THE MASSACRE AT PARIS

This June (at about the same time as MSAN goes to Press), the Marlowe Project will perform The Massacre at Paris at the Producer's Club, 358 West 44th Street, New York. The production features Douglas Gregory as the Duke of Guise and Gregory Contreras, Alfredo Narcisco, and Michael Gentile as successive kings of France. Catherine de Medici, the Queen Mother, is played by Alta Morice. The production is directed by Jeff Dailey, the Marlowe Project's artistic director.

KENILWORTH CASTLE

It has been my pleasure the last two times I visited Stratford-upon-Avon to take a side trip to the magnificent ruins of Kenilworth Castle. The site is maintained by English Heritage, the society dedicated to the preservation and restoration of historical buildings and monuments. The following description of Kenilworth is intended to interest members of the Marlowe Society in visiting it (if they have not already done so) and to provide a short history of the castle and its present state.

Kenilworth Castle is located in the town of Kenilworth, which is five miles north of Warwick, thirteen miles north of Stratford-upon-Avon, and 102 miles northwest of London. The castle is centrally situated in the midlands of Warwickshire at the end of a valley overlooking the countryside. It was originally built on a knoll of rock and gravel protected by marshes which were converted into a huge mere or artificial lake (now extinct). At the height of its development, the castle's walls, nearly 20 feet thick in places, enclosed an area of seven acres. In his novel Kenilworth, Sir Walter Scott reconstructed its magnificence:

The outer wall of this splendid and gigantic structure enclosed seven acres, a part of which was occupied by extensive stables, and by a pleasure-garden, with its trim avenue and parterres, and the rest formed by the large base-court, or outer yard,
of the noble Castle. The lordly structure itself, which rose near the centre of this spacious enclosure, was composed of a huge pile of magnificent castellated buildings, apparently of different ages, surrounding an inner court . . . . (289)

Kenilworth has a long and glorious history beginning in Anglo-Saxon times when a castle on the site served as a royal residence, which was destroyed during the Danish wars (Sugden 293). Around 1116, King Henry I gave the royal manor of Stoneleigh to his Chamberlain, Geoffrey de Clinton, who divided the grant into two segments. The first consisted of a parcel downstream with which he endowed an Augustinian Abbey that remained in existence until the dissolution of the monasteries in 1538 when it was given to the Dudley family. Its ruins exist today and can be visited on a easy walk 600 yards east of the castle. The second or upstream parcel Clinton reserved for his castle and its park, chase, and borough (Thompson 27).

Around 1166, the land was given back to the Crown, and in the ensuing two centuries, the castle became the focal point for the baronial wars between Henry III and the De Montforts and the site of Edward II’s imprisonment and deposition, among other notable events. The castle also underwent extensive changes when John of Gaunt owned it from 1361 to 1399. He erected a magnificent great hall and chambers overlooking the artificial lake. In 1413, Henry V, Gaunt’s grandson, constructed to the west of the castle a harbor and a pleasure garden, whose ruin is still visible. Finally, in 1563, Elizabeth gave Kenilworth to Robert Dudley, who built the castle to its ultimate grandeur.

The queen traveled to Kenilworth Castle in 1565, 1572, and 1575, and to accommodate her visits, Dudley undertook additions and renovations which cost between £60,000 and £100,000 (Nichols 190n). At the north end, he constructed a massive gate house which had high paralleled rooms with great oriel windows, colossal fireplaces, and an enormous dining room mantelpiece carved from solid oak with his initials “RD” on each side and inscribed with his motto “Droit et Loyal.” For its main entrance Dudley brought a battlemented porch from the inner court which had his initials on each side of the door and Tudor rose roundels crowning shell-head niches (Renn 12). The gatehouse is the only building of the castle still habitable, and one of its second floor rooms is used for meetings of the local council. He also built on the far side of his gatehouse, next to the keep, an ornamental Tudor garden which was reconstructed in 1970. Finally, he constructed a range of stables of stone and timber that today are used to house an historical exhibit and the gift shop.

When Elizabeth visited Kenilworth in the summer of 1575, she was feted for nineteen days at the cost of £1000 a . . . . (Continued on p. 3.)
day (Treasures, 253), as recounted in Richard Laneham's Letter and George Gascoigne's Princely Pleasures of Kenilworth. The pageantry concerning the Lady of the Lake, Triton, and Proteus took place on the great mere, which was over ½ mile long, 100 yards wide at its most narrow point, and 12 feet deep. Laneham captures the bejeweled essence of the castle during the fete:

And . . . consider . . . unto the stately seat of Kenilworth Castle, the rare beauty of biding that his Honor hath avanced, all of the hard quarry stone: every room so spacious, so well delightd, and so hy roofed within: so seemly to sight by due proportion without: a day tyme, on every side so glittering by glass; a nights, by continual breignes of candel, fyre, and torch-light, transparent through the lightsome wyndowz . . . .

The castle combined the medieval and Renaissance; it was a pastoral retreat and a magnificent repository of power. The pageantry which took place there influenced Spenser's presentation of progresses and pageants and Sidney's depiction of the siege of Amphialus' castle in Book 3 of the Arcadia (Schulz, Pigeon, and Hintz).

The primary interest of Kenilworth Castle for Marlovians lies in its appearance in Edward II. Edward has been captured at Neath Abbey (4.6) and taken to Kenilworth by Henry, Earl of Leicester. In 5.1, he advises Edward to

Imagine Killingworth Castle were your court,
And that you lay for pleasure here a space,
Not of compulsion or necessity. (2-4)

Nevertheless, Edward is then forced to resign his crown and is also told that he will be transferred to Berkeley Castle, where he is executed.

The castle fell into a state of disrepair after the Civil War when Parliament, in order to prevent its being fortified again, ordered that the outermost wall of the keep be blown up and the wall of the outer ward breached. In 1938, Lord Kenilworth gave the castle to the Office of Works, and English Heritage assumed its care in 1984 (Renn 32).

The most distinctive characteristic of the ruins today is their red stone patinaed by age and air pollution into a mellow autumnal red and a golden pink. In these walls, it is still possible to experience the profusion of rich architectural forms: the huge, vaulted arches; the filigree designs in sealed masonry; flowers frozen into stone, stone steps leading to desolate chambers, all producing in the onlooker, as Scott wrote, a sense of the transitoriness of such glory: "The bed of the lake is but a rushy swamp, and the massive ruins of the Castle only serve to show what their splendour once was, and
to impress on the musing visitor the transitory value of human possessions . . . ." (290).

Frank Ardolino University of Hawaii at Manoa
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"FORSAKE THY KING
AND DO BUT JOIN WITH ME":
MARLOWE AND TREASON


Christopher Marlowe is indebted to treason. Whether in the forms of his stage violence or in the political positions of
his central figures—"infidels," "tyrants," and "traitors" all— treason figures prominently in Marlovian dramaturgy. Throughout his work, Marlowe resorts to a discourse of treason, in which such politically-charged conceptions as "the country," male friendship, and rootlessness are violently contested amid forceful claims to affiliation.

Karen Cunningham, San Francisco, 1998

Like the plays contemporary with them, treason trials do the cultural work of defining and stabilizing the conceptual contours of something called "the realm." What makes treason a particularly provocative category is that in Marlowe's day it was, among other things, a crime of the imagination. In 1352 it had become treason (among other things) "to compass or imagine the death of the king, his Queen, or the royal heir." During the late Tudor era, apart from those for levying war, "indictments concerned with 'imaginnings' were dominant." Committed to revealing acts of intellection, treason trials necessarily put considerable weight on the rhetorical forms in which men's inner loyalties were made visible.

This paper focuses on the discourse of treason as it functions in Marlowe's major plays and in one of the sixteenth century's most infamous series of trials, those of Anthony Babington and his friends in 1586. As the trials argue issues of masculine affiliation and exile, they provide a complex view of England's developing national identity. Although the nation is in some way at issue in all treasons, it is not always identified with the same cultural themes. What distinguishes the Babington treasons is that the crime is structured explicitly as a contest over legitimate forms of masculinity, fidelity, and place in "the realm." The idea of "the country" hovers over the testimony, serving as motive and rationale for prosecutors and defendants alike: "his country," "your country," "the country"—these are treason's terms, each transformed into a shifting signifier of an unstable nation. The prosecution takes "the country" as a transparent referent and positions itself as the proprietor of a self-evident "England." It is, however, the secure referentiality of such phrases that putative "traitors" call into question, undermining their naturalness and contesting their meaning.

It is well documented that Marlowe had access to the discourse of treason from a range of literary and historical sources; from his personal legal and political activities; from events in Canterbury; and from "the grim row of traitors' heads" (in John Bakeless's image) marking the passage back and forth across London Bridge. More recently, it has been argued that Marlowe was among the spies commissioned by Francis Walsingham to infiltrate the Catholics at Cambridge following the exposure of the Babington plot. Like the Babington accounts, Marlowe's plays are engaged in constructing the conceptual contours of something called "the country" and its legitimate residents, those men who mentally inhabit "this realm." In these texts, traditional forms of authority announce their persistence in geographical terms; secure topography grounds authentic loyalty; and conventions of courtiership define forms of affiliation. Progressively dissociated from the dominant culture's ideas of the country and from the official associations that identify them as "true men," Marlowe's heroes are alienated by birth and by deed, and also, significantly, by imagination. Marlowe's plays conspire to compel characters and audiences to adopt the discourse of treason and to imagine the death of the king.

TAMPERING WITH THE RECORDS: ENGENDERING THE POLITICAL COMMUNITY AND MARLOWE'S APPROPRIATION OF THE PAST IN EDWARD II

Gaveston's parodies of metamorphic wantonness, or Isabella's complaints which draw on the *Heroïdes*, question the very notion of an "Englishness" established on the suppression of the private and emotional spheres, and this new form of lyrical narrative gives voice to women and passionate men, to the marginal elements that had been suppressed in *Holinshed*. Thus *Edward II* contributes to 16th-century debates about the nature of history and English identity, and express anxieties about what is being excluded from the definition of Englishness. *Holinshed* stigmatizes prodigality and emotional indulgence and so it excludes the prodigal, shameful, and errant form of authorship being defined by Marlowe. This paper will study *Edward II* not only as a response to contemporary debates about the nature of history and English identity, but also as a response to contemporary debates about the nature of authorship. The relationship between Gaveston and Edward is identified with private recreative activity, with wit and poetics. A parallel is established between this marginalized historical matter and poetry so that the debate over the nature and status of their relationship is also a vehicle for the exploration of the propriety of a new kind of Tudor authorship.

*Holinshed's* Chronicles promote stoic ideals of constancy, self-control, and self-sufficiency. For Marlowe's Mortimer, such spiritual and indeed economic self-sufficiency is threatened by Gaveston's luxurious Italianate clothes and the consequent estrangement of court fashion. Inconstancy, lack of self-control, and loyalty to one's private ends are traits that are threats to English integrity, and they are associated with the foreign and the womanish. (Both Gaveston and Isabella are French, and both are characterized as foreign and womanish, or perhaps even more disturbingly they both threaten to undermine the distinctions on which order depends by combining masculine and feminine characteristics.) Gaveston, Edward and Isabella are stigmatized in ways familiar from the chronicles, but their opinions and emotions are also explored, with interest and even sympathy. Peirs and Edward are partly undone by hostile reception and by gossip, and the need to protect integrity necessitates a renegotiation of the relationship between public and private spheres in the play. Thus, the frankness of the English ideal, the desirability of a life lived openly and publicly, the very idea that subjectivity can only be fully expressed in the public realm is challenged by the subject's acknowledged need to preserve its secrets and its integrity. Interpretation is rendered problematical not only because there are competing versions of the same individual or event, but also because the relationship between the record and what we might call objective reality is complicated by the play's awareness of the way individuals construct their own truth. As Paul Ricoeur has argued, history is more a question of representation than documentation. *Edward II* is a fragmentary text that dissipates the assessment of history among a number of conflicting perspectives, thereby undermining any single teleological narrative. The combination of fact and fiction raises questions about the nature of truth, while the exploration of the function
of language in expressing identity reveals that texts make their own claims on their subjects. Paradoxically, the subjective lyric material seems to be more like the truth of the situation than the objective chronicle material. In fact, this new kind of lyrical drama is a fuller and more effective means of recording the truth of events than traditional forms of historical narrative. Lyric and narrative complement each other in the play, but Marlowe's claim to attention comes from his partiality, from the distortions that record the perspective of the individuals who fashion history. As it explores how the private affects the public realm, and how the public affects the private realm, Edward II highlights the liminal nature of private experience and its dependence for its articulation on public means in the culture of Early Modern England.

SPACE, MEASUREMENT, AND CUSTOM IN TAMBURLAINE THE GREAT, PART 1


Measurement and custom are topics that preoccupy Christopher Marlowe in Tamburlaine the Great, Part 1, topics each of which bears an important relationship to the formulation of regional identities. In general, custom operates as a principle of sociospatial definition, as the articulation of a region's particularity, its vital incommensurability with other parts of the nation. Tamburlaine, Part 1, symbolically responds to the Elizabethan production of national statutory measures that pose a threat to both customary measures and the regional forms of self-identification with which they are imbricated; the play represents the production of a coercive vision of nationhood that emerges out of the near-universal imposition of Tamburlaine's custom, an example of which is to be found in the siege of Damascus. In response to the pleas for mercy offered up the young virgins of Damascus, Tamburlaine asserts that the Egyptians "know my customs are as peremptory / As wrathful planets, death, or destiny" (5.1.127-8). He also states that on his sword "sits imperious Death, / Keeping his circuit by the slicing edge" (5.1.111-12).

Most immediately, this "circuit" is the path traced by Tamburlaine's sword as he wields it against the hapless Damascenes. However, the metaphor also links death and justice; Death is compared to a justice of the peace making his "circuit" through the city and exercising judgment. In the name of peremptory customs, Death—Tamburlaine's sword—condemns the actions of the "proud Egyptians" (5.1.121). This act of judgment, the keeping of a circuit, would also seem to involve the traversing of a measured area. Contemporary meanings of "circuit" define it as "The line, real or imaginary, described in going round any area" (OED 1a) or "The space enclosed by a given circumference or boundary" (OED 2a).

However, insofar as Tamburlaine has not yet killed the Damascenes or entered their city, the "keeping" of the circuit is actually his measuring of it for the first time. Imperious death, in the form of Tamburlaine's weapon, both measures and judges the Egyptians, tracing with Tamburlaine a circuit of the city. Moreover, the particularized culture of the city, gives way before the imposition by Tamburlaine of a homogenizing spatiality that subdues all regions in the name of his (not their) customs.

Garrett A. Sullivan, San Francisco, 1998

This paper examines the effects of Tamburlaine's "customs" being pursued at the expense of other ones that define the particularity of the regions that Tamburlaine invades. Also, it will address the threat posed to certain forms of customary practice by contemporary efforts to standardize measurement. In the case of the customary mile or acre, custom is inseparable from forms of measurement that are bound up in regional conceptions of identity. As Witold Kula puts it, "Every measure as a social institution is an expression of a particular configuration of human relations and may well throw light upon these relations." Marlowe writes his play during a period in which the monarchy was engaged in standardizing measurement to a remarkable degree. Between 1582 and 1602, Elizabeth created not only standards for troy
and avoid du poiss weights, but also capacity measure standards. In 1593 the mile was standardized in a statute designed to prohibit new building in London’s suburbs. Tamburlaine, Part 1, symbolically responds to the Elizabethan production of national statutory measures both by making plain the relationship between customary measures and regional forms of identity and by dramatizing the challenge posed to the both of them by Tamburlaine’s territorial acquisitiveness; the play represents the production of a coercive vision of nationhood that emerges out of the near-universal imposition of Tamburlaine’s will, a force that, Marlowe shows, masquerades as custom even as it remains completely divorced from the customary.

**RICHARD III**

Directed by Elijah Moshinsky for the Royal Shakespeare Company on tour (seen at the Sheffield Lyceum, 21 October 1998).

Elijah Moshinsky’s touring RSC production of Richard III has proved controversial, with reviews in the British press sporting headlines such as “Ken Dodd and the Diddymen” and the Times Literary Supplement saying scornfully that this is just how Disney would do the play. However, the four members of my department who saw the play at the Sheffield Lyceum all loved it (perhaps the first time that we have ever been completely unanimous about any production). It is true, as many of the professional critics were quick to point out, that the director could profitably have found some overarching concept or idea. In so far as the production has an idea at all, it is essentially to be as unlike the recent McKellen film version as possible, to which end costumes and set are determinedly mediaeval: the women wear flowing robes, and the whole is set against a towering backdrop of mediaeval arches vaguely reminiscent of the sides of York Minster. The visual rather than cerebral nature of the production is made abundantly clear from the opening moments, when snow spectacularly swirls down onto the set. But it is also the emphasis on the visual which allows for the production’s most powerful moment, when the metal chains which, since the beginning of military preparations, have hung down in front of the Gothic arches suddenly clank to the floor. Behind them, the light flares red, and we are immediately in no doubt that the existence of a supernatural order is being definitively asserted and that Richard is bound for Hell.

This is all the more startling a moment because Richard has been so genial throughout. From the moment he steps on stage, Robert Lindsay’s Richard manipulates the audience, working the front row like a pantomime dame and talking to us over the shoulder of Lady Anne as she fawns on him. If you want to know what Lindsay looks like in the part, watch either Leonard Rossiter in Rising Damp or Peter Cook, also playing Richard III, in the very first episode of Blackadder. Lindsay combines the strong northern accent of the former with the lank-locked acerbity of the latter, and he also retains the comic emphasis, making more obvious than ever the links of this role with the Vice. It is impossible to hate him, but at the same time the strength of the other performers means that we never lose sight of his genuine evil and its terrible consequences to those around him. David Yelland’s smooth and silken Buckingham, who gives one a new sense of this confederate’s importance in enabling Richard’s rise to power, has received praise even from those reviewers who disliked the production as a whole, and Anna Carteret’s Queen Margaret is never less than riveting. Particularly interesting is Jo Stone-Fewings’ Richmond, young, clean-cut, and quite devoid of guile, whose first act after the Battle of Bosworth is to enquire eagerly after the safety of young George Stanley. The lack of any dark shadows hovering over his succession here made one glad that Richard had gone, but the great achievement of Lindsay’s performance was, for me, that it also made a Richard who was fully human, and whose descent into an undoubted and actual hell was, Faustus-like, felt as a shocking loss and waste.

Lisa Hopkins
Sheffield Hallam University

**RECENT STUDIES IN MARLOWE**


FROM THE EDITOR

MSAV has no backlog and depends upon the membership for its contents. We welcome reviews of films or productions of Renaissance (especially Marlovian) drama, brief articles and notes on Marlowe or other matters of interest to Marlovians, announcements and calls for papers, and ideas or experiences related to teaching Marlowe. The address and deadlines appear on page 2. Inquiries to the editor are welcome.