Northern Plains Conference on Early British Literature

Minot State University, 20-22 April 2017
Student Union, Metigoshe and Audubon Rooms

April 20-22 of 2017 Minot State University and the Department of English hosted the xx annual Conference on Northern Plains Conference on Early British Literature (NPCEBL). We had hosted previously, when Dr. Michelle Sauer was a faculty member here at MSU, so well knew about the value of the conference and had participated in iterations of it for years. But hosting a conference on the western side of the state is always a sketchy proposition. Few want to travel so far as they must to get here. Part of hosting NPCEBL thus entailed figuring out how to fetch people from elsewhere here.

The conference has always had a wide geographic draw from Canada, Minnesota, and the Dakotas, with some others from far and wide, but tended to gather scholars from the big universities. To boost our numbers, we fanned out, soliciting smaller colleges in North Dakota to participate. As a result, we gained scholars from Dickinson State University, Bismarck State University, and Williston State University—though only the one from DSU actually presented. We nevertheless sat getting others from the smaller colleges a coup of sorts. We also put our students and faculty to work on presentation papers, to ensure that if others showed up, we did too. We drew faculty from History, Literature, Humanities, and Foreign Language, and students from these same disciplines. But to draw the usual suspects west?

We argued effectively for heavy subsidies from Minot State University, and Laurie Geller, Vice President for Academic Affairs, agreed to pitch in all kinds of funding to augment membership fees for the conference attendees. As a result, we had all kinds of delectable cakes and torts and custard cups for breakfasts and in between conference presentations. Student workers shuttled conference goers from hotel to conference and back using university busses, and signage all over campus directed wandering conference attendees back on track at every step along the way. We also had Professor Tom Clayton, Regents Professor of Renaissance Literature, University of Minnesota Twin Cities, my former professor and the former professor of North Dakota Humanities scholar Clay Jenkinson, who intended to attend the conference and present too, but pulled out, I suspect, because he thought the moment belonged to Professor Clayton. Clayton gave a controversial talk on **Shakespeare and the Mediterranean** that generated much debate and discussion—just what you want at a conference.

We ended with a catered dinner in what of the ballrooms of a local hotel, where university musicians Diana (piano) and Erik Anderson (cello) provided the entertainment mid drinks and a massive intake of fish and steak and extras. Newspapers and news networks from both campus and the Minot community covered the event. We had a successful and informative conference.

NPCEBL 2017 Schedule of Events

Thursday 20 April

***Shakespeare-fest* Film, 7 pm., Aleshire Theater**

Kenneth Branagh's *Henry V*

preview before (6:30), discussion after, and light snacks the while.

Dr. Eric Furuseth, discussion leader

Friday 21 April

8:00-9:00 **Registration and Welcome**, Metigoshe and Missouri Rooms.

9:00-10:30

Panel I, Metigoshe Room. Chair Aili Smith

Stalking and Obsession in *Midsummer's Night Dream, Much Ado About Nothing,* and *The Tempest. Aili Smith, MSU (Wayne State University).*

Who Needs Men? Titania's World and Shakespeare's Argument for Marriage in *A Midsummer Night's Dream. Bob De Smith, Dordt College*

Shakespeare's Sonnets: From the Perfect to the Imperfect Forms of Love. *Wyatt Olson, MSU English.*

Panel II, Audubon Room. Chair: Sarah Aleshire

Clothing and Female Embodiment in Middleton and Dekker's *The Roaring Girl,* and Defoe's *Moll Flanders. Lesley Glendinning, Brandon University.*

"Mother Christ": Gender Glitch and the Physical Feminization in Julian Norwich's *Revelations of Divine Love. Casey Kohs, University of North Dakota*.

The Language of Materiality: Relic Discourse and Medieval English Anchoritism. *Michelle M. Sauer, University North Dakota*.

10:40-12:10

Panel I, Metigoshe Room. Chair: Harold Nelson

Axioms of Evil? : Thoughts on the "Good Advice" or 'Words of Wisdom' Given for Malicious, Immoral, or Cynical Reasons in Shakespeare. *Eric Furuseth, MSU (Washington State University).*

What Might Have Been: Bentham's Principles for Latin America. *Paul Cristofaro, MSU (University of Alabama).*

King Lear and the Making of Monsters. *Robert Kibler, MSU (University of Minnesota-Twin Cities).*

Panel II, Audubon Room. Chair: Stephen Hamrick

Is the Play (text) Really the Thing? Addressing Conflict between Shakespeare's Words and Contemporary Theatre Design Aesthetics. *Benjamin Weinert-Lishner, MSU (California State University—Long Beach).*

The Disturbing Last Chapter in *Don Quixote*. *Scott Sigel, MSU (Stanford University).*

'I Have Immortal Longings in Me': Gendered Performance in the Roman Shakespeare of Morecambe & Wise. *Stephen Hamrick, Minnesota State University-Moorhead.*

12:10-1:30 Lunch on location

1:30: 3:20

Panel I, Metigoshe Room. Chair: Robert Kibler

Synthesizing Religious and Civic Evils in Robert Gloucester's *Metrical Chronicle. William Christopher Brown, University of Minnesota-Crookston.*

Directorial Song Choices in *As You Like It. Susan Wood, Midland University, NE.*

Literary Origins of Existentialism. *Andrea Orta-Diaz, MSU English, Foreign Language.*

Nationalism and the *London Evening Post* of 1739. *Robert Kibler, MSU (University of Minnesota-Twin Cities).*

Panel II, Audubon Room. Chair: Jean-Francois Mondon

An Overview of the Linguistic Effects of Celtic on English. *Jean-Francois Mondon, MSU (University of Pennsylvania).*

Birds, Ballads, and Broads. *Deanna Smid, Brandon University.*

Literary Critique of Sir Thomas More's *Utopia*. *Alexander Grosz, MSU English.*

William Morris and the Middle Ages: How His Ideology Impacted Art, Architecture, and Philosophy. *Andrea Donovan, MSU (Western Michigan University).*

3:30-4:50 Keynote Address:
Tom Clayton, Regents Professor of English
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities

Shakespeare and the Mediterranean
Missouri and Metigoshe Rooms

NPCEBL Banquet at the Vegas Hotel
Social: 7; Dinner: 8

Erik Anderson, cello, and Dianna Anderson, piano.

Saturday 22 April

9:00-9:30. Muffins, coffee, juice, fruit, and information

9:30-11:30 Panel I, Metigoshe Room. Chair: Robert Kibler

"The Areopagitica and Prepublication Review: Contextualizing Milton." *Anne McMillan, MSU English Education.*

Splendor, Sighs, and Secrets: Scenes in a Renaissance Garden. *Martina Kranz, MSU English.*

Vondel's Quick Pen: Poetry and Playwriting in the Netherlands in the Age of Shakespeare. *Ernst Pijning, MSU (Johns Hopkins University).*

Sugar and Spice and Everything Nice: Juliet's Obedience in *Romeo and Juliet*. *Lara Carlson McGoey, Dickinson State University.*

Panel II, Audubon Room. Chair: Amanda Watts

Girdle Your Loins: Sexuality and Civil Strife in *The Thebaid* and *The Faerie Queene*. *CoryAnne Harrigan, Simpson College*.

The Influence of Iambic Pentameter. *Travis Barnes, MSU English*.

The Role of Benvolio in *Faustus*-B. *Bruce Brandt, South Dakota State University*.

Would you Adam and Eve it's Brown Bread? Cockney Rhyming Slang Past and Present. *Amanda Watts, MSU (Boston University)*.

Business Meeting and Lunch in Beaver Creek Café, MSU Student Union

Possibly Important Contact Information

Robert Kibler--701-720-2716, or robert.kibler@minotstateu.edu
Eric Furuseth—701-833-3574 or eric.furuseth@minotstateu.edu
Campus Security—701-858-4357
Hampton Inn Shuttle—701-838-1400
Plant Services—701-858-3210
IT Central—701-858-4444
Sodexo Food Service—701-858-4465

Hampton Inn Shuttle Arrangements

Friday 21 April, To MSU Student Union from Hampton Inn 7:45 for 8:00 am conference kickoff
Friday 21 April, To Hampton Inn from MSU Student Union 5:00 pm conference return Friday 21 April, **From Hampton Inn to Vegas Hotel Banquet 6:45 pm. For 7:00** start Friday 21 April, From **Vegas Hotel Banquet to Hampton Inn 9:30 pm and 10:30 pm**

*after 10:30 shuttle, participants still in attendance can take a cab the short ride to the Hampton Inn.

Cab telephone numbers: Central: 852-8000;Taxi 9000: 852-9000

Saturday 22 April, To MSU Student Union from Hampton Inn 8:45 for 9:00 am begin
Saturday 22 April, To Hampton Inn from MSU Student Union 11:00
Saturday 22 April, To Hampton Inn from MSU Student Union 1:00 pm

And participants can also call the Hampton Inn when in need of a shuttle at other times (but not beyond 10:00 pm): 701-838-1400

Shakespeare and the Mediterranean?

I. Introit

Before commencing on my sea journey, I want to focus your attention on a subject that has everything to do with most human discourse that is not strictly mathematical and scientific, and that is *bullshit*, a much more inclusive term than the subset, *fake news*. Bullshit has been perceptively theorized by moral philosopher Harry G. Frankfurt in a little book published by the Princeton University Press in 2005 under the title, *On Bullshit*. Princeton must have *loved* publishing that! I must note further before moving on that we and our students are all acutely aware of the plethora of bullshit everywhere in almost every discursive context, not just politics and the media.[1] But not so many are aware of the venerable antithesis, because most of our students do not study verbal logic as such in which this plays a part: it is Occam's Razor, a topic for another day.

I'll give most of your time to Soundings in the most "Mediterranean" of Shakespeare's plays, with some attention also to theoretical aspects of such proceedings, so I am limiting the attention I give to the topic I was assigned, "Shakespeare *and* the Mediterranean," very likely because it was the title of the World Shakespeare Congress held in Valencia, Spain, in 2001, and I was the senior editor of the proceedings. The thing I like best about the topic is that it is so spacious, or specious, that it will cover many kinds of address.

Thinking about the topic as such, I noted that Shakespeare used "Mediterranean" exactly once in the entire canon—in *The Tempest*, most appropriately, since in any sense *The Tempest* is the most "Mediterranean" of his plays and hence my focus to come. "Mediterranean" occurs in the first passage quoted in the Appendix handout of Passages and Epilogues. Instead of overheading or powerpointing, I resorted to print and paper for your consulting at will and takeaway. The handout enables more lines to be taken into account than would be practicable if all had to be read aloud. The text is from the revised Arden 3 edition of 2011.[2] The passages are given in order of their occurrence in the play. As you can see (and in this case hear), Ariel explains to Prospero that

> for the rest o'th' fleet,
> Which I dispersed, they all have met again,

And are upon the *Mediterranean* float, flote] *F*

Bound sadly home for Naples, [*short line*]

Supposing that they saw the King's ship wracked wracked] *F* (wrackt); wrecked *Ard3*

And his great person perish. (1.2.232-37)

It is of glancing interest here that "Médi'trán'yan" has four syllables, as typically in Shakespeare's malleable verse, not our six. And of *more* interest that the Folio's "wracked" (*t* modernized to *ed*) seems the better choice than "wrecked" for sound as well as sense: it's a strong word to the body's ear as well as the mind's eye.

So what is the "Mediterranean" that Shakespeare is supposed to "and" with—as in "Shakespeare *and* the Mediterranean"? One may take the question or the answers in many directions including the symbolic, the historical, the geographic, the textual—which does not exclude all or any of the rest, but is a good place if not the only place to start. Shakespeare uses the adjective as noun including "Sea," as everyone does. It is ironical but true that the word meant originally "inland, far from the coast," which also fits, because in most of Shakespeare's many so-called "Mediterranean" plays, the sea is not in sight, although it figures prominently in several. Exact counts are slightly arbitrary, but *non*-Mediterranean plays are easily identified as the Histories,*As You Like It, Hamlet, King Lear, Macbeth,* and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. I count *Measure for Measure* as Mediterranean because I agree with John Jowett and Gary Taylor that in accordance with its Italian names and action it was originally set in Ferrara and later cursorily revised to Vienna by Middleton. About fifteen *non*-Mediterranean plays (16 with *Sir Thomas More*), all the rest—20 to 24—Mediterranean, including *Cardenio*. As the canon rocks, so do the stats, of course; and these relations are all somewhat relative.

I infer that many of the settings were due to Shakespeare's sources, but that the further he was from home the freer he was in his explorations of character, politics, conduct, and theme. But I wouldn't peddle so breezy a speculation any further than to say that the Histories seem to me fundamentally patriotic on balance, and that the four classical—Greece- and Rome-set—tragedies are the darkest plays in the canon; the complement of Bradley's Big Four tragedies, of which three are Northern—but *Othello* is among the most Mediterranean. Unlike the classical tragedies, all of these end with a measure of poetic justice, in that the final survivors are not great but are good persons. Not so

the four Greek and Roman tragedies, *Coriolanus* and *Timon of Athens* being the darkest of all—and for some the most existential and truest to life. I think there is plenty to say about the correlation between place and setting, time of setting, and their meaning and significance, but I am here to talk mostly about the most Mediterranean play of all, *The Tempest*, set on an island in it.

II. Theory Weory

I am not now nor have I ever been a literary theorist. I would more accurately but parenthetically call myself a hypothesist, a very informal one concerned to find a way to talk fairly precisely and intimately about plays and poems—or anything else, including works of prose fiction, which require somewhat different attention. Critical activity and results at any level begin and end with reading, reading closely, and reading more than once.[3]

During my period of reviewing Guthrie Theater Shakespeare for *Shakespeare Quarterly* (1980-86), I found that I needed three viewings for a scholarly review: first time for impact, second for close observation, third to check the observation and observe any significant changes.

The first of three basic assumptions I think important is that dramatic persons do not exist except as functions of the text expressing them, including stage directions. They cannot be psychoanalyzed in themselves—even though "they" were for decades after Freud. A classic is *Hamlet and Oedipus* by Freud's lifelong friend and official biographer, Ernest Jones. We needn't eschew the pleasures of parlor psychoanalysis entirely, just recognize that the psychoanalysis of an extrapolation from a text is twice fictive. If we want to understand Shakespeare's Prince Hamlet, we will find the wherewithal in the text, or rather in four or more texts: the extant substantive ones—Q1 1603, Q2 1604-05, F 1623—and all the composite editions. And we ought to read it for the designs—by the play (inferentially the playwright) and on an audience. I realize that if such a criterion were strictly applied, two-thirds of the criticism—and 75% of the papers—we have read (and written), including those by the greatest critics, would be discarded. I don't suggest any such drastic recycling, but it is useful to bear in mind, while responding to the characters we or others have constructed, that the construction, however gratifying, may not be in accord with the play(wright)'s demonstrable and scripted design. Even though we naturally prefer our own, it is worth seeking the written, because we will—or should—learn and enhance

our experience and understanding by doing so. Consider the Hamlets. Oh, lord, consider the Hamlets we have known, heard of, and seen on stage. Then read again for relief. Finally, the "Death of the Author" perpetrated by Roland Barthes in 1967 was greatly exaggerated: the author exists or existed in historical time, the character never (unless originally historical, of course—but still a fiction in recreation).

The second basic assumption, closely related and equally heretical (?), is that the script has priority over *performance* as the primary object of understanding and criticism.[4]

Priority of script again privileges—as the cliché has it—the author, or rather the script, as the primary authority.[5] By *authority*, however, I don't mean dictatorship (though one thinks of that a lot these days). Perhaps *intentionality* would serve. With plays, it is useful, even essential, to differentiate between a production and an adaptation, performance being common to both and in itself neutral. Casual chat and deceptive production make no such distinctions. Admitting "Adaptation" has the advantage that it liberates the producers to do as they like with a script, free of accusations of vandalism—and they also assume the responsibility of making and performing a work that claims and demonstrates its own merits. I had the enlightening if frustrating experience of seeing at Shakespeare's Globe, London, in the summer of 2016 an ostensible "production" of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* directed by then-artistic director, Emma Rice; frustrating because the production, unlike the two-hour play, was three hours long. The extra hour did *not* include recently discovered lost parts by Shakespeare (none, to my knowledge), but padding of many kinds complemented, so help me, by *cuts*.

Reviews varied. Lyn Gardner, in the *Guardian* (5/5/16) wrote that

Rice, whose only previous encounter with Shakespeare was a production of *Cymbeline* for the Royal Shakespeare Company, makes no claims to be a Shakespeare specialist and has stated her belief that too often [in the UK] Shakespeare's plays are treated like a kind of cultural medicine that are [sic] supposed to do you good. Towards the end she even inserts a tongue-in-cheek line alluding to British theatre's obsession with text.[6]

By contrast, a conscientious director may go *too* far in specifying "adaptation," but he or she can hardly be faulted for lack of scruple. Of a Coral Gables, Florida, production of *The Tempest* in 2010,

reviewer Nicole Stodard wrote in *Shakespeare Bulletin,* "Although this production was identified as an adaptation, cuts to the script actually appeared relatively minimal and subtle. The most obvious edit involved the opening storm and shipwreck, which were pared down to a few moments of darkness with exposition provided by sound effects and voiceover" (29.2, Summer 2011, 251-56). At the Globe, Rice's predecessor, Dominic Dromgoole, directed and appointed other directors to direct actual productions.[7]

Rice's assertion that "too often . . . Shakespeare's plays are treated like a kind of cultural medicine that are supposed to do you good" is ungrammatical, of course, but more importantly it seems to take drama exclusively as entertainment. It is entertaining, of course, and for many no more; and nothing wrong with that, but there is much to be said for Samuel Johnson's dictum that "the purpose of writing is to instruct; the purpose of poetry is to instruct by pleasing." He was using *poetry* not as a synonym for verse but more or less in Aristotle's sense as *imitation, fiction, artistic representation.* His didactic view was the opposite of Rice's, but it makes sense: given the opportunity, we can hardly help but learn. To my way of thinking, Johnson's *Preface to Shakespeare* is perhaps the one indispensable introduction to Shakespeare. It is comprehensive, perceptive, and sound, if sometimes idiosyncratic (and so what?). When it is, it is often amusing, as in his witty and creative excursus on Shakespeare's quibbles. Much as I'd like to, I'll not read it, or not all of it, because it is among your quotations:

A quibble is to *Shakespeare,* what luminous vapours are to the traveller; he follows it at all adventures; it is sure to lead him out of his way, and sure to engulf him in the mire. It has some malignant power over his mind, and its fascinations are irresistible. Whatever be the dignity or profundity of his disquisition, whether he be enlarging knowledge or exalting affection, whether he be amusing attention with incidents, or enchaining it in suspense, let but a quibble spring up before him, and he leaves his work unfinished. A quibble is the golden apple for which he will always turn aside from his career, or stoop from his elevation. A quibble, poor and barren as it is, gave him such delight, that he was content to purchase it, by the sacrifice of reason, propriety and truth. A quibble was to him the fatal *Cleopatra* for which he lost the world, and was content to lose it.

We don't use the term *quibble*. We do use *pun* and *wordplay*, and for a time we used *ambiguity*, under the influence of the late William Empson in his *Seven Types of Ambiguity*, a scripture of the New Criticism (1930, rev. 1953).

These assumptions seem to me axiomatic. They give primacy to the script and seem commonsensical at any level of thought more demanding than literary gossip, or bullshit. The most basic assumption of all is that one way a—respected—script *must* be understood is in terms of what it says for itself. Making sense of the words on the page. I. A. Richards made the point acutely in his book *Practical Criticism* (1929), where he lists the ten chief difficulties of criticism, which he discovered from his experiments with students at Cambridge University. He had them write essays on unidentified and undated poems and then analyzed their "protocols," as he called them. From those came his "difficulties." The first was "the difficulty of making out the plain sense of poetry." He elaborated:

The most disturbing and impressive fact brought out by this experiment is that a large proportion of average-to-good (and in some cases, certainly, devoted) readers of poetry frequently and repeatedly *fail to understand it*, both as a statement and as an expression. They fail to make out its prose sense, its plain, overt meaning as a set of ordinary, intelligible English sentences, taken quite apart from any further poetic significance. And equally, they misapprehend its feeling, its tone, and its intention. . . . Nor is it only the most abstruse poetry that so betrays us. In fact, to set down, for once, the brutal truth, no immunity is possessed on any occasion, not by the most reputable scholar, from this or any other of these critical dangers. (12, emphasis Richards's)

As an object of cultural studies and many other kinds, it is possible that the verbal object need not be understood in detail in its own terms at all. I don't deny the possibility, but it is a completely different way of using a script, a way often more creative (if not destructive) than critical, and sometimes very successfully so—but as an adaptation or a spinoff.

Quite recently there has been an upsurge of theorizing in favor of centering criticism on the text rather than approaching it by way of some prior theoretical construct, a prevailing American mode for decades, as the recent contrarians note. I'll mention three. The first and "oldest" (earlier July 2016) is concerned with the theory and practice of interpretation. It is the article by C[rysóstomos] Mantzávi-

nos in the online *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (22 June 2016) on "Hermeneutics": "**Hermeneutics** as the methodology of interpretation is concerned with problems that arise when dealing with meaningful human actions and the products of such actions, most importantly texts." [8] An integral component of hermeneutics is the hermeneutic circle, which keeps us aware that we don't know the whole without the parts, or the parts without the whole. Such circles may loop anywhere outside the work as well as within it, but within it is where the critical action is. It is this that differentiates the eighteenth-century's "Beauties" from passages that may be "beauties," too, but have a function also in speaking for the whole as well as for themselves.

Second is "The Dogmatic Character of Imposed Interpretation," an essay by Zhang Jiang published in the journal, *Social Sciences in China* (37.3: 132-47) in September 2016 (online 9/3/16).[9] The Keywords epitomize its concerns: "imposed interpretation, dogmatism, using text to prove theory, interpretive function." In China the Humanities are closely affiliated formally with the Social Sciences, as we often are here by ideology or, more often, administrative thrift and fiat. At Minnesota, what used to be the College of Science, Literature, and the Arts has long been the College of Liberal Arts; that is, the Social Sciences dominating the Humanities and Fine Arts. The Sciences left for greener pastures in the 1960s, leaving the humanities without a sometime ally.

Third and last is "Against Historicist Fundamentalism," by Eric Hayot, published in *PMLA* (of all places) in October 2016 (131.5: 1414-22), which is concerned primarily with Chinese poetics but has broader application. The argument is not primarily specialist and takes issue with the view prevailing among critics of Chinese poetry to the effect that it is fundamentally different from the poetry of the West, which is dichotomous, whereas Chinese is holistic.[10] So much for cultural and theoretical parochialism.

So the essential activity is close reading or explication, reading to understand and experience fully, and this activity includes character-realization perforce. That is and is not contrary to what I said earlier. Drama is action and action requires doers, whose character is constituted by the dialogue spoken by and about the doer, and by his or her actions inferred from the dialogue, described in the dialogue, or specified in stage directions. We don't say "doers," I know, but critical discourse in English about drama is plagued with ambiguities. *Dramatis personae* is accurate but wordy. *Actors* are

performers. *Characters* is usually used but limiting and sometimes confusing. Aristotle could comfortably differentiate between doers [in Greek, πράττοντες] and their character [ἦθος], because the language allowed him to. Thus he could say intelligibly that the doers in tragedy needn't have character, though it was better when they did. Our *actors* [doers in Latin from *ago*], another potential ambiguity, in Greek were ὑποκριτάι,originally 'those who answer,' then 'people who play parts,' in due course 'hypocrites.'

At the threshold of *The Tempest* I want to put in circulation two useful quick-and-cleanly critical guides. They are the first of the quotations. The first is my formulation of the economical Aristotelian-universal question,

What is it(s) for(m)?

The second is familiar to everyone at least in the form of journalism's "5 Ws." But I recommend the ancient version descending from Hermagoras of Temnos, who taught Greek rhetoric to Romans in the first century BCE. He divided a topic into not five but *seven* "circumstances," expressed in Latin as

Quīs, Quĭd, Ŭbī, Quĭbŭs aūxĭlĭīs, || Cūr, Quōmŏdŏ, Quāndō?

That is, "Who, What, Where, with What Aids, Why, How, When?" "The line lends *itself* to appreciative explication, and one of its most prominent qualities is its meter, the epic dactylic hexameter. You probably heard it, because the sentence is hard to read without it.

III. Soundings in *The Tempest*

Soundings are literally "the action or process of sounding or ascertaining the depth of water by means of the line and lead or (now usually) by means of an echo; an instance of this"[11] (*OED* n. 2, 1.a, 1; 2023), and figuratively "to take soundings, to try to find out quietly how matters stand" (1.b). The *OED*'s example from Shakespeare is Montague's "[Romeo is] to himself so secret and so close, / So far from **sounding** and discovery, / As is the bud bit with an envious worm" (1.1.147). Taking "soundings" enables one to go straight to matters of notable detail instead of giving yet one more super-contextualization of, or new narrative or alternative fiction about, the whole play, which is certainly familiar to students of the period. And every sounding has hermeneutic implications for the

whole play, and vice versa. But I *will* offer a hundred-word summary, which resulted from a temporary urge I had to write 100-word summaries of some of the plays:

Prospero, Duke of Milan, so loved his studies that he delegated authority to his brother, who had Prospero and his young daughter Miranda banished in a boat that bore them to a desert island, where by his learning Prospero mastered the island's spirits, Ariel foremost, and coped with Caliban, a witch's son. Twelve years later, fortune or providence brings those who wronged him near, and he conjures a tempest sinking their ship but sparing all aboard for testing by adversities leading to reconciliation and the betrothal of his daughter to Ferdinand, son of the King of Naples his sometime enemy.

If The Tempest is not Shakespeare's greatest play, it is in many ways the most comprehensive.[12] That is the more remarkable, since it is the second shortest in the canon after *The Comedy of Errors* (14,369), though only 51 words shorter (16,036) than *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (16,087).[13] The three have much in common as Romances sui generis.[14] I want to Sound briefly several parts or aspects of *The Tempest* beginning with the first scene and ending with the Epilogue and Farewell, making a few other quiet observations on Shakespeare and *The Tempest* along the way.

I said earlier that *The Tempest* is Shakespeare's most "Mediterranean" play. It went Caribbean for a time, excited by a reference to the "Bermudas" in the passage containing Shakespeare's only use of "Mediterranean" that I cited in the Introit. But Paul Cantor put that misappropriation to rest in an admirable essay on "The Shores of Hybridity: Shakespeare and the Mediterranean," noting that "the mere mention of **Bermuda** at one point in the play (1.2.229) has been enough to outweigh the repeated Mediterranean references – to Naples, Milan, Tunis, and Algiers, and of course to the Mediterranean itself" (1.2.234).[15] For the line in context that is the root of the Caribbean transplanting, see the Appendix. Ariel reports to Prospero,

> . . . Safely in harbour 1.2.226
> Is the king's ship, in the deep **nook** where once
> Thou call'dst me up at midnight to fetch dew
> From the still-vexed **Bermudas**; **there** she's hid, Bermoothes] *F*
> The mariners all under hatches stowed, 230

Who, with a charm joined to their suffered labour,

I have left asleep. [=I've; *cf.* I *in* 233]

Nothing said here—the syntax least of all—supports Prospero's island's being in the Caribbean, unless "Bermudas" is erroneously taken to be the antecedent of "there"; but the syntactical and sense antecedent is "nook," where everything in the passage is centered except for Ariel's night flight from the nook to the Bermudas "to fetch dew." Ariel shares speed with Puck, who assures Oberon that "I'll put a girdle round about the earth / In forty minutes" (*MND* 2.1.175-76). In *The Tempest* proper, the Bermudas are as remote in imaginative space as they were and are in geography.

This passage invites several kinds of critical attention including a comment on ***semetrics***, with which you may not be familiar. I defer with pleasure and respect to the late George Wright on most matters metrical as such, and I am more interested in the *relation* between meter *and meaning* in Shakespeare and contemporaneous poets of the Shakespearean Moment like Donne.[16] For these, *meter* makes *meaning*, and I call the practice and study of that kind of metrical arrangement and expression *semetrics*. A one-line example is Mediterranean Antony's first line in his address to the Roman crowd after Brutus has concluded his prose oration and ill-advisedly departed. Brutus was not canny enough to know that he who speaks first does *not* speak best, and it has been repeatedly remarked of our 45th president that he embraces the position of the last person to speak to him about it. Antony famously appeals, "Friends, Romans, **coun**trymen, **lend** me your ears." That is the stress used by Marlon Brando in the film and heard almost invariably on the stage.[17] But what the *meter* says is "Friends, Romans, country**men**, lend **me** your ears." That is a standard blank-verse line, which supplies both the logical and rhetorically compelling stresses, here appealing to Roman machismo for Antony's turn to be heard, since the listeners have already lent their ears to Brutus.

In the passage from *The Tempest* just quoted, "Safely in harbor," a number of metrically variant lines' effect semantic emphasis. They do this, as usual, by the placing of polysyllabic words together with monosyllabic verbs and nouns to dictate stress and show sense. The only lines of mostly invariant iambic verse in the passage are 232-37. I personally doubt whether Shakespeare consciously labored over the semetrics of his verse, but it must have come to him instinctively and by training along with the gift of writing fluent blank verse itself.[18]

Far from semetrics is *The Tempest*'s **First scene,** where not a line of verse is to be seen or heard**.** We are so used to having the second scene follow the first *immediately*, even in the reading, that we are likely to miss the fact that with everyone sinking with the ship there is no one left to go anywhere, and nowhere *to* go but sea and sky. I have yet to see a performance with a long pause for reflection after scene 1, possibly because the audience, instead of stopping to think, might begin to natter. But the hiatus is deliberate, original, striking, and significant. Asking students who have not yet read the play to read the first scene and ask themselves what now and what next yields interesting results. I call the first scene Shakespeare's Roar-Shock text, because it compounds the ink-blot function with the noise and alarm generated by the abruptness and violence of the onset and termination of the action. Shakespeare's strong implication is that all interpretation is a matter of knowledge and perspective, and that is made clear from Miranda's response to open scene 2 (which you will see in the Appendix):

Miranda. If by your art, my dearest father, you have
Put the wild waters in this roar, allay them.
The sky, it seems, would pour down stinking pitch
But that the sea, mounting to th' welkin's cheek,
Dashes the fire out. O, I have sufferéd 1.2.5 *Accent supplied*
With those that I saw suffer—a brave vessel
(Who had no doubt some noble creature in her)
Dashed all to pieces. O, the cry did knock
Against my very heart! Poor souls, they perished.
Had I been any god of power, I would 10
Have sunk the sea within the earth or ere
It should the good ship so have swallow'd and
The fraughting souls within her.

Like us, she thinks the ship "dashed all to pieces"—because that's what we saw—and those aboard, "poor souls, they perished" (1.2.8, 9), she reasonably infers, like any innocent observer. Prospero, being responsible for the sinking as Miranda supposes, soon convinces her that "There's no harm done" (15), but we see no evidence of that.

This speech is remarkable in itself *and* in being the speech of a young girl, who is herself characterized as remarkable by it. It is the language of epic in its descriptive attributes and powers, and it establishes its speaker as gifted in several ways, most importantly in the depth of her sympathy but also in her inferences and intuition: the "brave vessel" contained not only "Poor souls" but "no doubt some noble creature"—and contrasts strikingly with the "rotten carcass of a butt" (1.2.146) that we soon learn brought Prospero and Miranda to the island.

For the beginning and end of *The Tempest*, could anything be less alike than the first scene, with themes articulated in confused alarms of struggle and flight, on a sinking ship where verse would be sane and controlled for the circumstances; and the last scene, with a comfortable epilogue in couplets appealing for audience reciprocation following an almost total reconciling of once-opposing parties?

IV. Stichomythia and Symmetreciprocity

Shakespeare's verbal art in *The Tempest* is everywhere to be seen and heard, to captivate and epiphanize.[19] The script should always be heard, with the inner ear as necessary; and if seen by the mind's eye, so much the better. The verse is used semantically and semetrically, with eloquence and skill, sometimes noticeably, often not: *ars est celare artem*, the art is to conceal the art. Verse speaks for character as usual in *The Tempest*, but with at least a couple of significant differences: Caliban speaks in verse, because, as he tells Prospero, "you taught me language, and I know how to verse." That textual joke aside—he actually *says*, tellingly, "I know how to *curse*"—, Caliban's *verse* is a measure of his verbal skill and his educational superiority to Stephano and Trinculo. Another striking example is the Boatswain's speaking in verse when at play's end Ariel enters "with the Master and Boatswain amazedly following" (at 5.1.215; Boatswain 221-24a, 229-40a).[20]

Now, here come *stichomythia* and *symmetreciprocity* in *The Tempest*. These are formal devices and accompaniments, and what is and should be more interesting to me and most is what the words *say* quite independently of their arrangement. But their "arrangement" is an integral part of the whole art and cause of effects, and I am giving attention to it here because aspects have been overlooked or neglected. Partly, no doubt, because the art *has* concealed the art.

All will be familiar with the term ***stichomythia***. The *OED* (1916, not yet updated) defines it as, "In classical Greek Drama, dialogue in alternate lines, employed in sharp disputation, and characterized by antithesis and rhetorical repetition or taking up of the opponent's words. Also applied to modern imitations of this." Fewer will be familiar with ***symmetreciprocity***, used by me as a portmanteau term for the cause and effect of such complementary equilineal speeches as those in *stichomythics*, which in Ferdinand and Miranda's cases are complimentary with an *i*, as well, as often in Shakespeare. The reciprocal speeches by these two also begin and end with interlocking half lines (*antilabe*[21]), as is the case with other such exchanges in the play. *Stichomythia* is one-liners. Stock terminology extends as far as *hemi-* for half and *di-* for double or couplets, but Shakespeare goes so much further as to give complementary speeches of *twelve* lines each to Ferdinand and Miranda, during their getting-acquainted and falling-in-love duologue in act 3, scene 1. There Ferdinand is happy enough carrying logs, whereas Caliban had grumped to Prospero earlier the non sequitur and doubtless fake news, "There's wood enough within" (1.2.315). The falling-in-love subscene begins with Ferdinand's log-happy soliloquy that ends with the half-line, "most busyless when I do it" (15a).[22] Miranda completes the verse line as she enters with "Alas now, pray you. / Work not so hard" (15b-16a). They then exchange complementary speeches of three lines, then four lines. And shortly after Prospero's observing—"Poor worm, thou art infected! / This visitation shows it" (31b-32a)—comes the exchange of 12-liners (*dodecastichomythics*!), which may be seen in the Appendix (37b-48a, 48b-59a).

The speeches cannot have come to be as they are by accident, and it seems hardly to be doubted that the complementarity had significance for Shakespeare. Whether his or any theater audience would *catch* the parallel seems doubtful, but such passages *may* have a corresponding effect even unnoticed. There are several such complementary passages, shorter ones especially, in *The Tempest.* But the most striking of all such exchanges is in the profound and affectionate (and thematic) exchange between Ariel and Prospero at a climactic moment just before Prospero's farewell to his art and the island beginning, "Ye elves of hills, brooks, standing lakes, and groves" (33). Numerologists should be especially interested to note that the complementary speeches of Ariel (7b-19a) and Prospero (20b-

32a) have the mystical number of thirteen lines each (*tridecastichomhythic*), the speeches separated by brilliantly interlocking and emotionally touching short lines.

The brief intermediate exchange between the longer speeches brings the two very close. Ariel's speech-concluding lines initiate: "Your charm so strongly works 'em / That if you now beheld them, your affections / Would become tender"[23]: " **Prospero.** Dost thou think so, *spirit*? (19b); **Ariel.** Mine would, sir, were I *human*" (20a); **Prospero**. "And mine shall" (20b; 2 lines and 4 speeches with antilabe). Here Prospero's gentle wit elicits Ariel's equally gentle, even wistful sincerity with its emphasis on "the human." This exchange seems to me the play's most thematically emphatic—and emotionally affecting—speech on ethics and social behavior, as "Our revels now are ended" is on the philosophical and aesthetic dimensions; and "Ye elves" is on multiple dimensions, including the personal and vocational. Prospero's speech centers on *kindness,* given prominence and depth by wordplay, as its counterpart is in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* with Theseus's "The *kinder* we to give them thanks for nothing" (5.1.89)—which is often cut and more of Shakespeare with it in performance.

The beginning of symmetreciprocity (with antilabe) is with Prospero and Miranda, as one would retrospect; and it is obviously a means by which their closeness in understanding and affection is established. It is also a means of artistically expressing the play's deepest concerns.

Miranda. O, the heavens!

What foul play had we that we came from thence? 1.2.60

Or blessed wast we did?

Prospero. Both, both, my girl.

By foul play, as thou sayst, were we heaved thence,

But blessedly holp hither.

There is another such exchange between Prospero and Ferdinand about the Wedding Masque and more, much more:

Ferdinand. This is a most majestic vision, and

Harmoniously charmingly. May I be bold

To think these spirits?

Prospero. Spirits, which by mine art 4.1.120

I have from their confines called to enact

My present fancies.

Ferdinand. Let me live here ever!

So rare a wondered father and a wise

Makes this place paradise.[24]

On the lighter side, Ferdinand's "most majestic vision," etc., is ready-made for reviewers and marquee-makers. Beyond the commercial potentialities, all of these lines are resonant beyond the immediate context and have an allegorical ring. And it seems quite remarkable how formal they are in verse and yet how very realistic in expressing character and feeling. Ferdinand's "most majestic vision" speaks far better of *The Tempest* than of the Wedding masque. Prospero's reply about spirits and his art certainly suggests Shakespeare's, and Ferdinand seems almost to wish to live in a world of the imagination created by Prospero. And the literal reference to the island "here" bonds the island's wonders to the theater's and the artist's. Ferdinand lives on in Shakespeare's *Tempest*. You may have an edition or editions reading "wondered father and a *wife*" instead of "wise," but there is neither textual nor contextual support for it, and whose "wife" under what circumstances is left to speculation.[25]

Before I turn to comment on the Epilogue and the Farewell, I want to draw your attention to a final reconciliatory exchange between Alonso, Prospero, and Gonzalo that is among the Appendix quotations: please don't fail to note the symmetreciprocity between Alonso and Prospero in the middle—and Alonso's "Amen" at the end. And Prospero and Caliban have their last exchange in four-line stichomythics in 291-98, with Caliban's last speech ending in midline and completed by Prospero's "Go to, away!" It is hardly reconciliatory in the same way as the others, nor should that be expected, though it often is. I am not sure that persons of the contemporary theater would have much use for this kind of artifice in Shakespeare's creation, but it was put there for purposes and remains available for recognition and response unless edited out or cut.

Shakespeare wrote few (surviving) epilogues, but on the ones for *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Tempest* (q.v. in Appendix) he clearly bestowed pains. *Dream*'s Epilogue spoken by Puck is appropriately in heptasyllabics except for the opening and closing octosyllabic couplets. Heptasyllabics are the meter Shakespeare used for the dialogue of fairies, spirits, and witches; and also in songs.[26]

The heptasyllabics in *The Tempest* thus associate Prospero with his spirits rather than with his human peers with their blank verse and his.

Both epilogues are implicitly divided into equal verse-paragraphs or stanzas of eight lines in *Dream* and ten lines in *The Tempest.* The appeal for applause is common to both, of course, but the terms, tone, and substance differ entirely, in accordance with play and speaker, Puck and Prospero, respectively (cf. the abrupt Roman "*Plaudite*!"). The first octave of *Dream*'s Epilogue promises the players' amending if they are forgiven for perceived shortcomings. The second stresses the "honest Puck," the mischief-maker who also rewards; who briefly seems to threaten—"Else *the Puck* a liar call"—but concludes heartily, "Give me your hands, if we be friends, / And *Robin* shall restore amends" (emphasis added). It seems hardly to be doubted that Robin actually shook hands at least with persons in the yard who were standing at the edge of the stage—which you can still be for £12 at Shakespeare's Globe in London, if you get there early enough and move fast (yard tickets were £5 pre-Covid).

The epilogues both conclude with a conditional penultimate line, with illuminating contrasts: "if we be friends" in *Dream* corresponds with "As you from crimes would pardoned be." The primary sense of *indulgence* is "forgiveness," or "favouring forbearance or relaxation of restraint" (*OED* 1.a, with Shakespeare's line as an example). "Gimme a break," in colloquial terms. But *indulgence* has, or for at least some in Shakespeare's audience would have had, connotations of considerable resonance and authority as "remission of punishment which is still due to sin [here 'crimes'] after sacramental resolution" (*OED* 3.a)—but of course the result is a kind of comic seriousness without solemnity. *The Tempest*'s Epilogue's last line seeks Golden Rule reciprocity, most fittingly for the last play of Shakespeare's sole authorship.

V. Farewell-Conclusion

I introduce my final comments on *The Tempest* with an epigraph from Jonathan Bate's admirable book on *Shakespeare and Ovid* (1993):

By transforming Shakespeare into Prospero, we make him into a kind of magician and we end in wonder, awe-inspired by his art. A new myth is created, that of Shakespeare's transcendent, history-

defying genius. The book is closed with a flourish, *The Tempest*'s privileged status being licensed by its prime position in the First Folio or [I'd say "**and**"] by a romantic construction of Prospero's epilogue as Shakespeare's farewell to the stage. [I'd say "**both**."] Many a reading concludes in some such manner. ¶ **But** Shakespeare's career didn't end with *The Tempest.* He went on to write his three collaborations with John Fletcher: *Henry VIII, The Two Noble Kinsmen,* and the lost *Cardenio*. . . .

By contrast, Northrop Frye wrote somewhat earlier (1959) that

It is not difficult to see . . . why so many students of Shakespeare, rightly or wrongly, have felt that *The Tempest* is in a peculiar sense Shakespeare's play, and that there is something in it of Shakespeare's farewell to his art. Two other features reinforce this feeling: the fact that no really convincing general source for the play has yet been discovered, and the fact that it is probably the last play wholly written by Shakespeare.[27]

It was easier to say that kind of thing comfortably in the 1950s. Most of the time since, it has seemed obligatory to deny it, as Bate does. But Shakespeare's going on to write parts of more plays is not weighty or even serious evidence *against The Tempest*'s being his farewell. All kinds of people, especially in show biz, are forever retiring and then unretiring. Frank Sinatra was a notorious case in point. He retired in 1971, came out to record again two years later, and continued to perform and record until his death in 1998. *The Tempest* reads and *feels* like Shakespeare's farewell with Prospero's giving up his substantially theatrical art and leaving the stage of the bare island, and it looks that way in retrospect. If this *is* the way it feels, looks, and seems, then either we suppose that giving that impression was inadvertent or we have to suspect it was deliberate. A question to be asked, it seems to me, is, if *Shakespeare* had decided to write an imaginatively dramatic farewell to the stage, how would it differ from *The Tempest*?

In conclusion, I have to offer one more perspective on the whole play in one of the most satisfying productions I have seen. This was an amateur one in London's Brixton on April 8th, 1981. All the performers were black except one. Guess which one? Experiment assures me that the actual one is invariably the last or near-last guessed. Why? Because it was assumed that the whiteness was deliberate and significant. In fact, *Trinculo* was white. Why? Because shortly before the production was to open, the black Trinculo got sick and the only Trinculo they could get on short notice was white.

The self-identified "Afro-Caribbean" production cited in the program *Purchas His Pilgrims* on a Carthaginian Expedition that found "a fertile desert island . . . distant many days' sailing from the African continent. . . . This is by some interpreted as the West Indies." The music was supplied by an on-stage reggae group called Wasimba, the lead singer of which played Ariel.[28] The production's Epilogue ended with the last couplet of the first ten lines to supply a plaintive refrain with past and continuing significance: "But release me from my bands, / With the help of your good hands." The band moved in, tacitly inviting the audience to clap in time with the music instead of applauding. This communal harmony went on for several minutes with everyone in the audience, more black than white, but many of each, quite spellbound. That of course was a farewell—and a welcome—of its own kind and relevance entirely in the spirit of Prospero and *The Tempest*.

Notes

[1] To sample generative AI on the subject (ChatGPT3 https://chat.openai.com/), I tried "What is bullshit?" twice on 5/8/23 with fascinating differences; e.g., the first drew on Harry Frankfurt, the second did not.

[2] Ed. Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan (London: Bloomsbury).

[3] My most basic assumption is that serious reading is phonics-based and any other kind of reading, very much including "whole language" and "three-cueing," is not properly *reading* at all.

[4] Until the early 1960s, drama was treated by Eng lit people mostly as literature, but around then theater came into the ascendancy and has reigned pretty much ever since. Neither perspective should do without the other, so long as they harmonize.

[5] The author, if dead, has no consultable authority. But the script has all the life put and left in it.

[6] https://www.theguardian.com/culture/2016/may/06/a-midsummer-nights-dream-review-a-rowdy-night-out-but-less-can-be-more. Gardner continues, "Purists may argue that she overfills the sugar spoon in her determination to make the medicine go down. And the relentless jokiness does detract from the comic climax . . . [with the] the rude mechanicals," and *Pyramus and Thisbe* "seems flat after the strenuous comedy that has come before. ¶ Rice's most potentially contentious change, which sees Helena becoming Helenus, yearning desperately after Demetrius, who sees marriage to Hermia as the best way to secure his place in society, works beautifully."

[7] Michelle Terry succeeded Emma Rice as artistic director in 2018. Owing largely to Covid, I have not seen productions under her artistic direction, but her experience with Shakespeare (also as an actress) and her continuing direction argue for her and the Globe's artistic success.

[8] https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/hermeneutics/

[9] http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02529203.2016.1194638?src=recsys

---

"Abstract. How to understand and handle the text is an important question raised by many scholars with reference to the theory of imposed or forced interpretation. It is indeed difficult to identify and distinguish imposed interpretation from the results of interpretation. The crux of imposed interpretation lies not in the outcome of textual interpretation, but in the way such interpretation is understood and approached. The theoretical impetus and tendency of imposed interpretation, as a way and means of achieving understanding and interpretation, are often determined by the philosophical preferences and cognitive approaches of the interpreter. Philosophical and cognitive analysis highlights the dogmatism of imposed interpretation, allowing us to identify and comprehend what imposed interpretation is from a new perspective. Imposed interpretation has its philosophical roots in **the dogmatism of ancient Greece [?!];** this was taken to an extreme by Leibniz and Wolff, but was then subverted by Kant's criticism. The expropriation of extrinsic theories, in particular, means that interpreters start from a given theoretical goal and use text to prove theory. Imposed or forced interpretation thus becomes inevitable; otherwise, it would be hard to achieve the goal of such interpretation."

[10] Chinese has no word for "lyric" or "metaphor," or therefore the corresponding phenomena, the conventional argument goes. It has its own culture-specific preoccupations with *fu* (the descriptive), *bi* (the comparative), and *xing* (the affective). As Hayot justly remarks, the Chinese preoccupations are not irrelevant to our own Western literary works.

[11] "The plummet of a plumb line" (*OED* lead, n.1, 4.a).

[12] Back in my first decade of teaching, I often used an essay question focused on *The Tempest* as a comprehensive expression of the major concerns of the canon. "Choose *n* assigned plays and discuss." I gave further specifications, of course. The ultimate purpose was for them to show that they knew the plays and could write intelligently about them in interrelation, not that they could regurgitate what they thought they heard or what they thought I thought. I don't flatter myself that I'll fully comprehend *The Tempest* ever, not least because I have to keep recovering what my memory has lost, sometimes only temporarily, sometimes not.

[13] Word counts are from Marvin Spevack's invaluable but sprawling 9-volume concordance based on the first edition of the *Riverside Shakespeare*. The shortest 4: *Mac*. 16,436, *MND* 16,087,

Tmp. 16,036, *Err*. 14,369. Word count has always seemed to me a somewhat less subjective way to measure length than number of lines.

[14] *Err*. has long been recognized in both criticism and performance as a proto-romance.

[15] Cantor, "Shores," *Literature Compass*, 3.4 (July 2006), 896–913. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.ezp3.lib.umn.edu/doi/10.1111/j.1741-4113.2006.00363.x/full

[16] See Patrick Cruttwell, *The Shakespearean Moment and Its Place in the Poetry of the 17th Century* (New York: Modern Library/Random, 1960).

[17] *William Shakespeare's Julius Caesar*, dir. Joseph L. Mankiewicz (1953).

[18] I would go so far as to confess that I believe he wrote from inspiration, instinct, reading knowledge, and a limited but integrated education that compounded with curiosity, intelligence, focused attention, and imagination to enable him to do much that the less gifted, observant, and attentive couldn't do with a degree and a rule book.

The skill to scan seems not to be universal among our students (and some of us?), not that scanning wins awards or qualifies for jobs. The shortfall is the less surprising when some theatrical authorities themselves don't scan well. In his otherwise excellent book on *Playing Shakespeare*, John Barton demonstrates arbitrary scansion in his chapter on "Using the Verse" (*Playing*, 1984). "Once more unto the breach, dear friends" is discussed in some detail on pp. 30-31. The problem arises from reading stress into what one *takes* to be the sense and calling that the meter, a scanning case of hysteron proteron. Sir Peter Hall does better in *Shakespeare's Advice to the Players* (2003).

[19] Not in the *OED*, which has not yet fully updated *epiphany* since 1891 (true in 2023).

[20] Not so Stephano and Trinculo after their ordeal, but their language and attitude tell us how far they are transformed (256-60). "**Stephano**. Every man shift for all the rest, and let no man take care for himself, for all is but fortune. *Coraggio*, bully monster, *coraggio*. **Trinculo**. If these be true spies which I wear in my head, here's a goodly sight."

[21] Not in the *OED* (2023), but it is in the *Wikipedia* et al.

[22] busiless] *Theobald* (busie-less); busilest *Arden 2-3*; busie lest *F* (busie least *F2*, with the right sense); and hence a much discussed and emended crux (see Arden 3, p. 241). *OED* s.v. *busyless* notes that "Theobald's reading of *The Tempest* (quot. 1733) has been challenged by most editors," who

might consider revisiting it, however, since it seems the best emendation of *F*'s "busie lest." *OED* entry updated March 2012 (3 of its 4 examples contain *i*, the fourth with *y* is dated 1987). The required sense seems to be that Ferdinand's work is least hard—so he is "most busiless"—when he does it.

[23] That^ *F*] That, *Ard. 3*, following "modern rules of punctuation" (131).

[24] The second and third passages are fully alike in beginning and ending with an interlocking half line, whereas the first has two full lines followed by a half line. The last line, Ferdinand's, is a terminal short line not completed by a following half line.

[25] The *wise/wife* crux is discussed in Tom Clayton as the second of "Two Textual Cruxes in *The Tempest*," *N&Q* 63.3 (Sept. 2016): 436-41. https://academic-oup-com.ezp1.lib.umn.edu/nq/article/63/3/436/article.

[26] Heptasyllabics are lines of seven syllables with both the first and last syllable stressed. Such lines are in some contexts "acephalous" ("headless," lacking the first syllable of the first foot) or "catalectic" ("incomplete," lacking the last syllable of the last foot).

[27] Ed., *The Tempest*, Pelican Shakespeare (Baltimore: Penguin, 1959), 22-23.

[28] See and hear, at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eLI0Tohajdk, Wasimba and Sweet Harmony - Honours, Riches, Blessings from *Adultz Only: Lovers Selection*. Also see https://music.metason.net/artistinfo?name=Wasimba%20%26%20Sweet%20Harmony&title=Honours%2C%20Riches%2C%20Blessings

Appendix: Passages and Epilogues Referred to in the Paper

Distributing the passages enables the speaker to take into account more and longer passages than would be practicable if each passage had to be read aloud. It is also a handy takeaway version for further attention after the lecture—if wanted. The text is from the current Arden edition: 3 of *The Tempest*, 2 of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*.[1] The passages are given in order of their occurrence in the play.

What is it(s) for(m)?

Quīs, Quĭd, Ŭbī, Quĭbŭs aūxĭlĭīs, || Cūr, Quōmŏdŏ, Quāndō?
Who, What, Where, with What Aids, Why, How, When?

A quibble is to *Shakespeare*, what luminous vapours are to the traveller; he follows it at all adventures; it is sure to lead him out of his way, and sure to engulf him in the mire. It has some malignant power over his mind, and its fascinations are irresistible. Whatever be the dignity or profundity of his disquisition, whether he be enlarging knowledge or exalting affection, whether he be amusing attention with incidents, or enchaining it in suspense, let but a quibble spring up before him, and he leaves his work unfinished. A quibble is the golden apple for which he will always turn aside from his career, or stoop from his elevation. A quibble, poor and barren as it is, gave him such delight, that he was content to purchase it, by the sacrifice of reason, propriety and truth. A quibble was to him the fatal *Cleopatra* for which he lost the world, and was content to lose it. (Johnson, *Preface to Shakespeare*)

The most disturbing and impressive fact brought out by this experiment is that a large proportion of average-to-good (and in some cases, certainly, devoted) readers of poetry frequently and repeatedly *fail to understand it*, both as a statement and as an expression. They fail to make out its prose sense, its plain, overt meaning as a set of ordinary, intelligible English sentences, taken quite apart from any further poetic significance. And equally, they misapprehend its feeling, its tone, and its intention. . . . Nor is it only the most abstruse poetry that so betrays us. In fact, to set down, for once, the brutal truth, no immunity is possessed on any occasion, not by the most reputable scholar, from this or any other of these critical dangers. (Richards, *Practical Criticism* 12)

Miranda. If by your art, my dearest father, you have
Put the wild waters in this roar, allay them.
The sky, it seems, would pour down stinking pitch
But that the sea, mounting to th' welkin's cheek,
Dashes the fire out. O, I have sufferéd 1.2.5
With those that I saw suffer—a brave vessel
(Who had, no doubt, some noble creature in her)
Dashed all to pieces. O, the cry did knock
Against my very heart! Poor souls, they perished.
Had I been any god of power, I would 10
Have sunk the sea within the earth or ere
It should the good ship so have swallowed and
The fraughting souls within her.

Miranda. O, the heavens!
What foul play had we that we came from thence? 1.2.60
Or blessed wast we did?

Prospero. Both, both, my girl.
By foul play, as thou sayst, were we heaved thence,
But blessedly holp hither.

Ariel. . . . Safely in harbour 1.2.226
Is the King's ship, in the deep nook where once
Thou call'dst me up at midnight to fetch dew
From the still-vexed Bermudas; there she's hid,
The mariners all under hatches stowed, 1.2.230
Who, with a charm joined to their suffered labour,
I have left asleep. And for the rest o'th' fleet,
Which I dispersed, they all have met again,
And are upon the Mediterranean float,
Bound sadly home for Naples, 235
Supposing that they saw the King's ship wracked
And his great person perish.

Ferdinand. Admired Miranda!
Indeed the top of admiration, worth
What's dearest to the world! Full many a lady
I have eyed with best regard and many a time 3.1.40
Th' harmony of their tongues hath into bondage
Brought my too diligent ear. For several virtues
Have I liked several women; never any
With so fun soul but some defect in her
Did quarrel with the noblest grace she owed 45
And put it to the foil. but you, O you,
So perfect and so peerless, are created
Of every creature's best!
Miranda. I do not know
One of my sex; no woman's face remember—
Save, from my glass, mine own. Nor have I seen 50
More that I may call men than you, good friend,
And my dear father. How features are abroad
I am skilless of, but, by my modesty
(The jewel in my dower), I would not wish
Any companion in the world but you, 55
Nor can imagination form a shape,
Besides yourself, to like of. But I prattle
Something too wildly, and my father's precepts
I therein do forget. 59

Ferdinand. This is a most majestic vision, and
Harmoniously charmingly. May I be bold
To think these spirits?
Prospero. Spirits, which by mine art
I have from their confines called to enact 4.1.121
My present fancies.
Ferdinand. Let me live here ever!
So rare a wondered father and a wise
Makes this place paradise.

Ariel. Confined together 5.1.7

---

[1] Arden 3 *Tmp.*, ed. Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan, rev. ed. (2011). Arden 3 *MND* (ISBN408142776), ed. Sukanta Chaudhuri, is due for publication on 7/27/2017. See http://www.bloomsbury.com/us/a-midsummer-nights-dream-9781408142776/.

In the same fashion as you gave in charge,
Just as you left them; all prisoners, sir, 5.1.9
In the line grove which weather-fends your cell. 5.1.10
They cannot budge till your release. The King,
His brother and yours abide all three distracted
And the remainder mourning over them,
Brimful of sorrow and dismay; but chiefly 14
Him that you termed, sir, The good old lord Gonzalo;
His tears run down his beard like winter's drops
From eaves of reeds. Your charm so strongly works 'em
That, if you now beheld them, your affections
Would become tender.
Prospero. Dost thou think so, **spirit**?
Ariel. Mine would, sir, were I **human**.
Prospero. And mine shall. 20
Hast thou, which art but air, a touch, a feeling
Of their afflictions, and shall not myself
(One of their **kind**, that relish all as sharply,
Passion as they) be **kind**lier moved than thou art?
Though with their high wrongs I am struck to th' quick,
Yet with my nobler reason 'gainst my fury 26
Do I take part. The rarer action is
In virtue than in vengeance. They being penitent,
The sole drift of my purpose doth extend 30
Not a frown further. Go release them, Ariel.
My charms I'll break; their senses I'll restore;
And they shall be themselves.

Ferdinand. Sir, she is mortal,
But by immortal providence she's mine;
I chose her when I could not ask my father 30 5.1.190
For his advice, nor thought I had one. She
Is daughter to this famous Duke of Milan—
Of whom so often I have heard renown
But never saw before, of whom I have
Received a second life; and second father 5.1.195
This lady makes him to me.
Alonso. I am hers:
But, O, how oddly will it sound that I
Must ask my child forgiveness.
Prospero. There, sir, stop.
Let us not burden our remembrances with
A heaviness that's gone.
Gonzalo. I have inly wept, 200
Or should have spoke ere this. Look down, you gods,
And on this couple drop a blessed crown,
For it is you that have chalked forth the way
Which brought us hither.
Alonso. I say, 'amen', Gonzalo! 205

Prospero. He is as disproportioned in his manners
As in his shape. Go, sirrah, to my cell;
Take with you your companions. As you look
To have my pardon, trim it handsomely.
Caliban. Ay, that I will; and I'll be wise hereafter 5.1.295
And seek for grace. What a thrice-double ass
Was I to take this drunkard for a god,
And worship this dull fool!
Prospero. Go to, away!

The Epilogues of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Tempest*

Puck. If **we shadows** have offended, 8
Think but this, and all is mended, 8
That you have but slumber'd here
While these **visions** did appear.
And this weak and idle theme, 05
No more yielding but a **dream**,
Gentles, do not reprehend:
If you pardon, we will mend.
Ánd, as I'm an honest Puck,[2] I am] *F, Ard3*
If we have unearnèd luck 10
Now to 'scape the serpent's tongue,
We will make amends ere long;
Else **the Puck** a liar call.
So, good night unto you all. 14
Give me your hands, if we be friends, 8
And **Robin shall restore amends.** 8

[2] I think this line is heptasyllabic (with "I'm"), so the heptasyllabic epilogue begins and ends with a full octosyllabic couplet. "I am" and "I have" are never contracted visually in *F*, but they often are metrically.

Prospero. Now **my charms** are all o'erthrown, 7
And what strength I have's mine own, 7
Which is most faint. Now, 'tis true 7
I must be here confined by you,
Or sent to Naples. Let me not, 05
Since I have my dukedom got 7
And pardoned the deceiver, dwell
In **this bare island** by your spell;
But release me from my bands 7
With the help of your good **hands.** 10 7
Gentle **breath** of yours my sails 7
Must fill, or else my project fails,
Which was to please. Now I want 7
Spirits to enforce, art to enchant; 7? 8?
And my ending is despair, 15 7
Unless I be relieved by **prayer**,
Which pierces so that it assaults
Mercy itself and frees all faults.
As you from crimes would pardoned be,
Let your **indulgence** set me free. 20

"Against Historicist Fundamentalism," by Eric Hayot, *PMLA* (131.5, October 2016): 414-22.
"The Dogmatic Character of Imposed Interpretation," by Zhang Jiang, *Social Sciences in China* (37.3, September 2016): 132-47. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02529203.2016.1194638?src=recsys
"Hermeneutics," by C[rysostomos] Mantzavinos, online *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (mounted 22 June 2016). https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/hermeneutics/

Dr. Bob De Smith
Dordt College

Who Needs Men? Titania's World and Shakespeare's Argument for Marriage In *A Midsummer Night's Dream*

What is the best context for understanding and enjoying Shakespeare' *A Midsummer Night's Dream*? The play was probably written in 1594-95, so just before or after *Romeo and Juliet*. With its farce of tragic love in the play of Pyramus and Thisby ("'very tragical mirth'" 5.1.57), is the play a witty rejoinder to *Romeo and Juliet's* tragedy of the star-crossed lovers, making the pair of plays an exercise in the range of romantic genres? Was the play written to celebrate a noble wedding, perhaps that of Elizabeth Vere to William, Earl of Derby or (more likely?) that of Elizabeth Carey, granddaughter of Lord Hunsdon, who as Lord Chamberlain was the patron of Shakespeare's company?[1] Or is it the context of the public stage, where, according to the first quarto, "it hath been sundry times publickly acted"? London theatregoers (literally—they were attending a stage called "The Theatre") would have responded particularly to Shakespeare's sendup of his theater's own conventions in the play rehearsed and performed by Bottom and his bodies. Or is the conversation between Theseus and Hippolyta at the beginning of Act 5, after the play's crucial action has been fulfilled in an off-stage triple wedding, one which argues for the power of the poet's imagination, the keynote of the play? Is it centrally about the act of creating, embodying, and performing a work of art? In this vein, Siegel suggests that Shakespeare writes "not only for all time but for the occasion" (139), and that's not bad. Audiences at the public stage may have caught a whiff, either via rumor or from the play's lyricism, that they were like uninvited guests at a recent wedding; noble audiences could revel not just in private meanings (lost to us) but in the contrast between their own experience and the one implied on other stages.

Here is an exchange uttered as an aside to the performance of the "rude mechanicals" (3.2.9) late in the play:

> HIPPOLYTA. This is the silliest stuff that ever I heard.
>
> THESEUS. The best in this kind are but shadows; and the worst are no worse, if imagination amend them.
>
> HIPPOLYTA. It must be your imagination, then, and not theirs. (5.1.209-12)

Among the things that Shakespeare is doing here—which includes setting Hippolyta up to be moved by the silliness she here disparages, but also reminding us through the word "shadows" that we are watching a play—he is highlighting the necessary imaginative role the audience must play in the drama. Taking our cue from Hippolyta's last line, we are perhaps free to imagine productively. This is what Siegel means when he suggests,

> By reading the play with the occasion constantly in our minds, by becoming the wedding guests in our imagination, we can recapture something of the total aesthetic experience of its first-performance audience, an experience which adds to the experience of the audiences of all ages a teasing piquancy of its own. (139)

As an aside, consider Shakespeare's confidence in conceiving (if that is what he did) a marriage entertainment in which we watch newlyweds watch a play. Of course, this means that the silly play-within-the-play, performed with great sincerity but little skill, stands in for Shakespeare's own work. "Shucks; 'twern't nothin' at all," he seems to say to his audience.[2] Seen from another angle, he creates a stunning contrast between the play which the on-stage audience is witnessing and his own imagined world where, like Hippolyta a little later, "Beshrew [our] heart[s], [we] pity" the characters (adapted from Hippolyta's "Beshrew my heart, I pity the man" 5.1.286). Thus some of the most productive imaginings around the play do indeed have to do with its possible origin, and nearly certain use, as wedding entertainment. We will never recover the private meanings and inside information available to an original audience—and particularly some happy couple who is called upon "To wear away this long age of three hours / Between our

after-supper and bedtime" (5.1.33-34).[3] This, by the way, is a promise the play fulfills. But the multiple layers of plot and character, as well as the circles of sophistication that move in Act 5 from the silly players, to the audience of young lovers and the Duke with his new Duchess, to the fairies who are sometimes visible in modern productions of the play (they have promised to "Dance in Duke Theseus' house triumphantly" [4.1.88], and they return in the final scene of the play—so they are in the neighborhood) to the audience in the theatre suggest the kind of experience of wedding guests during the skits and storytelling that often occur at current weddings. Not everyone gets the same jokes, and somebody gets seated at the far corner of the room. So we can imagine the lovely couple recognizing themselves in details meant only for them and their inner circle. Notice the interesting reversal here that when the play is performed publically, we become the insiders—the viewers with the most insight into the entire drama, its characters, its rhetoric, its themes. We become the lovely couple.

But if private meanings are tantalizing yet lost, we can still imagine that the action staged for us in Act 5 has actually occurred just before the play opens—the newlyweds, a pair or more, have just returned from the ceremony, perhaps have celebrated with a feast, and now settle down to attend to the entertainment. Of course, it's just as possible that Shakespeare wants to reproduce for us that experience. The wedding invoked may be our own! Nonetheless, if we are to assume that in the world outside the play a wedding has taken place, then the drama enacted is presented as a sort of flashback. This is evident when in the opening dialogue Theseus and Hippolyta anticipate their "nuptial hour" (1) four days hence and when, in the next exchange, Theseus's call for "merriments" (12) is overturned by old Egeus's intruding "vexation" (22). From the point of view of the newly married, who expect to see home movies of their lives, apparently they must rewind—they must go backward in order to go forward. In this way, Shakespeare suggests that he will invite them to relive the experiences leading to their marriage and even to experience, through the means of the imagination, what it takes to get to where they

are. They are invited to relive—or even to re-feel—the past in order to understand their present and move into their future. In that experience lies instruction, or better, insight.

The instruction begins with some destabilization in the rest of 1.1 where the definition of true love gets blurred. In a paper presented at this conference long ago, I argued that 1.1 of this play presents us (and its characters) with mostly unresolved, competing definitions of love. Discord before concord, as we might expect. Act 1.1 serves then as a compendium of definitions of love, one governed by a sort of kitchen-sink mentality. We begin with the opposites-attract love displayed by Theseus and Hippolyta (their relationship is often depicted as under strain in modern productions).[4] Egeus then makes a case for parental prerogative in love ("obedience" 37), contrasting his view with what he sees as the bewitching power of romantic love (27). Theseus reinforces Egeus's patriarchal position when he later advises Hermia "To fit your fancies to you father's will" (118). Hermia says she's made bold by a mysterious "power" (54) and later claims for herself autonomy over her "virgin patent," requiring her soul's consent before she gives up her "sovereignty" (80, 82).[5] Theseus, in a speech that is not without sympathy (he invites Hermia to "question" her "desires" 67), offers her the alternative of chaste religious devotion (another form of love). And in a joke meant to point up Shakespeare's kitchen-sink approach, Lysander gives this advice to his rival Demetrius regarding Egeus, "Do you marry him" (94).[6] Lysander then refers to Helena's love for Demetrius as doting love: "and she, sweet lady, dotes, / devoutly dotes, dotes in idolatry" (we get the point! 108-09). Indeed, of all the kinds of love mentioned, doting love will govern much of the play's action.

Skipping forward a bit, Helena offers a summary lament, though little clarification, for the vagaries of love in her well-known speech near the end of the scene which begins "How happy some o'er other some can be!" (226). Cue, "Why Do Fools Fall in Love?" Her couplet,

> Things base and vile, holding no quantity,
> Love can transpose to form and dignity (232-33)

comes as close as any lines to expressing one of the play's central themes, in which love transforms us either into fools or true lovers (or both). As the earlier compendium has suggested, love is difficult to pin down, contrary, and transforming. We really don't know yet whether this is good or bad.

When the royal couple withdraws, Hermia and Lysander resolve to elope, escaping "the sharp Athenian law" (162). They are, I would suggest, suffering from Romeo-and-Juliet syndrome, believing that "the course of true love never did run smooth" (134). When Hermia informs Helena of her plans, her leave-taking winds back the timeline of love that the opening of the play invokes for a wedding reception audience—to childhood. Suggestively, the place of the lovers' midnight meeting will be where the two young girls had escaped for pillow talk:

> And in the wood, where often you and I
> Upon faint primrose beds were wont to lie,
> Emptying our bosoms of their counsel sweet,
> There my Lysander and myself shall meet
> And thence from Athens turn away our eyes
> To seek new friends and stranger companies.
> Farewell, sweet playfellow. Pray thou for us,
> And good luck grant thee thy Demetrius!
> Keep word, Lysander. We must starve our sight
> From lovers' food till morrow deep midnight. (214-23)

The place Hermia describes is the central locus of the play. Not only, as described here, is it a place of fond memory for the women but it is also one suggestive of an erotic future. We later learn it is the place where Titania chooses to sleep and so where she is drugged and experiences love as only Bottom can give it. It appears also to be the same place where Quince holds his rehearsal, where tired lovers fall asleep, and, presumably, where the couples are awakened the next morning. For a secret and secluded place in the woods, it's pretty busy!

More importantly, with "Farewell, sweet playfellow," Hermia initiates an important theme in the play—one that we might suggest is directed especially at any brides in the audience: with every cleaving there is a leaving, to adapt language from the marriage ceremony. More precisely, part of the argument for marriage that this play enacts is a movement from pre-adolescent same-sex friendship, epitomized by the BFF relationship between Hermia and Helena, through the unstable, overheated state of adolescence to the more mature, more stable, heterosexual attachments that will sustain, and be sustained by, marriage. From one kind of concord, then, to discord, to a deeper concord.

Such transitions are not easy, and while Hermia's lines here are sweetly charged with fond memory, they can bring pain, particularly for Helena. This is clear in her lament, already cited, and becomes central to her response to Hermia in the woods when she believes Hermia is part of a cruel game to embarrass her. She begins where Hermia left off in Act One, almost bringing us back to that past place of tender togetherness:[7]

> Is all the counsel that we two have shared—
> The sisters' vows, the hours we have spent
> When we have chid the hasty-footed time
> For parting us—oh, is all forgot?
> All schooldays' friendship, childhood innocence? (3.2.198-202)

She goes on to describe how they would share needlework, repeating the word *one* for emphasis—"Both on one sampler, sitting on one cushion" (205)—and concludes,

> So we grew together,
> Like to a double cherry, seeming parted,
> But yet an union in partition,
> Two lovely berries molded on one stem. (208-11)

The language of unity and oneness here is remarkable, suggesting Shakespeare has in mind the marriage declaration that "they shall be one flesh" (Gen. 2:24). There must be "partition" before

a new union. Helena hints at as much when she moves from the past to the present:[8] "And will you rend our ancient love asunder, / *To join with men* in scorning your poor friend" (215-16, my emphasis). As Garber puts it, "This idyllic vision of undifferentiated mutuality is ruptured by adolescence, by courtship, and by heterosexual desire" (226). But Garber is a right to add that "the comic energies of this play . . . pull in another direction" (226). Shed a tear for the past, but don't walk out of the wedding reception.

Louis Montrose says that in this play "as in *As You Like It*, the dramatic process that forges the marital couplings simultaneously weakens the bonds of sisterhood and strengthens the bonds of brotherhood" (132). I'm not sure I agree. While the men are rivals in Act 1 and seem friendlier by the end of Act 4, we just have no evidence that they have become fast friends. In fact the play seems to lean toward seeing the male and female pairs as reinforcing each other, not as suggesting the contrasts Montrose sees. And though the women are at extreme odds in the middle of the play and woods, in a play where the keynote is "amity" (4.1.86), it would seem strange to suggest that their relationship is finally weakened, though it must make room for new commitments.

Two features of Hermia and Helena's complementary speeches regarding their childhood bring us to another female character in the play, Titania, Queen of the Fairies. The first is the metaphoric, lyric features of the speeches—they are both set pieces which are very evocative of idyllic worlds. The second is their women-only emphasis. Montrose would have us get to Titania through Hippolyta, the other woman in the play and an Amazon. And of course it is Shakespeare's practice to link the women at all levels of the plot (even the cross-dressing male actor playing one), and she is the first woman we meet. Her role is small, but with Theseus forms the framing action of the play—and if we consider the play in terms of wedding entertainment—they stand in for the couple.[9] What Hippolyta most brings to the play is her mythical import: she represents the unruly, powerful, attractive, threatening female figure—part of a warrior race and a matriarchy. And while a patriarchal reading of the play sees her as in

need of taming,[10] neither the evidence of her character in the play or the action (Garber's "comic energy") leans us in that direction. The traits of the Amazon are more fluid than this, as are (though this is not the place to argue them) Protestant instructions for marriage. It is interesting that in the opening dialogue of the play, the reputedly rational Theseus is the one who cannot wait for their wedding day while Hippolyta is more restrained, even rational.[11] Shakespeare does not mind playing with stereotypes.

And the context of the play we have been trying on here would suggest that in Hippolyta the playwright means to compliment the bride who is being entertained (she is beautiful, autonomous, and strong) while reminding her that she must give a little to form a happy union. If this contemporary description of Amazon culture is invoked in the play, "'that Matrimonie was not a mean of libertie but of thraldome'" (Andre Thevet [1568], quoted in Montrose 130), the play is in part designed to counter that claim.

A common thread among these womens' speeches is a world in which men are irrelevant and unnecessary, as they were to both young girls having a campout and and a female warrior. Which brings us, as I've said once before, to Titania. The Queen of Fairies is the only married woman in the play, and our introduction to her and Oberon does not offer up a vision of domestic bliss. This fact is central to the play's structure, of course, as Shakespeare brings us to the woods in order to invert expectations. Their mother of all domestic spats is like a *Honeymooners'* skit at a wedding reception: one that comically depicts the lovely couple some years hence. But Titania's world is also one in which love literally makes the world go round. Describing a natural world that is experiencing grave disorder, she concludes, "And this same progeny of evils comes / From our debate, from our dissension. / We are their parents and original" (2.2.115-17). The stray note of "parents" is Shakespeare's way of evoking the theme of offspring, tied to marriage. More to the point, discord in love brings a kind of universal unhappiness, and in the world of the play, Oberon and Titania's feud registers as both the source and epitome of the play's love problems.

They are fighting about "a little changeling boy" (120) in Titania's possession but claimed by Oberon. Montrose, I think, goes too far in imputing the Amazons' attitude to male offspring—whom they either sent back to their male consorts or killed—upon Titania in order to place her in the wrong (125). Garber does better to call him an "emblem of desire—irrational, unattainable" (219).[12] But he's essentially a MacGuffin: they are fighting because they are fighting. See *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf*.

In her next speech after the one just cited, Titania explains to Oberon why she will not, probably against custom, give up the child:

> Set your heart at rest.
> The Fairyland buys not the child of me.
> His mother was a vot'ress of my order,
> And in the spicèd Indian air by night
> Full often hath she gossiped by my side
> And sat with me on Neptune's yellow sands,
> Marking th' embarkèd traders on the flood,
> When we have laughed to see the sails conceive
> And grow big-bellied with the wanton wind;
> Which she, with pretty and with swimming gait,
> Following—her womb then rich with my young squire—
> Would imitate, and sail upon the land
> To fetch me trifles, and return again
> As from a voyage, rich with merchandise.
> But she, being mortal, of that boy did die;
> And for her sake do I rear up her boy,
> And for her sake I will not part with him. (2.3.121-38)

The first thing to notice about this beautiful speech is its sensuous, evocative tone. The set piece is a feast for the senses: The air is "spicèd," the sand "yellow," the gait of the pregnant woman "swimming," the "trifles" lovely to the touch (or the taste?). The evocative description of the passage is enhanced by the metaphor of commerce: the sea is full of ships "rich with merchandise." The world is one of plentitude, leisure, beauty, and enjoyment. This, of course, is rhetoric: Titania makes her case by powerfully evoking an idyllic scene. We want to open a Corona, not argue about a little boy. It's a set-up, too, as the lovely scene, a pleasing fantasy, is punctured by the reality of death associated with childbirth.

The next note is one of intimacy—reminding us of the sisterhood described by Hermia and Helena. The mother is dedicated to Titania—her "vot'ress"—but she is also an intimate gossip. While she serves Titania, her desire "To fetch me trifles and return again" has more to do with volition and reciprocity than with servitude. As it turns out, the mother's fetched trifles, tokens of dedication and of love, are replaced by the boy—he is the final gift bestowed upon Titania by her "vot'ress." Which brings us to the central metaphor of this speech: the mother becomes the ship, which she "imitate[s]." The word "rich" is transferred directly from the ship ("rich with merchandise") to the young woman ("rich with my young squire"). Her swaying, pregnant hips make her seem to sail like a ship (I'm working backwards), and then this: "When we have laughed to see the sails conceive / And grow big-bellied with the wanton wind." But here's the problem: where are the men? Titania has described the ships' sails as if they may "grow big-bellied" of their own accord in a kind of parthenogenesis. The same seems to be true of the mother. Shakespeare has had Titania create an idyllic, fantasy world where men have been written out of the picture. We know then that this world, for all its allure, is unrealistic, even not to be wished for. It's not that the young woman is punished by death in such a world, but we are led to associate the ultimate failure of that world with the tragic conclusion of the story.

What Shakespeare has done here, I think, is create his own argument, different from Titania's and directed at Herrick's virgins or at a new bride: he presents an appealing, sensuous, self-contained world of feminine exclusivity that, it turns out, is just a "shaping fantasy," to borrow that phrase from the play. Better, then, to accommodate one's self to the real world, full of vicissitude and emotion as it may be. There it is still able to achieve "something of great constancy" to borrow Hippolyta's line (5.1.26). Let the dancing begin!

---

[1]See Wiles, *Shakespeare's Almanac* (136ff).

[2]Wiles writes, "Shakespeare may be seen as offering a humorous apology and justification for the presence of his own company at an aristocratic wedding" (45).

[3]If the goal of the play is to reach bedtime, Oberon's final lines, which direct the fairies to bless the house's bride-beds, completes this action. Wiles suggests that "this house" and "the best bride-bed" (5.1.396-98) are located not in the play but that "There is a real bed in a real house that needs to be blessed. The time is really past midnight, and not the afternoon of a public performance" (ix).

[4]There are reasons for this, beginning with Hippolyta's silence after her first speech in the scene: even Theseus notices, asking, "What cheer, my love?" (1.1.122) as he exits. The potential for doubling, whether thematic or dramatic, with the fairy couple also influences how this betrothed couple is perceived.

[5]Hermia's full speech, responding to Theseus's choice between becoming a nun or marrying the wrong guy, is this:

> So will I grow, so live, so die, my lord,
> Ere I will yield my virgin patent up
> Unto His Lordship, whose unwished yoke
> My soul consents not to give sovereignty. (1.1.79-82)

The speech deftly summarizes Reformation debate on marriage and gender roles, particularly if we can see the word "Lordship" (which seems first to simply refer to Demetrius) as also suggestive of a status of superiority. The language of the speech is partly legal ("patent," "consents"), partly biological/social ("virgin") and mostly biblical "unwished yoke," "soul," and even "sovereignty," the gospel through thy eyes of the Wife of Bath.

[6]The taunt has a middle-school quality to it, hinting at the play's theme of adolescence giving way to maturity.

[7]Garber says, "the memory of this moment is already nostalgic" (226).

[8]In his fine book on the romances, Douglas Peterson demonstrates how characters in Shakespearean romances must recover their past in order move into a renewed future.

[9]Siegel writes, "The wedding guests could not miss the flattering similarity between the Elizabethan bridal couple and the gracious, exalted pair of legendary antiquity" (139).

[10]Montrose does not fully valorize this reading, though he does see the play in terms of gender and power. He cite lines early in *Two Noble Kinsmen*, probably written by Shakespeare, that address the Hippolyta of that play to this effect: "The passage registers Hippolyta's imposing combination of physical beauty and physical strength as something wonderful but also something unnatural and dangerous, and requiring masculine control" (130).

[11]Olson, while not imputing this view on the play, reports that Amazons in the Elizabethan era "had come to signify a false usurpation of the duties of the male reason by the lower, female passions" (102).

[12]She adds, using Gerard's term, that this is "'mimetic desire,' the desire for someone else's desire" (219).

List of Works Cited

Bevington, David, editor. *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*. 5th ed, Pearson Education, 2004.

Garber, Marjorie. *Shakespeare After All.* Anchor Books, 2004.

Montrose, Louis. *The Purpose of Playing: Shakespeare and the Cultural Politics of the Elizabethan Theatre*. U of Chicago P, 1966.

Olson, Paul A. "*A Midsummer Night's Dream* and the Meaning of Court Marriage." *ELH,* vol. 24, no. 2, June 1957, pp. 95-119.

Peterson, Douglas L. *Time, Tide, and Tempest: A Study of Shakespeare's Romances*. Huntington Library, 1973.

Seigel, Paul N. "*A Midsummer Night's Dream* and the Wedding Guests." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol, 4, no. 2, Apr. 1953, pp. 139-44.

Wiles, David. *Shakespeare's Almanac:* A Midsummer Night's Dream *and the Elizabethan Calendar*. D. S. Brewer, 1993.

Eric Furuseth

Minot State University

April 20, 2017

Shakespeare's "Axioms of Evil"

For several years, particularly since I began to teach Shakespeare on a regular basis, it has been something of a pet peeve of mine that writers quoting a line by a character in one of Shakespeare's plays will not attribute the line to that character in that situation in that play but rather simply say-- *Shakespeare*—an attribution similar to the pronouncements of Mark Twain or Oscar Wilde or Winston Churchill or Ben Franklin or any of the other famous producers of pithy axioms. I feel this practice of attribution to Shakespeare undermines our teaching of the richness and complexity of the great plays. Thus, for this paper, I have chosen some particular examples that over the years have gotten under my skin in hopes that by recognizing this problem we may combat it.

For my theme, I have created some rather arbitrary categories of wise sayings in the bard. One category will be those particular lines of advice given either by characters who are fathers or father figures; another bad advice by those who maliciously intend to misguide a person. But first, I'll point out how some readers produce lazy and somewhat irresponsible reading of lines of Hamlet's.

Hamlet

When, in *Hamlet*, at the beginning of another of Prince Hamlet's famous soliloquys, "Shakespeare?" says, "What a piece of work is a man! How noble in reason,

how infinite in faculty! In form and moving how express and admirable! In action, how like an Angel! In apprehension, how like a god! The beauty of the world! The paragon of animals! And yet to me, what is this quintessence of dust? *Man delights not me*;"

So, up until the final sentence, we have here a particularly strong statement of the humanistic Elizabethan Renaissance, the time period when, as earlier in Renaissance Italy, the intelligencia expressed fervently that “Man is the measure of all things!” And, after all, Shakespeare gave us so many delightful human characters in his plays, culminating in a Godlike character, Prospero in *The Tempest,* who says “I have bedimmed the noontime sun…graves at my command, have waked their sleepers, oped, and let 'em forth/By my so potent art” Furthermore, Propero is in some ways comparable symbolically to his creator Shakespeare, who creates worlds, thus being like a god himself in his own creations, but in *Hamlet* all of that praise of human ability and achievement is ironic. “man delights not me” are the bitter words of the melancholy Dane, exploding any paean to the glories of “man”.

I examine these lines from Hamlet, though, because they are given a special presentation in the highly amusing and popular play "The Complete Works of Shakespeare, Abridged" which a few years ago was running on stages everywhere, including here in Minot at our summer theater. I also saw it in London and New York. The speech is the one quiet moment in the whole, uproarious send up of the Bard’s plays. The three characters racing through the various play's stories at breakneck

speed, suddenly, actually stop to model the glorious poetry of Shakespeare's dialogue. In each of the three productions I saw, the actor took center stage and solemnly emphasized “what a piece of work is man” and pronounced "he delights not me" as kind of an afterthought, seemingly rather meaningless. Thus, the audience member may well be left with the mistaken idea that Shakespeare says, "What a great piece of work is man?” What a positive affirmation of his fellow human beings by this great, Renaissance literary genius! Perhaps, Hamlet now was "thinking positive" would just give in to his situation, smile, and "go with the flow" with these wonderful people until of course he is murdered in his turn.

The Advice of Fathers

Polonius, in act one scene three of Hamlet, counsels his son Laertes who is returning to university to “Neither a borrower nor a lender be, for loan oft loses both itself and friend.” this seems like good advice although it is advice that is very rarely followed either in our world or in Shakespeare's where the lending and borrowing of money are essential to most people's lives, but Polonius is an advisor (financial and otherwise) by trade, and he clearly has a great store of good tips and advice ready for all occasions. Polonius, who is father to Ophelia as well as Laertes, is beloved by them as we can tell from their passionate responses to his murder, but we audience certainly see him as a hypocritical meddler. When he attempts to negotiate with Hamlet he is rebuked with “words, words, words,” which really shows what a nattering buffoon he is and what a lot of nonsense he spouts. Later, in the middle of an overlong explanation

to the queen he utters another of his famous aphorisms: “Brevity is the soul of wit” again quite good advice but his *lack* of brevity makes for an obvious joke. Most damning of all, of course, is his prevention of the love affair between Hamlet and Ophelia, which very likely would have ended in marriage, making Polonius father to Hamlet. However, his prudent advice to Ophelia brings about their demise. Thus, Polonius, in the play *Hamlet,* featuring King Claudius as the false father, becomes comparably the figure of the hypocritical, foolish father, even if his aphorisms are basically wise. It is Shakespeare's genius that he puts these pithy truisms into such a character’s mouth. However, to say Shakespeare says “To thine own self be true,” “Brevity is the soul of wit,” or “Neither a borrower nor a lender be” is to undermine the true richness of Shakespeare's art. Thus, my own fatherly advice is not to quote Shakespeare as though his plays were some sort of “how-to” book of wise proverbs to guide our lives.

By contrast, my second example of a father figure is Falstaff in act two scene four of the first part of *Henry the Fourth*. He is another father figure giving advice. There is no pretense of morality or moderation or wisdom but rather there is an eruption of the imagination. Worlds, created as Shakespeare creates worlds, stories that are such obvious works of creative fiction that they demand to be appreciated as art. One defends Falstaff as one defends art for arts sake. When in the culmination of that scene, Falstaff and Prince Hal take turns playing the father, King Henry the 4th, and the son, Price Hal, and Hal says that he will banish Falstaff as an obvious rogue, Falstaff famously

replies, “Banish Plump Jack and banish all the world!” We understand at the end of the scene that this is the world in all of its truth and imagination, it's waking and sleeping. its entire compass of possibilities. It is not a restricted place where a few neat phrases can somehow give us the world. No, to turn from the grossness of Falstaff and his behavior is indeed to banish the world . Prince Hal may reply “I do. I will” banish Falstaff, but he continues to keep Falstaff by his side and continues to put up with his outrageous behavior and entertaining lies as though Prince Hal wishes to continue to carry the whole world with him in his preparations to be a great king, the conqueror of France.

Actually, you seldom find anyone referring to quotations from Falstaff as being something that Shakespeare says. I would submit it might be somewhat more accurate to attribute to Shakespeare "Banish Plump Jack and banish the world!" since that is probably closer to what the bard might give us by way of personal advice. Especially were he advising writers.

Wise Words with Clear Malicious Intent

My final Shakespearean quote comes from act 2 scene 5 of *12th Night*. It is the letter to the butler Malvolio, sent to set in motion a crushing practical joke by Sir Toby, Andrew Aguecheek, and Maria, containing the lines “Be not afraid of greatness. Some are born great, some achieve greatness, and others have greatness thrust upon them.” etc. Does Shakespeare thus perhaps admonish us boldly to rise to our true destiny. Certainly Malvolio sees it that way, and he boldly follows all of the ridiculous steps laid out in the

letter, which he believes is sent by his beloved Olivia. He is challenged to smile hugely and continuously, to cross-garter his stockings, and generally to come on boldly to his lady love. As we know, the advice led to the downfall of Malvolio. To such an extent, that in this comedy, he suffers a hellish fate locked in a dark cell and mentally tortured by Feste in a sadistic manner that I find difficult to take. I understand in the end of the comedy with all the lovers paired off, why he comes back to haunt the happily married couples. He utters clear plans for vengeance. He has been driven into this state of madness because he attempted common sensibly to keep the peace in the house where his employer Olivia was still in mourning. Furthermore, the riotous drinking bouts of Sir Toby and company, the aforementioned tormenters would surely annoy anyone who was not in their company. Asking them to be quiet, looks like a completely sensible and proper course of action no matter how pompous Malvolio may seem. His great problem is that he is a servant and Sir Toby and Anthony Aguecheek rank well above him, (even if Maria and Feste do not). They are nobles even if they are idiots. The long tradition (broken by *The Marriage of Figaro* in the late 1700's) is of showing the servant--even Feste and Lear's Fool--not only not being permitted the same rewards at the end of the comedy as the nobility but certainly suffering greatly for aspiring to rise above their station.

I know this because this Christmas I received from my dear niece, who is a highly intelligent young woman, a work of art (here it is) with a delightful Shakespeare face and this noble advice from the bard: “Be not afraid of greatness..." She had made it herself and I’m sure meant to please her loving uncle with wise and uplifting words from

Shakespeare, but my smile was somewhat forced as I gazed on my Christmas gift. Did she really know all that came of these words in the play? Was this a joke? Should I cross-garter my socks?

Joking more or less aside, I think there are a few important lines from Shakespeare that we can truly quote as the advice of the bard himself. I was reminded as a handful of us watched Henry 5 last night and the play famously erupts with the opening lines of Chorus: "O, for a muse of fire that would ascend the highest heaven of invention…" Surely this is Shakespeare own wish for all writers who do strive to create greatly.

And, finally, I think that in the epilogue of the Tempest, when Prospero turns directly to the audience to ask for forgiveness, he gives the very wise advice that "as you from crimes would pardoned be, let your indulgence set me free."

Author: William Christopher Brown, Ph.D.

Affiliation: Midland College

Email: wbrown@midland.edu

Office phone: 432-288-2329

Address: Fine Arts & Communications
3600 N. Garfield, 142 AFA
Midland, Texas 79705

Title: "Synthesizing Religious and Civic Evils in Robert of Gloucester's *Metrical Chronicle*"

Abstract: The *Metrical Chronicle* consistently illustrates an interest in legally checking kings when they refuse to serve the interests of their subjects. Sarah Mitchell's work has usefully contextualized the importance of the law in her scholarship on the *Metrical Chronicle*.[1] For Mitchell, Robert's focus on the "gode olde lawe" positions the Magna Carta as harkening back to the pre-Norman Anglo-Saxon rule of England. Mitchell's arguments are valid, but, as Phillip A. Shaw observes, "These notions of Anglo-Saxon sources for English legal freedoms are to be interpreted as part of a wider concern with the disruption of political and religious norms in the post-Conquest period" (704).[2] My paper seeks to contextualize this "wider concern" with "English legal freedoms" in theories of shared governance implied in Thomas Aquinas's *De regno* (*On Kingship*). "Synthesizing Religious and Civic Evils," shows the early compiler and Robert use the keyword "luþer" ('evil') in subtly distinct ways. Robert recognizes that the earlier compiler interprets "luþer" theologically and overlays those religious connotations onto the civic context of thirteenth-century English law. Synthesizing religious and civic evils in his utilization of the keyword "luþer" allows Robert to invest the humanly produced act of lawmaking with the power of historical precedent. This veneration of the law fits into thirteenth-century trends in political thinking, including Aquinas's *De regno*, that emphasize the importance of the community to influence the direction in which the king leads them.

As Robert of Gloucester's *Metrical Chronicle* (*c*.1300) progresses, its emphasis shifts from describing clashes between Christians and pagans to parsing the differences between "gode

[1] See "Kings, Constitution, and Crisis: 'Robert of Gloucester' and the Anglo-Saxon Remedy" and "'We Englisse Men': Construction and Advocacy of an English Cause in the Chronicle of Robert of Gloucester."
[2] Shaw, Phillip A. "Robert of Gloucester and the Medieval Chronicle." *Literature Compass* 8.10 (2011): 700-709. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-4113.2011.00824.x.

and luþer lawes" ('good and evil laws').[3] Both the original compiler and the continuator Robert use "luþer" as an admonitory term against the powerful who behave tyrannically. Among the numerous definitions of "luþer" in the *Middle English Dictionary*, the three most significant to the *Metrical Chronicle* focus on *acts*, *intentions*, and *laws*. "Luþer" *acts* relate to "wicked" and "sinful" "actions, speech, conduct, life, habits, and customs." *Intentional* "luþernesse" accounts for the heart, will, purpose, beliefs, [and] desires" when they veer towards evil or wrong actions. Finally, "luþer" "*laws*, advice, [or] council … lead to injustice, wickedness, or cruelty" (my emphasis). As a term of opprobrium, "luþer" functions similarly to John of Salisbury's distinction between the tyrant and the prince. A prince who behaves tyrannically no longer deserves the title of "prince"; instead, the proper name that signifies the ruler's identity properly becomes "tyrant."[4] Writers who invoke the term "tyrant" intend the epithet to help a ruler see himself in the reflection of his actions. The truth of the epithet teaches him how to monitor and correct his own behavior.

The writers of the *Metrical Chronicle* utilize "luþer" similarly. In the British section, "luþer" aligns with the first two definitions as a term to denote the activities and beliefs of pagans in their battles against Christians. The English section carries over this meaning to a legal context, but, as the history progresses, the pagan/Christian dichotomy gives way to an entirely Christian context. The Augustinian interpretation of history gives way to an Aristotelian one. The ultimate effect of this transformation of "luþer's" connotation is typological: the earlier compiler's personal and moralistic use of "luþer" gives Robert of Gloucester's interpretation of

[3] Though Robert of Gloucester's name appears in passing in the *Metrical Chronicle*, many scholars acknowledge the published text to be the work of at least two persons, the first part compiled by unnamed individual who stopped at the reign of Henry I and the remainder composed by the continuator who refers to himself as "Roberd" (Hudson, "Robert" 323).

[4] See John of Salisbury's *Policraticus Volume I* and *Volume II* (translations by Dickson and Pike).

"law" in the thirteenth century a sense of religious zeal in a secular context. The interweaving of the two definitional threads of "luþer" (the first two definitions paired with the third) in the text allows the continuator Robert of Gloucester to utilize the retrospective Augustinian condemnation of past behavior with contemporary attempts to intervene in the "luþer" laws that afflict contemporary England. Subtly, the meaning of "luþer" shifts to the third meaning as a way to determine the "riȝtnesse" of a king's relation to the secular law of the realm. In the remainder of this section, I will chart the changing connotations of the term "luþer" as it progresses through the earlier compiler's part of the chronicle and Robert of Gloucester's continuation of the history.

The earlier compiler uses "luþer" to identify wicked acts and evil believes. In particular, the British section invokes "luþer" as a description of wicked actions and conduct that occur when a character breaks one of the Ten Commandments. The moral guidance of the Ten Commandments extends anachronistically to pagan-era Britain when the immediate descendants of the Trojan Brutus battle for control of the island. When the British king Locrin, the oldest son of Brutus, commits adultery and leaves his wife for a foreigner, the original compiler refers to his reign as a "luþer time · [because] he striuede wiþ his wiue" (l. 623). The chronicle sums up Locrin's reign with a moral: "ȝif alle luþer holers · were iserued so · / me ssolde vinde þe les · such spousbruche do" ('if all evil whoremongers were served in this manner, we should find fewer adulterers') (ll. 624-25; my translation). The earlier compiler takes his example from Geoffrey of Monmouth, but he adds the references to the "luþernesse" of spousal striving and whoremongering. These "luþer" acts derive from sinful tendencies, but the dominant sense of the epithet concentrates on their wicked behaviors. Explicitly, the original compiler judges Locrin for breaking his oath to his father's partner in war, Corineus, but, implicitly, the judgment

extends to Locrin's desire for an outsider. Fellow Britons who trace back their lineage to Troy, Corineus and Locrin celebrate their common ancestry and seal their future alliance through the betrothal of the former's daughter to the latter (Olson 37). Betrothed to Corineus's daughter, Locrin earns the epithet "luþer" because he fails to distinguish his loyalties. Locrin's desire for the daughter of the invading king of Hungary threatens the stability of his subjects. His personal "luþernesse" in committing the act of adultery extends beyond his own personal morality and affects the entire community. At this point in the chronicle, "luþernesse" is not battled through laws, but through aristocratic characters. Corineus and his daughter Queen Gwendolyn correct Locrin's "luþer" acts by killing him in battle. The earlier compiler focuses on the clash of royalty in a battle of good over "luþer" rather than worrying over the legality of deposing a king.

The earlier compiler develops the importance of "luþerness" to his interpretation of British history in his portrayal of Vortigern. Repeatedly, the earlier compiler, following Geoffrey of Monmouth, associates Vortigern with "luþer" in the sense of the intention to commit evil acts as well as "luþer" as an evil act that has been committed. The earlier compiler makes national distinctions in his association of the British with Christianity and the Saxon invaders with paganism, though he still emphasizes history as a battle of good versus "luþer" as represented through its kings or leaders. As in the previous example of Locrin, Vortigern wallows in the sinful acts of "luþer" through his association with pagan foreigners who provide the means for indulging himself, physically and spiritually.[5] The chronicler, following Geoffrey, creates a femme fatale for Vortigern in the form of Rowen, the woman who teaches the British the Saxon word "wassail." In a similar way to Locrin's love for the foreign daughter of his

[5] I omit a closer reading of Vortigern's relationship with Rowen because it holds little variation compared to the themes in my earlier reading of Locrin.

enemy's king, Vortigern falls in love with Rowen, the daughter of the Saxon Hengist and cements his affiliation with pagans rather than Christians (ll. 2505-2538). The earlier compiler's portrayal of Vortigern adds a layer of luþernesse" distinct from Locrin's. Vortigern generally plots with "luþer" intention rather than simply commits "luþer" actions associated with the senses. From his earliest appearance in the chronicle, Vortigern aspires to gain power through calculated plotting. He enables the crowning of Constans, the oldest son of the assassinated king Constantine II.[6] Constans is unfit to be king because he has spent most of his life as a monk. Vortigern deftly manipulates the naïve monk into giving him power in all but name only; however, to retain his power, Vortigern must ally himself with Picts and later Saxons. The chronicle signifies a common bond between Vortigern and the Picts in its presentation of their "luþernesse" as a condition that separates them morally from the British. Vortigern's own personal "wickedness [as] an immoral free agent" divorces him from the rest of the British (Faletra 8). The Picts follow Vortigern readily because they "were of so luþer þoȝt" (l. 2359). As pagans, their thoughts and beliefs, that is, their intentions, render them "luþer" compared to the Christian "godemen" ('good men') of the British (l. 2675). Vortigern's alliance with the Picts who think "luþer þoȝts" illustrates his own corruption into "luþernesse": the sinful king allies himself with a sinful people.[7] Unlike the continuator Robert's portrayal of "luþer" as a king's distance from good laws, the earlier compiler categorizes "luþer" as an inclination of non-British peoples.

Distinguishing Good and Evil Laws

[6] See ll. 2288-2339 of the *Metrical Chronicle*.

[7] The earlier compiler emphasizes Vortigern's tendency to ally himself with "luthermen" when Merlin accuses Vortigern of "trayson" that allowed pagan "luþermen" from Saxony to overrun the island (l. 2831).

As the *Metrical Chronicle's* history approaches Robert of Gloucester's own timeframe, the text associates "luþernesse" with the king's relation to the "lawe," though the earlier compiler stresses personal spiritual goodness. The chronicle equates good kingship with respect of the property and "riȝts" of the Church, while tyranny thrives with "luþer lawes" that deprive people of their heritages. Initially, the *Metrical* chronicler awards the epithet "luþer" to the pagan Norsemen who raid and ultimately conquer England because of their avaricious and violent behavior; however, Cnut impresses the earlier compiler because he converts to Christianity and "make[s] gode lawes · & … sosteine[s] ech riȝt" (l. 6605). Following Henry of Huntingdon,[8] the earlier compiler praises the Danish king of the English because he fulfills his promise "to make gode lawes · & to sosteine ech riȝte · / þis biheste he huld vol wel · & gode lawes ynou · / He made þe beste þat miȝte be · & to eche godnesse drou" ('to make good laws and to sustain each man's rights. / This promise he held full well and many good laws he made / the best that might be and drew each man to goodness') (ll. 6605-07). His rationale, according to the earlier compiler, results from his guilt "for þe manslaȝt þat he adde ydo · & to þe vnriȝt ilome" ('over the manslaughter and injustice that he had frequently done') (l. 6608). Once Cnut puts England in order through his laws, he travels to Rome. The earlier compiler interprets the trip in accord with his larger concern that king's must act against the "luþernesse" that surrounds him.[9] While traveling, Cnut influences the princes of the realms through which he passes to change their "luþer lawes" (l. 6613) with the result "þat euere are he com · gode lawes he broȝte" 'that everywhere he came, he brought good laws' (l. 6617).[10] For the earlier compiler, Cnut strikes out

[8] Henry's chronicle provides a model of the Augustinian interpretation that frames Cnut's conquest of England as a positive act that stops the English from their "luþer" behavior.

[9] The original compiler turns to Florence of Worcester for Cnut's journey to Rome.

[10] Henry of Huntingdon's and William of Malmesbury's chronicles present different reasons for the journey. Henry reports that Cnut traveled to Rome to give his daughter in marriage to the Roman emperor (366-67). William of Malmesbury asserts that Cnut journeyed to Rome to atone for his crimes against England (199).

his misdeeds as a conquering king through his turn to goodness, right laws, and service to the Church. Warren observes that Cnut's dual respect "for both God and English tradition redeem[s] his usurpation" (108). Cnut's turn from pagan enemy to Christian leader fits into the Augustinian historical mode of chastising an entire "leode" for its sins. With his description of Cnut's reign, the earlier compiler begins transitioning to Robert of Gloucester's sense of "luþer" as a legal problem rather than a spiritual one. Robert's predecessor remains firmly committed to a moralistic vision of "luþer" because of the context of conquest that he describes.

Surprisingly, this pattern in the *Metrical Chronicle* of praising a king for his Christian behavior extends to William the Conqueror. Once again, following the Anglo-Norman chroniclers, Henry of Huntingdon and William of Malmesbury, the earlier compiler of the *Metrical Chronicle* frames the Norman Conquest in Augustinian terms of retribution against a people for its collective sins. Unlike the usurper Cnut, William retains a legal right to the throne: "he ruled Englnd *de iure* (and not by conquest)" (Cannon 343). Despite criticisms that the Normans placed England under their own yoke, Christopher Cannon calls attention to the fact that

> the method by which William systematically displaced English thegns of their land proceeded … by the logic of forfeiture (they were not simply unfortunates at the mercy of a victor, but rebels who had thwarted their rightful king's claims. William's endowment of his barons with the forfeited land gave them that land by virtue of Anglo-Saxon law—and thereby made even them subject to its structures" (343).

The "men of þis lond · pur heþene were" (l. 7504) in their actions: they ignored the Norman Conqueror William's "riȝt to the kinedom" (l. 7495). They "turnde to sleuþe & to prute · & to lecherie · / To glotonie & heyemen · muche to robberie" ('… turned to sloth, pride, lechery, and gluttony, while the high men of the land took to robbery') (l. 7508-09). William the Bastard, as medieval chroniclers often referred to the Conqueror, held a legal right to the crown of England

and received the earlier compiler's praise for bringing order to Anglo-Saxon England. The early compiler of the *Metrical Chronicle* emphasizes that William served the English as they deserved: "King willam was to mildemen · debonere ynou · / Ac to men þat him wiþ sede · to alle sturnhede he drou" ('King William was debonair enough, but turned to sternness to men who contradicted him') (ll. 7602-03). Though he faults William the Conqueror's disregard for the impoverished and his scorched earth policy in northern England (Turville-Petre 94), the earlier compiler ultimately praises William because he "broȝte vp moni oþer hous · of religion also · / To bete þulke robberie · þat him þoȝte he adde ydo" ('brought up many other houses of religion also to atone for that robbery that he thought had done') (ll. 7596-97). The surprising praise for the ruthless conqueror serves as a reward in perpetuity for his services to the Church. Because Cnut's and William's reigns benefited the Church to a greater extent than did those of the English kings who preceded them, Cnut and William receive the Christian historian's historiographic blessing of an Augustinian interpretation. As an agent of Augustinian retribution, William provides the firm hand needed to steer the English back onto the path of goodness and away from their "luþer" preoccupations with the Deadly Sins.

The earlier writer of the *Metrical Chronicle* associates the English with the refusal to follow legal precedent in coronation as well as the English elite's tyrannical refusal to restrain their own hands. Rather than being depicted as "luþer" tyrants, Cnut and William the Conqueror serve as the means of enacting punishment on the English for their collective sins. At this point in the history, "luþer" still functions as a term for moral critique. The earlier compiler's criticism of "luþer" acts combines with his criticism of "luþer þoȝts/willes" to illustrate a warning. Specific habitual acts of "luþer" are not simply isolated acts that call for correction. A "luþer" act reflects a pattern of other behaviors originating in the sinner's habitual "luþer þoȝts/willes."

The implication of the earlier compiler's shifting usage of the term sets up Robert of Gloucester's emphasis on distinguishing good and evil laws. Because of the King's relation to lawgiving, the "luþer" acts and will represent a continual threat to the community that must be controlled through administration and legal exertion, if necessary. Beginning with the Conqueror's son, William Rufus, the earlier compiler of the *Metrical Chronicle* supplements the criticism that "luþer" behavior derives from the refusal to resist the Seven Deadly Sins with the insight that "luþernesse" affects the community because of the king's relation to the law. Tyrants deserve the epithet "luþer" because they promote "unriȝt" laws, while princes promote "riȝt" laws that cause the community to prosper.

The earlier compiler initially praises William Rufus in terms similar to his father; but after Archbishop Lanfranc dies, William Rufus no longer follows the counsel of the Church.[11] The compiler refers to William Rufus as a "tirant tormentor · in speche and in dede" (l. 8005), partly because of his pride and lack of thrift (l. 8001). Frank Barlow notes the discrepancies in William Rufus's ideas of fulfilling obligations. In war, "he always observed safe conducts, and it is likely that on campaign he could be relied on to behave honourably" (118). He treated his "political engagements" less scrupulously and "disregarded many of the promises he made when close to death and was accused by … Malcolm king of Scots … of being in breach of treaty obligations" (118). The chronicle attributes his tyranny to his refusal to listen to counsel, following instead "is [own] luþer þoȝt" ('his [own] evil thoughts') (l. 8003). A "robbeour," he "destruede al þat lond" (l. 8007) of Scotland, particularly the abbeys and priories (l. 7997). According to the earlier compiler, he treated England little better.[12] At this point, the earlier

[11] The *Metrical* chronicler alludes cryptically to two "luþer lawes" associated with the Conqueror's son and heir, though he fails to clarify the nature of the laws.

[12] As in Scotland, "abbeys & priories · al to gronde he broȝte · / & holi chirche & þat lond · he destruede al to noȝt" ('he brought Holy Church's abbeys and priories to the ground and brought (ruined) that land to nothing') (ll.

compiler still interprets the king's tyrannical behavior through the lens of the Deadly Sins, such as William Rufus's pride. William's brother and successor, Henry I receives high praise from the chronicler because he vows "[t]o alegge alle luþer lawes · þat iholde were biuore · / & þe betere make þan hii were · suþþe be was ibore" ('to alleviate all the evil laws that were held before and improve the laws that were created after he was born) (ll. 8720-21). The chronicler praises Henry I because he refuses to wallow in the Deadly Sins and "chasty the proute" ('chastises the proud') (l. 8830). The earlier compiler's positive assessment accords with "the almost universal approval Henry earned from his contemporaries" (Hollister 484). C. Warren Hollister's report of Henry I's character shows a king who follows John of Salisbury's definition of the prince who controls the hands of others: "he called to justice royal officials who exceeded their authority and extorted from churches and monasteries[;] … he kept nobles from breaking the peace (even in the absence of the king) as they maneuvered to improve their own positions vis-à-vis their neighbors of the king" (485). Unlike William Rufus, who robbed and destroyed, Henry I "saui poueremen · vram richemenne vnriȝt" ('saved poorman from the unjust practices of the rich') (l. 8839).

William the Conqueror's sons, William Rufus and Henry I, serve as the last kings who mark a contrast in kings as tyrants and princes; thereafter, from Stephen to Henry III, the continuator Robert characterizes the Angevin/Plantagenet kings mainly in terms of the "luþer" that they perpetrate against the English and their laws. In a chronicle not characterized by speeches, the continuator Robert of Gloucester translates a long dialogue between the Earl of

8562-63). When bishops or abbots died, "Hor londes & hor rentes · þe king huld in is honed" ('the king held their lands and rents in his hand') (l. 8565). Prior to the passage describing the king's death, the chronicler reiterates his criticism against William Rufus's cruelty, tyranny, and willfulness (ll. 8613-25).

Chester and Robert, the Earl of Gloucester, bastard son to Henry I,[13] to illustrate the king's tyrannical attacks on the Church's property and "riȝtes." The original version of the *Metrical Chronicle* stops at Henry's death, while the continuator commonly known as Robert carries the chronicle forward through most of Henry III's reign. The continuator of the *Chronicle* follows the original compiler in linking "luþernesse" (l. 9530) and the Deadly Sin of pride (l. 9539). More significantly, Robert develops the notion of "luþernesse" in relation to "riȝt" laws: evil becomes the "unriȝt" disrespect of those good laws.[14] The Earl of Gloucester describes the king's "luþer weyes" (l. 9310):

> Mid unriȝt halt þis kinedom & · destourbeþ þat lond ywis ·
> & of monie þousend monnes deþe · encheson he is ·
> Hi binimiþ men hor riȝtes · & hor kunde eritages al so ·
> & delivereþ it oþer men · þat no riȝt nabbeþ þer to · (ll. 9306-09)
>
> With wickedness [Stephen] holds this kingdom and disturbs this land, for certain, and he causes many thousands of deaths. He takes away men's rights and their natural heritages, also. He delivers them to other men that had no right to them.

Characterized by weakness as much as wickedness, "the evil of Stephen's rule … was reflected in the withdrawal of virtually all public protection and safeguards of liberty, rather than in the unlimited use of royal power" (Nederman, "Changing" 18). Unlike Henry I, who kept strict control over the avaricious hands of the aristocracy, Stephen's "failure to impose law and order over England permitted others to exercise personal license" (18).

---

[13] The earl, Robert of Gloucester (distinguished from the chronicler of the same name), commissioned William of Malmesbury to write his history of the kings of England. Geoffrey of Monmouth wrote one of his two dedications to the *History of the Kings of Britain* to Robert. According to Geoffrey Gaimar, Robert circulated Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia* among friends of his: "Robert lent it to Walter Espec who gave it to Ralf Fitz Gilbert, who gave it to Lady Constance, who gave it to Gaimar, who used it and personally returned it to Robert" (Schichtman and Fincke 54).

[14] At a parliament, in London in 1145, the bishops excommunicated Stephen because "[m]uche robberie me dude · aboute in euerich toun · / & bounde men & enprisonede · vor te hii finede raunson · / Hii ne sparede nammore clerkes · þan lewed men iwis" ('he did much robbery in every town. He bound and imprisoned men in order to charge a ransom. He spared clerks no more than laymen, I think') (ll. 9520-22).

Robert's continuation of the earlier compiler's chronicle reflects his own historical moment as a witness to the Barons' Rebellions of the middle of the century. His interpretation of Henry of Huntingdon's report on the earls' rebellion against King Stephen resonates with his own experience of thirteenth-century England. Robert carries over the original compiler's interest in "gode" and "luþer lawes," beginning with Stephen's reign, but he deemphasizes the religious connotations in favor of strictly legal connotations. At his coronation, Stephen confirmed the "gode lawes" that Henry I instituted (l. 9171) and promised that he would "abate" the "oþer monye luþer lawes · þat is eldore adde ywroȝt" ('many other evil laws that his elders had wrought') (l. 9176). Stephen broke his word and "bigan to be luþer … [to] holichirche" ('began to be evil [to] Holy Church') (l. 9206).[15] His "luþer" acts against the Church began with his "robberye" (l. 9233) of the "tresour[s]" (l. 9215) of the bishops of Salisbury and Lincoln. With Robert of Gloucester's continuation, the emphasis on the Deadly Sins as a way to understand the moral failures of kings gives way to secular concerns of whether the institution should be excluded from the government's pact with mammon, taxation. The interpretation of robbery reflects the Deadly Sins, but the criticism opens itself to argument. Losing money through taxation may "hurt" as much as losing money through robbery, but the division between good and "luþer" laws becomes less absolute. In the context of taxation, "luþer" laws begins to take on a secular sense that artificially synthesizes the religious and secular definitions of the term of opprobrium.

The continuator Robert displays a subtlety as a chronicler with his own agenda through his continued usage of the earlier compiler's keyword "luþer." Commonly perceived as

[15] Stephen promised to "publicly distance himself from the public practice of simony," to "be responsible in his use of his right to the wardship of ecclesiastical sees in times of vacancy," to allow ecclesiastical courts freedom to "deal with clerics," and to allow the "clergy to dispose of the goods by testament" (Crouch 46).

ideologically synchronized with the earlier compiler, Robert contradicts the laudatory reading of William the Conqueror that his predecessor copied from Henry of Huntingdon. Whereas the earlier compiler praises the king of the Normans as an Augustinian force for enacting God's justice, Robert associates William with the "luþernesse" of his son William Rufus when he discusses the "luþer" reign of Henry II:

> þer adde er ibe · kinges of luþer dede ·
> As willam bastard & is sone · willam þe rede ·
> þat luþer lawes made ynou · & helde in to al þe lond ·
> þe king [Henry II] nolde nouȝt bileue · þe lawes þat he fond ·
> Ne þat is elderne hulde (ll. 9640-44)
>
> There had been before kings of evil deeds, such as William the Bastard and his son William Rufus, who made enough wicked laws and held in all the land. The king [Henry II] did not believe in the laws that he found, nor those that his elders held.

In chronicles by Henry of Huntingdon and William of Malmesbury, William the Conqueror earns praise for his founding and support of religious houses. Likewise for these chroniclers and the earlier compiler, William Rufus fails to live up to the respectful precedent by his father and receives harsh condemnation in return. Robert ignores these praises and makes no distinction between the father's and son's "luþer lawes."

The two Norman Williams serve as the exemplars of tyrannical behavior that characterized the Angevin Henry II and his relationship with the Church, particularly his former friend Becket. Robert refuses to call Henry II's "luþer lawes" by the name "laws"; instead he refers to them as "luþer costume[s]" (l. 9652). He makes the distinction between laws and customs based on their proximity to the "soþnesse" of the Gospel, which he associates with Becket: "sein tomas · / þougȝte þat þing aȝe riȝte · neuere lawe nas · / Ne soþnesse ac custom · mid strengþe up iholde" ('St. Thomas thought that anything against rightness was never a law. It was not truth, but custom that was upheld with strength') (ll. 9644-47). Robert points out that the

"soþnesse" ('truth') that he opposes to "costume" ('custom') relates directly to the teachings of Christ: "& he wuste þat vr louerd · in þe gospel tolde · / þat he him sulf was soþnesse · & costume nout · / þeruore luþer costumes · he [Becket] nolde graunti nouȝt" ('he knew that our Lord in the Gospel said that he himself was truth and not custom; therefore, Becket would not grant wicked customs') (ll. 9647-49). Robert follows his portrait of Becket's implacability towards wicked customs with Henry II's wicked laws and echoes his previous critique of the king's relation to the law: "þe king [Henry II] nolde nouȝt bileue · þat is elderne adde iholde" 'the king [Henry II] did not believe in what his elders had held' (l. 9650).[16] Henry's inability to distinguish between truth and custom means that he "drou to riȝte lawe · mani luþer costume" ('drew to right law many wicked customs') (l. 9652). Cannily, Robert's reading of the disagreement between the king and Becket sets up a precedent for judging the king according to his relation to the laws of the "leode."

The continuator Robert represents the sense of a king's obligation to maintain good laws during the account of the Battle of Lewes. In a message to Henry III, the barons state the conditions for their continued recognition of him as king: they desire "þat he ssolde vor godes loue · him bet vnderstonde · / & graunti hom þe gode lawes · & habbe pite of is lond · / & hii him wolde serui wel" ('that he should for God's love better understand them, grant them the good laws, and have pity on this land, and [then] they would serve him well') (ll. 11,355-57). According to Robert, the barons rebel against the king's tyranny, yet their purpose ultimately revolves around correcting his misbehavior rather than serving as an Augustinian instrument of God who punishes the king for his sins. Robert positions the barons in accord with Aquinas's

[16] Warren observes that Robert's identification with the archbishop over the king "overlooks [Beckett's] identity as one of the 'Normans among us'" (110).

ideals of kingship in that they both prefer kingship to rule by multiple leaders. Aquinas's ideal community "is said to be united to the degree that it approaches one [in purpose]. It is therefore better for one to rule than many, who only approach to one" (Dyson, *Aquinas* 11).[17] From Aristotle, Aquinas takes the metaphor for kingship of the lone "steersman" of a boat. He returns to this metaphor with his reference to the community being "tossed about" because of the multiple steersmen.[18] The king, thus, retains a moral responsibility "to secure the wellbeing of whatever it is that he rules" (10).[19] Though he dislikes oligarchies and aristocracies, Thomas sees an efficacy in those styles of rule because of the power of one tyrant to enact evil in a community.[20]

Despite their desire to be governed by a king, the rebels take a pragmatic approach to governance, much like Aquinas. In the *De regno*, Aquinas advises that one of the important tasks of a king "should [be to] restrain the men subject to him from iniquity by means of laws and commands, penalties and rewards, and lead them to do virtuous works, taking the example from God" (44). The barons believe that an explicit standard exists to determine whether the king secures his subjects' wellbeing. For them, "þe gode lawes" of the Magna Carta function as the legal exemplar that should guide the king's behavior so that he fulfills his function as a good king and not a tyrant. They recognize the king's claim to the throne and they want to serve him,

---

[17] Thomas writes, "Uniri autem dicuntur plura per appropinquantionem ad unum. Melius igitur regit unus quam plures ex eo quod approprinquant ad unum" (259).

[18] Thomas observes, "Nam provinciae vel civitates quae non reguntur ab uno, dissensionibus laborant et absque pace fluctuant" ('Provinces or cities which are not ruled by one man toil under dissensions and are tossed about without peace') (260; Dyson, *Aquinas* 11).

[19] The passage originally states, "… eius quod regendum suscepit salutem procuret" (259).

[20] He writes, "ita magis est nocivum si virtus operans malum sit una, quam divisa" ('[it is] more harmful for a power which produces evil to be united than divided') (260; Dyson, *Aquinas* 12). After the baron's victory at the Battle of Lewes, they, in essence, create "a narrow oligarchy" with Simon de Montfort as its "undisputed head" (Maddicott 317). Montfort, Richard de Clare earl of Gloucester, and Stephen Berksted bishop of Chichester held the power "to nominate nine councilors for the business of the king and kingdom" (285). Montfort headed the triumvirate, and Maddicott praises him for avoiding a total autocracy (288). His rule consolidated support of a "broad constituency of baronial, Episcopal and local support" (289).

but only insofar as he fulfills his obligation to "habbe pite of is lond." A leader such as Henry III only proves his "pite" and "vnderstonde[ing] for the people and the land by behaving in accordance with the rules agreed upon by the governed.

Conclusion

The *Metrical Chronicle's* representation of "luþernesse" as it relates to law of the "leode" overlays the theological understanding of "luþer" onto the civic context. Through this Aristotelian reinterpretation of the earlier compiler's keyword "luþer," Robert imbues the law with a hallowed quality. The "luþer" laws of the Angevins compare unfavorably to the pre-Norman Conquest era of England (Mitchell, "Kings" 43). The English laws, for Robert, reflect the good laws of a godly people that now lie in abeyance while Normans exert their evil interregnum over the native born Englishmen (43).[21] In essence, Robert positions the law and the "leode" in relation to the will and the body, that is, the law is to the "leode" as the will is to the body. The ability to degrade the body depends on the will's susceptibility to the "luþernesse" of sin; likewise, the degradation of the English "leode" results from the "luþer" penetration of the Norman's laws. The law and the will can provide either protection or destruction, according to the direction that they lead.

[21] This passage derives from Aquinas's second task for the king: "Secundo autem ut suis legibus et praeceptis, poenis et praemiis homines sibi subiectos abiniquitate coërceat et ad opera virtuosa inducat, exemplum a Deo" (276).

Works Cited

Aquinas, Thomas. "De regimine principum ad regem cypri" [*De regno*.] *Opuscula Philosophica*. Italy: Marietti Editori Ltd., 1954. 257-80. Print.

Barlow, Frank. *William Rufus*. 1983. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 2000. Print.

Cannon, Christopher. "La3amon and the Laws of Men." *ELH* 67 (2000): 337-63. Print.

Crouch, David. *The Reign of King Stephen, 1135-1154*. Harlow: Longman, 2000. Print.

Dickinson, John, trans. *The Statesman's Book of John of Salisbury: Being the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Books, and Selections from the Seventh and Eighth Books of the* Policraticus. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927. Print.

Dyson, R. W. (trans.) *Aquinas: Political Writings*. 2002. Cambridge: Cambridge, UP, 2005. Print.

Faletra, Michael A. "Once and Future Britons: The Welsh in Lawman's *Brut*." *Medievalia et Humanistica* n.s. 28 (2001): 1-23. Print.

Henry of Huntingdon. *Historia Anglorum The History of the English People*. Ed. and trans. Diana Greenway. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1996. Print.

Hollister, C. Warren. *Henry I*. Edited and completed by Amanda Clark Foster. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 2001. Print.

Hudson, Anne. "Robert of Gloucester and the Antiquaries, 1550-1800." *Notes and Queries* 16 (1969): 322-33. Print.

John of Salisbury (Ioannis Saresberiensis). *Policraticus* (*Policratici*) *Vol. I*. Ed. Clemens C. J. Webb. London: Oxoni, 1909. Print.

---. *Vol. II*. Ed. Clemens C. J. Webb. London: Oxoni, 1909. Print.

Maddicott, J. R. R. *Simon de Montfort*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994. Print.

Mitchell, Sarah. "Kings, Constitutions and Crisis: 'Robert of Gloucester' and the Anglo-Saxon Remedy." *Literary Appropriations of the Anglo-Saxons from the Thirteenth to the Twentieth Century*. Eds. Donald Scragg and Carole Weinberg. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000. 39-56. Print.

---. "'We Englisse Men': Construction and Advocacy of an English Cause in the Chronicle of Robert of Gloucester." *The Medieval Chronicle: Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on the Medieval Chronicle, Driebergen/Utrecht, 13-16 July 1996*. Ed. Erik Kooper. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1999. 191-201. Print.

Nederman, Cary J. "The Changing Face of Tyranny: The Reign of King Stephen in John of Salisbury's Political Thought." *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 33 (1989): 1-20. Print.

Olson, Katherine. "Gwendolyn and Estrildis: Invading Queens in British Historiography." *Medieval Feminist Forum* 44.1 (2008): 36-52. Print.

Pike, Joseph B., trans. *Frivolities of Courtiers and Footprints of Philosophers: Being a Translation of the First, Second, and Third Books and Selections from the Seven and Eighth Books of the* Policraticus *of John of Salisbury*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1938. Print.

Robert of Gloucester. *The Metrical Chronicle of Robert of Gloucester Part I*. Ed. William Aldis Wright. 1887. Lessing-Druckerei, Wiesbaden: Kraus Reprinting Ltd., 1965. Print.

---. *Part II*. Ed. William Aldis Wright. 1887. Lessing-Druckerei, Wiesbaden: Kraus Reprinting Ltd., 1965. Print.

Schichtman, Martin B., and Laurie A. Finke. "Profiting from the Past: History as

Symbolic Capital in the *Historia Regum Britanniæ*." *Arthurian Literature XII*. Eds. James P. Carley and Felicity Riddy. London: D. S. Brewer, 1993. 1-35. Print.

Shaw, Phillip A. "Robert of Gloucester and the Medieval Chronicle." *Literature Compass* 8.10 (2011): 700-709. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-4113.2011.00824.x.

Turville-Petre, Thorlac. *England the Nation: Language, Literature, and National Identity, 1290-1340*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1996. Print.

Warren, Michelle R. *History on the Edge: Excalibur and the Borders of Britain, 1100-1300*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2000. Print.

William of Malmesbury. *Chronicle of the Kings of England: From the Earliest Period to the Reign of King Stephen*. Ed. J. A. Giles. Trans. John Sharpe. New York: AMS P, 1968. Print.

What Music Do We Perform When We Perform Shakespeare's Plays ?

Susan H. Wood, Ph. D. Midland University

NPCEBL, April 21-22, 2017, Minot State University

I wrote some graduate papers on drama, but this will be my first presentation on Shakespeare. I selected the comedy, As You Like It, in order to discuss a topic that has always interested me, but I have had difficulty getting students to appreciate-- the music in the plays.

As You Like it is a play that splits from the court to the forest, from mannered art to the natural. Still, though it is tempting to suggest that nature is better and that the forest heals all, the contrast often allows one to displace the other, and undercut the idea of art (Long 140). In a similar way, the songs of Shakespeare's time are often broken up into "popular" versus "art songs" and performances thereby become off the cuff or "impromptu" versus polished or professional performances of songs.

The primary source of comedy in As You Like It is incongruity, and this is played out well in these instances_: 1) Rosalind dressing up like boy ;2) the people who belong in Arden--the shepherds and so on, vs. The 'court people' like Jaques and Touchstone; 3) melancholy of exile vs. the boisterous hunting of the foresters; 4.) Wooing of Audrey and Phebe. David Young writes that paradox and an interplay between expansion and reduction (the incongruity I mentioned) is a source of comic effect (62-3), and it should be evident that the songs play a role in this, of moving back and forth between idealism and satire, or between melancholy and pastoral—they add to ambiguity (Young 70).

Perhaps it is this tendency that has resulted in conflicting realizations—1.) As You Like It contains more songs than any other Shakespeare play (Dolon 402; Howard 1614). It is not

unlike a musical comedy (Lindley 190). And in fact, the opera may be the closest inheritor of Shakespeare's type of comedy (Frye 25). Yet often, the music is not considered part of the "drama."

2. However, the actual productions tend to take one of two possible routes about the songs—a.) they go very casual or b.) quasi authentic. Generally, there is a tendency to cut songs. We end up with two questions—1.) should we do the songs? And 2.) are the songs that have been used in a lot of productions done poorly? Lindley writes that these songs have less to do with the actual play than in other cases, and this is the kind of statement that leads to busy cutting! (190). It seems like a director of Shakespeare has many options for the songs:

1. He/ she can cut the songs as merely delaying the actions and not adding much.
2. He/ she can commission a set of new songs that fit the overall vision of the play and go together as a group.
3. He/ she can select specific songs for commission and select versions of others from compendium of what has gone before;
4. He/ she can select all the songs from the historical record of music.

Then there is the skill of the singers. Shakespeare's company eventually employed Robert Armin as a comedian and singer of songs; it is theorized that his presence may have encouraged the proliferation of songs in "As You Like It" and later plays; his facility with impromptu is especially noted (Henze 420-421). At the same time, Lindley remarks that this play has songs that require a singer to step out of being an actor and take the role of a singer, to perform songs like "Under the Greenwood Tree" very well(190). Lindley goes on to suggest that these songs "neither derive directly from events nor does anything happen because of them" (190). Indeed, there is much discussion of the songs being a result of Shakespeare's need to compete with

"Children's Companies" and their singing children in the late 1590s (Henze 419). Thus, the songs are part of the business of the theater, and thus there is no real reason to include them. However, I think this is not correct, and other critics—the more "myth" type critics, are apt to agree with me. Hughes says As You Like It is "working on the assumption . . . that a deliberately shaped ritual can reactivate energies in the mythic plane so powerfully . . . . [they can] reshape an ego" (90). I agree. The songs are part of the ritual effect that a drama has upon the viewer. Of all the criticism I read, Hughes' was to me the most compelling, and I will not go into it here except to say that I agree with his general premises as to what plays are for, culturally.

I believe the songs should be included if at all possible because if we respect Shakespeare's art, we have to assume he had a reason for them, and that there is a way to make them work. Are the songs done badly? I have to say, they often are. Typically, they are part of the set design and atmosphere rather than an act in and within themselves (Seng 76). We can commission new music for new productions, but if it is performed poorly, has no point, or makes no attractive appeal to the audience, I can see why it fails, and why directors want to cut it.

It happens that I was naïve in my initial question. As soloist and choir member, I have sung several songs inspired by Shakespeare's plays. It wasn't till I had been working on this paper for weeks that I recalled playing for the intro of a play, on my recorder, most likely "Comedy of Errors"; you see, I played in a group called Pro Musica at college. One day a week we sang Renaissance music, and two days a week, we practiced our instruments. It is not that I had forgotten being in the group, but until I was reading the book about instrumental music of the Renaissance and saw pictures of sackbuts and crumhorns, I was not feeling at all like the ideal person to be presenting this paper! So, while I have never been in a Shakespeare play, I do

know more about Renaissance music than I was giving myself credit for. I also was a member of a madrigal singing group for 2 years. Though we sang from other eras of music at times, Renaissance madrigals formed the core of our repertoire.

What I did NOT know was exactly what scholars had been up to on the subject. Even when I wrote graduate papers on Shakespeare, our professor was very specific about which criticism to pay attention to—we ignored all else. I did not realize there was a compendium on music for Shakespeare (this is Gooch and Thatcher A Shakespeare Music Catalogue, 5 vols, Oxford, 1991; plus a book by Ross Duffin –2004—that prints all the surviving contemporary music). The main scholarly sources I have used are Long(1961), Seng(1967) , and Lindley(2006). (See Notes 1, 2, 3).

So let me delve into the topic of the songs further. As Dan Hays and Lee Meyer, _ directors and professors of music and theater on the MU faculty told me, the music is part of the "director's vision of the play," and thus is an area of great flexibility. Dan said he usually commissions music for each new production. Lee, a music professor, said there are a wealth of music pieces by famous composers of Shakespeare songs, and these are often too difficult for students to sing, or require too much additional accompaniment, to fit into a stage production. Although Shakespeare productions can run 2 ½ hours to 3 hours, 90-120 minutes is optimal (Homans 20-30).

Lindley says the plays include both "popular" and "Art songs" (141). He cites W. H. Auden's criticism, which notes that a "called for" song and an "impromptu" differ; according to Auden, the impromptu requires an actor who just starts singing, whereas the "called for song" requires an actor to step out of being a character, and momentarily become a singer, whose primary role is to perform a song (Lindley 141). This seems to be the opposite of what Long

had indicated—that the songs, especially in this play, might be written for a professional singer, whom the audience would be happy to see come out and showcase the song. I suppose my point here is that verisimilitude is already not very important to Shakespeare's comedies. The films appear to show that the directors do not care enough about the songs to do anything creative with them. Or, indeed, so much emphasis is upon re-setting the play—the art direction, costumes, set design, casting—that music is another update that gets lost in the shuffle.

Northrup Frye says Shakespeare introduced the multiple arts of dance and music into his later romances (25). Here is a viewpoint that privileges the music. According to Frye, all comedy of Shakespeare is moving towards the "romance" with its rituals, and not towards the Jonsonian "comedy of manners" (where all other comedy writers were headed). (Frye 24-33). As we know, the late romances are more fond of ballet and song (there are stats on the subject, no less!) (Henze 440-441). Here, also, is how comedy differs from tragedy. A tragedy usually depicts an individual hero somehow in conflict with society, himself, or others. The soliloquy represents the truth and depth of his internal condition. A comedy is more of an ensemble piece. It is essentially conservative—it is reverting to normalcy. The song, in a comedy, is a rare moment for Shakespeare to insert some alternate view, and place it in the mouth of a less important character—the world of the play, speaks, through the song. Therefore, it is hard for me to dismiss them. Young emphasizes the uniqueness of As you Like It as a pastoral in creating an overall harmonizing effect. It would appear that songs could be part of this (70-71).

It would seem that films have the most flexibility of all in using the music—they have time, budget, and ability to set up the performance of the singer to be recorded to the best possible effect. Still, I would have to say the use of songs, in all the films I watched, has been disappointing.

Paul Czinner's 1936 film stars Laurence Olivier and Czinner's wife, Elisabeth Bergner (Jackson). This film works at a very fast clip. The set design by J.M. Barrie (Peter Pan author and well known in the time period 1915-1936) are really beautifully done, with live sheep and so on, though some reviewers have found them too frothy and happy (Jackson). In this1936 film, the song "Under the Greenwood Tree" is omitted, but the rest are written by British Modernist composer William Walton. Songs are not necessarily sung in their entirety, are not a focal point, and at times the lyrics are not even possible to hear. I was disappointed that the song, "It was a Lover and His Lass" was sung while Audrey is milking a cow, and that the song "What Shall He Have who Killed the Deer?" which was set nicely as a sort of march tune, was sung in the background of two scenes by a male chorus, but the scene it was in did not even really take place. Czinner sprinted through his film in 96 minutes, with quickly delivered lines. The film really focused upon Czinner's wife, who had performed this role many, many times(Jackson). I applaud Czinner for using as much music as he did, but it simply is never the forefront—the performance of his wife is.

The Canadian Stratford festival film (1989) made use of a band of instruments, but the 19th-century setting allowed for different types of songs. There was much occasional music, and even a sound of winter wind when the Duke was speaking—and an opening featuring a waif on the street singing "It Was a Lover and His Lass" in apparent high irony as street urchins huddled in their coats and scarves. However, there was much music introduced over half-way through the film, featuring Amiens dancing. If he sang "Under the Greenwood Tree," I could not tell, but he had a spirited rendition of "Blow, Blow," as well as the "Foresters' Song." The production also had two boy sopranos sing "It Was A Lover" and the marriage piece at the end. The production was a TV filmed live stage production of the Stratford Festival in Canada. The

production seemed to go for simple and rustic (read boisterous) for the first 3 songs, and then move to the "artistic" effect of choral music by boy sopranos towards the end when we perhaps are to see "civilization" take place in the forest as it is tamed by women and marriage.

The 2006 film by Kenneth Branagh, while extremely innovative on the use of the Japanese setting, substituted outdoor cinematography for other methods of scene-painting, and this didn't include most of the songs. Only Amiens gets to sing both "Under the Greenwood Tree" and "Blow, Blow Down Winter Wind." The singer is the composer, Patrick Doyle, who has worked with Branagh on a large number of films. Doyle also has actor credits, and played the part of Amiens. He and Branagh have done at least six Shakepeare films together. I thought lines of the songs seemed to be missing, and while the songs have a central role in developing the atmosphere of Arden and the incongruity between pastoral and melancholy, Jacques (the excellent actor Kevin Kline) to some extent upstages the songs in his scene. On the whole, I liked Branagh's concept more than I thought I would, but I was very disheartened by the presentation of music, especially since I'd seen how masterfully he and Doyle had used the cinema score and music in Henry V and Much Ado About Nothing. The only other singing was Hymen, which was a choral type presentation at the end. Therefore, Branagh only chose to use what I would consider to be the more "art" numbers in the film. Henry V uses the score to unify the whole series of post-war scenes around the character of Henry the V, now a hero, and Much Ado About Nothing does a very nice job both with the score and with the use of incidental song, particularly the use of voice-over. I rather liked the Japanese elements of songs that were used. However, I think the more "Elizabethan" "Forester's Song" and "It Was a Lover and His Lass" tend to not fit with the concept, and thus were removed. How Branagh is in dialogue here with Olivier and Kurosawa here would be another whole paper.

The acting in the Globe Theater production (2009) is very strong, and they did provide some good singers to perform as Amiens and Hymen. However, the music itself was not that attractive. Amiens' songs in Act 2 were both difficult and "art song like," but had no clear or memorable melody. They were composed by Stephen Warbeck. This stage version was taped before an audience, who did seem appreciative. Amiens did have a good voice. The only other song highlighted was that of Hymen. The Globe production made more of an effort with Hymen's song, but it was presented as a bass solo, rather than a small choral piece. I noticed that the character of Jaques DeBois was also omitted, so this version was not quite as traditional as it appears. In fact, one noticed the loveliness of Hymen's voice, but his presence was a little confusing to me. More lively was the dance number the cast performed during their curtain call, accompanied by a brass band that included a soprano saxophone (the saxophone was invented in the nineteenth-century). It seemed like the "tradition" aspect of the whole play was dropped at the point of the wedding scene.

Let us review the songs. "Under the Greenwood Tree," though sung by the courtier Amiens, is sung for all the exiles. Though they are cast away from "civilization," of the court and left with "shepherdesses" to love, there are compensations to living in Nature if the only care is "winter and rough weather." This corrective to the pastoral is highlighted when Orlando tries to hold up the Duke and steal food from him in order to save Adam from death. The Duke and his men are somewhat unqualified to live in the Forest because they don't really know how to work. A good version of the song was set by Ivor Gurney, WW1 poet and composer as a concert piece sung by tenor Ian Bostridge. So perhaps we cannot have Ian Bostridge perform the song, but what about this one, or the one written by Danish composer Carl Busch (Vincent 129-130)? The song brings us to the forest, whether we have a fancy set with trees or not. It introduces the

Duke and his band. I simply do not see how some productions omitted it. Behrens says that the "entire scene could be cut without any feeling of discontinuity of plot," but that" much of the theme would be lost." According to Alpers, the song alone brings in the tension between the idealism of the pastoral and the melancholy bitterness of Jaques (138).

The song, "Blow, Blow, Thou Winter Wind" somewhat picks up the sorrowful side of that previous tune. "Blow, Blow" compares winter weather to "man's ingratitude" and forgotten friends. It speaks of the pain of exile, of (obliquely) having your brother hate you. The darkness of the play is not the need to work or potential starvation, as some critics have liked to say: it is the sin of wanting your own brother dead, a topic doubled in Oliver/ Orlando and Duke Senior/ Duke Frederick. In the 1989 set, the idea is implied by the Victorian London sets at the beginning. The comic corrective to this is Celia and Rosalind being so mutually devoted that they flee to the forest together. The minor setting works well in 2006; in 1936 it is something between a hymn and a madrigal. This to me is the most important of the songs, and there are many fine choir settings of it, including Purifoy and Rutter, or a setting for baritone by William Arms Fisher (Vincent 129-130). Many of the songs move back and forth between minor and major keys, and I think this is an effective type of song. Again, I appreciate the words, and in my analysis, everyone DID include this song.

The song, "What Shall He Have Who Killed the Deer?" is often a candidate for cutting as it is a) in its own scene; b) the scene involves a lot of men, singing, and an entire dead deer; and c.) the image of the horn is a hilarious joke to Elizabethans about cuckoldry that will not mean anything to the modern viewer (Lewis 54). d. also, the scene is often scene as "atmosphere" that can be asserted in some other way, like with set design; or as a diversion while sets are changed, and unnecessary in the modern theatre. From a deconstructive perspective, though, this song

may represent exactly why the court does not belong in Arden. They are rushing about, killing animals (which makes Jaques cry), rather than working (as with the sheep). They are a totally "masculine" group that makes jokes about cuckolds, but may in fact be longing for women or wives who do not seem to be available (though their reversal of fortune at the end sends them back to court while the ascetic-seeking hermits, Jaques and Duke Frederick likely do not want any wives to deter them from their devotions—in this respect, the 2006 film was good). They put deer antlers on the successful hunter, thus making him into "prey, which is similar to how Rosalind changes herself into a man, Ganymede, in pursuing Orlando, but also speaks of ancient ritual that is tellingly deleted in 2009—apparently, it is not a politically correct ritual. The lively 1936 film has a chorus of foresters twice; 1989 does try to include it completely; the 2006 doesn't have it at all; these would seem to reflect the reading of the scene as sexist and the scene as not worth the trouble it would take to produce. The 1936 seems to echo nineteenth-century traditions, which sometimes took the entire audience outdoors and killed an actual deer though there are mentions in the stage history of outdoor productions with actual dead deer! (Morris) The song setting by William Walton , composer of "Belshazzar's Feast," is not highlighted, but is still a dramatically effective rendering of the concept. The problem is that the 1936 film doesn't even really let us hear it or see the scene or the song. Long indicates the song he has may be one of the original music settings from Shakespeare's time (Long 151). The Canadian production took a stab at Act 4, scene 2, but its effect was chaotic—a moment of chaos before we get back to Orlando and Rosalind.

The song "It Was a Lover and His Lass" was presented in 1936 and in the CBC film as part of the scene between Touchstone and Audrey. In the 1936 film, Audrey is the singer. This is the only time I can think of where a major player sang, and I found it a compelling idea—the

problem was the cow! Regarding this part of the play, Alpers says "After the lovers' quartet there is a brief scene 5.3, a kind of prologue to the long Finale, in which two pages—stock figures from Lyly's pastoral comedies, but coming from nowhere in this play—sit with Touchstone and Audrey to sing "It Was A Lover and His Lass." The scene consists almost entirely of the song (135-136). Alpers says that the song's purpose is to connect pastoral and comedy at the end of the play, or to harmonize what seems to be dissonant between those two forms. Dolan calls this the most famous of the play's songs (402). Yet, that does not amount to is inclusion—even while having what may be an original setting of the music!

In Act 5, the Hymen sings. Behrens says the god Hymen calls for and dance, "And so Shakespeare's happiest pastoral comedy makes no dramatic use of song!" As I have been indicating, it is this type of comment that results in all the songs being cut!

What is the answer?

Make the songs an event. Make the words (Shakespeare's words) count. Cutting whole scenes is easier than cutting obscure dialogue, but for modern productions, the feeling can be sought better through a multi-modal art rather than just the language. Comprise companies that include those who specialize in singing as well as those who act Shakespearean roles. When switching a whole production to a different culture and time, do not go overboard.

Most drama people only want a song that is "dramatically effective," that adds to the action, or so on. Music people are generally not cast in Shakespeare. I was not, for example. I had no strong desire to act, but I did have a yen to perform the songs. What better opportunity than to sing myself? After being thwarted so long ago, I do sort of want to sing these pieces~ Gurney's "Under the Greenwood Tree," the great choir pieces like Rutter's "Blow, Blow, Thou

Winter Wind" or the glee for the Forester's Song (4.2), are generally not known, or these forms are seen as "not dramatic, " and therefore not useful to the productions of the plays. On stage, this makes sense. But, in a film, if this is an "operatic" play with big moments for the songs, why not have Amiens be an opera singer? Why not have a chorus of Foresters? Why not perform with a choir? Richard Noble, writing in 1923, said:

> Since the plot of As You Like It is lazy and only moves by violent fits and starts, it is not surprising that none of the songs helps to develop the action; there is not one that brings on the scene . . . Neither is there any song, if we except those by Hymen, which is part and parcel of the action as are the two opening songs by Ariel in The Tempest. In fact, in the case of all the songs except "Blow, Blow, thou winter wind," the scenes would appear to have been created in order that the songs might be sung—a feature that would suggest that songs had been inserted to counter the competition of the Children at Blackfriars. Nevertheless each song fulfils a very important dramatic function, that of conveying colour of scene and sense of atmosphere to make good the lack of assistance of a scene painter in appealing to the imagination of the audience. In this play, therefore, song is employed definitely as scenery, and, for this reason alone, As You Like It constitutes a considerable advance in the dramatists' use of song (72). (modern underline and quotes added).

Surely, this is a strong statement that the words of the songs have value.

Still, people seem compelled to write new versions of the music for Shakespeare songs. In preparing this paper, I spent several hours watching YouTube videos, which is something I would not ordinarily do. I saw choirs in concert perform the Rutter piece; I saw clips of play productions, and I saw the retainers of the exiled Duke take up a guitar and sing around a

campfire their own version of the songs! Therefore, it seems a shame that so many productions do so little with them. In the time I have had available, I have tried to show it is worth exploring the historical resources of the music literature.

There is a cycle of life presented in this play that the sophisticated Jaques gives voice to, and which is the crux of the play. Hatred only makes the pain of life worse. Death is inevitable, but changing your role or location may increase your appreciation and allow you to see that love is best. The most famous song in the play, "It Was a Lover and His Lass" applies to everyone in the play except Duke Frederick and Jaques, who now have an opportunity at least to see the "springtime" as hermits. The play has moved from winter and friendlessness to springtime and marriage, with an autumnal hunting scene in between. Music reinforces all the most important themes in As You Like It.

Notes

1. Over the course of several volumes, Long talks about all the songs in all the plays, providing texts and some early music examples, in addition to discussions of how the songs function within the plays. It would be very valuable if one were trying to achieve an authentic sixteenth-century production. Long says that the songs used in this play, unlike those in Shakespeare's model, Thomas Lodge's Rosalynde, would be "popular," rather than literary (139).
2. Peter Seng, Harvard, is very scholarly, and copiously footnotes other critics and all the previous writers on the subject. For each play, Seng provides the original text of each song, and he writes about the textual history at length—as he did in his article about "The Foresters' Song."
3. Lindley's book takes a much more general standpoint; it talks about all music, and "Song" is just one chapter.

Works Cited

Alpers, Paul. "What Is Pastoral? Mode, Genre, and Convention." (1996). William Shakespeare's As You Like It. Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretation. Ed. Harold Bloom. Philadelphia: Chelsea House, 2004. 121-142. Print.

Behrens, Frank. "Shakespeare's Use of Songs—Part 2." Art Times Dec 2010. On-Line.

Dolan, Frances E. "As You Like It Introduction." The Complete Pelican Shakespeare. Ed. Stephen Orgel and A. R. Braunnuller, NY: Penguin, 2002. 401-406. Print.

Frye, Northrop. A Natural Perspective: The Development of Shakespearean Comedy and Romance. NY: Harbinger-Columbia, 1965. Print.

Hays, Dan. Midland University Director of Theatre Activities. Email Communication. January 31, 2017.

Henze, Catherine Q. "'Wise Enough to Play the Fool': Robert Armin and Shakespeare's Sung Songs of Scripted Improvisation." Comparative Drama Vol 47. 4 (Winter 2013): 419-450. Print.

Howard, Jean. As You Like It introduction. The Norton Shakespeare. (3rd ed). Ed Stephen Greenblatt et al. NY: Norton, 2016. 1613-1622. Print.

Hughes, Ted. "Active Ritual Drama and As You Like It." (1992). William Shakespeare's As You Like It. Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretation. Ed. Harold Bloom. Philadelphia: Chelsea House, 2004. 89-97. Print.

Jackson, Russell. "Filming As you Like It : a playful comedy becomes a problem." Texte Integral. 61-74. On-Line.

Lewis, Cynthia. "Horns, the Dream-Work, and Female potency in As You Like It." South Atlantic Review. Vol 66. 4 (Aut 2001) : 45-69. Print.

Meyer, Lee. MU Instructor of Music and Theatre. Email communication. Jan. 31, 2017.

Morris, Sylvia. "The End of a Tradition: Charlcote's deer and Nigel Playfair's As You Like It." Blog post. March 5, 2014. On-line.

Noble, Richard. Shakespeare's Use of Song. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1923. E-Book.

Seng, Peter J. The Vocal Songs in the Plays of Shakespeare. A Critical History. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1967. Print.

Shakespeare, William. As You Like It. The Norton Shakespeare. (3rd ed). Ed Stephen Greenblatt et al. NY: Norton, 2016. Print.

Shakespeare, William. As You Like It. The Complete Pelican Shakespeare. Ed. Stephen Orgel and A. R. Braunnuller, NY: Penguin, 2002. 407-437. Print.

Vincent, Charles. Fifty Shakespearean Songs. Philadelphia: Oliver Ditson, Co., 1906. Print.

Films.

As You Like It. 1936. Dir. Paul Czinner. UK 96 min. DVD.

As You Like It. 1989. Dir. John Hirsh. Stratford Collection. Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Canada. 155 min. DVD.

As You Like It. 2006. Dir. Kenneth Branagh. UK 127 min. DVD.

As You Like It. 2009. Dir. Thea Sharrock. Shakespeare's Globe Film Directed by Kriss Russman. UK. 147 minutes. DVD.

CD

Bostridge, Ian. Shakespeare Songs. Performance of Ivor Gurney's "Under the Greenwood Tree." Warner Classics. 2016. CD.

Lara Carlson McGoey

NPCEBL April 2017

Sugar and Spice and Everything Nice: Juliet's Obedience in *Romeo and Juliet*

I am hitherto your daughter. But here's my husband.
And so much duty as my mother showed
To you, preferring you before her father,
So much I challenge that I may profess
Due to the Moor my lord.
–Desdemona, *Othello* I.3.185-88

William Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* is a tragedy about two young lovers who, because of a feud, are not supposed to be together. Many readers focus on the nature of the main character, Juliet—a young girl, barely fourteen years old, who falls in love with Romeo—and see her as someone who changes significantly throughout the play. After all, she does secretly marry a Montague without her father's consent and later kills herself to join her lover in the afterlife. However, upon closer investigation, one can see that Juliet is actually rather flat; though she makes seemingly independent decisions along the way, her choices are still being dictated by a male, be it her father, husband, spiritual advisor, or the Prince of Verona. Hence, Juliet remains obedient throughout the play according to patriarchal expectations. Her only instance of a somewhat independent action is in her choice of Romeo as a mate. This demonstration of independence will is debatable, though, as will be discussed later in the essay. Ultimately, Juliet portrays an obedient woman that would fit well into Shakespeare's contemporary views of gender roles, yet her choice for a love match gestures towards a support of companionate marriage. Therefore, it can be argued that Shakespeare's use of an obedient female character created a sense of comfort for his audience in order to urge more allowance for her seemingly independent choice of marriage partner.

In order to better understand the role of obedience in Juliet, one must first look at the customs of the time period. Lawrence Stone's *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800* offers great insight into the marriage practices and expectations of each member of the family. According to Stone, the entering of marriage was a multi-step process, especially for those of a higher class. These steps included legal contracts between parents, "spousals" or the contract between the bride and groom, three public proclamations or "banns," and the actual wedding ceremony (31). The typical age for a female to get married in the late fifteenth century was around twenty years old, and this age rose during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (46). Stone suggests that multiple factors contributed to this increase in marriageable age: the rise in higher education, the high risk of childbirth in very young women, and the lenience of parents later on in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in their children's choice of mate (46). When considering these factors, it is important to remember that although *Romeo and Juliet* is set in Italy, Shakespeare's British culture and ideology influenced the way that he wrote his characters.

Still, in the sixteenth century, as in Juliet's case, parents had practically complete control over the choice of partner, partially due to "moral justification," such as the Commandment "Honor thy father and mother," and the impossibility of divorce (180). Since Juliet is of a high class in Verona, it is worthwhile to look at the practices of higher class marriage contracts. Stone explains that "Authoritarian control by parents over the marriages of their children inevitably lasted longest in the richest and most aristocratic circles, where the property, power and status stakes were highest" (184). This makes sense, as one would not want to sign away generations of wealth and property to a less-than ideal marriage partner. Stone further asserts that girls of wealthy families could only marry their choice of mate if they "possessed enormous persistence,

obstinacy and strength of will" (187). One would imagine that instances of the child marrying freely were few and far between, though. Stone presents "the hostility towards socially or financially unbalanced matches" and "the great influence over choice of partners still exercised by parents" as instances that show the lack of acceptance for a match made by love. When money, property, and reputation are at stake, parents would not want to trust their children's affections to make a proper choice for marriage. Antonia Fraser, in her work *The Weaker Vessel* states, "During this period, the emotion we should now term romantic love was treated with a mixture of suspicion, contempt and outright disgust by virtually all pundits" (26). However, Stone argues that this suspicion against romantic love lessened in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries due to the rise of the novel and its readership (283). In Shakespeare's time, though, parental control dictated marriages, and in *Romeo and Juliet*, one can see a very obvious instance of parental control, or at least an *attempt* at parental control, over Juliet's marriage partner.

At the beginning of the play, Lord Capulet, Juliet's father, begins the plans for the upcoming betrothal of Paris and Juliet. Paris is very insistent that he marry Juliet as soon as possible, while Capulet is a bit more reserved:

Cap: My child is yet a stranger in the world,

She hath not seen the change of fourteen years.

Let two more summers wither in their pride

Ere we may think her ripe to be a bride.

Paris: Younger than she are happy mothers made.

Cap: And too soon marr'd are those early made. (I.1.8-13)

While Capulet wants Juliet to marry and approves of Paris, he worries about his daughter's young age. Fraser comments that "The age of consent for a girl was twelve…. The mention of

'unripe years' might mean the postponement of such routine accompaniments to the marriage as consummation" (12). So, since Juliet is so young, barely fourteen, her ability to safely consummate her marriage and deliver children is questionable. Capulet is aware of this and demonstrates this by his hesitation for the betrothal. He even suggests to Paris that he "Hear all, all see, / And like her most whose merit most shall be" (I.2.30-31), meaning he should enjoy the Capulet ball and mingle with the other young ladies, not just Juliet.

Lady Capulet first sets the scene for Juliet's demonstration of filial obedience. When discussing the possibility of Juliet being married soon, Lady Capulet asks, "Tell me, daughter Juliet, / How stands your dispositions to be married?" to which Juliet replies meekly, "It is an honor that I dream not of" (I.3.64-5). Here it is seen that Juliet has not thought yet about marriage, but she understands it as an "honor" because she is expected to one day marry well. After the possibility of Paris as a suitor is brought up, Juliet states that she will think about marriage and investigate her feelings for Paris, "But no more deep will I endart mine eye / Than your consent gives strength to make it fly" (I.3. 98-9). She affirms that her parents' consent, specifically her father's (since Lady Capulet is also ruled by her husband in this patriarchal society), rules her actions in marriage. Since Capulet is the only dominant male figure in Juliet's life at this time in the play, it makes sense that she is willing to follow his rules and marry by his consent.

The wedding ceremony contains many symbols of patriarchal power, particularly in the role that the father of the bride plays as the one who gives away the bride. As Lynda E. Boose states, "For in Shakespeare's time—as in our own—the [wedding] ceremony acknowledged the special bond between father and daughter and the need for the power of ritual to release the daughter from its hold" (326). Juliet is her father's property, and because of this, she must

undergo a serious ritual to release his hold over her to her future husband. This ritual is completed in her marriage to Romeo; the only difference is that instead of giving obedience to her biological father, she follows her spiritual father, Friar Laurence, into the ritual. The Friar commands of Juliet, "Come, come with me and we will make short work, / For, by your leaves, you shall not stay alone / Till holy church incorporate two in one" (II. 6.35-7). Friar Laurence is ordering Juliet to follow him and Romeo into the church to complete the wedding ceremony, because he cannot leave them alone together until he marries them. Therefore, it can be argued that Juliet does not go against her father's will, for she is technically following her father's will…Friar Laurence's.

Furthering the idea of the ceremony as a patriarchal ritual, Boose looks at the other role the father plays in a wedding: "By playing out his role in the wedding ceremony, the father implicitly gives the blessing that licenses his daughter's deliverance from family bonds that might otherwise become a bondage" (327). If Juliet were not to get married, she would be constantly under the ruling of her father, a situation much like perpetual childhood. Juliet needs her father's blessing to marry and leave the nuclear family. Bruce Young investigates the role of parental blessings in Shakespeare's plays and argues that the modern reader will better understand Shakespeare's texts if one first understands the importance of the blessing within the family. Young states that the blessing of children by parents was "widely practiced in Renaissance England" (183) and "[b]y performing the ritual [the blessing], parents conveyed to their children divine influence—'blessing'—intended to enhance the children's happiness and prosperity" (182). Also, Young explains that the blessing was generally received by kneeling before the parent (184). As previously argued, Juliet received her paternal blessing through her spiritual father, Friar Laurence. When applying Young's work on parental blessings and the

tradition of kneeling, one can look at the typical stance a wedding couple takes while performing the marriage ceremony: kneeling. Therefore, Juliet kneels before her spiritual father and receives his paternal blessing during her wedding.

After receiving her patriarchal blessing, shifting from her biological father to her spiritual father, Juliet transfers her obedience to Romeo, her husband and new patriarchal leader. Previous to the wedding ceremony, Juliet has followed Romeo's plans. She agrees to marry him if he tells his honorable intentions to the Nurse the following morning:

> If that thy bent of love be honourable,
> Thy purpose marriage, send me word tomorrow
> By one that I'll procure to come to thee,
> Where and what time thou wilt perform the rite,
> And all my fortunes at thy foot I'll lay,
> And follow thee my lord throughout the world. (II.2.143-48)

She blatantly shows how her obedience will be transferred to him once he agrees to marry her and sets up the ceremony, where she can receive her paternal blessings from Friar Laurence. She calls him "my lord," a title only given to fathers, husbands, or men of a higher status. It is a sign of respect, and for her to call Romeo this title illustrates her willingness to obey his plans. Hence, Juliet's obedience has shifted from her father to her future husband, to her spiritual father, and back to her husband.

The morning after Juliet consummates her marriage to Romeo, she is informed by her parents that she is to marry Paris on Thursday, thereby completely skipping the banns and nullifying her father's previous hesitation to her marrying so young. Understandably, Juliet is horrified by the news and vehemently protests the marriage (III.5.119-20). When hearing of his

daughter's lack of obedience, Capulet responds with "But fettle your fine joints 'gainst Thursday next / To go with Paris to Saint Peter's Church, / Or I will drag thee on a hurdle thither" (III.5.153-55). What Lord Capulet does not know is that Juliet's duty is no longer tied to him; her obedience has been transferred to her husband, Romeo. If he had allowed his daughter to hold the banns, he could have seen Juliet's prior marriage to Romeo, thereby nullifying her betrothal to Paris. Capulet is angry because he perceives Juliet as not fulfilling her filial piety. He calls her "you green-sickness carrion…you baggage!" (III.5.156). These are harsh words for a father to use towards his only daughter, yet they demonstrate the ideology of paternal power and the shock at witnessing what is seen as disobedience.

Also in this familial scene, one can view the role of Juliet's mother in the patriarchal society. Juliet turns to her mother for assistance after her father's harsh ultimatum:

> Is there no pity sitting in the clouds
> That sees into the bottom of my grief?
> O sweet my mother, cast me not away,
> Delay this marriage for a month, a week,
> Or if you do not, make the bridal bed
> In that dim monument where Tybalt lies. (III.5.196-201)

Juliet is surprised by her mother's lack of pity, though, for Lady Capulet only follows what her husband has ordered by replying, "Talk not to me, for I'll not speak a word. / Do as thou wilt, for I have done with thee" (III.5.202-03). Even though Juliet has stated she would rather kill herself than marry on Thursday, Lady Capulet's only response is one of abandonment and coldness. Since the patriarch of the family has decreed that Juliet marry Paris, there is no way for the family go against the marriage. Lisa Jardine, in her work *Still Harping on Daughters; Women*

and Drama in the Age of Shakespeare, explains that "The family became…a little kingdom in its own right, ruled benevolently by the father (privy to divine purpose), supported by maternal solicitude" (49). One can argue how benevolent Lord Capulet is in this scene, but the reader can see by Jardine's statement that the family works as a unit to fulfill the wishes of the father. The mother, Lady Capulet works as his First Mate, essentially, and makes sure his orders are completed.

At this point in the play, Romeo has been banished and Juliet needs to stall her marriage to Paris. Because her husband is absent and her father's orders go against her husband's, Juliet turns to her spiritual father, Friar Laurence. He offers a plan for Juliet to appear to follow Capulet's wishes, yet she will get out of the illegitimate marriage by pretending to be dead. The Friar orders her to take a vial of potion that will make her seem like death, and afterwards, she will be buried in the Capulet tomb where she will later be saved by himself and Romeo (IV.1.93-115). Specifically, Friar Laurence commands her to "Be strong and prosperous / In this resolve" (IV.1.122-23). She must not let her fears get the best of her, or this plan will fail. Not only will the plan fail if she is ruled by her fears, but she will also be disobeying her spiritual father, putting more pressure on the situation.

Juliet's soliloquy after her meeting with her spiritual father shows some strive towards independence. She questions the Friar's integrity in giving her a potion:

> What if it be a poison which the Friar
> Subtly hath minister'd to have me dead
> Lest in this marriage he should be dishonour'd,
> Because he married me before to Romeo? (IV.3.24-7).

Juliet thinks for herself in these few moments, wondering if what she is being ordered to do is the best way to avoid a marriage to Paris. What if her spiritual father is planning to kill her to protect his own life and reputation? After all, the Friar could be sorely punished for marrying them in secret. Furthermore, Juliet is scared of the "hideous fears" she will witness upon waking in the Capulet tomb (IV.3.50). Still, Juliet decides to forego her independent thoughts and follows her spiritual father's order of drinking the vial. She has effectively signed her agency over from her husband to herself and from herself to Friar Laurence.

Finally, in Juliet's last act of transferring obedience from male to male, Juliet realigns herself with Romeo once she wakes in the Capulet tomb. Since he has been gone for a good portion of the play, she has followed her spiritual father's orders. Now that her husband is back, all respect due to her father is now due to her husband. Upon waking in the tomb, Juliet asks, "O comfortable Friar, where is my lord?" (V.3.148). It is interesting to note the names she uses for the two men. Friar Laurence is no longer her spiritual father; he is "Friar," and Romeo, her husband, is "my lord." Her pronouns give evidence of her transferring obedience from Laurence to Romeo. Once she sees her husband lying dead on the floor, Juliet is shocked because of the obvious failure to Friar Laurence's plan. Friar Laurence hears people coming to investigate the tomb, so he urges Juliet to follow him away from the scene of Romeo and Paris's death: "Stay not to question, for the Watch is coming. / Come, go, Juliet, for I no longer stay" (V.3.158-59). Romeo is to whom she owes obedience, so she tells her spiritual father, "Go, get thee hence, for I will not away" (V.3.160). Her seemingly independent and powerful words that *order* Friar Laurence away can be argued to show Juliet's agency in the situation. However, she is only following the role that her husband has set. She must kill herself to follow "her lord" into the afterlife.

When looking at the patriarchal hierarchy present in *Romeo and Juliet*, one notices that, of course, Juliet is ruled by her husband, her father, her mother—when she is administering the father's orders—, and her spiritual father, Friar Laurence. There is one more male present in the play that has not been touched on yet: the Prince of Verona. Since royalty in this time period was believed to be endowed by God with divine authority, the Prince technically has power over the patriarchs of the families. Hence, the Prince stands over the males in Juliet's family. Everyone must obey the Prince's rules. In response to the feud between the Montagues and the Capulets, the Prince orders for there to be peace in his city: "If ever you disturb our streets again / Your lives shall pay the forfeit of the peace" (I.1.94-95). The Prince makes his word into action when Romeo, Tybalt, and Mercutio fight in Act III. Since one from each house has been slain, the Prince banishes Romeo as further punishment: "And for that offence / Immediately we do exile him hence" (III.1.188-89).

The power of the Prince has been established in the play, and one must look at how Juliet fits under his rule. She must not spur on the feud, so her loving a Montague actually fits well within the Prince's orders. When looking at the Capulet ball scene, one can see where she might have gotten her respect for Romeo: her father. Lord Capulet tells Tybalt, who is enraged that Romeo has entered the house, to

> Content thee, gentle coz, let him alone,
> A bears him like a portly gentleman;
> And, to say truth, Verona brags of him
> To be a virtuous and well-govern'd youth. (I.5.64-67).

In this instance, one can see that the Prince's words have made some impression on Lord Capulet, and he sees Romeo as a decent man who can attend the Capulet party. This scene does

not prove that Capulet would have necessarily approved the marriage of Romeo and Juliet if he had known about it, yet it does show that he has no animosity for Romeo as a Montague. Also, this scene shows the influence the Prince has over the Capulet family, including Juliet.

After looking at the multiple instances of Juliet's switch in alliances towards the males in her life, it is important to note how Shakespeare's contemporary audiences would have reacted to the play. Joy Wiltenburg examines the role of women in literature in her work, *Disorderly Women and Female Power in the Street Literature of Early Modern England and Germany*. Wiltenburg writes:

> In upholding models for female emulation, authors worked within the socially accepted schemes of female virtue, praising chastity and passivity, but also occasionally admiring active courage….Authors considered what women would accept as well as what they should accept, and their messages both impressed social values on women and solicited women's participation in the reinforcement of those values. (47-48)

When this is applied to *Romeo and Juliet*, Shakespeare's writing of a woman in a way that is socially acceptable is showcasing the patriarchal society of England and reinforcing the proper conduct for a woman of that time period. She must be obedient to the males in her family, particularly her husband and father, and she must be chaste, virtuous, and passive. Wiltenburg adds to this list of female virtues by stating, "Women are also the preservers of domestic affection, overflowing with earthly tenderness" (55). Juliet's main prerogative in life is to marry well and take care of her family. She strays from this goal in her death, but she does marry with the hope of living well and continuing the tradition of womanhood her mother and Nurse set out for her.

What, then, would women of the sixteenth century take from Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*? First, they could see the obvious tragedy of love. They may also view Juliet as a disobedient daughter for marrying without her father's consent. Yet, when applying this argument of Juliet merely shifting her obedience from male to male, and particularly with her blessing from her spiritual father, Juliet is still following the set system of patriarchy. Depending on the situation at hand, Juliet follows the lead of the appropriate male she should serve under. In the beginning of the play, she is the dutiful daughter ready to please her father. After meeting Romeo, she agrees to marry him and receives paternal blessings from her spiritual father, Friar Laurence. When Romeo is banished, she falls back under the protection of her spiritual father, but immediately shirks his commands once Romeo comes back into the scene. If Romeo and Juliet's affair had been made public and recognized as an advantageous way to make peace between the two families, the tragedy would not have occurred. Therefore, Shakespeare may be gesturing towards marriages made through love matches. Juliet follows the correct patriarchal system while making a love match. If she can do both, then perhaps Shakespeare's contemporary audiences could be inclined to think more on the concept of companionate marriages.

Works Cited

Boose, Lynda E. “The Father and the Bride in Shakespeare.” *PMLA* vol. 97, no .3, 1982, pp. 325-47. www.jstor.org/stable/462226. Accessed 29 Mar. 2017.

Fraser, Antonia. *The Weaker Vessel*. Knopf, 1984.

Jardine, Lisa. *Still Harping on Daughters: Women and Drama in the Age of Shakespeare*. The Harvester P, 1983.

Shakespeare, William. *Romeo and Juliet*. Arden Edition Second Series. Edited by Brian Gibbons, The Arden Shakespeare, 2002.

Shakespeare, William. *Othello.* Arden Edition Third Series. Edited by E. A. J. Honigmann, The Arden Shakespeare, 2004.

Stone, Laurence. *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800.* Harper & Row, 1977.

Wiltenburg, Joy. *Disorderly Women and Female Power in the Street Literature of Early Modern England and Germany*. UP of Virginia, 1992.

Young, Bruce. “Parental Blessings in Shakespeare’s Plays.” *Studies in Philology* vol. 89, no. 2, 1992, pp. 179-210. www.jstor.org/stable/4174418. Accessed 30 Mar. 2017.

CoryAnne Harrigan

NPCEBL

June 27, 2017

Girdle Your Loins: Sexuality and Civil Strife in the *Thebaid* and *The Faerie Queene*

Publius Papinius Statius' *Thebaid*, a first-century C.E. Roman epic that relates the story of the seven against Thebes and the mutual fratricide of the sons of Oedipus, was an influential text in Renaissance England. Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* very pointedly draws on Statius' epic, particularly in Book IV, The Legend of Friendship. Book IV centers on the tournament held for the girdle of Florimell, a matrimonial belt that is imbued with special powers. This girdle, which Spenser tells us is one and the same as the cestus of Venus, also makes an appearance in the *Thebaid* in a back story that explains why all the women of Lemnos murdered their husbands. Earlier in Statius' poem, the necklace of Harmonia, a similarly disruptive artifact, is directly involved in Polyneices' decision to attack his home kingdom of Thebes, ruled by his brother Eteocles. I argue that Statius' necklace provides Spenser with the inspiration for the etiology of Florimell's girdle. Thus, in both texts, the girdle and the necklace, which alternately signify female fidelity or betrayal, prove to be catalysts of discord. Through their analogous narratives on the girdle and the necklace, both poets emphasize the interrelation of sexuality, gender, and civil strife.

Florimell is introduced in Book III of *The Faerie Queene*, the Legend of Chastity, as one of several characters representing the core virtue of that book. Her narrative continues into Book IV, the Legend of Friendship, and Book V, the Legend of Justice, finally reaching its resolution when she is united in marriage with her true love Marinell. Like Ariosto's Angelica, Florimell's beauty gets her into trouble; she is constantly in flight from potential rapists and loses her girdle

while being pursued by a lecherous monster who "feeds on womens flesh" (Spenser 3.7.22.9). The girdle is a highly coveted object, inspiring emotions from greed and lust to awe and reverence; it is offered as a prize in the tournament held in Book IV between the Knights of Maidenhead and the Knights of Friendship. Artegall, the titular knight of Book V, finally restores the girdle to Florimell in the tournament that accompanies her wedding feast.

Spenser provides an origin story for the girdle a little over nine cantos after its first appearance. This story explains the charmed nature of the relic and sheds light on its metaphorical significance. On one level, the allegory of the girdle of Florimell is straightforward: as a chastity belt, its presence signifies the sexual purity of its wearer, and its absence suggests the threat of concupiscence or sexual violation. However, the pedigree of this garment conflicts with this symbolism and the girdle's supposed powers. In Book IV, canto 5, we learn that this emblem of chastity is Venus' cestus, the belt created for her by Vulcan in honor of their nuptials:

> Her husband *Vulcan* whylome for her sake,
> When first he loued her with heart entire,
> This pretious ornament they say did make,
> And wrought in *Lemno* with vnquenched fire:
> And afterwards did for her loues first hire,
> Giue it to her, for euer to remaine,
> Therewith to bind lasciuious desire,
> And loose affections streightly to restraine;
> Which verture it for euer after did retaine. (4)

First, consider the irony that this girdle, which has previously in the poem been connected with the preservation of chastity, is now being identified as a garment that once belonged to Venus,

the Roman god of love and sexual desire. Then consider its function as described here: the cestus was supposedly designed to promote abstinence. And yet, in the stanza just prior to this genealogy, Spenser describes the most famous quality of Florimell's girdle:

> That girdle gaue the virtue of chast loue,
> And wiuehood true, to all that did it beare;
> But whosoeuer contrarie doth proue,
> Might not the same about her middle weare,
> But it would loose, or else a sunder teare. (3.1-5)

If any woman of classical and early modern literature ever proved contrary to "wiuehood true," that figure was Venus. As revealed in the final episode of Book IV's tournament, the girdle most assuredly does not work for the women of Faerieland the way it worked for her, who wore the cestus "[w]hat time she vsd to liue in wiuely sort; / But layd aside, when so she vsd her looser sport" (8-9). Apparently, only Venus gets to choose when she wants to be true to "wivehood."

The belt that was used in such a fickle way by its original owner does not seem to correspond with the garment that has been elevated to the status of a "precious relicke" (4.4.15.2)—a nearly religious artifact placed in its own ark for proper devotion at the tournament. The girdle of Florimell has the magical property of detaching from any woman who is not chaste. False Florimell, whom a witch crafted from snow to appease her grieving son when they found the true Florimell's girdle abandoned and presumed her dead, is initially awarded the belt. However, she can't wear it; each time she tries to fasten it, the belt "as oft was from about her wast disclos'd" (4.5.16.9). Likewise, every other woman at the tournament with the exception of the virtuous Amoret is shown, much to her chagrin, to be incapable of keeping it on: many "Ladies likewise tride, / About their tender loynes to knit the same; / But it would not on

none of them abide, / But when they thought it fast, eftsoones it was vntide" (4.5.17.6-9). In relation to the story Spenser tells about the creation of the cestus, this makes no sense. If anything, a girdle manufactured to "bind lasciuious desire" should hold fast around the likes of False Florimell. But the cestus as applied in the context of the tournament is only good for humiliating both the ladies and their defending knights, who are, of course, implicated in the dishonor of their girlfriends. As the Squire of Dames, the archetypal ladies' man, laughingly proclaims, "Fie on the man, that did it first inuent, / To shame vs all with this, *Vngirt vnblest*. / Let neuer Ladie to his loue assent, / That hath this day so many so vnmanly shent" (18.6-9). The garment created by Vulcan should be something every knight would be thrilled to have his lady wear, so long as he is the only one to remove it. But once this girdle becomes associated with Florimell, its powers become more threatening than desirable.

What makes Spenser's origin myth even more troubling is the mention of the specific occasion on which Venus "layd aside" her cestus for what appears to have been the last time:

> The same one day, when she her selfe disposd
> To visite her beloued Paramoure,
> The God of warre, she from her middle loosd,
> And left behind her in her secret bowre,
> On *Acidalian* mount, where many an howre
> She with the pleasant *Graces* wont to play. (4.5.5.1-6)

Mars, of course, was the paramour for whom Venus removed Vulcan's gift prior to the Graces bequeathing it to Florimell. This episode therefore connects domestic strife directly to the etiology of the girdle. Love succumbs to war, and marital chastity is abandoned in the process. Perhaps this abandonment of the girdle explains the subtle but significant shift in its function.

No classical source credits Vulcan with the creation of the cestus; Spenser appears to have concocted this etiology specifically for *The Faerie Queene*, further underscoring its consequence in the allegory. Spenser describes the belt in detail just prior to the tournament when Satyrane brings it forth to remind the knights what they are competing for: "A gorgeous girdle, curiously embost / With pearle and precious stone, worth many a marke; / Yet did the workmanship farre passe the cost" (4.4.15.6-8). It is odd that Spenser attributes the cestus to Vulcan's handiwork. For one thing, the word "cestus" means "perforated" or "embroidered," so Vulcan seems an unlikely craftsman for such a garment. Also, one of the god's later creations, a metal net so finely wrought that it was nearly invisible, was key to exposing the adulterous relationship that plagued his marriage. The long-standing affair between Venus and Mars caused Vulcan no end of jealousy and humiliation. Why, then, does Spenser create such an incongruous history for the girdle? A clue resides in the personification of Care presented later in this canto, as A. C. Hamilton suggests: "Spenser may have invented the story that it was fashioned by Vulcan in order to relate this classical type of the jealous husband to Scudamour who is about to suffer under the Vulcan-like Care" (Spenser 444 n.). In other words, sexual jealousy rather than conjugal bliss is somehow instrumental to the magical properties of the cestus. Analysis of this passage opens up connections between Book IV of *The Faerie Queene* and an episode featuring the cestus in Statius' *Thebaid*.

Spenser depicts the figure of Care—here meaning jealousy rather than attentiveness or concern—as a blacksmith who works unceasingly at his forge creating the "yron wedges" (35.8) of "vnquiet thoughts, that carefull minds inuade" (9). John Steadman has noted both the similarity between Care and Vulcan as well as the concurrence of "two traditional but antithetical concepts of the forge—as a symbol of jealousy or a figure of harmony" (135), the latter

specifically in a musical sense, but extending to a broader meaning of concord, the theme of Book IV. At this moment in the narrative, Care personifies the knight Scudamour's concerns about his love Amoret, from whom he has been separated. Scudamour can't sleep at the House of Care because he is tormented by the sounds of the forge, on the literal level, and the thoughts of his betrothed's possible disloyalty on the metaphorical level. Spenser's inclusion of this Vulcan-like figure of Care at the end of the canto suggests that the actual Vulcan who appears in the canto's opening is not the secure and loving spouse we are first led to believe him to be. Rather, the "vnquenched fire" (4.4) in which he forged the cestus was probably the fire of marital jealousy.

In the *Thebaid*, jealousy manifests itself in several contexts. Besides sexual jealousy, Statius depicts the jealousy of a god who feels insufficiently honored and the jealousy associated with material covetousness. The jealous god in this case is Venus rather than Vulcan; she is deeply involved in the tragic story of the women of Lemnos, which is described in detail during a lengthy digression in Book 5 of the epic. This story illustrates the disastrous effects of her jealousy and connects the removal of her cestus to the commencement of civil strife.

At this point in Statius' epic, the Argive army is en route to Thebes, Polyneices having secured the promise of Adrastus, who is the king of Argos, and five other warriors to help him overthrow his brother Eteocles. The army is in desperate need of water, so when they encounter a young woman on their march through Nemea, they ask her to guide them to the nearest stream. After quenching their thirst, they ask her about her background. She identifies herself as Hypsipyle, a servant to the king of Nemea since having been kidnapped years before as she fled the island of Lemnos. Hypsipyle explains that she had to leave her homeland because she betrayed her countrywomen by sparing her father from the mass murder of all the men of the

island. She reveals early in her story what prompted the women to commit such a crime. Though the country had previously been prosperous and apparently peaceful, Hypsipyle says that the nation's failure to worship Venus appropriately spurred the anger of the goddess: "'They say she left behind a hundred alters / on ancient Paphos, changed her looks, her hair, / took off her *nuptial girdle*, and dismissed the doves of Ida'" (Statius 116; italics mine). Statius presents the cestus here in a radically different context than it otherwise appears in classical literature. In Book 14 of the *Iliad*, Hera borrows Aphrodite's girdle in what is perhaps its most famous appearance to make herself irresistible to Zeus, thereby distracting him from his interventions in the Trojan War. In other words, the girdle has typically delayed warfare. But in Statius' poem, Venus removes her girdle not to sport with Mars, but to incite discord and ultimately violence on the island due to her wounded pride:

Elisabeth Vigée-Le Brun, *Vénus présentant sa Ceinture à Junon* (1781)

> "[…] some women
> say that the goddess, bearing other torches
> and weapons than the ones that kindle love—
> merciless to her faithful husband's people—
> flew through our bedrooms with the hellish Furies,
> brought cruel fear to the thresholds of our brides,
> and filled our homes' dark nooks with twining serpents.

> Next you, Amores, flew away from Lemnos.
> Hymen was mute, his torches overturned.
> Frozen care occupied the lawful couch;
> the nights produced no joy; none slept embraced,
> but bitter hate was everywhere, and rage,
> and discord parted couples in their beds. (116-17)

In this episode, when Venus sheds her girdle, she metamorphoses into one of the Furies, the classical figures of vengeance. The connection mentioned here between her husband—often referred to by the epithet "Lemnian" because of the traditional location of his forge—and the citizens of Lemnos underscores the familial betrayal inherent in Venus' actions. While Spenser's etiology of the cestus explains that it binds lascivious desire and restrains loose affections, Statius suggests that it also binds chaos and civil strife.

The artifact that brings Spenser's allegory of friendship full circle, so to speak, is Statius' necklace of Harmonia. This necklace is an extravagant work of art created by Vulcan and his craftsmen, the Telchines, monsters who were renowned for their brass work. Like the girdle of Florimell, this object is highly coveted; also like the girdle, its supernatural qualities are actually less than desirable. The necklace was created as a gift for Harmonia, the daughter of Venus and Mars, in honor of her marriage to Cadmus. (Note the overlap with Spenser's etiology of the girdle in regard to both the craftsman and the occasion.) It appears in Book II of the *Thebaid* when Polyneices bestows it on his new wife Argia, the daughter of King Adrastus, as a wedding gift. In Statius' account, the etiology of the necklace begins with an unusual interjection that sets an ominous tone: "The narrative is long, but what is known / about this evil thing I shall rehearse / so you will know the power of its curse. / Vulcan devised this gift as his revenge" (Statius 36).

As Charles McNelis and others have noted, this history seems to depart from other classical accounts of the necklace, none of which mentions Vulcan's ire toward Venus as a motive for his creation of it; moreover, several versions of the story do not credit him with having made it at all. In fact, Vulcan is generally not known for ornamental metalwork; rather, he is associated with the creation of weapons of war—albeit finely wrought ones—such as the shields of Achilles and Aeneas.

However, Statius leaves no question as to the purpose of this necklace: it is crafted to infect the house of Cadmus and the Theban line with generations of strife. Vulcan incorporates "emeralds that glittered secret fire / and adamant" and "figures / of evil fortune and the Gorgon" (36). The necklace has fluorescent green touches on "the vipers that slid down / the mane of the Medusa," "dread gold from Phrixus' golden fleece," and "the bull-snake taken from Tisiphone's / black forehead" (36-7). As if the literal details were not enough, Vulcan adds a few metaphorical touches to top off the cursed quality of the necklace: "the strength of different plagues," "pleasing poison," and "*the force of Venus' cestus*" (37; italics mine). McNelis asserts that, although a necklace falls outside of Vulcan's usual field of specialization, it is "an appropriate emblem of the fundamentally domestic nature of Theban strife" (61). Statius has thus directly linked the sexual powers of Venus's cestus with internecine war.

One more scene involving the necklace of Harmonia elucidates this connection. At the opening of Book IV of the *Thebaid*, three years have passed since Polyneices arrived at Argos, and the army that King Adrastus has assembled is finally prepared to make the trek to Thebes. One of the seven generals is the prophet Amphiaraus, who has already performed his auguries and therefore knows that the mission is doomed. Argia realizes that her husband and father need to secure Amphiaraus' participation in the campaign so the army will not lose heart. She also

knows that the prophet's wife Eriphyle has coveted the necklace since first seeing it, plotting "secret schemes to make that dread jewel hers" (37). Ignorant of the dreadful repercussions, Argia willingly parts with the necklace so Polyneices can bribe Eriphyle into convincing her husband to go to war against his better judgment. The narrator sums up the episode:

> That was the way the fatal jewelry reached
> the home of Eriphyle, where it sowed
> the seeds of powerful impieties
> and made the Fury named Tisiphone
> laugh loudly and rejoice in destiny. (90)

The mention of Tisiphone, a classical figure of discord and a constant presence in this epic, highlights the treachery that is born of jealousy: Venus' jealousy, Vulcan's jealousy, Eriphyle's jealousy. The ironically-named necklace of Harmonia actually brings conflict to fruition wherever it appears.

Ultimately, the necklace and the girdle both serve as signifiers of the instability of marriage. Concord is not easily achieved in Spenser's Legend of Friendship, and while marriage should grant the most secure variety of concord, the poem suggests that strife is inseparable from it. In fact, aside from the fantastical marriage of the Thames and the Medway that ends the book, the most noteworthy moment of concord occurs early, all the way back in canto 3, when Spenser provides a back story describing how the titular heroes Cambel and Triamond are "smote" (4.3.48.2) with a magic wand and drugged into submission with nepenthe by Cambina, Triamond's sister and soon-to-be Cambel's wife. The marriages that result from this episode (the Cambel-Cambina and Triamond-Canacee unions) are ideal: "theire daies they spent / In perfect loue, deuoide of hatefull strife, / Allide with bands of mutuall couplement (52.1-3). Spenser does

not explicitly reference Cambina or Canacee in the scene during which Florimell's girdle is passed around for fitting; when it comes to marital concord, perhaps "ungirt" is blessed after all.

Works Cited

McNelis, Charles. *Statius'* Thebaid *and the Poetics of Civil War*. Cambridge UP, 2006.

Spenser, Edmund. *The Faerie Queene*. Edited by A. C. Hamilton et al. 2nd ed., Pearson Longman, 2007.

Statius, Publius Papinius. *The Thebaid: Seven against Thebes*. Translated by Charles Stanley Ross, Johns Hopkins UP, 2004.

Steadman, John. "Care." *The Spenser Encyclopedia*, edited by A. C. Hamilton, U of Toronto P, 1990, pp. 135-36.

Vigée-Le Brun, Elisabeth. *Vénus présentant sa Ceinture à Junon*. *Flickr*, 15 June 2017, https://www.flickr.com/photos/144232185@N03/30284944735/in/photolist-Sf1Amy-RU44WY-ShCtaV-StRHva-GdLcV3-GfmZeb-C7E7CQ-otqwZL-szRx2Z-uCLbSV-twLxA2-owaRSg-HNC2y7-HQYgTg-HXmQnZ-uM94vX-ourdFd-yLpqVb-ukX1Nf-ovQ7R3-Qs29GU-ukX1KQ-tFw3Xs-N1CgeZ-N9bfXz-Mbtvoi-N1CsiT-yyPKch-pMNEbw-MrtDjm-ougoKG-oeFU1v-LBRZTQ-oxkUQH-owaxJZ-oeLnGd-oePSTH-ow4b5m-oeNQDs-N6QaJX-oeHJLJ-oeF3sc-osVzf3-ovRusi-oens5r-ovD7P1-yPust8-tFG5XD-tFG5jp-ot8Cxc.

The Role of Benvolio in Faustus-B

Christopher Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* exists in two significantly differing texts, both of which were printed long after Marlowe's death in 1593. The earliest, known as the A-text, was printed in 1604. The second, the B-text, was printed a dozen years later in 1616. By David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen's count, the A-text has 36 lines that are not contained in the B-text, while the B-text adds numerous episodes to the play which add up to an additional 676 lines (63).[1] Additionally, there are numerous small differences between the parallel portions of the texts. An extra feature of the textual puzzle is that in 1602, before the printing of either text, Philip Henslowe (the owner of the Rose Theater), paid Samuel Rowley and William Birde to write additional material for *Doctor Faustus* (62).

Faced with these two texts, early nineteenth-century editors choose to print the longer B-text, feeling that it was more complete.[2] However, in the late nineteenth-century and early twentieth century the editorial preference switched to the A-text on the basis that the longer length of the B-text represented Rowley and Birde's additions, and that the shorter A-text was thus more Marlovian, even if the comic scenes in the A-text were the work of a collaborator. In mid-twentieth-century the tide shifted under the influence of Frederick S. Boas, Leo Kirschbaum, and W. W. Greg, who argued that that the A-text was a memorial reconstruction. Greg's parallel text edition of 1950 also argued that the additions of Rowley and Birde were not present in the B-text. The B-text, in Greg's vison, was the work of Marlowe and an unknown collaborator who was responsible for the comic scenes; the A-text, although printed first, derived from the B-text; and the additions written in 1610 had been lost to us. Greg's theory carried the day for the primacy of the B-text, which became the copy-text used by a number of subsequent

editors: John Jump, Irving Ribner, Roma Gill, and Fredson Bowers. (Bowers thought Greg wrong concerning the additions, but accepted that the A-text was a memorial reconstruction.) By the last quarter of the twentieth-century the idea of the A-text being a memorial reconstruction was challenged by scholars, most notably Constance Kuriyama and Michael Warren, and the editorial work of David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen established that the A-text comes closest to what was originally written by Marlowe and his original collaborator. The B-text, in their analysis, incorporates material written later, presumably that written by Rowley and Birde, and perhaps includes other changes that were made in the years after Marlowe's death. They conclude that "Editors and critics alike need to be wary of claims based on a conflated text. Both texts of *Doctor Faustus* continue to deserve our divided attention" (77). This late twentieth-century conclusion remains the standard understanding of the two-text issue to the present day.

Bevington and Rasmussen's advocacy of a two-text solution sees the A-text as bringing us closer to Marlowe's' own vision and values the B-text for what it reveals about theatrical developments in staging and stagecraft. I concur with this idea of value in the B-text. I first began studying Marlowe while Greg's conclusions were at the height of their acceptance, so for me, the B-text was Marlowe's text, and it was the text that I submitted to close reading and analysis. Today I continue to be fascinated by aspects of the B-text's additions, and while they may not be Marlowe's, I find them intriguing and meaningful. Currently the most complex arguments about the differences between the two texts focus on their differing theological implications. However, the lengthiest part of the additions to the B-text concerns the knight who taunts Faustus while Faustus is entertaining Charles V, the emperor of Germany. This material includes a large portion of Act 4, scene 1, and the entirety of the following two scenes, and I will focus on these episodes. My underlying assumption is that Rowley and Birde faced the same

issues that a modern filmmaker faces when creating a new version of *King Kong* or *Godzilla*. The overall arc of the film or play must be maintained, but the new version may give deeper insight into the protagonist, thematic issues may be refocused, and special effects or action may be made more spectacular.

The knight bedeviled by Faustus originates in the play's source, *The history of the damnable life and deserved death of Doctor John Faustus*, commonly referred to as the *English Faust Book*. Chapter 30 is titled "How Doctor Faustus in the sight of the emperor conjured a pair of hart's horns upon a knight's head that slept out of a casement." This brief chapter describes what occurs after Doctor. Faustus has fulfilled the emperor's request to see Alexander the Great and his paramour. Faustus takes his leave of the emperor and goes into a gallery overlooking a garden where a number of courtiers are walking and talking. Faustus notices a knight who has fallen asleep inside the Great Hall with his head reclining on the window casement. For no particular reason Faustus has Mephistopheles plant a pair of hart's horns on the knight's head. The horns are so large that the knight is unable to draw his head back into the room, and the courtiers began laughing uproariously at him. The Emperor hears the laughter and comes to the garden, where he begins laughing heartedly as well. Faustus then without prompting removes the knight's horns. Chapter 31 is titled "How the above-mentioned knight went about to be revenged of Doctor. Faustus." After Faustus has left the city, he comes to wood where he is ambushed by the knight and his friends, who charge at him on horseback. Faustus quickly runs to some bushes, which he transforms into horsemen who charge and capture the knight and his companions. The Knight asks for mercy, and Faustus lets them go, but gives them all goat's horns, in addition to giving each of their horses a pair of ox horns. The horns lasted a month before vanishing.

The A-text draws on only the first of these two chapters. Marlowe's collaborator improves upon the Faust book by having the Knight present when the Emperor meets with Faustus and requests him to display his skill in magic. The knight is skeptical that Faustus possesses such skill, remarking in an ironic aside, "I'faith, he looks much like a conjurer" (4.1.11). After the Emperor then specifically requests to see Alexander and his paramour, Faustus responds that he is "ready to accomplish your request, so far as by art and power of my spirit I am able to perform" (4.1.44-45). The dubious Knight responds with another sneering aside: "I'faith, that's just nothing at all" (4.1.46). When Faustus begins to explain to the Emperor that he cannot present "the true substantial bodies of these two deceased princes" (4.1.48-49), the knight inserts a third scornful aside, saying "Ay, marry, Master Doctor, now there's a sign of grace in you, when you will confess the truth" (4.1.51-52). Finishing his explanation to the Emperor, Faustus goes on to explain that his spirits can resemble Alexander and his paramour exactly as they were in life. The Knight can no longer hold his peace and addresses Faustus directly:

> Knight: Do you hear, Master Doctor? You bring Alexander and his paramour before the emperor?
>
> Faustus: How then, sir?
>
> Knight: I'faith, that's as true as Diana turned me to a stag.
>
> Faustus: No, sir, but when Actaeon died, he left the horns for you.
>
> (4.1.59-64)

Faustus then dispatches Mephistopheles to fulfill the Emperor's request, and the knight leaves. After the faux Alexander and his paramour have appeared and exited, Faustus asks the emperor to call the Knight back. He enters with a pair of horns on his head. When he demands that

Faustus undo what he has done, Faustus answers that he has requited the Knight for crossing him during his conference with the Emperor. At the Emperor's entreaty, Faustus does release the spell, telling the Knight to "hereafter speak well of scholars" (4.1.94-95). The A-text has thus made the knight's role much livelier than in the source, incorporated it into the scene with the invocation of Alexander and his paramour, given Doctor Faustus a motivation for tormenting the Knight, and introduced the allusion to Actaeon, which adds an additional dimension to the knight's horns.

Some dozen years after *Doctor Faustus* was first written and performed, Philip Henslowe apparently felt that the play was becoming a bit stale, and he hired Samuel Rowley and William Birde to spruce it up for a new generation of playgoers. As mentioned, I conceive of their task as being similar to creating a remake of a classic film. The overall plot must remain the same and iconic scenes must be maintained, but the writers must seek to augment it in a way that enhances audience engagement and enjoyment. Seeking new material, Rowley and Birde returned to the *English Faust Book* and also found additional material in Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*. The play's enlargement took place primarily within the comic scenes, and whether A or B was the favored text at any given moment, the additional comedy (or indeed, any of the comedy) has not generally found favor with critics. Of course, there is no gainsaying that the powerful and moving poetry of Marlowe's sections of the play transcends the language of his collaborator and revisers. Still, plays are meant to be seen and not simply read, and readers can find it hard to appreciate the effectives of comic action. It is common sense to think that Rowley, Birde, and Henslowe knew their audience and understood their enjoyment of the comedy and stage magic of *Doctor. Faustus*. They would seek to give the Elizabethan audience more of such pleasure. Birde may have been the one responsible for enlarging the role of the Knight from that in the *English*

Faust Book and the A-text. Whoever did it named him Benvolio and gave him friends who interact with him, thus creating a more fully developed and humanized character. The friends, Martino and Frederick, begin the scene in which Faustus will display Alexander to the Emperor Charles. We learn that Faustus had a more specific reason for coming to court than was given in the A-text: he has rescued Bruno from the Pope and had brought him back to Germany and the Emperor. Bruno is another new addition to the play, and clearly Rowely and Birde have striven to tie their comic scenes together more tightly than was done in the A-text. Benvolio is not present when the scene begins. He drank too many toasts to Bruno the night before and now keeps his bed. When his friends call him, he says that he will watch from the window, as in the *English Faust Book* but not in the in the A-text. When Faustus agrees to bring Alexander and his paramour before Charles, Benvolio's asides in the window are similar to those in the A-text, but are lengthier and arguably clearer. Thus, "that's as true as Diana turned me to a stag" (4.1.62) becomes "an thou bring Alexander and his paramour before the Emperor, I'll be Actaeon, and turn myself to a stag" (4.1.99-100). The entrance of Alexander and his paramour is more elaborate than in the A-text. Rather than the two just parading separately before Charles, Alexander engages in combat with Darius, takes his crown and gives it to his lady and then presents her to Charles. Immediately upon their departure, Faustus directs Charles's attention to the window where Benvolio has fallen asleep. He is wakened to discover that he has sprouted horns. Reminding Benvolio of his jest about turning himself to Acteaon, Faustus now offers

> to raise a kennel of hounds shall hunt him so
> As all his footmanship shall scarce prevail
> To keep his carcass from their bloody fangs.
> Ho,Belimoth, Argiron, Ashtaroth!

(4.1.146-149)

This demonic pack of hounds is a thoughtful touch by the revisors. The use of the Actaeon myth is in itself quite Marlovian. In *Edward II* plans to entertain the king with a pageant that includes an actor dressed as Actaeon, who

> Shall by the angry goddess be transformed,
> And running in the likeness of an hart
> By yelping hounds pulled down and seem to die.

(1.1.67-69)

In Doctor Faustus, the Actaeon allusion foreshadows Faustus's own end, for it is he who is being pursued by a devilish pack.

Continuing to be inspired by the *English Faust Book*, the B-text adds Benvolio's attempted revenge for his humiliation. Benvolio, Martino, and Frederick gather a group of soldiers and set an ambush for Faustus. The three courtiers attack Faustus first and behead him, only to have him arise from his apparent death and have the three carried off by his demons to be tormented. This is the type of scene that critics have derided as being corny and unworthy of Marlowe, but Rowley and Birde are seeking to improve the A-text, in which the horse-courser is made to believe that he has pulled Faustus's leg off. If the Elizabethan audience had not found that scene to be enjoyable, one doubts that a second dismemberment scene would have been added. After Faustus has foiled the attempt to behead him, the soldiers attack, and Faustus raises an army of devils to fight them. Bevington and Rasmussen suggest that since this parallels Faustus's transformation of bushes into soldiers in the *English Faust Book*, there was yet another opportunity for some spectacular stage magic (46). Benvolio and his friends are rewarded with horns, and slink off to hide themselves away until such time as the horns disappear.

This, then, is a brief look at the enlarged role of Benvolio, one of the late additions to the play. Though the play has always been criticized for the low quality of the comic scenes and most readers have preferred the A-text, which has less comedy, I hope that I have shown that the comic scenes added in B are more tightly interwoven than were the comic scenes in A, that they are more fully spelled out and developed, and that they continue to reflect and comment on the themes and action of the main plot.

Bruce E. Brandt, South Dakota State University

Notes

1. References to Bevington and Rasumsseun are to their introduction to the Revels edition of *Doctor Faustus,* which is the text cited throughout for the two texts of Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus.*
2. For a fuller discussion of the following textual history, see Bevington and Rasmussen (62-77) and Brandt (17-21).

Works Cited

Brandt, Bruce E. "The Critical Backstory." *Doctor Faustus: A Critical Guide*, edited by Sara Munson Deats, Continuum, 2010, pp. 17-40.

English Faust Book, The. Edited by John Henry Jones. Cambridge UP, 1994.

Marlowe, Christopher. *Doctor Faustus: A- and B-texts (1604, 1616)*. Edited by David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen, Manchester UP, 1993. The Revels Plays.

---. *Edward II*. Edited by Charles R. Forker, Manchester UP, 1995. The Revels Plays.