



Proceedings
of the

**Fourth Dakotas – Nebraska
Conference
On Early British Literature**

Peru State College
Peru, Nebraska
April, 1996

*Bill Clemente
Mary Mokris
Editors*



Errata

"Clarissa's Clothes" is by Margaret Duggan, South Dakota State University.

"O Death! Where is thy sting?: Tragic virtue and the anticipation of Romanticism in Richardson's *Clarissa*" is by Dennis Ciesielski, Peru State College.

"The rubric and organization of 17th century English spiritual diary" is by Germaine Murray, Maryville College.

Introduction and acknowledgments

On April 25-26 of 1996, Peru State College proudly hosted the Fourth Nebraska and Dakotas Conference on Early British Literature, the first of the yearly meetings to be held in Nebraska. And following this year's successful fifth conference at Jamestown College in North Dakota, the Sixth Nebraska and Dakotas gathering will take place once again in Nebraska, at Wayne State College.

The positive comments we heard and received from those who attended gratified us and gave us confidence to host again in a few years. Thelma Greenfield, the keynote speaker, wrote to thank everyone, noting that she appreciated the "efficiency, grace, and thoughtfulness" of the conference's planning; she praised equally the quality of the papers as well as the wonderfully friendly atmosphere the presenters created. Following the tradition established by the previous three publications, *The Proceedings of the Fourth Nebraska and Dakotas Conference on Early British Literature* includes the papers of all the convivial presenters who submitted copies for consideration.

After Dr. Robert Burns, President of Peru State College, welcomed everyone, Dr. Thelma Greenfield gave the Keynote Address. Professor Emerita of English at the University of Oregon, Dr. Greenfield has published extensively on Renaissance literature, including, in addition to numerous articles, books on Renaissance Drama and Sir Philip Sidney's *New Arcadia*. Published recently by Garland Press in an anthology of contemporary essays on Shakespeare's *Midsummer Night's Dream*, her presentation, "Our Nightly Madness": Shakespeare's Dreams Without The Interpretation of Dreams" opened the conference on an enthusiastic note.

Over the next two days, some thirty scholars from eight states read and discussed their ideas about English literature and its sources, moving easily from Marie De France's *Eliduc* and Castiglione's *The Courtier*, to the television adaptation of *Gulliver's Travels* and a look at Milton's angels. Topics also ranged from

the journals of a former slave, Olaudah Equiano, to the fiction of contemporary African writer Bessie Head.

In addition to enjoying traditional presentations, those who attended also heard Dr. Peggy A. Horrocks' beautiful rendition of songs from Shakespeare composed over the past four hundred years. And at the banquet at the Lied Center's excellent facilities in Nebraska City, the Peru State Madrigal Singers — under the masterful direction of Dr. Tom Ediger of Peru State College's Department of Music — provided lively and wonderful entertainment.

This collection, we hope, captures much of the excitement the conference provided. While the number of responses to our Call For Papers threatened to overwhelm us, the variety and range of topics impressed us. Wanting to include all the papers forced us to divide the presenters into sections, which meant that those in attendance had to make very difficult choices. This publication will allow you to read again what you heard and to acquaint yourself finally with much of what you originally missed.

We owe thanks to many, many people for their help in organizing and presenting the conference; many others also played an important role in bringing *The Proceedings of the Fourth Nebraska and Dakotas Conference on Early English Literature* to fruition. Foremost in our thanks is our fellow editor, President Robert Burns. He found the financial support necessary first to bring the conference to Peru State College and then graciously provided the additional funds required to publish the proceedings — owing to the number of papers included, the price rose substantially from that of past editions.

Terry Dugan, an English major we selfishly hope will never graduate, designed the imaginative Call For Papers and worked on the program. Julia Perry and Linda Moody provided much appreciated secretarial, organizational, and emotional support. And our colleagues, Drs. Toney McCrann, Dan Holtz, and Sara Crook shuffled their busy schedules so that they could serve as moderators for various sessions. The long and involved editing process came to a successful conclusion only because of the professional support offered by the following individuals:

At Dakota State University, Dr. John Laffin and his talented student assistant, Brenda Eitemiller, compiled without complaint the essays that arrived in various and at times frustrating formats. At Peru State College, Leigh Calfee, an English major we will miss, for she now moves on to graduate school, read with patience and skill the entire manuscript.

We thank all the preceding people and those who attended the conference at Peru State College; and we hope that you all derive special pleasure from the essays compiled here for your personal enjoyment and professional interest.

Dr. Bill Clemente
Dr. Mary Mokris

May, 1997

Table Of Contents

Quest for the Holy God: Lay perceptions of God in "The Fortunes of Men," "Maxims I," and "Metrical Charms" <i>Martha Miller</i>	1
Pictures on a wall: The story of Queen Dido <i>Elizabeth S. Watson</i>	11
Speculations on the Celtic Origins of Marie de France's "Eliduc" <i>Tamora Whitney</i>	22
Intermediality and the simulation of the pastoral in Edmund Spenser's <i>Shepherd's Calendar</i> <i>Steve Raynie</i>	29
The feminine grotesque in Pope's <i>Dunciad</i> <i>Lysbeth Em Benkert</i>	39
The Seven Works of Bodily Mercy: Evidence of possible Wycliffe influence in Pepys 2125? <i>Anita Lundy</i>	50
"The sable author...a very sensible man": Olaudah Equiano and his <i>Interesting Narrative</i> <i>Spencer Davis</i>	69
Shakespeare's lyrics: Four hundred years of song settings <i>Peggy A. Horrocks</i>	81
Between "play" and "plain and simple": Bunyan's defense of fiction <i>Robert De Smith</i>	86

The reception of Castiglione's <i>The Courtier</i> in England <i>Douglas A. Northrop</i>	98
Tragic response to the B-text of <i>Doctor Faustus</i> <i>Bruce E. Brandt</i>	106
Making Swift safe for tv: An analysis of <i>Gulliver's Travels</i> , <i>The Miniseries</i> <i>Andrew Alexander</i>	115
A return to common sense: Swift's <i>Modest Proposal</i> and modern literary criticism <i>John H. Laflin</i>	124
Clarissa's clothes <i>Dennis Ciesielski</i> <i>Margaret Duggan</i>	135
"O Death! Where is thy sting?": Tragic virtue and the anticipation of Romanticism in Richardson's <i>Clarissa</i> <i>Margaret Duggan</i> <i>Dennis Ciesielski</i>	146
Shakespeare as a political thinker: <i>Richard II</i> and the making of a new idea of kingship <i>Hyosik Hwang</i>	154
The literary lineage of Lady Dalila <i>Jay Ruud</i>	165
Milton's angels in <i>Paradise Lost</i> : Creating new beings <i>Mary Mokris</i>	186
The rubric and organization of 17th century English spiritual diary <i>Bill Clemente</i> <i>Genevieve Murray</i>	201

Quest for the Holy God: Lay perceptions of God in "The Fortunes of Men," "Maxims I," and "Metrical Charms"

Martha Miller

Wayne State University

Because much Old English literature was written and recorded by clerical scribes, it is rife with didactic representations of Christian ideas. Although Old English religious works present thoroughly Christian ideas as being embraced within Old English culture, history tells a much different story. It is impossible to assume that England's conversion to Christianity took place at one specific point in time. It must have been a much more gradual process. Pope Gregory's policies give testimony to this fact. Charles Kennedy describes Gregory's advocacy of a "gradual policy of conversion" (8). Rather than advising missionaries to completely rid England of all vestiges of its former religion and gods, Gregory counseled them to convert the old places of worship into temples to the Christian God (Grendon 143-44), thus easing Anglo-Saxons into the practices of the new religion. Anglo-Saxon religious celebrations were continued under the auspices of Christian holidays. Thus Yuletide became Christmas and the German feast of October became All-Souls (Grendon 144). While these substitutions were taking place, Anglo Saxons were in a state of religious transition.

Other factors in the prolonging of the conversion to Christianity were the training and the background of the priests. The church especially sought to convert priests of the old religion as they already held religious sway over the people (Grendon 146). These priests would have had little formal training in the new religion and it is quite possible that they incorporated Christian ideas into their earlier religious practices as they carried out their duties. Karen Jolly points out the similarity between the old and new religions when she says, "the application of spiritual power

to natural elements was as clearly evident in the Mass at it was in the medical charms" (175). Because the first missionaries sought to emphasize the similarities between Christianity and the old Anglo-Saxon religious beliefs and practices, it is possible that lay people did not perceive a great difference between the two religions.

Certainly, there was room for much variation in religious practice and belief. Obviously, lay people and even priests converted from the old religion could not be expected to have internalized all the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church. Jolly designates two types of religious camps in Anglo-Saxon culture — the formal and the popular — although she acknowledges that neither is exclusive of the other (177), as some popular practices made their way into formal religion, and as parts of formal religion such as confession became a part of popular practice (178). Although distinctions could be made between formal and popular religion, there were many areas in which these distinctions blurred.

Unfortunately, no literature from before England's conversion to Christianity survives (Stanley 8), as Anglo-Saxons had no written language in pre-Christian times. The Anglo-Saxon texts which do exist today were most likely written or copied by clerics at the direction of another church official or patron such as King Alfred. So even texts which could be considered lay poetry such as "The Fortunes of Men," Maxims I," and the "Metrical Charms" were recorded under the auspices of an established Christian religion. These texts, however, do not contain such thoroughly Christian ideas as other clerical compositions such as saint's lives. They seem to have escaped a complete Christianization and to have retained some older ideas carried over from England's former religion. An examination of these texts reveals that lay people's concepts of the Christian God included ideas other than those accepted by the formal church.

Two aspects of "The Fortunes of Men" suggest that something other than formal Christian doctrine is involved in this composition. T.A. Shippey's brief paraphrase of "The Fortunes of Men" states, "These are the fortunes of men. There is nothing to be done about them" (l 1). It seems that the primary focus of this piece is on the helplessness of man to determine or change his

own fate. Although mention of God's "miltsum" or mercy is made at the end of the poem, there does not seem to be any evidence of this mercy in the rest of the poem. The Lord controls what happens to each man, but He is not shown to be a benevolent God in many ways. He is credited with giving good things to some men, but not because of anything those men have done to please Him.

The six times that God's name is mentioned are almost extra asides in the poem. Three are in what could be assumed to be stock Christian phrases such as "god ana wat" (line 76) or "God only knows" and "mid godes meahtum" (lines 1b and 58b) or "by God's power." One mention credits God with the action of dealing out fates to men (line 65). The final two references to God are as Lord and Savior in the conclusion, which doesn't seem to fit the tone of the rest of the poem in that it presents God much more benevolently. The conclusion states that God created and allotted men's skills and deserves their thanks for this merciful action (lines 93-97). Because it does not seem to fit the previous mode of the poem, it seems possible that the conclusion and the references to God were added at a later date to Christianize the poem when recorded by a scribe. Kennedy says that the descriptive sections of "The Fates of Men" are reminiscent of ancient Germanic concepts with their stress on "hardships, the wretchedness of life, on hunger, on war and exile" (153). In spite of the Christian references, this poem has some pre-Christian motifs.

Another aspect of "The Fortunes of Men" which points to an ideology other than a Christian one is the use of the term "wyrð" in line 41 (Shippey 58). "Wyrð" does occur in Old English accounts of "tipagan" beliefs (Stanley 92), and it is possible that this reference in "The Fates of Men" is related to the earlier idea of "wyrð" as a fate which controlled men's destinies. Dorothy Whitelock argues that by the time of the recording of such poems as "The Fates of Men," the idea of "wyrð" as Fate personified, who wove a web for man, was no more than a figure of speech (qtd. in Stanley 118-119). Even so, this figure of speech implies the traces of a belief other than the Christian view.

"The Fortunes of Men" then includes a combination of Christian and earlier Anglo-Saxon ideas. This poem portrays fate as a force controlled by God. Fate once decided men's destinies, but

God has usurped that power. A lay person might understand God and fate as one and the same, a power who distributes men's gifts and fortunes without respect to their actions. This idea is very different from the accepted church view that God judges men and rewards them according to their actions.

"Maxims I" also contains concepts which seem to be a combination of Christian ideas and those of an earlier religion. Like "The Fortunes of Men," "Maxims I" also gives a realistic picture of some of the hardships of Anglo-Saxon life. The speaker or speakers of "Maxims I" seem to be resigned to man's fate, as is the composer of "The Fortunes of Men." Lines 36-37 of part C declare that the person who lives alone is friendless because fate has established that this is so (Shippey 72). However, as Shippey points out, the idea that "God helps those who help themselves" is also evident in this poem (16). Lines 26-27 of part C state that God does not take care of a faithless or reckless man (Shippey 72). And line 51 says that good is effectual and that it is with God long, or that it is close to Him (Shippey 70). These lines indicate that God rewards men for their good or bad deeds in some way.

Another specifically Christian reference in "Maxims I" credits Cain with bringing battle into the world by killing his brother Abel. Lines 64-66 state that because of this deed, men make weapons and fight battles throughout the world (Shippey 74). Either "Maxims I" has been more successfully Christianized than "The Fates of Men" or it reflects a society with a more developed sense of formal Christian ideas.

One of the few mentions in Old English of the Germanic god Wodin is also found in "Maxims I." Line 62 of part B says that Woden made idols and God Almighty made the spacious heavens (Shippey 74). Here God is directly contrasted with Woden and portrayed as greater than him. Woden, however, is still in existence; he is just less powerful than God.

"Maxims I" includes both Christian and earlier Anglo-Saxon concepts. A lay person familiar with these gnomic verses would understand God as the controller of man's fate who is able to reward the person who pleases Him. He might also view Woden as an existing god who is not nearly as influential as the Christian God.

The "Metrical Charms" provide the best evidence for the continuation of non-Christian practices in Anglo-Saxon England and for the co-existence of practices of both Christian and Germanic origin. The church's original attempt to gradually convert the Anglo Saxons to Christianity encouraged the continued use of charm magic. As could be expected, the Germanic gods were replaced by the Christian God (Grendon 143), and Christian practices were used to work the desired results.

Thus the remedies that seem magical to a modern reader were approved by the Church because they used Christian rituals and language (Jolly 171). As Storms acknowledges, if these customs had not been Christianized, they never would have been recorded (7). Still, some of these charms have very recognizable elements carried over from the former Anglo-Saxon religious practices which indicate that some lay people combined concepts of both religions in the charm rites they practiced. Three charms particularly combine Germanic and Christian ideas. They are "Wið Færstice," "Nigon Wyrta Galdor," and "Acerbot."

"Wið Færstice" or "Against a Sudden Stitch" is a performance poem (Glosecki 106) in which a doctor or shaman seeks to remove a tiny spear from his patient which is causing the patient pain. The idea of being elf-shot by such spears comes from the Germanic idea of disease-shooting which is a typical shamanic form of attack (Glosecki 119-120). It is possible that this ritual was performed by a shaman or magician because it makes reference to ecstatic travel (Glosecki 113), as the speaker claims to see the mighty women who are responsible for sending the elf-shot which he plans to send back to them in lines 7-10 (Storms 140). Other references to early Anglo Saxon beliefs are found in the mention of esa, elves, and hags. "Esa," a form of the Icelandic name "Asir", which applies to all the gods including Woden (Storms 147), is equated here with elves and hags (Glosecki 102) who were typically much less powerful spirits.

Storms points out that in Germanic lore elves and hags could be helpful as well as harmful, but Christianity considered them all devils (51). The reference to the smiths may also be a vestige of German mythology in which one smith named Weyland has supernatural powers (Storms 146). It is possible that his assis-

tance, as well as that of the other six smiths, is being called upon to help free the patient of this elf shot. Sympathetic strength is often a part of shamanic ritual (Glosecki 135), as the doctor's blade is the work of smiths, and he is using it to rid his patient of a spear which is also the work of a smith.

The final action of the doctor or shaman dipping his knife into the solution he has made is also a sympathetic one in that he confronts the disease shooters with his own iron (Glosecki 132). It is not unusual for shamanic medicines to work their effects without even coming into direct contact with the patient's body, as they work suggestively in the minds of the doctor and the patient (Glosecki 131). Interestingly enough, just before the final action of dipping the knife into the solution he has prepared, the doctor says, "Helpe ðin drighten" or "May god help you" to the patient in line 28 (Storms 142), thus incorporating a small Christian concept into a charm filled with pre-Christian ideas.

"Nigon Wyrta Galdor" or the "Nine Herbs Charm" also includes a mix of Germanic and Christian concepts. This charm describes the power of nine herbs against nine different poisons and instructs the herb gatherer to sing this charm over the herbs, and also over the person when he applies the salve he makes to a wound.

This charm uses a sympathetic analogy also as each herb mentioned is credited with some quality associated with its form or origin which the gatherer hopes will be transferred to his patient. For example, the plant called "stune" grows on stones and it is hoped that his herb will stun the poison (Glosecki 103). Two herbs, Chervil and Fennel, are even credited with special power against poison in lines 36-40 because they were created by Christ at his crucifixion (Storms 188). In the very next section of the charm, lines 41-45, Woden, the Norse god of magic and charms, makes an appearance. He takes the nine herbs and uses them to strike a snake (Storms 188). Stephen Glosecki says that this snake represents a magic shot like the disease shot of the "Wið Færstice" charm (121). This makes sense because after Woden hits the adder and it divides into nine parts, these herbs are said to henceforth have power against nine types of poisons and ailments. Christ also appears in line 58 as he is credited with having power

over diseases of every kind (Storms 190). Thus Christ and Woden are attributed with similar powers in this charm.

Two pre-Christian elements are added at the conclusion of this charm. In line 59, the person performing the charm claims to know where a stream of running water is (Storms 190). This is significant because Germanic peoples believed that running water had special powers (Gordon 120). In the final lines of the charm, the poison is blown away, and the reciter of the charm sends it to the running stream to keep it from returning (Storms 196). After the herb mixture is prepared, it is applied to the patient's wound and the charm is sung into his ears, mouth, and over the wound — all the places by which "onflygan" (or flying poisons) were thought to enter the human body (Storms 179). Thus the patient is considered to be protected from the poisons.

"Æcerbot" or "Field Ceremonies," accommodates Christian and pre-Christian elements side by side more effectively than any other of the "Metrical Charms." G. Storms agrees that several of the Christian elements in this charm were specifically chosen because they were very similar in spirit to an earlier version of the charm (178). "Æcerbot" is a charm to ensure that a field will yield a good crop and not be barren due to witchcraft or sorcery. It consists of a set of elaborate instructions, as well as formulas to be sung. Four pieces of sod must be cut from four parts of the field before dawn, a typical prime time for the practice of magic, inferring the influence of the sun cult (Storms 88). Even Christian priests took part in the ritual of this charm as the performer of this rite is instructed to have a priest sing four Masses over the pieces of sod in lines 16-17 (Storms 172). The use of an acknowledged Christian symbol such as the cross in this charm may be related to pre-Christian practices. Crosses were associated with the cult of the sun long before they were recognized as a Christian symbol (Storms 8). Because the crosses represent the power of the sun, they are buried in hope that they will transfer this power to the field (Storms 181). Storms argues that because the crosses must be made of quick beam in order to "enliven" the ground and are placed at four sides of a field, this practice is very similar to older magic practices (178), even though it includes many Christian elements.

The instruction to turn to the east before praying may also be related to sun worship, as the sun rises in the east. This idea is reinforced by the next instruction which is to turn following the sun's course three times. This action honored the sun god and was used to gain his favor (Storms 183). Next, the performer of the charm is told to lie down on the ground. This act of prostration could have served two purposes. It may have represented his desire to transfer his own fertility to the land, but this action was also considered Christian in that three prayers are recited as this point (Storms 184). Clearly practices from both religions may be involved here.

The purchasing of a mystery seed from beggars indicates another pre-Christian ceremony (Grendon 155), as the planter hopes that by giving beggars twice as much seed as they gave him, he will encourage Mother Earth to do the same thing with the seed that he plants (Storms 185). The charm which follows the placing of the seed on the plow is addressed to "Erce," which is probably a name for Mother Earth as line 54b indicates (Storms 176). Glosecki describes this part of the "Æcerbot" charm as intriguing because it 'Makes mention of both Mother Earth and God' (105). The performer prays that God will give Mother Earth an abundant harvest, although it is not clear whether the person reciting this charm is imploring Mother Earth or God for the desired results.

When the first furrow is plowed, and after another charm is recited to Mother Earth, a loaf of bread made with holy water must be buried under the first furrow in lines 75-77 (Storms 176). This is also to encourage Mother Earth to produce a good crop by reminding her of what will be offered to her when she does so (Storms 186). In the final instructions a Christian chant is added, which asks God to make the land fertile, and the performer of this charm is once again instructed to recite some Christian prayers.

The laymen who practiced these charms weren't taking any chances at offending gods they considered to have power over any aspect of their lives. This is probably why there are favorable mentions of the charm god Woden, the smiths, the Mother Earth, and references to the cult of the sun, as well as appeals to the Christian God to procure the desired outcomes in these

charms. The "Wið Færstice" charm is careful to acknowledge the power of the iron smiths and that of God, as it rejects the power of the esa, the witches and the hags as inferior powers which can be controlled by a doctor or shaman. Mother Earth and practices of the cult of the sun are present in the "Æcerbot" charm, although Mother Earth seems to be subordinate to God as the performer prays that God will give Mother Earth an abundant harvest. The relationship between God and the practices of the sun cult are more vague. They may be on equal footing, as both are respected, or it may be that practices which honor the sun god take precedence because of the importance of the timing with the sun of each of the activities in the charm. In the "Nigon Wyrta Galdor," God and Woden have quite similar influences as they are both credited with special power over poisons. Some of these ideas that existed in popular religion at certain times would be unthinkable to the hierarchy of formal religion.

Anglo-Saxon lay conceptions of God were likely to include influences of this people's former religious beliefs and practices. Because the church sought to convert the Anglo-Saxons gradually, many practices which were outside of formal religion were tolerated during England's period of conversion to Christianity. Traces of these former religious practices and ideas which give insight to popular religion can be found in Christianized lay poetry such as "The Fortunes of Men," "Maxims I," and the "Metrical Charms."

Works Consulted

- Anderson, George K. *The Literature of the Anglo-Saxons*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1949.
- Canton, William. *The Bible and the Anglo-Saxon People*. London: J.M.Dent and Sons. Ltd., 1914.
- Garde, Judith. *Old English Poetry in Medieval Christian Perspective: A Doctrinal Approach*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1991.
- Glosecki, Stephen. *Shamanism and Old English Poetry*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1989.

- Grendon, Felix. "The Anglo-Saxon Charms." *The Journal of American Folk-lore*. 22-84 (1909): 105-237.
- Jolly, Karen Louise. "Magic, Miracle, and Popular Practice in Early Medieval West: Anglo-Saxon England." *Religion, Science, and Magic: In Concert and in Conflict*. Ed. Jacob Neusner, et. al. New York: Oxford UP, 1989. 166-82.
- Kennedy, Charles W. *The Earliest English Poetry: A Critical Survey*. London: Oxford UP, 1943.
- Lee, Alvin A. *The Guest-Hall of Eden: Four Essays on the Design of Old English Poetry*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1972.
- Lapidge, Michael and Helmut Gneuss. *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England*. Cambridge UP, 1985.
- Opland, Jeff. *Anglo-Saxon Oral Poetry: A Study of the Traditions*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1980.
- Shippey, T.A. *Poems of Wisdom and Learning, in Old English*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1976.
- Stanley, E.G. *The Search for Anglo-Saxon Paganism*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1975.
- Storms, G. *Anglo-Saxon Magic*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1948.
- Wilson, James E. *Christian Theology and Old English Poetry*. The Hague: Mouton and Co., N.V. Publishers, 1974.

Pictures on a wall: The story of Queen Dido

Elizabeth S. Watson
Washburn University

Employing examples is a practice as old as the study of rhetoric, and literary examples have long been recycled. Some of them, however, have carried along with them the ghosts of their earlier contexts. For an example at once typical and unique, I have chosen to trace the case of Dido, legendary queen of Carthage, to explore ways in which her links to visual arts and the theme of the Trojan War complicate her appearance in post-classical narratives.

There are several reasons for this choice. First, Dido was, according to earliest legends, a city-builder, a clever strategist, and a model of good rule in antiquity. Some feminist critics have pointed out that when ancient women appear as examples of rulers, they are invariably portrayed as people outside the boundaries of the then-civilized world; they are barbarians or they are virile and unfeminine (Jordan 197; Millan 258); they belong to the realm of the "wild." Although this does seem to be the general pattern, and although Dido, as a North African queen, lived outside the Western world, she does not fit as neatly into the pattern as other queens do. Secondly, because of conflicting accounts of Dido, her fame sometimes resides in one version of her story, sometimes in its opposite, and sometimes in a strange or ambiguous mix of sources. The shifts in the way examples were employed may partially explain this. For Dido, however, one of the literary sources, Vergil, set in motion conflicts which undermined the stability of later Dido narratives.

As a historical personage, Dido first appears as an example along with other heroines collected in the *Strategemata* of Polyaeus, itself preserved as a fragment borrowed from an earlier (third century B.C.) Greek history (Lord 32-33). Roman and Early Christian literature provide three main versions of the Dido

story. The briefest version, Justin's, based on another lost Greek text, recounted the mythical founding of Carthage by a clever queen named Elissa some eighty years before the founding of Rome by the equally mythical Romulus and Remus. Elissa, later called "Dido" (or 'valiant'), was a good and chaste ruler, who killed herself to avoid a marriage with the Libyan king Iarbas that would have ended the autonomy of Carthage (Lord 34; Roberts-Baytop 107; Schmitz 17). This was the Dido Jerome would offer as a model of a chaste widow (Lord 35).

In their literary appropriations of the story, however, Vergil and Ovid portray a woman who gave in to passion, and they shift her back in time, departing radically from the sketchy historical accounts. Ovid's imaginary letter from Dido to Aeneas in *Heroides* VII was based on Vergil's *Aeneid*, with some changes. The miserable and abandoned Dido writes one last emotional (but not frenzied) plea before her suicide. Although she calls Aeneas false, faithless and perjuring, she does not curse him or wish him harm.

The best known literary version of the Dido story, *Aeneid*, is largely Vergil's creation. He greatly expands the story and uses it as a framework for the retelling of the Trojan War and Aeneas's flight, beginning *in medias res*. After hostile Juno dashed the Trojan ships against the Libyan coast near Carthage in a violent tempest, Aeneas is incited by his mother, Venus, to delay his mission to settle in Italy and found a new people. Dido, we learn from Venus, had been the wife of a Phoenician king, murdered at the altar of his temple by Dido's evil and lustful brother, who hid the deed, and when he could not find his victim's wealth, demanded his sister in marriage. The ghost of her murdered husband appeared to the grieving Dido in a dream, urging her to take his treasure from a secret hiding place and to flee with her faithful supporters. Dido did this, landing on the coast of what was then Libya; she bargained with the local king, Iarbas, for some land and gained enough for a small city-state through a trick — told that she could have as much land as an ox-hide would cover, she cut the hide into one narrow continuous strip to encompass her territory.

At the moment when the shipwrecked Trojan arrives in Carthage, the city is still under construction. Hidden by a cloud, Aeneas makes his way into Carthage to a temple where Dido is administering to the needs of her city and judging cases. When the mist clears and Dido meets Aeneas for the first time, she is delighted to help the Trojan she has heard so much about in stories. She holds a banquet for him, lavishes gifts on him, and hears from him everything that has so far happened on his voyage. Then, holding Cupid disguised as Aeneas's young son on her lap, she falls desperately in love. Further entertainments include the hunting expedition when Dido and Aeneas escape a thunderstorm by retreating into a cave; their liaison begins here. Dido considers herself by the laws of the time to be married; Aeneas does not.

A year later, warned by the gods to move on to his destined land, Aeneas prepares for a secret departure. Dido, however, finds out and rushes raging to Aeneas in despair, trying to persuade him to stay, and, when he will not, accusing him of being a traitor and an abuser of her hospitality. Mad with hopeless love, she first curses him, then turns to a priestess for magic to prevent his departure. In the dead of night, though, Aeneas slips with his men out of the harbor. When Dido sees the departing ships at daybreak, she approaches the pyre she has ordered built, climbs atop it, and stabs herself with Aeneas's own sword.

The Dido episode in Vergil's epic lends itself particularly well to visual representation, since it contains within it a vivid description of a work of art (ekphrasis) — a further example. When Aeneas pauses to admire the paintings of the Trojan War on the outside walls of Dido's Temple of Juno, he reacts with emotion, reliving each event as he moves along its pictures surfaces, and in some cases filling in remembered details not before his eyes (Rudd 24; Williams 150-51). Coming just before Aeneas actually meets Dido, this is the first of the constant interruptions in Dido's story. Then, at the banquet Dido hosts to honor her guest, a hymn on the origins of earth, heavens, beasts, and humans (Book I) is sung by the bard Iopas, followed by the long recounting of the fall of Troy by Aeneas himself (Books 2-3). These breaks and the pictorial and Trojan associations of the Dido story would

have structural consequences for some later adaptations of the example. Even when Aeneas encounters Dido's shade in the underworld in Book 6, what pain he feels at learning of her death is quickly forgotten when he meets the fallen Trojan heroes next.

The conflicting accounts — historical and literary — also produce differing examples: a good Dido and a bad or weak one; a heroic Aeneas and a cheating one. Vergil himself was in part responsible. In giving the Carthaginians a motive for their historic hatred of the Romans — a rivalry that would lead to the Punic Wars and Hannibal's invasion of Italy — he also made Dido's love for Aeneas appealing at the same time that he made the Trojan hero appear opportunistic and vacillating. During the Middle Ages, Western Europeans tended to sympathize with the Greek heroes anyway because of a widely read version of the Greek side of the story. Furthermore, legends sprang up around Vergil which associated him in popular imagination with witchcraft, both because of references to magic in the *Aeneid* and because his name meant 'rod' or 'wand' in Latin — like the wand of a necromancer (Spargo 443).

Vergil's Dido also appeared weak, since her story was constantly interrupted — especially by accounts of the Trojan War — her grip on government undermined, and her chastity questioned. Medieval religious literature generally treated Dido as frail in the flesh or as a temptress (Allen 443); Augustine, in the *Confessions*, admitted that as a schoolboy in North Africa, he had wept over Dido, but when he followed Aeneas' footsteps to Italy, his mother and other women came to represent to him types of Dido holding him back from full involvement in the Christian life (Fichter).

Secular literature revised, translated, and changed over and over the epic of Aeneas, always retaining affection for Dido. In England, Geoffrey Chaucer retold the tale twice, both times with sympathy for the suffering queen. However, in his *The House of Fame*, only part of the blame for her woe rests with the gods and the action of fortune; Dido was too trusting, said Chaucer, and too easily misled by appearances (Hall 156-57): she "loved al to sone a gest" (288). The Dido of Chaucer's *Legend of Good Women*, a martyr to love, is also deemed too innocent to see

through the deceptions of Aeneas. In both versions, Chaucer's Dido acts like a much younger woman than Vergil's Dido (Schmitz 34). Her governing and her city-building are played down as well; Dido as lawgiver is not even mentioned. Thus, Chaucer's Dido is more the heroine of a romance than an independent and tragic queen.

With Chaucer, we also return to the pictures on the temple wall. Dido herself is one in a list of lovers whose stories are painted on the walls of the dream temple of *The Parliament of Fowls* (289), though no details are given. Chaucer's Aeneas in *The Legend*, like Vergil's, reacts with grief to the paintings on the wall, but the episode is shortened in the medieval version and Aeneas weeps now for the shame of the fall: "Allas, that I was born!" he wails. The Trojan loss of power and wealth has been so great that the disgrace of it is painted everywhere in the world for all to see (1027-1032).

In the *House of Fame*, Chaucer puts the entire story of Dido and Aeneas on a temple wall. The narrator, in the first part of his dream vision, finds himself in a glass temple dedicated to Venus; all around him are golden images, altars, and painted portraits of Venus, Cupid and Vulcan. The story, however, is graven on a brass tablet on the wall in words rather than pictures. The narrator quotes the first four lines of an English translation of Vergil's epic, then tells the story in his own words, giving Dido the starring role. Although the story is "graven" in words, the narrator consistently speaks of seeing it rather than reading it (Ruggiers 34-37). The tempest which cast Aeneas onto Dido's shores would strike fear into anyone who saw it painted on a wall, he said (lines 209-11). Chaucer leaves out everything in the story between Aeneas debarking and Dido falling in love, because, he assures us, he has not the skill, and the story would become too long (381). By leaving out Aeneas at Dido's temple, Chaucer avoids the complications for his own story written on the wall. His narration paints the words for us. Because Chaucer is retelling a story, the original becomes lost in ambiguity, even error, and we do not know if the series of women of antiquity betrayed by men is the narrator's digression or part of the text on the bronze tablet (it comes from Ovid's *Heroides*).

The pictures on the wall raise questions about the integrity of the story. Vergil, by describing the pictures carefully, makes clear exactly how much of the story is painted — and thus how much Dido knows — and how much is missing, waiting to be filled in by an eyewitness. The painted story is a partial one. Chaucer's narrator, however, deliberately leaves out sections of the story and adds to it; his reader can always look it up in Vergil and Ovid, he comments later in the episode (376-78). For a reader who does not already know the story, there is no way to ascertain where Chaucer departs from his model to build more sympathy for Dido and to criticize traitorous men and untruthfulness. Furthermore, the narrator is left with a sense of conflicting accounts, which Sheila Delany attributes to the ambiguous nature of Fame itself (56-57, 67; also Rudd 23).

Omission was another method for shaping the Dido story. To a woman writer aware that Vergil's story was itself untrue to history, the way to rehabilitate Dido as *virago* was to drop the anachronisms. Christine de Pisan, however, found the love story too strongly entrenched to omit, and she resolved her discomfort by dividing the Dido story into two examples in *Le Livre de la Cité des Dames* (*The Book of the City of Ladies*) of 1405. The first, narrating the story up to the founding of Carthage, makes Dido a model of prudence in her city building and devotion to justice for Christine's ladies (line 1.46.3). In the second example, Dido dies as a victim of her constancy in loving Aeneas (2.55.1). Perhaps with Christine's woman-built city in mind, but without naming Dido, Georgette de Montenay honored her patron, the Queen of Navarre, as a prudent ruler and builder of religion in a sixteenth-century emblem depicting the queen in the act of laying bricks on the wall of a temple, under the motto, SAPIENS MVLIER AEDIFICAT DOMVM (34), much as the manuscript illumination created under the supervision of Christine de Pisan shows two women mortaring stones in place on the wall of their city (2).

Next, we turn to an actual painting which alludes to Dido's temple and the Dido and Aeneas story. The so-called *Sieve Portrait* of Queen Elizabeth I, now thought to have been painted by Cornelius Massys, draws on more than one classical example (Jordan, "Representing" 157). First, the sieve held by the Queen

alludes to the story of a chaste Roman named Tuccia, who proved her virtue by carrying water in a sieve. The column to the Queen's left and the globe at her right side both symbolize empire. The column, however, is covered with plaques depicting scenes from Book IV of the *Aeneid* (the abandonment of Dido). Some of these scenes are based on a Marcantonio Raimondi print copied after a lost work by the painter Raphael (Petrucci, pl.14). In the background of the painting of the Queen, courtiers stand in a passageway (or loggia) lined with columns. Although the viewer cannot see what is behind the columns, there may be paintings of Troy, which the English also claimed as legendary origin through Brutus, another fleeing Trojan. The gestures of the courtiers are reminiscent of those of Aeneas and his friend by the temple wall in the lower left-hand frame of the Raimondi print. Critics have debated whether the Queen follows the example of Aeneas as empire builder more, or whether she subsumes both Dido and Aeneas (Yates 115; Strong 68; Hazard 74). By calling attention to both the pictures within the picture and to the background scene, we can say that not only are empire building and chastity important here but also temple building (Elizabeth I as titular head of the Church of England), lawgiving, and nation building. If Elizabeth is a Dido figure in the *Sieve Portrait*, she is a Dido for whom the story stopped at the moment when Aeneas first saw her; she is the chaste queen described by Justin, the queen whose name is also Elissa. Historically, though, the painting was produced during the time (around 1580) when Elizabeth was toying with the possibility of a match with the Duke d'Alençon, a match many of her subjects considered potentially as disastrous as Dido's passion for Aeneas (Gallagher 134-35).

A ekphrastic Fall of Troy takes Aeneas at the Temple of Juno as Vergilian model: Shakespeare introduces such a painted scene into his long poem, *The Rape of Lucrece*. While the virtuous Roman Lucrece awaits the return of her husband so that she can tell him of the outrage of Tarquin's rape before killing herself, she passes time by studying "a piece / Of skillful painting" hanging on her wall (lines 1366-67) to which an artist has given "lifeless life" (1274). As Lucrece's eyes pass from one vividly described episode to another, she seek a face which will mirror her own

emotional agony; finally she finds it in the face of Hecuba, queen of Troy. Only when she sees the queen's painted tears — and knowing the story of the murders of all Hecuba's family — can Lucrece begin to voice aloud her own sorrow and desire for revenge. The assault on Troy mirrors the rape of Lucrece's body, and Lucrece foresees herself becoming an example to others (Dundas 13-14).

Finally, how does one stage the pictures on the wall in early theaters employing only minimal stage props? Dido remained a popular story. At least three Latin Dido and Aeneas plays were written in Elizabethan England; one of them, now lost, was performed before the Queen in 1564 (Roberts-Baytop 13). The only extant Latin play (by William Gager) omits the temple wall scene entirely. One school play that survived the transition to the popular stage, Christopher Marlowe's *Dido, Queene of Carthage*, reduces the artwork to a single stone statue, which Aeneas, in a physical and mental fog, mistakes for the real King Priam of Troy. Marlowe makes a number of changes and panders to Elizabethan taste by having the Libyan King Iarbas kill himself over Dido's corpse for unrequited love, followed by the suicide of Dido's sister Anna, who was in love with Iarbas.

I would also like to suggest a fragmented return to elements of the Dido story in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, from the allusion Hamlet makes about a Dido in a play he once saw — probably a university play in Wittenberg — to the tale of brother killing brother (or, in Vergil's case, brother-in-law) to gain a throne and a wife, a murder revealed through the ghost of the dead king. When Hamlet hesitates to kill his stepfather at prayer, he may not only have Christian codes in mind, but also the memory of the impiety of the murder of Dido's husband before an altar. In this reading, Queen Gertrude is a failed Dido, who does not flee from an incestuous marriage and who unknowingly marries her husband's murderer. In Gertrude's closet, the walls are hung with tapestries, although they probably do not have Trojan scenes on them. The tapestries literally (with Polonius hiding behind and probably peering through a hole) become an audience for the scene staged by Hamlet, a reversal of the temple picture's role. However, there are also pictures on the wall: the good soldier, old King Hamlet,

and the morally and visibly weak new King Claudius. Hamlet, commenting on the pictures, forces his mother to admit the difference between the two, then makes her look into a mirror at her face, the flawed surface of the glass reflecting her own spotted nature. Her weakness prevents her from seeing the ghost. Thus, even in a theater, pictures and hangings could serve to suggest moral examples with dramatic effect, while the complex Trojan example becomes a player's speech within a play rather than a pictured scene within a written text — or an engraved text set among pictures, as in Chaucer.

The Dido story carries along with it through time its own subtext, which erupts through the simpler example of the ill-fated queen like an omen of ruin. The flames of Troy eventually lead to Dido's funeral pyre — and to Lucrece's stabbing and Gertrude's poisoning. Because the example of Dido as a feminine hero is profoundly ambivalent, it tends to fracture and split open to reveal a more powerful and more masculine example beneath its surface. The pictures on the wall foreshadow Dido's fate. R. Rawdon Wilson explains the intrusions of the Dido story in both *Lucrece* and *Hamlet* as examples of "embedded narrative, always disruptive," which "perturb the dramatic actions that contain them by the intrusion of a different story. . . a further fictional world" (54-55). Is it not also possible that the fragility of Dido's tale made it readily transferable from a didactic medieval example to the rich allusiveness more typical of literature from Shakespeare and beyond?

Works Cited

- Allen, Don Cameron. "Marlow's *Dido* and the Tradition." *Essays on Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama in Honor of Hardin Craig*. Ed. Richard Hosley. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1962. 55-68.
- Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*. Ed. F. W. Robinson. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton, 1957.
- Christine de Pisan. *The Book of the City of Ladies*. Trans. Earl Jeffrey Richards. Ed. Marina Warner. New York: Persea, 1982.

- Clemen, Wolfgang. *Chaucer's Early Poetry*. London: Methuen, 1963.
- Delany, Sheila. *Chaucer's House of Fame: The Poetics of Skeptical Fideism*. 1972. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 1994.
- Fichter, Andrew. *Poets Historical: Dynastic Epic in the Renaissance*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1982.
- Gallagher, Lowell. *Medusa's Gaze: Casuistry and Conscience in the Renaissance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 1991.
- Hall, Louis Brewer. "Chaucer and the Dido-and-Aeneas Story." *Mediaeval Studies* 25 (1963): 148-59.
- Hazard, Mary E. "The Case for 'Case' in Reading Elizabethan Portraits." *Mosaic* 23.2 (Spring 1990): 61-88.
- Jordan, Constance. "Feminism and the Humanists: The Case of Sir Thomas Elyot's *Defence of Good Women*." *Renaissance Quarterly* 36 (1983): 181-20.
- . "Representing Political Androgyny: More on the Siena Portrait of Queen Elizabeth I." *The Renaissance Englishwoman in Print: Counterbalancing the Canon*. Ed. Anne M. Haselkorn and Betty S. Travitsky. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1990. 157-76.
- Lord, Mary Louise. "Dido as an Example of Chastity: The Influence of Example Literature." *Harvard Library Bulletin* 17 (1969): 22-44, ff.
- Marlowe, Christopher. *The Life of Marlowe and The Tragedy of Dido Queen of Carthage*. Ed. C. F. Tucker Brooke. 1930. Rpt. New York: Gordian, 1966.
- Millan, Betty. *The Monstrous Regiment: Women Rulers in Men's Worlds*. Windsor Forest, Berks: Kinsal, 1982.
- Montenay, Georgette de. *A Booke of Armes, or Remembrance, Wherein Ar [sic] One Hundered Godly Emblemata*. . . . Frankfurt am Main: Unckels, 1619. Microfilm.
- Roberts-Baytop, Adrienne. *Dido, Queen of Infinite Literary Variety: The English Renaissance Borrowings and Influences*. Salzburg: Institut für Englische Sprache und Literatur, Universität Salzburg, 1974.
- Rudd, Niall. *The Classical Tradition in Operation: Chaucer/Virgil, Shakespeare/Plautus, Pope/Horace, Tennyson/Lucretius, Pound/ Propertius*. Robson Classical Lectures. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1994.
- Ruggiers, Paul G. "Words into Images in Chaucer's *House of Fame*: A Third Suggestion." *MLN* 69 (1954): 34-37.
- Schmitz, Götz. *The Fall of Women in Early English Narrative Verse*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Narrative Poems and Poems of Doubtful Authenticity*. Ed. Richard Wilbur and Alfred Harbage. 1966. New York: Penguin, 1979.
- Sidney, Philip. *An Apology for Poetry*. Ed. Forrest G. Robinson. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1970.
- Spargo, John Webster. *Virgil the Necromancer: Studies in Virgilian Legends*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1934.
- Strong, Roy. *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1987.
- Vergil. *The Aeneid of Virgil*. Trans. Rolfe Humphries. New York: Scribner's, 1951.
- Williams, R. D. "The Pictures on Dido's Temple (*Aeneid* I, 450-93)." *Classical Quarterly* ns 10 (1960): 150-51.
- Wilson, R. Rawdon. "Shakespearean Narrative: *The Rape of Lucrece* Reconsidered." *Studies in English Literature 1600-1900* 28 (1988): 39-55.
- Yates, Frances A. *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.

Speculations on the Celtic Origins of Marie de France's "Eliduc"

*Tamora Whitney
Creighton University*

Although none of the Breton lais have survived in their original Celtic form or come down to us in the Breton-Gaelic, Marie de France has retold a dozen of them in Old French. In the Medieval Breton lai, "Eliduc," Marie de France indicates that the story is, "a very old Celtic tale," (1218) and that she will tell it, "at least as I've been able to understand the truth of it" (1218). The basic plot of the story is fantastic. A good and loyal knight is in exile from his own country, France, and offers his services to a king in England. There he falls in love with the princess even though he has a loyal and loving wife at home. He brings the young princess to France, but she does not survive the passage. At home, his wife discovers the girl's body, brings her back to life then joins a convent so the knight and the princess can be married with the approval of the church.

When I first read this, the resolution seemed implausible. When I taught it, my students had a similar reaction; I believe they phrased it, "No way." I realize that the role of religion was stronger and more inclusive in 1150 than it is today, but human nature has not changed that dramatically, and it seemed unnatural to me that the loving wife Guildelüec would that quickly and easily give up her husband to another woman. However, when we look at this story in the broader scope, we can see how this could occur. Marie de France is writing in the late twelfth century in a Christian country. Any story with a hero and a happy ending must have a Christian hero and a Christian happy ending. The problem with this would be that the original story was Celtic, and the ancient Celtic world which included Brittany was not Christian. In order to make the old stories acceptable to the medieval audience, the people and ideas would have to exist in a Christian framework.

The ancient Celtic society was set up differently from the medieval Christian society. Celtic society was not monogamous. Celtic warriors and chieftains had several wives and the children from all the wives were raised together. The Celtic man tended cattle, would go to battle with neighboring tribes on occasion, and would go on cattle raid when needed. On raid the man would bring back whatever cattle and horses he could, and would bring back other spoils of battle when possible. The Celtic warriors brought back heads as trophies from war, and as spoils they liked jewelry, cloth, metal, and women. The women of the tribe worked around the house, wove, cooked, tended the fires, and raised the children. A first wife was usually pleased when another wife was added to the family — it eased the burden of the work to have another wife to help around the home. If in the original ancient Celtic story Eliduc went on a cattle raid, perhaps to England (the Celts were no strangers to water travel), and came back with a princess, his first wife would be pleased. No one would have seen anything wrong with him stealing the girl away from her father. It would be a way of building up Eliduc's riches and those of his tribe. Guildelüec would have welcomed the new wife into the family as a sister-wife and asset to the home.

By the middle ages, however, the society had changed drastically. Brittany was by then a part of France, a Catholic country, and the stories, including the folktales, had to reflect that Christianity was firmly ingrained into the culture. While the Celts saw nothing wrong with stealing an English princess from her land and her father and bringing her back as another wife for a Celtic warrior, the Catholics did. If Eliduc was to be hero in a medieval French story, he needed to be Catholic and follow the rules of the Church. His character is changed from a Celtic warrior to a knight errant. His decision to steal the princess is fraught with guilt because of his loyal and loving wife, Guildelüec, at home, and because polygamy is against the rules of the Church. Instead of raiding the city for cattle and riches, the medieval Eliduc offers his services to the king; then with the full courtly tradition, falls deeply in love with the king's daughter. In medieval society stealing women is not acceptable, so Eliduc had to fall in love with Guilliadun. The courtly love tradition was full of romance

and unrequited love. Many knights did battle in the name of a lovely woman and offered to give their lives for these women even though they were not married. Of course, Eliduc was married, and that is what causes some problems. He has promised his wife that he will be true to her and will not betray her. It is stated clearly that their married is not merely arranged or of convenience: "They lived happily for several years, since it was a marriage of truth and love" (1218). To our hero's credit, the young princess Guilliadun makes the first move and comes on to him rather than the other way around, but they do fall deeply in love with each other. In the eyes of the church he is still the guilty one. He was well aware of the promises he made to Guildelüec. He had a commitment in the eyes of God to his wife. Guilliadun had made no such previous commitment, and was completely unaware of the situation Eliduc had left behind in Brittany. Our heroic Celtic warrior is not making such a true Christian knight.

After Eliduc steals the princess, and that part is left reasonably in tact, although she is a willing participant in the theft she is taken without the permission of her father, he takes her back to France. In the Celtic, as we have said, Eliduc's bringing a wife back from a raid would have been a boon, not a problem, but in the medieval this is not the case. This aspect of the story is not adequately explained. Eliduc has returned to Brittany to help his old king, then returns to England to get Guilliadun and bring her back home with him. The reader immediately assesses the problem. He already has a wife at home. This is medieval France and now two wives are not acceptable. What is he going to do with Guilliadun once they get back to France? This question is never dealt with at all. Eliduc knows that when he gets back he will have in his possession one wife too many and he never has any explanation for how he will deal with Guilliadun, or what he will say to Guildelüec, neither of whom know about the other. Divorce is not an option in this Catholic society. He has taken the other girl by force from her father, so he would not be welcome to return there. Polygamy is illegal. This problem is too big to be taken lightly, and is never appropriately dealt with in the medieval story. From the Celtic, there would be no reason for explanation because there would be no problem. Bringing a

wife back from a raid would be a good thing, but this adaptation for the medieval is not assimilated well.

On the trip home there is a terrible storm at sea. The others in Eliduc's company blame the bad luck on Guilliadun.

One of the sailors began to shout "What are we doing? My lord, it's the girl you've brought aboard who's going to drown us all. We'll never reach land. You have a proper wife at home. But now you want another woman. It's against God and the law. Against all decency and religion. So let's throw her in the sea, and save our skins" (1226).

Eliduc, not Guilliadun, is going against the law of God. This is the first she has heard of a wife at home. Eliduc is the one who has made an oath before God to be faithful and he is the one who is breaking the law. The sailor should want to throw Eliduc overboard, but Eliduc is his lord and someone else must take the blame and be the scapegoat. The old Celtic ritual of the wicker man incorporates one person dying in a ritual bonfire for the good of the others and for the crops. The druid sacrifice tradition was based on a person willingly coming to the sacrifice for the good of the others. This idea is of course also evident in Christian myth, as seen in the sacrificial lamb. The old Celtic religion was what we would consider very superstitious. A storm at sea such as this, especially coming as it did after smooth sailing, must have some cause to it. Somehow the gods of the sea must have been angered or some ritual must have been neglected or performed wrong. In the Christian retelling, the problem is that bringing Guilliadun back as a wife is going against the laws of God. From the Celtic, the explanation must be purely speculative. Perhaps Eliduc did not give proper thanks to the gods after the raid so his spoil is to be taken from him. Perhaps he angered a druid or a bard and they have called up the elements against him. He took Guilliadun away from her father who is described as a "very powerful old man" (1218). His power in the original Celtic may have been more than political; it could have been magical. By angering her father Eliduc has brought this bad luck onto himself and his companions. In their minds, the only way to rid them-

selves of this bad luck is to rid themselves of what caused it: Guilliadun. Guilliadun, "seasick and riven by what she'd just heard: that her lover had a wife at home ... fainted and fell to the deck, deathly pale; and stayed like that, without breath or sign of consciousness" (1226).

Here she has died for their good. Eliduc gets them to shore, but he is devastated by the loss of Guilliadun. He takes Guilliadun's body to the chapel of an old hermit monk who lived near his house. The Hermit has just died, but Eliduc leaves Guilliadun's body there until he can figure out how to have the grave blessed and arranged to build a church on the site to her memory. He vows that he will renounce the world the day he buries her and will enter a monastery. He does not tell his wife the reason for his despondency, but she follows him to the chapel one day and realizes the reason for his grief. At this point the modern reader expects all hell to break loose. The wife has now found out about the mistress. It seems reasonable to the modern reader to expect Guildelüec to confront Eliduc with this information and to demand reasons for his betrayal. Instead, she is as taken with Guilliadun's beauty as Eliduc was:

"She's as lovely as a jewel. She's my husband's mistress. That's why he's so miserable. Somehow it doesn't shock me. So pretty ... to have died so young. I feel only pity for her. And I still love him. It's a tragedy for us all" (1228).

This doesn't even seem right for medieval literature, human nature being what it is. A wife would surely not be this accepting of a mistress, regardless of the circumstances. Unless having another wife would be beneficial to the first wife, as it would have been in ancient Celtic society. Guildelüec would have been as upset as Eliduc was at the sorcery that occurred on the seas. Here Eliduc was bringing home the spoils of battle including a woman from good stock when she was taken from him by magic. This would have been the conflict in the original story, the loss of the girl and the attempt at restoration of Eliduc's wealth. In this story Guildelüec's page clubs a weasel so it won't run over Guilliadun's corpse. When the weasel's mate sees it dead, the live weasel picks a red flower and places it in the dead animal's mouth. The animal

is instantly restored to life. Guildelüec uses the flower to restore Guilliadun to life. The modern reader does not understand this. Why doesn't Guildelüec leave well enough alone and keep her husband to herself? What woman in her right mind would bring her husband back together with his mistress? A woman who had as much interest in another wife as her husband would. A woman who was interested in restoring to her family the wealth that was taken from them. As a matriarchal head of a Celtic family, Guildelüec would have been well-versed in herb lore and magic. She would have known what plants were helpful and which were baneful. In Celtic society the women were the healers and used the local herbs in a variety of ways. She would have known what plants would restore life and which would take life. As the true and loving wife she was, she was able to restore to her husband and their tribe that which was taken from them. So here was the crux of the Celtic story: the girl that was lost was restored and they all lived happily ever after.

In the movement to the medieval story, however, this is not an appropriate resolution. We still have one wife too many. We've got to get rid of one wife, and since we've just brought one back from the dead, it doesn't seem right to kill or banish her. Back to the idea of sacrifice, Guildelüec now offers herself as a sacrifice to God. She joins a convent so Eliduc and Guilliadun can marry with the full blessings of the Church. This ending is an obvious added resolution to appease Christian moralities which cannot bear the idea of polygamy. The only appropriate thing is for one of the wives to leave, and since divorce is not allowed, she has to leave in a way approved by the Church. Here Guildelüec becomes a nun and renounces all worldly things. Eliduc and Guilliadun do marry and live happy generous lives for many years until they too renounce the world. Eliduc joins a monastery and sends Guilliadun to his first wife Guildelüec at her convent where "Guildelüec received her as if she were her sister and did her great honor, teaching her how to serve God and live the religious life of the order. They prayed for the salvation of Eliduc's soul, and in his turn he prayed for both of them" (1230).

This ending brings the story into the scope of the medieval morality, but is obviously contrived. Stripping away the Christian

references, we get a basic Celtic plot of a warrior who leaves his wife to go on raid. He steals the daughter of a powerful foreign man, and while bringing her home he is caught in a dreadful storm during which she dies. He is despondent at her loss, as is his wife. His wife is able to bring her back to life, and they live happily together, the first wife as the wise older woman teaching the young girl about their religion, customs and lifestyle. The morality of medieval France however, could not allow this pagan situation. The theft of Christian women and the idea of polygamy were not the proper subjects for a hero, so the situations must be changed in order to bring the story into line with appropriate behavior. The warrior becomes a knight, the stolen woman becomes a willing accomplice, and the first wife sacrifices her worldly life for the happiness of her husband. They all join the religious life to live happily ever after in an ending as contrived then as it seems to us now.

Source

Marie De France, "Eliduc." John Fowles, trans, in Maynard Mack et al eds., *The Norton Anthology of World Masterpieces*, Volume 1, sixth edition. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1992, 1218-1230.

Intermediality and the simulation of the pastoral in Edmund Spenser's *Shepherd's Calendar*

Steve Raynie

University of Missouri - Kansas City

My argument for interpreting the *Shepherd's Calendar* grows out of two premises. First of all, the palimpsestual relationship that deconstructionists describe must include any illustrations or front matter among the elements which compose a certain reading. Secondly, if the *Shepherd's Calendar* is subversive to Elizabeth's court, it is not so in a simple political sense, but in the way it displays the body politic as sterile through its discovery of the *simulating* nature of apotheosis. That is, "timelessness," as utopia, requires a disjuncture from signification, a kind of death. Because calendars in general translate the passage of time into a spatial construct, they create, as Jean Baudrillard says, an "artificial resurrection, as everything is already dead and resurrected in advance" (6). In the specific case of the *Shepherd's Calendar*, the illustrations necessarily misrepresent the text because of the context-dependent nature of meaning: there can never be an equivalence between modes of signification or even among seemingly equivalent signifiers. The gap between what one expects from the text after viewing the illustration and the alteration which follows creates eddies in narrative progression, simulations of an undetectable sign which seems like utopia, like the sign itself. In removing herself from "being in" the world and in refusing marriage, Elizabeth privileges the body politic, a tactic which similarly simulates participation in the body natural. What would have been subversive would have been to represent the court as subject to time, as interested in its progress. The *Shepherd's Calendar* is not consciously subversive of the body politic but it exposes its defeat through its own failure of poetical apotheosis, through its own attempt to

structure the body natural as present in the terrain of the court in an exchange of signification which reveals the monarchy as a kind of theme park centering the absence of natural generative power.

The view of *Februarie* as a moral allegory showing the foolish short-sightedness of youth is "undercut" by the depiction of the "goodman" suspended in the act of felling the oak. Both tree and oak are being used toward an end that is beyond their control, and the woodcutter cares little for the ethical intricacies of his cutting of the tree or of the later consequence to the briar. He is disinterested and de-centered from the surface issues concerning the allegorical figures, just as in the illustration Cuddie and Thenot are spatially distant from the judgment of the ax-wielding goodman. The distance of the goodman from the moral, however, displaces the moral from the tale — he is the "executive" of the action, but not the initiator of it. In this case, the illustration stresses that which the text does not: that there is an unfathomable arbitrary agency acting independently of the reasoning of both oak and briar. Cuddie and Thenot, as well as the oak and briar, signify "the body natural" displaced from the center of the illustration and marginalized as (pre)texts for "the body politic" goodman's action. The illustration reverses the hierarchy of the way the tale is framed by centering the figures marginal to it, shaping the pastoral not, as Paul Alpers claims, an anonymous mode of "rhetorical sufficiency" in the shepherd's "simplicity and innocence" (166). Instead, the *Februarie* illustration reveals an anxiety of presence that molds the pastoral as more defensive than authoritative. In the "argument," Immerito references the illustration, describing the aged shepherd's telling of the tale as "so lively, and so feelingly as if the thing were set forth in some Picture before our eyes" (423). But the moral is ironically amoral in that the goodman is not subject to original sin because he is beyond the consequences to either oak or briar. This privileging of the telling of the tale over the tale itself suggests that the simulation of the body politic is being privileged over the body natural in an attempt to embrace the contradiction between the plaintive suit for acceptance in the simulated world of the pastoral and the lack of representation in the body natural.

Hence the rather feminine-looking "goodman" with her exaggerated vulval apron mimics the political process of Elizabeth and her court.

The *March* illustration depicts two shepherd boys who appear to be in conversation. The centering of Aries at the top of the illustration suggests sexual excess. The figure of Cupid to the left of the tree, however, seems to be frowning and his bow is not drawn. A figure to the right of the tree seems to be caught in the act of throwing a rock and to the left of the two centered figures, there is a creature caught in a net. Importantly, at opposite sides of the illustration, one sees aggression against love and its capture, read "backwards" from right to left. Again, the illustration displaces the centrality of the poetry by centering the conversants rather than the substance of the conversation. Though Thomalin and Willye contrast two kinds of love, neither type is depicted in the illustration as an aggressor, in spite of the stories told by each. Willye's story of how his father "caught" love in a "fowling net," as well as his emblem of "Of Honye and of Gaule in love there is store; / The Honye is much, but the Gaule is more" (429), when opposed to Thomalin's unsuccessful attempt to shoot Cupid with an arrow, suggests an opposition between the real and the imaginary as each simulates an attitude toward love in narrative. But *March* begins a season of concupiscence and fertility. The illustration subverts the season by simulating it as a recognition of lacking love and aggression against it rather than as the desire to surrender to it. An attempt is made to ground the simulacra of love in the body natural, but it proves impossible in the pastoral world of simulation.

Although sheep are present in the text as signifiers of responsibility, their absence from the *March* illustration (Aries the Ram?) implies that love and the utopian vector of the pastoral world are not compatible, that love must be captured or restrained in a simulation with its referent outside of itself, in the realm of the body politic or the body poetic. As E.K. says, *March* is recreative, not "creative." It echoes the sterility of the body politic by drawing attention to the disruption of order in the body natural; it transforms the hierarchy of love/(pro)create into an

alternate signification of love as subordination and death in the pastoral. As Willye relates,

Thomalin, I have no care for thy,
My selfe will have a double eye,
Ylike to my flocke and thine:
For als at home I have a syre,
A stepdame eke as whott as fyre,
That dewly adayes counts mine (37-42).

The protected space of the pastoral results in sterility through its simulation of danger in the domination of love in the body natural and by its reference through absence of the body politic as a sterile but "responsible" site. It draws on the contradiction inherent in a calendar's timeless cycles juxtaposed against the movement toward an end within it.

The illustration to *April* likewise reverses the representation of *March* by centering the simulated world of the court. Also denoted as "recreative," the "argument" specifically evokes Elizabeth: "This aeglogue is purposely intended to the honor and prayse of our most gracious sovereigne, Queene Elizabeth" (431). Rather than show the sun at its zenith, however, the illustrator places it on the horizon, either at sunset or sunrise, suggesting ambiguity in the presence of the courtly ladies when actualized in the world of the pastoral. The apotheosis of Elizabeth in Hobbinol's song, as Phoebus "blusht to see another Sunne below" (77), makes her presence only simulated in the landscape; The-not's comment that "Ah foolish boy, that is with love yblent" (155), makes her real only by her absence. She is simultaneously seen and unseen in the pastoral world, "Syrinx daughter without spotte, / Which Pan the shepherds God of her begot" (50-1). More importantly, both *Maye* and *April* depict a response to music, with *Maye's* wagon-driving Flora playing opposite the Elizabeth of the previous illustration. The association of Flora, Elizabeth, and the "musical" Pegasus undercuts the desirability of the court's simulation in the pastoral by surrounding it with the body natural of the naive Kidde from *Maye*.

Though the illustration centers Elizabeth and her ladies, it pushes the shepherds into background. Importantly, it is not

Hobbinol singing Colin's song that is represented but the simulated production of music by the court which is not present in the text. All of the ladies, Elizabeth included, have their backs turned against the pastoral landscape and are not in the least bit attentive to its activity. Elizabeth and her ladies seem as if they are about to play their own music, their own simulation of the pastoral that competes with Hobbinol's singing. The sceptered figure does not supervise the shepherds; she is present in the landscape without taking part in its action. That Phoebus hides when faced with Elizabeth's apotheosis suggests an interruption of the body natural, a promotion of the body politic that dominates the terrain of the illustration. The illustration is (re)creative through contrast; the foregrounding of the stiff and elaborately dressed court figures counteract the smooth and relaxed postures of the shepherds in the background. Hobbinol's appropriation of Colin's song in the text recalls the constructedness of the landscape; the court ladies are unable to participate in the simulation of the pastoral even though they dominate it. Like *March*, the apotheosis and simulation of the body natural becomes the body politic, revealing unrequited love as a form of sterility and non-presence.

Like the moral tale of *Februarie*, the illustration to *Maye* relegates the allegory of the narrative to the fringes of its space. In the center of illustration, a wagon drawn by a winged horse is ringed by male and female dancers. The sun sits on the horizon, creating uncertainty whether it is dawn or dusk. Although the time of year might imply that it is dawn, the connection with the text in terms of the allegory of the Kidde and the Foxe skew the possibility of a straightforward interpretation. The center of the text is the allegory, while in the illustration, it occurs on the margins. The sequence of action begins on the right with the Gate speaking to her Kidde, moves to the left across the May dancers to left side for the temptation scene, and then to the upper left for the Foxe's escape. The illustration undercuts the moral message of the allegory by promoting the festivities of May (or dawn), but also reinforces the moral message by surrounding the festivities with death (dusk). The dancers and the wagon are a "pretext" for the moral, making its force less real, a simulation

of death. The Foxe's trick with the mirror lures the Kidde to its death through blindness to it. But the presence of Pegasus in the illustration foregrounds the moral of the narrative by placing it in the utopian world of the court, in the terrain of death as not death, pastoral in that it is mythopoeic, removed from generation and procreation. The winged horse, unmentioned by the text, recalls not only Pegasus' help in the slaying of Chimaera, but the founding of the Hippocrene. The court can only simulate generation through the body politic, referring to the pastoral as a site of sterility, condemning the presence of the body natural as a "gate-way" to sin.

The illustration to the last moral tale, *October*, also shows two shepherds, but the one on the left seems classically garbed and has a laurel wreath crowning his head. The buildings to the left are likewise of classical design and the figures gathered near them suggest that these buildings are not in the past but used in the present. The pipes he presents to the shepherd on the right are Pan pipes rather than the English models previously shown. The shepherd on the right points toward the Pan figure in a manner similar to the attitude of Hobbinol in the previous illustration. The birds in flight seem to be leaving the building, flying in a line down toward the horizon. Both shepherds have sheep, and the ones belonging to the shepherd on the right seem hunched together defensively. The text points out that the debate is between two modes of poetry, one that "is a divine instinct and unnatural rage passing the reach of comen reason" (459) and one that "restraine [s] / The lust of lawlesse youth with good advice" (21-2) with "dapper ditties." But the shepherd on the left seems to resist this apotheosis of the poet, the raising of his poetry to the level simulation in the pastoral. Piers' advice to "Abandon then the base and viler clowne" (37) demands the expulsion of love from the mythopoeic:

All otherwise the state of Poet stands,
For lordly love is such a Tyranne fell:
That where he rules, all power he doth expell.
The vaunted verse a vacant head demaundes,
Ne wont with crabbed care the Muses dwell:
Unwisely weaves, that takes two webbes in hand
(97-102).

The text makes no mention of classical buildings or of the casting of Piers as a Pan-like figure. But Cuddie confronts the stylized world of the court, the simulation that, like the buildings, seem to be inhabited but are in fact, artifacts of the past, dead and sterile. The pastoral only *seems* more real because the rustic lyric tries to simulate unskilled spontaneity rather than overtly represent the paradise referenced by the (dis)simulation of the court. The illustrations are elements of the simulation, making the pastoral appear just over the horizon, deferring signification of the moral eclogues by marginalizing their content. But simultaneously, the attempt to frame the moral removes it to a similar realm of apotheosis, to a space that is also not real.

The last of the recreative illustrations, *August*, centers three main figures, one of whom plays a pipe. A spotted lamb stands in the foreground, and a mazer lies at the feet of the pipe-playing shepherd. In the left background, a female figure (perhaps the missing Rosalinde) examines herself with a mirror, and behind her, three farmers bind sheaves. In the text, the song of Willye and Perigot stands in sharp contrast to the lament sung by Cuddie. The posture of the seated Cuddie suggests lordship, and the space inhabited by the three shepherds seems manicured and artificial. The illustration confirms the theatrical narrative posing of the figures, and the extended dialogue makes this eclogue seem more like a skit than a spontaneous activity. The female figure to left gazing in the mirror further confirms the dramatic aspect, and while Perigot and Willye seem spontaneous in their song, Cuddie pulls the group down into a dark mood. Aside from the spotted prize sheep, there are no other animals in the illustration; the shepherds are not actively keeping track of their flocks, but have abandoned them for song. The triangular arrangement of the two prizes and Cuddie seem to confirm his rule here, but the screening bushes which hide the horizon limit his judgment to the immediate area. There is a sense of illusion and contradiction; of judgment followed by a complaint. The interior framing of the illustration suggests that this small slice of lawn is perhaps really part of the court; the female figure off to the side would seem to confirm that this world is one determined by simulation rather than rustic simplicity — surely the mazer is too

elaborate a gift for a shepherd to possess. Like the *April* illustration, it introduces the court into the pastoral world, but here it is far less obtrusive.

The hat of the shepherd on the left is unlike the hat of any of the other shepherds depicted: it looks rather ecclesiastical. Another sign that this world is not the pastoral is the cloth or blanket upon which Cuddie sits; not mentioned in the text, it seems of some elaborate design. The recreative eclogues aim at simulating the court through the pastoral, a move which the plaintive eclogues acknowledge as barren. The moral eclogues are likewise unsuccessful in replacing the simulation of the court because they too are simulations. The realization is that while the currency of the pastoral and the currency of the court might be of equivalent value in terms of simulation, both are sterile worlds. The illustrations by themselves only posit the existence of the pastoral, inviting the reader to consider its operation in the following lines. But they simultaneously undercut it because in exposing the apotheosis of the court as a simulation, the alternative is also simulated. The poet is both successful and unsuccessful in grounding the poetry through the simulation of the illustrations; at crucial points, they undercut the reader's attempt to create meaning from the text, exposing the artifice of the body politic while trying to simulate it through poetical apotheosis.

Because Spenser has dissipated meaning by subdividing authorship, no account of intention is possible. Still, the creation of meaning or acting in the world mandates temporal progression. The illustrations of the *Shepherd's Calendar* do not represent the pastoral in the sense that they are "companion" prints for the text. Rather, they circumscribe an intermedial terrain where a substitution of signifiers occurs prior to entering the utopia of the pastoral, defined by Louis Marin as a "fragment of the ideological discourse realized in the form of myth or a collective fantasy" (294). The illustrations negotiate an exchange between the currency of poetry and the currency of the court, a move which recognizes the marginality of both while questioning the desirability of inhabiting either. The attempt through illustration to make the pastoral synchronic, and therefore outside of the *Calendar's* movement, fails. The drive by the

poet to resolve the competing simulations of the body poetic and the body politic in the pastoral subvert the court only because the pastoral is also exposed as a simulation; as such, it is not directly subversive of Elizabeth's political apotheosis, but attempts to endorse it partially through the intermedial exchange of signs. The subversion lies in the poet's failure. While seeking to legitimize its currency, the *Shepherd's Calendar* only arrives at the emptiness of its simulation.

References and Works Cited

- Alpers, Paul. "Pastoral and the Domain of Lyric in Spenser's *Shepherd's Calendar*." *Representing the English Renaissance*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt. Los Angeles: U of California P, 1988.
- Barthes, Roland. *S/Z*. Trans. Richard Miller. New York: Noonday Press, 1974.
- Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulacra and Simulation*. Trans. Sheila Faria Glaser. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1988.
- Blank, Paula. "The Dialect of the *Shepherd's Calendar*." *Spenser Studies* X (1989): 71-93.
- Bryson, Norman. "Intertextuality and Visual Poetics." *Style*. XXII (1988): 183-93.
- Hill, O.G. *The Manor, the Plowman, and the Shepherd: Agrarian Themes and Imagery in Late Medieval and Early Renaissance England*. Cranbury, New Jersey: Susquehanna Press, 1993.
- Ivins, William M. *Prints and Visual Communication*. 1953. Cambridge, Ma.: The M.I.T. Press, 1970.
- Lane, Robert. *Shepherds and Devises: Edmund Spenser's Shepherd's Calendar and the Institutions of Elizabethan Society*. 1993.
- Marin, Louis. "Disneyland: A Degenerate Utopia." *Contemporary Literary Criticism*. Ed. Robert Con Davis and Ronald Schleifer. 3rd ed. New York: Longman, 1994. 283-95.
- Panofsky, Erwin. "Comments on Art and Reformation." *Symbols in Transformation: Iconographic Themes at the Time of the*

- Reformation*. Ed. Hedy Backlin-Landman and Barbara T. Ross. Princeton : Princeton Printing, 1969. 9-14.
- Spenser, Edmund. "A Theatre for Worldings." *The Works of Edmund Spenser*, vol. 2. Ed. Edwin Greenlaw, Charles Grovenor Osgood, Frederick Morgan Padelford, et al. Baltimore : Johns Hopkins UP, 1947.
- Spenser, Edmund. "The Shepherdes Calendar." *The Poetical Works of Spenser*. Ed. J.C. Smith and E. De Selincourt. 1912. London : Oxford UP, 1961.
- Wagner, Peter. *Reading Iconotexts: From Swift to the French Revolution*. London : Reaktion Books, 1995.
- Whipp, Leslie. "Weep for Dido: Spenser's *November Eclogue*." *Spenser Studies* XI (1990) : 17-30.

The feminine grotesque in Pope's *Dunciad*

Lysbeth Em Benkert
Northern State University

Readers variously describe Alexander Pope's *Dunciad* as grotesque, incongruous, obscene and disgusting. No doubt this is all true, just as it is true that Pope used this imagery in order to vilify those writers and critics who had attacked either his writing or his person over the course of his career. Conversely, just as critics agree that Pope did not write *The Dunciad* solely as delicious revenge, Pope did not construct his images through simply describing the disgusting and filthy. Pope constructs his portraits carefully by building imagery into an intricate grotesque, that grafts onto men exaggerated feminine stereotypes. By instilling men with these so-called feminine vices, he manages one more inversion in a world turned upside down by animalistic caricature and parodies of classical literature. His portraits in this way become further exaggerations, since those foibles society viewed as unpleasant or trivial in women became disgusting and dangerous when manifest in men.

The grotesque, at best, can only vaguely be described as an attempt to mesh together into one image elements which cannot be reconciled. It includes nearly anything unexpected, much that is shocking, and a great deal that is perverse. In modern western culture, the rediscovery and excavation of Nero's "Golden Palace" in Rome at the end of the fifteenth century reintroduced the grotesque to popular tastes. These rooms contained fantastical wall and ceiling frescoes.¹ The presumed artist, Fabullus, covered the walls with intricate designs which began as vegetation and ended in animal shapes. They twined over the plaster: art for art's sake. Their only purpose appeared to be delicate and ostentatious decorations.² Artists of the Renaissance popularized the style, calling it *grotesche*, and the grotesque became associated

with darkness, caverns and the underground because the only access to these paintings came through a descent into buried rooms.³

Once the form became popularized, however, it came to inhabit a nebulous realm between meaning and meaninglessness; because of this, opinions about it were often quite ambivalent. The grotesque occupies a "no man's land" between semiotic system and chaos, and because of this, seems somewhat threatening.⁴ It offers compelling images that promise equally compelling interpretations, a promise which it often, seemingly invariably fails to fulfill. This ambiguity invests the grotesque with an artistic power matched by little else. Its "yoking violently together" of images is emotionally compelling because it pushes at the boundaries of social intercourse in order to create new meaning, or, at least, it seems to promise this creation. Because of this promise, the grotesque both fascinates and repulses its viewers. This compelling ambiguity combined with its association with dark, cavernous places made it a natural vehicle for visual portrayals of hell. In fact, hell offers the ultimate in grotesque, where nothing is what it ought to be, and, because God's absence, nothing makes any sense, though it may tease with the promise of meaning.

The basis of Pope's grotesque imagery derives in large part from the freak shows and madhouses that were popular attractions during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Popular culture thrived on the bizarre claims of degraded humanity, such as Mary Toffees's claim that she had given birth to rabbits, a claim Pope ridicules in *The Discovery, or, The Squire Turn'd Ferret*.⁵ Yet, while Pope draws on examples of popular culture readily available to him, he never adopts them wholesale. Instead he alters those images to highlight the reduction of humanity to its animal nature, often by drawing on the various stereotypes of and cultural myths about women, an addition effective because of society's revulsion for the man who becomes a woman.⁶

The myths surrounding women in the eighteenth century were often contradictory and mostly unflattering.⁷ Reflecting the essential ambiguity of the age toward women, these myths portrayed women at once as the pillars of spirituality and as highly sexual beings.⁸ Ellen Pollock documents how the ideal for

women slowly became, over the course of the eighteenth century, one of "cultivated passivity."⁹ At the same time, however, a prominent Augustan opinion stated that "women universally possess unregenerate natures which irredeemably condemn them to lives of vanity and ignorance."¹⁰ Insecurities about the position of women in society manifested themselves in the common view of women as proud and fond of exhibitionism.¹¹ Out of these stereotypes came the stock characters of the prude, the coquette, the censorious woman and the scold.¹²

Felicity Nussbaum also finds a pervasive myth of women's inconstancy and inability to reason that accuses them of striving for advanced learning only for their own self aggrandizement. Inconstant, self-centered, and affectedly witty, the female sex often attempts to outshine men when it should only reflect the light of the superior sex.¹³ Women, much more so than men, were prone to the error of misplaced wit, resulting from their susceptibility to fancy and vanity.

Pope's reliance on negative gender stereotypes surfaces in works like *Jane Shore*, "Epistle to a Lady," and *The Rape of the Lock*. In "The Rape," Belinda's primping and autoerotic love represent those failings to which women are most prone. They transform Belinda into "the embodiment of self-enclosed narcissism."¹⁴ Her primping has as its objective not pleasing men, but gaining power over them; her card-playing grows into a power game instead of a pastime; her flirtations surface as another gamble for power, rather than as a bid for marriage. As such, her characterization capitalizes on the common gender stereotype of women as sexual and self-serving individuals. Her inability to successfully resist her assailant reveals her pride as the pretentious self-delusion it is.¹⁵ Ariel, Belinda's protecting sylph, also evolves out of these sexual myths. She is the false prude, whose only interest in chastity is because it allows her some measure of power, not because of any true religious devotion.

Pope's ridicule of women surfaces primarily when they presume to cross over into the realm of male prerogative. It is this that makes their portraits truly grotesque — the marriage of socially incompatible images, the head emerging from the end of the vine, the woman presuming to speak with a man's voice.

Belinda is grotesque because of her insistence on her physical independence despite her "innate female weakness." She dreams of public power as she primps in her boudoir. In the "Epistle to a Lady," grotesque images emerge from the images of women who refuse to dwell within their limitations, but instead, attempt to become more man-like, to speak publicly and to influence public opinion. For Pope, women who speak publicly become hermaphrodites, and as such are more like the curious beasts of Bartholomew Fair than women.

Even as they attempt to gain autonomy, however, both within Pope's discourse and without, women exert little control over the public discourse in eighteenth century culture. As keepers of the domestic rather than the economic sphere, they present little threat to English society as a whole. Because of this, the images of women Pope constructs are dismissible, trivial rather than threatening. In the end, Belinda is a threat only to her own reputation, and the bluestockings portrayed in the Epistle to a Lady can only embarrass themselves, as Pope portrays them as having little impact on society at large.

Yet some of Pope's most effective uses of female stereotypes appears in his satires of men. In his "Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot," Pope renders a picture of Sporus as a grotesque cross between a man and a woman, combining the most negative imagery from both:

Let Sporus tremble-What, that thing of silk?
 Sporus, that mere white curd of Ass's milk?
 Satire or Sense alas! can Sporus feel?
 Who breaks the Butterfly on the Wheel?
 Yet let me flap this Bug with gilded wings,
 This painted Child of Dirt that stinks and stings;
 Whose Buzz the Witty and the Fair annoys,
 Yet wit ne'er tastes, and Beauty ne'er enjoys,
 So well-bred Spaniels civilly delight
 In mumbling of the Game they dare not bite.

Whether in florid Impotence he speaks,
 And, as the Prompter breathes, the Puppet squeaks;

His Wit all see-saw between *that* and *this*,
 Now high, now low, now Master up, now Miss,
 And he himself one vile Antithesis.
 Amphibious Thing! that acting either Part,
 The trifling Head, or the corrupted Heart!
 Fop at the Toilet Flatt'rer at the board,
 Now trips a Lady, now struts a Lord.
 Eve's Tempter thus the Rabbins have exprest,
 A Cherub's face, a Reptile all the rest;
 Beauty that shocks you, Parts that none will trust,
 Wit can creep, and Pride that licks the dust. (11 305-33)

The attack on Lord Hervey relies on feminine stereotypes for much of its effect. Hervey becomes guilty of the most vile of female failings. The portrait is one of "gutless androgyny."¹⁶ He possesses a woman's "silk" softness, her self-centered emotionlessness, her "gilding" and "painted" looks, the "Buzz" of her uncontrolled talkativeness, her "Spaniel-like" defenselessness, her "Amphibious" inconstancy, as well as the "Beauty that shocks you [and] the Parts that none will trust." Although the portrait includes elements of the traditional grotesque, such as the blending of the reptile and cherub, the portrait depends heavily on the feminization of Sporus; for its satiric effect Pope reduces Hervey to a grotesque hermaphrodite, much like the women he treats — Sporus is a man, but yet not a man. Just like the feminine, curling vines of Fabullus's frescoes that end in a man's face, Pope creates his grotesque portrait of Hervey by grafting together what should be incompatible images, until Hervey is a gilded, feminine man/child, an inconstant Lady-Lord. The melding of these images depicts a man particularly contemptible because, unlike a woman, Hervey has the capability of reason, but chooses to follow a woman's way of inconstant reason. In this portrait, he becomes the image that promises the creation of reason (or a decision) yet fails to produce.

This grafting of the feminine onto the masculine contributes in large part to the effectiveness of the grotesque in *The Dunciad*. By describing the dunces as falling prey to vices to which women are seen as particularly susceptible, Pope belittles them in a way not possible had they been allowed to maintain their masculine dignity.

Nearly all of the traits capitalized on by Pope can be traced back to these feminine stereotypes.¹⁷

The links between the dunces and female sexuality are set up at the start of the poem through Pope's creation of the goddess Dulness. Pope blends the negative eighteenth-century stereotypes of women with the most infamous traits of ancient goddesses in order to turn their life-giving potentialities into Dulness's darkness, triviality and abortion. In this way, Pope sets the dunces beneath the rest of mankind by making them subject not to God, the Father, but to a goddess who embodies all of the worst characteristics of the female myth. Her images gather to her the orgies of ancient fertility rites along with the frenzied, violent celebrations of Cybele and her eunuchs dressed as women.¹⁸ By association, Cibber/Theobald becomes Dulness's chief worshipper, and a close parallel to Attys, Cybele's mythological priest who castrated himself in her service. In this case, however, the "high priest" cuts himself off from true wit, a distinctly masculine trait in the eighteenth century.

As the games begin in Book II Pope portrays the gamesters as inversions of their classical models not only in their complete lack of dignity, but in their lack of masculinity as well. The games open with a race between men to whom athleticism is a foreign term. Curl in his chase for the phantom author, runs "as when a dab-chick waddles thro' the copse / On feet and wings, and flies, and wades, and hops" (1742.II.64-3). At the same time, his opponent, "huge Lintot" runs behind:

So laboring on, with shoulders, hands, and head,
Wide as a wind-mill all his figures spread,
With arms expanded Bernard rows his state,
And left-legg'd Jacob seems to emulate. (1742.65-69)

The exhibitionist tendencies of the dunces in Book II particularly mark them as effeminate. Women were often complained against for their sexually-related exhibitionism, and this trait is repeatedly emphasized in this section of *The Dunciad*. Theobald in the 1729 and Cibber in the 1742 versions are marked by the "jealous leer" in their faces (6). Curl and Osbourn are graphically depicted as they attempt to display their sexual potency in the p — ing contest.

Perhaps the longest example of the dunces' exhibitionism, however, is the diving contest, in which Dulness exhorts her worshippers to "strip, my children! here at once leap in" (1729.275). Oldmixon steps up "In naked Majesty," and Smedley returns from the deep with tales of the beautiful mud nymphs who fell in love with him (325-36). The second book closes with a picture of Norton Defoe's "never-blushing head." The dunces are quite proud of themselves, and vie with one another for their mistress' full attention. Defined by her gaze, Pope sets them on the same level with women who are defined by the opinion/gaze of men.

Their pride, selfishness and exhibitionism clearly mark the dunces as irrational and tending toward insanity. Such a link serves as a crucial foundation of Pope's satire. Dulness, herself, has already been associated with Bacchanalian frenzy, but in addition to these classical links, Pope explicitly portrays the dunces as mad. Their actions are dominated by fancy and the imagination, traits consistently identified by the eighteenth century as feminine, rather than the masculine quality of right reason. While the dunces' participation in the games alone marks them as irrational, in the later version of the poem, Pope takes care at the start to remind the reader of "Great Cibber's brazen, brainless brothers," those statues standing at the front of Bedlam which his father had carved for the institutional Cibber's kinship with madness is maintained throughout the poem, both through his own actions and those of his subjects.

One powerful image of their closeness to insanity surfaces during the dream states of Theobald and Cibber. The dream state places the individual closest to the imagination, and farthest from the control of the reason proper. Although dreaming is a state experienced by all, David Morris argues that Cibber's dreams indicate an affinity for the fanciful greater than that of sane men. Cibber's dreams affirm the visions of his waking self so that "the dream becomes a component of madness."²⁰ Waking and sleeping are one and the same for the king of dunces. The same could be said of Theobald in the earlier version of the poem, as Book III opens with a picture of the sleeping laureate while

Him close [Dulness] curtain'd round with vapors blue,
And soft besprinkled with Cimmerian dew.

Then raptures high the seat of sense o'erflow,
Which only heads, refined from reason, know.
Hence, from the straw where Bedlam's Prophet nods,
He hears loud oracles, and talks with Gods. (3-8)

A dunce is unreasonable, irrational, and subject to the hallucinations of that most female of failings, fancy.

They are also more prone to the ravages of pride. Cibber turns away his face as Settle praises the future glory of his reign, but Pope carefully points out Cibber's "ne'er blushing head." Cibber's pride, Morris argues, is "the center from which radiates the ultimately annihilating power of madness: just like Belinda at her dressing table."²¹ In comparing Cibber to Belinda, Morris says more than he knows, for he inadvertently points out that Cibber's failing is, in Pope's scheme, a woman's defect. While essentially trivial in Belinda, however, these failings threaten the end of polite society and learning when they appear in those responsible for public discourse. These images are not just disgusting; they are, in fact, much more compelling than plain grossness. They fascinate because they link together culturally irreconcilable images — a man with a woman's failings. Rather than giving his Bottom the head of an ass, Pope has given him the head of a woman. In so doing Pope demonstrates the hell-like chaos generated by publishers and writers who, though responsible for generating meaning, fail to do so.

These issues are to a great extent complicated by what some critics have seen to be Pope's ambivalence towards the dunces and their real-life models. They are at once laughable and dangerous. Emrys Jones has convincingly shown that the dunces have a child-like quality about them. As they take part in the games of Book II no hint of malice between them appears. There is, in fact, an air of naive simplicity about their play, no awareness of embarrassment in their actions as they strip naked in a public street in order to plunge into Fleet Ditch, no awkward hesitation as Curl and Osbourn have a p—ing contest in the middle of the street.²² Conversely, even if they are children, they pose a terribly real threat to Pope's concept of learning, knowledge and the construction of polite society. Book IV predicts the destruction of all civilization, hardly the logical product of harmless

children. Dennis Todd argues that the *Dunciad* rests on the paradox that the power of the dunces lies in their triviality, in their inability to move an audience to the sublime passions of Homer.²³ However, their real power may, in fact arise from the grotesque grafting of this triviality onto the masculine producers and controllers of public discourse. As poets and members of the publishing community, these men hold uniquely masculine places in society. They are, in a sense, the arbiters of taste, and wield very real control over the marketplace of ideas. Yet while they represent public, masculine discourse, they fail to produce meaning for or within society. The promise of their texts becomes lost in a sudden curlicue of feminine abandon. The emotional power Pope creates in the *Dunciad* emerges out of the grotesque juxtaposition of these contradictions — the power of discourse wielded by the feminine.

In working with the available semiotic systems, Pope creates images of men far more complex and far more satirically effective than if he had relied on the purely gross or the plainly disgusting. By grafting female stereotypes onto male characters, Pope is able to draw on the strongly prejudicial, radically contradictory attitudes his era held about women not just to trivialize his satiric victims, but to emphasize their potential to distort the social fabric. just as the best woman is a "softer man," the worst man is a harder woman. By extension, just as the worst woman is annoying and potentially embarrassing, the worst man can disrupt polite society altogether.

End Notes

- 1 Geoffrey Galt Harpham *On the Grotesque: Strategies of Contradiction in Art and Literature* (Princeton: Princeton U P, 1982), 23.
- 2 *Ibid.*, 25.
- 3 *Ibid.*, 27.
- 4 *Ibid.*, 31.
- 5 Roger D. Lund, "Pope's Monsters: Satire and Grotesque in *The Dunciad*," in *The Scope of the Fantastic — Culture, Biography, Themes, Children's Literature: Selected Essays from the First International Conference on the Fantastic in Literature and Film*,

- ed. Robert A. Collins and Howard D. Pearce, 61-78 (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1985), 62.
- 6 See that woman's book on the theater in 18th C England.
- 7 Ellen Pollak, *The Poetics of Sexual Myth* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1985). By "myth" Pollak refers to "literary and epistemological structures by which certain propositions about the phenomenal world... are made to seem outgrowths of the natural order," 4.
- 8 *Ibid.*, 5.
- 9 *Ibid.*, 42.
- 10 *Ibid.*, 42-3.
- 11 *Ibid.*, 59.
- 12 *Ibid.*, 66.
- 13 Felicity Nussbaum *The Brink of All We Hate: English Satires on Women: 1660-1750* (Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1984), 148.
@WORKS CITED = 14 Pollak, 78.
- 15 *Ibid.*, 79.
- 16 Clive T. Probyn, "Pope's Bestiary: The Iconography of Deviance," in *The Art of Alexander Pope* (NY: Barnes and Noble, 1979), 222.
- 17 Catherine Ingrassia gives a thorough treatment of Pope's portrayal of women in *The Dunciad*, and how this portrayal reflects "Pope's escalating fear of a pervasive 'feminization' that threatens to permeate nearly every aspect of English culture", in "Women Writing/Writing Women: Pope, Dulness, and 'Feminization' in *The Dunciad*, Eighteenth Century Life (November 1990): 40. When read in this context, Dulness comes to represent the, "feminization" of the age in its increasing dependence on financial speculation and the commodification of literature. Pope's portrayal of Eliza Haywood replaces a transgressive female author to her properly passive, child-bearing, rather than text-producing, woman's role. The dunces themselves are revealed as effeminately dependent on their mother Dulness for both their sustenance (economic and otherwise) and their self-esteem. In light of this argument, one can see how Pope builds on these essential underpinnings to create his feminizing grotesquerie.

- 18 Thomas C. Faulkner and Rhonda L. Blair, "The Classical and Mythographic Sources of Pope's Dulness," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 43 (1980): 213-46; Douglas Brooks-Davies, *Pope's Dunciad and the Queen of Night: A Study in Emotional Jacobitism* (Manchester, UK: Manchester U P, 1985).
- 19 Davis B. Morris, "The Kinship of Madness," *Philological Quarterly* 51 (1972): 813-31.
- 20 *Ibid.*, 821.
- 21 *Ibid.*, 826.
- 22 Emrys Jones, "Chatterton Lecture on an English Poet: Pope and Dulness," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 54 (1968): 253.
- 23 Dennis Todd, "The 'Blunted Arms' of Dulness: The Problem of Power in *The Dunciad*," *Studies in Philology* 79 (1982): 194.

The Seven Works of Bodily Mercy: Evidence of possible Wycliffe influence in Pepys 2125?

Anita Lundy

University of Missouri - Kansas City

Pepys Manuscript 2125 contains both prose and verse of the fourteenth century, mostly in English. Because of its similarity to the BL Harley 2398, "which served as the direct exemplar for two of 2125's more unusual texts," Pepys 2125 is believed to have originated in or near Gloucestershire. Much of Pepys Manuscript 2125 is still unpublished, offering challenges and rewards to the researcher. The following essay is based on my transcription of Pepys MS., ff. 102r - 102v, pertaining to the seven bodily works of mercy, poverty and worldly goods. All definitions and accompanying citations are from the *Middle English Dictionary (MED)*. A copy of my transcription, with explanatory notes, is located in the Appendix.

It is my belief that parts of the manuscript, particularly that transcribed by Scribe C, contain strong Wycliffite influences. There has been little work done on this topic, and only vague inferences have been made by manuscript catalogers Rosamund McKetterick and Richard Beadle suggesting a possible Wycliffe connection. The approach I have taken is from a textual and linguistic basis formulated from the transcription I made of ff. 102r-102v of the manuscript under the direction of Dr. Voigts. Based on my transcription, I have found numerous references that are of possible Wycliffite origin. The evidence includes specific vocabulary as well as rhetorical devices employed by Wycliffe and his followers in the late fourteenth century.

For purposes of this paper, I have divided the examination of my thesis into two main areas. First, I will review the significant historical and religious factors relating and leading up to the late

fourteenth century. Second, I will closely examine the textual evidence within the Pepys manuscript.

Historical Background

Knowledge of the religious events of the late fourteenth century adds greatly to the reader's understanding of the text's specific references to secular and monastic lifestyles, and provides the framework for the possible Wycliffite connection to the text. Limitations of space forbid a detailed discussion of this topic; the following is a brief overview of the significant factors as related to the changing religious attitudes of the late fourteenth century. The late fourteenth century was a time of great change in England, but especially with regard to religious movements and assumptions of religious and secular life. Following the Black Death and during the Great Schism, many questioned the role of the church and sought alternatives to existing religious orders to serve the changing needs of the pious.

M. D. Knowles comments extensively about the relaxed discipline in the monasteries of this period. Knowles states that towards the end of the fourteenth century a considerable change was visible in the dealings of the Roman Curia with individual religious. Requests for privileges during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries were generally channeled between abbots, priors, or the prelates and their communities, and the pope. The privileges often included "papal protection or confirmation, the bestowal of exemption or of the *pontificalia*, the granting of indulgences or the remissions of papal taxes." As a result, the individual monk had no direct contact with the Curia except through his religious superior. Gradually, these traditions began to be reversed, in part owing to the "mechanization of all administrative departments of the Curia during the period of residence at Avignon, (and) partly owing to the increasingly materialistic outlook of the papal bureaucracy." As a result, individuals within the Church began to attain privileges at an unprecedented rate.

Two religious privileges granted during the late fourteenth century proved especially destructive to monastic life: appointment as papal chaplain, and permission to hold a benefice. The

papal chaplaincy allowed the holder exemption from regular life and obedience. The disruption to monastic life was affected to a greater degree with the granting of permission to hold a benefice with or without the cure of souls. A benefice is a permanent form of ecclesiastical living which could be granted not only to a monk, but also to a secular prelate or layman. According to Knowles, the result of these privileges was a turning point in the development of monastic orders:

Such a privilege not only broke the ties of the religious life, but reversed the secular policy of the papacy, which had indeed often permitted and even encouraged monks to evangelize a pagan country, but which had hitherto consistently distinguished between the monastic orders and the benefice-holding secular clergy.

Clearly, as a result of these privileges, a rift was being formed between the monastic community and secular clergy and the laity. C.H. Lawrence notes that the "drifting away from strict observance of the Rule . . . was not a question of scandalous vice — though cases were not unknown — so much as a general dilution of community life in favor of the individual." Adding to the degradation of the monastic community was the fact that changes and relaxations in church policy had become an accepted part of Benedictine life and were formally acknowledged and regularized by a series of constitutions issued by Pope Benedict XII in 1336.

From the mid-fourteenth century onwards monastic and secular life was often the object of criticism and satire owing to its declining moral standards. The problems of abuse of office and deteriorating moral standards were not limited to monastic orders. The Church was troubled by heretical movements and attacks on its own wealth and secularization. Works satirizing the holy institution, such as the Wycliffite *The Perversion of the Works of Mercy*, were not uncommon. Chaucer's monk and friar are verisimilar representations of the contemporary image of religious life. The monk is worldly and self-indulgent, while the friar possesses questionable morals. In the *General Prologue to The Canterbury Tales*, Chaucer notes the monk's extravagance

for worldly goods by describing his love for fine pins: "He hadde of gold ywrought a ful curious pyn; A love-knotte in the gretter ende ther was." Chaucer adds that "His bootes souple, his hors in greet estaat." The friar, a mendicant, is described as one who ". . . knew the tavernes wel in every toun / And everich hostiler and tappestere . . ." Indeed, Chaucer's monk and friar are less than holy men, but mendicant friars were especially the subject of ridicule:

They were a class of men exceedingly popular and venerated . . . Their vows of poverty, their professed disinterestedness, their pretensions to extraordinary sanctity, and the contrast between them and the secular clergy, won the affections of the people. At the same time, the eminent attainments of some of them, in canon law and scholastic theology, procured for them the most important offices. They enjoyed also peculiar papal immunities, in return for which they devoted themselves to the maintenance of the honours and prerogatives of the see of Rome.

Evidence of this moving away from monastic life is found in the Pepys 2125 manuscript on ff. 117v. Beadle notes that after Line 14, the text of a well-known meditation diverges to what appears to be a social commentary about monastic orders expressing "an unorthodox sentiment of some kind, possibly Lollard," but ends abruptly with the absence of the following leaf. The last lines read as follows:

I thanke þe hertily. my lord iesu crist. for þou hast not clepid me to þe rewle of seynt Benet. ne of seynt Austyn. ne of synt Fraunceys. ne to no oþer rewle. ordenyd by mannes chesyng. but to þat souereyn and to þat holyst rewle. þe . . .

Clearly, this anti-mendicant commentary, written by the Scribe C of the Pepys manuscript, emulates Wycliffite sentiment against the Church and monastic orders in the late fourteenth century.

Further proof of the anti-mendicant sentiment is displayed by John Wycliffe himself, who, in the late fourteenth century, wrote

of the fifty heresies and errors of friars. Wycliffe stated that although the friars pretended to follow Christ strictly, they were the most covetous of men:

Also freris feynen hom, as ypocritis, to kepe straytly þo gospel and povert of Crist and his apostils; and 3itt þei moste contrarien to Crist and his apostils in ypocrisie, pride, and covetise. Fo þei schewen more holynesse in bodily habite and oper signes þen did Crist and his apostils; and for hor synguler habite or holynesse þei presumen to be even wiþ prelati and lordis, and more worthy þen oper clerkis; and in covetise þei con nevere make an ende bot by beggyng, by queethyng, by biring, by salaries and trentals, and by schryvyngis, by absoluciouns, and oper fals meenes, cryen evere after worldly godis, where Crist usid none of alle þese. and þus for þis stynkyng covetise þei worshippen þo fend as hor God.

The influential power of Wycliffe's words, such as those in the above quotation, upon English politics and spirituality cannot be ignored. He was a pivotal figure in the struggle for power between the English Church and the English State in the late fourteenth century.

It was in Wycliffe's sermons that some of the most detrimental proclamations were made against the English Church and against friars, in particular. For example, in Sermon VIII, Wycliffe preached against false prophets, the friars, and against the false doctrines introduced by them:

þis gospel biddiþ Cristene men to be ware wiþ false prophetis, þat comen in cloping of sheep. And þes wordis may be applyed unto fals freris; for soþe þis lore of Crist wolde he not 3yve in tyme of grace, but is sicke men weren for to come which þei shulden flee . . . Wel Y wote þat þe Churche profitide before freris camen in, and siþen han ben sown many flas lores, boþe in þer religioun, and preisyng of scribis; as we seen of þe sacrid oost, of þe begginge of Crist, of lettris of þe brepheed, and oþer workely lyvyng.

This quotation also refers to other issues Wycliffe and his followers raised against the church, such as false teachings, questions of transubstantiation, and begging friars. These themes were commonplace in much of Wycliffite writing, and numerous references to "proud prelacy," "fat benefices," "feigned," "neigromancy," "privy falseness," and "the venomous dotaciun" are found.

The condemnation of Wycliffe and the persecution of many of his followers as heretics was a direct result of these beliefs. Wycliffe's heresy consisted of errors in his teachings, according to Pope Gregory XI, which combined theological, political and popular radicalism in a single programme of reform. Specifically, the Pope's bull of 1377 listed nineteen errors committed by Wycliffe. In the bull, two primary strands of Wycliffite thought can be found which offended the authorities. The first dealt with dominion: "that only a man in a state of righteousness can truly be said to have authority, whether over inanimate objects or over animate nature." Wycliffe believed that since God alone could ascertain the righteousness of any individual, only God could pronounce absolution of sins. True contrition and faith were the only prerequisites of absolution, according to Wycliffe, and the minister of the church could at best only act as "God's mouth-piece." Wycliffe was soundly opposed to the granting of absolution by the church, as well as excommunication, the Church's ultimate refusal to grant absolution. Wycliffe believed that both imposed upon God's absolute knowledge. The second aspect of the 1377 bull that implicated Wycliffe was Wycliffe's criticism of the excessive wealth of the church. The English church had, by this time, amassed large sums of wealth and property and had special exemption from many of the laws and taxes imposed by the secular ruler. Wycliffe believed that Christ and the early apostles had taught that Christians should be subject to temporal powers, and that the clergy's business was with spiritual matters, not matters of earthly wealth. These two strands of thought came together to form the foundation of Wycliffe's belief: the contemporary Church was corrupt, and the righteousness of its ministers, and therefore of their true dominion, temporal or spiritual, was in question.

Wycliffe's seemingly inflexible outlook on faith and morals, especially of those individuals in religious life, is clear considering the corruption and public loss of confidence during his day. As a result of the intermittent Hundred Years' War with France, England was worn down both financially and emotionally. According to William Mallard, the plague had reduced the population and production of Europe, and the English suffered "for lack of money and yet had to watch a great deal of it vanish into most questionable hands." Given the state of Europe and of England in the late fourteenth century, it is not difficult to understand why many who sought a spiritual life chose a path that led toward the development of heretical movements such as the Lollards.

Adding to the changing religious atmosphere of the late fourteenth century was the changing outlook of philosophers and theologians at the English universities. Knowles notes:

There was a noticeable drift away from metaphysics and natural theology, and a tendency to separate the realms of faith and reason The theological ground where the feet can rest firmly on the authorities of old, but move in a rarer atmosphere, half theological, half logical, from which the lights of Christian theology — god the Father of all and Christ, the Brother, the Master, the Redeemer — have disappeared, and in their place is a God of illimitable, indefinable power, whose action is so unpredictable as to fall outside the sphere of attention.

This was the breeding ground for John Wycliffe and his followers, and so too was it the foundation for the changing religious atmosphere which leads to the composition of the Pepys manuscript of the seven works of bodily mercy.

Gloucestershire and Lollard Activity

According to dialectical evidence and close connection to another manuscript, British Library Harley 2398, the Pepys manuscript 2125 originated in Gloucestershire probably at the

Benedictine abbey of St. Peter in Gloucester. St. Peter's did have a priory for students at Oxford, and, therefore, communication was constant between Gloucester and Oxford. Unfortunately, the quality of education at St. Peter's was less than stellar. Herbert Workman notes that ". . .the monks were supposed to send three or four of their number to study in theology or other lawful faculties at Oxford or other university, but by their own confession this they often found it difficult to do, because of the low standard of scholarship." The exchange of information between Oxford and Gloucester allows for the possibility of Lollard activities to filter into Gloucester and St. Peter's through either a visiting student or a monastic.

Gloucester was also an active site of government and heretical activity during the late fourteenth century. Of special note is the parliament which met at St. Peter's, Gloucester, on the 20th October 1378. Parliament was held at Gloucester instead of London because of the continued riots in London during this period. Wycliffe was among those present at the meeting. What was significant about this meeting is that it was at this parliament that Wycliffe introduced his argument and defense of the Crown's action with regard to sanctuary and debt. This was the result of the case of Haulay and Shaky, in which the privilege of sanctuary was in question. The Church defended the practice of sanctuary, but the Crown said that in matters of debt, no rights of sanctuary were allowed. Wycliffe believed that "neither God in His omnipotence nor the pope in his sanctity could grant a local exemption from actions of debt." So strong were Wycliffe's feelings toward this matter, he later incorporated his defense of the Crown in his *de Ecclesia*.

During this Parliament, it was difficult for Wycliffe to ignore the lavishness of the abbey at St. Peter's, which lodged forty-four monks and their two hundred servants. The atmosphere at the abbey was ". . . more like a fair than a house of religion, and games were played in the cloister garth." Wycliffe also noticed the newly renovated great hall with its large tank for keeping fish and ". . . other evidences of luxury." Indeed, Wycliffe was troubled by the fact that the abbey was in debt by 8,000 florins and wondered if the income of 1,700 marks a year was being spent in the best interest of

the Church, especially since much of the income came from seventeen wealthy individuals. Clearly such sites would have confirmed Wycliffe's position against all possessions by members of the Church.

At this same Parliament, envoys of the Pope and antipope appeared in person to state their positions, but Urban was made pope by Act of Parliament against pope Clement. Immediately, orders were given to confiscate the benefices of all cardinals and others who sided with Clement. Numerous arrests were made as a result of this act. In an opposing action, John Aston preached at Gloucester on September 21, 1382 against the bishop of Norwich's crusade to convert the Flemish supporters of the anti-pope by use of arms. This is but one of numerous events in Gloucester revolving around the heretical movement of the late fourteenth century, and may have been one of the sources for Scribe C's "pro-Wycliffe" commentaries.

Textual Evidence of the Wycliffite Connection

The remainder of this paper will examine the textual evidence found within the Pepys manuscript as it relates to a possible Wycliffite connection. Comparisons of style of prose and vocabulary with other Wycliffite writings will be explored in their relationship to Wycliffite doctrine.

The biblical source for Pepys 2125 ff. 102r-102v is found in Matthew 25: 34-46 where Christ plainly states to his disciples the first six corporal works of mercy. Eternal damnation at the Last Judgment (Matt. 25: 41) is stated as the penalty for failure to perform these acts of mercy. The seven corporal works of mercy grew out of the medieval eschatological teachings of the Church that emphasized the parable of the sheep and the goats are found in Chapter 25 of St. Matthew's Gospel. On the Judgment Day, men and women would be judged by their actions towards the poor and weak and not by their professions of piety. According to Matthew 25: 31-33, "When the Son of Man comes in his glory and all the angels with him, he will sit on his glorious throne, with all the nations gathered before him. He will separate people into two groups, as a shepherd separates the sheep from the goats;

he will place the sheep on his right hand and the goats on his left." This passage shows clearly that there were only two types of men: the good and the evil. There is no question that any mixture of the two is nonexistent in the eyes of God. Therefore, the corporal works of mercy to feed the hungry, give drink to the thirsty, clothe the naked, house the homeless, visit the sick, and to ransom the captive, "loomed ever larger in late medieval perceptions of the Christian life, and hence of preparation for judgment."

Christianity was changing during the fourteenth century and so were the attitudes toward charity to the needy. Francis Schüssler Fiorenza writes of the distinctive developments within the Church, specifically noting what he calls "the segmentation, institutionalization, and specialization of the works of mercy" during this period. He states that "instead of polemic or apologetic approach, the distinctiveness of its development should be seen within its social context."

The development of the works of mercy are most apparent in the changing role of the medieval hospital. The hospitals of this period were becoming increasingly specialized and diversified. Several types included the *syndochium*, which gave lodging to the poor; the *procotrophium*, which gave food; the *gerontocomium*, which was open to the elderly; the *orphanotrophium*, the orphanage; and the *brephotrophium*, which nourished infants. There was also increased need and reliance upon monasteries to care for the poor and the sick. Specific religious orders emerged during this time committed to the works of mercy. All of these changes are attributed to the increasing role of the medieval city in the care of the needy. While the monasteries also increased their care to the needy during the fourteenth century, there was a very significant rise of the mendicant religious orders. With their vows of poverty, the mendicant monks were examples of religious piety through involuntary poverty. Additionally, cities and local churches played an active role in the care of the poor. Bishops were often at the forefront of measures instituted by the cities to care for the poor and needy.

The question of which version of the Bible is the source for the Pepys Manuscript 2125 text, especially of the biblical quota-

tions, is still unclear and may never be determined. The Latin Vulgate passages of Matthew 25:34-46 are certainly a possibility for the source of the Pepys passage. The passages of Matthew do bear a close resemblance to much of the text, but it does not appear that the scribe was copying the Vulgate passage directly. Unfortunately, the Paues edition of the Bible, *A Fourteenth Century English Biblical Version*, does not include Matthew chapter 25 and therefore cannot be used as a possible source.

In addition, Matthew 25 of the *Wyclif Bible* of 1380, edited in the *English Hexapla*, bears little resemblance to the text examined here and is not the source for this passage. Furthermore, *The Holy Bible* "made from the Latin Vulgate by John Wycliffe and his followers," edited by Josiah Forshall and Frederic Madden, shows little if any resemblance to the dialogue of the Pepys 2125 version of the seven works of bodily mercy.

Influence of Wycliffite Doctrine

Evidence pointing to a possible Wycliffite connection of the Pepys 2125 manuscript is found on folio 117v of the Pepys manuscript. As mentioned earlier, the scribe departs from the meditation, stating how thankful he is not to have been called to be of the rules of Benedict, Augustine, or Francis, or to any other Rule formed by man. Curiously, the following folio has been removed from the manuscript. Beadle states only that this passage and the missing folio are the result of the copyist's "unorthodox sentiment of some kind, possibly Lollard." Possibly, this "unorthodox sentiment" was expressed by the scribe who was either active in the Lollard movement or at least was a Lollard sympathizer influenced by the activity of the Lollards in and around Gloucestershire in the later fourteenth century.

As mentioned earlier, Wycliffe was an active participant in the events of the late medieval government and church. While many of his writings dealt with what he saw as a demoralization of the priesthood and the fabric of the Church, one of his sermons and several of his exegetical treatises may have served as sources for the author of the text examined here.

Sermon CXLVIII, given on the Monday of the first week of Lent, is based upon Matthew Chapter 25. Wycliffe begins his sermon by stating, "þis gospel telliþ in what forme Crist shal come to þe laste dome, and preyse just men, and reprove opere, for werkis of bodili mercy; and þes werkes ben more knowun þan opir betere werkes of þe soule." He continues by naming those people who lead evil lives yet want to perform the seven works of bodily mercy:

And so men knowen of yvel liif shulde wante þe werkes of mercy, as strong beggers, and proude and riche men on oper side; and so it semeþ to many men, þat neiþer freris, ne shrewid preestis, ne knowun riche beggers, or men þat feynen hem, or ellis men þat shal be dampnid, shulden take of men þes werkes of mercy.

While Wycliffe cautions his followers that it is only God who can judge who is admitted into heaven and hell, clearly his statement of those who perform the works fruitlessly is directed towards mendicants and rich clergymen. This is a direct attack upon the Church and what Wycliffe views as its unholy preachers. William Mallard supports this sentiment by stating, "the raw appetites Wycliffe knew around him evidently drove him to his prudish derogation of natural good, and inspired the self-righteousness that so favored invisible and abstract things." Lines 26-29 of the Pepys text examined here echo a similar sentiment with references to "þes covetous wordli men," and "beggeres of þis wordle."

In an exegetical treatise titled "þe Seven Werkys of Mercy Bodyly," Wycliffe again emphasized the importance of performing the seven works of bodily mercy. It begins, "ʒif a man were siker þat he schulde to morowe come bifore a juge and oper lese or wyne alle þe godes þat he hadde and also hys lif to he wolde drede þis jugement." Accordingly, "the man is a fool who grasps for temporal security through abuse of God and neighbor, for he sacrifices all claim on both the present and the future." Therefore, Wycliffe stresses that alms should not be given to able bodied friars, but to the truly poor and sick:

But Crist hap lymtyd in hys lawe who schulde have suche almes, — pore men and blynde, pore men and lame, pore men and febel, þat neden suche helpe. And so þes starke beggeres don wronge to suche pore men; for ypocrisie, by Poule seyng, is most privey synne þat dos harme to þe Chirche in þe laste daies.

Wycliffe continues in this treatise to comment strongly on the wealth of the Church and its officials in comparison to their giving to the poor. A similar commentary is made in the Pepys 2125 text in Lines 5-8: “þ^r / a man of religion • maȝ nau ȝyue mete to hem þ^r beþ hungry • ne fulfille / þe oþer workes of mercy • For y haue put mȝ wil in oþer mannes wil ¶ / And þerfore hit were better for me to be seculer.” Similarly, in Sermon XLVII, Wycliffe preaches against the indulgences of the papacy and the hypocritical acts of priests:

And so no þing is falsur þan ypocritis to boste þus, and ȝif men loke to resoun þei may wele se þat many sicke feynnyngis ben of þe fendis scole. For ellis myȝte a pope assoile men boþe of peyne and blame, for þei killen þer evene cristene, and ever while þei done so; and ȝif þei ceessen fro sich killing, þer assoilinge shal ceesse.

Wycliffe demands moral results and “insists that his hearers correct their fellowmen . . . he requires it of a true Christian, and especially a priest.” This theme is echoed throughout Pepys 2125 ff. 102r-102v. The demand for moral good as a key to heaven is shown on Lines 7-8, which states: “And / þerfore hit were better for me to be seculer.” Lines 9-11 also address a similar theme: “To þis y answeere • hit is better • to haue sorwe in þyn herte / compassien of þyn evencristen • þan þose þ^u hadde for al þe wordle to ȝyue / for goddis loue.”

An additional Wycliffite version of the seven works of bodily mercy is located in Rylands English 85, f.15 rv and begins as follows:

Feede þe hungri ȝyue drynk to þe þirsti cloþe þe nakid herberwe þe housles visite þe pore sike helpe þe vngilti prisoner and birie deede men þese ben / þe seuene werkis

of merci bodili þe whiche shulden be to do discreetli to cristis pore seruauntis whiche monn on no wise rewarde þee bodili aȝen and wysli take heeds of feyned pore men þat vndir colour of nede beggen goodis of þe peple to maintene idilnesse and lustis of her fleish

While this version is not identical to the Pepys 2125 passage, it does show marked similarities in language, especially with its use of “pore men.” Again, although this does present evidence of the origin of the Pepys text, it does demonstrate a thematic relatedness to Wycliffite doctrine.

Style of Prose

Yet another point can be added to the theory of the Pepys text being of Wycliffite origin; that is the style of the prose, which is similar to the catechetical teachings of the late fourteenth century. The revival of commerce, and the accompanying growth of town life and urban institutions affected the religious orientation of European civilization and the traditional modes of catechesis. In the 13th century, in an attempt to satisfy the needs of an urbanized society, parish priests were obliged to explain the articles of faith in simple and clear fashion during services on Sundays. Part of this obligation involved the adaptation of catechetical methods to suit the needs of the changing society:

By the later Middle Ages there was in Europe a gradual but perceptible change in the religious, spiritual and practice that showed itself in an overemphasis on the external elements of religion. More subtle were the effects of the widespread disintegration of a catechetical synthesis, and abuses in liturgical and sacramental practice.

The dialogue form of the text shown in the Pepys 2125 text may, indeed, be a by-product of the urbanization of the late fourteenth century, while at the same time be reflective of current trends in religious teachings. Although it is not a true catechetical text, the scribe, perhaps a monastic or a Lollard, may

have adapted the body of the text from its source and restructured it in a pseudo-catechetical format. Evidence to support this theory begins at Line 5, in which a rhetorical dialogue begins "But now may þ^u sey to me þus." The dialogue continues and an answer is given on Line 9, "To þis y answere." An initial conclusion is derived in Line 12, "Soth hit is better a man to 3eue hýmselfe," and is supported by a quotation from the gospel. A second question is quickly raised in Lines 17 and 18 suggesting that "to be a domesman" might be a better choice. This is addressed in the remained of the text with specific examples of "covetous wordli men," in Line 27, and the conclusion is finally reached that is it best to "loueþ pouert."

Similar types of discourse are found in many of Wycliffe's sermons and other writings. In *De Pontificum Romanorum Schismate*, Wycliffe employs the use of a similar type o discourse to his doctrine and reasons for his opposition to the Church. Much of treatise is formed by questions and answers specially relating to Wycliffe's positions on church reform. For example, in Chapter III, the question is asked, "Lord! where it be Goddis wille to lette to preche þe gospel, and 3ev leve and counseil to prestis to slee men?" The rely states, "Hit semeþ þat suche dedis schewiþ whos beþ þes prelati; ffor every man her meree, and specially prelati, schewen bi her werkis whos children þei beþ." Wycliffe's Sermon CCXX also uses a dialogue format to address issues of avarice committed by the clergy.

Vocabulary

While the tone of most Wycliffite writings is clearly that of opposition to the orthodox church, the vocabulary they employ in their admonishment of the church is another issue. Anne Hudson explores question of the possibility of the existence of "a particular Lollard sect vocabulary" in *Lollards and their Books*. Two terms are frequently associated with Lollardian writing: *trewe* and *pore*. While both terms are commonplace outside Lollardian writing, the words are given special emphasis in their particular use within the text. For example, in the Pepys text examined here, Line 23 states, "And þ^t haueþ pore men." The

term *pore men* is prevalent in Lollard texts and is often used to express the persecution which the Lollards were suffering. In contrast, Lines 33-34 reinforce the Lollardian sentiment of true verses false preaching by stating, "And þ^t beþ þese goode holy men of religion • 7 þey beþ trewly pore." *Goode holy men of religion* may be a possible reference to the Lollards as being those who are preaching the true gospel, the Wycliffite doctrine, as opposed to those they suggest are preaching false teachings. In addition, *trewly pore*, may be a reference to those who propound Wycliffite doctrine and who are truly poor as opposed to those mendicants and clergymen who profess to being poor but who are in reality wealth. The condemnation of the clergy, especially the Mendicant friars, is found in Line 27, "þes covetous wordli men," and Line 29, "beggeres of þis wordle." Line 27 shows a possible reference to religious orders and clergymen who had become desirous of acquiring worldly goods. This was one of the main points of contention which the Lollards had against the orthodox practices of the church. Line 29 is a reference to the Mendicant orders of monks who made their livelihood through begging and alms.

Vocabulary typically found in Wycliffite writings is present not only in ff. 102r-102v, but in other sections of the Pepys manuscript. Although I have not examined all of the manuscript, the vocabulary indicative of Wycliffite doctrine appears to be present predominately in the sections of the manuscript copied by Scribe C. Further examination and evaluation of the manuscript and its vocabulary is needed before a conclusive decision can be made.

Conclusion

While clearly the evidence stated is strongly in favor of a Lollardian connection with the Pepys 2125 manuscript, many questions still remain unanswered, and perhaps always will. This examination has shown that what on the surface appears to be a late fourteenth century religious text, possibly for a male recluse or monastic order, contains numerous personal commentaries made by either a Lollard or a monastic Lollardian sympathizer that are related to other known heretical works and events.

Appendix

Analogues

Analogues of the Pepys text of the seven works of bodily mercy includes four pieces in prose: University of Leeds Library MS Brotherton 501, a mid-fifteenth century warning to man that he must account for works of bodily mercy at the Last Judgment; Bodleian Library MS Lyell 29, possibly of Wycliffite origin warning man to observe the works of bodily and spiritual mercy for the sake of his salvation; and Bodleian Library MS Bodley 841 and St. Cuthbert's College, Ushaw, MS 28, both versions of the *Speculum Christiani*.

Several examples of mnemonic verses on the works of bodily and spiritual mercy are also found in Salisbury Cathedral Library MS 126, Henry E. Huntington Library MS 126, the *Speculum Christiani* and the *Floure of the Commaundementes*. Bodleian Library MS Ashmole 1286 contains a mnemonic verse of the works of bodily mercy only. The Vernon and Simeon manuscripts, as well as the Worcestershire Miscellany, contain confessions for negligence of the works of bodily mercy.

Editorial Apparatus

A Note on the Transcription Pepys Manuscript 2125, ff. 102r-102v.

For this transcription I have observed the following conventions:

Lineation of the manuscript has been preserved. The spelling and word-order of the manuscript are retained. Where the manuscript is unclear, I have emended and annotated as necessary using the symbol []. Blank square brackets [] indicate an omission in the manuscript. The p^t and p^u have been retained and the ampersand is shown as 7. All thorns have been retained. The dotted y is printed as \acute{y} to distinguish it from the y. All abbreviations which are expanded are printed in *italics*. I have preserved the manuscript's usage of u and v, and retained i for j. The capitulum sign is noted by the ¶. The *punctus* has been retained as per the manuscript, with the exception of the double *punctus elevatus* ••, which represented as §.

The Text : Pepys 2125 102r-102v

102r

1 The seuen workes of mercý bodili be þese 7 the first is to fede þe hungry • þe seconde to 3yue drynke to be þurstý • þe þrydde to cloþe þe naked •

þe ferþe to herborwe þe pore • þe fifte to visite hem p^t beþ in presone • the

[si]xte to comfote þe sike • þe seueþe to burye þe dede § These seuen

5 [w]orkes of mercý longen to þe body • ¶ But now may p^u sey to me þus u [] • p^t

a man of religion • maý nau 3yue mete to hem p^t beþ hungry • ne fulfille

þe oþer workes of mercý • For y haue put mý wil in oþer mannes wil ¶ And

þerfore hit were better for me to be seculer • p^t y myzt do 7 fulfille þese

workes of mercý § To þis y answeze • hit is better • to haue sorwe in þyn herte

10 compassien of þyn evencristen • þan þose p^u hadde for al þe wordle to 3yue

for goddis loue • 3if þe self 7 p^u 3euyst more • þan þose p^u 3af al þe wordle

7 þen may p^u sey to me þus • ¶ Soth hit is better a man to 3eue hýmselfe

102v þan to 3yue of his good • better ys p^t on • þan p^t oþer and better is to do boþe. þan

to do p^t on by hit self § wheþer is hit better to be cleped god. or his seruaunt • p^u []

15 wel to be clepid god. is better ¶ They p^t suffereþ mychel hungry • þurst • 7 oþer diseses

here in þis wordle • god clepeþ hem hymself • for he seyþ in þe gospel ¶ What

þt 3e do to þe leste of myne • 3e doþ to me ¶ On p^t oþer syde were ther is better

to be demed or be to deme 7 be domesman § Wer p^u wost • to be domesman 7

deme ¶ And þ^t doþ þe pore do god seiþ in þe gospel ¶ 3e þt
 haueþ forsake

20alle þoure goodes • For my loue • at þe day of dome when y shal
 sitte in my mageste •

3e shal sitte upon twelf trones • 7 3e shal deme þe twelve tribus of
 Israel ¶ On

þ^t oper syde • Wheþer is better. to haue þe ioýe of he e in
 possession • or in premiss

¶ þ^u wost wel • in possession ¶ And þ^t haueþ pore men • For
 god seiþ in þe gospel

y blessed be þei. þt beþ pore of spirit • For heres is þe ioýe ¶ He
 seiþ nat [hye]

25shal be • bute he seiþ • heres ys ¶ Bute he is verrey pore 7
 ho nat and ho is

veray riche 7 ho nat • ¶ Ther ben somme þ^t haueþ richesse 7
 loue hem • ¶ And þat

beþ þes covetous wordli men ¶ They beþ oper þ^t haueþ no
 richesse • but 3et

þey loue hem 7 fayn wolde haue hem • And þes wiste how to
 gete hem • And

þ^t beþ.þese beggeres of þis wordle ¶ There be somme þ^t haueþ
 richesse • but

30þei loue ^{hem} nat and neuerþeles þey wolde fayn haue good
 • þ^t were ri3tfully

purchased ¶ And þ^t beþ þese goode husbonde men of þe wordle
 • þ^t gladly

despenden her goodes in good use ¶ Ther beþ oper þ^t haueþ
 no richesse [nay]

þay loue hem nat • And þ^t beþ þese goode holy men of religion
 • 7 þey beþ

trewly pore • And heres is þe blisse of heuene ¶ They beþ riche
 • þ^t haueth

35richesse 7 loue hem ¶ They beþ pore • þ^t haue pouerte 7
 loueþ pouert and þ^t

haueþ richesse 7 loueþ pouert.

“The sable author...a very sensible man”: Olaudah Equiano and his *Interesting Narrative*

Spencer Davis
 Peru State College

Of the more than one hundred full-length slave narratives *The Interesting Narrative of the Life of Olaudah Equiano, or Gustavus Vassa, the African, Written by Himself* is second only to Frederick Douglass's *Narrative* in importance. Nine British editions were published during Equiano's lifetime — the first in 1789 and the ninth in 1795. Ten other editions were published including translations into Dutch (1790), German (1972), and Russian (1794). The last edition was an American edition in 1837.

The Interesting Narrative then went out of print for about a century until Benjamin Brawley published an excerpt in his 1935 anthology *Early Negro American Writers*. (1) Today Equiano's autobiography is in print in several complete editions and one lightly edited version. Excerpts are included in many anthologies. (2)

The popularity of *The Interesting Narrative* is easy to understand in some respects. Equiano describes his childhood in West Africa; his capture, sale, and survival on the Middle Passage; his life as a slave in the West Indies and in colonial North America; his life in England and role in the abolitionist movement. (3) His autobiography therefore can be used in a variety of history courses. Since the work combines a fast-paced adventure tale with powerful passages on slavery and racism, it can be used in Afro-American and British literature courses. These facts explain why publishers would reprint and instructors would assign *The Interesting Narrative*.

The second reason for its popularity is its current high standing with specialists in black literature. Modern commentators agree on the importance of the work. Chinosole terms it “pivotal today

for black literature, internationally." (4) Henry Louis Gates, Jr. has judge it "the prototype of the nineteenth century slave narrative." (5) Kendell Jackson makes an even stronger claim for the work, describing the work as "an eighteenth-century classic that would become as influential as Voltaire's *Candide*...and Benjamin Franklin's *Autobiography*." (6) On January 29, 1996 BBC-2 presented "Son of Africa," the life of Equiano told in the words of his *Interesting Narrative*. (7) William L. Andrews, in what is perhaps the most illuminating study of Afro-American autobiography as literature, concludes that Equiano was "the first black autobiographer in English to indict a detailed analysis and powerful denunciation of slavery," that the *Interesting Narrative* "is different in kind as well as degree from the more schematized Afro-American autobiographies of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries," and that Equiano's ambitious strategy of the technical skill in educating his contemporary reader out of "cultural myopia" makes the *Interesting Narrative* "a signal achievement of the Afro-American literary tradition." (8)

A third reason for reading the *Interesting Narrative* is revealed in a passage from Arna Bontemps. After describing it as "the first truly notable book in the genre now known as slave narratives," he continues in a somewhat autobiographical vein.

It is a book that has had many lives and tends to be revived every time a black resurgence occurs. Bibliophiles in Harlem during the Renaissance of the twenties spoke of it with whispered pride as one of the most important books attributed to American Negro authorship. It was they who observed that with exception of the folksongs, the Negro's worthiest contribution to American literature had been his personal memoirs.

Looking backward they noticed that the evolution of practically every black American, if he accomplished anything important, was likely to have been filled with drama. They realized, therefore, that pending the emergence of a Pushkin or a Dumas, whose rampant creativity might eclipse his own personality, there would continue to be more interest, or significance, in how a Negro achieved in the white world than in what he achieved. The brooding scholars moving among the young poets and artists of the New York enclave did not hesitate

to suggest that in 1789, the year of its publication, few books had been produced in America with the vigor and sweep, the thrust and picturesqueness, of Vassa's *Narrative*. (9)

A fourth reason for the appeal of *The Interesting Narrative* is that it can be put to many uses. Thus Robert J. Allison uses Equiano as an occasion for reasserting the validity of Eric William's *Capitalism and Slavery* (10). For scholars interested in an English radicalism less insular than that of E.P. Thompson, Equiano serves as a major figure in the multi-radical radicalism of the English Atlantic culture. (11) Radical literacy critics as well as radical historians have turned to Equiano. Thus Equiano's *Narrative* is the first work to receive sustained analysis in Houston A. Baker's *Blues, Ideology, and Afro-American Literature*. (12) Louis Henry Gates, Jr. used the "talking book" passage from Equiano in his effort to make language and linguistic tradition (rather than authors or works) a subject requiring a distinct field of black literary critical and radical theory. (13)

It might seem by now that Equiano's work is no more than a handle that fits many tools, but that is not the case. *The Interesting Narrative* really is interesting because it presents the evidence — or some of the clues — to the complicated cross-currents in Equiano's intellectual and spiritual development. It is a beginning but only a beginning, to recognize the doubleness of outlook — both African and British — in Equiano. (14) There is a second doubleness, one recognized by Henry Louis Gates, Jr., the doubleness of voice.

These two voices are meant to distinguish, in language, the simple wonder with which the young Equiano approached the New World of his captors, and the more sophisticated vision, captured in a more eloquently articulated voice, of the author's narrative present.

Paul Edwards identified a third doubleness, the contrast between passages employing "heightened, rhetorical language" and more effective passages employing "dramatic simplicity." (16)

Noting these contrasts in social context, voice or rhetoric is necessary and valuable but does not, I think, reach the heart of the enigma and the appeal of Equiano's work. Scholars have stopped only to pluck passages from the *Interesting Narrative* that suited their purposes. What fascinates is the energetic way in

which Equiano makes his way through the world. Not that Equiano is free from despair; the *Interesting Narrative* has moving passages recording his despair at the way cruel and treacherous whites treat him. Nevertheless, the dominant impression is Equiano's energy.

There are four possible explanations for why the Equiano of the *Interesting Narrative* is so active and energetic. The first is that Equiano deliberately fashioned the reality of his life into an adventure story to attract readers (17). The second possibility is that having survived the Middle Passage as a young boy, Equiano was hardened to face whatever life might bring thereafter. A third possibility is that Equiano was by temperament restless and energetic. A fourth possibility is that Equiano saw life — his life — under slavery rather differently than we do.

It is this last possibility I want to develop. A passage by Paul Edwards provides the beginning of this approach. Edwards says of Equiano that "He never wholly loses his sense of proportion, tries to fight prejudice with reason, and makes no effort to capture our sympathies sentimentally by presenting himself as a man persistently ill-treated by an irredeemable wicked world. His white men are like his fortunes, a very realistically mixed bag" (18).

One can quarrel with this way of putting things, but it is true that Equiano found among the generally hostile or indifferent majority of whites, a handful of very helpful white persons.

It is also true that, from the time of his captivity, it is only these white benefactors with whom he experienced (or at least allowed the *Interesting Narrative* to record) formative relationships. When Equiano was twelve, he met Richard Baker, the first of these benefactors.

There was aboard the ship a young lad who had never been at sea before, about four or five years older than myself: his name was Richard Baker. He was a native of America, had received an excellent education, and was of a most amiable temper. Soon after I went on board he shewed me a great deal of partiality and attention, and in return I grew extremely fond of him. We at length became inseparable; and for the space of two years, he was a very great use to me, and was my constant companion

and instructor. Although this dear youth had many slaves of his own, yet he and I have gone through many sufferings together on shipboard; and we have many nights lain in each other's bosoms when we were in great distress. This such a friendship was cemented between us as we cherished till his death, which, to my very great sorrow, happened in the year 1759, when he was up the Archipelago on board his majesty's ship the Preston: an event which I have never ceased to regret, as I lost at once a kind interpreter, and agreeable companion, and a faithful friend; who, at the age to fifteen, discovered a mind superior to prejudice; and who was not ashamed to notice, to associate with, and to be the friend and instructor of one who was ignorant, a stranger, of a different complexion, and a slave!

In a later passage Equiano described Baker as "my friend, who I loved and grieved for as a brother." (19)

While serving on the *Aetna* Equiano met Daniel Queen, who may have been something like a surrogate father for Equiano judging from the description of their relationship Equiano has left.

While I was in the *Aetna* particularly, the captain's clerk taught me to write, and gave me a smattering of arithmetic as far as the rule of three. There was also one Daniel Queen, about forty years of age, a man very well educated, who messed with me on board this ship, and he like wise dressed and attended the captain. Fortunately this man soon became very much attached to me, and took very great pains to instruct me in many things. He taught me to shave and dress hair a little, and also to read the Bible, explaining many passages to me, which I did not comprehend. I was wonderfully surprised to see the laws and rules of my country written almost exactly here; a circumstance which I believed tended to impress our manners and customs more deeply on my memory. I used to tell of this resemblance; and many a time we had sat up the whole night together at this employment. In short he was like a father to me; and some even used to

call me after this name; they also styled me the black Christian. Indeed I almost loved him with the affection of a son. Many things I have denied myself that he might have them; and when I used to play at marbles, or any other game, and won a few halfpence, or got any little money, which I did sometimes, for shaving any one, I used to buy him a little sugar or tobacco, as far as my stock of money would go (20).

In the West Indies Equiano was purchased by Robert King, a Quaker merchant who treated Equiano and his other slaves far better than the average West Indian slaveholder (21). Even more important to Equiano was Thomas Farmer, captain of one of King's ships, who insisted Equiano serve on his ship, protected Equiano, and forced King to live up to his word to let Equiano purchase himself. When Farmer died Equiano grieved.

Every man on board loved him, and regretted his death; but I was exceedingly affected at it, and found that I did not know, till he was gone, the strength of my regard for him. Indeed I had every reason in the world to be attached to him; for, besides that he was a general mild, affable, generous, faithful, benevolent, and just, he was to me a friend and father; and had it pleased Providence that he had died but five months before, I verily believe I should not have obtained my freedom when I did; and it is not improbable that I might not have been able to get it at any rate afterwards. (22)

Benefactors like these provided some counter-balance to the racial prejudice from so many of the whites Equiano dealt with. Nevertheless, the need for benefactors can itself be troubling; Paul Edwards has remarked on the element of suppressed anger that characterized Equiano's relations with his benefactors (23).

Having survived the Middle Passage and a brief stay on a Virginia plantation, Equiano was then purchased by Michael Paschal, a Royal Navy Lieutenant returning to England. That this was the result of a situation which initially seemed hopeful helps explain the tangle of emotions endured by slaves.

When I arrived I was carried on board a fine large ship, loaded with tobacco, & c. and just ready to sail for England. I now thought my condition much mended; I had sails to lie on, and plenty of good victuals to eat; and every body on board used my very kindly, quite contrary to what I had seen on any white people before; I therefore began to think that they were not all of the same disposition. A few days after I was on board we sailed for England. I was still at a loss to conjecture my destiny. By this time, however, I could smatter a little imperfect English; and I want to know as well as I could where we were going. Some of the people of the ship used to tell me they were going to carry me back to my own country, and this made me very happy. I was quite rejoiced at the idea of going back; and thought if I should get home what wonders I should have to tell. But I was reserved for another fate, and was soon undeceived when we came within sight of the English coast (24).

The situation is complex certainly. Equiano's youth at the time of his capture and his passage out of the West Indies to England, his service in trade and sailing set him apart from the majority of Africans enslaved and sent on the Middle Passage. These unusual experiences explain the fact that Equiano found (used?) a number of white benefactors and seemed always to expect to find more. Hence, in part, his energy and ambition.

Equiano learned that the regional variations of slavery were also significant. Equiano saw slavery (either as slave or free man) in Africa, the Middle Passage, the British West Indies, French West Indies, England, Virginia, Georgia, South Carolina, Philadelphia, and New York City. He thought the regional variations significant. He seems to have considered slavery a nearly universal and also quite diverse institution. As the son of a slaveholder and the child of a slaveholding society, he seems not to have been appalled by slavery *per se* but by the inhuman versions of colonial and racial slavery. A passage in which Equiano urged West Indian planters to moderate their brutality implies that he believed a mild sort of slavery (such as he had known in Africa) was tolerable (25).

Equiano knew he was very fortunate, providentially blessed he believed, not to be a slave on a West Indian sugar plantation. But he also knew that slavery was no single, monolithic entity. Slave systems varied by region, and in each region the human beings involved—tyrant or Quaker, slave holder or overseer, planter or merchant — mattered a good deal. As an Anglo-African, Equiano struggled against exploitation and prejudice, but that struggle was a series of separate episodes with new character, circumstances, and settings. This may also explain Equiano's energy, since life — even under slavery and racist exploitation — was so various and contained new openings to liberation.

But there is something disturbing in that life. Equiano presents his life as a series of episodes — each episode originating in some type of racial exploitation and each episode culminating in Equiano's escape from harm. As the episodes accumulate, the reader is forced to admire Equiano's brains, skills, and determination. But at the same time the reader, at least this reader, responds in another and contradictory way, feeling exasperated that Equiano repeats unhappy episodes, puts himself in harm's way yet again and seemingly has learned nothing from his previous adventures. Equiano may have trusted in divine deliverance from every fresh disaster, but is there no room for prudence? Equiano, we can feel, is clever but not very wise. Why go to sea yet again? Why trust goods to yet another duplicitous white merchant? Why again loan money to a ship captain?

We can ask if Equiano was wise or merely clever. But we can ask questions that lead in other directions. We could ask whether the genres Equiano knew, spiritual autobiography and picaresque novel, distorted the real story of his life. We can ask if Equiano tailored the contents to fit the expectations of his likely readers in the British abolitionist movement (26). We can ask if Equiano is omitting important facts — how did he make enough money to leave a decent estate if his *Narrative* reveals nothing but absconding and depredation by whites? Finally we can ask if the repetition and episodic nature in Equiano's life reveal some deeper truths about slavery and race than Equiano wanted to state (27).

These are serious questions, which I cannot now answer. I can submit the outline of a possible response.

The sketch of a fuller answer to the puzzles in the *Interesting Narrative* begins with the observation that Equiano sought not so much adventure for its own sake as fluid social situations in which the power of racism had not yet or could not congeal into constricting laws and customs. Hence his sea-faring, his touring England and Ireland.

Hence also his service as an overseer on a plantation in Central America. Equiano went so far as to assist Dr. Irving in purchasing the slaves in Jamaica to labor on Irving's plantation. This episode reveals a good deal.

Creating a plantation required assuaging the Indians of the Mosquito Shore. But the liquor their "governors" demanded led to problems. The local "Governor, getting quite drunk, grew very unruly, and struck one of our most friendly chiefs, who was our nearest neighbour." Irving could not end the conflict and fled the scene. Equiano took command of the situation and ended the dangerous altercation. While Equiano neither boasts of his success nor gloats over Dr. Irving's discomfiture, it is clear that he enjoyed — and I would argue, even sought — situations in which he could take command (28).

The picture of Equiano we can construct from the *Interesting Narrative* reveals a man driven out of settled situations in which racism and slavery are codified and therefore potent, and toward dangerous, strange, unusual settings offering more scope for his talents. And because these situations are so short-lived, Equiano's life is a series of episodes, repeating tragically the same depressing pattern and result. This conclusion is both a historical and a literary judgment. Equiano's life should restrain attempts to portray eighteenth century slavery as monolithic. At the same time we can see that the situations Equiano sought were inherently unstable so that the episodic, repetitive structure of the *Interesting Narrative* can be seen as an appropriate literary structure for Equiano's life.

Notes

¹Benjamin Brawley, *Early Negro American Writers* (New York: Dover, 1970 [1st ed., 1935])

- ²Complete texts – though of different editions have been reprinted – Arna Bontemps, ed., *Great Slave Narratives* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969); Henry Louis Gates, Jr., ed., *The Classic Slave Narratives* (New York: Mentor, 1969); Robert J. Allison, ed., *The Interesting Narrative of the Life of Olaudah Equiano, Written by Himself* (Boston: Bedford Books, 1995); and Vincent Carretta, ed., *Olaudah Equiano: The Interesting Narrative and Other Writings* (New York: Penguin, 1995). An abridged version edited by Paul Edwards was published in the Heinemann African Writers Series as *Equiano's Travels* (Oxford: Heinemann, 1967). When it went out of print Edwards prepared another, and longer, edition for another series (Paul Edwards, ed., *The Life of Olaudah Equiano* [London: Longman, 1988 – Longman's African Classics]). Dorothy Porter, ed., *Early Negro Writing, 1760-1837* (Baltimore: Black Classic Press, 1995 [1st ed., 1971]); Thomas R. Frazier, ed., *Afro-American History: Primary Sources*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: Dorsey, 1988 [1st ed., 1970]); Arthur P. Davis, J. Saunders Redding and Joyce Ann Joyce, eds., *The new Cavalcade*, Vol. I (Washington, D.C.: Howard UP, 1991 [1st ed., 1971]); Paul Edwards and David Dabydeen eds., *Black Writers in Britain, 1790-1890* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1991); Philip Curtin, ed., *Africa Remembered* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1962); James Walvin, *The Black Presence: A Documentary History of the Negro in England, 1555-1860* (New York: Schocken, 1972); Paul Edwards and James Walvin, *Black Personalities in the Era of the Slave Trade* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1983); Adam Potkay and Sandra Burr, *Black Atlantic Writers of the Eighteenth Century* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995).
- ³Equiano's role in the British abolitionist movement is described in Keith A. Sandiford, *Measuring the Movement* (Selinsgrove: Susquehanna UP, 1988) Ch. 5 Works describing Anglo-African life in Equiano's day include Gretchen Gerzina, *Black London* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 1995) and Edward Scobie, *Black Britannia* (Chicago: Johnson Publishing Co., 1972) ch. 5-8.

- ⁴Chinosole, "Tryin' to Get Over: Narrative Posture in Equiano's Autobiography" pp. 45-53 in John Sekora and Darwin T. Turner, eds., *The Art of Slave Narrative* (Macomb, Ill: Western Illinois UP, 1982) at p. 45.
- ⁵Henry Louis Gates, Jr., *The Signifying Monkey* (New York: Oxford UP, 1988) pp. 152-3.
- ⁶Kennell Jackson, *America Is Me* (New York: Harper Collins, 1996) p. 41. More restrained assessments which nevertheless recognize the importance and literary value of the work can be found in Frances Smith Foster, *Witnessing Slavery*, 2nd ed. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1994) pp. 47-52 and Marion Wilson Starling, *The Slave Narrative*, 2nd ed. (Washington, DC: Harvard UP, 1988) pp.66-77.
- ⁷Denrele Ogunwa, "Collage," *West Africa* (No. 4082, Jan. 15-21, 1996) pp. 79-80.
- ⁸William L. Andrews, *To Tell a Free Story* (Urbana: University of Chicago Press, 1986) pp. 56-58.
- ⁹Arna Bontemps, "The Slave Narrative: An American Genre," quoting p. xiv in Arna Bontemps, ed., *Great Slave Narratives* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969).
- ¹⁰Robert J. Allison, "Introduction: Equiano's Worlds," in Robert J. Allison, ed., *The Interesting Narrative of the Life of Olaudah Equiano* (Boston: Bedford Books, 1995).
- ¹¹See the two works by Paul Gilroy, *Small Acts: Thoughts on the Politics of Black Cultures* (London: Serpent's Trail, 1993) and *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1993) and Carl Pedersen, "Sea Change: The Middle Passage and the Transatlantic Imagination," pp.42-51 in Werner Sollars and Maria Diedrich, eds., *The Black Columbiad* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1994).
- ¹²Houston A. Baker, *Blues, Ideology, and Afro-American Literature: A Vernacular Theory* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984) pp. 34-55.
- ¹³Louis Henry Gates, Jr., *The Signifyin(g) Monkey* (New York: Oxford UP, 1985).
- ¹⁴This is the perspective of Paul Gilroy.

- ¹⁵Henry Louis Gates, Jr., "Introduction," p.xiv in Henry Louis Gates, Jr., ed., *The Classic Slave Narratives* (New York: Mentor, 1987).
- ¹⁶Paul Edwards, "Editor's Introduction," p. xvi-xvii in Paul Edwards, ed., *Equiano's Travels* (Oxford: Heinemann, 1967).
- ¹⁷This interpretation is at least implied in Frances Foster Smith, *Witnessing Slavery: The Development of Ante-Bellum Slave Narratives*. 2nd ed. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1994) [1st ed., 1979] pp. 48-50.
- ¹⁸Paul Edwards, "Introduction," *Equiano's Travels*, p.xvii. In a later essay Edwards took a harsher view of Equiano and the world of slavery he faced. Paul Edwards, "Three West African Writers of the 1780's," pp. 175-198 in Charles T. Davis and Henry Louis Gates, Jr., eds., *The Slave's Narrative* (New York: Oxford UP, 1985).
- ¹⁹Olaudah Equiano, *The Interesting Narrative and Other Writings*. Vincent Carretta, ed. (New York: Penguin, 1995) pp.65,80.
- ²⁰*Ibid.*, pp. 91-92.
- ²¹*Ibid.*, pp. 99-103.
- ²²*Ibid.*, p. 143
- ²³Edwards, "Introduction," p. xvi.
- ²⁴*Interesting Narrative*, p. 64
- ²⁵*Ibid.*, p. 112. It is true that another passage-highly rhetorical-apparently represents a universal condemnation of slavery. *Ibid.*, p. 61.
- ²⁶This possibility is considered in Angelo Costanzo, *Surprising Narrative: Olaudah Equiano and the Beginnings of Black Autobiography* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1987) pp. 17-18.
- ²⁷Every autobiography constitutes a version of the author's life. What I am asking is whether we can identify the reasons for Equiano giving the version of his life (perhaps even the most accurate possible) that he did in the *Interesting Narrative*.
- ²⁸*Interesting Narrative*, pp. 202-8.

Shakespeare's lyrics: Four hundred years of song settings

Peggy A. Horrocks
Peru State College

Was ist Sylvia,
saget an,
dass sie die weite Flur preist?

To the non-German speaking listener, hearing these lyrics sung at the beginning of a presentation on Shakespeare and song must have been puzzling. The music was written by the prolific "father of the German Lied" (art song), Franz Schubert. A translation of the text reveals it to be "Who is Sylvia, What is she, That all our swains commend her," Thuriol's familiar song from Act IV of *Two Gentlemen from Verona*. It is not surprising that the composer who set the words of Goethe and Schiller was also attracted to the words of "the immortal bard." During the past four centuries, Shakespeare has provided lyrics for countless composers. A 1964 catalogue, *Music to Shakespeare*, listed more than 600 examples of song settings, incidental music, and other related music.

An example of a Shakespearean lyric that has retained its popularity over the centuries is "Take, oh take those lips away," from *Measure for Measure*, IV:i. John Wilson, one of the most popular song-writers in pre-Restoration England incorporated his setting into Beaumont and Fletcher's *The Bloody Brother*. Wilson, who might have known Shakespeare in his youth, was a singer and lutenist on the London stage from 1615 to 1642. Wilson's starkly notated setting for solo voice accompanied by the lute represents the style that would have been heard in Shakespeare's day. The singer was expected to add additional notes and flourishes in a practice which is known as "ornamentation." Wilson also added a verse which begins "Hide, oh hide those hills of snow, which thy frozen bosom bares."

"Take, oh take" was one of several Shakespeare lyrics which inspired the American composer Amy Cheney Beach. Beach's setting from the early 20th century reflects the Romantic, operetta style of the blossoming school of American song writers. Beach's songs were appealing and commercially successful and the sheet music found its way onto the pianos in parlors throughout middle-class America.

Songs with the refrain "Sing willow, willow" were popular throughout the 16th and 17th centuries. The most famous of the willow songs, dating from the early 17th century, may have been the setting used in *Othello* where it was sung by Desdemona in Act IV, Scene iii. Other existing popular songs were also incorporated into Shakespeare's plays, as in the series of "airs" sung by Ophelia in Act IV, Scene v of *Hamlet*: "How should I your true love know;" "Good morrow, It is Saint Valentine's day;" and "For bonny sweet Robin is all my joy."

One of the few surviving tunes possibly used during Shakespeare's life is a setting of "It was a Lover and his Lass" by Thomas Morley from *As You Like It*. Morley and Shakespeare were neighbors in London and Morley's song for solo voice accompanied by lute and bass viol was published in 1600.

Several composers of the classical period were also known for their settings of Shakespearean lyrics. The English composer Thomas Arne who lived from 1710-1778 wrote several settings. "Blow, Blow thou Winter Wind" from *As You Like It* (II:vii) has remained a popular piece for the bass voice and is included in many current vocal anthologies.

Franz Joseph Haydn lived most his life employed as the resident composer at the Esterhazy estate in Austria. After his "retirement," Haydn made several trips to England where he had gained great popularity. He wrote a number of English songs and canzonettas. On his second trip to London in 1795, he composed a setting of Viola's story to the Duke in Act II, Scene iv of *Twelfth Night*. Unlike most of the lyrics chosen for song settings, Haydn's text was not originally meant to be sung in the play, but rather is the narrative "She never told her love." This marvelously dramatic setting functions almost as an operatic scene in miniature.

Although this presentation focuses primarily on the use of Shakespeare's lyrics for individual song composition, it is appropriate to mention the numerous operas that have been based on Shakespeare plays. Many of the Italian and French operas, such as Verdi's *Otello* and Gounod's *Romeo et Juliette* follow the story line but take a great deal of liberty in their translations. The 1960 operatic adaptation of *A Midsummer's Night's Dream* by Benjamin Britten retained Shakespeare's language, although Britten rearranged the order of some of the scenes. An interesting aspect of the opera was Britten's concept of writing the music for the fairies in the upper registers of the voice. The part of Tytania was written for coloratura soprano and that of Oberon for counter-tenor, the two highest female and male voice categories, respectively.

Many of the most popular English song composers of the twentieth century were attracted to Shakespearean lyrics. Roger Quilter (1877-1953) was particularly fond of Elizabethan lyrics and wrote perhaps the longest list of Shakespeare Songs in this century. "Oh Mistress Mine" from *Twelfth Night* II:iii is a particularly delightful setting from a set published in 1905 as *Three Shakespeare Songs*. Sir William Walton composed the music for a 1937 film version of *As You Like It* directed by Paul Czinner. "Under the Greenwood Tree" provides a modern setting which retains the simplicity of the late Renaissance style.

In 1942 Gerald Finzi published a set of five songs entitled *Let Us Garlands Bring*. The title, of course, refers to the final line of "Who is Sylvia," one of the songs included in Finzi's collection. Finzi's sprightly setting aptly represents the lasting interest of Shakespeare's lyrics which have appealed to composers and singers and delighted audiences for four-hundred years.

References

- Boustead, Alan. *Music to Shakespeare*. New York: Oxford UP, 1964.
- Christy, Van. A. *Expressive Singing*. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Publishers.

MacClintock, Carol, ed. *The Solo Song, 1580-1730*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1973.

Springfels, Mary. Liner notes. *Musick for Severall Friends*. The Newberry Consort, Mary Springfels, Director (Harmonia mundi 907013).

Discography

The listed recordings were all available through the Tower Records online catalogue as of May, 1996.

An Anthology of English Song. Janet Baker, soprano (Saga Classics). Contains "It was a lover and his lass," "Come Away, Death."

The Best of British Song. (IMP Classics). Contains examples of Shakespeare settings by several composers.

Britten, Benjamin. *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. (London/Decca).

Dr. Arne at Vauxhall Gardens. Emma Kirkby, soprano (Hyperion Records). Contains settings of Shakespeare by Thomas Arne.

The English Lute Song. Julianne Baird, soprano (Dorian Recordings). Many fine examples of authentic Elizabethan era songs.

Musick for Severall Friends. The Newberry Consort, Mary Springfels, Director (Harmonia mundi). Contains Wilson "Take oh take," and "Where the Bee Sucks."

Over Hill, Over Dale. Holst singers, Stephen Layton, director (Hyperion Records). Includes Shakespeare Songs of Ralph Vaughan Williams.

Shakespeare's Kingdom. Sarah Walker, soprano (Hyperion Records). Contains Ophelia Songs, "Willow, willow,"

Schubert "An Sylvia," many other interesting settings.

Songs to Shakespeare. Anthony Rolfe-Johnson, tenor (Hyperion Records). Includes several Roger Quilter settings.

Songs of an Innocent Age. Paul Sperry, tenor (Albany Records). Includes settings by several turn of the century American composers.

Twenty Four Aspects of an Amorous Nature. Peter Jeffes, tenor (Symposium). Several Shakespeare settings by various contemporary English composers.

The Vagabond. Bryn Terfel, Bass. (Deutsche Grammaphon). Contains Gerald Finzi Let Us Garlands Bring.

The Very Thought of You. Al Bowlly, Bass. (Empress). Includes "Blow, Blow Thou Winter Wind."

Walton, William. Complete Songs. Constance Lambert, Soprano. (Et Cetera Records).

Between “play” and “plain and simple”: Bunyan’s defense of fiction

Robert De Smith
Dordt College

I think I may truly say that.... all the things that here I discourse of, I mean as to matter of fact, have been acted upon the stage of this world, even many times before mine eyes. — Mr. Badman

Any careful reader of Bunyan’s *Grace Abounding* (1666) and his *The Pilgrim’s Progress* (1678) will notice the many ways in which they are related. Indeed, the “Preface” to *Grace Abounding*, providing as it does some important contexts for reading that spiritual autobiography, could function quite well as a preface to *The Pilgrim’s Progress*. That “Preface” begins,

Children, Grace be with you, Amen. I being taken from you in presence, and so tied up, that I cannot perform that duty that from God doth lie upon me to youward, for your further edifying and building up in Faith and Holiness, &c., yet that you may see my soul hath fatherly care and desire after your spiritual and everlasting welfare; I now once again, as before from the top of Shenir and Hermon, so now from the Lions Dens, from the Mountains of the Leopards (Song 4. 8), do look yet after you all, greatly longing to see your safe arrival into the desired haven. (GA 1; italics omitted)

The reference to the “Lions Dens” evokes the opening of *The Pilgrim’s Progress*, in which the narrator lies down in a “den” (glossed “The gaol” in the seventh edition; Sharrock, *Bunyan* 70). This sense is reinforced by the frontispiece to the 1679 edition, which depicts a dreaming Bunyan, his arm resting on the top of a cave out of which peers a lion. The lion represents ‘persecution,’

which suggests for Bunyan a role like that of the Apostle Paul, who also wrote from prison (Eph. 3:1; Phil. 1; 2Tim. 1:8) and out of deep longing to be with the recipients of his epistles (1Thes. 2:17; 2Tim 1:4). Indeed, the opening lines of this “Preface” consciously imitate the language of Paul’s epistles in the Authorized Version.

In these ways, Bunyan identifies his purpose for writing as pastoral and his primary audience as his congregation at Bedford. He writes “for your further edifying and building up in Faith and Holiness” and because his “soul hath fatherly care and desire after your spiritual and everlasting welfare” (GA 1). As further evidence, his “Preface” dedicates the work “to those whom God hath counted him worthy to beget to Faith, by his Ministry of the Word” (GA 1). *Grace Abounding* is an extension of Bunyan’s role as preacher and pastor. Furthermore, he makes clear that he writes primarily for the saved, not the lost: “The Philistians understand me not,” he adds (GA 1).

Clearly, *The Pilgrim’s Progress* was written out of similar motives and for a similar audience. In his verse “Author’s Apology,” Bunyan addresses his reader as “O man of God” (47), and he identifies the goal of *The Pilgrim’s Progress* as “thy good” (44).² More fundamentally, Bunyan’s allegorical method in *The Pilgrim’s Progress* cuts both ways. While on the one hand it invites identification between the reader and its protagonist Christian, it also distinguishes between two kinds of readers: those who can understand the allegory because their experience — especially their experiential knowledge of Scripture — confirms its veracity and meaning, and those who remain, like Ignorance himself, clueless to the meaning both of their own state and of the edifying implications of the allegory. “The Philistians understand me not” (GA 1) applies as much to Bunyan’s allegory as to the “Preface” of *Grace Abounding*. As a prison document and as a work of edification, *The Pilgrim’s Progress* works to define and shape its own audience.

There are even in the “Preface” to *Grace Abounding* some hints that Bunyan will eventually turn to the kind of fictional narrative that *The Pilgrim’s Progress* represents. For one, Bunyan uses in this “Preface” the metaphor of the Christian life as a journey, telling his readers he is “greatly longing to see your safe arrival

into the desired haven" (GA 1). Also, his description of *Grace Abounding* as "a Relation of the work of God upon my own Soul, even from the very first, till now; wherein you may perceive my castings down, and raisings up; for he woundeth, and his hands make whole" (GA 2) anticipates the pattern of Christian's progress toward the Celestial City: within a narrative that moves from a beginning to an end, figuring the life and telos of the believer, there is a circular movement of falling and rising.³

But if these hints suggest that fiction was a somewhat natural progression for Bunyan as he attempted to achieve his pastoral goals from prison, fiction also presented Bunyan, or any Puritan or dissenter in the era, with a problem. Bunyan identifies that problem in his "Preface" to *Grace Abounding*, in a passage that aims at affirming the factual veracity of his spiritual autobiography. Bunyan writes,

I could . . . have stepped into a stile much higher than this in which I have here discoursed, and could have adorned all things more then here I have seemed to do: but I dare not: God did not play in convincing of me; the Devil did not play in tempting of me; neither did I play when I sunk as into a bottomless pit, when the pangs of hell caught hold upon me: wherefore I may not play in my relating of them, but be plain and simple, and lay down the thing as it was. (GA 3-4)

Bunyan's argument here is probably more strategic than it is a heart-felt denunciation of fiction. Essentially, he is allowing one kind of truth to stand in for another: by emphasizing the factual truth of his autobiography, he intends to confirm the more important truths contained in those facts — the truth of God's working in the heart of man.⁴

Still, in this passage Bunyan draws on what are traditional Puritan disparagements of fiction in order to affirm the truthfulness of his *Grace Abounding*. His mention of "stile" and "adorned" suggest the association of eloquence with falsifying embellishment. This is Stephen Gosson's complaint (in *The School of Abuse*, 1579) when he compares the poet to "The deceitful phisition" who "geveth sweet syrups to make his poison go down

the smoother" (Rollins and Baker 601).⁵ Similarly, Henry Crosse (in 1603) declares that poets use "fluant termes, and imbossed words, to varnish their lies and fables" (qtd in Fraser 4).

Secondly, Bunyan's iteration of the verb "play" evokes the association of fiction with frivolity, falseness, and even the misuse of time. Poets in the sixteenth century and seventeenth centuries characteristically presented their works as "trifles" or "toys" — as playful, childish things. And as Russell Fraser points out, literature in general — and playgoing in particular — were throughout the era disparaged as thieves of time and ruiners of industry (51-76). Bunyan's response to the possibility that he has contributed either to embellishment or triteness is that he will "be plain and simple, and lay down the thing as it was" (GA 3-4); that is, he will be direct, truthful, and factual.

Fraser accurately identifies the central animus of this anti-fictional bias in the 16th and 17th centuries as "the delight in Naked Truth: the thing itself, undefiled, unaccoutered, for which the playwright or the vulgar empiric substitute their specious approximations" (28). At the root of Puritan (and other reforming) objections to poetry and playing, says Fraser, is "their lack of utility" (4). Such fictions "turn the reader's attention from primary to secondary business" (4). Fraser quotes Henry Crosse: "Since they trade in circumstantial 'phrases, Metaphors, Allegories, and such figurative and superlative termes, and so much vaine eloquence,' they 'yeeld no fruite at all'" (4). This attitude toward fiction was broadly held, and it is the view which we have every reason to believe Bunyan would endorse. Indeed, as a measure of the extent of this view, it is interesting to notice that Tyndale and Bunyan complain about the same books — and for essentially the same reasons. In his *The Obedience of the Christian Man*, Tyndale worries about "Robin Hood, and Bevis of Hampton, Hercules, Hector and Troilus, with a thousand histories and fables of love and wantonness" which "corrupt the minds of youth" (Duffield 331). Bunyan similarly worries about those who shun the Bible in favor of "a ballad, a newsbook, *George on horseback* or *Bevis of Southampton*" (*A Few Sighs From Hell*, MW 1:332-33).

Bunyan's "Author's Apology for His Book," which prefaces *The Pilgrim's Progress*, shows that, to quote Hill, Bunyan "was genuinely worried about the propriety of writing fiction on so serious a subject" (198).⁶ Bunyan even gives voice in his "Apology" to the potential critic, who says "Well, yet I am not fully satisfied, / That this your book will stand, when soundly tried"; this critic later complains that such a "feigned" work must "want solidness" (45-46). Bunyan's qualms about presenting a fictional narrative are especially evident in the early lines of this verse apology, where he twice refers to writing "In such a mode" and once refers to his allegory as his "method": his opening lines draw attention to the problem. He exhibits his worries as well by offering two very traditional defenses of this work. The first appeals to the work's spontaneity: he says that while working on another piece of writing he "Fell suddenly into an allegory"; he adds that ideas came "Like sparks that from the coals of fire do fly," and, switching to the metaphor of spinning thread, "Still as I pulled it came" (43). His second defense is that his intentions when he wrote were private and recreative: he calls his work a "scribble" written in "vacant seasons" to "divert myself" (43). But these are not so much defenses as excuses, ones that are frequently cited in the prefaces Of printed works. To cite just one example, Matthew Grove (writing in the 1580s), says his poems were "such as at leisurable times hapned to my mind, and not of purpose invented" (qtd in Saunders 149).⁷ For Bunyan, these excuses tend to highlight his worries about printing his fictional narrative.

Bunyan does offer more substantive defenses of his fiction in this "Apology"; in fact, Cunningham calls these lines a "powerful bout of hermeneutic theorizing" (223). Two of his arguments are especially helpful for understanding why Bunyan moved from his personal account in *Grace Abounding* to the fictional narrative of *The Pilgrim's Progress*. The first is, simply stated, that his end justifies his means. Addressing those who advised him against printing his work, he writes,

May I not write in such a style as this?
In such a method too, and yet not miss
Mine end, thy good? (44)

To prove that his end is his readers' good, Bunyan compares himself to a fisherman or fowler who uses "divers means" to catch his prey. Paul's defense of his ministry, "I have become all things to all men, that I may by all means save some" (I Cor. 9:22) is not far behind these analogies. In fact, Paul's argument invokes his freedom as an apostle, a freedom that, Bunyan implies, he can claim as well. Bunyan is ultimately less concerned with the propriety of his means than with the urgency of his ends and with the utility of his method.

Bunyan's second defense responds to the charge that metaphors "want solidness" and so obscure the truth — they "make us blind" (46). Bunyan asks,

But must I needs want solidness, because
By metaphors I speak; was not God's laws,
His Gospel-laws in olden time held forth
By types, shadows and metaphors? (46)

In fact, elsewhere in his "Apology" Bunyan demonstrates that metaphors can indeed be "solid," that is, vivid and memorable. He says his book "chalketh out before thine eyes / The man that seeks the everlasting prize" (48) and that his "fancies" will stick like "burrs" (49).

But his central argument in the passage just cited appeals to the example of Scripture, "Which for its style and phrase puts down all wit" (46): Scripture's use of metaphor valorizes Bunyan's use — so long as his goal is the same as that of Scriptures, namely to present truth. Bunyan concludes,

My dark and cloudy words they do but hold
The truth, as cabinets enclose the gold. (46)

Bunyan uses the word *truth* eight times in the last half of his "Apology" (not to mention his twice referring to "light" as a metaphor for truth), setting up a kind of echo which summarizes his arguments. Since he seeks to advance the truth, and since his fiction tells the truth about human experience, he is justified in presenting his "feigned" work. Thus near the end of his "Apology," Bunyan concludes about his work,

It seems a novelty, and yet contains
Nothing but sound and honest gospel-strains. (48)

Bunyan offers one more defense of his fiction which is less formal and more experiential. This defense will help us return to the "Preface" of *Grace Abounding* in order to consider once again the path between that work and *The Pilgrim's Progress*. He promises that "This book will make a traveller of thee" (48), and in the last lines of his "Apology," he asks,

Would'st read thyself, and read thou know'st not what
And yet know whether thou art blest or not,
By reading, the same lines? O then come higher,
And lay my book, thy head and heart together.

The kind of reading Bunyan demands is interactive: interpretation, both of the book and of the reader, becomes a matter of the head and the heart.⁸ Moreover, with "read thyself" Bunyan makes clear that his character Christian provides a kind of illumining example which can allow the reader to see himself. Now, this is precisely the goal Bunyan expresses for his spiritual autobiography in the "Preface" to that work: he says he has published his account so that, "if God will, others may be put in remembrance of what he hath done for their Souls, by reading his work upon me" (4).

Bunyan does not characteristically present himself and his own experience as normative. He writes, for instance, "If God will deal more gently with thee than with others of his children, grudge not at it" (*Come and Welcome*; MW 8:354-55). Instead he presents his experience as exemplary, enjoining his readers to find parallel experiences from their own lives. This attitude is based on Bunyan's own experience: he, after all, "did greatly long to see some ancient Godly man's Experience" (GA 40), and when he finds Luther's commentary on Galatians, he says, "I found my condition in his experience, so largely and profoundly handled, as if his Book had been written out of my heart" (GA 41). Thus when he holds up Luther's experience with the Gospel, or when he describes himself in terms that identify him with the Apostle

Paul (the "chief of sinners," for instance), his goal is to illuminate the shared experience that identifies one as a believer.

And so when Bunyan presents his own experience as a prompt for his readers to remember and examine their own, he has, in effect, presented his own story as a possibility, as a kind of edifying fiction — its truth residing not so much in the factual account of his own experience but in the meaning of that experience for his readers. Seen this way, the step to a fictional character, like Christian, who illustrates the believer's journey and who similarly invites readers to reflect on their own experience, is a small one.

This is the point of Bunyan's injunction later in the "Preface" to *Grace Abounding* that his readers "look diligently, and leave no corner" of their experience "unsearched"; he adds, "Have you forgot the Close, the Milk-house, the Stable, the barns and the like, where God did visit your Soul?" (GA 3). These lines contain an example of that flair for familiar detail for which Bunyan is famous, but, more importantly, his list is instructive in two ways. First, it expresses the assumption that, as Hill puts it, "Intimations of grace occurred in normal daily life" (66). All life is metaphoric, needing to be interpreted by the believing heart in the light of Scripture.⁹ It is this sense which underlies Bunyan's evocation, early in the "Preface," of lions' dens and mountain tops to describe his experience, and it is this sense as well which underlies *The Pilgrim's Progress*. Second, Bunyan invites readers to build their own narrative — to tell their own story — by substituting their scenes for the ones that Bunyan presents in *Grace Abounding*. These two principles are crucial to reading *The Pilgrim's Progress*: the mundane details of Christian's journey — a muddy road, encounters with travelers — contain those intimations of grace. And they aim to teach a similar habit in Bunyan's readers: they are enjoined to find their own "Sloughs of Despond" and perhaps even to moralize the stretches of bad road they might encounter around Bedford, using them as occasions for self-reflection.

This is all to say that fiction was a rather natural progression for Bunyan as he attempted to achieve his pastoral goals from prison: he discovered, I would say, that his character Christian provided a more flexible and more universal illustration of the experience of the believer's way than his own factual account of

his experience. Bunyan moved from the exemplarity of his autobiography to the exemplarity of fiction. And the effect of this movement, more than Bunyan's formal arguments, become his best defense of fiction.

Notes

- 1 Bunyan seems to have in mind a description in Hebrews 11:37-38 of persecution suffered by the those who lived by faith:

They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword: they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented; (Of whom the world was not worthy:) they wandered in deserts, and in mountains, and in dens and in caves of the earth. (NASV)

- 2 Something of the same may be implied in the circumstances Bunyan says led to the writing of *The Pilgrim's Progress*. In his "Apology" he says,

I writing of the way
And race of saints in this our Gospel-day,
Fell suddenly into an allegory
About their journey, and the way to glory. (43)

Sharrock (*Bunyan* 71) suggests *The Heavenly Footman* (1671?) or, less likely *The Strait Gate* (1676) as the work from which Bunyan turned, but Bunyan's account emphasizes the continuity in subject between the two works: indeed, *The Pilgrim's Progress* is presented as a natural development of the theme of the "way / And race of saints."

While his verse "Author's Apology" tells readers, "This book will make a traveller of thee, / If by its counsel thou wilt ruled be" (48), perhaps implying that his book seeks the reader's conversion, neither Bunyan's theology nor other statements in his "Apology" support that sense as his primary intention. Bunyan did not believe that his words could effect conversion

— only God's Word could do that. It is, however, intriguing to suggest that the persistent biblical references in Bunyan's writings are not only an expression of own habits of mind but also a conscious attempt to keep before his readers that saving Word.

- 3 Such circularity may be the point of an illustration of the "Plan of the Road from the City of Destruction to the Celestial City," produced in a nineteenth-century edition of *The Pilgrim's Progress* (see plate 5 in Furlong, which she identifies as used by the permission of the Trustees of Bunyan Meeting, Bedford).
- 4 Interestingly enough, this kind of strategy is commonly used by fiction writers, and it an attitude which helps to explain Bunyan's way out of this dilemma. Nelson suggests that from antiquity the storyteller has two options, especially for presenting fictions: "He might brazen it out by insisting that his fiction was not fiction at all but true history"; "The other course was over or tacit admission that the story was indeed fiction and therefore not subject to judgment as to whether it was historically true or false" (8). He adds that in the Renaissance, despite much effort spend defending "the proposition that though fiction was not the truth of history it was nevertheless truth in some other, more profound sense," there remained "a stubborn conviction that true report was superior to any imitation of it" (8). Bunyan distinguishes his autobiography from fictional accounts in order to associate it with the superior kind of truth.
- 5 Gosson also compares poets to the dishonest servants in Latin comedy:

Many good sentences are spoken by Davus to shadow his knavery and written by poets as ornaments to beautify their works and set their trumpery to sale without suspect. (Rollins and Baker 601)

Gosson's physician metaphor is, of course, quite flexible, as any viewer of *Mary Poppins* knows. Bunyan, in his *Instruction for the Ignorant*, puts it this way: "When doctors give their

Physic to the Sick / They make it pleasing with some other thing."

- 6 Similarly, Keeble calls the author of *The Pilgrim's Progress* "diffident," noticing that he withheld publication of his work for a number of years, "and only printed it with a very defensive prefatory 'Apology'" (245).
- 7 Saunder's "The Stigma of Print" provides the best account of such excuses.
- 8 In his *Pharasee and Publican* Bunyan addresses his readers:

Wherefore, in reading this little book thou must needs read thyself. I do not say thou must understand thy condition; for it is the gift of God must make thee do that. Howbeit, if God will bless it to thee, it may be a means to bring thee to see whose steps thou art treading, and so at whose end thou art like to arrive. (qtd in Baird 10).

- 9 The parallel passage in Bunyan's "Apology" cites the "sober man" must interpret Old Testament:

[he] . . . seeks to find out what by pins and loops,
By calves, and sheep, by heifers, and by rams,
By birds and herbs, and by the blood of lambs
God speaketh to him. (46)

List of Works Cited

- Baird, Charles W. *John Bunyan: A Study in Narrative Technique*. Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press, 1977.
- Bunyan, John. *Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners*. (1666). Ed. Roger Sharrock. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1962.
- Bunyan, John. *The Pilgrim's Progress*. (1678). Ed. Roger Sharrock. Penguin Classics. New York: Penguin, 1987.
- Cunningham, Valentine. "Glossing and Glozing: Bunyan and Allegory." In Keeble, *Bunyan* 217-40.
- Duffield, G.E. *The Work of William Tyndale*. Philadelphia: Fortress P, 1965.
- Furlong, Monica. *Puritan's Progress*. New York: Coward, 1975.

- Fraser, Russell. *The War Against Poetry*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1970.
- Hill, Christopher. *A Tinker and a Poor Man: John Bunyan and his Church, 1628-1688*. New York: Knopf, 1989.
- Keeble, N.H. "Of him thousands daily Sing and talk': Bunyan and Reputation." Keeble, *Bunyan* 241-63.
- Keeble, N.H., ed. *John Bunyan: Conventicle and Parnassus. Tercentenary Essays*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1988.
- Nelson, William. *Fact or Fiction: The Dilemma of the Renaissance Storyteller*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1973.
- Rollins, Hyder E. and Hershel Baker, eds. *The Renaissance in England*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath, 1954.
- Saunders, J.W. "The Stigma of Print: A Note on the Social Bases of Tudor Poetry." *Essays in Criticism* 1 (1951): 139-64.
- Sharrock, Roger. *John Bunyan*. London: Hutchinson, 1954.
- Sharrock, Roger, gen ed. *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan*. 12 vols. (in progress). Oxford: Oxford UP, 1976 -.

The reception of Castiglione's *The Courtier* in England

Douglas A. Northrop
Ripon College

W. B. Drayton Henderson, in a note to the Everyman edition of *The Courtier*, says with self-admitted hyperbole, "that without Castiglione we should not have Hamlet," for "Hamlet... is the high exemplar of [the courtier]." With I hope less hyperbole I will argue that without Castiglione we should not have Osrice, the self important, ceremonious courtier of the play's fifth act.

I would heartily agree with Henderson that "The ideal of the courtier, soldier, scholar, developed first in Italy, and perfected in the narrative of *Il Cortegiano*, was Castiglione's gift to the world. . ." (xii). And when Roger Ascham in *The Schoolmaster* (first edition 1570) refers to Castiglione, Ascham has that high ideal in mind. Ascham has supported the traditional ideals of learning, virtue, and service to the commonweal as the proper functions of the gentry. He enlists Castiglione in his cause when he says, "To join learning with comely exercises, Conte Baldasare Castiglione in his book *Cortegiano* doth trimly teach; which book, advisedly read and diligently followed, but one year at home in England, would do a young gentleman more good, iwis, than three years' travel abroad spent in Italy" (55). Ascham particularly commends Sir Thomas Hoby's translation of Castiglione which appeared in 1561 and was reprinted in 1571 and 1603, but we should also remember that *Il Cortegiano* was published in England in Italian in 1571, 1577, 1585, and 1593 plus a three language version (Italian, French, and English - Hoby's translation) in 1588. Ascham goes on to express his concern in 1570 that the book was little read. His remark seems unprophetic given its printing history in England for the rest of the century; his concern that it be "advisedly read," however, proved to be a very serious issue.

In 1547 in France a satiric attack had already been made against the Italianate courtier who places his reputation above all other considerations including religion or justice, who is adaptable to fashions without regard to truth, and who values learning only to sprinkle it in his conversation. This satire by Philibert de Vienne is given a second edition with some revision in 1548, and is translated into English by George North in 1575 from the 1548 edition. Daniel Javitch has argued that there was an amalgam of Machiavelli and Castiglione that occurred in France and which was connected to the Italianate influence at the French court, and that these special circumstances produce the satiric reaction. As those circumstances did not obtain in England in the 1570's, he concludes that North missed the satire and translated what he took to be a helpful exposition of how to be a courtier.

If North's translation is accepted as a satire, it reveals concerns about Castiglione's conception of a courtier or at least concerns about some misconceptions of the courtier. If the translation is accepted as straightforward exposition, then Castiglione may suffer even more, for his high ideal of honor and reputation as a means to civic service has been turned into mere unprincipled self-seeking. *The Philosopher of Court*, as Philibert's book is titled, follows those authors in its exposition of the virtues who are "least scrupulous" (22); it allows courtiers "to beguile, filch, or cogge, and to do the worst we can, so that neither lawe, Judge, nor justice may touch or catch hold of us for it" (48); it urges fellow courtiers to disregard parents, friends, and God if respecting them would "hinder or lesse our honour" (82). Such statements continue throughout the text, presenting a position that follows fashion over reason, self-interest over religion, and always appearance over reality. The new courtier, as presented by Philibert and as faithfully translated by North, is shown to be superficial, quarrelsome, and concerned only with his own reputation.

An explicit, and much more positive, reference is made to Castiglione in a little book called *Cyulle and vncyuoole life, A discourse very profitable, pleasant, and fit to bee read of all Nobilitie and Gentlemen* published in London by Richard Jones in 1579. It is a dialogue between representatives of the courtly life and the

country gentleman's life arguing the relative merits of these lifestyles. The courtier leaves the detailed description of court to "Earle Baidazar, whose Booke translated by Sir Thomas Hobby I think you have, or ought to have read" (Kiiv). But the defender of the court then gives a primarily pragmatic argument that it is healthier, less costly, quieter, and more interesting to live in the city nearer court, than in the country. None of the high idealism of Castiglione has survived in this debate, and the elegance of expression urged and exemplified by Castiglione is regularly criticized. The courtier is reprimanded for being "full of respectes, which humor you found beyond the Mountaynes. . ." (Liv). And as a gloss on the term, "respectes," the country person notes that in the country they "lacke the Arte of Adulation, or the skil of ceremonious speech, which you travellers have brought from beyond the Seas" (Miiiiiv).

A further insight into the sixteenth century understanding of Castiglione comes from Stefano Guazzo, *The Ciuill Conversatian* (1574), translated by George Pettie (1581) with the addition of Book IV by Bartholomew Young (1586). In the discussion of civility that occurs there, a speaker comments on his interlocuter's use of Petrarch and Vida without acknowledgment and provides us with another English translation of Castiglione's concept of sprezzatura: "You have swarved nothing at all in this discourse from the dutie of a perfect Courtier, whose property it is to do all things with careful diligence, and skilfull art: mary yet so that the art is hidden, and the whole seemeth to be doone by chance, that he may thereby be had in more admiration" (27). Pettie's preface to the readers makes clear that the context in which he sees this book is the education of gentlemen for service (9). In the text, however, such principles are missing and the "fruite and lawfull rewarded of our travell" is said to be "everlasting praise" (217). Castiglione has argued that the courtier should seek "estimation," but such praise, fame, or reputation was only the means to service. Here the estimation is the end itself.

When Gabriel Harvey in his *Letterbook* mentions Castiglione, Harvey is pointing out that students want to become men of affairs rather than seekers of truth. He continues: "And nowe of late forsoothe to helpe countenance owte the matter they have

gotten Philbertes Philosopher of the Courte, the Italian Archebysshoppes brave Galatro, Castiglioes fine Cortegiano, Bengalassoes Civil Instructions to his Nephewe Seignor Princisca Ganzar: Guatzoes newe Discourses of curteous behaviour . . . and I knowe not howe many outlandishe braveries besides of the same stampe" (l. 136-37). Let me briefly comment on the two other books in this list which have not yet been mentioned.

Galateo is a book by Giovanni Della Casa, translated by Robert Peterson in 1576. The book presents an older man counselling a young arrival at the court on how to behave. It is a practical and specific book covering the use of toothpicks as well as the telling of jokes. It is concerned with conversation, personal interactions in the court; it can be technically called a courtesy book, dealing with manners and interpersonal behavior. It notes that good manners give delight, and that one should always conform to the practices of the place: "bee it right or wronge, consent to the minds of the most" (62). The English translation gives the subtitle: "A Treatise of the Manners and Behaviours, it behoveth a Man to use and eschewe, in his Familiar Conversation. A Worke very necessary & profitable for all Gentlemen, or Other." The subtitle is accurate: conversation has become the whole content; there is no mention of the profession of arms, just a brief comment on duelling, and no mention of service.

The other book, supposed to be written by Bengalasse, is *The Court of Civil Courtesie* (1577). It purports to be a translation from the Italian, but modern consensus is that it is the original work of Simon Robson (S. R. was stated to be the translator.) A second edition was printed in 1591 with a number of omissions from the text. The subtitle is lengthy but again so descriptive as to be worth quoting: "Fitly furnished with a pleasant porte of stately phrases and pithy precepts: assembled in the behalfe of all young Gentlemen, and others that are desirous to frame their behavior according to their estates at all times, and in all companies. Therby to purchase worthy prayse of their inferiours; and estimation and credite amonge theyr befters." The book provides advice on conversational responses with numerous examples for many situations such as seating arrangements, jesting, insults, dealing with roisterers, etc. It gives prominent attention to questions of

honor and when and how to challenge for a duel. Matters of courtliness and courtesy are becoming issues of honor and arms.

The final allusion to Castiglione that I want to consider is in William Segar's *The Booke of Honor and Armes* (1590). The book is concerned with who is noble or a gentleman and how such a person should behave, but a prominent issue is knowing: "what iniure is, and how to repulse it, when to fight, when to rest satisfied, what is Honor and good reputation, how it is gained, and by what meanes the same is kept & preserved.... Segar goes on to explain that "the Earle Balthsazar Castilio in his booke of the Courtier, doth among other qualities requireable in a gentleman specially advise he should bee skillful in the knowing of Honor and causes of quarrel" (A3r).

It may help to characterize Segar's book to note that Touchstone in *As You Like It* (V.iv.50-104) could have taken much for his speech on the seven causes for quarrelling, such as the lie certain, the lie conditional, the lie general, the lie special, etc. straight from Segar's table of contents. By the 1590's dueling with its formal codes of behavior had many manuals published, and as Segar indicates, these issues have become linked with Castiglione because of the emphasis on honor, estimation, or reputation.

Ascham's *The Schoolmaster*, with its stress on virtue and service and its acknowledgement of Castiglione's support for these qualities, is reprinted five times by 1590, so not all the references to *The Courtier* or to courtiers are to ostentatious language and quarrelsome behavior. But as these other texts reveal, Castiglione is seen as supporting the new emphasis on honor leading to the increasing occurrences of duels. He is seen as a contributor to the ceremonious use of language that is associated with the court and courtly behavior. Finally, Castiglione's insistence on service as the end of the courtier is forgotten, and the means, that is, the reputation, becomes perceived to be an end in itself.

Two possible explanations can be offered for this distortion of Castiglione. First, Castiglione's work is presented in the form of an extended conversation, an after-dinner discussion among elegant ladies and gentlemen that took place at the court of Urbino. The strength of Castiglione's form is that many of the precepts of the courtier can be instantly exemplified. The weak-

ness of Castiglione's form is that only those precepts concerned with conversation can be so exemplified. The principal profession of the courtier is arms; where is that exemplified; how can it be? One of the results of the courtly report seems to be that the new courtier is defined by his conversation, that issues of truth seem to be submerged into issues of polite consensus, and that the education of nobility seems to be accomplished by learning the conversational style of the courtier.

Second, it is of course not just the gentry who are learning behavior but also those who aspire to that condition. Several of the books we have looked at have been addressed to "gentlemen and others." *The Court of Civil Courtesie* was "assembled in the behalfe of all young Gentlemen, and others that are desirous to frame their behavior according to their estates at all times, and in all companies." The books are directly concerned with the self-centered aspirations of these climbers, providing them with the attitudes, the phrases, and the behaviors they need to fulfill their ambitions.

What does Shakespeare make of these recommended behaviors of duelling and ceremonious speech? In *Romeo and Juliet*, Mercutio's antagonism to Tybalt is not the result of the family feud, but rather because Tybalt is a "new tuner of accent," one of those "who stand so much on the new form that they cannot sit at ease on the old bench" (II.iv.31,33-35). Part of this newness is Tybalt's allegiance to the new schools and books on duelling, Segar among them, but also Saviolo and Carranza. But Tybalt's faults are more numerous and include the "antic lipping affecting phantasimes," indeed his entire fashion. The Italian context for this play may thus include not only Petrarch and the duelling manuals, but also the other qualities of the new courtier which have come from over the mountains.

I am happy to accept the suggestion of the Arden edition of *Romeo and Juliet* and compare Mercutio's characterization of Tybalt as one of "these strange flies" (II.iv.32) with Hamlet's characterization of Osric as a "waterfly" (V.ii.82). Indeed, the second quarto stage direction for Osric's arrival — "Enter a courtier" — may say it all. Certainly Osric has "the Arte of Adulation, or the skil of ceremonious speech" which as we have

heard was "brought from beyond the Seas" (*Cyuite and vnciuile life* Miiiiiv). If Hamlet, the character, may owe something to Castiglione when *The Book of the Courtier* is advisedly read, then Osric may equally owe something to the growing distortions of Castiglione and the caricatures of the Italianate courtier.

List of Works Cited

- Ascham, Roger. *The Schoolmaster*. Ed. Lawrence Ryan. Folger Documents of Tudor and Stuart Civilization. Ithica: Cornell UP, 1967.
- Casa, Giovanni Della. *Galateo, of Manners and Behaviours: A Renaissance Courtesy Book*. Intro. J. E. Spingarn. London: Grant Richards, Ltd., 1914.
- Castiglione, Baldassare. *The Book of the Courtier*. Trans. Sir Thomas Hoby. Everyman's Library, No. 807. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1956.
- Cyuite and vncyuite life, A discourse very profitable, pleasant, and fit to bee read of all Nobilitie and Gentlemen*. London: Richard Jones, 1579.
- Guazzo, Stephano. *The Ciuile Conversation of M. Steeven Guazza*. Trans. Bks. 1-111 George Pettie (1581), Bk. IV Bartholomew Young (1586); Intro. Sir Edward Sullivan. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1925.
- Harvey, Gabriel. *The Works of Gabriel Harvey*. Ed. by Alexander B. Grosart. Three Volumes. The Huth Library. 1884. New York: AMS Press, 1966.
- @WORKS CITED = Javitch, Daniel. "The Philosopher of the Court: A French Satire Misunderstood." *Comparative Literature* 23 (1971): 97-124.
- Philibert de Vienne Champengois. *The Philosopher of the Court*. trans. George North. London: Henry Binneman, 1575. [orig. Fr. ed. 1547]
- [Robson, Simon]. Mont. Priscacchi Retto, Bengalasse del. *The Court of ciuill Courtesie, Filie furnished with a pleasant porte of stately phrases and pithy precepts: assembled in the behalfe of all young gentlemen, and others, that are desirous to frame their behaviour according to their estates, at all times, and in all*

- companies. Therby to purchase worthy prayse, of their inferiour; and estimation and credite amonge theyr betters. Out of Italian, by S[imon] R[obson] Gent. London: Richard Jones, 1577; 2nd edition, with deletions, 1591.*
- Segar, William. *The Booke of Honor and Armes*. London: Richard Jones, 1590.

Tragic response to the B-text of *Doctor Faustus*

Bruce E. Brandt
South Dakota State University

Drawing upon Stephen Booth's argument that "Tragedy is the word by which the mind designates (and thus in part denies) its helplessness before a concrete, particular, and thus undeniable demonstration of the limits of human understanding," this paper takes issue with the frequent assertion that the A-text of Christopher Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* is tragic while the B-text provides no more than an orthodox medieval allegory.¹ I would argue instead that B evokes a profound and very modern sense of tragedy, but one with which some viewers may be less comfortable than they are with the tragedy of A. Note that pursuing this argument is not an attempt to resolve the relationship between the two texts or to solve the attendant problems of authorship.² I am, in fact, content with current thinking that suggests that we simply have two texts, neither of which can be used to elucidate the other, and each of which is worth study.³ My argument is simply that the B-text is truly a tragic text.

The argument that B is not tragic is rooted primarily in three moments in the B-text which are not found in A: B shows the devils assembling to watch over Faustus's initial conjuring, it shows them gloating over Faustus's final moments, and it contains Mephostophilis's revelation that he led Faustus's eye when Faustus paired the biblical texts from which he drew his fatal syllogism. B differs from A in other ways, of course, but it is this heightening of the demonic presence that has led many readers to find the play both less tragic and more morally orthodox than A.

Critics holding this opinion have come from all sides of the textual wars surrounding *Doctor Faustus*. For example, W. W. Greg's argument that the B-text more closely reflects Marlowe's original conception than does the A-text dominated Marlowe studies for a quarter-century. Nonetheless, Greg's aesthetic pref-

erence was for the A-text. He found B to be abstract and allegorical, the heir of the medieval morality, and felt that "A undoubtedly heightens the effect of the human tragedy."⁴ Roma Gill, who has come to strongly advocate the primacy of the A-text, shared this judgment of B-text tragedy in her first New Mermaids edition, and has reiterated the point in her new *Complete Works*, arguing that "the whole nature of the play is changed" by the difference in the B version of V.ii: "Without it we have the tragedy of an individual who willfully seeks his own destruction; with it, *Dr. Faustus* is a more medieval play where man is a puppet manipulated by external powers."⁵ Such too is the reaction of Michael Warren, who moved away from the idea of subordinating one text to the other with his argument that we have two received, and incompatible, texts:

The A-text maintains a consistent Christian context

The B-text, by contrast, appears to reflect a Christianity which is less intellectual, more homely, more timid, superstitious even. Although its conclusion — that God will withdraw divine grace in anger against a great sinner — is terrible, it reflects a simpler doctrine, a more certain absolute, and pious confidence in its cautionary morality, in what could be conceived as its homiletic message.⁶

Those who see a mere puppet in the B-text *Faustus* often see logical or theological problems being created by the emphatic demonic presence. Greg, for example, felt that having the devils lying in wait for Faustus to conjure contradicts Mephostophilis's explanation that he had come on account of Faustus's blasphemy rather than the actual conjuration.⁷ Similarly, Constance Brown Kuriyama has argued that B confuses the theological issues more than A, with Mephostophilis's claim to have led Faustus's eye during the construction of the fatal syllogism contradicting his earlier assertion that Faustus's fate is the result of his own seeking.⁸ However, we surely do not need to presume that Mephostophilis speaks the whole truth and nothing but the truth when he speaks to Faustus, nor that evil cannot anticipate the blasphemy to which it is happy to respond. Nor need we conclude that the leading of Faustus's eye absolves him of responsibility.

Rather, and at the root of the play's tragedy, the theology of the B-text insists precisely that the sinner deserves his punishment even if he is tempted and even if the chance of his acting differently turns out to be very slim indeed.

Once one accepts them as being something more than textual confusions, the most salient point concerning these three moments is that they are clearly incompatible with some interpretations based on A. Any understanding of Faustus that stresses his Renaissance individuality and daring, for example, does not mesh well with the notion of Mephostophilis leading Faustus's eye during his perusal of the Bible, and as illustrated above, the lesser autonomy of the B Faustus lessens the play's tragic effect for many readers. What, then, does *Faustus B* offer in place of this classical tragedy of the individual? The answer begins with the recognition that the B Faustus is free to act, to accept grace, and to repent; in a Calvinistic sense, he is not reprobate. There is never, of course, unanimity among critics, but this sense of the B Faustus's freedom generally accords with the scholarship of the last forty years or so, a period in which most published criticism has referred to texts based on B. The overwhelming consensus has been that Faustus has the possibility of repentance⁹ and that he is damned because of his despair: he can not bring himself to repent.

The issue of God's mercy, human fate, and the possibility that damnation is either inevitable or highly likely is raised in the much discussed syllogism in Faustus's opening soliloquy:

Stipendium peccati mors est. Ha!
Stipendium, etc.
 The reward of sin is death? That's hard.
Si peccasse negamus, fallimur
Et nulla est in nobis veritas.
 If we say that we have no sin,
 We deceive ourselves, and there is no truth in us.
 Why then belike we must sin,
 And so consequently die.
 Ay, we must die an everlasting death. (B:1.1.37-4.)¹¹

Noting that Faustus's citations are distorted by being taken out of context, modern critics have emphasized the underlying irony of the passage. The major premise, that sin's reward is death, is from Romans 6:23, which continues "but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." The minor premise, that we deceive ourselves if we deny our sinfulness, is from I John 1:8, and the next verse goes on to say that "If we acknowledge our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." In short, what these passages assert, and what Faustus has omitted, is Christ's mercy and the promise of salvation. Moreover, it has been amply demonstrated that Marlowe's audience should have been well-equipped to respond to the irony of the passage and to supply the omitted promise of mercy. Similar syllogisms, along with the proper refutation of the argument, are found in Spenser, Luther, and Thomas Becon.¹² The passage from John would also have been especially familiar to the audience since it appears in the Order for Morning Prayer in *The Book of Common Prayer*, where it is followed by a homily emphasizing the infinite goodness and mercy of God.¹³

The point that Faustus should have been able to connect the premises of his syllogism with the promise of mercy is obviously well-taken. However, it is worth reminding ourselves that at least one of the important usages which can be mentioned as showing Elizabethan familiarity with the passage from John does not focus on God's mercy and promise of salvation. This is its use in Article 15 of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England:¹⁴

Of Christ alone without Sin

Christ in the truth of our nature was made like unto us in all things, sin only except, from which he was clearly void, both in his flesh, and in his spirit. He came to be the Lamb without spot, who by the sacrifice of himself once made, should take away the sins of the world, and sin, as Saint *John* saith, was not in him. But all we the rest, although baptized, and born again in Christ, yet offend in many things; and if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

Article 15, in short, contrasts human sinfulness and unworthiness with Christ's perfection, emphasizing humanity's distance from Christ, and it does so by truncating the passage from John in precisely the manner of Marlowe's Faustus.

The resonances of the allusions, then, may be more complex than is often suggested. The reason that we can find so many other examples of the syllogism, after all, is precisely because the confrontation with despair is an important concern within the Christian experience, and was especially so at a time when the prevailing doctrines of predestination left many unsettled over the question of whether or not they were among the elect.¹⁵ Moreover, the point of the opening soliloquy is surely not to provide us with a final rather than an initial understanding of Faustus. What the syllogism really does with its overt denial of the possibility of salvation and its implicit reminder of the mercy that makes salvation possible is to evoke the range of theological speculation and concern in Marlowe's day. Contemporary theology may have insisted on God's mercy, but many would also have insisted that saving grace is not granted to everyone and that most people are not saved. How, then, is God's mercy to be understood? Marlowe's way is not to resolve such questions, but to ask us to think, to weigh "The form of Faustus' fortunes, good or bad."

The form of those fortunes not only differs in A and B, but readings of A have radically diverged. For some, the A-text shows the tragedy of the reprobate sinner who comes to know that he is reprobate.¹⁶ By raising the question of whether one is among the elect or not, the play thus enables its Elizabethan viewers to see in Faustus that which they fear for themselves, but then allows them to distance themselves from him and reassure themselves that they are not reprobate. Alternatively, A's omission (or non-addition!) of the devils who watch Faustus so closely and intervene in his reading of the bible has led many to find that the Faustus of A is freer than the Faustus of B. We therefore can identify with his aspiration and Renaissance striving, but then separate ourselves from him. We, after all, would not so obviously misread the Bible or commit any of the other errors of this vain and foolish man. We may see in him things we fear for ourselves,

but we can safely distance ourselves from him since we can assign him responsibility for his own fall.

Such readings exemplify the point of Booth's discussion of tragedy, which sees it as a term we use to shield ourselves from the unknowable, to ease our discomfort by providing a definition for what in fact is beyond human definition.¹⁷ Indeed, he suggests that grappling with the definition, deciding what fits Aristotle's rules and what doesn't, is in itself a way of insulating and protecting ourselves from more direct confrontation with the reality of what we are defining.¹⁸ The B-text, I would suggest, offers us less of this consolation than does the A-text. Here Faustus does not simply suffer a willful sinner's fate in a way that leaves us confident that God's mercy had been available, nor does Faustus simply suffer the fate of the non-elect. The crux of the matter, as I have argued elsewhere, is that despite its insistence on free will, the possibility of repentance, and the availability of grace, the play elicits an emotional rejection of its Christian vision, for although salvation is theologically possible, Faustus's chance for escape is so narrow as to be a practical impossibility.¹⁹ Faustus's "*Che serà, serà*" is wrong; he is not fated (or predestined) to everlasting death. But he is playing a losing game: his freedom to choose grants him the responsibility for his fall, but the limits within which he must make his choice are so small that he cannot succeed, and it is precisely this existential quandary that constitutes his tragedy. He is not a puppet, but a man who has found that there is no room in the human condition for the meaningful exercise of freedom.

This discovery evokes a tragic response which differs from that of A, one from which it is much harder to comfortably shield ourselves. It is the same difference, I would argue, that we find between the tragic effects of *Hamlet* and *King Lear*. It is no secret that *Hamlet* is easier to bear than *Lear*. Identification with Hamlet is, in short, not painful; who does not enjoy some self-association with Hamlet's wit or intellectual prowess, or even with his moodiness and procrastination. We can see ourselves in him, but it is always safe, for he is always other; we are not Prince Hamlet, and we know it. *King Lear*'s problems are more deeply, and obviously, rooted in each of us: who has not seen that the

justice of the world is not poetic justice; who has not wondered if the gods are kind, if there are gods; who has not asked, "Why should a dog, a horse, a rat have life, / And thou no breath at all?" It is less easy to filter this tragedy, to find defensive strategies that make it bearable. Similarly, I would argue that it is easier to admire, and then to distance ourselves from, the Faustus of A than of B. The brilliant, albeit wrongheaded sinner who bears the responsibility for his own damnation may indeed be tragic, but so may the individual confronting the unfathomable mystery of life and finding in it neither meaning nor justice. B is tragic in precisely this sense. Faustus is not an Oedipus, or a Hamlet, struggling to bear the fate that has been prepared for him; he is rather every person who has looked into the abyss and found Lear's "nothing" — found that the promises of life's meaning were not validated.

Notes

¹ *King Lear, Macbeth, Indefinition, and Tragedy* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1983) 85.

² In brief, *Doctor Faustus* exists in two versions, the A-text of 1604 and the B-text of 1616, both of which appear long after Marlowe's death in 1593. A is shorter and may reflect memorial transmission and/or acting cuts. B is longer, but may contain later additions to the play. B shows signs of having been censored. The textual waters are further muddied since an edition of A provided some of the copy for the printing of B. Marlowe may have originally worked with a collaborator, and the later additions to the play, if B does contain them, might be by the same collaborator. For convenience, I simply refer to the author as Marlowe throughout the paper.

³ Michael Warren, "Doctor Faustus: The Old Man and the Text," *English Literary Renaissance* 11 (1981): 111-147; David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen, eds., *Doctor Faustus: A- and B-texts (1604, 1616)*, *The Revels Plays* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1993) 48; David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen, eds., *Doctor Faustus and Other Plays*, Oxford Drama Library [hardback]/World's Classics [paperback], (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).

⁴ *Marlowe's Doctor Faustus 1604-1616: Parallel Texts* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1950) 130.

⁵ *Doctor Faustus*, New Mermaids (London: Ernest Benn, 1965) xviii; and *Dr Faustus*, vol 2 of *The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990) xxiv.

⁶ Warren, 139; Bevington and Rasmussen endorse Warren's reading in *Doctor Faustus: A- and B-texts (1604, 1616)*, 48.

⁷ Greg, 102.

⁸ "Dr. Greg and *Doctor Faustus*: The Supposed Originality of the 1616 Text," *English Literary Renaissance* 5 (1975): 177.

⁹ See, for example, Paul Kocher, *Christopher Marlowe: A Study of His Thought, Learning and Character* (1946; rpt. New York: Russell and Russell, 1962); Douglas Cole, *Suffering and Evil in the Plays of Christopher Marlowe* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1962); Margaret Ann O'Brien, "Christian Belief in *Doctor Faustus*," *ELH* 37 (1970): 1-11; and Gerard H. Cox "Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* and 'Sin against the Holy Ghost,'" *Huntington Library Quarterly* 36 (1973): 119-137.

¹⁰ See, for example, John G. McCloskey, "The Theme of Despair in Marlowe's *Faustus*," *College English* 4 (1942): 110-113; Lily B. Campbell, "Doctor Faustus: A Case of Conscience," *PMLA* 67 (1952): 219-239; Joseph Westlund, "The Orthodox Christian Framework of Marlowe's *Faustus*," *SEL* 3 (1963): 191-205; Arieh Sachs, "The Religious Despair of Doctor Faustus," *JEGP* 63 (1964): 625-647; Susan Snyder, "The Left Hand of God: Despair in Medieval and Renaissance Tradition," *Studies in the Renaissance* 12 (1965): 18-59; R. H. Bowers, "Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus*, Tirso's *El Condenado por Desconfiado*, and the Secret Cause," *Costerus* 4 (1972): 9-27; Pauline Honderich, "John Calvin and *Doctor Faustus*," *MLR* 68 (1973): 1-13.

¹¹ The edition cited is Bevington and Rasmussen, *Doctor Faustus: A- and B-texts (1604, 1616)*. However, in my own text, I use the normal B spelling "Mephostophilis."

¹² Snyder traces all of these allusions, 30-32; Kocher discusses Bacon, 106-107.

¹³ Diane Elizabeth Dreher, "Si Peccasse Negamus: Marlowe's *Faustus* and *The Book of Common Prayer*," *Notes and Queries*, ns 30 (1983): 143-144. Gill notes that the English of *Faustus*'s quotation

of John is not directly from any translation of the Bible but from the 1559 *Book of Common Prayer: Complete Works*, xxv.

¹⁴ The relevance of Article 15 to the discussion of Faustus has been pointed out by Michael Keefer, ed., *Christopher Marlowe's Doctor Faustus: A 1604-Version Edition* (Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press, 1991) lii.

¹⁵ A good discussion of the unease of English Protestants is contained in the first chapter of Dayton Haskin's *Milton's Burden of Interpretation* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994): 1-28.

¹⁶ That A is Calvinistic but B is not is argued by Robert G. Hunter, in *Shakespeare and the Mystery of God's Judgments* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1976) 39-66; and Leah S. Marcus, "Textual Indeterminacy and Ideological Difference: The Case of Doctor Faustus," *Renaissance Drama* 20 (1989): 1-29. Paul R. Sellin finds Calvinism in both A and B: "The Hidden God: Reformation Awe in Renaissance English Literature," *The Darker Vision of the Renaissance: Beyond the Fields of Reason*, ed. Robert S. Kinsman, UCLA Center for Medieval and Renaissance Literature, vol. 6 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974) 147-196. Others do not distinguish A and B in their discussions of Calvinism: see Alan Sinfield, *Literature in Protestant England: 1560-1660* (Totowa, NJ: Barnes and Noble, 1983) 116-120; and some attempt to focus on texts found in both versions: see Martha Tuck Rozett, *The Doctrine of Election and the Emergence of Elizabethan Tragedy* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1984) 209-246. Rozett does find, however, that having his eyes lead by Mephostophilis when he reads the Bible transforms a renowned scholar into a puppet: 238.

¹⁷ For discussions of the audience's fear and denial being elicited by *Doctor Faustus*, see Philip K. Wion, "Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, the Oedipus Complex, and the Denial of Death," *Colby Library Quarterly* 16 (1980): 190-204; and Constance Brown Kuriyama, *Hammer and Anvil: Psychological Patterns in Christopher Marlowe's Plays* (New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1980): 131-135.

¹⁸ Booth, 85.

¹⁹ *Christopher Marlowe and the Metaphysical Problem Play*, Elizabethan and Renaissance Studies, 97 (Salzburg: Universität Salzburg, Institut für Anglistik und Amerikanistik, 1985) 174-198.

Making Swift safe for tv: An analysis of *Gulliver's Travels, The Miniseries*

Andrew Alexander
Wayne State University

Teaching *Gulliver's Travels* has never been, for me, an especially successful or satisfying experience. I enjoy the work, and have ever since I first read it as an undergraduate, but many of my students (probably the majority) do not. Most seem fairly interested as we move through the first and second voyages. Somewhere in the second voyage, however, their attitude changes; and by the time they reach the end of the work, their reaction has become quite negative. How does one explain this shift from moderate fascination to resistance? From their comments, students seem to appreciate the fantasy elements of the story: a world of little people, another world of giants, a flying island, horses that talk. Some also appreciate the scatological humor. Yet these elements cannot hold their interest in the face of what they dislike about the *Travels*. They find the narrative flat and un compelling, and come to see the narrator as dull, boring, and ultimately quite unsympathetic. If some find the emphasis on bodily functions funny, others tend to see it as vulgar and gross. Many are put off by the political satire, which they find obscure and dated. And most are bewildered by the way the book ends, with a man openly expressing his disdain for humanity and his preference for the company of horses.

Now I admit that I am overgeneralizing a bit here. Not all students react this way; some no doubt like the work as much as I do. And as Swift himself might point out, it is quite possible that students are reacting not to the work being taught, but to the person teaching it. But I do not think my experience is entirely unique. I remember attending a session of an MLA conference devoted to Swift. While the session's papers never directly addressed pedagogical issues, many of the follow up questions did, and several who spoke seem to have had experi-

ences similar to mine. To paraphrase one such query: "How do you get your students to appreciate someone who seems to dislike them so much?"

One possible answer to this question is: "Let them watch a video." And indeed, there are advantages to this. Students enjoy watching movie versions of books. More importantly, because transposing a work from one medium to another always involves some interpretation, videos can provide a useful starting point for critical discussions. How, for instance, do the director and the actors conceive of the characters? How faithfully does the production follow the original plot? What does it do to the setting? What changes does it make, and how do those changes affect the themes of the work? These are all good questions for getting students to engage and scrutinize a text. But videos are by no means an unmixed blessing. Their danger is the danger posed by visual media generally, namely, that visual images tend to overwhelm words. A screen version of a work can easily become *the* standard by which students will judge it. If it translates easily and smoothly to the screen, then it is a good work. If it does not, well then, so much the better for the producers who "improved" the original, so much the worse for the poor, benighted writer who did not know enough to think of these things himself; and so much greater the tendency to dismiss the original as a relic of a useless and irrelevant past. Thus the question of whether to use a video version of a work in class comes down to a utilitarian calculation of risks and benefits: do the potential benefits of getting students to engage a text outweigh the potential danger that they will only be reinforced in their already strong belief that the literary and aesthetic standards of television culture are the only standards worth having.

I wish to apply this calculus to the version of *Gulliver's Travels* that aired on NBC in early February of 1996. Unfortunately, I have no experimental data to report, for I most recently taught a British Literature survey last fall, and thus have not had an opportunity to show this production to a class. Before I were to screen it, however, there are some matters I would consider.

The first is purely practical, and concerns time. This is a very thorough version of the *Travels* in that most of the major inci-

dents in the book find their way onto the screen. But that very thoroughness helps make the production quite long: four hours on the air, and over three even without the commercials. That would be a week of class time for me, which is too much, especially in a survey course where the emphasis is on coverage rather than intensive study. One could probably solve this problem either by arranging for students to see the program outside of class, or by showing bits and pieces of it over several days as part of class discussion. The length, then, may be a drawback, though not an insurmountable one if other advantages can be found.

The program's length is, of course, the result of more than mere thoroughness. The producers have also added a whole new sub-plot. In the book, the travels are presented as a series of separate and self-contained voyages, each punctuated by Gulliver's return to England. On the show they are presented as a single voyage, recounted in a series of flashbacks by Gulliver when he finally returns home. The framing device of his homecoming is elaborate and dramatic, a major part of the story. We watch his initial encounter with his wife and children, his disorientation and confusion around humans, his involuntary commitment to a Bedlam-like institution for mental illness, his "trial" for madness, and finally his freedom and return home. Dr. Bates, who is briefly mentioned at the outset of the book as Gulliver's mentor in surgical medicine, plays a large role in the television plot line as the villain. He is primarily responsible for having Gulliver committed, and does so to secure his own position as usurper to the affections of Gulliver's wife Mary. Her role is similarly enlarged. Although one does get some sense of the fidelity and patience of Mary Gulliver from Swift's text, her character is of decidedly marginal importance: she is usually mentioned only at the beginning and end of each voyage, but is never given any distinguishing features to speak of. Here, however, she is presented as a kind of eighteenth-century Penelope, ever faithful and hopeful, doing her best to fend off the demands of an intruding suitor. She is equally steadfast during Gulliver's time in the hospital, and is his staunch advocate during her husband's sanity hearings and trial. Much the same point applies to Gulliver's son, Tom, who is barely mentioned in the book, but

here is transformed into a veritable Telemachus, determined to resist the authority of the usurper Bates, and to rescue and vindicate his father.

Before discussing the effect of this additional plot line, I would like to point out another kind of change which seems in some ways related to the matter of plot. I call it the "feminization" of the voyages. Swift's version is by and large a masculine world. With the exception of the Queen of the Lilliputians and Glumdumglitch in Brobdingnag, Gulliver's significant encounters in his travels are always with males (probably white ones). The television version changes this. The leader of Brobdingnag, with whom Gulliver debates the merits of European civilization, is transformed into a black woman. Glumdumglitch, Gulliver's adolescent caretaker in Brobdingnag, has a somewhat more prominent role, part of which includes a timid romantic interest in him. The Struldbrugs, a race of immortals that Gulliver encounters on the voyage to Laputa, in the book have no leader; they are merely exhibited to Gulliver as a curiosity. Here they are a menacing race that kidnaps strangers and seem to be led by a woman who tries to seduce Gulliver into becoming an immortal by drinking from a well. And in the voyage to the Houyhnhnms the dapple-gray horse who initially befriends Gulliver is changed from male to female, and called Mistress instead of Master.

Why did the producers do this? Making the leader of Brobdingnag a black woman can perhaps be seen as an attempt to update the political satire a bit. In the book, this voyage features a harsh critique of European institutions and cultural practices, and a denunciation of Gulliver's own smug patriotism. As the King tells Gulliver at one point in the text,

My little friend..., you have made a most admirable panegyric upon your country....But, by what I have gathered from your own relation, and the answers I have with much pains wringed and extorted from you, I cannot but conclude the bulk of your natives to be the most pernicious race of little, odious vermin that nature ever suffered to crawl upon the surface of the earth (106-107).

Putting these words into the mouth of a black woman does give the attack a more contemporary feel since, in our times, criticism of a Eurocentric world view is commonly associated with feminine and minority viewpoints.

The other female characters require a different explanation, one that has less to do with contemporary cultural politics than with the celebrity status of the main character. Gulliver is in this production played by Ted Danson, who is probably most familiar to a television audience as Sam Malone, the shallow but likable philanderer who runs the bar on the long-running television series *Cheers*. An audience tuning in to a show starring Danson may well expect to see, at some point, glimpses of the character they know and love. So when Gulliver grins rakishly after dousing the prudish Queen of the Lilliputians with urine, or when he tells Glumdalclitch that though he cares for her, marriage between them is out of the question, or when he gently resists the obvious sexual interest of the Struldbrugian leader, what we are really seeing is the old, familiar Sam Malone on the make with the ladies. And if it is totally inconceivable that Swift's Houyhnhnm Master would ever allow Gulliver to even touch him, it makes perfect sense in this context that the Houyhnhnm Mistress would allow Gulliver to ride her before he is exiled from the country.

One could use a similar rationale to explain the use of Mary Steenburgen as Gulliver's wife. Steenburgen and Danson are married in real life, and a promotional article by Daniel H. Cerone in *TV Guide* featured relatively little about *Gulliver's Travels*, but a lengthy discussion of the courtship and married life of Danson and Steenburgen (18-20). In this respect, their roles in the production seem to be primarily a means of reminding the audience that they are celebrities, and are also married; both are, to some extent, playing themselves, and their own relationship. But these explanations only raise a more fundamental question: why did the producers see the need for a Gulliver with sex appeal, a dotting wife, and an elaborate family life?

One possible answer to this question lies in the credits at the beginning of the show. There we are told that this version was "Based on *the novel* by Jonathan Swift" (emphasis added). This is significant because eighteenth-century scholars do not classify

Gulliver's Travels as a novel. Though it resembles a novel in some respects, it lacks the intricate relationship between plot, structure and character development that has come to be regarded as the hallmark of that literary genre. Indeed, the original title of the work (published in 1726) was not even *Gulliver's Travels*, but rather *Travels into Several Remote Nations of the World*. Only later did the title come to include the name of its alleged author, a transformation that corresponds with the growing literary prominence of novels, with their emphasis on carefully developed characters. What the producers have done, then, by developing Gulliver's character to emphasize romance and sexual intrigue, and by adding an elaborate sub-plot about his return to his home and family in England, is to novelize what is usually regarded as a prose satire.

The producers might well defend these changes as necessary to attract and hold the interest of a television audience. And they are probably right: a version which followed the text faithfully would simply not appeal to contemporary tastes. But to the extent that these changes compensate for what a twentieth century television audience might regard as "deficiencies" in the original, they reveal much about our current literary expectations, including those of my students. As I mentioned before, they tend to be dissatisfied by the original, in part because they find its narrative is too simple and its narrator too boring, that is to say, too unlike a novel. They seem to pick up prose fiction — any prose fiction — fully expecting that it will take the familiar form of a novel; when it does not, their conclusion is that something must be wrong with the work. As much as anything, then, the television version of *Gulliver's Travels* suggests the triumph of the novel as *the* literary form of prose fiction, and the degree to which this form has influenced our expectations of other media, including, obviously, cinematic story-telling.

The television version does something similar with the end of the *Travels*. I mentioned before that some students tend to be put off by Gulliver's unyielding misanthropy, but to be fair they are not alone in their reaction. Generations of critics have struggled to understand this part of the *Travels*. One critical strategy that was common in the nineteenth century was to

assume that the misanthropy expressed by Gulliver is a sign of mental illness, and that Swift himself shares both features. In other words, Gulliver is misanthropic and therefore mad; Swift created Gulliver, and is therefore equally misanthropic and equally mad (Landa, 289-91). This view of *Book 4* — a libel against humanity written by a mad man — is eloquently if extravagantly expressed by William Makepeace Thackeray in his *The English Humorists of the Eighteenth Century*:

...as for the moral, I think it horrible, shameful, unmanly, blasphemous; and great and giant as this dean is, I say we should hoot him.... A monster gibbering shrieks, and gnashing imprecations against mankind — tearing down all shreds of modesty, past all sense of manliness and shame; filthy in word, filthy in thought, furious, raging, obscene (31).

The television program takes a portion of this critical approach and incorporates it into the story itself. By having Gulliver involuntarily committed to a mental institution and eventually "tried" for madness before a panel of physicians, the story explicitly raises the question of whether the *Travels* should be seen as the ravings of a madman. In the climactic scene, the physicians, led by Dr. Bates, ask Gulliver to disavow the truth of his tale. When he insists that he is not lying about his travels, Bates excoriates both Gulliver and his narrative in a style that borrows heavily from Thackeray:

He's a lunatic, gibbering imprecations against mankind, tearing down all shreds of decency and modesty, filthy in word and filthy in thought, with a heart burning with hatred against the whole human race, and a mind fueled with images from the dung hill.... Are we to stand by and hear our whole nature libeled and besmirched? You are either a liar, sir, or a lunatic. Which is it?

It is significant, however, that while the program appropriates the critical framework (and even some of the very words) of the nineteenth-century critics, it does not endorse their conclusion.

Bates is their spokesman, and he is the program's villain. Mary's voice is the one with whom we are supposed to identify and sympathize. In the same scene, Bates asks her if she believes her husband. She responds:

I believe in him.... What if his stories are true, what if they're not? What does it matter? ...who are we to judge him? Who are we to doubt his word, and compel him to remain here? ...who in this room has been harmed by him?

Her point that the literal truth of the narrative is not really the most important issue is a well established critical defense of all fiction, but she casts that view in a manner which clearly suggests the values of television culture: that everyone is entitled to his own opinion, that the truth of ideas is of little importance anyway, and that as long as no one is physically harmed by what a person says, what does it matter? The whole critical issue is thus reduced to a question of a person's right to free speech.

Having transformed the question of truth and madness into an issue of personal rights, the program then conveniently resolves the whole problem by having Gulliver's son Tom enter dramatically with one of the Lilliputian sheep, which proves, presumably, that Gulliver was not lying. This plot device allows the program to avoid the hard critical question it has raised about how we should understand a story and a narrator like this. Likewise, it allows the producers to recast Gulliver's concluding misanthropy into a form that is much more palatable to a twentieth-century audience. Swift's Gulliver never fully accepts his wife or children once he returns from Houyhnhnm Land. The most he can tolerate of his family members' company is permitting his wife to dine with him — but only in silence and from the far end of a long table. Moreover, he continues to find the sight and smell of humans quite disgusting. Apparently, the producers of the TV version found Swift's bitter finale simply unsuitable for their audience. Their Gulliver expresses his scorn for humanity, but in the context of the story, his bitterness seems more directed toward society's oppressive institutions (like the medical and mental health professions) than towards humanity in general. Moreover, his family is exempted from this condemnation. The

final scene fades out with Gulliver and Mary linked arm-in-arm, strolling across the verdant, sun-lit meadows of their home. Gulliver's voice-over suggests some reticence toward humanity, but the visual image far overpowers his words, and conveys an unmistakable sense of everyone living happily ever after.

It's hardly a surprise that this program conveys television's values, which are far different from those of Swift's satiric masterpiece. But precisely because they are so different, I think the television version would make a useful point of departure in a critical discussion of *Gulliver's Travels*. The critical framework it offers (however distorted) does provide a useful starting point for a discussion of a vexing critical point: how to understand the conclusion of the work. And its numerous changes could help students to see more clearly the assumptions and expectations that they bring to their reading, and the extent to which those assumptions are shaped by the literary culture in which they live.

Works Cited

- Cerone, Daniel Howard. "Ted and Mary's Excellent Adventure." *TV Guide* 44 (February 3-9, 1996): 18-20.
- Greenberg, Robert A., ed. *Gulliver's Travels: A Norton Critical Edition*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1970.
- Gulliver's Travels*. Screenplay by Simon Moore. Prod. Duncan Kenworthy. Dir. Charles Sturridge. NBC. KTIV, Sioux City. 4-5 Feb. 1996.
- Landa, Louis A. "Jonathan Swift." *Gulliver's Travels: A Norton Critical Edition*. Ed. Robert A. Greenberg. New York: W. W. Norton, 1970. 287-296.
- Thackeray, William M. *The English Humorists of the Eighteenth Century*. Ed. Stark Young. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1911.

A return to common sense: Swift's *Modest Proposal* and modern literary criticism

John H. Laflin
Dakota State University

I have been assured by a very knowing American of my acquaintance in London, that a young healthy child well nursed is at a year old a most delicious, nourishing, and wholesome food, whether stewed, roasted, baked, or boiled; and I make no doubt that it will equally serve in a fricassee or a ragout (2182).

I have taught Jonathan Swift's "A Modest Proposal" in a variety of classes for more years than perhaps I would like to admit. And what was true of my very first group of students still holds true of students today: there are always a substantial number who misread this classic satire and take Swift seriously. If anything, the number of these misreadings has increased over the years. Although my response was once shocked disbelief — after all, how could anyone believe that Swift was serious? — I began to ask a different question: why are so many students misled?

Certainly, New Historicism to the contrary, Swift could not have imagined the Holocaust. But "post-Holocaust" readers are not as outraged as Swift's contemporaries at the brutality of the proposal. When Sylvia Plath can write of her skin being made into a "Nazi lampshade" and her foot into an ashtray, when people of all ages were murdered in the names of science and racial purity, selling children for food seems almost tame by comparison. In a world where children are gunned down on the streets, where children sell drugs and where children are sometimes traded for drugs, Swift's grim humor is no longer an outrageous fantasy, but a frightening possibility.

During this past semester, when I taught a course in satire, I tried valiantly to teach Swift once again. I should have known better. Even in this class, significant numbers of students still took Swift's projector persona seriously. One student even went so far as to ask "How do you know it's a satire?" When my only answer was to supply details of Swift's biography (totally irrelevant to most modern critics) I began to get the feeling that I was on uncertain ground. When I returned to the text to look for assurance as to its intent, I was surprised to find that Swift actually gives the reader very few textual clues that his proposal is a satire.

For the sake of comparison, let us examine just two passages from one of Swift's other great satires, *Gulliver's Travels*. In Book I, Gulliver describes the burial customs of the Lilliputians:

They bury their dead with their heads directly downwards because they hold an opinion that in eleven thousand moons they are all to rise again, in which period, the earth (which they conceive to be flat) will turn upside down, and by this means they shall, at their resurrection, be found ready standing on their feet. The learned among them confess the absurdity of this doctrine; but the practice still continues, in compliance to the vulgar (2068).

This passage attacks not only the foolishness of many burial customs, but the gulf between the "learned" and "vulgar," and no modern reader outside of the Flat Earth Society, would fail to see the humor.

A little farther on in the same book, Gulliver describes the duties of parents and their responsibilities to their children:

For which reason they will never allow, that a child is under any obligation to his father for begetting him, or to his mother for bringing him into the world; which, considering the miseries of human life, was neither a benefit in itself, nor intended so by his parents, whose thoughts in their love-encounters were otherwise employed (2070).

Here the understatement sharpens the humor of the passage, and few modern readers would fail to appreciate the point of Swift's prose.

But "A Modest Proposal" is very, very different.

In his introductory footnote, M.H. Abrams points out that Swift uses his "favorite satiric devices. . . . Irony pervades the piece. A rigorous logic deduces ghastly arguments from a shocking premise so quietly assumed that readers assent before they are aware of what that assent implies. [and] Parody, at which Swift is adept" (2181).

Certainly the entire proposal parodies what Abrams refers to as "the by then familiar figure of the benevolent humanitarian" (2181). Well, at least this figure may be familiar to us — some of Defoe's pamphlets immediately spring to my mind — but I doubt if this humanitarian projector is familiar to many undergraduates taking a survey course. Thus many readers may take Swift's imagery at its face value:

this prodigious number of children in the arms, or on the backs, or at the heels of their mothers, and frequently of their fathers, is in the present deplorable state of the kingdom a very great additional grievance. . . . the whole number of infants at a certain age who are born of parents in effect as little able to support them as those who demand our charity in the streets (2181).

The irony of the first passage, which suggests that the fathers are sometimes not part of the family may be obscured by the second assertion, that children are often born into families who have no means to support them. Some may recall Swift's remark from *Gulliver's Travels* cited earlier that the parents' thoughts were elsewhere engaged at the moment of conception, but to expect such recall from casual readers is clearly asking too much.

Swift's rhetoric is confusing: he places negative terms such as "dam" and "breeders" alongside phrases construed to elicit a positive response, such as "sacrificing the poor innocent babes, . . . more to avoid the expense than the shame, which would move tears and pity in the most savage and inhuman breast" (2182); he combines terms such as "rags" which clothe these beggar

children with images of farmers and laborers who, even though they have employment, are nonetheless reduced to virtual beggary. The tone throughout appears to be one of concern for the people of Ireland. Out of this concern, Swift proposes his solution.

If the tone provides the casual reader with few clues, perhaps the structure of the argument will. "A Modest Proposal" follows the classical structure for a persuasive essay intended for a potentially hostile audience. Swift begins with an introduction designed to arouse pity in his readers and to enlist them on his side of the argument:

It is a melancholy object to those who walk through this great town, or travel in the country, when they see the streets, the roads, and cabin doors, crowded with beggars of the female sex, followed by three, four, or six children, all in rags, and importuning every passenger for an alms. . . . therefore whoever could find out a fair, cheap, and easy method of making these children sound, useful members of the commonwealth would deserve so well of the public as to have his statue set up for a preserver of the nation (2181).

Swift then moves to eliminate the opposition, calling the other projectors "grossly mistaken in their computation" (2182), and then fortifies his forthcoming premiss with numeric calculations of his own.

Then in paragraph nine (just one quarter of the way into his thirty-two paragraph essay), Swift introduces his proposal: sell the children for food. Swift then continues his argument, overlooking the (hitherto) unheard of brutality of his proposal, and produces several points in its favor. He lists six separate "advantages" to his proposal, and concludes that "many other advantages might be enumerated" (2184-85). Swift ends by disclaiming any personal advantage:

I profess, in the sincerity of my heart, that I have not the least personal interest in endeavoring to promote this necessary work. . . . and my wife past childbearing (2187).

From this structure we see nothing that is particularly "wrong" with Swift's argument. What more could we ask of a project? How many bills introduced into our national and state legislatures could boast of so many advantages to the public weal while disclaiming any personal profit to their proposers? Of course there are logical flaws, such as the terrific problem with the argument's major premiss, but Swift so constructs his argument that he lures his reader into his insidious logic. To discover the satire, we must dig deeper.

In Swift's day the concept of selling children for food would have been so monstrous that few, if any, would have taken Swift seriously. But today, many readers see a grim reality in Swift's argument, and since Swift proposes his solution so early in the essay these readers may close their minds too soon. Their outrage blinds them to the ironic possibilities that Swift's argument raises.

It has been said somewhere that the laughter of a satirist is the laughter of madness, that such laughter grows out of despair where laughter is the only remaining response. Every society has its ills, problems which to an outsider seem extreme, but which those living within the society have learned to accept or to avert their eyes from seeing. Rather than "kill the messenger," modern readers should ask what kinds of conditions prompted Swift's message? If extreme conditions required such an extreme response, what were those conditions? Just how bad were conditions in Ireland?

People are mentioned as salable commodities twice before Swift's persona announces his proposal: "sell themselves to the Barbadoes" (2181), refers to the practice of emigrants indenturing themselves to pay for their passage out of Ireland. Things must have been bad, indeed, for someone to use slavery as an escape. And in paragraph seven, just two paragraphs before the proposed solution, Swift refers to children of twelve as "no salable commodity" on the Exchange (2182). To Swift's contemporaries these kinds of sales were so common that they would not have raised an eyebrow. But even though Swift's reader may not have noticed anything "wrong," the modern reader should. Swift's solution merely takes the concept of selling human beings one "logical" step farther.

Swift several times paints a picture of extreme poverty: mothers beg for sustenance for their infants; the unemployed turn to thievery for want of work; tenant farmers are unable to pay their rent, their "corn and cattle being already seized and money a thing unknown" (2185); the children are dressed in rags and turn thieves:

They can very seldom pick a livelihood by stealing till they arrive at six years old, except where they are of towardsly parts, although I confess they learn the rudiments much earlier. . . . I have been informed by a principal gentleman in the county of Cavan, who protested to me that he never knew above one or two instances under the ages of six, even in a part of the kingdom so renowned for the quickest proficiency in that art (2182).

To imagine six year old thieves is shocking; to imagine even one or two younger is unthinkable. Or is it?

Swift's benevolent projector, like most projectors, uses the rhetoric of mathematics to strengthen his argument. Aside from providing laborers and cottagers with "something valuable of their own," this proposal will increase the nation's stock (a particularly devastating pun) some 50,000 *pounds* per annum (while decreasing the population some 120,000 *persons* per annum). And, all of this money which is put into the economy is home grown: "the money will circulate among ourselves, the goods being entirely of our own growth and manufacture" (2185). Families of "breeders" will gain not only eight shillings "profit" on the sale of each child, but their income will be increased by not having to maintain their children after the first year. Trickle down economics indeed! Tavern business will increase as rival inns strive to develop the best recipes for infant's flesh, and Ireland will have an exportable commodity. The economic advantages alone are staggering.

More detailed statistics paint an even grimmer picture: of the two hundred thousand couples who would bear children in any given year, only thirty thousand (just fifteen percent) are able to care for their own children; fifty thousand (twenty-five percent)

will likely lose their children to miscarriage or to death within the first year; one hundred twenty thousand children (sixty percent!) will be born into poverty so extreme that death would be a blessing:

I desire those politicians who dislike my overture, . . . that they will first ask the parents of these mortals whether they would not at this day think it a great happiness to have been sold for food at a year old in the manner I prescribe, and thereby have avoided such a perpetual sense of misfortunes as they have since gone through by the oppression of landlords, the impossibility of paying rent without money or trade, the want of common sustenance, with neither house nor clothes to cover them from the inclemencies of the weather, and the most inevitable prospect of entailing the like or greater miseries upon their breed forever (2186-87).

Ironically, Swift's inhuman solution would increase humanness. It would increase the care of mothers for their children and of husbands for their pregnant wives: "Men would become as fond of their wives during the time of their pregnancy as they are now of their mares in foal, their cows in calf, or sows when they are ready to farrow; nor offer to beat or kick them (as is too often a practice) for fear of a miscarriage" (2185).

Swift even rejects a friend's suggestion that older boys and girls could supply sport for huntsmen (since game is now so scarce) as "a little bordering upon cruelty" (2184), although he does allow that certain extravagant, but penniless, young women would scarcely be missed from the kingdom.

But Swift's most bitter irony is saved for the times when infant's flesh might be served: "at merry meetings, particularly weddings and christenings" (2185).

Although Swift admits that his proposal is likely to lessen the population of Ireland, he answers that it was "the principal design in offering it to the world" (2185). The plan would not only decrease the general population, but also the numbers of Papists, since Roman Catholics would likely be the primary breeders. Citing Rabelais as his authority, Swift wryly notes, "fish being a

prolific diet, there are more children born in Roman Catholic countries about nine months after Lent than at any other season" (2183).

To reinforce the notion that he is writing about eighteenth century Ireland, and not about the general condition of mankind, Swift asserts "that I calculate my remedy for this one individual kingdom of Ireland and for no other that ever was, is, or I think ever can be upon earth" (2185). This remark is a far cry from many statements made in *Gulliver's Travels*, to the effect that "any similarity to any persons living or dead is purely accidental, etc. etc."

Swift does give his reader two possible textual clues as to his intentions. As Abrams indicates in his footnote, the "Proposal" extends the "rather trite metaphor: 'The English are devouring the Irish'" (2181), which Swift makes plain:

I grant this food will be somewhat dear, and therefore very proper for landlords, who, as they have already devoured most of the parents, seem to have the best title to the children (2183).

And again, a little farther on:

The flesh being of too tender a consistence to admit a long continuance in salt, although perhaps I could name a country which would be glad to eat up our whole nation without it (2186).

But both of these clues appear after the proposal has been raised — i.e., after many readers have already turned against Swift.

The other main textual clue pertains to the old and sick as well as to the young laborers, but it, too, comes after the proposal has been announced:

But I am not in the least pain upon that matter, because it is very well known that they are every day dying and rotting by cold and famine, and filth and vermin, *as fast as can be reasonably expected*. And as to the younger laborers, they are now in *almost as hopeful a condition*.

They cannot get work, and consequently pine away for want of nourishment to a degree that if at any time they are accidentally hired to common labor, they have not strength to perform it; and thus the country and themselves *are happily delivered* from the evils to come (2184, *my emphasis*).

But these clues are few and far between. The reader must understand the dark, bitter irony that pervades the "Modest Proposal," and the best way to gain this understanding is to know something of the times which spawned the proposal and of Swift's biography.

Satire is sometimes defined as depicting the disparity of how things are and how they should be, and the basic technique that Swift employs in "A Modest Proposal" is irony—a dark, bitter irony to be sure, but irony nonetheless. Irony, often defined loosely as "saying one thing but meaning its opposite," also depends on a knowledge of how things are to make its point. Removing an ironic remark from its context removes the irony, and students lacking knowledge of the historical, sociological and philosophical conditions of eighteenth century Ireland have no context in which to evaluate Swift's irony, and, hence, his satire.

In his *Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature*, Wilfred Guerin maintains that "any knowledge or insight (with special reference to scholarly disciplines like history, philosophy, theology, sociology, art, and music) that can help to explain or clarify a literary work ought to be given the fullest possible chance to do so" (27). Modern literary criticism has tended more often than not to "de-Stalinize" former critical approaches, putting all faith in the latest "ism" to come along. Sometimes, teachers of literature have succumbed to teaching these "ism's" rather than the literature itself.

I am not suggesting that we abandon all critical theory in favor of emoting over the texts; however I am suggesting that we, as teachers, examine what approach, from the current plethora of "isms" would best serve the needs of our students for each text that we teach. For many early British texts, the old-fashioned "biographical/historical" approach may indeed be the best.

Unless students have already taken courses in European or English history they are unlikely to know much about the situation in England and Ireland in the first quarter of the eighteenth century. They may have heard about the potato blight and famine in Ireland, but may not realize that Swift is writing more than 100 years before. They may know little to nothing of the tension between Catholics and Protestants that in many ways defined English (literary) history from the time of Elizabeth I to the reign of George II; of "Wigs" and Tories (except as quaint terms of limited meaning); of absentee landlords; of importing and exporting and taxes — in short, of any of the historical background that informs Swift's satire, and that causes his outrageous proposal.

Swift's biography also does much to inform a reading of "A Modest Proposal." The Norton Anthology gives some details of Swift's biography (the satire textbook did not, by the way) (2007-09), and they give enough information to convince most readers that Swift was clearly not serious. For most students all that is needed is to point out that Swift was a clergyman, albeit an Anglican one, in Ireland. At one time Swift supported upholding the Test Act, a political doctrine that discriminated against Roman Catholics and Dissenters. From this isolated fact, some may conclude that Swift was anti-Catholic, a feeling expressed by the persona in "A Modest Proposal," and therefore serious. But Swift also became one of Ireland's most ardent patriots, beginning in 1724 (five years prior to the appearance of "A Modest Proposal") with the publication of the "Drapier's Letters." As Abrams points out, "Swift is still venerated in Ireland as a national hero. He earned the right to refer to himself in the epitaph that he wrote for his tomb as a vigorous defender of liberty" (2008).

But Abrams then continues:

@BLOCK QUOTE = In his epitaph he [Swift] spoke of the "fierce indignation" that had torn his heart, an indignation that found superb expression in his greatest satires. It was provoked by the constant spectacle of creatures capable of reason, and therefore of reasonable conduct, steadfastly refusing to live up to their capabilities (2009).

This indignation is the emotion behind "A Modest Proposal." Although Swift had written other pamphlets on the "Irish problems," it is this essay which has survived to be anthologized alongside *Gulliver's Travels*. The bitter irony and the dark logic are the outgrowth of a political and historical situation that has grown so bad that the response is the desperate laughter of the satirist.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H., et al, eds. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature, Volume 1*. 6th edition. New York: W.W. Norton, 1993
- Guerin, Wilfred. *A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature*. New York: Oxford UP, 1992.

Clarissa's clothes

~~Dennis Ciesielski~~ Margaret Duggan
~~Peru State College~~ South Dakota State University

In Samuel Richardson's complex novel, *Clarissa*, the heroine's dress is one of the many ambiguous sign languages Richardson uses to convey meaning. In the conventional garb of an eighteenth-century English lady, clothing that both entices and conceals, Clarissa is an attractive object of desire and also a potential victim. In VanDyck costume, she is a unique and free human being associated with an ideal past, but as such, out of place in her own time. In her unadorned and featureless dress of white damask, she is outside of all time, but is therefore a moral force within the context of eternity.

Clarissa's family, the Harlowes, who have gotten rich by trade, regard her as a commodity to be bargained off in marriage to increase their estate and enhance their status — a not altogether uncommon view at the time. In other words, as her brother puts it, Clarissa is, "a chicken bred for other men's tables." And the tasty morsel must also have eye appeal, so Clarissa's personal beauty and desirability is set off by lovely clothes, for the Harlowes set great stock in dress as a way of displaying power and wealth and as a means of claiming a high place in the world. So James Harlowe, the *pater familias*, uses the promise of rich clothing to try to bend his daughter to his will and to make her agree to marry Roger Solmes, a neighboring landowner whom she detests because she finds him physically repulsive and morally despicable.

Clarissa has been made to suffer for her steadfast refusal of this suitor. She is a near prisoner in her room, she is under continual watch by the servants, her ink and paper have been taken away, she is subject to abuse from her brother and her sister, her father refuses to see her and her mother has apparently been commanded not to admit Clarissa to her company. Under orders from her father, her mother must therefore write a letter to Clarissa to attempt once more to persuade her to accept

Solmes by bribing her with a beautiful trousseau of silks which "are the newest, as well as richest, that we could procure; answerable to our station in the world. . . .

Your papa intends you six suits (three of them dressed) at his own expense. You have an entire new suit; and one besides, which I think you never wore but twice. As the new suit is rich, if you choose to make that one of the six, your papa will present you with a hundred guineas in lieu.

The six suits — or dresses with their petticoats and stomachers — the same number of dresses that Lady Frances Carteret, a society star, had in 1748 when she married the Marquis of Treddale [Aileen Ribeiro, *Dress in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (New York, 1985), p. 59], make an enviable trousseau. That one of Clarissa's dresses would cost 100 guineas — or 120 pounds — helps one to gauge the wealth of the Harlowes and what they were willing to spend on clothes. Around the time of *Clarissa*, most ladies' silk dresses cost anything from ten to fifty pounds, with court dresses costing much more [P. Thornton, *Baroque and Rococo Silks*, London, 1965, p.80]. One hundred twenty pounds would buy a magnificent dress indeed. (The price of this one dress would keep a young gentlemen about-town living in London in comfort and style for half a year, would maintain two clergymen and their families in decency for a whole year, (or three clergymen and families in a country village like Goldsmith's sweet Auburn, each "passing rich with forty pounds a year"). The six dresses Clarissa's father promises might easily cost as much or more than a house suitable for a substantial London merchant, which could be bought for about 500 pounds[Ribeiro, *loc. cit.*]. The attempts by clothes to get Clarissa to consent to marry Solmes fail, so her family plans to use force. When Clarissa discovers that the wedding date is set for just a few days away, she escapes a forced marriage, but only after having been tricked into accepting the "protection" of Robert Lovelace, a handsome, rich, aristocratic would-be suitor, who, despite his chivalrous appearance (and unknown to Clarissa), desires nothing more than to seduce her. To the outside world, she was not escaping a marriage she did not want, but forever ruining her reputation. However, the infor-

mal, at-home attire she is wearing shows she had not planned to run away with a man.

It seems odd that Clarissa's face is mentioned by her lover not at all in the long, detailed account he wrote of the scene to his friend Robert Belford. Even her "starry" eyes, which after a few moments "began to sink into a less dazzling langour," receive scant tribute. Lovelace is clearly interested in Clarissa's "wax-like flesh" with its "delicacy and firmness," "all glowing, all charming flesh and blood," but seemingly even more in the clothes which conceal it. In the extensive description of Clarissa's costume he provides, perhaps Lovelace, an accomplished rake, is displaying his knowledge and expertise about feminine attire in a kind of artful striptease. The scene Lovelace described must have interested Francis Hayman, who painted it in loving detail around 1753-54 and titled it *Robert Lovelace Preparing to Abduct Clarissa*.

Lovelace had written: "Her morning gown was a pale primrose-coloured paduasoy: the cuff and robing curiously embroidered by the fingers of this ever charming Arachne in a running pattern of violet and their leaves; the light in the flower silver; gold in the leaves. A pair of diamond snaps in her ears. A white handkerchief, wrought by the same inimitable finger, concealed — ah Belford! what still more inimitable beauties did it not conceal! — And I saw, all the way we rode, the bounding heart; by its throbbing motions I saw it! dancing beneath the charming umbrage."

He also notes Clarissa's diamond earrings, her mob cap and ruffles of the same lace, her flowered lawn apron, her petticoat of quilted white satin, her blue satin shoes with a simple blue braid and neat buckles, and black velvet glove-like muffs.

In the painting by Francis Hayman, *Robert Lovelace Preparing to Abduct Clarissa* (1753-54), too, Clarissa wears a morning dress, a sacque. But Hayman is not absolutely faithful to Lovelace's words: the mob cap is no more than a suggestion, we cannot see the diamond clips in Clarissa's ears, the black velvet gloves are absent — probably to allow Clarissa's hands to express shock, and simultaneous compliance with and resistance against Love-

lace's advance. And the white satin quilted petticoat — that is, the underskirt visible at the front opening of the overskirt — which would probably been worn over a hoop, has been replaced in Hayman's painting by a petticoat of the same material as the dress and similarly embroidered in silver and gold in the violet and leaf motif. We can see, as we could not if she had been wearing the hooped quilted petticoat, the line of her left leg, with the slight bend at the knee, which helps characterize both decision and reluctance in her situation. Also, Hayman's Clarissa, without full hoop and petticoat, is physically more accessible, more vulnerable to hurt and more in need of protection than she might be if fortified with whalebone.

The underpinnings of Clarissa's appearance are created, in the Hayman picture, first by the stays, which went on over the chemise (a long undershirt of fine linen) and were usually laced down the back. These were responsible for rigid posture of the eighteenth-century lady, especially the *English* eighteenth-century lady, who was renowned for "strait-lacing" — that is, tight lacing. Then, as in this case, when the hoop was omitted, small side hoops or panniers, which were tied about the waist over the stays, were added to provide some bounce and to take up the skirt to prevent it from dragging on the ground. An entirely hoopless look, which began to come in after the midcentury, was known as the *trollopee*, which as Aileen Ribeiro says, "was a particularly descriptive word for the sometimes slovenly appearance which such a tailing gown, without hoops, made to the eye of those accustomed to the tautness of silk spread over an understructure. It could also mean the original 'contouche' style of sack which some preferred for comfort and convenience" [Ribeiro, p. 104]. If Hayman's Clarissa had been wearing a full-sized hoop, it would have been fastened on, depending on the season, directly over the stays in warm weather, or over an under-petticoat or two in cool weather. A less vulnerable Clarissa, whose clothing is the invention of the artist, appears in Joseph Highmore's *The Harlowe Family* (ca. 1748-49), Clarissa, who has just arrived home after a short stay with her friend Anna Howe and has not yet had time to take off her short black jacket, is learning that her family has decided she must marry Solmes.

She is shown with a large hoop, as are her mother and sister. The large hoops accord with the 1740s as well as with the Harlowe family style and with eighteenth-century notions of decorum. When some women began to appear hoopless shortly after mid-century, dragging their skirts along the ground, they created a scandal. They offended the sense of propriety that found Thomas Gainsborough's 1760 portrait of the seated Ann Ford, (Mrs. Philip Thicknesse) with her leg crossed above her knee masculine and indecent. So the hooplessness of Hayman's Clarissa outside her garden gate was still in 1753-54 daringly fashionable though unintentional, for Clarissa had not dressed intending to go out in public.

What would Clarissa's clothes have meant to Lovelace? When Lovelace met Clarissa at some time after eleven p.m. on the fateful day he would have been aware that Clarissa's dress was the conventional morning attire for a stylish, wealthy young woman, and that she was not wearing the more formal attire she would have donned if she had dressed for dinner. He might well have interpreted this as an indication of Clarissa's anxiety about her situation — and as a further sign of her vulnerability. At a time when men's and women's clothing were made of similar materials, Lovelace would probably recognize the costliness of the pale primrose-coloured paduasoy, a silk fabric similar to grosgrain whose beauty was much enhanced by the exquisite silver and gold thread embroideries worked by Clarissa herself. It was, in fact, very similar to a dress described by Mrs. Delany as worn by the Duchess of Bedford at St. James in 1740: "the petticoat was green paduasoy, embroidered very richly with gold and silver and a few colours; the pattern was festoons of shells, coral, corn, corn-flowers and sea-weeds; everything in different works of gold and silver except the flowers and coral." [Aileen Ribeiro, *The Dress Worn at Masquerades in England, 1730-1790, and Its Relation to Fancy Dress in Portraiture* (Garland Press: New York and London, p. 122, f.n. 45)]. Lovelace would have known that Clarissa's dress was appropriate to courtly circles. He would also have appreciated the elegance and taste of the rest of her costume, with its variety of pattern, texture and harmony of colors. He might have recognized how much the costume was an

expression of Clarissa's own exquisite self-image as a lady who wished to be treated as a lady: precious, unique, unsuited for the wicked world, in a dress she herself embroidered with silver and gold to set off the pattern of violets, the flowers of vulnerability, delicacy and retirement. But we guess that, for Lovelace, the most appealing features of Clarissa's costume were its *fragility*, the susceptibility of the delicate fabrics to soil and to wear, and its utter unsuitability as a costume to run away from home in before the middle of April. In other words, not just the costume could easily be ruined and spoiled: to Lovelace the seducer, so too could its wearer.

Lovelace's pleasure in carrying off Clarissa is heightened by his realization that, although she is not totally unaware of his potential for villainy, she expects him to behave on this occasion as a rescuer and protector, not as seducer. She expects him to behave as a gentleman.

But Lovelace claims gentility in a different way. Although he seems to exempt Clarissa from the social climbing of which he accuses her family and says in a letter to Belford that she is the only one of her family worthy of him, he is aware that she is the daughter of a merchant who is dressed like a duchess and who acts like a queen. Clarissa's appeal to him is founded in part on his appreciation of her vulnerability on these grounds also: seducing her, in the world in which social climbing and social status are of primary importance, he can easily degrade her. She will then no longer be a model of social virtue but a fallen woman, a social outcast.

However, Clarissa portrayed full-length in VanDyck taste and costume in the portrait mentioned by her sister Arabella and later in her will by Clarissa herself indicates that the conquest of her body does not mean victory over her for Lovelace. Then, as now, portraits by VanDyck of the royal family and the high aristocracy at the Caroline court, eschew "everything common" and "everything which bears the stamp of passion," filling the "figures he portrayed with an aristocratic and tranquillity of soul." [H. Knackfuss, *VanDyck* (Bielefeld and Leipzig, 1899), pp. 78-79]. The VanDyck costume in portraiture, popular at the time the novel was published and charged with political and social mean-

ing, places Clarissa in an earlier era nearly a century removed from 1720, (the year the events of the novel take place) and over a century from the time of the novel's publication. It associates her with the spirit, refinement and aristocratic aloofness of the Caroline court, qualities which separate her from her family and which make her forever unavailable to Lovelace. True, we do not know exactly what Clarissa's portrait in the VanDyck style and costume was like. What was called the VanDyck style in mid-eighteenth century England covered a lot. It referred to portraits painted by artists from Lely and Kneller to Gainsborough and Lawrence who wished to imitate what they regarded as the high water mark of painting in England. It was used to refer to paintings in which the garb and pose of subjects VanDyck had painted were referred to or copied. It was also used to describe portraits in which sitters are merely shown in costumes which refer to the English 1620's and 1630's in the treatment of fabrics, collars, the cut of sleeves, the placement of jewelry or decorations. Around the time *Clarissa* was written and published, when the style was beginning to be popular, several painters, among them John Robinson and Joseph Vanaken, specialists in the depiction of satins, silks and laces, were employed by fashionable portraitists to supply a VanDyck touch. We get an idea of what such portraits were like from Thomas Hudson's *Portrait of a Lady* (now in Yale's British Art Center), whose clothing, hair style and pose refer to VanDyck.

Joseph Highmore, Allan Ramsay, Johann Zoffany, Joshua Reynolds, and especially Thomas Gainsborough all were practitioners of the style, for subjects from upper middle class individuals and their families through the ranks of the aristocracy to the highest in the land. In 1770, for instance, Zoffany painted *George III, Queen Charlotte and their six eldest children*, using VanDyck costume and allusion to VanDyck's own paintings to provide charm, dignity and quite possibly a connection linking this German princely family to the English past.

Did Richardson intend readers to interpret Clarissa's portrait in the VanDyck taste, as Janet Aikins suggests ["Richardson's 'speaking pictures'," p. 163, in *Samuel Richardson: Tercentenary Essays*, ed. Margaret Anne Doody and Peter Sabor (Cambridge

UP: Cambridge, 1989)], as an indication of the Harlowes' vulgarity and attempts at social climbing? Or was it one of those portraits, which, as Aileen Ribeiro proposes, enhanced their sitters by references to timelessness, refinement and civilization? Joseph Highmore's lost portrait of Clarissa in VanDyck taste, painted in 1747 after he had read part of *Clarissa* in manuscript but before the novel was published was probably of this latter type. Richardson described his friend's painting in a letter to Lady Bradshaigh as

. . . Clarissa at whole length, and in the VanDyck taste and dress. . . His [Highmore's] own imagination was his principal guide: and he has given it great intelligence, sweetness and dignity. As you propose to see it, I will say no more about it.

It is noteworthy that Richardson was not concerned with the details of VanDyck dress, but rather on the personality and moral qualities visible in the portrait. In the case of Clarissa, such a portrait might have placed her in her proper element — at the head of an aristocracy, in a remote time and place where her virtue is beyond assault. Clarissa is not like her family. Rather the VanDyck portrait clarifies their differences. She a lady, an heiress, not of father but of her grandfather, who hails from better times — i.e., from the Caroline past — and whose wealth derives from land, not trade. A connection like this has political links with the royalist past as well, as, perhaps, Tory sympathies, as Margaret Doody suggests ["Richardson's Politics," *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 2: 2 (Jan. 1990), p. 122].

Like her grandfather, Clarissa thinks of the world as "but one great family" whose troubles can be blamed on "this narrow selfishness that reigns in us," a view which does not agree with that of her family, who think of contracts as instruments of power, and of the world as an entity to be carved up for their own benefit. Clarissa, like her grandfather, is definitely not a mercantilist. According to Doody, because of these things, Clarissa is, in fact, a Tory sympathizer. But it would seem, rather, that she is against petty politics, an opponent of mere legalism. This does not make her a Tory,

but makes her quite definitely not a Whig or Whiggish sympathizer in the tawdry England of the 1720s or the 1740s.

The portrait in the VanDyck style also links the Caroline Clarissa with Lovelace of the Cavalier name, and suggests that in this sense she is on a social plane at least equivalent to and perhaps superior to his, and with the ideals he ought to have upheld. It suggests that an alliance between Clarissa and Lovelace might be proper and even desirable. But it also shows an unbridgeable distance between the two because Lovelace actually is a Cavalier manque, who falls far short of the Cavalier ideals he ought to have upheld.

The white damask dress Clarissa wears after she has been drugged and raped by Lovelace is unlike her other dresses in that it has no specific features and timebound characteristics. It has only its whiteness, the color of innocence and chastity, perhaps as a declaration of blamelessness or as a statement that she has been wronged. Clarissa refuses to undress, even to sleep, while she is confined under Lovelace's power. Lovelace marvels that, although she has not removed her gown for well over a week, it is still neat and immaculate. The gown shows that, although Lovelace has in fact raped Clarissa, he has not accomplished his purpose of degrading and subduing her: the essential Clarissa, still spiritually inviolate, has evaded him. What he had assumed to be results of normal earthly wear-and-tear and soil simply do not apply to her.

A month later, after her escape from Lovelace, and her consignment to debtor's prison by the agents of Lovelace's accomplice, Mrs. Sinclair, she wears the same dress, whose whiteness under the circumstances even more underscores her innocence and incorruptibility.

The scene Belford describes at Rowland's, the sponging house, has a squalor worthy of the end of Hogarth's *Harlot's Progress*: darkness, walls covered with the scribblings and scratching of former inmates, broken-paned windows, a cracked looking glass, chairs spilling their stuffing, a broken-tiled chimney. In a corner of the room kneels Clarissa, leaning against an old table, her face on

her arms crossed upon the table, the fore-finger of her right hand in her Bible. . . Her dress was white damask,

exceeding neat; but her stays seemed not tight laced. . . her laces had been cut when she fainted way at her entrance into this cursed place; and she had not been solicitous enough about her dress to send for others. Her headdress was a little discomposed; her charming hair, in natural ringlets. . . but a little tangled, as if not lately kembled, irregularly shading one side of the loveliest neck in the world; as her disordered, rumpled handkerchief did the other.

When I surveyed the room, and the kneeling lady, sunk with majesty too in her white, flowing robes (for she had not on a hoop), spreading the dark, though not dirty, floor, and illuminating that horrid corner; her linen beyond imagination white, considering that she had not been undressed ever since she had been here; I thought my concern would have choked me.

Clarissa's dress, hoopless and stayless — that is, *in trollopee* — indicates her vulnerability to evil, and even hints at its commission. After all, in a sense her progress is that of a harlot and from social heights she has plunged to the depths: a debtor's prison. Her pose, too, is that of a suppliant, a Magdalene, the penitent prostitute, recognizable from scores of continental paintings. Like Magdalene, she kneels and supports her head on her arms. Like Magdalene's, her gown is loose and flowing. Like Magdalene's, her hair is important "in natural ringlets. . . but a little tangled, as if not lately kembled." But instead of the sinner's red or penitential purple Magdalene usually wears, Clarissa, who was victim rather than co-agent in the carnal act, is attired in the white of innocence. What most strikes Belford is the dazzling whiteness of Clarissa's dress in the midst of this suggestive squalor, the whiteness a proper sign of innocence, a brightness which shines out in darkness and a purity over which evil has no power.

The absence of color in Richardson's description may be due to Richardson's having seen Magdalene-like poses in black-and-white engravings of various religious paintings. But more likely, the choice of black and white was intentionally symbolic. To Terry Castle, the whiteness of Clarissa's dress, though in some

sense an invitation to interpretation as wedding dress or shroud, is really a sign of her denial of her own part in the system, the white dress also suggests "blankness, absence, opacity" — it is an "effort at self-exemption. He makes herself unavailable to interpretation according to dress [*Clarissa's Ciphers* (Cornell U Pr., Ithaca: 1982), p. 125]. But whiteness can also have a positive side: the luminosity of Clarissa's dress in her dark surroundings might just as well be a assertion of the moral force which gives innocence and blameless ascendancy over evil and which keeps soilage and spoilage from corrupting it. At least it seems to me that this is the way Richardson would prefer his signs to be read.

**“O Death! Where is thy sting?”:
Tragic virtue and the anticipation of
Romanticism in Richardson’s *Clarissa***

Margaret Duggan Dennis Ciesielski
South Dakota State University Peru State College

In his preface to *Clarissa*, Samuel Richardson discusses various editorial views concerning the form and structure of his novel and its relative length. It is, indeed, a weighty tome, but, perhaps the size of the book is as much a formal statement as any of the text within. There is an almost biblical message of virtue and vice here, and the major editorial concern was not so much deletion for the sake of narrative unity and plot as it was the consideration of what to retain for the sake of didactic value. Thus, conforming to the Horatian/neo-Classical code that art should both teach and delight, the novel is presented in its vast entirety, bringing an overt moral agenda at the risk of obscuring an intensely dramatic storyline imprisoned within instructional rhetoric as readily as *Clarissa* herself is imprisoned within her own virtuous code system. This system, we soon discover, is based in the patriarchal authority of family, community, and government that she is unable to assimilate either physically or politically; hence, she must react on an abstract plane to find a neo-Romantic solace from the physical with her “true” father [a male God-figure] by virtuous suicide.

The didactic imperative turns on Richardson’s choice between two editorial advisors. In his preface to the text, he describes one editor’s wish to “give a narrative turn to the letters” in order to deliver a story of dramatic quality, while the other editor insists that the story “could not be reduced to a dramatic unity, nor a narrative way, without divesting it of its warmth and a great part of its efficacy” (Richardson 36): efficacy, here, relating to the instructional, rather than dramatic, nature of the novel.

Historically, this editorial debate anticipates the evolution from a text-centered Georgian social utility to a more reader-centered “Romantic” view of literature and the editorial/authorial presupposition of a new class of audience preferring to be moved and inspired rather than proselytized and instructed. Editor number one realized the import of the “teach” part of the neo-Classical dictum, but was so caught up in the “affecting story that he was desirous to have [the sentimental didacticism] parted with” (36). *Delight* here, precludes *teach*, a critical sign of things to come. But enlightenment thought wins out. Thus, in much the same way that *Robinson Crusoe* found a socially-based artistic validity in its use as a “boy’s book,” *Clarissa* is seen as a handbook on moral “behaviour” for its contemporary readers; and, in this way, *Clarissa* finds a niche in its own world.

In light of the Augustan call for utilitarian art forms, *Clarissa* is a success. There is a sense of Hogarthian justice here, as well as the flavor of Lord Chesterfield’s treatise on gentlemanly etiquette. But Richardson’s didactic blade holds a double edge, for while he “teaches” against youthful caprice and parental oppression, his stated goal, he simultaneously turns the power of decorum and propriety in upon itself to show how the very codes by which the landed gentry perpetuate place and position will also bring them down. Thus, in the implication of virtue as the epitome of goodness and inner-power, he correspondingly reveals the inhumanity of the ideology that both promotes and destroys the only goodness it knows — *Clarissa*.

But *Clarissa* symbolizes more than true virtue in a pragmatically vindictive society; she (along with Lovelace) represents, as well, the *anticipation* of the Romantic hero[ine], breaking ground for early Romantic authors like Goethe (who denied his Romantic nature in the name of tragedy) and overtly subjective characters like his Young Werther. Concepts like the despondency of unrequited love and psychological abuse, combined with a sense of alienation and fierce introspection and a sense of the over-active tragic response (melodramatism), culminates in a departure from the political and sensual world to a “better place.” In *Clarissa*’s case this better place is her true “father’s

house": heaven, the place of virtue and true sentiment away from a world of physical contracts and unendurable emotional crises.

Here, another historical move must be considered, for with the textual, quasi-generic changes inherent in *Clarissa*, must come, as well, a change in readerly interpretation. The static acceptance of a didactic "lesson" here must necessarily fall to a transactive interpretation if the "history" that is *Clarissa* is to survive as art in eras beyond Richardson's own time. In a phenomenological approach to genre studies, Patricia Spacks notes the novel's ability to bring to the reader a vicarious "ethical experimentation" by which she is able to gauge her own ethical values in the application of personal experience to the "gray areas" (183) or what Roman Ingarden refers to as "spots of indeterminacy" (246-54), within the text. This type of "storying" constitutes ethical judgment in the case of the reader (rather than the author) while simultaneously realizing the ethical paradigmatic quality within the novel genre (Spacks 183) — ethics become the province of a socially interactive audience. In a more reader-oriented society, this transaction between the reader and the text over-powers 18th-century didacticism and precludes the idea of the novel as merely a moral "rule book." Thus, Spacks sees *Clarissa* as attenuating rather than perpetuating the didactic ideal by representing a "theater of conduct" rather than a model of conduct (182). Active interpretation, in concert *with* the text, rather than passive "understanding" *through* the author's didactic agenda, becomes necessary to the text's own historically dynamic survival. That *Clarissa* has, indeed, survived indicates a moral plasticity which extends beyond the basis of its contemporary (Augustan) success and thus allows a new readership to usher it into new eras of subjective and historical meaning.

Although the Romantic genre is not here entirely, the near voyeuristic view (we *are* reading another person's mail) of the epi-tragic quality of self-denial for a greater good prevails in Richardson's novel. As Terry Eagleton avers, *Clarissa's* death must be public, for it is a political gesture, a statement, "a shocking act of resignation from a society whose power system she has seen, in part, for what it is" (74). Eagleton's ideological approach addresses Richardson's and his editor friends' didactic

stance. There is a message here; but the novel's message, rather than moral, teaches an overt socio/political lesson. *Clarissa* can no longer bear her society on either the practical or the personal level; and the reader must lay blame at the feet of both the Harlowe family *and* her "savior," Lovelace.

The vehicle for this message lies in the pathetic. By tugging at the readers' heartstrings, Richardson drives home the point that there is a wealth beyond the Harlowe family's materialism and their prestigious values on the one hand, and a pleasure beyond Lovelace's overt sensuality on the other, that there is a higher Will found in the Christian ethic of an ultimate Good. Of course, the problem here is that *Clarissa* must die to attain it. The polysemous symbol on her self-chosen coffin (in itself, a Romantic action), a serpent biting its own tale, works on both natural and Christian levels. In the decidedly Romantic imagery here, the symbol represents a cyclic regeneration both physically and metaphysically: in dying physically, *Clarissa* will be born again through the natural birth-death cycle; dying metaphysically, she will be born again in spiritual grace. Thus, the negativity of suicide is attenuated by the melodramatically positive idea of a spiritual transportation to the more pure, untainted, model upon which her earthly existence is based — and *Clarissa's* virtue remains intact.

Richardson insinuates the imminent demise of "enlightenment" values in his presentation of the Harlowe family as an ideological attack on the 18th century nouveau riche and the dichotomy of "virtues" they represent. Here familial decay is economically stimulated; success on one level breeds failure on another. The family unit, in its move from natural unity to artificial contracts, has become as rigid as the authoritarian royal courts upon which it is patterned. In their bid to reflect courtly sensibility and contemporary models of success, they maintain a refracted version of true ethical codes which obscure the secure ties necessary to a family's positive micro-political unit. Hence, the debilitating formality of family relationships and the stultifying language used in even the most simple communications successfully disallows any true sense of human kindness to sift through the dense protocol of family business. The hierarchy of

the false nobility within the Harlowe House "Palace" is somewhat ironic; for the family's decay, a metaphorically downward movement, takes a materially upward route. The more materially successful the Harlowes become, the more they fail as a family. As Clarissa asserts, the family fault is "riches" (61). Anna Howe concurs, "You are too rich to be happy, child . . ." (68). The ironic, un-Augustan tenet, that unchecked ambition and upward mobility are destructive, anticipates the future Romantic ideal of the honest common man, rural, good, and unfettered by material (and "sentimental") falsity.

Clarissa, herself, anticipates this Romantic ideal in action as well as language. She finds her peace outside of Harlowe House in the natural, pastoral surroundings of the "dairy house" built for her by her grandfather on the Harlowe grounds. Secluded in a grove away from the superstructure of the family house, the dairy house produces a natural, honest product through hands-on labor. Pre-figuring Romantic stagings in line with Burns' rural settings, Wordsworth's "Ruined Cottage" and "Michael," and Keats' "Autumn," Clarissa's refuge is rural in nature and simple in its production, yet couched within a materialistic "over-world." It allows her to retain the innocence of a country wife, a virtuous milkmaid in broadcloth simplicity, within the silken confines of her real bourgeois existence. True to form, she raises peafowl near the periphery where, notably, she maintains contact with the outside world via her own contrived postal system — a loose brick in the wall that both separates her from and joins her with Lovelace's real-world of unbridled sensuality and desire. Hence, it is her *natural* side that connects her with the world beyond the Harlowes' reach. But, even in the world outside, Clarissa is an inassimilable alien. Her only joy is in the artificial in-between-world of her dairy-house — in reality she fails both as an aristocrat and as a commoner. The world of the worry-free dairy house becomes a dream-goal for both Clarissa and the sentimental reader and, thus, anticipates the imminent desire for a return to a more subjective, simple existence.

Considering Richardson's contemporary success and his audience's growing desire to return to the naturalness threatened by enclosure and the new industrialism, the author seems to exploit

the nurturing (and escapist) qualities of the dairy-house, using it as a semiotic tool — Clarissa becomes what her surroundings imply: she is an innocent milkmaid, happy in her own devices, close to self, nature, God, and her own virtuous desire for these things. Although her language and actions are not in the *traditional* sense Romantic (since the genre has not yet "officially" surfaced) they surface as an "emergent ideal" (Williams 121-28) which serves to lift her outside of the historical dominant culture as a sort of Hegelian antithesis, a continuation of the accelerated cultural and literary dialectic prevalent in the mid 18th century. Since *avant-garde* action precludes the language by which it might define itself, Clarissa's own words cannot reflect the true Romantic idiom until, in fact, that idiom becomes fully and empirically present through a succession of other works which build upon and shape the seminal Romantic premises in Richardson's novel. Thus Clarissa might be seen as a prototypical Romantic tragi-figure lost in a world as yet un-worded with the vocabulary by which she might define and, in the process, save herself.

Caught between the Harlowe's vicious decorum and Lovelace's anarchic sensuality, Clarissa cuts a tragic figure in her inability to assimilate either extreme offered her; but, even more tragic, is her failure to find a secure place in the "in-between" where subjective and objective models meet to form a contextual environment where she might dialogue with the extremes she denies. This inability stems directly from the absence of a language with which she might speak, not to her "prison guards," but to her own sense of self. Trapped within her own sense of virtue and self-denial, she would consent to be governed through and by a patriarchy and yet remain untouched, unassimilated. Her denial of the liberatory power of her grandfather's will which would render her independent, her refusal to marry Mr. Solmes for the sake of family gain, or Lovelace for a sense of personal (and sensual) wellness, all place her in a constant state of siege from both camps. And, in not exercising the language of self-authority, Clarissa becomes nothing more than the spoils in a complex war of competing values, economic desires, filial jealousy, and sensual needs — she becomes own-able and thus property in a property based ideology.

Unable to communicate with or through the love-property-duty hegemony maintained by the gentry society-at-large, Clarissa is compelled to *write* her final decision in overtly figurative language. In her famous "my father" letter of Aug 23 she begs Lovelace not to disturb her while she prepares to rejoin her "father's house" (Richardson 1233), a message the ideologically centered Lovelace, who sees his world in literal terms, fails to read as either metaphor or suicide note. Both Clarissa and Lovelace are lost in their own language — one in the subjective discourse of a hopeless romantic, the other in the coarse objectivity of false sentiment — and can no more meet linguistically than they can in matters of the heart.

Thus, Clarissa withdraws into the alternative world of spiritual allegory where her earthly "house" becomes a coffin; her "father" becomes the Christian (male) God, and her sensuality and passion become diluted in martyrdom to her own exaggerated sense of virtue. In the end she speaks (for she can no longer write for physical weakness) the language of quasi-prayer, "O Death! Where is thy sting? . . . It is good for me that I was afflicted," exclamations that Belford "supposes" to be "words of scripture," rather than her own (1361). But, whether scriptural or literary, Clarissa's last words comprise the voice of Romantic desperation and thus herald an end to her earthly tribulation in a suicide of the will.

The didactic purpose in *Clarissa*, claims Richardson, is to "caution parents in the undue exertion" of parental right regarding marriage and to warn children against "preferring a man of pleasure against a man of probity" (36). The vehicle for this instruction is in the moral "fable" of a recalcitrant child, an ambitious family, and an unreformable rake. But, within the instruction, inside the story, Richardson achieves, in the mass acceptance of his work, an art that becomes as Terry Eagleton observes, "tied to the progressive class by personal as well as ideological bonds." It becomes a work that "will do more than reflect the interests of those for whom it speaks. It will prove an active force in the very framing of interests, shaping them into a world view rich and coherent enough to challenge the dominant ideology" (Eagleton 3). Eagleton's claim reflects the emergent

change from the rigid age of reason and external modes of knowing to the more subjective qualities intrinsic to the new Romanticism on the contemporary horizon. Thus, the lesson within Richardson's lesson represents the bourgeoisie's struggle to attain noble status as well as the futility of such a struggle and, in the process, suggests that the price one must pay for virtue's sacrifice in the presence of material/political power and selfish sensuality may be well beyond the capacity of anyone who retains a sense of the unrelenting innocence and the Romantic idealism that was all too evident in Clarissa Harlowe.

Works Cited

- Eagleton, Terry. *The Rape of Clarissa: Writing, Sexuality, and Class Struggle in Samuel Richardson*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1982.
- Ingarden, Roman. *The Literary Work of Art*. trans. George Grabowicz. Evanston, IL, Northwestern UP, 1973.
- Richardson, Samuel. *Clarissa*. Penguin Books, 1985.
- Spacks, Patricia. "The Novel as Ethical Paradigm." *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*. 21 (2-3) (Winter-Spring 1988). 181-88.
- Williams, Raymond. *Marxism and Literature*. London, Oxford UP, 1977.

Shakespeare as a political thinker: *Richard II* and the making of a new idea of kingship

Hyosik Hwang
University of Nebraska - Lincoln

When Shakespeare began the writing of the second cycle of English history his eye for politics became much deeper than before. The rapidly changing political situation in the 1590's made him more alert to what was happening in his political realm. After 1588, the year of the Spanish Armada, various socio-political issues burst out. The Tudor political doctrine, an ideological sinew that bound the English people together in this time of crisis, was seriously in doubt. Once the threat of foreign invasion lifted, English people now began to reflect about themselves.

From 1595 the problem of royal succession became more urgent. Queen Elizabeth's decrepitude was apparent but there was not yet an agreed upon heir. The anxiety coming from the circumstances might have keenly whetted Shakespeare's sense of politics as he was growing into his maturity. The dramatist was then at the height of his power and happily got regular access to the court, the center of the Tudor politics, as a writer for the Lord Chamberlain's Men (1594-1603) (Kay 243).

As a matter of course, it is not so difficult to assume Shakespeare's engagement in contemporary political problems. Renaissance English men were king struck. Monarchy was usually regarded as the best form of constitution. Since the king's role in the affairs of the nation was most important, much ink was spent on "defining the nature of the ideal prince" (Wells 62). Now, for the first time in Shakespeare's life, England was going to have a new monarch. What king would they have? What kind of ruler should he be (Thayer viii)? It is very likely that Shakespeare would have been preoccupied with these questions of the times.

My essay is about Shakespeare as a political thinker. Shakespeare, of course, was a dramatist first of all and not a political theorist. But as a dramatist, Shakespeare discussed contemporary political topics and issues through a dramatic mode. So in my essay his way of characterization and handling of action will be considered as significant cues for his political idea. Adaptation of source materials will be also examined for the same purpose in the immediate context of the Tudor politics.

In the Elizabethan times the history from Richard II to Henry V almost acquired "an epic quality" (Wilson 11). The period of history was repeatedly referred to among Elizabethans when they talked of contemporary politics (Gohn 954). Rewriting the history of Richard II in his play, Shakespeare discussed the topics of his own age. Among the dramatist's discussion of them my essay focuses on three topics intensively — the Tudor political doctrine, royal prerogative issue, and the problem of deposition.

To begin with the Tudor political doctrine, the validity of the doctrine was seriously in doubt when it came to the 1590s. With a clear awareness of this trend, Shakespeare gave a full-scale discussion to the doctrine in his play. It is through Gaunt's mouth that Shakespeare gives a speech on the Tudor doctrine of unconditional obedience. Gaunt is the normative man in the Tudor era. He has no doubt in the value of unconditional obedience as was exhorted by the Tudor homilies. But Shakespeare's disapproval of his idea is certain although his way of disapproving is very subtle. Shakespeare doesn't confront the idea, but lets it grows until it bursts into failure.

In the Renaissance, talking politics was very dangerous for those who were not in power. In order to avoid this danger Shakespeare had to be very subtle and indirect. He repudiates the idea by the way of drama. Gaunt is portrayed in the play as a sophisticated moron. He is caught in an ideological trap and finds no way to get out of it. His talks are abstract sermons useless to the immediate problems raised by the murder of Gloucester and later his son's exile. His inactivity comes from his blind acceptance of the Tudor doctrine of obedience. This inactivity leads to frustration and the frustration leads to his death. Something is

surely wrong with the doctrine of obedience. This is not expressed on the surface level but implied through dramatic action.

When it comes to Richard's extravagant speech on the divine kingship, Shakespeare takes the same strategy: first give a full exposition of it and then reject it throughout the drama, not confronting the idea directly. To put an edge on his discussion Shakespeare made Richard "an advocate of divine right" (Prior 141), a side of him that had been touched fragmentarily in Holinshed. Richard's concept of kingship in the play, however, is a popular absolutism and not the original one, according to which a king is to be limited by law (Sommerville 36). Even if he is exempted from human accusations, he is still subject to divine law. But Richard here assumes the position of God to himself.

Queen Elizabeth never proclaimed her absolute power in spite of the autocratic sentiment inherited from her father. She just pretended to be absolute (Ribner 309). It was an ideology useful for her image-making, not the reality itself. But dramatic Richard here regrettably mixes ideology with reality.

Shakespeare allows Richard to give a bombastic display of his divine kingship after his return to the shore of England. But his speech is soon subdued by himself at the report of the upcoming reality of power. Through Richard's lamentable raving in the deposition scene Shakespeare "enumerates the various elements which make up the estate royal" — scepter, balm, sacred state, manors, rents, revenues, acts, decrees, and etc. (Keeton 272). Richard in the play is portrayed as an unlawful, irresponsible, and pejorative figure, though humanized by the dramatist's touch. Divesting all these magnificent items of the estate royal from him in the ceremony of deposition Shakespeare undermines the Divine Right Of Kings.

Shakespeare was in line with the current trend of skepticism on Tudor political doctrine. But he didn't stay with the repudiation of the worn-out political doctrine. As a response to the urgent political problems in the 1590s, Shakespeare as a dramatist-historian presents his own "book of counsel."¹

Two other topics — royal prerogative issue and the problem of deposition — are all closely related to the dramatist's counsel to the monarch. Royal prerogative was "the right of the king to

take any action at his own discretion, regardless of whether it violated customary norms" (Gohn 943). It was frequently discussed in the contemporary parliament, raising conflicts between the Crown and the Commons.

Shakespeare seems to have a clear design to discuss royal prerogative issue from the beginning of the play. The court scene in the opening of the drama makes a good symmetry with the parliament scene in Act IV. In the former Richard is provided as a negative model, while in the latter Bolingbroke as a positive one.

Richard is a consistent double-dealer in coping with his matters. His intervention in the trial by combat is surely within his prerogative. But the problem is he is using this prerogative arbitrarily for his own convenience. He sentences both parties to exile feigning concern about peace on the land but actually it is a mean device for him to hide his mortal crime and still save his solemn face as a king. According to the Renaissance absolutist idea "the king always possesses extra-legal rights. But he can only justly exercise these if he believes that the laws of the land do not sufficiently provide for the public good" (Sommerville 101). The extra-legal right should be exercised for the fulfillment of the idea of law and not against it. Richard's use of the royal prerogative is far from this model. The injustice of Richard's abuse of the prerogative is emphasized by his arbitrary deduction from Bolingbroke's exile years.

Bolingbroke, on the contrary, respects the legal process. When he rules as a chief judge in the parliament, Bolingbroke does his best to be impartial. Unlike Richard's way of legal process which is secretive and unpredictable, Bolingbroke's is public and impartial and exhaustively based on evidence. Likewise, Bolingbroke postpones the judgment but it is only until a witness can be produced. What seems to be problematic with Bolingbroke is his administration of the death penalty to Richard's favorites. But it should be considered that it was done in a war situation.

Sir Thomas Smith, an Elizabethan constitutionalist, summed up the conventional wisdom, declaring that "in war time and in the field the prince hath absolute power, so that his word is law; he may put to death or other bodily punishment whom he shall

think so to deserve, without process of law or form of judgment" (Sommerville 102).

In spite of this, since Bolingbroke was not a king it is still problematic. But according to the common lawyers "when the constitution breaks down, the fundamental principles of the common law could only be vindicated extra-legally. Politics, and ultimately war, continued the rule of law by other means" (Sommerville 105). If Bolingbroke relies upon these principles his use of emergency right may be justified.

The procedure of the prosecution is properly kept in the trial. Richard's favorites are condemned as "the caterpillars of the commonwealth" that he publicly swore "to weed and pluck away." The pretext of Richard's confiscation, on the other hand, is for the supply of money for the Irish expedition but, actually, the property was allotted to his favorites even before the war. When Richard laid his hands on Gaunt's property he already went far beyond his prerogative and, consequently, by repudiating other's hereditary right he put his own kingship in danger based on the same right.

Discussing the use of prerogative right Shakespeare counsels the monarch that it should be exercised for the purpose of the welfare of the nation. Queen Elizabeth usually toned down "assertions of her prerogative right" but instead emphasized "the talk of duty and public interest" (Kelley 77). It might have been a much less disturbing topic to the monarch compared with the next one — the problem of deposition. Is it right to replace a legitimate king if he becomes a tyrant with a lawful ruler-candidate? If so, in what condition is it allowable? This issue became very sensitive in the later years of the Elizabethan reign. The political circumstances got tense as the Queen was aging and there was no apparent heir yet. Adding tension to the situation, the Earl of Essex began his ill-fated provocation to the Crown.

Composing *Richard II* at that time, Shakespeare had to be very cautious and indirect in suggesting his idea. He made his position sound ambiguous and uncommitted, but I don't doubt that Shakespeare had his own political convictions as an acute individual living in real political circumstances. The matter of concern for him was how to deal with this danger while avoiding

an embarrassing situation. As a dramatist he solved the problem dramaturgically.

What makes the audience puzzled in *Richard II* is the ambiguity of Bolingbroke's action. For Bolingbroke it is a calculated pattern out of his personality; for Shakespeare it is a good dramatic design to handle an uneasy political issue. The historical Bolingbroke surely did double game: he made an oath at Doncaster that he should vindicate his own inheritance right only but changed his mind when the time turned out to be opportune. Hall consistently portrayed Bolingbroke in a favorable way (Ornstein 17). Holinshed put incompatible opinions of him together from both sides (Thayer 38), providing good dramatic potential to Shakespeare who in his turn made it purposefully ambiguous. In the play Bolingbroke's Doncaster oath is first alluded by Northumberland (2.3.149) and repeated by him (3.3.112-14). Bolingbroke also claims the same to York giving a confirmation of it (3.3.38-41). But his action in the execution of Richard's favorites reveals that he goes far beyond his words.

The scene at Flint Castle, in which the royal power is virtually transferred from Richard to Bolingbroke, is very puzzling if it is seen in terms of surface logic. Bolingbroke harps the same music, claiming his property right. At Bolingbroke's claim for his own right, Richard voluntarily offers abdication. Moreover, once it is offered Bolingbroke takes it as a matter of course. What is going on here? The missing piece might be filled in if the underlying dynamic of power between the two is taken into account. I don't think Richard jumped off the cliff as Gohn said (971). He succumbed to Bolingbroke, driven by the inner dynamics of power at which the latter was very skillful. But Shakespeare made this point ambiguous on purpose, though dramaturgically it is an intriguing point which allures our attention. Granted the condition of play-writing threatened by censorship and his compromising nature, Shakespeare had no reason to jeopardize his career by making the highly sensitive issue explicit.

Shakespeare, however, portrayed Bolingbroke very favorably. He took especially great care to mitigate Bolingbroke's usurpation. The historical Bolingbroke tried to legalize his coup d'etat after the event. The committee he appointed to consider the

problem fabricated the official account of the events and made Bolingbroke a legal heir to Richard (Gohn 949-50). The legality with which Shakespeare might have been fascinated traces back to the official account and what Shakespeare did in *Richard II* was to maximize this potential modifying his source material to a large extent.²

In the play, Richard already showed his intention to abdicate when he heard of the increasing power of Bolingbroke's army (3.2.98-100). At the suggestion of Northumberland Richard agrees to accompany him to Bolingbroke for conference. So, in the play, Northumberland didn't have to use violence by attacking Richard on his way to Flint as he did in Holinshed. At Flint Castle, though emotionally divided and confused, Richard repeats his will to abdicate to Bolingbroke consistent with his previous suggestion (3.3.204-06).

The parliamentary scene invented by Shakespeare might be the most crucial one and deserves a special attention. In the Chronicles Richard's formal abdication took place in the Tower. It is rearranged by Shakespeare in the parliamentary setting. Richard is deposed in the parliament and it is legitimized through the ritual of succession by abdication. Bolingbroke is insistent on imposing his idea of resignation to Richard (4.1.190). In spite of his sentimental accusations Richard publicly hands the royal power over to Bolingbroke by proclaiming that "God save King Harry, unking'd Richard says,/ And send him many years of sunshine days" (4.1.221-23)!

Northumberland urges Richard to read indictments for the sanction of the Commons for deposition. Since medieval England the Commons were often used by the factions for their own sake in parliamentary politics. Northumberland's emphasis of the Commons' sanction in the play, however, reflects the increasing power of the Commons in the contemporary parliament. With these rearrangements for the parliamentary scene Shakespeare, I suppose, is giving a significant gesture to the audience. Essex, whose followers asked the Lord Chamberlain's Men to perform *Richard II* with the deposition scene on the eve of the rebellion, had a plan to call a Parliament after the event (Tennenhause

88). If his attempt had been successful, Shakespeare's version of Richard's deposition might have happened in reality.

The famous royal anger burst upon Lambard about this play can be also considered in this context. Elizabeth snapped, "I am Richard II. Know ye not that?"³ Her eye for the drama was high enough that she could clearly catch the direction of Shakespeare's gesturing. In legal terms Elizabeth's origin of royal power is from Parliament — the Act of Succession of 1543 (Levine 125-6). This suggestion for the origin of her power was hardly permissible for Elizabeth, especially now when the anxiety for succession was escalating.

Though indirectly, Shakespeare gives an approval to deposition: it is better to replace a tyrant with a well qualified ruler for the welfare of the nation than to be passively patient with him. But Shakespeare argues through drama that to be legitimate it should be done in a legal way as a form of succession in a parliament. Shakespeare's idea of deposition has been shaped throughout the dramatic exploration. York, "the most compromised figure" in the play (Selden 108), shows this steady exploration from the passive obedience to the pledge for "the new-made king" (5.2.45). His divided allegiance in the middle of the conflicts between "duty" for Richard and "conscience" for Bolingbroke (2.2.111-15) is also the embodiment of the age's dilemma between the observance of the law and the welfare of the nation, from which Shakespeare was not totally free either. After the moment of indecision York turns his allegiance from Richard to Bolingbroke. A warning he had given to Bolingbroke still has an aura of the Tudor doctrine: "Take not, good cousin, further than you should,/ Lest you mistake the heavens are over our heads" (3.3.16-17). Bolingbroke's response to York shows a great shift from the doctrinal concept of heaven: "I know it, uncle, and oppose not myself/ Against their will" (3.3.18-19). He believes that the king's power comes from heaven. But it is neither the directly retributive heaven which pours vengeance on the heads of evil doers nor the ever intervening one which sends angels to fight against human soldiers. For Bolingbroke God's will is mostly done through human agents and the measure of a good ruler is the humble attitude to ask himself if he is in God's side.

We can see a great change in York's idea of heaven in the following sorrowful description of the deposed Richard though given in a self-rationalizing tone for the deposition:

...had not God for some strong purpose steeled
The hearts of men, they must perforce have melted
And barbarism itself have pitied him.
But heaven hath a hand in these events,
To whose high will we bound our calm contents.
(5.2.34-38).

Bolingbroke, though an usurper, is a justful and able ruler who is well-qualified for kingship. Richard, though legitimate, undermines kingship throughout the dramatic action. Bolingbroke, as Selden said, is the kingly person Richard should have been (111). In the play kingship is re-established by the ritual of the parliamentary succession in which the crown is transferred from Richard to Bolingbroke. So, though kings are changed, kingship is continuous. Since human adjustment is engaged in the process "the Divine Right of Kingship" is inevitably weakened. But the origin of the king's power is still believed to be from heaven. When York said he took a pledge for "the new-made king" in the parliament it was not the single voice of one character. Bolingbroke became a new king based on the new idea of kingship and Shakespeare has been consistently building up this idea of kingship in the play.

Notes

¹ I generally agree to Guy's understanding of Shakespeare's Roman and English history plays in the humanist convention of "the books of counsel." See Guy, 409-10.

² It is very unlikely that Shakespeare himself read the official account which distorted the facts in order to justify Bolingbroke's usurpation as a legal succession by device. This account was adopted and supplemented by the chronicles in the Lancastrian line. Shakespeare might have had the second knowledge of the

account through those chronicles. See Saccio, 32. and Butt, 440-50.

³ See Wilson, 15-16.

Works Cited

- Butt, Ronald. *A History of Parliament: the Middle Ages*. London: Constable, 1989.
- Boris, Edna Zwick. *Shakespeare's English Kings, the People and the Law*. London: Associated UP, 1978.
- Gohn, Jack Benoit. "Richard II: Shakespeare's Legal Brief on the Royal Prerogative and the Succession to the Throne." *Georgetown Law Journal* 70:3 (1982): 943-973.
- Guy, John. *Tudor England*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1988.
- Kay, Dennis. *Shakespeare: His life, Work and Era*. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1992.
- Keeton, George W. *Shakespeare's Legal and Political Background*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1967.
- Kelley, Donald R. "Elizabethan Political Thought." *The Varieties of British Political Thought*. Ed. J.G.A. Pocock. London: Cambridge UP, 1993.
- Levine, Mortimer. "A Parliamentary Title to the Crown in Tudor England." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 25:2 (1962): 120-127.
- Prior, Moody E. *The Drama of Power: Studies in Shakespeare's History Plays*. Evanston: Northwestern UP, 1973.
- Ribner, Irving. *The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare*. London: Methuen, 1957.
- Saccio, Peter. *Shakespeare's English Kings: History, Chronicles, and Drama*. London: Oxford UP, 1977.
- Selden, Raman. "Richard II and the Politics of Kingship." *Critical Essays on Richard II*. Ed. Linda Cookson and Bryan Loughrey. Harlow, Essex: Longman, 1989. 104-11.
- Shakespeare, William. *William Shakespeare: The Tragedy of King Richard The Second*. Ed. Matthew W. Black. London: Penguin Books, 1970.
- Sommerville, J.P. *Politics and Ideology in England, 1603-1640*. London: Longman, 1986.

- Tennenhouse, Leonard. *Power on Display: the Politics of Shakespeare's Genres*. London: Methuen, 1986.
- Thayer, C.G. *Shakespearean Politics: Government and Misgovernment in the Great Histories*. Athens: Ohio UP, 1983.
- Wells, Robin Headlam. *Shakespeare, Politics and the State*. Macmillan, 1986.
- Wilson, John Dover. "Introduction to Richard II (1939)." *Richard II: Critical Essays*. Ed. Jeanne T. Newlin. New York: Garland, 1984. 5-22.

The literary lineage of Lady Dalila

Jay Ruud

Northern State University

When in Book IV of *Paradise Lost*, the narrator excuses Uriel's failure to recognize the evil he allows into the world by saying "neither Man nor Angel can discern / Hypocrisy, the only evil that walks / Invisible, except to God alone" (682-84), the words might just as easily be applied to readers and critics of the well-known Dalila scene in *Samson Agonistes*. This has long been recognized as perhaps the pivotal scene of the play — Radzinowicz says it is "Milton's most original invention, [and] contains the high point of the drama" (*Toward Samson* 36). Given the episode's importance, it is perhaps inevitable that scholars disagree about how it should be read; however, interpretations of this scene have differed so radically, and resultant readings of *Samson Agonistes* have been so diverse, that it may be productive to look at the Dalila episode again from a slightly different angle.

Most recent assessments of Dalila have portrayed her positively: last year at this very conference, Jennifer Widman contended that "Far from being merely a temptress . . . the Dalila of *Samson Agonistes* is a complex character whose shortcomings are finally balanced by the positive effects she has on Samson's spirit" (96-97). Perhaps most radically, taking a clue from Mollenkott's comment that in interpreting the poem, "judging everything from Samson's viewpoint has been a frequent error" (92), John Ulreich has proposed Dalila as a tragic figure. Exploring what happens when we decide to take Dalila at her word, Ulreich declares that Dalila's offer to care for Samson "seems genuinely compassionate, even selfless" (188). Her desire to touch him is meant to inspire compassion in him, and to "mitigate his suicidally destructive rage," but her "failure is a symbol of her tragedy" (189). Ulreich even goes so far as to claim "she becomes an ironic type of salvation, whose potential for redemp-

tive love is frustrated as much by Samson's demonic impulses as by her own" (186).

Ulreich's reading, like all good critical commentaries, forces us to return to the text and to rethink what we may have folded up and put away long ago. It is quite true that many first readers react strongly against lines like Samson's "out, out Hyaena" (748) and "How cunningly the sorceress displays / Her own transgressions, to upbraid me mine!" (819-20). And when he spurns Dalila's touch, threatening in "My sudden rage to tear thee joint by joint" (952), Samson puts a large number of us into Dalila's corner. It is only when after this rebuff Dalila spitefully gloats in her victory over Samson — "Nor shall I count it heinous to enjoy / The public marks of honor and reward / Confer'd upon me" (991-93) — and the Chorus calls her "a manifest Serpent by her sting / Discover'd in the end, till now conceal'd" (998), that the reader may feel Samson is in the right. So Ulreich's reading is compelling, especially if we take Dalila's final goads to be simply a frustrated attempt to save some face after her gruff rejection, and if we regard the Chorus as merely saying what they think Samson wants to hear. It is a compelling argument *if* we can in fact believe what Dalila says about herself.

I firmly believe that we cannot. It may be that neither man nor angel can discern hypocrisy, but as readers considering the whole of the drama — past, present and future at one glance — we are in the position of God and so should be capable of recognizing insincerity. A broad look at the literary traditions implied by the Dalila episode suggests that Milton has set Dalila up to be disbelieved from her first appearance in the poem. My intent is to explore the kinds of allusions outside the Samson tradition that the imagery and language associated with Dalila recall, and to suggest how these allusions color our perception of what she says.

Barbara Lewalski has already pointed out that the initial description of Dalila recalls the Whore of Babylon in the book of Revelation ("the epitome of all idolatry and sensuality") in her apparel (I. 712), in the serpent imagery used to describe her (II. 726, 997, 1001), in her harlotry, and in her idolatry (1058-59) (*Samson Agonistes*).

The Whore of Babylon was usually interpreted as a symbol of Rome. Rome, city of Empire, was associated by the author of Revelation with idolatry and with excessive wealth and luxury. In time the Great Whore had become a potent iconographic symbol, and certainly other figures recalling the image of Revelation could have been in Milton's mind when he wrote *Samson*. Lady Meed in *Piers Plowman* is one of the best known of these figures. Lady Meed is, according to Derek Pearsall, "the personification of the force that perverts men from the way of Truth — bribery, love of money, desire for gain, the acquisitive instinct, or, in theological terms, *cupiditas*, the love of worldly goods as an end in themselves" (55) (Dalila, it should be remembered, has taken money to betray her husband). Like Dalila and the Whore of Babylon, Lady Meed is first described in terms of the finery of her garments: she is "a womman as hit were wonderly yclothed... Here robynge was ryche þen y rede couthe" (II, 9-14), as Dalila is "so bedeckt, omate, and gay ... With all her bravery on, and tackle trim" (712-718). As Dalila enters and begins to defend herself against Samson, hoping to convince him to come back to her, so Lady Meed is brought to court and put on trial before the King, defending herself against Conscience to whom the King would like to marry her. Samson's replies to Dalila's arguments are generally harsh and bitter — like the "Out, out Hyaena" (I. 748) mentioned earlier. But the replies of Conscience to Lady Meed's arguments in *Piers* are no less vituperative in tone than Samson's, and the same pains to expose specious rhetoric are evident. When in her defense Lady Meed quotes Proverbs "*Honorem acquirit qui dat munera*," Conscience replies that the Latin is true, but

@BLOCK QUOTE = Thow art lyk a lady þat a lessoun radde,
Was *omnia probate*, þat plesede here herte;
That line was no lengur and at leues ende.
Ac hadde she loked in þe luft half and þe lef turned
A sholde haue yfonde folwyng felle wordes aftur,
Quod bonum est tenete, a tixst of Treuthes makynge.
(III, 487-92)

In what is probably Samson's least sympathetic action, he spurns Dalila's offered human contact bitterly and violently, with the cry "Not for thy life, lest fierce remembrance wake / My sudden rage to tear thee joint by joint" (11. 952-53). In *Piers Plowman*, Conscience reacts equally harshly to the suggestion of physical contact with Lady Meed: "Kusse here," the King tells Conscience, to which Conscience replies "'Nay, by Crist ... congeie me rathir! / But Resoun rede me þer-tyl rather wokle y dey'" (IV, 3-5).

Since we know what Meed is, and we understand *Piers* on the level of allegory, we feel no compunction to sympathize with Lady Meed in Langland's poem. Conscience *should* spurn the idea of being bought by material goods. But I would suggest that some of this kind of allegory, similar to that of the morality play tradition that colors English drama, colors as well the Dalila scene in Milton's play. Thus one could see Samson's rejection of Dalila as the rejection by the human conscience of the concupiscent that the richly-dressed lady traditionally represents. This being the case, the harshness of Samson's responses is somewhat less unpalatable.

This is not to suggest that Milton used *Piers Plowman* as a source for *Samson Agonistes*, though it is not impossible that he may have read Langland (there is no proof that he did). But the tradition of the false female representing worldly baubles, brought to trial to defend herself against righteous (or self-righteous) accusers, could not have been unknown to Milton. A more obvious case than *Piers* may have been the portrayal of the Goddess Fortuna in Boethius' *Consolation of Philosophy*, and certainly Langland's depiction of the fickle Lady Meed, who represents all of the earthly goods man may desire, owes something to the tradition of the fickle Fortuna, in whose province God has placed all of those worldly goods. A reader familiar with Boethius may have been struck by Dalila's first defense of her betrayal: "it was a weakness / In me, but incident to all our sex, / Curiosity, inquisitive, importune / Of secrets, then with like infirmity / To publish them, both common female faults" (11. 73-77). How much this sounds like Fortune's defense — that falsehood is simply part of her nature, and that she cannot cease her inconstancy because then she would cease to be Fortune:

"Why should I alone be deprived of my rights," she asks. "Shall I ... permit man's insatiable cupidity to tie me down to a sameness alien to my habits?" (24). Philosophy tells Boethius "You are wrong if you think Fortune has changed toward you. This is her nature, the way she always behaves" (21). If Dalila uses the excuse that lack of steadfastness is her nature and therefore excusable, she seems to be identifying herself with the Goddess Fortuna, and thus with inconstancy.

Philosophy also warns Boethius that to follow Fortune is to lose freedom, and she uses the image of a ship at sea — "If you hoist your sails in the wind, you will go where the wind blows you, and not where you choose to go" (22). Perhaps coincidentally, the Chorus introduces Dalila with the image of a ship. The image suggests chiefly the ornateness of her apparel, but also, perhaps, her inconstancy, her changing with the wind: she comes to Samson "like a stately Ship / ... With all her bravery on, and tackle trim, / Sails fill'd, and streamers waving, / Courted by all the winds that hold them play" (11. 714-19). Blowing with the wind traditionally suggests inconstancy; in Chaucer's poem "Against Women Unconstant," for example, the faithless woman is compared with a weathercock:

Ther is no feith that may your herte embrace;
But, as a wedercok, that turneth his face
With every wind, ye fare, and that is sene;
In stede of blew, thus may ye were al grene.
(11. 11-15)

Surely Dalila, as changeable as Fortune, represents for Samson many of those things (particularly sensual pleasures) which Fortune gives — "though sight be lost," she tells him, "Life yet hath many solaces, enjoy'd / Where other senses want not their delights" (11. 914-16). His rejection of her is his refusal to put himself into the position of one clinging to Fortune's wheel, riding for a second fall: "Thy fair enchanted cup, and warbling charms / No more on me have power, thir force is null'd / So much of Adder's wisdom I have learn't / To fence my ear against thy sorceries" (11. 934-37).

The allusions to Fortuna have ramifications beyond an implied characterization of Dalila: they raise the question of Milton's genre in *Samson Agonistes*. In his introduction to the poem, Milton acknowledges his debt to Greek tragedy, to the plays of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides. He follows Aristotle in emphasizing the importance of catharsis, though he gives it a Renaissance twist in borrowing Minturno's homeopathic principle. But Milton says little about the tragic plot, forgoing any mention of the *peripetia* and *anagnorisis* so important in Aristotle's idea of tragic action. It may be that at least in part, Milton's idea of tragic plot derived from the medieval notion of tragedy as *de casibus virorum illustrium*. Certainly in the Samson tradition, Milton had long-standing precedents for making *Samson* a *de casibus* tragedy. Krouse cites numerous medieval examples (including the *Cursor Mundi*, Boccaccio, Chaucer, Gower, and Lydgate) to show that "when Samson's story was told in secular poetry, it was presented as a great man's fall from happiness to misery resulting from the perfidy of a woman" (58). Chaucer's treatment of the story in "The Monk's Tale," which Milton would certainly have known, depicts Samson thrown down by Fortune's turning wheel, but chiefly *because* he "toold to women [his] secree" (VII, 2053). Thus the narrator of that tale sees it as an example: "Beth war by this ensample oold and playn / That no men telle hir conseil til hir wyves" (VII, 2091-92).

Clearly the Chorus of Milton's play, at least, sees the tragedy much as Chaucer's Monk had: both as a tragedy of Fortune brought about by trusting a woman, and as an example. In their *parados*, the Chorus says "The rarer thy example stands, / By how much from the top of wondrous glory, / Strongest of mortal men, / To lowest pitch of abject fortune thou art fall'n" (II, 166-69). When Manoa comes to find his son, the Chorus directs him toward the figure of Samson with the lines "As signal now in low dejected state, / As erst in highest, behold him where he lies" (II, 338-39). Later, in an address to God, the Chorus describes His ways to man as if *He* were Fortuna:

Yet toward these, thus dignifi'd, thou oft,
Amidst thir height of noon,
Changest thy count'nance and thy hand, with no regard

Of highest favors past. . .
But throw'st them lower than thou didst exalt them high
(II, 682-89)

Clearly the Chorus is wrong about a number of things in the play, and this confusion of God with the Goddess Fortuna is good reason not to trust their judgment. Milton's tragedy is not simply a *de casibus* story, and Samson clearly accepts the full responsibility for what he has done, though without exonerating Dalila. From the beginning Samson asserts "of what I now suffer / She was not the prime cause, but I myself" (II, 233-34). But in hearing the Chorus emphasize the traditional *de casibus* interpretation of Samson's story, we are given a strong indication of how to read Dalila, that bauble of Fortune who deflected Samson's will from the Highest Good and who set him up for his great fall when Fortune's wheel turned.

Dalila seems also to represent for Samson a real temptation. Ann Gossman, speaking of Samson's three temptations, says of this scene that "it is proof of Samson's moral immunity to sloth, lust, and sensual ease that he rejects Dalila's offer to care for him at home" (538). But the significance of the temptation goes further than Gossman describes. Conceiving of Dalila as a figure of Fortune, offering Samson all the transient goods under Fortune's sway, suggests another tradition which may color the way we perceive her, and predispose us as well to distrust whatever Dalila says. This is the tradition of the three temptations of Christ and the "triple equation" as discussed by seventeenth-century theologians. In exegetical tradition dating back to the Church fathers, the three temptations of Christ in the wilderness — that is, the temptation of bread, the temptation of the kingdoms, and the temptation of the tower (commonly rendered "the flesh, the world, and the devil") — were parallel to the temptations surrounding the Fall of Man, and were analogous as well to the temptations human beings must face in this fallen world. Thus the temptations form what Pope calls a "triple equation" (51-69). In Milton's plot, Samson confronts three visitors, each of whom represents for him a different kind of temptation. Krouse pointed out long ago (125-31) that the first temptation, *concupiscentia carnis* (traditionally equated with "the flesh"), conceived of by

Protestant theologians as "temptation by necessity," is that offered by Manoa in Milton's play. The last, the *superbia vitae*, regarded as temptation by *violence or fear* ("the devil"), is clearly that represented by Harapha. The second of the three traditional temptations is the temptation of the kingdoms, or the *concupiscentia oculorum* ("the world"), and was identified by the theologians as temptation by fraud or persuasion. It included riches, honor, wealth, power, fame, and all other appropriate glories of this world (all of the gifts of Fortune). It also included, at least for Protestant theologians, the sensual delights of the world, and Pope cites Giles Fletcher and J. Bale, as well as the banqueting scene from *Paradise Regained*, to suggest that the temptation of the kingdoms had developed the connotation of including "seductions of luxury and magnificence" (Pope 71) — the kind of *excess* and *opulence* reminiscent of the Whore of Babylon.

Dalila's chief function in this scheme, then, is to tempt Samson through fraud and persuasion to the pleasures of this world, of "the kingdoms." Clearly she has the means to be the most persuasive of any of Samson's visitors, and she lays before Samson the temptation of all the sensual delights of the world:

Life yet hath many solaces, enjoy'd
Where other senses want not their delights
At home in leisure and domestic ease,
Exempt from many a care and chance . . . (11. 915-18)

But the association of Dalila with the temptation of the kingdoms goes beyond simply her fraud and her offer of sensual delight. She clearly embodies all of the opulence and excess suggested by the temptation of the kingdoms, being "bedeckt, ornate, and gay" (1. 712), "with all her bravery on" (1. 717), and with "An Amber scent of odorous perfume / Her harbinger" (11. 720-21). Her portrait further suggests that she not only represents for Samson the *concupiscentia oculorum*, but that she is herself a figure of one who has given in to that temptation. Her gaudy appearance (like the throne of Satan in *Paradise Lost*) suggests excess of riches; the fact that she has sold her husband for money (11. 830-31) lurks behind the visible luxury of her

appearance. She has, she says, been swayed by the Princes of her country, who urged her "by all the bonds of civil Duty / And of Religion" (11. 853-54) to betray Samson, convincing her "how just it was, / How honorable, how glorious to entrap / A common enemy" (11. 854-56). Thus her motive for violating what Samson calls "natural law" — by which he means the inclining of her greatest worldly love toward that which should be its natural object, her spouse — is worldly glory, one of the false goods of Fortune. This turning of desire from the Highest Good toward lesser goods, or the unnatural turning of love from its proper object, is in a very real sense a kind of idolatry, so it is no accident that Dalila's betrayal is cloaked as well in the cover of her false religion, of her very literal worship of the false idol of Dagon.

Her own final consolation, of course, is worldly fame:

I shall be nam'd among the famousest
Of Women, sung at solemn festivals,
Living and dead recorded, who to save
Her country from a fierce destroyer, chose
Above the faith of wedlock bands (11. 982-86)

Riches, honor, glory and fame have swayed Dalila, and thus she becomes the perfect choice to represent for Samson the temptation of the kingdoms. Certainly, as Krouse said of Dalila, "bedeckt with the signs of prosperity granted to those who follow the way of 'the world' — [she] represents the insidiousness of fraudulent persuasion" (131). But just as she represented Fortune at the same time she was also clearly in Fortune's power, so she represents *concupiscentia oculorum* while being fully yielded to it herself.

But isn't Dalila-as-temptress just a different way of referring to Dalila-as-lover, and does her profession of love for Samson not mitigate some of her apparent guilt? The answer is no. For one thing, as Ricki Heller has demonstrated, Dalila's "impression of love includes none of the spiritual unity and restorative functions of true love," of the sort Milton described in his divorce tracts (197). Instead, an appropriate literary tradition provides a context for our reading of Dalila: in this case the courtly love tradition seems most instructive, for Dalila has many of the

attributes and mouths many of the words of the conventional literary lover (see Steadman 133). In the courtly tradition, one of the most popularly recurring images is that of the lady as healer, the only one whose love can cure the lover's malady, and without whose healing powers the lover threatens to die of love. This is given an ironic twist in *Samson*, since the wound which Dalila has inflicted on Samson is his blindness rather than the traditional "wound of love," and he is not begging for the cure she freely offers to him (which is no cure at all but merely a kind of bestial oblivion). Steadman also points out how the conventional symbol of the prisoner of love lies behind Dalila's desire to keep Samson her literal prisoner: "Milton has given this rhetorical figure a literal application" (135), he says. It becomes, isolated from its conventional rhetorical context, a frighteningly neurotic suggestion of "perfect thralldom."

But in another unusual twist, the relationship between Dalila and Samson seems to parallel the traditional lover-mistress relationship of courtly poetry. Though it was not unheard of for the woman to assume the role of the courtly lover, it was at best unusual, and the Dalila-Samson relationship seems something of a reversal of the usual expectations, with Dalila attempting to woo the unresponsive Samson, who seems to display the traditional *daungeur* of the courtly mistress. The typical courtly lover stands humble and abashed in the presence of his beloved — he can barely bring himself to speak because of his knowledge of his own unworthiness and his fear of displeasing her. So Dalila comes to Samson, "With doubtful feet and wavering resolution / ...still dreading thy displeasure" (11. 732-33). The courtly lover is everywhere and at all times obsessed by thoughts of his beloved, and seeks her presence always to bask in the glory of her light. Dalila tells Samson that "conjugal affection, / Prevailing over fear and timorous doubt, / Hath led me on desirous to behold / Once more thy face" (11. 739-42). The courtly lover seeks only to serve his beloved, to do her every bidding. So Dalila offers to serve Samson forever, "where my redoubl'd love and care / With nursing diligence, to me glad office, / May ever tend about thee to old age" (11. 923-25).

Particularly instructive in Dalila's case is the conventional courtly love dilemma of telling the true from the false lover. *Fin amors*, it must be remembered, is ennobling — it improves the characters of those in love. Further, only the truly noble could truly love. Samson recognizes this when, in response to Dalila's argument that she has done all for love, or "The jealousy of Love" (1. 791), he asserts that "love seeks to have Love" (1. 837). The false lover is the one who feels only carnal passion, whose burning is not a real wound of love but only the itching of lust. This is how Samson interprets Dalila's professed love: "call it furious rage / To satisfy thy lust" (11. 836-37). Dalila is in the same position as the conventional courtly love poet, writing a love song to his lady. All of the conventional language — tone, style, imagery, vocabulary — are as available to the false as to the true lover, thus it is virtually impossible to tell one from the other. Thus Bernart de Ventadorn, for example, laments

Ah, God! if only true lovers
stood out from the false;
if all those slanderers and frauds
had horns on their heads (11. 33-36)

The only way for the true lover to demonstrate the sincerity of his love longing absolutely would be for the lover actually to die of love — a radical step to say the least. Small wonder that the courtly mistress tended toward the aloof; with no way to tell the false from the true, she was better to adopt a healthy skepticism about her lovers' motives. Certainly Samson feels that way about Dalila and her professions of love in this scene.

The way that Dalila turns on Samson in her last speech, scornfully dismissing whatever bad fame she may have "among the Circumcis'd" (1. 975), while glorying in the prospect that "In Ekron, Gaza, Asdod, and Gath / I shall be nam'd among the famoussest / Of Women" (981-82), suggests that she is no true lover either — that like the false lovers of the courtly tradition, she is what Samson says she is: a viper, a hyaena, a sorceress, motivated by a "furious rage / To satisfy her lust."

Given Milton's attitude toward the courtly and Petrarchan love traditions, which in *Paradise Lost* he calls "Court Amours, /

Mixt Dance, or wanton Mask, or Midnight Ball, / Or Serenate, which the starv'd Lover sings / To his proud fair, best quitted with disdain" (IV, 767-70), Dalila's association with the tradition seems clearly to put her in a negative light. For Milton, the true and primary purpose of the relationship between a man and a woman is "a meet and happy conversation," as he calls it in the *Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*. Satisfaction of the body is secondary; in fact "some unaccomplishment of the body's delight may be better borne with than when the mind hangs off in an unclosing disproportion" (707). Clearly this is Samson's view of true love and marriage. Dalila's idea seems to be simply to keep Samson around for her sensual delight but ultimately, as he says, "uxorious to thy will / In perfect thralldom" (11. 945-46). Again, Dalila not only represents for Samson the temptation of carnal love, but is also an individual steeped in that very love herself.

Dalila's shift from apparently sincere solicitation to ultimate ruthlessness may have been suggested again by literary tradition, by one play which almost certainly was one of Milton's sources for *Samson*: Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus*. Most scholars who have considered the relationship of Milton's tragedy to the classics have seen a prototype of the regenerate Samson, rising from abject misery and degradation to an ultimate triumph in his destruction of God's enemies (or his revenge, depending upon how one reads the play), in blind Oedipus's rise from degradation to apotheosis in his own tragedy (see Furman 174, Woodhouse 216-17, Mueller 193-212, Parker). But parallels run deeper than a simple comparison of the protagonists. The episode in *Oedipus at Colonus* most closely resembling the Dalila episode is the scene where Creon enters and attempts to persuade Oedipus to return to Thebes, and tries to justify himself to the Chorus, defending himself against Oedipus's angry and embittered rebuffs. Like Dalila, who enters cautiously trying to insinuate herself back into Samson's good graces, Creon enters with words designed to reassure the Chorus and Oedipus that they have nothing to fear — "Don't be afraid, / and don't greet me with anything uncivil. / I haven't come here with any thought of force" (11. 828-30). Like Dalila, who comes, she says, "that I may fetch thee / From forth this loathsome prison-house to abide / With me" (11.

921-23), Creon has come to call "poor pitiful Oedipus" to "come home! / Your whole people summon you, rightly so, / and I first among them" (11. 840-41). In both cases, it is the person who is largely responsible for the protagonist's losing his home who is calling Samson or Oedipus back. Nor in either case is the invitation selfless. We know that Creon wants Oedipus back to be buried on Theban soil because of the prophecy concerning the blessing of his grave. Dalila wants Samson back not for his comfort but for her own, as her frankly possessive lines clearly demonstrate: she betrayed Samson, she says, to keep him from going away from her:

While I at home sat full of cares and fears
Wailing thy absence in my widow'd bed;
Here I should still enjoy thee day and night
Mine and Love's prisoner, not the *Philistines'*,
Whole to myself, unhazarded abroad,
Fearless at home of partners in my love (11. 805-10).

Ultimately, as Dalila turns on Samson in her last gloating speech, so Creon's true colors show as well, as he reveals his armed guard which has already seized Ismene and now threatens Antigone. The conclusions of the two episodes make a fascinating contrast. Dalila reaches out to touch Samson, but he refuses the human contact with her. In *Oedipus*, Creon's troops seize Antigone, Oedipus's one comfort, and as the old man reaches out to his daughter he calls "Your hands, dear — touch me," to which she can answer only "I can't, I'm helpless..." (1. 967). Creon follows this by attempting to lay violent hands upon Oedipus himself, which Oedipus resists as strenuously as Samson resisted the touch of Dalila.

Milton says in his introduction to *Samson* that "they only will best judge who are not unacquainted with *Aeschylus*, *Sophocles*, and *Euripedes*" (550), and familiarity with Sophocles must have included *Oedipus at Colonus*. Anyone knowing Sophocles' play must recognize the parallels in these two episodes — the protagonist is asked to return to a place from which he was driven, he feels betrayed and will not trust the persuader, who uses soothing and enticing promises to try to persuade the protagonist to do

something which is in the best interests only of the persuader. In both cases, in fact, the protagonist will be going into a situation where he will be in a prison worse than his blindness. Since the audience would have been familiar with the dissimulating arguments of Creon the Sophist, the similar situation of Dalila must predispose the reader to distrust her words.

But are we, in fact, to allow the traditions recalled by Dalila's depiction to govern how we read her? The point is arguable. Joseph Wittreich once made the statement that, in reading Milton, the importance of knowing the tradition is to enable us to mark Milton's *deviance from* that tradition. But in the case of Dalila, I would argue that tradition is character: as John T. Shawcross has said of the characters in *Samson*, "at least Dalila and Harapha stand for types" (297). This is borne out by the language of Dalila's very first speech to Samson. Just as the audience of Sophocles' play would have recognized Creon's rhetoric as Sophist and would have been on their guard immediately, so does a reader respond to Dalila's language, particularly her opening speech, which displays the kind of sinuous duplicity one would expect from the viper she represents. The language of these speeches has been examined before, and I can add only a little to the discussion. Radzinowicz noted that Dalila's lines are spoken in "a curiously seductive cadence, hesitation embodied in feminine lines, the unaccented last syllables and plentiful caesuras of which emphasize lightly breathed dubiety" ("Eve and Dalila" 172). The "feminine" lines no doubt evince her submissiveness as well as what she calls her "timorous doubt":

With doubtful feet and wavering resolution
I came, still dreading thy displeasure, *Samson*,
Which to have merited, without excuse,
I cannot but acknowledge; yet if tears
May expiate (though the fact more evil drew
In the perverse event than I foresaw)
My penance hath not slackn'd, though my pardon
No way assur'd. But conjugal affection,
Prevailing over fear and timorous doubt,
Hath led me on . . . (11. 732-41)

Thomas Kranidas notes how this "timorous doubt" is "beautifully expressed in the short phrases timidly and waveringly set forth. Here is even a little crescendo of bravery in the sound of 'Prevailing over fear.' Dalila remains in control" (127-28).

She certainly does. But there is more expressed in the syntax and structure of these lines than simply submissiveness and timidity. There is also duplicity. Laurie Morrow sees in this kind of speech "a 'Hyaena' counterfeiting the voice of penitence" (40). Search these nine lines for a direct statement and you will come up empty handed. Her words double back on themselves, second guess and qualify themselves, present contrasts and possibilities, but never simply and unequivocally *declare*. Even her most direct statement, that she deserves Samson's displeasure, is couched in an ambiguous double negative — "I cannot but acknowledge." The next sentence begins with a "yet" — it will contrast or qualify the confession of the first, and then lapses into the subjective — "if tears may expiate" — a subjunctive that is immediately qualified by the parenthetical expression beginning with "though." As the sentence ends and she has subjunctively referred to her unslackened penance, she adds another qualifying phrase, "though my pardon / No way assur'd." The next sentence begins not a new idea but another doubling back on this one, beginning with the contrasting "But," implying that what she has just said is not completely true, because here is something else to contrast with it. These initial lines give the impression of a Dalila who, as Low describes her, "is not repenting but evading, yet her evasions do nothing but reveal her for what she is" (156). No one else in the play speaks in this sinuous way. But the same short phrases, the same parenthetical remarks constantly qualifying the sentence, the same subjunctives and all around lack of directness, can be found in speeches like these from another viper:

Wonder not, sovran Mistress, if perhaps
Thou canst, who are sole Wonder, much less arm
Thy looks, the Heav'n of mildness, with disdain,
Displeas'd that I approach thee, thus, and gaze
Insatiate, I thus single, nor have fear'd
Thy awful brow, more awful thus retir'd. (PL IX, 532-37)

One could easily argue that, in looking only at the literary contexts of Dalila's figure, I have ignored the sympathetic human qualities she seems to display in the poem. This may be true, but those apparently sympathetic qualities are precisely what one may use to mask hypocrisy, as Satan uses the apparent curiosity and longing for created beauty of the stripling Cherub he seems to be in order to deceive Uriel.

Still, doesn't all of this talk about literary traditions make us lose sight of the Dalila who is a unique character in Milton's drama? Thinking sympathetically of Dalila, one could well ask about her motivation in coming to Samson in the first place. Few contemporary critics would agree with A.S.P. Woodhouse that Dalila's motives are deliberately obscure, that "they do not matter: she is there for the sake of Samson and the action, not in her own right" (211). Most critics would prefer her to be motivated. "What good is in it for Dalila?" Mollenkott asks. The apparent answer is that we must take her at her word, that she has come out of love, for "unless we are willing to accept Dalila's reason for coming to Samson, we are forced to assume with certain critics that the whole episode is doubtfully motivated and dramatically weak" (Mollenkott 94-95). Empson said that "it would be wilful to doubt that she still loves him and wants to help him, because we are given no other reason for her visit" (220).

But we have no reason to believe Dalila's motives as she presents them, and what she says makes her appear to be self-deceived. She says her motive was love, but clearly her kind of love is selfish, possessive, and stifling self-gratification. Hers is a love that in one breath can tell Samson she betrayed him for love — "what if Love, . . . The jealousy of Love, . . . Caus'd what I did?" (11. 790-93) — and in the next breath tell him that she *hesitated* to betray him because of love — "Only my love of thee held long debate, / And combated in silence all these reasons" (11. 863-64). But it is also a love that wants only to possess that which it desires — to keep Samson "mine and Love's prisoner, not the *Philistines*" (l. 809). As Low says, "she thinks she has acted, and is acting, out of love. There is no need entirely to disbelieve her . . . [but] her kind of love is often indistinguishable from jealousy or hatred, nor is it incompatible with treachery or malice" (152).

On the human level, Dalila is a pitifully self-deluded creature; on the level of Samson's tragedy, she represents a temptation he must face and reject. If his rejection causes us some consternation as readers, we need to consider the literary lineage of Dalila, and to realize that in that context, she was born to be distrusted.

Notes

1 Most critical opinion about Dalila falls roughly into two camps: there are those who say, with Thomas Kranidas, that "we must see Dalila as firmly culpable, in certain areas self-deluding, but in general quite deliberately wrong" (126), or with Radzinowicz that Dalila is "presented as desiring several things not compatible as goals in a stable ego, but are only compatible as aspects of a recognizable psychopathic personality" (38). At the very least, critics have said with Irene Samuels that "poor Dalila is sincere enough," but that she "is surely the most bird-brained woman ever to have gotten herself involved in a major tragedy" (248). Opposed to this "sinner or psychotic" camp are those who read Dalila's appeals to Samson as very sympathetically human, and Samson's embittered rebuff of her as not merely unchivalrous, but as actually lacking charity in any Christian sense. William Empson, in a rather quirky reading of the poem, called Dalila a "high-minded great lady" (224), whom "a modern jury would at once regard . . . as a deeply wronged wife" (211). While most critics have not gone so far, a number of others have defended Dalila with various degrees of commitment. For Joseph Wittreich, the Dalila scene serves to illustrate the unregenerate Samson: "Dalila quickly makes an issue of Samson's 'uncompassionate anger' . . . Samson's is an anger that . . . judging from the Dalila episode, knows no real forgiveness and never with patience will be crowned" (318). John Mason points out that "from her own point of view, [Dalila] is forgiving, loyal, and sensible" (32). Virginia Mollenkott says that "on the human level, Dalila's reasons for betraying Samson are valid in their own way" (96), and that "Dalila is a flawed but decent woman" (101).

A third opinion is summarized by Barbara Lewalski: "A feminist reading might identify Dalila as a site of all the stereotypes

of the female in a patriarchal society, a woman who has so entirely internalized those cultural norms that she can only voice and enact them" ("Milton's *Samson*" 240).

2 I do not refer to the long tradition of literary depictions of Samson. Certainly Krouse has gone far in demonstrating the kind of reputation Dalila had before Milton: "Like Samson," Krouse says, "the seventeenth-century reader would readily have perceived the speciousness of Dalila's defense of herself The readers for whom Milton wrote probably reacted to Dalila as they reacted to Satan or Belial: they were prepared for a Devil equipped with what appear on the surface to be the best of arguments" (102). I have no intention of redoing what Krouse has already done.

3 As a result, the courtly love system is easily parodied. There are poems with unconventional or unlikely speakers, and Chaucer, for one, has at least one poem, "Merciles Beaute," in which he goes through the motions of the traditional lover in the first two sections, insisting that his love will kill him if his lady does not grant him the reward of her favors — "Upon my trouthe I sey you feithfully / That ye ben of my lyf and deeth the quene; / For with my deeth the trouthe shal be sene" (11. 8-10). But he breaks off in the last section of the poem, apparently after his lover has rejected him, and reveals his true colors, wanting nothing to do with the lady or the Love's prison ever again — "Sin I am free, I counte him not a bene" (1. 39). The irony is that he shows himself in the end to be precisely what he protested he was not in the beginning of the poem: a false lover. This is quite similar to Dalila's progress in her scene with Samson.

4 Stella Revard believed Dalila's complexity to be paralleled by the women in Euripidean tragedy, and cites Medea, Hecuba, Phaedra, Clytemnestra, and particularly Helen as models. Parker saw the scene of Helen's defense in Euripedes' *Troades* as Dalila's closest parallel in all Greek drama (126), but did think that Creon in *Oedipus at Colonus* had qualities of both Dalila and Harapha (174).

Works Cited

- Bernart de Ventadorn. "Non es meravelha s'eu chan." *Lyrics of the Troubadours and Trouweres: An Anthology and a History*. Ed. And trans. Frederick Goldin. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press, 1973. No. 21.
- Boethius. *The Consolation of Philosophy*. Trans. Richard Green. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1962.
- Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The Works of Chaucer*. Ed. F.N. Robinson. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Riverside, 1957.
- Empson, William. *Milton's God*. Rev. ed. London: Chatto and Windus, 1965.
- Furman, Wendy. "Samson Agonistes as Christian Tragedy." *PQ* 60 (1981): 161-81.
- Gossman, Ann. "Milton's Samson as the Tragic Hero Purified by Trial." *JEGP* 61 (9162): 528-41.
- Heller, Ricki. "Opposites of Wifhood: Eve and Dalila." *Milton Studies* 24 (1989): 127-202.
- Kranidas, Thomas. "Dalila's Role in *Samson Agonistes*." *SEL* 6 (1966): 125-37.
- Krouse, Michael. *Milton's Samson and the Christian Tradition*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1949.
- Langland, William. *Piers Plowman: An Edition of the C-Text*. Ed. Derek Pearsall. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1978.
- Lewalski, Barbara K. "Milton's *Samson* and the 'New Aquist of True [Political] Experience.'" *Milton Studies* 24 (1989): 233-52.
- . "Samson Agonistes and the 'Tragedy' of the Apocalypse." *PMLA* 85 (1970): 1050-62.
- Low, Anthony. *The Blaze of Noon: A Reading of Samson Agonistes*. New York and London: Columbia UP, 1974.
- Mason, John B. "Multiple Perspectives in *Samson Agonistes*: Critical Attitudes Toward Dalila." *Milton Studies* 10 (1977): 23-33.
- Milton, John. *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* (Selections). *Complete Poems and Major Prose*. Ed. Merritt Y. Hughes. New York: Odyssey Press, 1957. 696-715.

- . *Paradise Lost. Complete Poems and Major Prose*. Ed. Merritt Y. Hughes. New York: Odyssey Press, 1957. 173-469.
- . *Samson Agonistes. Complete Poems and Major Prose*. Ed. Merritt Y. Hughes. New York: Odyssey Press, 1957. 531-93.
- Mollenkott, Virginia R. "Relativism in *Samson Agonistes*." *SP* 67 (1970): 89-102.
- Morrow, Laurie P. "The 'Meet and Happy Conversation': Dalila's Role in *Samson Agonistes*." *Milton Quarterly* 17 (1983): 38-42.
- Mueller, Martin. *Children of Oedipus and Other Essays on the Imitation of Greek Tragedy 1550-1800*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1980.
- Parker, William Riley. *Milton's Debt to Greek Tragedy in Samson Agonistes*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1937.
- Pope, Elizabeth Marie. *Paradise Regained: The Tradition of the Poem*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1947.
- Radzinowicz, Mary Ann Nevins. "Eve and Dalila: Restoration and the Hardening of the Heart." *Reason and Imagination: Studies in the History of Ideas, 1600-1800*. Ed. J.A. Mazzeo. New York: Columbia UP; and London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962. 155-81.
- . *Toward Samson Agonistes*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1978.
- Revard, Stella P. "Dalila as Euripidean Heroine." *PLL* 23 (1987): 291-302.
- Samuels, Irene. "Samson Agonistes as Tragedy." *Calm of Mind: Tercentenary Essays on Paradise Regained and Samson Agonistes in Honor of John S. Diekhoff*. Ed. Joseph Wittreich. Cleveland and London: Case Western Reserve UP, 1971. 235-57.
- Shawcross, John T. "Irony as Tragic Effect: *Samson Agonistes* and the Tragedy of Hope." *Calm of Mind: Tercentenary Essays on Paradise Regained and Samson Agonistes in Honor of John S. Diekhoff*. Ed. Joseph Wittreich. Cleveland and London: Case Western Reserve UP, 1971. 289-306.
- Sophocles. *Oedipus at Colonus. The Three Theban Plays*. Ed. And trans. Robert Fagles. New York: Viking Press, 1982. 260-372.
- Steadman, John M. *Milton and the Renaissance Hero*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

- Ulreich, John C., Jr. "'Incident to All Our Sex': The Tragedy of Dalila." *Milton and the Idea of Woman*. Ed. Julia M. Walker. Urbana and Chicago: U of Illinois P, 1988.
- @WORKS CITED = Widman, Jennifer. "Dalila: Too complex to Categorize." *Proceedings of the Third Dakotas Conference on Earlier British Literature*. Ed. Bruce E. Brandt. Brookings, SD: South Dakota SU, 1995. 91-98.
- Wittreich, Joseph. *Interpreting Samson Agonistes*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1986.
- Woodhouse, A.S.P. "Tragic Effect in *Samson Agonistes*." *University of Toronto Quarterly* 28 (1959): 205-222.

Milton's angels in *Paradise Lost* Creating new beings

Mary Mokris
Peru State College

Milton's angels, those numberless spiritual beings who dwell in joy and light in the presence of God and dine with Adam and Eve in Eden, who "high above the ground . . . March (6.71), have long been neglected by critics. Milton's angelology, according to Rex Clements in his "The Angels in *Paradise Lost*", "has been left largely untouched by the many scholars, both American and European, who have done so much in recent years" (284). Clements also points to numerous others who feel that this may be attributed to the angel's lack of "affinity with frail mortality", compared to the "closer affinity" he says mortals feel with Satan and his followers. Another complaint, from Samuel Johnson on, is that Milton's angels simply fall short. According to Johnson, the angels contribute "[a]nother inconvenience" to Milton's work — "that it requires the description of what cannot be described, the agency of spirits" (Johnson 81). As a result, all Milton could do was "show angels acting but by instruments of action", and thus "invested them with form and matter" (Johnson 81). Thomas Greene, in *The Descent from Heaven: A Study in Epic Continuity* echoes this overriding sentiment: that "[a]lthough the anatomy of evil in the poem is so brilliant as to be unsurpassed in its kind, the dramatization of goodness fails" (409). West, in his *Milton and the Angels*, adds that another "minor complaint" lies in that the angels, "in spite of their special powers, . . . are disappointingly ineffective as agents in the action" (107). The most insurmountable obstacle for the study of Milton's angels simply is the passage of time: "The theology and morality of *Paradise Lost* were anachronistic at their appearance" (Morris 44). Although this statement may be true of today's reader, it is not appropriate to Milton's time. Given the angelology of Milton's day, and the

frequency of discussions and arguments appearing in various contemporary tracts, a curiosity about angels emerges appropriate to the time in which Milton was writing. In fact, in *Paradise Lost* Milton creates his own specific angelology, which answers many of the questions with which contemporary angelologists wrestled. Not only that, Milton's angelology goes beyond a mere underlying support to the plot: Milton creates a new and radical angelology which "imaginatively realize[s] a hundred prose discussions of angels, from Origen to Heywood", and becomes the last statement on "The Hierarchy [which] fell into ruin; and for two hundred years its scattered detritus [has been] all that was left to our literature" (Briggs 183).

In order that his audience might accept him as a reliable angelologist, "Milton had to establish himself as a writer informed about angels and able in the discussion of them" (West 114). This was particularly true because Milton was about to introduce the 17th century to a new way of looking at angels: "Because whatever early confidence in his angelology Milton could gain from his reader was going to have to carry the burden of his radicalism on angelic eating and love-making" (West 114). The first task which Milton had to undertake in setting up a specific doctrine of angelology was to adopt an interpretation of the celestial hierarchy.

The earliest known book which divides the heavenly beings into a specific hierarchy is the Book of Enoch, written sometime between 200 b.c. and 100 a.d. The Book of Enoch tells the story of Enoch's translation to Heaven, in which an angel guide leads him on his journey. The hierarchy sets the Seraphim above the Cherubim (Morris 39), and is "the earliest work to rank angels at all and possibly had some influence on Dionysius himself" (Morris 40). Dionysius the Areopagite, or Pseudo-Dionysius, as he is also called, initiated serious study of the heavens with his *Celestial Hierarchy*. During the Middle Ages and beyond, Dionysius was revered as the foremost authority on the subject of angels. This was due, in large part, to the legend that he had

learned about this arcane matter from St. Paul, who instructed him at the time of his conversion. If this legend was current in the Middle Ages from the sixth century

on, it explains the almost canonical authority of the writings of Dionysius (Adler 46).

Dionysius' description of heaven includes perfect order, separated in threes, where the Seraphim, Cherubim, and Thrones occupy the first level; the Dominations, Virtues, and Powers occupy the middle level; and the Principalities, archangels, and angels occupy the last level. Thus, the hierarchy moves down from the Trinity, and "in threes through the nine angelic orders, thence to the ecclesiastical organ of bishops, priests, and deacons" ("Pseudo-Dionysius" 944), eventually to the faithful, each occupying a specific place in the heavenly order. Variations on the Dionysian hierarchy appeared in Gregory the Great's sermons, advanced by Bernard of Clairvaux, where the order is moderately altered; and alter in a work by Gregory the Great and Isidore of Seville, where the order is once again shifted slightly.

Significantly, Protestant England began to reject the teachings of Dionysius and to question the hierarchies advanced by him. Especially suspect was the comparison Dionysius made of the heavenly hierarchies to the worldly Catholic Church. Thus, according to C. A. Patrides in "Renaissance View on the 'Unconfused Orders Angelick'",

most Protestants of the XVIth century, and nearly all in the XVIIth, avoided strict classifications of the angels, preferring to speak vaguely of the 'unconfused orders Angelick' or to state cautiously that they have 'sundry names'. But no one doubted that there were 'degrees of glory' in Heaven (267).

The reasoning behind the abandonment of celestial hierarchy lies not only in the fear that analogies to "priestcraft" and "ecclesiastical hierarchy" might be made, but also that "it might open doors to magic by the ready parallel between the orders and the celestial spheres" (West 40). Anything that placed God at a distance and another celestial being in His place was undesirable.

In effect, the Protestant Reformation did away with the discussion of angelic hierarchy. Calvin himself derided Dionysius subtly while begrudgingly praising him:

No man can deny that great subtlety and acuteness is discovered by Dionysius, whoever he was, in many parts of his treatise on the Celestial Hierarchy; but if any one enters into a critical examination of it, he will find the greatest part of it to be mere babbling . . . (qtd. in Adler 46).

Thus, Milton was stepping into the middle of a controversy of the age when he set out to incorporate a celestial hierarchy into his poem. It appears to me that he does create a celestial hierarchy of his own, and on this point I am in opposition to certain critics who believe that Milton straddled a fence on the hierarchy, not wishing to get involved in the argument. On the contrary, the very nature of his work has thrust him into the midst, not only of the story of the angels, but also of the controversies concerning them. He was not unaware of his precarious position, and he backed up his own ideas with as much proof as he could obtain from the current arguments on angelology.

Milton names all nine orders of angels through the course of *Paradise Lost*, and also gives them a certain order which recurs, chorus-like, from time to time. Among the "Sanctities of Heaven" (3.60), Milton has created "Hierarchs in orders bright" (5.587). The Seraphim and Cherubim are closest to the Throne of God, and it is from among the Seraphim that Raphael takes his leave (5.246) when he is sent to minister to Adam and Eve. Milton placed the Seraphim, those "wing'd" (5.277) "Celestial Ardors" (5.249) around the throne praising God. According to Thomas Greene, "Ardors" directly "refers to the seraphim, the highest of the nine angelic orders, associated by the pseudo-Dionysius and later angelologists with a fervent and burning love of God" (379 n. 27). Thus Milton classed the Seraphim first, undeniably, as he calls them "the Brightest" (3.381). Then come the "watchful Cherubim; four faces each" (11.128). The Cherubim stand and guard the entrance of Eden after the expulsion of Adam and Eve, their "Bright array" (12.627) bringing the last clear sight of heaven's beings to fallen man.

Archangels and angels remain the lowest ranks in Milton's angelology, often standing for some unnamed creature whom God has bid to serve as messenger. For the rest of the "Progeny

of Light" (5.600), Milton's most frequently repeated order is: "Thrones, Dominations, Princedoms, Virtues, Powers", which occurs in at least four places (5.601), (5.772), (5.840), (10.460). Other references exist where Milton mentions the ranks; however, they are incomplete in that they do not name all five of the middle ranks. Sporadically, Milton will link three of the ranks in a somewhat arbitrary manner, and call attention to the fact: as in speaking "Of Seraphim and Potentates and Thrones / In thir triple Degrees" (5.749-50). This attempt at organization appears on the surface to be rather sketchy, but Milton seems to have had a more organized angelology in mind.

Milton's celestial hierarchy does not match any of the thirteen in existing angelology, but it cannot be denied that, in any case, no one hierarchy can unequivocally be declared correct. Milton's hierarchy, in effect, is as good as the next. Milton works carefully with the idea of a hierarchy of angels; the critics do not agree that he succeeds in achieving one. According to Robert West, the genius of the scheme "is a sort of general allusiveness that does not seriously exceed what Protestants would accept nor yet fall wholly short of what Catholics claimed" (West 136). One must ask, however, what kind of stand Milton was taking. His heaven's creatures are:

if not equal all, yet free
Equally free; for Orders and Degrees
Jar not with liberty, but well consist. (5.791-793)

Evidently, all of the characteristics of hierarchy exist in *Paradise Lost*, yet Clements says "The ninefold classification [serves] . . . something of the purpose of metrical pattern in verse as an instrument on which variations may be played" and thus Milton can employ it in various orders "solely in the interests of scansion" (Clements 289-90). According to Patrides, ". . . Milton did not attempt any classification of the angels" (163). Patrides qualifies this with the fact that Milton "did not deny of course, that a celestial hierarchy exists . . ." (Patrides 163). Attributing such inattention and deliberate arbitrariness to Milton seems unfair: it seems better to cling to "The assumption that John Milton knew what he was doing when he wrote poetry" (Cyr 309).

Milton carefully organized his heaven, and his heavenly beings, according to the Scriptures and other reliable historical information. Having undertaken the task of creating a "new heaven" so to speak, Milton proceeds to include all of the relevant topics in his work. According to Robert West, Milton "does not have to commit himself very deeply in *Paradise Lost*" regarding the three most frequently debated angelic topics between Catholics and Protestants "those on worship of angels, the personal guardian, and the Dionysian orders" (West 131). But if this statement were true, Milton would have avoided these topics. However, as can be seen from his treatment of the Dionysian orders, Milton embraces each of the topics, and generates a response for each controversy.

Adam and Eve do not worship the angels, but they do have a prelapsarian relationship with the celestial beings. Adam does not hesitate, however, in "bowing low" (5.360) to Raphael as a sign of his respect and position below him in the celestial hierarchy: the angel has "a superior Nature" (5.360) to Raphael as a sign of his respect and position below him in the celestial hierarchy: the angel has "a superior Nature" (5.360). This does not indicate that Milton supported angel worship; it does indicate that Adam had the ability to recognize a creature whose "glorious shape" (5.360) must come from heaven. The angel adds a hint that such worship would be inappropriate, because the "time may come when men / With Angels may participate" (5.494).

Regarding the question of the personal guardian, Milton makes a direct statement to this point: not everyone has one. Milton's idea of predestination, as he discusses in *The Christian Doctrine*, applies to the workings of angelic beings as well. The spirits from Hell can freely pass to earth and "tempt or punish mortals, except whom / God and good Angels guard by special grace" (2.1032-1033). Thus, according to Milton, each person on earth does not have a guardian angel. This doctrine opposes others which indicated an individual protection for all, generally derived from Jesus's saying "See that you do not despise one of these little ones; for I tell you their angels in heaven always behold the face of my Father in heaven" (Mt. 18:10). Such a point as whether or not every person has a guardian angel seems

unimportant today; however, in Milton's time, such questions fired controversy.

C. S. Lewis, one of the few 20th century critics to write on Milton's angels, strikes another crucial chord regarding Milton's depiction of the heavenly beings. Milton has not created merely metaphorical creatures, but "poetizations of the glimpses which contemporary *scientific* imagination thought it had attained of a life going on just above the human level though normally inaccessible to direct observation" (Lewis 111). This idea that Milton's angels, especially in the battle in Heaven, constitute depictions of somehow analogous but totally alien beings stands on the following lines, spoken by Raphael:

how last unfold
The secrets of another World, perhaps
Not lawful to reveal? yet for thy good
This is dispens't, and what surmounts the reach
Of human sense, I shall delineate so,
By lik'ning spiritual to corporal forms.(5.568-573)

This metaphor becomes adopted by critics as an explanation for the whole of the celestial existence, as with Robert West, who proposes the "theory" that "Milton conceived those beings . . . as in themselves abstract, but, like Raphael, he put them into metaphor" (West 136). C. S. Lewis points out that immediately after Raphael makes this statement, he "half withdraws from his position" (Lewis 108), when he says:

. . . though what if Earth
Be but the shadow of Heav'n, and things therein
Each to other like more than on Earth is thought?
(5.574-576)

Milton (with Raphael) withdraws the metaphor, at least partially, because of the "high seriousness" of the subject, according to Marc Cyr. "That the metaphorical nature of this narrative not be pushed too far is essential for Milton's aims" (Cyr 313). Cyr says that having Raphael as the narrator lends an "internal heavenly authority" (310) to *Paradise Lost*. This "heavenly

authority" has a great deal to say about the workings of the angelic world, and Milton uses all of the angels as mouthpieces for presenting his angelology — where the angels were *not* merely metaphorical, but as Lewis says, "Milton's picture of the angels, though doubtless poetical in detail, is meant in principle as a literally true picture of what they probably were according to the up-to-date pneumatology of his century" (Lewis 105).

Another heated debate regarding angels was whether or not angels were corporeal beings. There were two schools of thought: the Platonists believed that angels had a certain aery substance which made up their bodies, and the Scholasticists believed that angels were purely intellectual and spiritual beings, incorporeal (Lewis 105). With just one tear that "half cut sheer" (6.325) and then "Deep ent'ring shear'd / All his right side" (6.326-7), Satan's body is wounded at the battle in Heaven. Milton stresses the "Nectarous humor" (6.332) which pours forth from the wound, and the celerity with which the "liquid texture" (6.347) closes upon the wound. Milton shapes his angels with a specific form. If angels call God "invisible" (3.3.74), God must be more invisible to them than these "Ethereal Sons" (5.863) are to each other. There appears to be a gradation from man, who is visible, to angels, who are less visible, to God who is invisible. Thus, Milton "was a materialist, who believed that there was no soul without a body of some kind" (Briggs 179). This idea was one rather in vogue in Milton's time, according to Mortimer Adler:

Since the sixteenth century, materialism has become a much more sophisticated philosophical doctrine than that of atomism in either its ancient or its modern form (104).

Having established that Milton wrote his *Paradise Lost* with a corporeal angel in mind, I might raise other questions Milton addressed regarding widely accepted teachings on angels.

Angels have historically been thought of as able to bilocate. In other words, when an angel is on earth, it does not leave God's presence in heaven. Adler delineates this angelic property:

First, an angel is spiritually present at whatever place in physical space happens to be occupied by the body on which it acts. It can be present at that place without leaving Heaven, which is its spiritual residence, just as a corporation that has its legal residence in Delaware can act in Honolulu without leaving the state in which it is incorporated (129).

This thinking creates a problem for the believer in a material angel, however. The angels in Milton's *Paradise Lost* are local — that is, if they are on earth, they are where they are, and are not in heaven at the same time. Milton makes this clear when Raphael asks Adam to recount the story of his creation. Although this appears to be a stylistic technique to allow Milton to tell the story of man's creation, it is also another aspect of angelology which emerges. If Milton's angels could bilocate, Raphael's statement would not be rational:

... say therefore on;
For I that Day was absent, as befell,
Bound on a voyage uncouth and obscure,
Far on excursion toward the Gates of Hell;
(8.228-231)

Raphael was absent bodily from Heaven on a journey, and while gone he did not have insight into what was happening elsewhere in the Universe, as he might have had if he could bilocate.

Of course, the lack of bilocation does not leave Milton's angels without other superhuman powers. Michael Psellus, an angelologist, wrote three tracts on angels between 1577 and 1615. According to Psellus, angels could vary their appearance at will, grow or shrink, and heal instantaneously if struck (West 110). Milton makes similar statements regarding his angels:

... as they please,
They limb themselves, and color, shape or size
Assume, as likes them best, condense or rare.
(6.351-353)

Milton shows such traits in his angels, as with the winged Seraph Raphael changing shape, and then again "to [a] proper shape return[ing]" (5.276), with Michael's "mounted scale aloft" (5.1014), or with the dark transformations on the other side. Without these properties, the combat in Heaven could not be explained. As Lewis says of the aerial combat, "I have never seen it, but in the sixteenth century nearly everyone seems to have done so" (108). In addition to this ability to change appearance, angels have sharpened sight, as Uriel does as God's "Eyes" (3.650), and Raphael does in seeing from Heaven everything "however small" (5.58), and nothing could "obstruct his sight" (5.257). Angels also move more quickly than the eye, and can travel, as Raphael does, "distance inexpressible / By Numbers that have name" (8.113-114). These powers are specific to angels, however, and where Milton deviates from other angelologists comes in his insistence on the corporeal nature of the being.

Milton seems to have thought that angels, as corporeal beings, would necessarily need angelic food, rest for their bodies, and some method of sexual expression. Milton's Raphael explains that angels eat "Angels' Food, and [drink] rubied Nectar" (5.633), grown and harvested in Heaven's own gardens. Their meals are a "communion sweet" (5.637). After the meals, "All but the unsleeping eyes of God to rest" (5.647). Raphael, too, makes a lengthy statement about the manner in which angels love each other — and, according to Lewis, "It is inconceivable that Milton should have so emphasized the reality of angelic nourishment (and even angelic excretion) if the bodies he attributed to his angels were merely a poetical device" (Lewis 105). These angel bodies

... both contain
Within them every lower faculty
Of sense, whereby they hear, see, smell, touch, taste,
Tasting concoct, digest, assimilate
And corporeal to incorporeal turn.
(5.409-413)

This last idea, that angels can turn corporeal food (i.e., the food Raphael eats with Adam and Eve) into incorporeal substance,

together with the question of whether or not angelic beings engage in love-making, combined reveal another aspect of Milton's angelic beings. According to Robert West, "Milton enters here into two questions debated among angelologists [who] almost unanimously decided against his view" (West 106).

A chief problem with Milton's angels is the fact that Raphael concedes to a sort of angelic love-making. This opposed all the prominent teaching by angelologists, because "angels did not propagate, so they performed nothing among themselves that could be called an amorous activity" (West 89). God was "wise", says Adam, to have "peopl'd highest Heav'n / With Spirits Masculine" (10.889-90). But Raphael says that angels *can* love with their entire essence, and that

... we enjoy
In eminence, and obstacle find none
Of membrane, joint, or limb, exclusive bars:
Easier than Air with Air, if Spirits embrace,
Total they mix, Union of Pure with Pure
Desiring; nor restrain'd conveyance need
As Flesh to mix with Flesh, or Soul with Soul
(8.623-629)

These angels, however, are not living a life of "homosexual promiscuity" (Lewis 109). The beings love, for "without Love no happiness" (8.621).

As for eating the same food that Adam and Eve eat, Milton makes clear that the Apocryphal Book of Tobit's account of Raphael only *seeming* to eat earthly food is an unlikely one. Milton's Raphael says that he has the power to "convert, as you / To proper substance" (5.491-92) the food he has eaten. Thus Milton has once again taken a radical view of angels — his can eat human food and digest it into their aery substance.

Milton also makes statements about angels by differentiating between the "specific" angel and the "individual" (Adler 126). Angelologists questioned whether a whole order of angel would be identical — in other words, all Seraphim would be identical to each other, and thus would have no distinct individual personalities. Milton makes sure that his angels do have personalities all their own.

No one would mistake Michael for Raphael, or Gabriel for Uriel. As Samuel Johnson has said:

Among the angels, the virtue of Raphael is mild and placid, of easy condescension, and free communication; that of Michael is regal and lofty, and as may seem, attentive to the dignity of his own nature. Abdiel and Gabriel appear occasionally and act as every incident requires . . . (73).

Raphael — "God has healed" — speaks "mild" (5.371) words. Michael, foremost among the heavenly powers, and whose name means "Who is as God" looks with "regard benign" (11.334), befitting his eminent position in heav'n. Gabriel — "God is my strength" — sits "Betwixt these rocky Pillars" (4.549). Milton characterizes Abdiel by his "flame of zeal severe" (5.807), and uses him to show that "no man can be sure that he has found the truth until he has compared it with all possible forms of error" (Goldman 250). Uriel's "sharpest sighted" (3.691) eyes allow him to see everything but evil. Milton clearly creates a diversity of angels among the angelic ranks, each one with his own personality.

The communication between the angels and man, specifically with Raphael in the garden, becomes the pivotal point of the plot. Such scenes impact greatly, as it is "the most important indication in *Paradise Lost* of man's original intimacy with the angels . . . [because] the ease of communication with the angels and with God in Paradise was for Milton one of the principal reasons for Adam's bliss" (Knott 37). Milton characterizes Raphael as the angel who speaks with Adam and Eve in a setting where the first couple reveal their hospitality. This facility of communication reveals "the close connection between Earth and Heav'n" (Low 140). Milton makes Raphael the most central angel to the plot, creating a dichotomy between the good angel Raphael and the evil angel Satan. As Beverley Sherry notes in "Milton's Raphael and the Legend of Tobias," the entire future of the world "depends on which angel Adam and Eve really listen to, which one they prefer finally to converse with, Raphael or Satan" (Sherry 227). This becomes especially evident when the word "Guide" is traced through the books. First, Adam calls God, and God

answers "I come thy Guide" (8.298) and joins him in the garden. Later, Eve speaks to Satan, "her guide" (9.646). In the meantime, God orders Raphael to "Converse with Adam" (5.230), and when he ends at the beginning of Book VIII, the words still echoed in Adam's ear:

The Angel ended, and in Adam's ear
So Charming left his voice, that he a while
Thought him still speaking . . .
(8.1-3)

Similarly, Satan's words echo in Eve's ears after the serpent speaks:

. . . in her ears the sound
Yet run of his persuasive words, impregn'd
With Reason, to her seeming, and with Truth;
(9.736-738)

Adam and Eve must choose which angel to believe — Raphael or Satan. The result will affect the future converse with angels and thus becomes a part of the tragedy of the fall: that man no longer has easy access to the messengers of celestial light.

Because of the lack of access to these heavenly beings, angelologists have been relegated to guessing about the actual nature of the beings. Milton's *Paradise Lost* qualifies as a poetic work which purveys a doctrine about angels subtly, yet definitely. Robert West refers to John Salkeld, in *A Treatise of Angels* (1613), who divided his book into specific chapters, each answering a question regarding the nature of the angelic beings. Salkeld, a Scholasticist, asks first if angels are "corruptible" (West 44). Milton's Raphael says that angels "Cannot but by annihilating die" (6.347), although after his wound heals, Satan mistakenly believes his form "Imperishable" (6.435). Salkeld next asks whether angels "compound of matter and form" (West 44). Milton, as has been shown, believed that the angels had some sort of corporeal body, which they can shape as they please. "How do they move?", Salkeld asks. Milton answers that they move with great speed, much faster than humans can calculate. Salkeld

also asks how angels understand themselves and God and nature" (West 44). Milton shows the angels in various relationships with each other, praising God about his throne, and communing with Adam and Eve in the garden. He makes it clear that angels have intelligence apart from God, and that they fall short of being all-knowing. They can communicate freely with God, each other, and man through language understandable to their hearer. Another of Salkeld's questions is whether or not an "order exists among them" (West 44). Milton clearly has set up an order of his own regarding the angelic hierarchy; therefore Milton believed in a heavenly system of ranks. Salkeld's final question is whether or not the "good sin", and for Milton, that is evident in Satan's fall.

Milton relies heavily on the workings of angels in *Paradise Lost* in order to reveal the difference between their divine substance and the substance of the "Man of Clay" (9.176). Boethius, in his *Consolation of Philosophy* compares the two:

For in hygge and diuine substance, that is to say, in aungles, is bothe infallyble iudgement, incorruptyble wyll to euyll, and redye power to do thynges desyred, but it behoueth that mens soules be more free, when they kepe them selves in the contemplacion of goddes mynde and wyll, and they be lesse free when they slyde into bodyes humayne, that is to saye, when they behold worldly thyngs. (120).

For Boethius, the secret for the human race, then, becomes to look upward toward heav'n, and one day achieve the commerce with celestial beings that was so accessible before the fall.

Works Cited

- Adler, Mortimer J. *The Angels and Us*. New York: MacMillan, 1982.
 "Angels." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. 1967 ed.
 Boethius. *Consolation of Philosophy* Trans. George Colville, 1556.
 London: David Nutt, 1907.

- Briggs, K. M. *The Anatomy of Puck: An Examination of Fairy Beliefs among Shakespeare's Contemporaries and Successors*. New York: Hillary House, 1959.
- Clements, Rex. "The Angels in Paradise Lost." *Review of English Studies* 16 (1940): 415-31.
- Cyr, Marc D. "The Archangel Raphael: Narrative Authority in Milton's War in Heaven." *Journal of Narrative Technique* 17 (1987): 309-316.
- Davidson, Gustav. *A Dictionary of Angels, Including the Fallen Angels*. New York: The Free Press, 1967.
- Erivgenae, Iohannis Scoti. *Expositiones in Ierarchiam Coelestem*. Turnholt: Typographi Brepols Editores Pontificii, 1975.
- Goldman, Jack. "Insight into Milton's Abdiel." *Philological Quarterly* 49 (1970): 249-254.
- Greene, Thomas. *The Descent from Heaven: A Study in Epic Continuity*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1963.
- Johnson, Samuel. "Milton" (1779). James Thorpe, Ed. *Milton Criticism: Selections from Four Centuries*. New York: Collier Books, 1950.
- Knott, John R. "The Visit of Raphael: Paradise Lost, Book V." *Philological Quarterly* 47 (1968): 36-42.
- Lewis, C. S. "The Mistake about Milton's Angels." *A Preface to Paradise Lost*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1942. 105-111.
- Low, Anthony. "Angels and Food in Paradise Lost." *Milton Studies* 1 (1969): 135-144.
- Morris, Harry. "Some Uses of Angel Iconography in English Literature." *Comparative Literature* 10 (1958): 36-44.
- Patrides, C. A. "Renaissance Thought on the Celestial Hierarchy: The Decline of a Tradition." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 20 (1959): 155-66.
- . "Renaissance Views on the 'Unconfused Orders Angelick'." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 23 (1962): 265-67.
- Sherry, Beverley. "Milton's Raphael and the Legend of Tobias." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 78 (1979): 227-41.
- West, Robert H. *Milton and the Angels*. The University of Georgia Press, 1955.

The rubric and organization of 17th century English spiritual diary

Bill Clemente Germaine Murray
Peru State College Maryville College

During the last ten years scholarly interest in the journaling impulse especially in seventeenth century England has increased. The diaries and journals of seventeenth century England hold a wealth of information about the social, historical, personal and theological contexts of this period. One issue which has not been raised concerning the diary form is the origin and rubric of the spiritual diary. This paper will concern itself with the reasons behind the rise of journaling and the possible motives behind the organization of seventeenth century Puritan diaries especially. The work to figure prominently in this discussion is John Beadle's *A Journal or Diary of a Thankful Christian*, 1656. In this short manual, Beadle describes the method and organization of the spiritual diary in order that the faithful can make a proper reckoning of their souls. It is an important book because it is the only book of its kind written in seventeenth century England.

There were essentially three specific circumstances which made possible Beadle's thorough discussion of the diary form. They were: 1) the Puritan's psychological need for a structured confessional experience where he specifically documented his shortcomings while also enumerating his blessings; 2) the increased knowledge of accounting theory and practise, the language of which was ingrained in the Puritans who made up a substantial portion of the new merchant middle class; 3) and, finally, the Puritans' keen interest in recording and understanding the symbolic and cosmic significance of the public and environmental workings of Providence, a practice which complemented their interest in the private workings of Providence and which probably also derived from the already entrenched practise of keeping commonplace books, and from the medieval

and Renaissance fascination with prodigies and the ordinary workings of natural events.

Antecedents

The book Beadle produced, *A Journal or Diary of a Thankful Christian*, is essentially a manual, a how-to book about how to write a spiritual diary; moreover, it is the only one of its kind written in seventeenth-century England. No religious or spiritual writer before Beadle's publication had extensively or systematically documented any rubric or tradition for diary-keeping. However, several religious writers did recommend keeping a journal of sorts, as part of daily devotional practise for the purpose of facilitating a complete examination of conscience, and an awareness of the movements of the soul and heart. For example, Richard Baxter, in *The Saints' Everlasting Rest* (1650), suggests that when one begins to take stock "it would not be unuseful to write out some of the chief and those Scriptures withall which hold them forth, and so to bring this Paper with you when you come to the Examination." Baxter further suggests that after one has studied these written observations and has arrived at a conclusion concerning his application to life, one should permanently document his truth to stave off future backsliding:

be sure to Record this Sentence, so passed, write it down: or at least write it in thy Memory: At such a time upon thorough Examination, I found my state to be thus or thus: This Record will be very useful to thee hereafter. If thou be ungodly: what a damp will it be to thy presumption and security, to go and read the Sentence of thy Misery under thy own hand? If thou be godly: what a help will it be again the next Temptation to doubting and fear, to go and read under thy hand this Record?

Another Protestant devotional tract which discussed the efficacy of journal-keeping as a vehicle for confession was Isaac Ambrose's *Prima, the First Things in reference to the Middle & Last Things*, (1654). In a section called "Of the time of our Self-tryal,"

Ambrose, like Baxter, recommends that the sinner examine himself: "After supper, when you lie down, and are ready to sleep, and have great quietnesse and silence, without presence or disturbance of any, then erect a Tribunal for your own Consciences." He goes on to suggest that the conclusions or "accounting" of "tryals" be recorded in a diary in order that the penitent may refer during the year to his dealings with God and God's dealings with him:

To this purpose we read of many Ancients that were accustomed to keep Diaries or Day-books of their actions, and out of them to take an account of their lives: Such a Register (of Gods dealings towards him, and of his dealings toward God in main things) the Lord put into a poor creatures heart to keep in the year 1641. ever since which time he hath continued it, and once a year purposes (by Gods grace) to examine himself by it. . .

A third contemporary of Beadle's who wrote and spoke about the necessity of journal keeping was Edmund Staunton, a Puritan divine. In *A Sermon preacht at Great Milton in the county of Oxford at the funerall of Mrs. Elizabeth Williamson, late wife of Dr. Henry Williamson principall of Magdalen Coollege. Whereunto is added a narrative of her godly life and death*, December 9, 1654, Staunton spoke much in the same terms as Ambrose, Baxter and Beadle concerning the purpose of keeping a diary: "She kept a Diary of Gods dealings with her soule, and of those various dispensations she met withall." Again, Mrs. Williamson used her diary as an aid to self-examination and as a tool for better understanding God's intentions for her. It helped her to "account" for various vicissitudes of her spiritual progress and the "returns" of grace with which God had chosen to reward her.

It is quite probable that Beadle had read about both Baxter's and Ambrose's instructions for journal keeping and decided to expand on them more completely. However, Beadle's ideas on journal keeping pre-date both Baxter's and Ambrose's recommendations by many years as is evidenced by the eyewitness account of Arthur Wilson, a contemporary of Beadle, who witnessed Beadle preaching on the subject of diary-keeping on

July 21, 1644. In this text Beadle sees God setting a precedent for every Christian concerning the keeping of a journal. According to Wilson's own journal account Beadle insists that

every Christian ought to keep a record of his owne actions & wayes, being full of dangers & hazards; that God might have the glorie. For this command was given to Moses . . . by God himself; that there might be a remembrance to posteritie of the deliverances which God had & would worke for his people...

Hence, for Beadle, the keeping of a journal was not simply a matter of preference, but an issue of obedience to God typified in His command to Moses as is written in Beadle's proof text as Numbers 33.2: "And Moses wrote their goings out, according to their Journeys, by the commandement of the Lord."

Coupled, then, with the obligation to obedience, was the obligation to imitate God's example as *the* Record Keeper, and Author of Scripture, the ultimate record; as Beadle says at the end of his book, "God himself seems to keep a Journall by him of all the care he hath of us, the cost he bestows upon us, and the good things he gives to us. He hath a book of remembrance of every passage of providence that concerns us. And indeed, the Scripture for a great part is little else but a history of his goodnesse to his people" (Beadle). Moreover, if the Puritan believed that God himself keeps a record of every gracious soul's journey, then on judgment day the soul's journal must somehow mirror or match God's record. In essence, the soul faces God with a written record of his life, containing both the evil committed and the charity bestowed, with the judgment depending somewhat on how closely the solitary soul's diary corresponds to God's. Hence, the compelling issue for the solitary soul is whether or not he has kept an accurate record and whether or not he has been an industrious and faithful steward over the blessings of "God's goodnesse, [and] mercies with joy and thankfulness" evident in his life.

Clearly Beadle was not unique in his belief that Christians should keep a written record of both their offenses against God and the benefits received from him. Spiritual diaries of the kind Beadle prescribes were written before Beadle's time, and we

possess many manuscripts and printed examples of them. Yet, it was not until the early to middle seventeenth century that the practise became truly prevalent, especially within the nonconformist community. Indeed, Beadle's detailed treatise was possible because he lived at a time when he was able to take full advantage of a variety of societal influences and cultural circumstances which made the codification of rules governing Puritan spiritual diary-writing both possible and necessary within the context of Puritan life. In brief, Beadle's instructional manual helped to popularize the already well-known practise of diary writing among every level of the faithful and also to emphasize it as an important component of Puritan spirituality and Christian devotion. He himself asks, with regard to the number of faithful keeping diaries, "Where is the man that makes conscience of private fasting and prayers, that shuts himself up in his closet, and wrestles with God in secret, that his Father that seeth in secret may reward him openly? To conclude, how few are there that keep a Diary by them of all Gods gracious dealings with them?" (Beadle).

The Puritan Diary as Confessional

First, there is little doubt that the Puritan proclivity for diary-keeping stemmed from the Puritan's need for self-reflection, for a regimented examination of conscience, for the giving of public and private penance, for assurance of election and forgiveness, and for offering thanks for the benefits and blessings bestowed on him by God. Indeed, the Puritan diary, or a "Register-book for Conscience," as Beadle calls it, in order to fulfill these needs (especially the examination of conscience), was used as a confessional vehicle or more specifically as a replacement for the Catholic sacrament of auricular confession which had given pre-Reformation generations a spoken assurance of forgiveness. Beadle's prefatory instructions also attest to the confessional nature of the spiritual diary, when he commands, "providences must be registred. Who can number the stars, or sands; Gods blessings, or our sins? the most eminent of the first magnitude are to be noted down; as all our sins are to be laid to heart, but

especially the most hainous." Concomitantly, William Haller early observes, in his classic *The Rise of Puritanism*, that "The diary like the autobiography, of which it was the forerunner, was the Puritan's confessional. In its pages he could fling upon his God the fear and weakness he found in his heart but would not betray to the world." Furthermore, the Puritan diary conflated the practise of confession with the examination of conscience which are two separate processes in the Catholic tradition. The examination which preceded confession and the tradition of the *septenary* interrogation of the confessional between priest and penitent, which asked the penitent the circumstances of his sins, are both replaced with the self-interrogation of the diary.

In coalescing elements of the two, Beadle's rubric retains many elements of the Catholic examination of conscience. For example, when a Catholic prepared for confession, he was asked to consider several personal circumstances such as "The state of [his] degree, person, or calling;" "The offices and daily exercises, wherein [he] [has] beene occupied;" "The places wherein [he] [has] liued or dwelt;" and "the persons with whom [he] [has] kept company, & byn most conuersant." Similarly, Beadle recommends that the diarist record, "his effectual calling, and of his age in Christ"; "all the men and means that God hath in providence used for our good"; while also suggesting that "it will be of singular use to put into our Diary, what Times we have lived in, what Ministers we have lived under, what Callings we were of, what Wealth was bestowed on us, what places of Authority and Command were committed to us." Beadle also strongly reminds the "thankfull Christian" to "remember your sinfull estate, when you were in a naturall estate, and therefore in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity"

Another part of the Catholic examination of conscience which Beadle adjusts to the diary form is the penitent's self-interrogation concerning his obligation toward God, toward his neighbor, and toward himself. Traditionally, the penitent asked himself if he had sinned against God, his neighbor, or himself "by thoughts, by words or by deedes." Further, he would ask himself with regard to his relationship with God if he had "loued God, wyth all his harte, and with hys soule, as was bounde to doe: But

hath settled his affection [on] . . . the vanitie of this worlde, forgettingte his creator altogether." He would also check "in lyke maner for beinge ingratefull towards the benefites of god; and for not rendering unto him due thanks therefore, and for that he hath not endeouored to serue and loue more earnestly the giuer of al goodnesse." In chapter 6, Beadle's prescription for self-accusation bears a striking resemblance to these questions. He begins the chapter with this instruction: "when you have read over your Journall, and made such use of it as hitherto I have shewed you; ask youre owne hearts these three questions: The first concerns God; the second, our neighbour; and the third, ourselves" (Beadle). He then lists a number of questions the diarist should ask himself: "What honor do I bring to God for all this?" "I have all from him, but do I anything for him?" "Can I say with St. Paul, *His I am, and him I serve?* He is the *alpha* of all my happinesse, why should not he be the *omega* of all my thankfulness?"

The purpose behind Beadle's written adaptation of the Catholic examination of conscience and the oral *septenary* was to aid the diary keeper's memory in permanently recording the dialogue between his conscience and his sinful self so that he might then absolve himself. However, the adaptation possessed a not easily surmounted limitation: how was the writer to be sure that he had been forgiven in the eyes of God?

Whereas in confession the priest functions as a proxy for Christ and speaks with His voice, the puritan diary keeper serves as both examiner and penitent; therefore, he had to detach himself in such a way as to render "a scientific judgment on himself; his conscience examines his experience as would an eternal, objective observer, God." In a pre-Beadle devotional tract entitled *The Saints' Everlasting Rest*, Richard Baxter demands that during self-examination one should "resolve to judge thy self impartially; neither better nor worse then thou art, but as the Evidence shall prove thee;" and then after the judgment "when by all this pains and means thou hast discovered the truth of thy state, then pass the Sentence on thy self accordingly." This kind of objectivity on the part of the diarist was virtually impossible, and thus, assurance of God's favor became more elusive and uncertain. The only way this limitation could be overcome

was by rigorous and prolonged daily examination which would ultimately produce a written and therefore visual pattern of one's life, character and circumstances which would, in turn, produce proof of forgiveness and election. Over a period of several months or years a pattern of assurance emerged and was augmented by the very act of keeping diary which "proved" the diarist's commitment to penance, reform and thanksgiving. According to Michael McGiffert, "the keeping of a journal, which seems to have been an important point of Puritan piety, was itself a means of assurance, or was so intended. Ability to sustain this methodical, painful discipline could be regarded as a mark of a gracious soul, and the regularity of the exercise may itself have contributed to the diarist's composure."

As with the absolution of auricular confession, this written record was meant to give its writer assurance of forgiveness, and a greater awareness of personal sinfulness, while also validating and ordering both his personal and his communal existence. In other words, the Puritan believed that because his life experiences, his successes, his failures, his faults, were written, or in a sense stored permanently on the page, that his narrative arrangement of all of these circumstances constituted both a true mirror of himself and of his favor in the eyes of God. Thus, constant review of this document and disciplined, honest expansion upon it would make more clear one's relationship to God, one's realization of salvation, and one's innate sinfulness.

The Diary and Spiritual Account Book

The second cultural circumstance which undoubtedly influenced the keeping of spiritual journals and, therefore, the development of Beadle's pattern for journal-writing, was the increased knowledge of bookkeeping methodology and accounting theory which became ingrained very early in the Christian sensibility. Puritans especially made up a large majority of the merchant class in England, in the seventeenth century, so it is not surprising that they heavily borrowed from the language and theory of commerce. In his book, *The Family Life of Ralph Josselin: A Seventeenth Century Clergyman*, Alan MacFarlane concludes

that one reason for the "rapid growth of diary-keeping after the Reformation" had to do with the "increased interest in household accounting." Likewise, P.A. Spalding observes that the majority of early diaries in England and America "developed, almost unawares, as the amplification of account-books or other domestic records." The language of accounting, already imbedded within his consciousness, furnished the Puritan with a vocabulary allowing him to objectively document his private life, while also adding to it a sense of mathematical precision which made it more presentable and seemingly ordered in his eyes and in the eyes of God. Beadle himself maintains that when keeping a diary "a methodical way is a successfull way." Samuel Pepys's diary, one of the most famous diaries ever written in the seventeenth century, was directly influenced by the "methodical way" of accounting. Pepys "was by nature a man of system, and one to whom the keeping of records was necessary to the art of living. The diary was one of a series of records, which by the 1660's included petty-cash books, account books, letter-books, memorandum books . . . All were a means to a disciplined life, methods of canalising the stream of experience." Indeed, the "keeping" of a diary, like the "keeping" of accounts, became the "practical part of Religion," a practical aid in keeping the sacred account book, so that the Puritan with greater credibility could "well convert his spiritual examination into a kind of general audit, totalling up sins and graces and exulting in spiritual riches."

An additional piece of information should be taken into account in considering the Puritan's borrowing of accounting nomenclature: and that is, the instructions of confessional manuals were also imbued, consciously or unconsciously, with the language of accounting and finance, which the Puritans in all probability borrowed and then adapted to the practice of spiritual journal-writing. In fact, the *septenary* of questions asked by the priest during confession directly influenced the invention of double entry bookkeeping and the ethics of early accounting business practice. The seven questions which asked the specifics of each sin: who, how much, why, in what place, at what time, by what means and instruments, how often, are the same questions which shaped the method expounded by Luca Pacioli's late

fifteenth-century treatise on double-entry bookkeeping called *De Computis et Scripturis* (1494).

Pacioli's methodology spread rapidly throughout Europe, where the Dutch and the English efficiently adapted its principles to their economic contexts. In England, one of the earliest accounting manuals to appear was James Peele's, *The Maner and Fourme How to Keep a Perfecte Accompte* (1553), which was clearly an almost word for word adaptation of Pacioli's treatise. Peele's argument for this new practise hinged on its ability to help the merchant achieve more true "reconyngs."

Undoubtedly, Beadle was well aware of, and, as his parish records show, fairly adept at the accounting methods growing ever more popular during his life-time. He himself was a clerk, and the parish records from Barnston surviving him indicate a definite bookkeeping expertise. Likewise, the accounting terminology and business vocabulary Beadle and John Fuller consciously use throughout *A Journal or Diary of a Thankful Christian* also betray a deliberate effort to adapt this language and theory of "reckoning" to personal diary writing. Beadle borrows Pacioli's and his English successors' ideas concerning the purpose of accounting and applies them to the keeping of a spiritual journal. For Beadle, and for many diarists of the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the diary becomes a conflated spiritual version of the Memorandum, the Journal, the Ledger, and the Remembrance book of bookkeeping practise.

But the most important benefit of applying accounting principles to personal diary writing was the creation of a sustained and conscious connection between the Puritan's private and public existence. Order in one's books could not help but bring divine satisfaction. For like the goal of business account keeping, which was "to give contentment unto the Book-owner, and to shew him (or them, whom they do concern) at all times, and in every degree, how his Estate standeth in the so written books," the goal of the thankful Christian was to be a diligent steward over both his soul and the benefits awarded to him by God so that he might give contentment to God.

In accounting for one's private concerns, one participated in the spiritual counterpart of his secular business, using a kind of

sacred numeration, a "divine Arithmetick," in order to help one thrive "in this spirituall soul-trade." Beadle, all the while acting as a faithful and loyal steward, instructs his readers in this "divine Arthmetick" or sacred "accounting" when he counsels each Christian in keeping his private books to "mark what returns, what answers God gives to your prayers"; "to reckon how many ways those wants are supplied with other comforts"; "to reckon often, not onely what you have, and what you want, but what you may want; cast up all hazzards . . . and reckon upon losses"; and to "make [a] collection of praises from friends, that the summe maybe made up the more full."

The Diary as Book of Providences

The final component of the Puritan spiritual diary which explains more fully its role as a confessional vehicle is its concern with documenting and interpreting the public and natural workings of Providence in the family, in the society, and in the body politic. In brief, the Puritans, in both England and America, interpreted every natural phenomenon or worldly event as either a portent or a sign of God's will toward his people on earth. This belief in the doctrine of providence crossed denominational lines; however, the Puritans were among the most zealous interpreters and recorders of God's providential manifestations in the world, and they created what can be described as a method of exegesis for interpreting God's handwriting in the book of nature. "They insisted that providence be acknowledged as the surest sign of God's sovereignty," and they "sincerely believed that there was a link between man's moral behaviour and his fortune in this world, whether in bodily health or professional success." Again, this concern with passages of Providence was closely related to the Puritan's constant need for salvific assurance. Assurance was possible if the Puritan's private confessional record was in consonance with his assessment of the public mercies or trials bestowed on him by Providence. And if the two recordings did not balance, "the correct reaction on the part of a believer stricken by ill fortune was therefore to search himself in order to discover the moral defect which had provoked God's wrath, or

to eliminate the complacency which had led the Almighty to try him." Apparently, the close observance of illustrious providences could then act as a catalyst to reform and conversion and an assurance of election. Moreover, the Puritan also believed that by both noticing and then documenting "special providences," either trivial or important, he would be able to glean a pattern of God's workings in the community or in his family; this knowledge would allow no harm to befall him unless God permitted it.

Alongside the Puritan's accounting of his "own and others sins with shame and sorrow" he detailed all blessings, notable judgments, and remarkable happenings in his life. He would also chronicle any conspicuously symbolic judgments which had befallen others. Very often, the Puritan diarist would remark on an historical event, anecdote, or quotation which held a particular significance to a contemporary situation or which providentially taught a moral lesson concerning human nature or God's will. He undoubtedly borrowed this convention from the already ingrained practice of keeping a commonplace book, used during the Renaissance and throughout the seventeenth century "as a stimulus and guide to thought and expression."

Puritan diary practise borrows and subsequently applies the rhetorical motivation for the "places" by encouraging the diarist to record examples of both contemporary and historical *Divina Exempla*, which aid the diarist's memory, while also furnishing proof and thus making a case for his holiness and election. Consider, for example, the way in which Walter Powell, a seventeenth century diarist, describes the purpose and function of his diary:

a booke of ould remembrances. . . and of the matters happening in my occasions, collected out of ould Almanacks, wch I have filed together from yeare to yeare, . . . to be caried about me helpe my memorie concerning those things & vpon all occasions.

The sacralizing of the commonplace impulse is especially evident in the number and size of the collections of "illustrious passages" published in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Three such collections that Beadle seems to have on hand in writing *A Journal or Diary* are Edmund Rudierd's *The Thun-*

derbolt of Gods Wrath, or an Abridgement of Gods Fearefull Judgements, (1618); Thomas Beard's *The Theatre of Gods Judgements*, originally published in 1597 and much expanded in later editions; and Samuel Clark's *A Mirroure or Looking-Glasse both for Saints and Sinners*, originally published in 1648, and later enlarged into a second edition. These compendia furnished ministers and their faithful with a body of lore which ostensibly demonstrated God's intimate connection with His creation and, as Hershel Baker observes in *The Wars of Truth*, "like the mystery of the Incarnation it [the diary] brought God and man into an intimate relation with no jeopardy to God's sovereignty but with the prodigious increase of man's dignity. If everything that happens — the traffickings of daily life no less than the great movements of history — can be referred to God for causality and therefore justification, then everything assumes a dimension in infinity." In a sense, the Puritan saw in ordinary and extraordinary events of his communal and personal life, direct participation by God; and therefore, if the Puritan could record the trappings, the outward signs of this involvement he could discern the will of God toward him and toward his community. If God's will toward him was favorable, if there were no physical signs of trouble, he could interpret this as a sign of absolution and election. However, this theory also worked in reverse and carried with it a certain inevitable lack of certitude. As Keith Thomas observes concerning the loopholes in the theory,

At the same time it can hardly escape notice that the doctrine of divine providence had about it a self-confirming quality. For there was no way in which the theory once accepted could be faulted. If the wicked man encountered adversity this was clearly a punishment from God; if a godly man was smitten then he was being tested and tried. The pious Christian for whom events went well could thank God for his good fortune without in any way being worried by the equal prosperity of his reprobate neighbour, since he knew that the absence of worldly afflictions could sometimes be a dreadful sign of God's lost love.

Thus, along side the recording of their examination of conscience and the recognition of their sins, Puritan diarists also kept track of "judgements, great changes, overturnings, and the sins of the age," while also noting "the works and operations of God, wherein God hath exceeded to them; but we must also consider, wherein they and others have exceeded against God in their transgressions . . . and the judgements both spirituall and temporall of our times, else we may be equally destroyed, and sure shall not keep a faithfull Journall." For the Puritan it was essential that the personal and private records be congruent and complementary, and that the blessings outnumber the punishments; any overabundance of punishments and any imbalance between one's sins and one's interpretation of Providence could otherwise indicate the displeasure of the Almighty with the diarist. More specifically, their diaries were made up of essentially three parts: one part accounted for private sins, the second recorded and interpreted providential blessings and the third kept track of what were deemed to be providential punishments. Beadle mandates this organization when he says, "There is a book of three leaves thou shouldest read dayly to make up this Diary; the black leaf of thy own and others sins with shame and sorrow; the white leaf of Gods goodnesse, mercies with joy and thankfulness; the red leaf of Gods judgments felt, feared, threatned, with fear and trembling" (Beadle). In effect, this is the fundamental blueprint for the Puritan spiritual diary.

In the end, Beadle's book encourages the keeping of a "Gather-book," a "Mirroure of mans Estate," a proper reckoning of man's soul before God, and of a man's outward estate before God. Nevertheless, it is also a "Factor-book" where there is entered every "return" of prayer or blessing, and every providential memorial proving the veracity of the diary keeper's life. Assuredly, Beadle's structure, method, and the coalescing of the form's influences which helped to spur its development, aided in standardizing the practice of journal keeping among the Puritan middle-class, while also influencing its further development as a confessional vehicle and a tool for self-discovery in years to come.