

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS

Character in literature generally, and in fiction specifically, is extended verbal representation of human beings, the inner self that determines thought, speech, and behaviour (Robert, 143). Beside Thomas Becket as the main character in this play, there are also some other characters like Tempters, Priests, Women of Canterbury, Knights, as minor characters.

Through interactions between Thomas and other characters the writer will try to study how Thomas' spirit of martyrdom arises. And to be more specific, the writer will analyze the conflict between Thomas and Tempters as a source to find out the development of martyrdom in Thomas personality and after that the writer will study the significance of Thomas' martyrdom.

Thomas is a priest who has been exiled in France for seven years because he is accused of having betrayed the King when he was a chancellor to King. After seven years Thomas returns to England, but, his arrival is still considered as a challenge to King's power. Then he is chased, terrorized, and finally killed by King's vassals. In his struggle to fight King's power he meets Tempters who offer several ways to end up his conflict with King.

However, Thomas prefers to die than following King's order and Tempters' temptations on the ground that he is a priest who must not obey people other than God alone. Before he dies under the swords of the Knights Thomas gives his preaches in Christmas morning. In this preaches Thomas reemphasises his true existence as a priest who is also a disciple of Christ. As a disciple of Christ, his martyrdom is only one consequence he has to face in doing his duties which are based on the "design of God", a way to prove God's love to mankind. Finally, Thomas is murdered by the Knights in the cathedral of Canterbury.

A. Tempters as the personification of Thomas' inner conflicts.

By creating another characters, that are Tempters, the play has helped his audiences, and certainly his readers also, to view Thomas' inner conflicts in a clearer way. In other words, these living persons, with their different characterizations and through their temptations against Thomas, are actually the representations of some different conflicts. These are the conflicts between the shadows of Thomas' life in the past and the reality of his life in the present. And their existences have helped the readers to understand the process of conflict development in Thomas' inner self by

personifying each conflicts in the presence of First Tempter, Second Tempter, Third Tempter and Fourth Tempter. This recognition is supported by what Martin Browne, the original producer of Murder in the Cathedral, says. "I have tended more and more to interpret the Tempters as the exteriorisation of Thomas' inner conflict, present or past (Coghill: 106)". And this statement by Browne will be reasonable on condition that all the temptation by the Tempters and all the rejections by Thomas are viewed as a description of conflicts between the past Thomas and the present Thomas in facing his present problems. And the problems which should be handled here are the choices between to take and to loose chances the Tempters give together with the consequences of taking or loosing those chances.

So, it is noteworthy that the existence of those four Tempters above are principally the result of the author's creative thinking in his effort to picture the conflicts within Thomas' inner self. It means that the real conflicts to be studied in this play are not the conflicts between Thomas and the four Tempters but between some contradictive aspects in Thomas' personality. As Nevill Coghill in his Notes and Introduction to Murder in the Cathedral also emphasizes that "The Tempters would appear from the text to be four aspects of Thomas himself, which, by an effort of will, he discards as untrue

to his innermost, real self" (106). Therefore, in the following studies, the writer will treat Tempters not as separable characters that are different from Thomas, but these Tempters will be treated as another aspect of Thomas' qualities which are minggled together in Thomas alone and, because of their differences, the unity of these aspects in one person will potentially bear conflicts within Thomas' inner self.

A.1 Thomas Who Loves Pleasure.

Being close to the King as His chancellor has brought many influences that help to shape one specific characteristic of Thomas personality. Realizing it or not, directly or indirectly, Thomas has been captured in the situations within which he has to adapt. Beside the advisory thoughts he has to give to his Master in the management of state affairs, Thomas has also to be involved in some royal ceremonies which became the habit in the life circle of a King, although these situations are principally in contrast with his existence as a priest. And as a chancellor of government, which was a post of highest importance, and carried a power second only to that of the King, Thomas had great possibilities to live in splendour and enjoyment. These royal habits and the possibilities to live in splendour by using the power he has have shaped one of the other aspects

that, of course, has a powerful influence in Thomas' personality.

The situations which have a very powerful influence as stated above, although after that Thomas refused to cooperate with King so that he has to be thrown to France for seven years, become the historical backgrounds to the revival of aspect of Thomas personality who loves pleasure. As Coghill said, "As natural and sensual man Thomas loves pleasure, athletics, music, good company, luxurious, fare, gaiety and romance (106). And Elliot personifies this aspect through the existence of First Tempter.

Through his temptations the First Tempter offers to Thomas a chance to renew the amity, the friendship with King so he will be saved from the deadly threat of the King. The First Tempter also thought that in his good relationship with King, Thomas could possibly bring the shadow of happiness in his past back into reality in recent time. As First Tempter clearly says below:

Be easy man!

The easy man lives to eat best dinner.

Take a friend's advice. Leave well alone,

or your goose may be cooked and eaten to the bone (26).

This temptation is actually the picture of one aspect of Thomas' qualities which insists him to memorize

and regain the happy days (party, gaiety, athletic, etc) he had experienced when he was a Chancellor. Here Thomas is advised by his friend (First Tempter) to be an "easy" person who does not have to consider too seriously about the idealism of being a priest, and just take the chance to "eat best dinner" (the activity Thomas used to experienced with King), a symbol of living in luxury. Or there is nothing left for him because "the goose may be cooked and eaten to the bone", because the chance will be gone.

However, Thomas rejects the suggestion because he thinks that the offer is contradictive to the duty as a priest which is to serve God first than to do the governmental duties. Thomas believes that priest does not serve King but must serve God through His people. There is a self-consciousness in Thomas that to re-"eat best dinner" in King's table means neglecting his people's interest that need to be served.

For Thomas, renewing the relationship with King means repeating the same mistake he had done in the past time. He says, "But in the life of one man, never the same mistake returns ..." (25). Here Thomas realizes that his past cooperation with King is a kind of mistake. Because this cooperation enables him to be trapped into the condition where he will do the duty to God less than the duty to King. So he does not want to make the same

mistake again. And another reason why he does not want to fall into the same mistake is his consciousness that "Only the fool, fixed in his folly, may think he can turn the wheel on which he turns" (25). Here Thomas considers that he has been a fool when he cooperated with King, so he has to fix this foolishness not by turning the wheel on which he turns but by turning the wheel of his life forward. Repeating the same mistake is clearly not the picture of a life of a man who wants a kind of progress to the meaningful one in his future.

According to his recognition about a meaningful life where the mistake must be fixed and a life of a man must go on and not go back to the previous time, Thomas finally refuses this advice above. The advice which was actually the picture of the other side of his personality, the picture of the aspect of a man who loves pleasure. And in connection with his existence as a priest his rejection means that he has to serve his people first than the King. He has to put aside his own desire to be glorified in the world by joining King's dinner, accompanying King's guests, doing governmental duties, but he has to put forward the glory of God by serving his people.

Here we see that it is his desire to renew his life along with his faith to God that finally could end up the conflict between past Thomas and present Thomas. Past

Thomas who used to live in pleasure comes to insist present Thomas to regain that kind of life again. But Thomas has changed. Living in pleasure no longer becomes the concern of a man who has come to realize what must be the most important thing of someone who is a priest.

A.2 Thomas Who Loves Politics

The presence of the Second Tempter in this play is intended to describe another aspect of Thomas' personality who love politics. Here the Second Tempter tries to remind Thomas to the advantages if he has a real power in politics. And this power could be obtained if Thomas reconciliates his relationship with King by becoming a Chancellor again. Because by becoming a Chancellor in only one strike Thomas can easily grab two possibilities to do good deeds. In only one strike Thomas will have the chance not only to rule the country by becoming King's partner in the implementation of governmental duties, but also has the chance to "Rule for the good of better cause" (28), like protecting the poor, disarming the ruffian, strengthening the law (Thomas was also known for his chastity). In other words, these two possibilities also mean the chances to have power and glory that is the 'power to rule' and the 'glory' obtained by that power. So, Thomas past decision to resign the Chancellorship by becoming Archbishop of Canterbury, according to the

Tempter, was a mistake. Because by depending merely upon the status as an Archbishop Thomas will not obtain any direct access to the political power by which he could possibly grab those two fundamental advantages. And here the Tempter comes to tempt Thomas with the seduction of compromise, of sinking his difference with the King so as to become, with him, an all-powerful but benevolent diarchy of King and Chancellor, dispensing justice and creating a sort of welfare state by which he would certainly thrive on earth, and perhaps in heaven as a reward as what the Second Tempter says:

Kings commands, Cancellor richly rules
 This is a sentence not taught in the schools
 To set down the great, protect the poor,
 Beneath the throne of God can man do more?
 (28).

The writer has clearly stated previously that the Tempters are the picture of Thomas' aspects in his personality. Therefore, the explanations about the temptations of the Second Tempter above must be directed to be the explanations about Thomas' aspect as a man who loves politics. As Nevill Coghill says that the second aspect of Thomas "is the man who seeks the exercise of political power and who therefore having resigned the Chancellorship on becoming Archbishop, a great mistake for anyone avid of rule" (107). As a man whose

capabilities in mastering politics is acknowledged and has more than enough experiences in politics, Thomas can easily read the situation he faces from political angle. He knows that the King needs his political capabilities in the cooperation to rule the country. He also realizes that his people who have been neglected when he was exiled, need him to create a sort of welfare state. So he comes to the conclusion that he should not have resigned the Chancellorship, or not have chosen to be Archbishop either, because "the man of God" did not have real power in politics. However, the chance to obtain real political power may still be regained. Then the coalition with King must be rebuilt.

Here the conflict arises. The spirit to help his people which is strived by chastity values he has in his soul together with his willingness to regain his political power by renewing the relationship with King who used to be his best friend, are in conflict with his self-realization as a priest. Those two intentions above are really positive and does imply a useful implication to Thomas himself and also his people if we see it from the political point of view. However, Thomas is not a politician. He is a priest. Doing such business is nothing to do with the duty of a priest. For Thomas, the point is not underlined in the possibilities of doing such good things, but to obey King as supreme power in

the world means to ignore the power of Pope who leads all of priests. A priest must obey the Pope not the King. Like what Thomas says:

No! shall I, who keep the keys
 Of heaven and hell, supreme alone in England.
 Who bind and loose, with power from the Pope.
 Descent to desire a punier power? (31)

Moreover, Thomas realizes that the power in government is only temporal and "what was once exaltation would now only means descent", (32). It means that the exaltation obtained from the wordly power like "Life lasting, a permanent possession. A templed tomb, monument of marble", (27-28), only "breed fatal disease, degrade what they exalt" (32). In other words, the real happiness for Thomas is not found in the place he thinks he can find that happiness, but, the real happiness for him will be found in the place where God points to him.

Here we see that it is his spirit of priesthood that guides him to the search of a better life which is not just temporally but eternally. This spirit of priesthood also has annihilated his weaknesses such as love pleasure, desire to keep friendship with the King which is tempted by First Tempter and agree on some wordly compromise in power-politics which is tempted by Second Tempter to be more confident in his faith. It is by surrendering his will in the will of God he will find out

what is the plan God gives him. And this will be achieved by his effort to get out of the royal sphere of power and get into the sphere of God's authority to escape from the temptations of his weaknesses.

A.3. Thomas as A Rebellious Priest

The Third Tempter in this play comes with the offer which is very contradictive with the advice of the Second Tempter especially in the way to look political power as an important basic to change the people's life. Here, the Third Tempter asks Thomas not to regain his political power but to empower the people power through the coalition with barons who are not satisfied with the rule of King. The Third Tempter convincingly abandons the important role of Thomas as a Chancellor and gives more attention to the important role of Thomas as an Archbishop. To be certain, the Third Tempter provides Thomas with several facts as some supporting reasonings. First, the Second Tempter is sure that Thomas has no hope of reconciliation with King because he thinks that "real friendship, once ended, cannot be mended" (33). Besides, the Tempter says that Thomas is not a politician anymore. And as a country man who cares for the country and knows what the country needs, Thomas is suggested not to be "plotting parasites about the King" (33). It means that, according to the Tempter, Thomas has to make a new

friendship with other friends. And the friends who are possible to make a new constellation with are the barons. This is clearly depicted by what the Third Tempter says in p.34 as follows:

We are for England. We are in England.
 You and I, my lord, are Normans.
 Sovereignty. Let the Angevin
 Destroy himself, fighting in Anjou.
 He does not understand us, the English barons.
 We are the people.

Second, the King is not in England but still fighting in Anjou, France. And now in England there are King's sons who are waiting for the chance to rule England. So there is a vacuum of power in the government.

These facts are the open chance for Thomas to make a rebellion through the cooperation in what Tempter says as "a happy coalition of intelligent interests" (35). The coalition between barons and Thomas. Here Thomas is suggested to use his Lordship to accommodate his people's needs in the making of a powerful party. Through this powerful party Thomas, in Tempter's view, can achieve two advantages. First, the new coalition that can fight for the sovereignty of people of England from the tyrannous jurisdiction ruled by King. We know that King Henry's father is a France (Geoffrey of Anjou; Coghil:113) and

his rule has provided various oppressions among the people where King's only purpose is "to sieze the power and keep it" (14). Second, the new coalition that can fight for the liberty of ecclesiastical life from the power of King. The fact that the Church of England includes its bishops and priests should obey the King not the Pope has also supported Thomas to make a rebellious decision. So, it is the chance to fix these mistakes and Thomas, according to the Tempter, are the only person who are most potential to lead the people, by using his Lordship's influence, to make a rebellion against the King who has been tyrannous in his rule over the country.

Here, from the descriptions through the temptations of Third Tempter, the writer finds out another aspect of Thomas' personality. Nevill Coghill in his notes said that the Third Tempter is another variation of the Second Tempter where Thomas become a man who might have used the power of the Church in secular ways, making cause with the 'people' against the 'throne' (106). The question is, why Coghill suggest the Third Tempter as another variation of the Second Tempter. The writer has stated before that the Second Tempter is the representation of Thomas' aspect who loves politics. As a man who loves politics Thomas uses political ways to achieve his 'dream'. Through the Second Tempter Thomas wanted to help his people by regaining the position of Chancellorship.

By applying this political power he thought that the way to what was said in the previous section as "dispensing justice and creating a welfare state" will be easier. But through the temptation of Third Tempter, the other aspect of Thomas who wants to use his priestly power to achieve the same reason with the Second Tempter's reason, that is, to dispense justice and create a welfare state, is revealed.

Here, depicted through the temptation of the Third Tempter, Thomas faces another choice which he can make it easily. After his exile from France Thomas realizes that he will never have another chance to make a reconciliation with King. King has accused him of making a rebellion against the emperor, an activity that could only be forgiven by Thomas' death. In this threatening condition Thomas realizes that, beside two supporting facts above (the advantages of new coalition), he still has his people of Canterbury, including barons and his followers, who might stand for him and who along with him, can make a rebellion against the rule of tyrannous King. In this threatening situation the spirit of rebellious priest of Thomas is insisted to revive, the spirit which had been arised when he decided to end his relationship with King by resigning the position of Chancellor.

But again this temptation is refused. Thomas princi-

pally thinks that he has never betrayed the King and it is his own will to diminish the thought of doing so. He quit to be a Chancellor not because he has no more loyalty to the King but because he wanted to separate the duty to serve God as a priest and the duty to serve King as a Chancellor. What was offered by the Third Tempter was loaded by a political interest too, the way of thinking that should have been the way of thinking of a man who has a political role like Chancellor. The way of thinking which is the same with the one of the Second Tempter which he had refused.

Thomas believes that he is not a politician. He is a priest who has nothing to do with the political intrigue or manouvre. For Thomas, either to use his political power as a Chancellor or to use his priestly power as an Archbishop, although both have a good purpose which is to dispense justice and to create a welfare state, are not the duty of a priest. Furthermore, Thomas can not trust the barons because he thinks that the barons are used to work for King's undoing. It seems that the barons here want to use Thomas' power as an Arbishop for the sake of their personal interest. Barons are the people that work for King when King is still in his powerful performance. But when King's power is going to fall down by the threatening effort of his sons, the barons immediatelly look for another master to work for. And they find it in

Thomas capabilities. However, Thomas finally refused this coalition with barons for he believes that, "Shall I who ruled like an eagle over doves, now take the shape of a wolf among wolves? (36)". Here Thomas considers that the barons as wolves who are glad to wait at his door. Not only in the court, but in the field. And in the tilt-yard he makes many yield (36). Beside that, Thomas considers that if he cannot trust the Throne any more so he has good cause to trust none but God alone, and if he should have had any desire to make a rebellion against the King (he did think about this possibility before), would in his present circumstance, be the hopeless attempt of a failing man and would only achieve the destruction of himself. Thomas illustrates this condition by using what *Samson* achieve in Gaza, when he pulled down the pillars of the house in which three thousands of Philistines had gathered to watch him do feats of strength: and so pulled down the same destruction on himself (37).

It is the thought about the uselessness of the political coalition with barons to rebel the King's authority that could brings him to a self-destruction, that drives Thomas to trust none but God alone. In other words, it is the recognition to trust none but God alone does finally become the basic thought that drives Thomas to solve the conflict between him as a priest and the temptation of his own aspect of rebellious priest in his

personality.

A.4. Thomas Who Loves Eternal Pride

The Fourth Tempter appears to explain the weaknesses of the three Tempters before and also the consequences of Thomas' acceptance to their temptations. In accordance with the temptation of First and Second Tempter, the Fourth Tempter assures Thomas about the impossibility of renewing the relationship with King because he thinks that King whose hardened hatred shall have no end, will never trust twice the man who has been his friend. And in relation to the temptation of Third Tempter, the Fourth Tempter reminds Thomas to the "...trap to snap, having served your turn, broken and crushed (38)". If he should have has accepted that cooperation with barons then Thomas himself will be destructed, for "Greater enemies must kings destroy (38)". Even if Thomas finally should have has accepted those temptations, the possible reward it would bring him is only a temporal glory. A glory he could earn merely in the world and not the one Fourth Tempter says as "a glory after death (40)". As Fourth Tempter emphasizes that nothing in the world will last forever. Even "the shrine shall be pillaged, and the gold spent, the jewels gone for light ladies' ornament (40)". What was considered to be sacred and important (place for worshipping the Supreme Being as the Creator of human

being) could only be desacralized by a very simple reason like, for the sake of an artificial beauty of 'little' (compared to Supreme) being who probably need an added value to improve her performance to get attention from her opposite sex, for example. And in Thomas' case, according to the Tempter, if the faith of his followers to him vanish through the passing of time then he will get nothing but be forgotten or probably defamed or even execrated.

Then the Fourth Tempter offers something which is more permanent than just a temporal glory that could bring Thomas even a worse condition. This richness of a heavenly grandeur the Tempter offers to Thomas is uncomparable with the the poverty of the earthly pride. And according to Fourth Tempter, this condition is possible to Thomas who, as a priest, "hold the key of heaven and hell. Power to bind and loose (39)" and therefore has an authority to "wind the thread of eternal life and death (39)". And this power, the tempter considers, could be won by way of martyrdom. Through this temptation the Fourth Tempter suggests Thomas to seek the way of martyrdom, to make himself the lowest because, for the Tempter, if compared with the earthly glories which are offered by the three Tempters before, being a martyr would bring Thomas to the glory in heaven.

And Coghill's opinion about this temptation are as

follows;

It may, however, seem that the Fourth Tempter, for all his subtlety, is being a little inconsistent. On one hand, he is urging Thomas to snatch at martyrdom for his personal glory; on the other hand he prophesies a time when there will no longer be any such glory to be snatched. He is really presenting Thomas with two different temptations, both deadly. The first is the blasphemy of using martyrdom and sanctity as a means for his personal glory. The second is to undermine his faith by prophesying a time when all faith will perish. This a temptation to despair, to what the middle ages called wanhope, a sub-division of capital sin of sloth or apathy. Thomas feels this in his question "Is there no enduring crown to be won? (Coghill: 116)."

Here, Thomas is facing a dilemma which is actually his inner conflict: if he refuses the temptation to power (pride) offered by the Second and Third Tempters, by choosing martyrdom instead, he is yielding to an even greater sin of pride, the wish to be "high in heaven". The wish to be highest in heaven was the wish of Lucifer which, in Christian thought and imagery, began the

perpetual struggle of Good and Evil. However, Thomas refuses this suggestion because he believes that "I well know that this temptation means present vanity and future torment (43)".

Through the temptations of Fourth Tempter above we can understand the aspect of Thomas' personality who loves an eternal pride. The promise to be high in heaven which is guaranteed by the spiritual glory is the the basic thought that drives Thomas to eliminates his inner desire to be glorified in the world which are offered by three Tempters before. The desire to have an eternal glory also drives Thomas to choose the way of martyrdom, to be the lowest in the world and to be highest in heaven. We can say that, in the writer's opinion, the desires to be high in the world which are described through the temptations of three Tempters before are the desires to achieve a wordly pride, which Thomas finally realizes as a sort of pride that only means temporal because it happens only in the world and not last untill the day after death. While the wish to be high in heaven by becoming a martyr is a kind of eternal pride. The pride of a martyr ,in Thomas' view, is not achieved in the world only but also in heaven. Although Thomas' death, in King's mind, will probably be considered as a death of a political criminal who has an opposite political view with King and so must be punished, but

the death of Thomas in his followers' mind and in Thomas' too is a death of a martyr. However, then Thomas realizes that the wish to be high in heaven by becoming a martyr on behalf of his 'personal' eternal glory will sink him to even a greater sin. Here the conflict arises where the wish to be high in heaven for the sake of personal glory must face with the thought that to do the last temptation means to do the right deeds for the wrong reason. To be a martyr is a right deed but to be a martyr for his own glory is wrong. His will to be a martyr should not come from the wish to be praised as a saint but should have been based on the thought that being a martyr is his consequence of ignoring the King's order for a better reason, that is, to obey only to God by losing his will in the will of God. So, Thomas finally refuses this temptation too.

From the explanation above we know that these four characters are possible to Thomas and the fact that they appear to him shows how well he has come to know his own nature and its danger. Here we also find out that Thomas actually has the quality of loving pleasure which is represented in his desire to regain the royal sphere he earned when he was a Chancellor. Thomas also has a quality of being a politician in which through his acknowledged capabilities in policy, he could rule the country again if he cooperates with King. And with his

fortunating position as an Archbishop where lots of his people are supporting him, Thomas also realizes on his chance to make a rebellion against the King. Finally, his last temptation is the picture of Thomas' desire to have an eternal glory if he choose to be a martyr.

As Coghill says,

Each Tempter in turn annihilates the argument of Tempter before. The Second Tempter derides 'deceitful shadows' (proposed by the First); and the Third Tempter derides the possibility of renewed friendship between Thomas and the King (proposed by the Second). The Fourth Tempter's speech derides all earlier temptations offered (Coghill: 114).

Coghill's explanations means that Thomas does have all that qualities above and he realizes all these aspects of himself as challenges for defending his faith. And by firmly holding on his believe as a priest, that is to surrender his will in the will of God, Thomas could finally handle his challenges and proceedingly annihilates all those temptations one by one. In other words, Thomas really proceeds his inner conflict before he choose to die. Becoming a martyr for Thomas is his own choice because he believes "the true martyr is he who has lost his will in the will of God, and who no longer

desires anything for himself, not even the glory of being a martyr (53)".

Now it is clear to us that these explanations above is a description about the stages Thomas has been through in the development of his spirit of martyrdom. Being a martyr for Thomas is not an easy choice to be taken. But to be a martyr needs a firm faith in order to snatch away all the challenges he faces. And these challenges do not actually come from the external aspects of his life but do emerge from the internal aspects of Thomas himself. And Elliot has clearly depicted these internal challenges through the creation of another living characters, that is, Tempters.

B. The Martyrdom of Thomas Becket

What have been described in the previous sections have brought us to the deeper understanding about Thomas real self. Those descriptions, and their explanations as well, have helped us to enter into each path of Thomas' life (past and present) through which he has come to know the best choice he should choose in his life. The existence of Tempters and their temptations have given us the notions about several aspects of Thomas' personality as well as the conflicts among them. Nevertheless, what has been explained in the section before is nothing more than just a picture about the process within which the spirit of martyrdom in Thomas' personality has developed. The process itself becomes important for Thomas because from the process the spirit of Thomas to be a martyr is more strengthened. Therefore, our search about Thomas' self will not stopped only until the invention of the complete knowledge about the development process in Thomas' spirit of martyrdom but, the study about Thomas should also be directed to the search about what exactly the starting point in Thomas' self that drives him to be a martyr. "Is it his aim to be glorified in the world? Or, "Is it his desire to search the glory of being a saint?" The answer is "No!" if it refers to the analysis in the previous sections. However, it is true, according to the previous analysis, that it is Thomas' own will which becomes the reason why he surrendered his will in the will of God.

But there are still further questions to be answered, that is, "Why does Thomas want to surrender his will in the will of God by becoming a martyr?"

Through the next section the writer will try to answer this question. We will try to dig up more explanations behind this martyrdom of Thomas Becket.

B.1 Martyrdom as a Design of God

In the previous sections we have talked about what Thomas mentioned as "to surrender in the will of God". It is how Thomas was eventually driven to put aside his personal desires in order to devote himself into the participation on performing God's will. What exactly this "will of God" is described through Thomas' preach in the Cathedral on Christmas Morning. In this preach Thomas explains it as a "design of God," a phrase that seems to imply a greater plan of God behind His deeds to human beings. As Thomas says,

A Christian martyrdom is never an accident. for Saints are not made by accident. Still less is a Christian martyrdom the effect of a man's will to become a Saint, as a man by willing and contriving may become a ruler of men. A martyrdom is always the design of God, for His love of men. to warn and to lead them, to bring them back to His ways (53).

But first of all, before we come to the understanding of the "design of God", we will look further to the important of God's involvement beside Thomas' role in performing martyrdom. In the previous section it seems to us that Thomas was the only person whose important role could make the martyrdom possible. Our concern in the previous section has been focused on the role of Thomas as if Thomas was the most important key person in the realization of martyrdom. But, the above statements has surprisingly offered us with another more important role played by God. These statements imply that the martyrdom will succeed not only if Thomas surrenders his will in the will of God, but it also depends upon what has been designed by God. It means that the role of Thomas is only a part of a greater role played by God. Even this role of Thomas as a martyr is never the will of Thomas himself but it was believed as a part of greater plan that has been designed by God alone. For it was said that "The Christian martyrdom is never an accident". It was not the accidental desire of a man who has come to his consciousness about the role he must play as a priest, that is, to surrender his will in the will of God, neither it was an accidental event triggered by human error of Knights whose most concern has been focused to the governmental duties ordered by King rather than considering God's plan behind the death of Thomas.

Therefore, in an attempt to understand the relation between Thomas' involvement in performing martyrdom and God's role through this "design of God", it is important to see Thomas in his capacity as a priest. In Christian thought a priest also means a disciple of Christ. As a disciple of Christ Thomas is also provided by some consequences to face which were stated as: "they went forth to journey afar, to suffer by land and sea, to know torture, imprisonment, disappointment, to suffer death by martyrdom (52)". This statement has given more explanation about the martyrdom itself, that martyrdom is actually one of the consequences Thomas should face in performing his duty as a priest. It is clear now that martyrdom is nothing but the "way" of God in performing His "design" by using the priesthood of Thomas as His instrument.

Finally we find out that the significance of martyrdom does not merely lie in the death of Thomas Becket, in the sacrifice of one's soul for the sake of God's will, but rather in the duty it carries in performing the "design of God". It is the duty which is driven by what Thomas said as "For His love of men". The "love" of men that drives Him to delegate His disciples as His instruments, though they have to be martyred, to warn human being from the sin they made, to lead them to the right direction toward the eternal peaceful life with Him on earth as it is in heaven. In short, what has made Thomas

to surrender his will in the will of God is because Thomas is a priest, a disciple of Christ, whose duties are to warn, to lead, and to bring men back to His ways. And these duties actually are part of the "design of God" which is driven by His love to all mankind. Whether these duties could lead the disciples into death, it is only a matter of reasonable consequences which should be taken by them in doing their duties.

B.2 The Murder in the Cathedral

In section (A) of Chapter III which talked about the process of martyrdom development in Thomas' self, we have finally found out the final decision of Thomas in facing his inner conflicts which were depicted through the temptations of Tempters. It was said that Thomas finally surrendered his will in the will of God and derided all dilemmas which came from his inner soul. What can be inferred from that section is how Thomas could finally prepare his psychological consciousness to receive his death as a consequence of being a priest. Or, in short, psychologically, Thomas was ready to be a martyr. And his physical death then is triggered by his conflict with Knights. In other words, what seems to be the psychological martyrdom of Thomas depicted in Act I is then accentuated by his physical martyrdom described in Act II. As Thomas says, "Death will come when I am worthy, and if I am worthy, there is no danger. I have therefore only to

make perfect my will (75)". The will to surrender his will in the will of God will be completed in his death under the swords of Knights.

The conflict between Thomas and Knights is more appropriate to be said as a conflict between Thomas and King because the Knights are indeed the delegates of King who are sent to make Thomas obey the King. The Knight's who carry King's authority on their back come to Thomas with certain charges. First, Thomas has to resign the position of Archbishop. He was accused as a traitor who show no gratitude to King who has give him the power of Archbishop. Thomas was described by the knights as "the creature that crawled upon the King; swollen with blood and swollen with pride. Creeping out of the London dirt, crawling up like a louse on your shirt, the man who cheated, swindled, lied; broke his oath and betrayed his King (64)".

Thomas rejects this charge by reassuring that he has been loyal to the King, and against his position that now has been opposited to the King's is due to the fact that he is a priest, that has to serve God first than the king, rather than a Chancellor whose most concern are the governmental duties.

Second, Thomas has to absolve all bishops he has excommunicated. It was told that in Thomas exile in France, King Henry II, who has been anxious about the succession to his throne and felt it might help to secure

it to his eldest son by crowning him while he was still alive, has asked Archbishop of York, together with bishop of London and Salisbury, to officiate at this advance-coronation, an authority that had been claimed as the right of Archbishop of Canterbury. Seeing this, Thomas instantly suspended the Archbishop of York and his partners, and persuaded the Pope to confirm their suspension.

Thomas rejects this charge on the argument that he does not deny that the suspension was done through him. But it is not his authority to loose what had been bound by the Pope. Thomas said that the knights should have asked the absolution directly from the Pope.

The story about the assassin of Thomas Becket itself occurs in the cathedral of Canterbury. When Thomas was about to have dinner with his priests in his residence, there come four Knights with the charges described above. Initially they come without any intention to kill Thomas but to force him to renew his obedience to the King. But realizing that Thomas' faith was unchangeable they get back to prepare their swords as the weapon to kill him. Striving by the spirit to protect their bishop, the priests drag Thomas to the cathedral and try to bar the cathedral's door.

But Thomas orders the priests to unbar the door because he does not want to make the church to be a fortress. Thomas says, "The Church shall protect her own, in her own way, not as oak and stone ... The Church shall

be opened, even to our enemies (78)". The Church in what Thomas meant here is not a Church as its physical building but a Church as an institution of Christian people that must accommodate all kinds of human being which of course also includes the knights who want to murder Thomas. And another reason why Thomas insists to open the door and to face the knights is his faith that the triumph he is affording will not be achieved by fighting. He only has to conquer the knights by suffering. "This is the easier victory. Now is the triumph of the Cross (80)". Here what Thomas did seems to resemble the way how the victory of Christ was achieved through His crucifixion in the cross. In Christian thought, it is believed that Christ's suffering in the Cross does not mean to show His incapability to fight the emperor of Rome but rather this suffering means the sacrifice of Christ in His attempt to absolve the sins of mankind. And Thomas' suffering under the swords of the knights does not mean to reflect his incapability to fight the knights nor the incapability of his priest and his people to protect him (Thomas has the possibility to fight the knights by the power he can afford from his people), but this suffering is intended as his way to perform his duty a disciple of Christ. Here it is explicit that some truths can only be expressed and apprehended in paradox, the way to reveal truth in the flash of contraries. The attack of the knights with their swords will be defended not by the

fight with swords too, but it is triumphed by the suffering under that swords.

When the cathedral's door was open the knights came in with the swords on their hands. And before Thomas was killed the knights repeated again the charges they have mentioned before. Thomas, with his strong faith to serve God first than the King, however, has never hesitated to make his will perfect, that is, to surrender it in the will of God. What he said before the knights' swords touched his head could be the picture of how Thomas has finally surrendered himself in the assassination that he believed as a part of "the design of God" to warn and to lead mankind back to His way as a prove of His love to all mankind. As he says,

For my Lord I am now ready to die,

That his Church may have peace and liberty.

Do with me as you will, to your hurt and shame:

(81,82).

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION