area in which Ramus breaks from tradition in order to make his own intentions clearer.

The fact that Ramus used the vulgar French in *Dialectique* adds bite to Guise's next few lines, as the Catholic leader specifically uses Latin, the language of the tradition from which Ramus has severed himself, to critique the educator's teachings. These last few lines attack the scholar's logic and beliefs in particular.:

¹⁰ For the names of Ramus' works, I refer to his biography in the *Dictionary of Literary Biography (Vol. 327-Sixteenth Century French Writers)*.

And *ipse dixi* with this quiddity:
Argumentum testimonii est inartificiale
 To contradict which, I say: Ramus shall die.
 How answer you that? Your *nego argumentum*
 Cannot serve, sirrah. –Kill him. (ix:33-37)

Here Guise shows the depth of his understanding of Ramistic logic, proving in the tradition of Quintilian that he recognizes and understands his opponent's stance. The practice that Guise debates in these lines is Ramus' claim that the mind recognizes a statement as truth as soon as it comprehends it. Duhamel says "this had the effect of making all true propositions postulates, i.e., a proposition whose truth is so patent that the mind cannot refuse consent" (169). The use of the traditional syllogism, which derived an answer through two premises, then became only useful to point out the obvious truthfulness of a proposition as highlighted in contrast with a false proposition.

A reference to propositions and their syllogisms is evident in the line "And *ipse dixi* with this quiddity" (ix.33) as *ipse dixi* translates to "I have spoken," alluding to the belief that a statement is true because it has been spoken (Marlowe 117). Ramus did not agree with this more traditional position in philosophy; the next line "*Argumentum testimonii est inartificiale*" is a better summation of his position, which stated that simply because one proposition was more true than another, that did not make it wholly true, and to assume its factuality on the authority of the person making the claim is not good enough grounds to establish the proposition as truth (ix.34). In quoting this line from Ramus' work, Guise shows that he knows the position of the philosopher and sets up the problem so that he can dismantle it.

Guise's next lines undermine Ramus' position on authoritative argument ironically, as he says "To contradict which, I say: Ramus shall die. / How answer you that? Your *nego argumentum* / Cannot serve, sirrah. – Kill him" (ix.35-37). Ramus' "*nego argumentum*," or belief that an argument made simply on authority is invalid, will not stand in this case because of the unequal balance of power between himself and Guise (ix:36). Because of the authority that he clearly wields over Anjou and his other followers, Guise's statement that "Ramus shall die" really will be the cause of Ramus' death (ix.35). Guise's "*ipse dixi*" cannot be debated, and what he says will pass (ix.33). Guise's grasp of Latin and classical logic is every bit as strong as Ramus', and he uses it in order to thwart the ideas that the logician put forth in the vernacular French.

The second part of Guise's argument shows not only his knowledge of the scholarly language but also his grasp of Ramistic logic. In order to so fluidly refute Ramus' logical theories, Guise must have a good understanding of what those theories entail. While he may not agree with Ramus' viewpoint, Guise is clearly a man learned in both traditional and unconventional logic. The arena of education is one in which he is just as capable of doing battle as he is in that of religion, especially when the topic is one that mirrors his stance in religion and politics. On the one hand, this approach reflects well on Guise as it shows that he is knowledgeable enough about the topic being discussed that he can respond with a reasoned argument. This method also pays homage to the Ciceronian tradition of the orator knowing the subject upon which he declaims, a point which Guise has already argued against Ramus. Guise's delivery of his speech may be less Ciceronian, however, in his intention of using his words to harm.

Guise as Tyrant

Guise's side of the logic argument reflects his tyrannical desire to control, fueled by his emotional response to Ramus' defiance. As his character is galled by Ramus' methods and their implications for the traditional Catholic education taught in universities like the Sorbonne, Marlowe uses scathing language in Guise's argument to show the Catholic's escalating frustration. In fact, Guise's entire appearance in this scene occurs through artistic license and entirely for dramatic effect; there is no proof of who really killed Ramus, but it most likely would not have been the noblemen leaders of the slaughter (Glenn 372). Despite this fact, Guise's presence in the scene is necessary as it is the biggest scene in the massacre. Marlowe not only utilizes this scene to establish Guise as a counterweight to Ramus' character and a mouthpiece for Catholic tradition, but also to show his qualities as a tyrannical leader and provide him with the pride suited to the typical Marlovian villain, molds he will grow into as the play progresses.

Marlowe does not give many stage directions in the Ramus scene, or if he did originally, they have been lost in the corruption of the play. Nevertheless, it is possible to consider Guise's dismissive tone in the logic debate as demonstration of the power differential between the characters and the personalities that appear onstage. Guise's order to "Stab him," trivializes Ramus; he does not call the scholar by name and does not waste words in his command to have Ramus killed (ix.22). As usual, Guise has his henchmen do his dirty work for him, refusing to kill Ramus himself and therefore not giving his rival the respect due to an equal. By contrast, the following speech that comprises Guise's part of the logic debate seems almost an outburst. For someone who is so disinterested in the scholar

moments before, Guise launches into a tirade when Ramus asks how he has "been so offensive" (ix.23). He immediately begins to attack Ramus, starting with common arguments and then narrowing to specific annoyances that perhaps he finds particularly bothersome, but never attempting to defend his own side. That Guise does not feel the need to offer a defense of conservative academia suggests that there is no doubt in his mind that he is right and Ramus is wrong. Statements like "in *your* judgment" (ix.29), and "*Your nego argumentum / Cannot serve*" are scathing and targeting (ix.36, emphasis mine). Guise also makes sure to call Ramus "sirrah," rubbing his class superiority in the scholar's face (ix.37). Because of the targeting nature of his threats, Guise's response to Ramus' question seems particularly defensive.

Guise's emotional reaction to Ramus shows that he is not only a scholarly traditionalist, but that he is personally offended by Ramus' logic and approach because it undermines the Sorbonne's, and therefore Catholic, customs. Perhaps Marlowe uses Guise here to comment on blind adherence to tradition. While he staunchly supports the traditional approaches, Guise does not give any reasons why they are better than Ramus'. Guise has fallen into the traditionalist trap that leads a man to accept the old ways without question for no reason other than their ability to withstand the test of time and fears the religious and educational changes that are happening instead of trying to compromise with them. Alongside his taking offense at his authority being challenged, Marlowe has created in Guise a tyrant whose strict unwillingness to compromise contrasts sharply with the more accommodating personality of his representation of Ramus.

Holistically Guise, though a cruel character, is not an entirely unlikeable one. Towards the end of the play, he begins to fit into the mold of the Marlovian tragic hero as he fearlessly faces his own death. In the massacre scenes, however, he is the clear aggressor and a cruel tyrant, and the Ramus scene allows for glimpses into his character that will develop along with the plot. Guise's order to kill Ramus is made to seem crueler in relation to the non-aggression portrayed by the philosopher. When Retes tells Anjou "'Tis Ramus, the King's professor of Logic" (ix.21), Guise responds in a tone that is chillingly dismissive, "Stab him" (ix.22). Instead of feeling the pity and respect for Ramus that the audience does, Guise is prepared to have him die with a simple order, and only launches into his argument when Ramus challenges him. Guise's blunt dismissal of Ramus shows his pride as he considers one of the most respected scholars in France to be below him. Glenn suggests that Guise's role in the scene also serves to establish a conflict of "the authoritarian against the independent intellectual" (373). Indeed, Guise is the clear authority in the scene, giving orders in a clipped voice and only giving a lengthy response when Ramus asks "wherein hath Ramus been so offensive?" (ix.23). Guise's response is not only long but heated, making clear that Marlowe's leader of the Catholic cause is a character who does not appreciate his authority challenged.

Although Ramus may be willing to stand up against Guise's tyranny, the scene provides an important look into the power balance of the Duke and other characters, particularly that of the Duke of Anjou, who will later become Henry III, King of France. Guise is the clear authority with all the lines in the scene; Anjou speaks rarely, and the only line he has of any substance is as he kills Ramus. This inequality of lines and Guise's direct

speech to Anjoy illustrate the balance of power between them. Anjoy is the one to tell Ramus "Well, say on," when the scholar begs for a chance to speak, which shows that he does have some authority (ix.39). However, after Ramus says his part, Guise demands of Anjoy, "Why suffer you that peasant to declaim?/ Stab him, I say, and send him to his friends in hell" (ix.53-54). Anjoy immediately does as he is told, submissive to Guise's authority. If Anjoy starts out badly in terms of standing up for himself, he fails to become stronger as the play progresses, constantly manipulated whether the puppet master is Guise, the Queen Mother, or Epernoun. Guise's authority does not just extend to Anjoy, however; he demands obeisance from everyone, from nameless scholars to the King himself, and as he proves in this scene, he is not afraid to use violence to obtain it.

Ramus as Nationalist and Contemporary England

If Guise represents Catholicism in the scene, then although Ramus never mentions religion anywhere in his defense, it becomes clear from his conviction and his juxtaposition with Guise that Marlowe is invoking the philosopher's Protestantism. The implications of this characterization go further than simple surface-level propagandizing, however. Often, the words of the two men reflect English fears and possible solutions for resolving the potential crisis in Anglo-French relations that seemed inevitable in the early 1590s. Guise is not only a Catholic but a tyrant, evoking images of Imperial Spain supported by the many instances that link Guise with the Catholic empire in the play. In his first scene, Guise references the financial aid he receives from Spain (ii.57-58), and a cry to "Phillip and Parma" are among the last words he speaks before he dies (xxi.83). Likewise, Ramus is both a Protestant and a dedicated educator who is loyal to his country. Marlowe also shows the philosopher as

committed to tolerance as a comment on the contemporary political climate. Just as Guise demonstrates England's worst fears about Spain, Ramus symbolizes an English people who can survive whatever may come out of France through devotion to Queen and country and a willingness to compromise for a greater good.

Knowledge of Ramus' religious and social stances is important to our understanding of why he is such an important character to the massacre scenes of Marlowe's play. Ramus' loyalty to his country is of great importance to both the play and the political atmosphere of the 1590s. Under the threat of Henri IV's likely conversion to Catholicism and subsequent pressure from Spain, loyalty to one's country could not be stressed enough. Upon hearing the "fearful cries [comes] from the river Seine" (ix.1), Ramus' friend and coworker Taleus begs the scholar to escape, as "The Guisians are / Hard at thy doore, and meane to murder vs" (ix.7-8). Ramus refuses, and even says "Sweet Taleus stay," encouraging his friend to weather the coming onslaught with him (ix.10). Despite Guise's advances Ramus chooses to stand his ground, brave in the face of certain death. Strong national pride was common under Elizabeth, and under the current political circumstances, national loyalty was important. By stressing Ramus' refusal to flee despite the fact that the Guisians are massacring in the streets, Marlowe makes his character exceptionally sympathetic to his audience, who would already have lent their support to the Protestant victim due to like religious belief. Not only will Ramus not leave, he asks Taleus to stay with him, which Glenn argues inspires the man to the only courage he shows in the scene, his declaration in defense of his friend, "I am as Ramus is, a Christian" (ix.14). Ramus is not simply an unrepentant Protestant, but a brave and loyal citizen of France who inspires his friends to remain steadfast. This mentality of

nationalism and inspiration to others was necessary in contemporary England lest the country have to stand against Spain without aid from the French.

Ramus also differs from Guise in that he approaches his side of the argument as a defense rather than as a statement of his beliefs. During the French civil wars, the Huguenots were often on the defensive against the Catholics as their forces were consistently smaller. Placing Ramus in the defensive position also raises implications of England's perceived stance in her relationship with Spain; naturally, the English considered themselves the victims of the empire. As Guise has already stated his point of view in his rebuttal, Ramus has no need to explain his work; his enemy's threats, however, do give him cause to defend it, especially since Guise has specifically attacked Ramus' teachings. He begins his argument by saying "Not for my life do I desire this pause, / But in my latter hour to purge myself, / In that I know the things that I have wrote" (ix:40-43). Considering his situation, Ramus shows real courage in these lines. He does not ask for the chance to speak in order to prolong his life, but to speak on the things that he has written. With the massacre underway outside his door and Guise and his cronies in the room with him, Ramus is unlikely to escape and he knows it. What is important to Ramus in his situation is not that he lives, however, but that his educational work survives. Nowhere does Ramus say that he regrets or recants anything; "I know the things that I have wrote," he says, with absolutely no hint of apology (ix:43). In making this claim, Ramus does little more than acknowledge his work and claim it as his own. He will not apologize for having offended Guise, and from his first few lines he refuses to back down.

In fact, when pressured with his imminent death, Ramus is not only steadfast but proud in his unwillingness to allow his work to be discredited. This pride is a facet true to the nature of the historical Ramus. Though he discredited their tenets, Ramus nevertheless relied on many of the rhetorical rules laid down by authors like Quintilian in his own work, often failing to recognize his reliance on the ancient texts (Kennedy 250-251). In his defense Ramus claims that "one Scheckius takes it ill, / Because my places, being but three, contains all his," (ix.43-44). Scheckius is a reference to Joseph Schegk, an Aristotelian with whom Ramus had once engaged in a debate (Kusukawa 166). Here Ramus shows that he clearly considers his work to be superior to that of Schegk, as his work is more concise. Comparing his shorter work with Scheckius' also shows Ramus' faith in his own methods and belief that the more succinct version is the better. His comparison to Scheckius' work coupled with his refusal to apologize renders Ramus as a proud man, but this pride allows the philosopher to bravely defend himself and his work to the man who just tore apart his ideas and has issued the order for his death. Like his Protestant beliefs, Ramus believes his logic to be superior because of its lack of complexity and its accessibility to others. As a teacher, Ramus' primary responsibility was to help his students gain command of important ideas, a task he found was made easier by simplifying the work. Though his prideful response shows a less sympathetic side of the philosopher, Ramus' stubbornness easily echoes the adherence to religious suits and loyalty to one's country that Marlowe endorses elsewhere.

Ramus, Logic, and Education

While he will never apologize for his work, Ramus makes a point to defend his argument against Aristotle, as Guise's displeasure and that of the Sorbonne seems to hang

most specifically on that point. He does not meet Guise's argument spar for spar, but instead focuses his rebuttal on the aspect of his work that caused the most problems for the most people: his break from traditional Aristotelian logic, which resulted in his disagreement with the approach of older Catholic institutions like the Sorbonne. "I knew the *Organon* to be confus'd," he says, "And I reduc'd it into better form" (ix.45-46). Indeed, Ramus challenged Aristotle in both his master's thesis and early books, whom he claimed failed to follow his own principles, resulting in a confused mess of logic (Duhamel 165). Marlowe takes Ramus' pride into consideration here as well, as the philosopher distinctly says that he put Aristotle's work in a "better" form (ix.46). Ramus' break from the scholarly tradition is significant in terms of religious politics because it mirrors his religious past. Having started life as a Catholic, Ramus, with the help of an old schoolmate, the Cardinal of Lorraine (who also appears throughout the play), was appointed by Henri II as "Royal Professor of Philosophy and Eloquence" (Glenn 366). Nevertheless, Ramus' dismissal of Aristotle put him at odds with many of the conservative Catholic educators where he attended in the College of Navarre, University of Paris, and at the College du Mans, College de l'Ave Maria, as well as the College de Presles, where he took his differing views into other subjects, after he was forbidden to teach philosophy (Kusukawa 163-64). Even when his religious views were more conservative Ramus was an opponent of adherence for tradition's sake. It would not be long before Ramus would sever his ties with Catholicism in much the same way as he did with Aristotle's logic. In 1561, Ramus converted to Protestantism (Glenn 366).

Nevertheless Ramus has a higher purpose than just the acting Protestant on stage in this scene, and Marlowe gains even more sympathy for his Protestant martyr by creating in

the philosopher a character who acknowledges his opposition. In his speech, Ramus' treatment of Aristotle is almost kind. Whereas Guise is scathing in his remarks towards Ramus, the philosopher treats his predecessor Aristotle with a respect not found in his historical counterpart's works. Ramus does not remark on the legitimacy of Aristotle's work or suggest that it is useless, but instead says that it is "confus'd," (ix.45) and that his "reduc[ing]" of it helped; as Ramus was first and foremost a teacher, he intended his epitomes to be more digestible to students (ix.46). Immediately after, Ramus says "And this for Aristotle will I say, / That he that despiseth him can ne'er / Be good in logic or philosophy" (9.46-48). Whether due to the swords currently pointed at his throat or to a realization that without the *Organon* he would have had no thesis, Ramus in this moment sees fit to defend his old intellectual adversary. Though the historical Ramus was almost violent in his rejection of ancient rhetorical practices, Marlowe utilizes the philosopher's position as an innovator who drew on the old ways to promote tolerance. Marlowe's Ramus claims that his frustration was not specifically aimed at Aristotle himself, but rather at the obscure way in which he presented his logic. Adherence to outdated and confusing traditions is the real source of dramatic philosopher's ire, as it is less a crime to produce a work that is confusing than to persist in it.

Marlowe's Ramus defends Aristotle's work despite his confusing writings, but his historical counterpart was also strongly against educators and universities that he felt perpetuated obfuscation, and the character represents this frustration as well. His reference to the University of Paris as "blockish Sorbonnests [who]/ Attribute as much unto their works/ As to the service of the eternal God" is especially pertinent (ix.50-52), as it was the

Sorbonne's Department of Theology that was the authority on religious matters, and was therefore primarily responsible for the restrictions upon books and the subsequent witch hunts for heretics (Knecht 45). When Ramus says the Sorbonne put as much effort into providing a well-rounded education as they put into their service to God, he makes a caustic comment on ignorance in the name of tradition and its very real devastating effects. Because of its fierce censorship of books and intolerance for Protestantism, the Sorbonne limited education not only in its refusal to allow Aristotle's works to be approached in a new way, but also in the theology department in particular's disallowance of differing opinions on any religious matter. In sixteenth-century France, a refusal of tolerance and unwillingness to compromise went beyond stifling education and often resulted in war and death.

Ramus' refusal to capitulate to the tradition even in the face of mortal danger makes him a perfect martyr. This stubbornness does not make him less sympathetic; where he could appear snobbish, through Marlowe's careful manipulations Ramus seems instead courageous. He is the only character in the massacre scenes who has attempted to fight back, even if it is in the form of a speech that ultimately does little to extend his life. Also, Ramus' commitment as an educator is reflected in the fact that he always returned to France from teaching elsewhere, devoted to the students of his own country even when his life was at risk. Because of this dedication, Ramus' response is not without emotion. His frustration with the "blockish Sorbonnists" is tangible, as is his bitterness with some of his fellow scholars' refusal to make Aristotle's texts more accessible to the students to whom Ramus was so committed and therefore limit the education that they were able to receive (ix.50).

Ramus and Education as Religio-Political Ameliorative

As with Guise, there are few stage directions that apply to Ramus in the scene. The scene as a whole, however, functions in order to portray Ramus as a character with whom an English audience can sympathize, a necessity if Marlowe is to present tolerance through education as a solution to an impending crisis. Ramus' fame provides ample reason for the expansion of his scene in particular, as opposed to the other scenes of the massacre. As Glenn notes, "the recognition of an actual personage from recent history awakens audience interest and lends credibility and force to the dramatized massacre" (369). The people of London, regardless of their rank, would all be familiar with the French philosopher who challenged Aristotle's dominion in the universities. Because Ramus' name was widely known, it would be easy for an Elizabethan audience to feel emotional attachment to him. Of all of the candidates for an expanded scene, only Ramus is famous; the other characters involved in the short massacre scenes include a preacher named Loreine, a man named Seroune, and a couple of nameless Schoolmasters who accompany Navarre and Condy (Scene ix). Marlowe's expansion of this scene in particular is sensible as it contains a character with whom the audience can already identify. Added focus on Ramus' educational views in stark contrast with the more oppressive views of Guise and the Sorbonne aids in the making of the philosopher as a martyr.

In contrast to the caustic and passion-fueled logic debate between Guise and Ramus, the philosopher's relationship with his coworker Taleus casts a kinder light on the scene while giving Marlowe the opportunity to show education as an ameliorative to religious strife as opposed to a weapon to promote fear and intolerance. Like Guise's, Taleus' presence is

added to the scene through artistic license; Glenn notes that Taleus had died ten years before the massacre took place (371). Marlowe's choosing to include the scholar in the scene and show him as close friends with Ramus promotes education as a peaceful alternative to the intolerance caused by an inability to compromise. The friendship between Ramus and Taleus is important not only because of the loyalty that the scholar inspires in his friend but also from a religious perspective. When Taleus defends Ramus, saying "I am as *Ramus* is, a Christian," Retes responds by telling Gonzago "O let him goe, he is a catholick" (ix.15). Taleus was a close friend and follower of Ramus, and from Retes' statement "'Tis Taleus, Ramus' bedfellow," it is clear that, at least for the purposes of the play, they are living under the same roof, most likely to aid in collaborative work (ix.12). That Taleus, a Catholic, and Ramus, a former Catholic turned Protestant reside in the same house and are such close companions is indicative of an ideal peace between the two factions on a smaller scale that was not possible in contemporary Paris or in the larger French political moments of the mid 1500s. For these two educators, religion is not an issue, and they are able to rise above such differences to attain a common goal. None of the other characters in the play are willing or able to compromise, not even Navarre, who ultimately proclaims a death sentence on Catholics who aided Guise. Perhaps a capacity for tolerance is the peaceful solution to a violent problem.

Marlowe also presents education as a pacifistic option in Ramus' lines concerning Aristotle. While he admits that he "knew the *Organon* to be confus'd," Marlowe's Ramus is quick to defend Aristotle as a master of philosophy and logic (ix.45). Regardless of his strong feelings on the teaching of Aristotle, Ramus' speech presents a compromise, which reflects

his religious stance and his relationship with Taleus. Ramus is a Protestant; he has adhered to his faith since his conversion despite great threat to his life. Nevertheless, he does not hate his friend Taleus, a Catholic, but rather consents to live under the same roof as him, happy to study alongside his friend. Ramus is able to see past religious differences in the name of education and learning, and though it manifests itself in a different way, the speech conveys his willingness to compromise well. Marlowe's Ramus no longer denounces Aristotle, but rather the unprogressive traditionalists who refuse to see a different way of teaching the philosopher's works, and he defends his method of condensing as conciliation to the argument.

Applying Tolerance and Education to Marlowe's England

With Henri IV about to convert to Catholicism to preserve his country, a message of conciliation and tolerance was one that the English people needed to hear. If Henri converted, France would have no ties to England in terms of religion that she could use to enlist the country's help in defense against Catholic Spain. Also, a Catholic France would open up a space for French negotiations with Spain, placing England in a bad religio-political position. Henri's conversion would unite France, Protestant and Catholic alike, and England needed to do the same to maintain her freedom from the Spanish empire forever on her heels. Despite the clear Protestant majority in England, plenty of Catholics remained on the island. Events like the Babington plot, in which Catholic recusants sought to kill Elizabeth in favor of Mary Queen of Scots, proved that English Catholics remained enough of a presence to cause concern. As Elizabeth had no heir, the English people felt anxiety as to who would become her successor, fearing that their country too could collapse into the same kind of civil war

that had plagued France for half a century. All of these concerns called for not only peace between Catholics and Protestants but unification as Englishmen, and the Ramus scene presents education as a possible solution.

Education as a means to tolerance was an idea strongly supported by Renaissance humanists and one that has persisted even in our contemporary academy. With greater knowledge comes greater understanding, and when we learn to understand others we learn to be tolerant of their differences. Much of the early modern curriculum catered to this idea, and in the later part of the century, educators in England began blending Ramus' approach with the structure of classical logic, creating a compromise between the two (Howell 282). Cicero and Quintilian set the groundwork for well-rounded argument, which early modern educators fleshed out for their own purposes. Concepts like *copia*, or the ability to express oneself in several different ways, and arguing on both sides of the question taught students not only to use the correct rhetorical approach for any given moment, but simultaneously forced an understanding of their opponent's viewpoint. Since Quintilian, rhetoric had been an art not only practical, but moral, and students were expected to be able to argue rightly not only to further their own claims, but to undermine those who would use rhetoric for ill means. Joel B. Altman claims that this approach of moralizing rhetoric "produced in [Renaissance humanists] an eristic turn of mind that permanently affected the way they conducted themselves, the way they read, and the way they wrote" (32). Classical figures were taught alongside early modern moralists and educators like Thomas Wilson and Erasmus in the most prestigious universities and the smallest grammar schools, ensuring that the theory of moral argument transcended class boundaries. Indeed, many of the exercises practiced by

students included political questions, and knowledge of how to make an effective moral argument was considered a must for politicians, diplomats, and monarchs. England's Elizabeth I was a devout practitioner of humanistic principles as demonstrated in her treatment of the Catholics in her realm shortly after her ascension to the throne. Having somewhat of a liking for certain Catholic customs like the music and imagery and a desire to not alarm the powerful Spanish empire at such a precarious time in her reign, Elizabeth opted to continue some of the traditions of the Catholic church in her own church. Susan Doran remarks that the queen endorsed Latin prayer books in some universities, and that she won an argument with the archbishop of Canterbury who finally allowed her "to keep a silver cross or crucifix and two candlesticks" near the royal chapel's altar (Doran, *Religion* 8). Likewise, Elizabeth went to great lengths to not stir up resentment in the Catholic populace of England, believing that the religion would die out on its own if left alone. No Catholics were executed, and only those who showed flagrant disregard for the new laws were punished for maintaining their faith. By showing tolerance for her Catholic citizens upon becoming queen, Elizabeth stopped the rebellions that may have occurred otherwise in their tracks, and made the transition to Protestantism easier for those who would convert.

The actions that Elizabeth took towards dealing with Catholics after she became queen prove that tolerance was an approach that had worked in the past when trying to unite her people. Viewing the friendship of Ramus and Taleus with this knowledge shows yet another instance of Marlowe's support for his monarch's diplomatic policies. Despite the occasional Catholic rebellion, like that of the Babington plot, most Catholics continued to lie low. However, anti-Catholic propaganda stirred up by the wars in France caused an often

heated response from Protestants, and under the threat from Henri IV's conversion, continued national unity was a must. Marlowe clearly saw the need for endorsing a path of tolerance, hence the friendship of Ramus and Taleus staged in *The Massacre*. "I am as Ramus is, a Christian," Taleus remarks when pressured by Guise's henchmen (ix.14). If they were to stand strong as a country against their enemies, the English people needed to transcend the labels of Catholic and Protestant like Taleus and be willing to stand next to their fellow countrymen in times of strife.

With this need for tolerance in mind, Marlowe draws on the language of education, a rhetorical strategy that Elizabeth often used in relation to her people. Elizabeth and her advisors relied on the image of the queen as a learned prince throughout her reign, initially feeling the need to establish her as a wise monarch because of her status as an unmarried female. This focus on the queen's education and learning took many forms, including that of the diplomatic rhetoric of Neo-Stoicism Elizabeth employed throughout the 1580s in her dealings with the French Huguenots. During times of political and religious upheaval, Elizabeth's counselors and advisors referred to her as a representative of divine wisdom, and one who knew and wanted the best for her people. Later on, Elizabeth took up the same approach and came to often rely on the image of herself as schoolmistress of the English citizens. As an unmarried queen with no children of her own, Elizabeth used the image of a loving educator who gently teaches and guides her students when dealing in domestic diplomacy. Elizabeth also adopted the concept of herself as a possessor of divine wisdom when uniting her people in religion. By presenting herself as a monarch of love and a schoolmistress, the Queen could bring her students together under her singular religious

approach.¹¹ Though her approach would ultimately come to differ from the Neo-Stoicism of Henri IV's, Elizabeth also used the language of education and tolerance to unite her people by transcending traditional religious rhetoric.

Though Henri IV was currently causing much grief for the English as a result of his likely conversion, he too could provide a model for transcending religious difference through Neo-Stoicism. Indeed, Neo-Stoic rhetoric was also employed by Elizabeth during this stressful period in Anglo-French diplomatic history, its focus on prudence and reason overruling the emotionally charged rhetoric of religious fervor. Perhaps most pertinent to the discussion of easing tensions between religious factions in England is the concept of the *politique*. In late sixteenth-century France, the *politiques* were the moderate Catholics who supported Henri IV on the basis of his Neo-Stoic approach. Fearful of the zealotry of the Catholic League, the *politiques* favored a king who would rule with tolerance as opposed to the witch hunt the League seemed intent on pursuing. Elizabeth's approach of winning over the English Catholics upon her ascension through tolerance worked in much the same fashion as Henri's prudential approach, and might work again. As a philosophy focused on reason, Neo-Stoicism has great ties to education. Seneca's works were translated in pamphlet form, and would have been available to the masses (Parmelee 35). Like those of other philosophers who enjoyed such high status in Elizabethan England, Seneca's works inspired their readers to rise above emotionally charged feelings of hate or anger and to let reason guide them instead. Reason would not prove to be enough in the aftermath of Henri's conversion, however, and Elizabeth would begin to exercise the rhetoric of prudence and love in her

¹¹ For more information on diplomacy via Elizabeth's learning, see Linda Shenk's *Learned Queen: The Image of Elizabeth I in Politics and Poetry*."

domestic dealings, initiated by her translation of Boethius' *Consolation of Philosophy* (Shenk). Like Lady Philosophy, Elizabeth would play schoolmistress to her people, helping them to rise above their differences and unite under love of their queen.

Marlowe's Ramus scene depicts intolerance and cruelty at its worst in the form of Guise, who stirs up images of England's worst fears of Imperial Spain in his tyrannical treatment of the Protestant philosopher. Nevertheless, Ramus is not willing to give up without a defense of his work, in which he takes pride despite the danger. Marlowe's depiction of Ramus' bravery and loyalty to his home country are qualities necessary to the English people if they were to maintain their independence in a world that was growing increasingly hostile. However stark his representation of the cruelty of the tyrannical, Marlowe also gives an outlet for peace; Ramus and Taleus' friendship depicts an ideal world where Protestants and Catholics can live amongst one another and transcend their differences in pursuit of a greater good. Illustrating both cruelty and hope within the same scene, Marlowe proves his ability to represent in drama the contemporary struggles and concerns of England in relation to the world around her, as well as his faith in his queen's diplomacy and leadership.

CHAPTER FIVE. CONCLUSION

Christopher Marlowe's *The Massacre at Paris* encompasses the concerns and interests of the English people during a pivotal time in Anglo-French diplomacy. While the Catholic League applied pressure to Henri IV of France to convert to Catholicism, England awaited the conclusion of the French Civil Wars with anxiety. If Henri were to do as the League hoped and convert, France would stand united, possibly at the expense of the English. A Catholic France could open up negotiations with Imperial Spain, leaving England with no one to help her stand against the Catholic superpower. These fears combined with the celebrity status of Henri IV, renowned for his bravery and benevolence on the battlefield, and the great number of English troops engaged in battle alongside him made events in France fascinating to Englishmen and women from commoners to nobility. Unlike his overconfident villain Guise, Marlowe was savvy in his understanding of his audience; *The Massacre at Paris* was a great success amidst the anxiety and excitement of the early 1590s.

Certainly, the play pandered to its audience's interests. Because of the religious violence depicted in *The Massacre*, scholars often have dismissed it as mere propaganda not worthy of a deep reading. Marlowe was more subtle in his manipulations of the play to connect to his audience, however. Rhetorical principles and knowing how to argue rightly were a necessary part of an early modern education, and the English playgoers would have received these lessons, whether from a lowly grammar school or a private tutor. The audience would then recognize the high style of Guise's oratory and his overwrought appeals to *pathos*, and Navarre's prudent, steady Stoicism would reach them as well. Likewise, the popularity of news quartos and pamphlets coming in from France would have acquainted the

English with the names and characters who appear in Marlowe's play, familiarizing them with the subject matter. Marlowe's employment of these strategies suggest a much more careful and meticulous approach than that with which *The Massacre* is often credited.

By focusing on the rhetorical techniques employed by the characters in *The Massacre*, I have found it possible to reconstruct a better concept of the popular reception of the French Civil Wars and their influence on the emotions of the people of late sixteenth-century England. Also, Marlowe's clear interest in the contemporary Anglo-French political milieu suggests his knowledge of the foreign policies implemented by the Queen at that time, making Navarre's seemingly bland dramatic presence more understandable. Neo-Stoicism, while it may have won Henri IV the hearts of the English people, does not translate very well onstage. Guise, on the other hand, has a charisma as magnificent as his fall from grace, and Marlowe's audience would have recognized his ill-use of *pathos* to achieve his dastardly ends. As leader of the Catholic League, Guise aroused feelings of distrust and panic amongst the English, who had been fed on anti-League and anti-Guise pamphlets. Between these instances and Guise's ill-treatment of Marlowe's deliberately over-sympathetic martyr Ramus, Guise is set up to fail and allow Navarre to assume the position of power his historical counterpart achieved.

Despite my efforts to provide a new perspective on *The Massacre*, much work remains to be done with this play. Sara Munson Deats posits that the play, ignored for far too long, is an "interrogative drama possessing a sufficient number of typically Marlovian traits to make it of interest to students of the playwright" (200). My study of *The Massacre* has led me to agree. Through my rhetorical parsing of the play it has become clear to me that

Marlowe had a specific intention beyond simple propaganda, yet I have only just begun to unravel the political and historical significance behind it. The approach that I have taken of analyzing religio-political rhetoric has proved beneficial to understanding *The Massacre* in its historical context, and I would like to continue to study the play from this angle.

One character I would like to conduct a focused study on, much like my chapter on Guise, is Marlowe's rendition of Catherine de Medici. Though I was not able to attribute the time to her that I would have liked to here, her position as a woman who wields significant political power links her with Elizabeth I in ways that have yet to be examined. Scholars have made the observation, but my research did not turn up any in depth readings of the Queen Mother's likeness to Elizabeth. While I find it doubtful that Marlowe would openly criticize his queen, I have considered that Catherine's character may embody more of the role of a warning to monarchs on avoiding detrimental alliances. The Puritan preacher John Stubbes argued strongly against the Queen's possible engagement to the Duke of Alençon, fearing that England would be brought under France by the Salic Law, which forbade a woman to rule in France (Hillman 60). Also, Catherine's relationship to Elizabeth is interesting in conjunction with Anglo-French politics, from her attempts to marry the English queen to Alençon to their eventual straying apart. Looking at Catherine's portrayal in the play alongside Elizabeth as a ruler could provide some interesting perspectives on the queen's rule, political position, and diplomatic strategies as a single female monarch.

The question of the Queen's longevity could provide another interesting reading of *The Massacre*. I have discussed in this thesis the anxiety that arose from Henri IV's imminent conversion, but domestic politics in the 1590s also caused the English large amounts of

stress. With Elizabeth gaining in years, England feared the outcome should she die without naming an heir. The English people had seen what could happen as a result of sectarian disagreements over who had the right to rule; they had watched France tear itself apart for fifty years. From this perspective, many questions arise concerning ascendancy to the throne in the play. All of the heirs gain the throne after violent events; Marlowe suggests that Catherine poisoned Charles IX, and Navarre only becomes king after King Henry's violent demise by poisoned dagger. Also, the way that characters treat their progeny in the play complicates this reading, particularly Catherine's violent dismissals of her children and Guise's treatment of his pregnant wife. King Henry's threats to Guise's young son are pertinent along these lines concerning who is or is not allowed to take the throne. Considering that Elizabeth's successor was a great concern for the English people in the 1590s, a reading of the play from this viewpoint could prove every bit as productive as the one that I have used in this thesis.

More research still remains to be done on the play in terms of its reception in the political sphere as well. Though *The Massacre* was a great success in England, it received much less friendly reception in France. Perhaps it was easier for the English to appreciate the play as they were at least somewhat removed from the horrific wars that *The Massacre* represented in drama. Also, the play was resurrected several times after its initial performances (Voss 124). Taking a deeper look at the political atmosphere in England and France around these later stagings of the play could provide interesting historical perspective. Considering Marlowe's portrayal of Guise and other characters alongside those of his contemporaries could also prove an interesting study. Shona McIntosh has begun this effort

with her article on George Chapman's *Guise* in comparison with Marlowe's, but little else has been written along these lines and there are other references to *Guise* in Elizabethan popular culture worth examining. Also, an investigation of Marlowe's work in conjunction with John Dryden's much later play *The Duke of Guise* might prove fruitful. Though they were not contemporaries and were separated by great political upheaval, an analysis of the *Guise* in relation to both political milieus could be beneficial.

Though I have endeavored to be thorough in this thesis, I know that my work is far from exhaustive. *The Massacre at Paris* has been either ignored or berated for such a long time that very little research has been done on it in comparison to Marlowe's other plays. I may very well pursue one of the options I have presented in my doctoral dissertation, and I encourage other scholars of Marlowe to not too readily dismiss this play. Although the copy passed down to us is assumed abridged and fractured, the basic form of the play remains, and this edition remains conducive to analysis. Marlowe's subtle manipulations of the characters' rhetoric also suggests that he had plans for this play that extended beyond the simple propaganda for which it has long been condemned. My own work on *The Massacre at Paris* has proven very enjoyable and enlightening, and I look forward to continuing my research on Elizabethan drama and the transnational political atmosphere of the time.

WORKS CITED

- Altman, Joel B. *The Tudor Play of Mind*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1978. Print.
- Anonymous. *Concerning the Yeelding of the Cittie of Grenoble into the King's Obedience, Agreed Upon Between the Lord Desdiguers, and the Committees of the Countrey. Together with the Besieging and Yeelding Up of Chartres*. (STC 1307:04). Trans. E.A. London: John Wolfe, 1591. *EEBO*. Web. 23 February 2012.
- Anonymous. *A Discourse and True Recitall of Euerie Particular of the Victorie Obtained by the French King, on Wednesday the Fourth of March, Being Ash Wednesday* (STC 569:17). Trans: A Anonymous. London: Thomas Orwin for Richard Oliffe, 1590. *EEBO*. Web. 16 February 2012.
- Anonymous. *The Contre-Guyse, Wherein is Deciphered the Pretended Title of the Guyses, and the First Entrie of the Saide Family into Fraunce, with Their Ambitious Aspiring and Pernituous Practises for the Obtaining of the French Crowne*. (STC 304:07). London: John Wolfe, 1589. *EEBO*. Web. 11 March 2012.
- Ashworth, E. Jennifer. "Logic in Late Sixteenth Century England: Humanist Dialectic and the New Aristotelianism." *Studies in Philology*. 88.2 (1991): 224-36. *JSTOR*. Web. 17 May 2011.
- Bakeless, John. *The Tragical History of Christopher Marlowe (Two Volumes)*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1942. Print.
- Bennett, H.S., ed. *The Works and Life of Christopher Marlowe*. New York: Gordian Press, Inc., 1966. Print.
- Blum, Paul Richard. *Philosophers of the Renaissance*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic U of America P, 2010. Print.
- Bréhier, Émile. *The History of Philosophy: The Middle Ages and the Renaissance*. Chicago: The U of Chicago P, 1965. Print.
- Briggs, Julia. "Marlowe's 'Massacre at Paris': A Reconsideration." *The Review of English Studies*. 34.135 (1983): 257-78. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 June 2011.
- Chamberlain, Stephanie. "Fantasizing Infanticide: Lady Macbeth and the Murdering Mother in Early Modern England." *College Literature*. 32.3 (2005): 72-91. Print.
- Crawford, Katherine. "Catherine de Medicis and the Performance of Political Motherhood." *The Sixteenth Century Journal*. 31.3 (2000): 643-673. Web. 3 July 2011.

- Crouzet, Denis. "Henri IV, King of Reason?" *From Valois to Bourbon: Dynasty, State and Society in Early Modern France*. Ed. Keith Cameron. Exeter: U of Exeter P, 1989. 73-106. Print.
- Deats, Sara Munson. "Dido, Queen of Carthage and The Massacre at Paris." *The Cambridge Companion to Christopher Marlowe*. Ed. Patrick Cheney. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004. 193-206. Print.
- Doran, Susan. *Elizabeth I and Foreign Policy, 1558-1603*. New York: Routledge, 2000. Print.
- Doran, Susan. *Elizabeth I and Religion, 1558-1603*. London: Routledge, 1994. *Iowa State University Ebrary Reader*. Web. 15 Dec. 2011.
- Duhamel, Pierre Albert. "The Logic and Rhetoric of Peter Ramus." *Modern Philology*. 46.3 (1949): 163-71. *JSTOR*. Web. 18 May 2011.
- du Plessis-Mornay, Phillipe. *An Aduertisement from a French Gentleman, Touching the Intention and Meaning Which Those of the House of Guise Haue in Their Late Leuying of Forces and Armes in the Realme of France*. np, 1585. *EEBO*. Web. 11 March 2012.
- du Plessis-Mornay, Phillipe. *The Declaration of the King of Nauarre Touching the Slaunders Published Against Him in the Protestations of Those of the League That Are Risen Up in Arms in This Realm of Fraunce (STC [2nd Ed.] 13106)*. Trans. Claudius Hollyband. London: John Charlewood, 1585. *EEBO*. Web. 23 February 2012.
- Eliot, John. *The Survey or Topographical Description of France*. 1592. Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1979. Print.
- Frieda, Leonie. *Catherine de Medici*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 2003. Print.
- Galloway, David. "The Ramus Scene in Marlowe's 'The Massacre at Paris.'" *Notes and Queries*. 198.4 (1953): 146-47. Print.
- Glenn, John Ronald. "The Martyrdom of Ramus in Marlowe's 'The Massacre at Paris.'" *Papers on Language and Literature*. 9 (1973): 365-79. Print.
- Greengrass, Mark. *France in the Age of Henri IV: the Struggle for Stability*. New York: Longman Group Ltd, 1984. Print.

- Hailey, R. Carter. "The Publication Date of Marlowe's Massacre at Paris, with a Note on the Collier Leaf." *Marlowe Studies: An Annual*. 1 (2011): 25-40. Print.
- Henke, Robert and Eric Nicholson. *Transnational Exchange in Early Modern Theater*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2008. Print.
- Hillman, Richard. *Shakespeare, Marlowe and Politics of France*. New York: Palgrave, 2002. Print.
- Howell, Wilbur Samuel. *Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700*. Bristol: Thoemmes Press, 1999. Print.
- Kennedy, George A. *Classical Rhetoric & Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1999. Print.
- Kirk, Andrew M. *The Mirror of Confusion: The Representation of French History in English Renaissance Drama*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1996. Print.
- Kocher, Paul H. "Contemporary Pamphlet Backgrounds for Marlowe's *The Massacre at Paris*." *Modern Language Quarterly*. 8.2 (1947): 151-74. *EBSCOhost*. Web. 29 October 2011.
- Kocher, Paul H. "Contemporary Pamphlet Backgrounds for Marlowe's *The Massacre at Paris* Part Two." *Modern Language Quarterly*. 8.3 (1947): 309-319. *EBSCOhost*. Web. 29 October 2011.
- Kocher, Paul H. "Francois Hotman and Marlowe's *The Massacre at Paris*." *PMLA*. 56.2 (1941): 365-366. *JSTOR*. Web. 14 September 2011.
- Knecht, R.J. *The French Civil Wars 1562-1598*. Singapore: Pearson Education, 2000. Print.
- Kruse, Elaine. "The Woman in Black: The Image of Catherine de Medici from Marlowe to *Queen Margot*." "*High and Mighty Queens*" of Early Modern England. Ed. Carole Levin, Jo Eldridge Carney, and Debra Barrett-Graves. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003. 223-237. Print.
- Kusukawa, Sachiko. "Petrus Ramus (1515-1572): Method and Reform." *Philosophers of the Renaissance*. Ed. Paul Richard Blum. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic U of America P, 2010. 163-67. Print.
- Marlowe, Christopher. *Doctor Faustus (Revels Edition)*. Ed. David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1993. Print.

- Marlowe, Christopher. "The Massacre at Paris." *Dido Queen of Carthage and The Massacre at Paris (Revels Edition)*. Ed. H.J. Oliver. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1968. 91-180. Print.
- Martin, Randall. "Anne Dowriche's 'The French History', Christopher Marlowe, and Machiavellian Agency." *Studies in English Literature*. 39.1 (1999): 69-87. *JSTOR*. Web. 11 March 2012.
- McIntosh, Shona. "The Massacre of St. Bartholomew on the English Stage: Chapman, Marlowe, and the Duke of Guise." *Renaissance Studies*. 26.2 (2011): 1-20. *Wiley Online Library*. Web. 16 March 2012.
- Nicholson, Bruce Ambler. *Marlowe's Mighty Massacre*. Diss. University of California Riverside, 2011. Ann Arbor: UMI, 2001. ProQuest. Web. 1 November 2011.
- Parmelee, Lisa Ferraro. *Good Newes From Fraunce: French Anti-League Propaganda in Late Elizabethan England*. Rochester: U of Rochester P, 1996. Print.
- Potter, David. "Marlowe's Massacre at Paris and the Reputation of Henri III of France." *Christopher Marlowe and English Renaissance Culture*. Ed. Darryll Grantley and Peter Roberts. Brookfield: Ashgate, 1996. Print.
- Rigoulot, Robert B. "Pierre de La Ramée." *Dictionary of Literary Biography Vol. 327: Sixteenth Century French Writers*. Ed. Megan Conway. Farmington Hills: Thomson Gale, 2006. 227-33. Print.
- Roberts, Yvonne. "Catherine de Médicis: A Profile By Jean-Antoine de Baïf." *French Studies Bulletin*. 70 (1999): 6-8. Print.
- Roelker, Nancy Lyman. *One King, One Faith: The Parlement of Paris and the Religious Reformations of the Sixteenth Century*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1996. Print.
- Rufo, Jeffrey. "Marlowe's Minions: Sodomitical Politics in *Edward II* and *The Massacre at Paris*." *Marlowe Studies: An Annual*. 1 (2011): 5-23. Print.
- "Ruth." *OED.com*. Oxford English Dictionary, Oxford UP. Web. 13 Dec. 2011.
- Salmon, J.H.M. *Renaissance and Revolt: Essays in the Intellectual and Social History of Early Modern France*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987. Print.
- Sanders, Wilbur. *The Dramatist and the Received Idea*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1968. Print.

- Schillinger, Stephen. "The Murder of Ramus and the (Mis)recognition of Rhetorical Power in *The Massacre at Paris*." *The Marlowe Society of America Newsletter*. 21.2 (2001): 3-5. Print.
- Shenk, Linda. *Learned Queen: The Image of Elizabeth I in Politics and Poetry*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010. Print.
- Voss, Paul J. *Elizabethan News Pamphlets: Shakespeare, Spenser, Marlowe & the Birth of Journalism*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP, 2001. Print.
- Wilson, Thomas. *The Arte of Rhetorique*. London: George Robinson, 1585. *EEBO*. Web. 28 November 2011.
- Woodfield, Denis B. *Surreptitious Printing in England 1550-1640*. New York: Bibliographical Society of America, 1973. Print.
- Wraight, A.D. *Christopher Marlowe and Edward Alleyn*. Adam Hart Publishers, Ltd.: London, 1965. Print.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my program of study committee, Dr. Michael Mendelson and Dr. Kathy Hickok, for the opportunity to study with them during my time at Iowa State University. Your guidance and teaching has been invaluable!

Thanks also to Rachel McKenny for providing me with feedback and suggestions along the way. I really appreciate your support!

Very special thanks to Dr. Linda Shenk, who has been my guide throughout my writing of this project. Thank you so very much for your continuous support and for helping me find my feet as a scholar. I am greatly indebted to your instruction and your insight and am forever grateful for the guidance you have provided me as a burgeoning scholar.

I would also like to thank my mother, Bonita Blackburn, whose constant support has enabled and encouraged me to pursue my education. Thank you!