Proceedings of the 24th Northern Plains Conference on Early British Literature

South Dakota State University
Brookings, South Dakota

April 15 & 16, 2016

Acknowledgements

For providing financial support for the conference, we would like to thank the SDSU Office of Academic Affairs (Dr. Laurie Nichols, Provost and Executive Vice President), the SDSU College of Arts and Sciences (Dr. Dennis Papini, Dean), and the SDSU Department of English (Dr. Jason McEntee, Head).

For getting us on the Web, we thank Robbie Gascoigne from South Dakota State University Marketing and Communications and NPCEBL Webmaster Stephen Hamrick from Minnesota State University, Moorhead. A special thank you to Jason McEntee, SDSU English department Head, and Tiffani Pirner, SDSU English department Senior Secretary, for their unflagging help and support along the way. Finally, we would like to thank the NPCEBL Advisory Group for their dedication to the conference over the years and for allowing us this opportunity to host it this year.

We are especially grateful to Dr. Lawrence Manley for presenting this year's plenary address.

Sincerely,

Bruce Brandt, Mick Nagy, and Sharon Smith
South Dakota State University

Table of Contents

24th Northern Plains Conference on Early British Literature

South Dakota State University Student Union

April 15 & 16, 2016

Conference Schedule

Friday, April 15, 2016

8:00-8:40: Breakfast & Check-In
Room 169 A & B: Campanile and Hobo Day Gallery

8:40-8:50: Welcome
Dr. Jason McEntee, Head, SDSU English Department
Room 169 A & B: Campanile and Hobo Day Gallery

Session I: 9:00-10:15

Renaissance Comedy
Room 269: Walder

Chair: Stephen Hamrick, Minnesota State University, Moorhead

1. Gayle Gaskill, St. Catherine University, "Hearing and Interfering in Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure*"
2. Robert Kibler, Minot State University, "The Duke as Bungler in *Measure for Measure*"
3. James McGinnis, James Madison University, "Ben Jonson's Plautine Comedy"

Representations of Masculinity in the Long Eighteenth Century
Room 260: State

Chair: Sharon Smith, South Dakota State University

1. Art Marmorstein, Northern State University, "The Tragedy of the Common Madman: Nathaniel Lee's *Tragedy of Nero* and its Sources"
2. Kathryn Dirks, South Dakota State University, "Finding the Right Man: The Eighteenth-Century Ideal of Masculinity in *The Female Quixote* and *The Mysteries of Udolpho*"
3. Jodi Napiorkowski, St. Cloud State University, "Rogues and Rascals: Why Do Readers Love the Bad Boy in Jane Austen Novels?"

Friday, April 15, 2016

Session II: 10:30-11:45

Early British Literature in Film and Modern Media
Room 169 A & B: Campanile and Hobo Day Gallery

Chair: Bruce Brandt, South Dakota State University

1. Emilee Ruhland, North Dakota State University, "Heroic Mistakes: Presenting Medieval Ethos to a Modern Audience"
2. CoryAnne Harrigan, Simpson College, "The Film's the Thing: How Kurosawa's *The Bad Sleep Well* Helps Us Read *Hamlet*"
3. Eric Furuseth, Minot State University, "Filmic 'Hurricanos': Inspired Responses to *The Tempest*"

Rebels and Savages in Early British Literature
Room 269: Walder

Chair: Jesse Swan, University of Northern Iowa

1. Christina DiGangi, Dawson Community College, "Feminism, Antifeminism: Post-Boccaccian Adaptations of the Fall of Zenobia of Palmyra"
2. Melissa Kleinschmidt, University of Kansas, "The Wild, the Savage, and the Untamed: Embodied Environments in Milton's *Paradise Lost*"

Women and Poetry in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries
Room 260: State

Chair: Susan Wood, Midland University

1. Elizabeth Mouw, Minnesota State University, Mankato, "Aemilia Lanyer's Feminist Natural Law"
2. Anna Basel, Minnesota State University, Mankato, "Women's Inferior Souls in John Donne's 'The Blossome,' 'Love's Alchymie' and 'The Primrose'"
3. Sharon Smith, South Dakota State University, "'With Satyr Arm Thy Quill': Elizabeth Thomas's Militant Muse"

11:45-12:45: Lunch

Friday, April 15, 2016

Session III: 12:45-2:00

Chaucer
Room 169 A & B: Campanile and Hobo Day Gallery

Chair: Stefan Thomas Hall, University of Wisconsin, Green Bay

1. Jay Ruud, University of Central Arkansas, "Troilus's Hymn in Book III: Before the Wheel Turns Down"
2. Christopher Lozensky, Independent Scholar, "'Fro His Lust Yet Were Hym Levere Abyde': (Dis)placed Desires, Misplaced, in Fragment V of the *Canterbury Tales*"
3. David Sprunger, Concordia College, "Chaucer's Last Waltz"

Renaissance Tragedy
Room 269: Walder

Chair: Gayle Gaskill, University of St. Catherine

1. Bruce Brandt, South Dakota State University, "'Fatal Destiny': Fortune and Skepticism in *Soliman and Perseda*, *The Spanish Tragedy*, and *Dido, Queen of Carthage*"
2. Nicholas Curry, South Dakota State University, "The Shifting Significance of Blood in Christopher Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*"
3. Trista Gareri, St. Cloud State University, "'Though this be madness, yet there is method in't': Agency: The Method to Ophelia's Madness"

"Sweet Religion Makes a Rhapsody of Words": A Discussion of Religion and Literature in the Early British Literature Classroom
Room 260: State

Chair: Stephen Hamrick, Minnesota State University, Moorhead

1. Bob De Smith, Dordt College, "The Challenges of Teaching Religion and Literature to Students of Faith"
2. John Kerr, St. Mary's University of Minnesota, "Christianity and Its Others"
3. Stephen Hamrick, Minnesota State University, Moorhead, "Respecting the Sacred and Respecting the Method"

Friday, April 15, 2016

Session IV: 2:15-3:30

Shakespeare
Room 169 A & B: Campanile and Hobo Day Gallery

Chair: Bruce Brandt, South Dakota State University

1. Elizabeth Williamsen, Minnesota State University, Mankato, "Treason and the Blood of Kings in Shakespeare's *Richard II*"
2. Nicholas Wallerstein, Black Hills State University, "Fortune and Forgiveness in *The Tempest*"
3. Jon Schaff, Northern State University, "Canst Thou Not Minister to a Mind Diseased? Abraham Lincoln, *Macbeth*, and Political Corruption"

Theorizing and Historicizing the Eighteenth Century
Room 269: Walder

Chair: Sharon Smith, South Dakota State University

1. Stephan Flores, University of Idaho, "Theorizing Early Modern Trauma Studies: Defoe's *Roxana*, the Advent of Subjectivity, and the Limits of Sovereign Power"
2. Jesse Swan, University of Northern Iowa, "Scientism and the Return to Reading the British Eighteenth Century"
3. Judith Dorn, St. Cloud State University, "Daniel Defoe's Secret Histories and a Poetics of Public Knowledge"

Medieval National Identities
Room 260: State

Chair: Jay Ruud, University of Central Arkansas

1. Mick Nagy, South Dakota State University, "'The Song of the Husbandman' and National Identity"
2. Matthew T. Pullen, South Dakota State University, "Tending the Half-Acre: Environment and National Identity in *Piers Plowman*"
3. Stefan Thomas Hall, University of Wisconsin, Green Bay, "Blind Hary's *Wallace* and Scottish Identity"

Friday, April 15, 2016, 3:45-5:00

Plenary Address

Dr. Lawrence Manley
Yale University

A Book That Wasn't:
Thoughts on Erasmus, More, and the Renaissance That Was

Room 169 A & B: Campanile and Hobo Day Gallery

Dr. Lawrence Manley is the William R. Keenan, Jr., Professor of English at Yale University. Dr. Manley specializes in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century British literature, with a particular emphasis on literature and society, theater history and performance studies, intellectual history, and the classical foundations of the English literary and critical traditions. He is the author of *Convention, 1500-1750* (Harvard UP, 1980); *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London* (Cambridge UP, 1995); and most recently *Lord Strange's Men and Their Plays, 1589-1593* (with Sally-Beth MacLean, Yale UP, 2014). He is the editor of *London in the Age of Shakespeare: An Anthology* (Croon Helm, 1986) and *The Cambridge Companion to the Literature of London* (Cambridge UP, 2011). In addition, he has contributed to *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, *The Cambridge History of Early Modern English Literature*, *The Blackwell Companion to Renaissance Drama*, and the forthcoming *Shakespeare Encyclopedia.*

Friday, April 15, 2016, 6:00-8:00

Annual Banquet

The Pheasant Restaurant & Lounge
726 Main Avenue South
Brookings, SD

Saturday, April 16, 2016

8:00-8:45: Breakfast & Check-In
Room 169 A & B: Campanile and Hobo Day Gallery

Session V: 8:45-10:20

Late Eighteenth-Century Fiction
Room 169 A & B: Campanile and Hobo Day Gallery

Chair: Stephen Flores, University of Idaho

1. Susan Wood, Midland University, "Failed Christianity: The Unredeemed Schedoni in Ann Radcliffe's *The Italian*"
2. Wesley Hellman, University of Mary, "Surveillance of the Body: Women in *Caleb Williams*"
3. Amber Fagan, University of St. Thomas, "Sensibility in Godwin's *Caleb Williams*"

Medieval Monsters and Monstrosity
Room 269: Walder

Chair: David Sprunger, Concordia College

1. Michael Holstead, University of Wisconsin, Green Bay, "REVENGE! A Neuropsychological Interpretation of Grendel in *Beowulf*"
2. Jacob Herrmann, University of Kansas, "Monstrous Bodies and Transformation in Marie de France's 'Bisclavret' and Chaucer's 'The Wife of Bath's Tale'"
3. Johnathan Woelfel, St. Cloud State University, "Monsters and Monstrous Knights in Chrétien's *Yvain*"

Anglo-Saxon History and Translation
Room 260: State

Chair: John Kerr, St. Mary's University of Minnesota

1. Karyn Hixson, University of Nebraska, Kearney, "The Old English Maxims: A Guide to Anglo-Saxon Society"
2. Katie Walkner, Silver Lake College, "Somewhere Between Fact and Fiction: The Historical Value of Vortigern and the Adventus Saxonum as presented in Historia Brittonum"
3. Peter Ramey, Northern State University, "Experimental Poetics: Revisiting William Morris' 1895 Translation of *Beowulf*"

Saturday, April 16, 2016

Session VI: 10:30-11:45

Medieval Heroes and Heretics
Room 169 A & B: Campanile and Hobo Day Gallery

Chair: Mick Nagy, South Dakota State University

1. Randi Anderson, South Dakota State University, "Heroism in the Face of Fatalism: The Importance of Staging and Posturing in *The Saga of Ragnar Loðbrok*"
2. Neil Polzin, University of Nebraska at Omaha, "'You have my sword!': Perceptions of Community Represented by Unferth and Wiglaf in Their Swords within *Beowulf*"
3. Jordan Koel, University of Wisconsin, Green Bay, "'By some contrivance': Medieval Flying Machines and Their Makers in Early English Literature"

Cultural Translation and Representation
Room 269: Walder

Chair: Judith Dorn, St. Cloud State University

1. Rachel Roberts, Baylor University, "'Englishing' A Spanish Romance: Cultural Translation in Margaret Tyler's *Mirror of Princely Deeds and Knighthood*"
2. Kaari Newman, University of St. Thomas, "Romantic Heroism: Friend or Foe of Abolitionism in Aphra Behn's *Oroonoko*?"
3. Anna Wagemann, University of Nebraska, Kearney, "Examining the Foreign and the Fine: The Role of the East for Early Eighteenth-Century Women Authors"

A Portfolio Approach to Shakespeare: Instructor Strategies and Student Experience
Room 260: State

Chair: Bob De Smith, Dordt College

1. Bob De Smith, Dordt College, "Why Portfolios?"
2. Jonathon Janssen, Dordt College, "Old Texts and New Discoveries: Using Portfolio Items as a Bridge between Past and Present"
3. Erica Liddle, Dordt College, "Making Connections: Connecting Shakespeare and Theatrical Practice"

11:45-12:45: Business Meeting
Room 260: State

24th Northern Plains Conference on Early British Literature
Organizing Committee

Bruce Brandt, Professor
Renaissance Literature and Culture
English Department, South Dakota State University

Mick Nagy, Associate Professor
Old English, Old Norse, and Middle English Language, Literature, and Culture
English Department, South Dakota State University

Sharon Smith, Associate Professor
Restoration and Eighteenth-Century British Literature and Culture
English Department, South Dakota State University

Northern Plains Conference on Early British Literature
Advisory Group

Lysbeth Benkert-Rasmussen, Northern State University
Bruce Brandt, South Dakota State University
Glenn Davis, St. Cloud State University
Bob DeSmith, Dordt College
Elizabeth Haller, Northern State University
Stephen Hamrick, Minnesota State University, Moorhead
Matthew Harkins, College of Saint Benedict, St. John's University
Erin Lord Kunz, Mayville State University
John Kerr, Saint Mary's University of Minnesota
Mick Nagy, South Dakota State University
Michelle Sauer, University of North Dakota
Sharon Smith, South Dakota State University

Hearing and Interfering in *Measure for Measure*

Vienna's Duke Vincentio, according to Lord Escalus, was "one that, above all other strifes, contended especially to know himself" (3.2.186-87), and *Measure for Measure* opens with the Duke beginning a new course of self-study by which he leaves his city's government—"mortality and Mercy in Vienna"—to the moralistic but untried Angelo in order to overhear his surrogate's judgments and his citizens' gossip. Claiming he does "not like to stage [himself] to [public] eyes" (1.1.68), he goes disguised as Friar Lodowick, a man whose religious habit gives him universal entrée to Vienna's court, prison, streets—and to a remote moated grange. Over the course of his role-playing, the Duke employs private and public strategies of hearing that transform him from a protected, passive observer into a self-conscious actor who interferes in his subjects' lives in order to discover and display his ducal authority.

When the Duke discovers that the hypocritical Angelo blackmails a nun, Isabella, into accepting rape in exchange for the life of her condemned brother, Claudio—and then orders Claudio beheaded anyway—he knows he has been a poor judge of his deputy, but he earns that self-knowledge piecemeal, by overhearing unwelcome truths in dramatic, disquieting ways, and by interfering for good with ethically questionable strategies. To undo Angelo's chilling injustices, he tries on the role of a hero, but it fails to fit.

The Duke discovers his compassion through eavesdropping in prison. While visiting the prison as Friar Lodowick the Duke eavesdrops on Isabella's outraged account of Angelo's cruel proposition and on Claudio's forlorn, dishonorable hope that she acquiesces. Suddenly

his compassion for these tense, frustrated siblings drives a need to challenge Angelo for the very power he himself has authorized. As he overhears Isabella grow strident with revulsion and fear while Claudio pleads for life on any terms, he abruptly interferes and offers an alternative to either death or dishonor, an elaborate bed trick that converts the play from a philosophical puzzle into a thriller.

Claudio is Angelo's first public example of the newly enforced, rigorous punishment for sexual license. He is a gentleman in reduced financial circumstances, and his betrothed, Juliet, is with child. "O, let him marry her!" cries Isabella (1.4.50), offering what critic Bernice Kliman labels "an obvious solution to the social ills engendered by the supposed crime (the child that will have to be supported by the state)" ("Hearing" 150). The couple has delayed their marriage, however, for want of Juliet's dowry, as Claudio explains to his loyal, cynical friend Lucio:

> She is fast my wife,
> Save that we do the denunciation lack
> Of outward order. This we came not to,
> Only for propagation of a dow'r
> Remaining in the coffer of her friends,
> From whom we thought it meet to hide our love
> Till time had made them for us. (1.2.117-23)

Proof of Claudio's aristocratic social status lies in Escalus's complaint: "Alas, this gentleman / Whom I would save had a most noble father!" (2.1.6-7). Isabella shares her brother's social status and financial plight. Kliman summarizes: her "parents are dead and there is no

fortune. . . . The nunnery of the Poor Clares is the only possible refuge for dowerless Isabella" ("Isabella" 138-39). She chooses the convent for lack of any honorable option.

While Angelo interviews Isabella, the Duke-as- Friar meets Juliet, who welcomes her pre-marital pregnancy:

> I do repent me as it is an evil,
>
> And take the shame with joy. (2.3.35-36)

Far from blaming Claudio for disgracing her, Juliet, a gentlewoman by the Provost's account (2.3.10), relinquishes her reputation in the name of their love, but the disguised Duke coldly asserts that "Your partner, as I hear, must die tomorrow" and scurries away (2.3.40), leaving her shaken with horror. Horror here becomes the play's theme. The Duke counsels Claudio:

> Be absolute for death. Either death or life
>
> Shall thereby be the sweeter. (3.1.5-6)

To a young man whose betrothed waits nearby to make him a father, the impersonal philosophy offers neither divine hope nor human sympathy. Judith Rosenheim explains that the false Friar's advice is not even Christian but Stoic, "informing the flatness of [his] personality and his conspicuous callousness as congruently human expressions of a Stoic . . . ethic at its point of clearest divergence from the Christian norm" (171). He does not hear Claudio but lectures him. As the counsel of a melancholy narcissist the words emphasize their speaker's lonely, sterile bookishness.

Meanwhile, Claudio's sister hurries to the prison seeking sympathy and offering her own strange counsel. Their scene marks the play's turning point, for overhearing Isabella's highly emotional conference inspires the Duke to abandon his passive Stoicism and act on her behalf.

He protests not Angelo's injustice in treating an act of mutual love as a capital crime, but his assault on Isabella, corresponding as it does to Angelo's abandonment of his own fiancée, Mariana. That ironic, double injustice rouses the Duke to interfere. Dramatic anxiety accelerates, however, because despite his newly authoritative posture, the Duke hesitantly delays his scheme. Costumed in the authority of church or state, he commands unquestioning obedience while dangerously improvising his commands from moment to moment.

If the audience watches the Duke eavesdropping, they may observe what the psychoanalytic critic Carolyn E. Brown calls the "appeal to the voyeurism of the duke, to his ability to envision the rape . . . and [his propensity] to identify with Angelo and secretly gratify a fantastical preoccupation with pain" (197). That Freudian option may account for the alacrity with which the false Friar Lodowick drops his Stoicism and reveals himself as the schemer who convinces Isabella to accept Angelo's offer but to designate her place in his bed to Angelo's spurned yet faithful fiancée. Despite his murky motives, the Duke has discovered his impulses to demand justice and to trust women's courage.

Through hearing malicious gossip, the Duke unexpectedly learns the vulnerability of his unguarded public reputation. The Duke makes a second major self-discovery in the ensuing scene, 3.2, as behind his Friar Lodowick disguise he overhears Lucio sardonically explain his own ducal character to himself. Lucio contrasts the supposedly absent Duke with the unrelenting Angelo by confiding knowledge of the Duke's secret licentiousness: "He had some feeling of the sport; he knew the service, and that instructed him to mercy." The Friar solemnly remonstrates, "I never heard the absent Duke much detected for women," but Lucio—

unfazed—boldly insists, “Sir, I was an inward of his” (3.2.95-104). As a public figure, the Duke discovers, he is especially susceptible to salacious conjecture.

Playing the straight man to Lucio’s braggadocio, the Duke makes his disguise the excuse for sanctimonious scolding, but Lucio controls the scene. Friar Lodowick further berates the bawd Pompey for deriving his living from the labor of harlots: “Canst thou believe thy living is a life, / So stinkingly depending? Go mend” (3.2.22-23). The impudent Pompey, however, follows his stinking trade for want of other opportunities. As Jonathan Dollimore earnestly points out, “poverty drove [prostitutes] to the brothels and after a relatively short stay in which they had to run the hazards of disease, violence and contempt, most were driven back to it” (85). Pompey cheerfully accepts an alternate, state-approved job as a hangman’s assistant, though the Provost grimly announces that the “trades weigh equally” (4.2.22). Lucio, unlike the Duke-as-Friar, laughs at Pompey instead of reproving him, but neither the cynical man nor the righteous one pays the poor bawd’s bail. Instead, Lucio comically portrays the absent Duke as a foil for his pretentious deputy: “Lord Angelo dukes it well in his absence; he puts transgression to’t. . . . A little more leniency to lechery would do no harm in him. Something too crabbed that way, friar.” (3.2.76-79). Trapped in his humble though indignant religious role, the Duke can only fret. As Claudio’s exasperated friend, Lucio complains, “Why, what a ruthless thing is this in him, for the rebellion of a codpiece to take away the life of a man!” (3.2.91-92). Then he stretches the irony: “Would the Duke that is absent have done this?” Lucio’s rhetorical question declares the scandalized Duke a powerful role model for sexual license in his Vienna.

Still acting the Friar, the Duke takes umbrage, thus missing both Lucio’s joke and his helpless pity for Claudio, along with his own lack of compassion. As Herbert Weil points out,

"Lucio means to compliment the Duke—both the ruler and the man—in contrast with the policies of the unnaturally cruel Angelo, . . . [but] angered by the sexual allusion the disguised Duke Vincentio ignores the compliments, praises himself, and forcefully rejects all these claims" (32). His outrage only spurs Lucio on: "This sterile [Angelo] . . . will unpeople the province with continency. . . . The Duke yet would have dark deeds darkly answered; he would never bring them to light" (3.2.137-40). Lucio's exit line drives the incensed Duke to pause for a soliloquy.

Constrained by his disguise, he cannot silence Lucio or, he discovers, rely upon a remote, royal reputation to save him from gossip's merry attacks. Instead he gravely reflects,

> No might nor greatness in mortality
> Can censure scape. Back-wounding calumny
> The whitest virtue strikes. (3.2.146-48)

The humor of the scene, shadowed as it is by the violent threats to Claudio and his sister, balances against the Duke's rescue scheme. When he imagines himself a hero, the Duke fails to take Lucio into account. As Weil observes, "clearly the point is *not* what Lucio knows or what source he finds for his gossip; it is how the Duke reacts. . . . A director, attempting to present . . . a Providential or ideal Duke would cut . . . many of these lines. . . . The comic, ridiculous, pompous side of the Duke is an essential part of his rich, complex characterization" (33), but the Duke himself is slow to accept that facet of self-knowledge. He continues to brood on the ephemeral nature of his good name, while offstage Isabella convinces Mariana to keep the despicable liaison with Angelo, an offstage piece of persuasive dialogue that even Shakespeare does not attempt to dramatize.

At this crucial moment, when everything hangs on Mariana's willingness and ability to carry off her desperate assignment, the Duke broods on Lucio's gossip:

> O place and greatness!
>
> . . .
>
> Thousand escapes of wit
>
> Make thee the father of their idle dreams
>
> And rack thee in their fancies. (4.1.57; 60-62)

Another sort of Duke might focus on the shame and danger to which —safe in his pious disguise—he exposes these trusting ladies whom he delivers to danger, but his nagging thought is how to preserve the "place and greatness" of patriarchal authority. Overhearing Lucio detail the absent Duke's peccadilloes to the Friar, the all-too-present Duke gains troubling self-knowledge at a cost.

Through a public hearing the Duke recognizes that he is alone and incomplete. In Act 5, the Duke trades secret eavesdropping for a very public hearing whereby he brings the unjust deputy to justice and rescues his intended victims. Even as he reveals his princely power and metes out "mortality and Mercy in Vienna," the Duke continues to discover that self-knowledge remains a puzzling strife. "Give me your hand," he bids Isabella, "and say you will be mine" (5.1.480), and her wordless reply, following their shared trials, may offer a final revelation of both identities.

In contrast to private conversation, where the listener may remain silent or respond cryptically, a public hearing requires testimony before witnesses, whose statements lead to judgment. In his religious disguise, the Duke persuades Isabella very publicly and against her

inclination, to denounce Angelo for forcing her to yield him her virginity. That shocking confession and the Duke's initial public rebuke of Isabella prepare for Mariana's veiled entrance with her claim upon Angelo as her husband.

The ladies' timing and nerve form the lynchpin of his scheme, yet the Duke keeps them in the dark. Isabella not only perjures herself with false testimony but she also identifies herself as no virgin but a would-be nun who sells her soul for sex with a powerful celebrity, yet the Duke flatly denies her charge and orders her to prison. Though subsequently the Duke denounces Angelo and addresses Isabella as "dear maid" and "O most kind maid" (5.1.376; 381), she has insisted that she is no maid in an open court where her chastity is her only authority. The spotlight, however, focuses not on Isabella's shame but on the gleeful Duke's success. He reveals Angelo's calumny, marries him off, and pardons him, restores life and marriage to Claudio, and even pardons the intractable but miraculously long-lived inmate Barnardine. His ascension from self-doubt to divine authority makes him giddy.

In 1950 in the first major production of *Measure for Measure* since World War II, director Peter Brook emphasized the Duke's role as an instrument of Providence. Brook trimmed the script to present him as the wise and benign, autocratic redeemer of a fallen city. In subsequent productions the Duke grew into an allegory of divine mercy, in contrast to Angelo's corrupted, unbending justice. In 1966, Tyrone Guthrie produced, according to Graham Nicholls, "the climax to the duke-as-God-the-Father school" (53). Later directors displayed the Duke's quasi-divinity by keeping him in his Friar's habit while he took the judgment seat, proposed to the novice nun, and made his final bow. Like Brook, they eliminated lines that made him sound funny or inept.

In 1970, however, RSC director John Barton focused on character psychology, restored the disconcerting lines, and discovered the Duke's manipulative deceits by which he props up his public image. Though he cares for Isabella, for example, enough to offer her marriage without a dowry, still the Duke convinces her that Angelo has killed her brother. She must publicly kneel to him and plead for Angelo's life before he presents the living Claudio to prove his providential power. Barton suggested that Isabella's response to the Duke's sudden proposal should not provide the audience with joyous assurance that this problem play is a romantic comedy after all but leave them puzzling out the psychology of justice. Gareth Lloyd Evans asked Barton if he realized "what a great shock you gave quite a lot of people because, in your production, Isabella quite firmly did not agree to marry the Duke," and Barton's reply explains his challenge to the Duke's notion that his lucky scheming earns him a bride: "What I actually intended was that Isabella's response should be open-ended, . . . that she was in no state at that moment to accept the proposal, and I asked her to reject it and yet to think about it. The last thing that I presented on the stage . . . was Isabella wondering, puzzling about what she should do" (66). Barton replaced resolution with ambiguity, and his interpretation quickly came to North America. Marjorie Garber recalls a compelling Isabella of the Stratford Shakespeare Festival in Ontario, probably Martha Henry in 1975-1976 under Robin Phillips's direction:

> Everyone but Isabella left the stage. She alone remained, dressed in her white novice's robe. Slowly she reached up to remove her headdress, and then shook her hair free. Instantly her novice's robe was converted to a wedding gown, and

> she smiled at the audience, indicating, perhaps, her readiness to leave the convent, even though she had not yet accepted the Duke. (585-86)

Extending the final moment beyond any sort of hearing or interfering, this reading seizes the play's convincing last word from the Duke and awards it to Isabella in her silent utterance of a self-freeing gesture and a knowing smile.

A new Stratford, Ontario, production in 2013, however, to which Martha Henry returned as the director, concluded with the spotlight full on the Duke, costumed in the dress uniform of a powerful secular commander. He pushed Angelo out of the judgment seat and claimed that place to dispense not mortality but mercy in Vienna—even to Angelo, who melodramatically addressed the Duke as "O my dread lord" (5.1.354) and begged for death. The Duke's elaborate interference has led to highly gratifying self-knowledge, for he sees that in his public persona he commands godlike power to restore life from death and fruitful marriage from betrayal. At the height of his triumph, the Duke offers his hand to a perjured, dowerless maid. If Isabella hesitates long enough, he gains one more piece of self-knowledge: in his private heart he is alone. This time Henry's youthful Isabella failed to acknowledge the Duke's gawky proposal, as she had earlier failed to recognize Angelo's clumsy seduction. Meanwhile, the pardoned Lucio swaggered forward, smirking as he silently claimed the last word. The Duke, despite his intense overhearing and busy interfering, remained a frail figure of ambiguity.

Gayle Gaskill
St. Catherine University, St. Paul MN

Works Cited

Brown, Carolyn E. “The Wooing of Duke Vincentio and Isabella.” *Shakespeare Studies* 22 (1994): 189-219.

Dollimore, Jonathan. “Transgression and Surveillance in Measure for Measure.” *Political Shakespeare*. Ed. Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield. Ithaca NY: Cornell UP, 1985: 72-87. Print.

Evans, Gareth Lloyd. “Directing Problem Plays: John Barton Talks to Gareth Lloyd Evans.” *Shakespeare Survey* 25 (1972): 63-72. Print.

Garber, Marjorie B. *Shakespeare after All*. New York: Random, 2004. Print.

Kliman, Bernice W. “Hearing Power in *Measure for Measure*.” *Who Hears in Shakespeare?* Ed. Laury Magnus and Walter W. Cannon. Madison NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2012: 145-62. Print.

——. “Isabella in *Measure for Measure*.” *Shakespeare Studies* 15 (1982): 137-48. Print.

Kliman, Bernice W., and Laury Magnus, eds. *Measure for Measure*, by William Shakespeare. The New Kittredge Shakespeare. Ser. ed. James H. Lake. Newburyport MA: Focus, 2012. Print. All citations refer to this edition.

Nicholls, Graham. *Measure for Measure: Text and Performance*. London: Macmillan, 1986. Print.

Rosenheim, Judith. “The Stoic Meaning of the Friar in *Measure for Measure*.” *Shakespeare Studies* 15 (1982): 171-215. Print.

Weil Herbert. “The Options of the Audience:” *Shakespeare Survey* 25 (1972): 27-36. Print.

Rogues and Rascals:
Why Readers Love the Bad Boys in Jane Austen Novels

During her short life, Jane Austen wrote six complete novels, and in these novels her female protagonists end up with good, decent men. However, she also included wicked male characters that readers can't forget. Austen obviously knew what makes a man a good choice, but some of her bad characters are as intriguing, and sometimes more so, than the love interest the protagonist ends up with. For example, Willoughby is much more of a heartthrob than Colonel Brandon in *Sense and Sensibility*. Is this a clue that Austen secretly desired the bad boy of her time? Is that why she never married? This paper will explore readers' obsessions with George Wickham, Henry Crawford, and John Willoughby and try to explain why readers love them as much as the romantic leads. For the sake of time, I have narrowed it down to three novels, *Pride and Prejudice*, *Mansfield Park*, and *Sense and Sensibility* and their three attractive rogues.

Did Austen prefer the bad boy? There are clues that maybe she did. She herself had moments of impropriety in her words and actions, but she kept most of these instances within the secrecy of her family. Marilyn Butler, who wrote *Jane Austen and the War of Ideas*, is reported as describing Austen as "'most retired and reticent,' … more, for instance, than the stern but reclusive Emily Bronte" however, this "is questionable to some who see Austen as rather outspoken in the manner of women of her time, i.e. Observing decorum in public but speaking unequivocally about people and behavior in her novels" (Odom 26). The idea that her

outward and inner behaviors differ greatly could suggest that her taste in men was also widely diverse, outwardly expressing a liking for a decent, well-behaved man, and secretly longing for a bit of excitement in the form of a dashing stranger, aka John Willoughby or Henry Crawford.

In a letter to her sister Cassandra, Austen reveals a bit of impropriety when she wrote, "You scold me so much in the nice long letter which I have this moment received from you, that I am almost afraid to tell you how my Irish friend [Tom Lefroy] and I behaved. Imagine to yourself everything most profligate and shocking in the way of dancing and sitting down together" (Chapman 1-2). She seems to be confessing an inappropriate behavior and does so in such a way as to draw humor in order to deflect her breaking of societal decorum, which may not have been noticed by the ballroom, but was nevertheless obvious to her. There is a bit of excitement in her tone as she writes this. The breach of decorum might have excited her a bit. It could also have been an excitement in first love, which Tom Lefroy was purported to be for her.

However, there is evidence that one of the actual purposes of Austen's bad boys is to make the reader choose, to test the reader's ability to detect deception and determine moral propriety. Berger writes, "Like the heroine, the reader is obliged to choose between [the hero and the rake], and in certain novels, the choice involves as stern a challenge to the reader's moral judgment as to the heroine's" (532). Austen did not prefer the rake, but she demonstrated how easy it was to be taken in by him and gave warnings to her young female readers within her novels.

For example, in *Pride and Prejudice*, Darcy is disliked by the reader in the beginning for his pride and his prejudice as imposed on him by Elizabeth at the assembly ball. He acts above

the people in the neighborhood and insults Elizabeth by not dancing with her and commenting negatively on her looks. She determines at that point not to like him.

Since the story is told from her point of view, the reader sides with her. Austen wrote this way in order for the reader to like who Elizabeth likes and dislike who she dislikes. Berger explains, “Through a series of steps… Austen establishes a prejudice in the reader’s mind against Darcy, and reinforces it amidst counter-indications of his good sense and sensibility and growing attachment to Elizabeth. Wickham enters the story at a moment when we are feeling particularly ambivalent about Darcy” (537). Wickham is a foil to the Elizabeth / Darcy match. He comes into the story seemingly to save Elizabeth from a life alone or from feeling obliged to marry Mr. Collins. Mr. Wickham is too good to be true.

Wickham is admired as handsome by the two younger Bennet girls (49) and most everyone else in the neighborhood, and he is amiable and generous with his good-humor (Berger 537). Austen writes, “Mr. Wickham was the happy man towards whom almost every female eye was turned, and Elizabeth was the happy woman by whom he finally seated himself” (*P&P* 52). He also seems very attentive to Elizabeth, telling her a “pitiful story about how the proud Darcy has refused him an inheritance and ruined his prospects" (Odom 78), furthering Elizabeth’s and, therefore, the reader’s dislike of Darcy. Elizabeth and readers are attracted to Wickham for his handsomeness, his polite acceptance of society, and his sympathy-inducing story of hardship. Both Elizabeth and the reader are led to believe that he is a victim of Darcy’s pride and prejudice, too, until Darcy’s letter reveals the truth of Wickham’s deceptions and depravity.

Once Wickham's true character is revealed to Elizabeth (and the reader), she has the decision of revealing it to society or keeping it to herself. Wilkie writes, "After Elizabeth Bennet has told her sister Jane that the generally admired Mr. Wickham is really a rake, an ingrate, and a liar, and after Jane recovers from her shock at this revelation, the two young women ponder… the advisability of publishing Wickham's true character, weighing the pragmatic consequences" (532). They decide to be silent, which turns out to be a mistake, and Lydia is ruined due to the result of their silence.

This dislike of Darcy and attraction to Wickham is set up by Austen to test readers' judgements, to warn them that first impressions, the original name of the novel, are not always correct.

In *Mansfield Park*, Austen sets up a hierarchy at the house with poor relation, Fanny Price, at the bottom of the ladder. The two Bertram girls are conceited and not interested in befriending Fanny at her arrival (Austen, *MP* 11). The eldest son, Tom Bertram, is wild and uncontrollable, and is also not a friend of Fanny (Austen, *MP* 15). The only friend Fanny finds at Mansfield Park is the younger son Edmund, who is generous and kind (Austen, *MP* 13). Eventually Edmund decides to become a clergyman, which is not a wealth-producing career or a very exciting one. The reader is led to think kindly of Edmund, but since he is Fanny's cousin, he is not the first choice for her to marry, although this practice was normal at the time the book was written. There are also some impediments to their choice of each other, in the form of Sir Thomas and Mrs. Norris, who didn't like the idea of Edmund marrying beneath him.

When Mary and Henry Crawford arrive, they seem to be a happy alternative to marriage for Edmund and Fanny. They are described as charming and interesting, which makes the

reader attracted to them. Austen writes, “Mary Crawford was remarkably pretty; Henry, though not handsome, had air and countenance; the manners of both were lively and pleasant” (Austen, *MP* 31). Although their sister, Mrs. Grant, is playing matchmaker, which they find humorous, the reader is not told that there are flaws in their morality on first introduction.

Even Jane Austen’s brother Henry is taken with Henry Crawford, who is named after him. Peter W. Graham writes, in his essay, “Ambiguities of the Crawfords,” “Henry and Mary Crawford, arguably Jane Austen’s most controversial sibling pair, have exerted a strong appeal on readers all the way back to the author’s time, when her favorite brother, Henry, hoped his charming namesake would gain the hand of the heroine in the novel his sister was writing” (132). Austen wrote in a letter to her sister, "Henry is going on with 'Mansfield Park.’ He admires H. Crawford: I mean properly, as a clever, pleasant man” (Chapman 377-378), and then, “[Henry] said yesterday at least, that he defied anybody to say whether H.C. would be reformed, or would forget Fanny in a fortnight” (Chapman 381). This might hint that the type of man Henry Crawford is is approved of, but earlier in the same letter, Austen says, “[Henry] took to Lady B. and Mrs. N. most kindly, and gives great praise to the drawing of the characters. He understands them all, likes Fanny, and I think, foresees how it will all be” (Chapman 376). Lady Bertram and Mrs. Norris are not the most likeable of characters. Lady Bertram is slothful and inattentive. Mrs. Norris is an abusive busy-body. So, these praises by Henry Austen are nothing more than praises of a most beloved sister for the ability to write good characters.

Both Henry and Mary Crawford reveal their inappropriate qualities early on, during the family production of a play. This leads to Edmund’s wavering on his decision to propose to Mary, and Fanny’s refusal of Henry when he decides to toy with her affections and eventually

develops his own feelings for her. Her refusal of Crawford causes Sir Thomas to send her home to her poor family in Portsmouth where Crawford then appears and, in a seeming display of reformation, tries to win Fanny's heart. Berger writes, "We are … obliged to choose between an attractive rake and a problematic hero…. Henry Crawford is introduced as a 'wicked' character, but emerges as a possible hero…. Gradually…, certain pressures are applied which reactivate the charm and tempt the reader to hope for the marriage" (534). This again is a test and lesson for the reader's morality.

There are hints that Crawford is still not moral and is nothing more than a rogue. For example, his pressure on Fanny, because it is unwanted, is a sign of narcissism. If he really cared about her, he would desist since she finds his attention so painful. In a way, he is stalking her. These are not the actions of a moral man. And eventually he shows his inappropriateness by running off with the married Maria Bertram. And Mary shows her inappropriateness when she describes this elopement to Edmund as, "folly, and that folly stamped only by exposure. The want of common discretion, of caution… [it was] the detection, not the offence which she reprobated" (Austen, *S&S* 309). To moral people such as Edmund and Fanny, the detection of the elopement was not the reason why it was problematic.

In *Sense and Sensibility*, John Willoughby is an attractive hero figure, probably the most attractive of Austen's rakes. He swoops the romantically-minded, injured Marianne into his arms in the rain and carries her to safety (Austen, *S&S* 35). What reader would blame Marianne for swooning a bit over that? Austen writes, "His manly beauty and more than common gracefulness were instantly the theme of general admiration; ... [Marianne] had seen enough of him to join in all the admiration of the others, and with an energy which always adorned her

praise. His person and air were equal to what her fancy had ever drawn for the hero of a favourite story; and in his carrying her into the house with so little previous formality there was a rapidity of thought which particularly recommended the action to her" (*S&S* 36). Soon afterwards, he visits her, shares his opinions with her, is light-hearted, and has fun with her. As Austen intends, the reader agrees with Marianne and shares her good opinion of him. For a heroine so romantically inclined, Willoughby seems perfectly suited to her.

The reader doesn't even notice when Willoughby speaks unkindly of Colonel Brandon to the Dashwood women. Since readers are already emotionally attached to Willoughby, because Marianne is, they accept this negative view of the colonel as well. Humorously, Willoughby declares, "I have three unanswerable reasons for disliking Colonel Brandon: he has threatened me with rain when I wanted it to be fine; he has found fault with the hanging of my curricle, and I cannot persuade him to buy my brown mare. If it will be any satisfaction to you, however, to be told, that I believe his character to be in other respects irreproachable, I am ready to confess it. And in return for an acknowledgment, which must give me some pain, you cannot deny me the privilege of disliking him as much as ever" (Austen, *S&S* 44). So, although there is a compliment about Brandon's character in this ridiculous list of reasons for disliking him, Willoughby admits the compliment gives him pain, and still Brandon's irreproachable character is not enough for Willoughby to change his mind. If readers are paying attention, they can infer that there are other reasons for this dislike which are not confessed here, which could leave doubts in their minds about Willoughby's character. If they are paying attention.

When Willoughby leaves suddenly, leaving most of the family in tears (Austen, *S&S* 64), the reader also feels sad and confused. Austen has done her job of drawing pathos from the

reader, but leaving Elinor there with logic, leaving her, and in the process, the reader, to wonder why Willoughby left so suddenly without explanation. This gregarious man is suddenly silent. It is suspicious, as Elinor concludes.

Colonel Brandon is not made out to be a romantic figure as Willoughby is, but his worth is made clearer towards the end of the novel. When Marianne is taken ill at the Palmer's house, he fetches her mother to comfort her (Austen, *S&S* 255), which is a very kind and generous act. At this point, Austen even supplies a few pages of dialogue between Elinor and her mother, extolling the virtues of Colonel Brandon (Austen, *S&S* 276-278), and since it is the heroines of the story that decide when the men are worthy, he is now set up to take the place of the romantic hero for Marianne, if not completely for the reader.

With Willoughby's appearance during Marianne's illness and his attempt at an explanation of his behavior (Austen *S&S* 260-273), which only shows him to be less than moral, there is a direct contrast between his morality and the colonel's. By showing Willoughby as an immoral man, Austen has shown in the actions of the colonel, the morality of a better man, to her readers. He is a man who cares for and about women.

Jane Austen has written well-developed rogues and rascals, but also moral romantic heroes. The rogues and rascals are tempting to both the heroines of the stories and the reader, testing the morality detectors of both. The moral choices are there, but sometimes they are not the obvious choices. Sometimes they are made to sound like the wrong choices, as in the proud and prejudiced man, the boring clergyman who is too swayed by another woman, and the somber, older man. Their charms are hidden sometimes until the end, as with Mr. Darcy

and Colonel Brandon. And sometimes they have to take their own test of morality, as with Edmund Bertram.

The drawing of her heroes, and that they are the ones ultimately chosen by her heroines, shows that Austen was actually a moral woman. Her characterizations of her bad boys show she understood the dangers of the rogues and rascals of her society. She was aware they were real and a threat to the morals of young women, and wrote her stories to show readers how easy it was to fall for their charms. She wrote cautionary tales. And the reason why she never married could be that she never found a man ethical enough for her own morality.

Jodi Napiorkowski
St. Cloud State University

Works Cited

Austen, Jane. *Mansfield Park*. New York: Norton, 1998. Print.

--- *Pride and Prejudice*. New York: Norton, 2001. Print.

--- *Sense and Sensibility*. New York: Barnes & Noble, 2004. Print.

Berger, Carole. "The Rake and the Reader in Jane Austen's Novels." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*. 15.4 (Autumn 1975): 531-544. *JStor*, Academic Search Premier, SCSU. Web. 31 Mar. 2016.

Chapman, R.W. *Jane Austen's Letters to her Sister Cassandra and Others*. 2nd Edition. London: Oxford UP, 1964. Print

Graham, Peter W. "Ambiguities of the Crawfords." *Approaches to Teaching Austin's Mansfield Park.* Ed. Marcia McClintock Folsom and John Wiltshire. New York: MLA, 2014. 132-142. Print.

Odom, Keith C. *Jane Austen: Rebel of Time and Place*. Liberal Arts, 1991. Print.

Wilkie, Brian. "Jane Austen: Amor and Amoralism." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*. 91.4 (Oct. 1992): 529-555. *JStor*, Academic Search Premier, SCSU. Web. 31 Mar. 2016.

The Film's the Thing:
How Kurosawa's *The Bad Sleep Well* Helps Us Read *Hamlet*

Akira Kurosawa's *The Bad Sleep Well* is a film I have taught a number of times in Shakespeare on Film courses, most recently in a short term course devoted to Kurosawa's adaptations of Shakespeare's plays. Besides this film, there are two other Kurosawa films inspired by Shakespeare: *Throne of Blood* (*Macbeth*) and *Ran* (*King Lear*). While some of my students, undergraduates taking the course to fulfill a general education requirement, are fans of Shakespeare, most are rather indifferent to his work, having read the requisite *Romeo and Juliet* or *A Midsummer Night's Dream* in high school and feeling none the wiser for the experience. But they generally enjoy these films, despite the fact that they are subtitled and that two of the three are in black and white. The unexpectedness of the setting in Kurosawa's films (two of which are set in feudal Japan and therefore feature samurai battle sequences) and the elimination of Shakespearean dialogue seem to have the beneficial effect of making the content and themes of the plays more accessible.

Nevertheless, the question "But is it Shakespeare?" hovers over me every time I prepare to teach a course dealing with film adaptations of his work—especially when those films originate in non-English speaking cultures. Critics like Douglas Lanier and Kenneth Rothwell have by now firmly established that Shakespeare is legitimately and powerfully represented through popular media ranging from film and television to YouTube and the graphic novel. With popular adaptations of his plays having been normalized, Lanier argues that there is, in fact, "a process of reciprocal legitimation" at work, "whereby Shakespeare's association with a mass-

cultural product, medium, or genre lends that item a moiety of highbrow depth, 'universality,' authority, continuity with established tradition, or seriousness of purpose, while at the same time the association with mass culture lends Shakespeare street credibility, broad intelligibility, and celebrity" (104). Still, a tinge of cultural and linguistic superiority infects anything that is seen as a less-than-"faithful" rendering of Shakespeare's plot, characters, and figures of speech. Trevor Nunn, The Royal Shakespeare Company's former artistic director, expressed his distaste for the modernized versions of four plays in the BBC's *ShakespeaRe-Told* series from 2005, saying, "Ultimately for me, it's the language that matters—no language, no Shakespeare" (Hastings).

If Shakespeare's greatness boils down to his sublime use of English, translations of that work into other languages will always be sub-par. But thinking of Kurosawa's films as non-Western "adaptations" of the most revered writer of the English speaking world is pretty unfair to both Kurosawa and Shakespeare. In his article "Reading Kurosawa Reading Shakespeare," Anthony Dawson announces his intention in analyzing the former's films and the latter's plays to "speak across cultural boundaries without implying the superiority of either and hoping that, by recording the passage as carefully as possible, something about film, about Shakespeare, about Kurosawa, might emerge into the light." I wish to follow Dawson's lead and add the further goal of acknowledging the inherent problems of identifying Kurosawa's film as even a "free" adaptation of Shakespeare's play. (Apparently, Kurosawa himself "denied any particular influence from Shakespeare" [Rothwell 192].) As Kaori Ashizu has argued so persuasively in her article "Kurosawa's *Hamlet*?", Kurosawa's film can only be understood fully by regarding it first as a work of art in its own right, without the additional cultural and academic baggage that

comes when we read it shot-for-shot against Shakespeare's work. While the film does, indeed, feature scenes and characters that are analogous to many of those in *Hamlet*, its value for me rests not in how it represents an early modern British play, but in what it teaches us about that text: that ghosts are very much alive; that insanity signals conscience; and, most of all, that justice remains an unattainable ideal.

Kurosawa's film, the setting of which is contemporary with its 1960 release, explores the troubling collusions between business and government that were common in Japan after World War II. Todd Borlik, in his study of business-themed *Hamlet* adaptations, says the film "can be taken as a commentary on the re-emergence of the Zaibatsu, or family-run financial cliques and business conglomerates" (241). While Occupation powers had attempted to break up these networks in the interest of spreading democracy, economic and political realities prevailed: "McCarthyism trumped MacArthurism […] as the plan for economic deconcentration of Japan's major corporations was soon hobbled amid fears that such policies would leave Japan vulnerable to Communism" (241). Kurosawa must have brooded over this conundrum for years prior to making his film. In fact, he had to wait to make a film that was so censorious of the Japanese government until he had greater artistic freedom: this was the first he made under the auspices of Kurosawa Productions, a self-funded unit (246).

The Bad Sleep Well opens with a sequence that prepares viewers for a critical examination of Japanese business practices. We learn that Nishi, the Hamlet-analog, has just married the daughter of his boss, Iwabuchi, the vice president of the Public Corporation for Land Development. But the large and formal wedding reception has been marred by the arrival of police and reporters, who suspect that Public Corp. took inflated bids and received kickbacks

from the Dairyu Construction Company. An arrest is made, though the ceremony continues awkwardly as various executives of both Dairyu and Public Corp. use the occasion to declare their upright business practices. Iwabuchi and his two henchmen spend the remainder of the film trying to determine who is attempting to expose their crimes.

While we soon learn that Nishi is responsible for tipping off the cops, we only discover much later in the film why he has an interest in bringing these men down: Nishi's father Furuya, who worked at Public Corp., committed suicide five years earlier, apparently having been compelled to do so for the good of the company. Wada, the official who was arrested at the wedding, was prepared to do the same thing prior to Nishi's interference. It is he who tells Nishi that bureaucrats will never expose their superiors. The statement is unconsciously prophetic, since neither one lives to see the plans for revenge through. At the end of the film, we hear from Itakura, the Horatian friend with whom Nishi swapped identities so he could insinuate himself into Iwabuchi's business and personal life, that Nishi has died in a car accident rigged to look like the result of drunk driving.

The resemblances between Kurosawa's film and *Hamlet* appear and recede like a mirage. For example, the opening wedding scene of *The Bad Sleep Well* has frequently been compared to the "Mousetrap" scene in Act 3, scene 2, since Nishi has orchestrated—with the intent of unnerving his boss—the arrival of the reporters and the delivery of a special wedding cake in the shape of the office building from which his father jumped to his death. But as Ashizu points out, "there is no implication throughout the extraordinarily sustained first sequence that he is involved with the disaster afflicting the corporation. Unlike Shakespeare's voluble hero, Nishi is a quiet, impassive, and bespectacled salaryman" (74-5). Also, while the theme of

madness permeates the film—Yoshiko (the Ophelia analog and daughter of Iwabuchi) and Shirai (one of Iwabuchi's henchmen) are both driven to insanity, and other characters approach that state—Nishi is the one figure who is consistently in control of his wits with no pretense of being otherwise. In spite of such apparent discrepancies, a close study of Kurosawa's film is able to offer something very different to a viewer than a straightforward adaptation does. It has forced me to reconsider many of my long-standing assumptions about Hamlet: for one thing, that he acts entirely out of self-interest. Consider, for example, the opening of Act 1, scene 4. This scene has no analog in Kurosawa's film as far as I can tell. However, it benefits from being read alongside one of the more muted scenes of the film.

The Bad Sleep Well is often criticized for taking a turn from a noir-like investigation of corrupt systems in its first half toward "melodrama" in the end. The last third of the film indeed moves at a very different pace after Nishi has completed his subversive campaign of terror against Shirai, who goes mad as a result of guilt over his complicity in the suicide of Nishi's father. However, a subsequent scene at the crux of the film, during which Nishi contemplates his next course of action, offers a way to reexamine a key aspect of Shakespeare's protagonist. Kurosawa's scene suggests that Hamlet, from the very start of the play, is motivated by more than revenge in his long and often exasperating pursuit of the truth of what happened to his father. Nishi's circumstances reflect back on Hamlet's, suggesting that Shakespeare's character has goals that are much loftier: he wishes to eradicate corruption in Denmark.

Hamlet's initial encounter with his father's ghost in Act 1, scene 4, is prefaced by his discourse on the "custom" (12)—a word first introduced by Horatio, to whom he explains the practice—of the king keeping "wassail" (9) and punctuating his "draughts of Rhenish" (10) with

trumpet flourishes and cannon fire. Charles Ross notes that Hamlet's explanation doesn't actually answer definitively any questions about this custom, and that the play in fact "represents the force of customs by hiding them" (106). The prince's comments to Horatio take on the reflective and analytical tone of one of his soliloquies; in the space of about thirty lines, he shifts from reprimanding his countrymen for their drunkenness to meditating on the ability of a small character flaw to ruin a person: "His virtues else, be they as pure as grace, / As infinite as man may undergo, / Shall in the general censure take corruption / From that particular fault: the dram of ev'l / Doth all the noble substance of a doubt / To his own scandal" (1.4.33-38). Hamlet's spinning out a thought is not unusual, but the placement of this speech just prior to a visit from the ghost of his father is odd, and it has linked custom with corruption in an intriguing way.

The hidden forces of custom certainly apply to Kurosawa's mid-twentieth-century Japan, a culture in which suicide, as Borlik notes, "represents a selfless act of clan loyalty" (243). The scene from Kurosawa's film that elucidates Hamlet's comments on custom arrives at a point about two-thirds of the way into the film, following Nishi's shocking and suspenseful confrontation of Shirai. Nishi sits in profile in the center of the frame, flanked by Itakura and Wada, both of whom represent different aspects of his conscience. While they are not exactly speaking as "bad angel" and "good angel," Itakura seems to suggest that Nishi should have no regrets about what he has done so far, whereas Wada reminds him of the innocent people who have been hurt by his schemes, even if they were intended to punish the wicked. Nishi reflects on his actions up to this point, considering whether he hates his enemies enough to continue with his plot to avenge his father's death. While Nishi admits he has exhausted his reserves of

hatred toward evil, he apparently still possesses the “rare sense of justice” that he was credited with during his wedding ceremony: “I want those villains brought to justice for the sake of all the helpless people who don’t even know they’ve been had”. He renews his resolve to expose Iwabuchi and Moriyama (the remaining henchman) for their roles in his father’s death, but not out of a sense of obligation to his father. In fact, we shortly learn of Nishi’s animosity toward his father, who abandoned his mother after learning she was pregnant. Therefore, regret and guilt motivated him initially at least as much as hatred for the men who instigated his father’s suicide. But because of his lack of respect for his father, something else was certainly driving him all along: his idealism and sense of justice. He wants to stick it to the man.

Several critics have pointed to this scene as an indication of Nishi’s failure to exact the revenge he originally sought. Donald Richie suggests that Nishi is having a crisis of conscience: “[he] shows us that evil begets evil, that the revenge is as bad as those he wants to be revenged upon, that murder is contagious. At the same time, however (and here lies the ambivalent meaning of the film), he is an unsuccessful revenger” (145). Likewise, Robert Hapgood claims that

> Kurosawa plucks out the heart of Hamlet’s mystery. Instead of the strange inertia that possesses Shakespeare’s hero and mystifies even himself, Nishi faces a clearcut dilemma between his love for his wife and his hatred for her father. Instead of Shakespeare’s gradual widening of the implications of Hamlet’s quest, Nishi is given a single scene where he realizes the destructiveness of his hatred and where his motives of personal revenge are explicitly converted to a desire for social justice. (243)

However, the development of Nishi's character over the course of the film shows us that these two motives were always working in concert with each other. Richie and Hapgood's comments suggest the real concern of critics is with Kurosawa's failure to represent Shakespeare's protagonist in a way that aligns with traditional Western readings of *Hamlet*. But if we instead look at this Japanese character for clues about Shakespeare's development of his protagonist, we get a new perspective on Hamlet's strange digression on custom.

Hamlet's sidebar in 1.4 might seem abstract at first, but the scene raises questions about his own father's role in the customs that cause the world to regard the Danes as drunkards. Again, recall that Shakespeare's scene takes place *prior* to Hamlet's encounter with the ghost. Having at this point no charge to enact vengeance on Claudius, his comments on custom can be taken as more general in their disapproval of the Danish penchant for revelry than as specific criticism of the new king: "to my mind, though I am native here / And to the manner born, it is a custom / More honor'd in the breach than the observance" (14-16). These lines and the subsequent digression on corruption might lead one to the conclusion that Hamlet is simply a prude, the only Dane who doesn't like to party. But Nishi's contemplation of his father's role in government corruption points to the possibility that Hamlet is considering the same thing. When we learn of the reasons for Nishi's distant relationship with his father, we understand, as Mark Thornton Burnett concludes, that "Furuya was no heroic anti-type; rather, he emerges as a faithless and neglectful parent, another cog in the system who sides with company interests rather than familial values" (408). At this early point in Shakespeare's play, there is room to conjecture that the deceased king could be the subject of Hamlet's consideration of the "particular men" who carry "the stamp of one defect, / Being nature's

livery, or fortune's star" (Shakespeare 1.4.23, 31-2). It is certain that Hamlet is not speaking of Claudius here, to whom he is not so generous, having already identified him in Act 1, scene 2 as a "satyr" next to his father's "Hyperion" (140).

The way Hamlet's interest in corruption emerges in the play suggests that it is a long-standing preoccupation for him. Although his suspicion of and anger toward Claudius is not strong enough to provoke him to kill the king until the final scene, his urge to root out corruption might be the thing that spurs him on in his various attempts to expose state crimes. Nishi reaffirms his commitment after considering that filial duty is insufficient incentive. This might be exactly what Hamlet concludes and why he so closely scrutinizes the actions of all suspicious characters in the court, from the insipid Rosencrantz and Guildenstern to his own mother. Like Nishi, Hamlet understands that he is uniquely equipped to pursue the cause of justice. Perhaps he is not the self-absorbed and vacillating character so often portrayed in stage and film productions. Rather, he could fit nicely into Kurosawa's world as a scourge of corporate greed and vice.

CoryAnne Harrigan
Simpson College

Works Cited

Ashizu, Kaori. "Kurosawa's *Hamlet*?" *Shakespeare Studies* 33 (1995): 71-99. Print.

Borlik, Todd. "Denmark, Inc.: Artistic Temperament and Anti-Corporate Satire in Three Film Adaptations of *Hamlet*." *Merchants, Barons, Sellers, and Suits: The Changing Images of the Businessman through Literature*. Ed. Christa Mahalik. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010. 236-58. Print.

Burnett, Mark Thornton. "Re-reading Akira Kurosawa's *The Bad Sleep Well*, a Japanese Film Adaptation of *Hamlet*: Content, Genre and Context." *Shakespeare* 9.4 (2013): 404-17. *Encore*. Web. 29 Jan 2016.

Dawson, Anthony. "Reading Kurosawa Reading Shakespeare." *A Concise Companion to Shakespeare Onscreen*. Ed. Diana E. Henderson. Oxford: Blackwell, 2006. *Kindle*. Web. 9 April 2016.

Hapgood, Robert. "Kurosawa's Shakespeare Films: *Throne of Blood*, *The Bad Sleep Well*, and *Ran*. *Shakespeare and the Moving Image: The Plays on Film and Television*. Ed. Anthony Davis and Stanley Wells. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994. 234-50. Print.

Hastings, Chris. "Nunn Lays into BBC for Shakespeare-lite." *Telegraph*. Telegraph, 9 Oct. 2005. Web. 10 Apr. 2016.

Kurosawa, Akira, dir. *The Bad Sleep Well (Warui Yatsu Hodo Yoku Nemuru)*. 1960. Criterion, 2006. DVD.

Lanier, Douglas. "Recent Shakespeare Adaptation and the Mutations of Cultural Capital." *Shakespeare Studies* 38 (2010): 104-113. *Encore*. Web. 9 Apr 2016.

Richie, Donald. *The Films of Akira Kurosawa*. 2nd ed. Berkeley: U of California P, 1970. Print.

Ross, Charles. *The Custom of the Castle: From Malory to Macbeth*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1997. Print.

Rothwell, Kenneth S. *A History of Shakespeare on Screen: A Century of Film and Television*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. *The Riverside Shakespeare*. 1st ed. Ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974. 1135-97. Print.

Troilus's Hymn in Book III: Before the Wheel Turns Down

Thirty-five years ago, as a part of my dissertation, I examined what I consider the last two embedded lyric passages in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*, and concluded that they reflect one of the major Boethian themes of the text: the transcendence of universal love over worldly love. The "Hymn to Love" with which Troilus ends Book III is a fairly close translation of Book II, meter 8 of the *Consolation of Philosophy*. But Troilus's substitution of his love of Criseyde for the Divine Love that binds the universe together must be construed as contrary to the natural order. In Troilus's final song in book V---an extended metaphor one stanza in length—the ship of Troilus's life is described as having lost the direction that Criseyde and her worldly love as his lode-star had given him. "His mistake," I wrote at that time, "again is his exclusive faith in the wrong kind of love; that is what, in the end, will break his ship, will drag him into Charybdis."

That was 1981, and that analysis was perfectly in line with the prevailing critical opinion on Chaucer's *Troilus* throughout the entire twentieth century. This monolithic critical wall began to crumble near the turn of the millennium, when Henry Ansgar Kelly, in his *Chaucerian Tragedy*, opined "Just as I do not think that Troilus is presented as morally culpable in loving Criseyde, so too I do not think that Chaucer means to blame him either for losing physical possession of her or for losing his place in her heart" (106). In the past ten to fifteen years, furthermore, revisionist interpretations of Boethius's *Consolation* have forced Chaucerians to revise what once were regarded as truisms about Chaucer's use of Boethius, particularly in *Troilus and Criseyde.*

In his 2003 study of Boethius, John Marenbon maintained that Lady Philosophy's arguments in the *Consolation* are far more complex than had previously been assumed. Considering Book II in particular, she does not simply condemn all of Fortune's goods. She concedes that they bring "felicity," and so are not without value. Of course, because they are transient and people must fear losing them, they cannot bring ultimate happiness or *beatitudo*. But people would not fear losing these gifts if they were not precious (Marenbon 104). Marenbon goes on to argue that in fact there may be a scale of value in Philosophy's mind that applies to worldly goods:

> Philosophy has attempted to show Boethius that, although he has lost status, wealth, and power, and he faces death, he still has "goods" (*bona*) which "no one doubts are more valuable than life": his wise and virtuous father-in-law Symmachus, his sons, and his wife. Although these are gifts of fortune and might be taken from Boethius (indeed, Symmachus was executed shortly after his son-in-law), Philosophy ranks them higher than other goods of fortune; riches, status, and power are by comparison mere "ornaments". (Marenbon 104)

Megan Murton, in a recent article in the *Chaucer Review*, expands on this Boethian notion, declaring that the *Consolation* leaves the question "about the value of human love" unanswered (Murton 308). In his translation of Book II, meter 8 in the *Boece*, Chaucer praises marriage as a "sacrament" in ll. 23-24, and therefore a "conduit of divine grace" (Murton 309). Chaucer's paraphrase of that same meter in this "Hymn to Love" in Troilus, is what Murton calls a "hopeful and prayerful answer to a question left open in the *Consolation*" (308), in which

Chaucer chooses to resolve the ambiguity he finds in Boethius "in favor of a positive valuation of human love, articulated through the hopeful prayer of a lover" (Murton 310), a prayer contained in the final stanza of the poem addressed to "God, that auctour is of kynde" (III, 1765).

John Hill goes further than this, insisting that Chaucer presents the love of Troilus and Criseyde, particularly here in Book III, as "something supremely desirable…a form of joy that Chaucer countenances" but which scholars have to been unable to accept (Hill 283). Hill goes on to make two major assertions:

> first, that Book III is, from middle to end, Chaucer's best effort at the dramatization of sexually manifested joy between two beings on this mutable earth; and second, that, as such, his drama poses earthly joy and sufficiency in relation to philosophical or clerical felicity. (289)

Though the love of Troilus and Criseyde is not the Highest Good, the beatitude of the philosophers, it does not follow that it is not in itself desirable and of great value. A positive demonstration of that value is manifest in Troilus's discernable growth in virtuous behavior and deeds as a result of his love. Barry Windeatt, questioning the conventional wisdom that Troilus's Book III hymn is an expression of his "mistaken overvaluation" of romantic love which "points forward to the disengagement of the poem's conclusion," argues that, conversely, in the text "love's morally improving effect upon the lover is recurrently recorded" (Windeatt 93). Indeed, by the end of Book III Troilus has become the most courageous and feared of all Troy's warriors, and at the same time the most humble. As the Narrator describes him,

> And though that he be come of blood roial

Hym liste of pride at no wight for to chace;

Benigne he was to ech in general,

For which he gat hym thank in every place.

Thus wolde Love—yheried be his grace!—

That Pride, Envye, Ire, and Avarice

He gan to fle, and everich other vice. (III, 1800-06)

Considering these effects, it would seem perverse to condemn the love that brought about that virtue.

And indeed, Troilus' love for Criseyde must be presumed to be the cause of this behavior. From a philosophical standpoint, Thomas Aquinas had argued that "Love is the cause of all that the lover does," asserting "Now the end is the good desired and loved by each one. Wherefore it is evident that every agent, whatever it be, does every action from love of some kind" (*ST* 1.2.q.28.a.6). Dante, of course, has Virgil reaffirm this in canto 17 of the *Purgatorio*, where he elaborates that if that love is misdirected or perverted, the love leads to sin. In the case of Troilus, love has led him to virtue; therefore his love of Criseyde must be neither misdirected nor perverted. "By their fruits ye shall know them," Christ had pronounced (Matthew 7.20), and Chaucer makes it clear that the fruit of Troilus's and Criseyde's love is virtue, not sin.

Troilus's "Hymn to Love" in Book III, lines 1744-71, translates in four rime royal stanzas the 30 lines of Boethius's Book II, meter 8. Though a fairly close translation by medieval standards, it is not as close as the one Chaucer made for his full translation of the *Boece*. Chaucer begins his poem with several lines of anaphora that emphasize, by repetition of the

phrase “Love, that…,” the topic of the poem. These opening lines actually come from two sections at the middle and the end of Boethius’s text (lines 13-16 and 21-24 in Chaucer’s *Boece*). In the *Troilus* version, the opening lines declare the power of love in terms moving from the general to the specific, from the macrocosm to the microcosm. Love governs the earth, sea, and heavens; it binds nations of people together; and it binds smaller groups of people as well—“compaignie” and “couples” (1748-49):

> Love, that of erthe and se hath governaunce,
> Love, that his hestes hath in hevene hye,
> Love, that with an holsom alliaunce
> Halt peples joined, as hym lest hem gye,
> Love, that knetteth lawe of compaignie,
> And couples doth in vertu for to dwelle,
> Bynd this accord, that I have told and telle.
>
> (III, 1744-1750)

The most noteworthy change from the original that Chaucer makes here is altering Boethius’s reference to the holy bond of marriage—“love binds sacred mariages by chaste affections,” Boethius says (‘knytteth sacrement of mariages of chaste loves” Chaucer says in *Boece* [(ll. 21-23]. Troilus changes the reference to “couples.” The popular twentieth-century view held that this was a significant clue to Troilus’s confusion: Ida Gordon argued that the change “betrays the inapplicability” of this holy love to Troilus’s love for Criseyde, “for an illicit relationship cannot, by its very nature, belong to the divine order of harmony” (Gordon 34-35). This is certainly overstating the case somewhat—Chaucer need only look as far as Dante and Beatrice

to find that the love of "couples" might in fact be reconciled to the universal harmony. But it *could* be argued that Troilus's love must be construed as misplaced in this case, since as a confused pagan he in fact sees no ultimate source for the love he shows as governing all, other than his love for Criseyde, by implication attributing this harmony to the god of Love:

> Al this doth Love, ay heried be his myghtes! (III, 1757)

Note, however, that Boethius too attributes all this to Love, and there is no indication that *he* means "Cupid" by this. But to argue further along Gordon's lines, Troilus and Criseyde are patently *not* enjoying the "sacrament of marriages of chaste loves." Their affair is illicit and hence, according to this moralistic point of view, not a part of God's cosmic harmony—thus confusion, folly, irony must follow. But there are two obvious rejoinders here: first, Boethius himself at this point acknowledges that human love is indeed a part of the universal love that binds the universe, and thus, as we have already seen, of great value even though, like everything else in the sublunary world, it is transient. And secondly, as Murton argues, Chaucer responds to the Boethian ambiguity concerning human love by "resolv[ing] it in favor of a positive valuation of human love, articulated through the hopeful prayer of a lover" (312). Whether this love is married love or unmarried love is subordinate to Chaucer's chief emphasis.

Stanza two, in words very close to Boethius's opening lines, more directly describes Love as the power that holds together, by a perpetually existing bond, all the intensely conflicting elements that make up the universe. Next Troilus here echoes Boethius in praising the orderly movement of the sun and moon, of night and day, as part of Love's governance:

> That Phoebus mote his rosy day forth brynge,
>
> And that the mone hath lordshipe over the nyghtes,—

Al this doth Love, ay heried be his myghtes.

(III, 1755-57)

In his third stanza, Chaucer combines the lines of Boethius immediately following these on the sun and moon, concerning Love's holding back the sea, with Boethius's later lines about what would happen if Love did *not* order all things. Chaucer, in Troilus's voice, here actually works Boethius's original lines into a more logical order: the fact that the greedy sea is held within certain limits, rather than flowing fiercely out to drown the earth, is Love's doing, says Troilus. And if ever love should slacken its rein, "lete his bridel go," all would be lost, split asunder.

It has been noted that Chaucer uses all of Boethius's lines except the last, translated in *Boece* as "O weleful were mankynde, yif thilke love that governeth hevene governed yowr corages" (Hagopian, no. 2). Troilus expands this idea into the wish that God, the "auctour" of "kynde," would bind all human hearts by this same harmonious force, compelling them to love:

That from his bond no wight the wey out wiste;
And hertes colde, hem wolde I that he twiste
To make hem love, and that hem liste ay rewe
On hertes sore, and kepe hem that ben trewe.

(III, 1768-71)

Now the standard twentieth-century reaction to Chaucer's change here from Boethius's original would be that these final lines emphasize again the confusion in Troilus's mind concerning the two types of love. The first three stanzas of his hymn have celebrated the universal binding force of Divine Love, the harmony of the universe; the last stanza, with its reference to the

ordering of "cold hertes," to the desire that all those cold-hearted mistresses will be compelled to have pity upon their suffering servants, and to the wish that Love would protect all true lovers, reveals that, in Troilus's mind, there is no difference between the two modes of love. As Ira Gordon wrote in 1970, "it's ambiguous which love is meant, and the point is that Troilus doesn't know the difference. Troilus's hymn shows that what his love is really seeking is the true happiness" (Gordon 35). One might go further and argue that what Troilus is wishing for in this lyric is that all hearts be compelled to the *lesser* love in which he engages, and to which he alludes in his final stanza—a situation that would reverse the effects of the harmonious love he has been praising throughout the poem, for if what Troilus wishes were to come about, the love of God would no longer be the unifying force in the universe—or at least among humankind—but all would be attracted to partial and transient good, and chaos would be the result.

However, considering the recent revaluation of Boethius, Murton focuses on the prayer evident in these last lines and, noting how in Book V, prose 6 of the *Consolation*, Boethius's Philosophy presents, at the climax of the text, a turn toward hope and prayer, and noting that "because humanity has freedom, hopes and prayers…are not futile and in all things that are 'ryghtful' God will help human petitioners" (302). Murton goes on to call this last stanza "a prayer to a personal, interventionist God like that of the *Consolation's* conclusion." Troilus has, here, made a moral and spiritual leap: heretofore, he has prayed almost exclusively to the god of Love, as he does, for example, after his first "Canticus Troili" in Book I, when he immediately prays to Love:

> And to the God of Love thus seyde he
> With pitous vois, "O lord, now yours is

My spirite, which that oughte yours be."

(I, 421-23)

It's all part of the conventional courtly game called the "religion of love" characteristic of *fin amors*. But in this lyric, as Murton points out, the god of Love is a minor deity, "subordinate to a Creator who, in the hymn's final stanza, resembles the Christian god" (307). Troilus's love of Criseyde can hardly be deemed misdirected or misplaced when it has led him, though a pagan, to this profound recognition.

If we are changing so radically the Boethian lens through which we have so long examined Troilus, it may be time to consider applying a different lens altogether. It has long been recognized that *Troilus and Criseyde* abounds with allusions to—even lines translated directly from—Dante's *Comedy*, some of which I've already alluded to in this paper. More than twenty years ago, Richard Neuse took issue with those readers who see the Dantean echoes in Chaucer's *Troilus* "as ironic reminders of another, sublime world of values by comparison to which Chaucer's Trojan world falls pitifully short." Instead, Neuse asserted that the two works are linked by the fact that "in both, erotic love possesses a powerful religious, even theological dimension" (200).

In particular, acclaimed contemporary philosopher Martha Nussbaum, known for her work on the intelligence and history of emotions, provides an approach to Dante that may prove applicable to Chaucer's *Troilus* as well, though I can only suggest the general direction of such a study here. Nussbaum begins her overall study by proposing that

> Instead of viewing morality as a system of principles to be grasped by the detached intellect, and emotions as motivations that either support or

> subvert our choice to act according to principle, we [should] consider emotions as part and parcel of the system of ethical reasoning. (Nussbaum 1)

In her chapter focusing on Dante and Beatrice, Nussbaum characterizes Dante's poem as one that "in the context of Christian salvation" depicts "the *truest* and *most adequate* love of the individual, a love that most completely sees and loves the individual in all of his or her distinctness and uniqueness. Individuality is not just preserved in beatitude, it is heightened" (560). And she contrasts this with the conventional "courtly" love of Paolo and Francesca as presented in canto V of the *Inferno*: a love that "depicts lovers as passive before inexorable currents of desire, as lacking in wholeness and even identity" (563). Finally, Nussbaum asserts that "the love of Dante and Beatrice is…a love that respects subjecthood and freedom….To that extent, it recognizes the fact that each person is a distinct individual, having only a single life to live" (571).

The individuality of Criseyde is something we understand about her from the beginning of the poem. Though the narrator has a tendency to describe her in conventional terms—"men might in hire gesse / Honour, estat, and womanly noblesse" (I, 286-87) he says in an early description—two individualizing things stand out about her from the first: she is "the ferfulleste wight / That myghte be" (II, 450-51), a result of the Greek siege exacerbated by her father's desertion and the Trojan citizen's cry for revenge upon her; and she is also a feisty woman with something of an attitude, as her answer to Troilus's initial gaze suggests when at the Palladium she freezes him with a look that says "'What, may I nat stonden here?'" (I, 292). That woman with an attitude sparkles in Book II when we witness Criseyde's cleverness and wit, and her

ability to compete on equal footing with Pandarus in the verbal duel he introduces. From the opening sally, when Pandarus threatens to die if she does not accept Troilus as her lover, she puts herself on her guard, thinking "It nedeth me ful sleighly for to pleie"—and slyly she plays, matching her slick-talking uncle blow for blow and calling him out when he oversteps, as when she answers his allusion to "Whan ye ben his al hool as he is youre" with a definitive "Nay, therof spak I nought, ha, ha!" (II, 587-89).

The long interior monologue Chaucer gives to Criseyde in Book II allows us to see in an unprecedented way into the individualized workings of her mind, rationally weighing the pros and cons of letting Troilus into her life (II, 694-812), and we see that her peace, her privacy, her independence are things she seems to value most, while at the same time she relishes her freedom to be able to choose any love she wants to without anyone or anything constraining her. And ultimately, in an ironic twist that underscores Nussbaum's identification of emotions "as part and parcel of the system of ethical reasoning," it is Criseyde's emotional response to Antigone's song about the bliss of lovers that ultimately helps her decide what to do.

In all of these things, Criseyde is her own woman, as close to a flesh and blood figure as had ever been poetically conceived before Chaucer's day, and a far cry from the conventional courtly love mistresses, so interchangeable that readers have remarked how every medieval poet appears to have been in love with the same woman. Not only does the Narrator present Criseyde as a unique individual, but the story makes clear that Troilus recognizes her uniqueness and her value as an individual human being, and not simply as an ideal. It is Criseyde to whom he listens (ultimately to his sorrow) at the end of Book IV, when faced with the decision of how to respond to Parliament's trading of Criseyde for Antenor, Troilus yields to

Criseyde's plan to go to the Greek camp and find a way to return within ten days. Why? Because he acknowledges her intellect, and she presents him with a point-by-point argument as to why this will work, examining her father's motivations (IV, 1338-44), the likelihood of a peaceful settlement to the war (IV, 1345-65), her anticipated ability to win her father over through his own greed (IV, 1366-1400), and, failing that, her confidence that she can persuade Calcas that he has misread the portents (IV,14-1-14). One may argue that she bases much of her reasoning on assumptions that prove ungrounded, but her intellect and her rhetorical skill are still significant aspects of her individual character, and Troilus loves her for them. His acquiescence to her wishes in this case, without mansplaining to her why she is wrong, is also an acknowledgement of her subjectivity and her agency, further criteria for what Nussbaum calls "Christian love."

In the end, yes, Criseyde forsakes Troilus—or at least, as the Narrator says, she is "unkind." It would be the work of another full paper to consider whether Criseyde's love of Troilus is in the same Nussbaumian category as Troilus's love for her. But it is most meaningful that even when Troilus is utterly convinced of her desertion, he asserts "I ne kan nor may, / For al this world, withinne my herte fynde / To unlove yow a quarter of a day!" (V, 1696-98). He knows her for what she is, he knows her virtues and in the end her weaknesses as well, and still loves her as a whole person.

Criseyde *may* be no Beatrice, but Troilus may be closer to Dante than at first appears. The love of Beatrice leads Dante the pilgrim from his sympathy with sinners like Francesca to his vision of the face of God in the Empyrean heaven. Love of Criseyde---a true "Christian love" that recognizes her individuality and her agency, lifts Troilus from a sharp-tongued scoffer who

ridicules others to a courteous, empathetic and heroic prince, one capable at the height of his joy in his new life to utter a hymn to love, which ends in that momentary recognition, conferred on him–as on Dante's Trajan or Ripheus, his pagans in Paradise—in Troilus's case for his true, Christian love. We don't see Troilus enter Paradise in the end, but we do see him, at this point, get a glimpse of it, a glimpse of the "God, that auctour is of kynde" (III., 765), and we have, in this hymn, Chaucer's testament to the power of romantic love, not to its confusion. Human love may not be the Highest Good, but for Chaucer, as for Dante, it is the nearest we can approach it in this sublunary world.

Jay Ruud
University of Central Arkansas

Works Cited

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *Boece*. *The Riverside Chaucer*. Edited by Larry D. Benson, et al. 3rd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987. 395-469.

---. *Troilus and Criseyde. The Riverside Chaucer*. Edited by Larry D. Benson, et al. 3rd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987. 471-585.

Gordon, Ira L. *The Double Sorrow of Troilus: A Study of Ambiguities in* Troilus and Criseyde. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970. Print.

Hagopian, John V. "Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*, iii, 1744-1771." *The Explicator* 10.1 (September 1951): no. 2. Print.

Hill, John M. "The Countervailing Aesthetic of Joy in *Troilus and Criseyde*." *Chaucer Review* 39.3 (2005): 280-297. Print.

Kelly, Henry Ansgar. *Chaucerian Tragedy*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1997. Print.

Marenbon, John. *Boethius.* Great Medieval Thinkers. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2003. Print.

Murton, Megan. "Praying with Boethius in *Troilus and Criseyde*." *Chaucer Review* 49.3 (2015): 294-319. Print.

Neuse, Richard. "*Troilus and Criseyde*: Another Dantean Reading." Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde: "Subgit to alle Poesye": Essays in Criticism*. Ed. R. A. Shoaf with Catherine S. Cox. Binghamton, N.Y.: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1992. 199-210. Print.

Nussbaum, Martha C. *Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. Print.

Thomas Aquinas, Saint. *Summa Theologica*. Translated by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province. 3 vols. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1947. Print.

Windeatt, Barry. "*Troilus and Criseyde*: Love in a Manner of Speaking." *Writings on Love in the English Middle Ages*. Edited by Helen Cooney. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006. 81-98. Print.

Chaucer's Last Waltz:
Chaucer and 1970's Rock Culture

On the surface, there seems to be little connection between the medieval poet Geoffrey Chaucer and "The Last Waltz," a 1976 rock and roll spectacle organized by the Canadian-American rock group known simply as "The Band." The concert is today best known as the subject of a well-received 1978 documentary directed by Martin Scorsese and also titled *The Last Waltz*.[1] While the film continues to garner considerable approval from critics and fans,[2] shockingly little critical attention has been paid to Chaucer's cameo appearance, briefly at the live event and even more briefly in the documentary.

About 26 minutes into the movie, as The Band completes its song "It Makes No Difference," the musicians are setting aside their instruments when a faint voice-over fades in about half way through the first sentence of Chaucer's General Prologue to the Canterbury Tales. The camera cuts to a darkened stage where a neatly trimmed man in sport jacket and scarf recites Chaucer into a single microphone. As he strides confidently away, an off-camera announcer identifies the speaker as "Michael McClure." The audience responds

---

[1] To differentiate the concert from the film, future references to the film will use the italicized form *Last Waltz* while the unitalicized Last Waltz will signify the concert. The phrase The Band with its capitalized The will refer to the musical group.

[2] For example, the film is number 2 on *Rolling Stone* magazine's list of best rock documentaries and maintains an impressive score of 98% on Rotten Tomato as of 15 May 2016. Writing for Cheatsheet, Jacqueline Sahagian recognizes that *The Last Waltz* is "considered by many to be the best rock and roll film ever made," but she also puts it at number two on the site's listing of "7 of the Greatest Rock and Roll Documentaries of All Time." Janet Maslin's 1978 review notes camera work that conveys "more joy and lyricism than any other rock film has ever approached," tempered by the interviews and world-weariness that come "dangerously close to self-importance and self-pity." Roger Ebert acknowledges that the film "has inexplicably been called the greatest rock documentary of all time," but his review of the 25th Anniversary DVD concentrates on the weariness: "The overall sense of the film is of good riddance to a bad time."

enthusiastically, the stage lights come back up, and Dr. John launches into “What a Night.” Here’s that sequence: Clip 1 (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TwZzWHvEtY8).

My analysis differentiates three versions of the Chaucer passage. First, we have in its entirety the opening of the General Prologue to the Canterbury Tales, an 18-line passage that has an iconic presence beyond the concert, the film, and even Chaucer studies. Next, we have a somewhat shortened version of the lines as they were performed at the 1976 concert. Finally, we have an even more truncated performance from the 1978 film. By juxtaposing the Chaucer in printed texts with the Chaucer at the actual Last Waltz concert with the Chaucer in the documentary film, we may puzzle out how Chaucer might have been received by a variety of mid-1970s constituencies.

Because my interest is in what Chaucer meant to the audience and to rock and roll culture in general, my focus is more on the presence of the Chaucer text rather than on the person who recites the lines. McClure is still living, but he has consistently ignored my inquiries about how he was chosen for the event, why he decided to recite Chaucer, or what feedback he received for his performance. In the 1970s, McClure was a well-established San Francisco poet with a continuing presence in rock culture. His career is intertwined with Jack Kerouac, Allen Ginsberg, and other Beat writers. He was a mentor to Jim Morrison of the Doors, is credited with co-writing the song “Mercedes Benz” (made famous through Janis Joplin’s recording), and had been in Bob Dylan’s entourage for the 1975 Rolling Thunder tour. Nothing in his background reveals him as an aficionado of medieval poetry in general or Geoffrey Chaucer in particular.

To approach Chaucer's relevance to The Last Waltz, it's important to understand the event as more than a simple evening of musical entertainment in order to appreciate key differences between the concert and the film. In 1976, The Band announced that after 16 years of touring, The Last Waltz would be their final live appearance. The event was conceived as an opportunity for The Band to play with a wide array of guest musicians who, in the words of lead guitarist Robbie Robertson, "represent different spokes of the wheel that makes up rock 'n' roll" (qtd. in Hoskyns 333). By accompanying these musicians, The Band would thus demonstrate both their playing facility and their wide range of musical influences.

For The Last Waltz, The Band assembled an appropriately diverse lineup of musical guests, all of whom agreed to participate in the event for no compensation beyond expenses (Marsh 410n). Guests were chosen to highlight 1950s and '60s rock, the New Orleans tradition, the blues revival, folk rock, and more. Some of the musicians were included because The Band had served apprenticeships with them: this category included rock and roller Ronnie Hawkins and more famously Bob Dylan, who had recruited The Band under its original name, The Hawks, for his 1965-1966 touring band. Another set of musicians – Bobby Charles and Dr. John – represented the New Orleans musical tradition. Muddy Waters, Paul Butterfield, and Eric Clapton showcased different sides of the blues revival. Folk rockers Neil Young and Joni Mitchell shared Canadian roots as did most members of The Band. Other artists, such as Neil Diamond and Van Morrison, do not fit neatly into categories but contributed to the Last Waltz's encyclopedic diversity. The evening ended with two jam sessions at which a number of prominent musicians not featured elsewhere in the film traded riffs with those who had already

been on stage. This group included former Beatle Ringo Starr, Rolling Stone Ronnie Wood, guitarist Stephen Stills, bassist Carl Radle, and others.

The entire event was massive theater, the proceedings running over seven hours. Some 5000 fans paid $25 for a deluxe ticket to a seven-course meal and an evening of what was announced only as "The Band and Friends." Ticket holders sat at long tables in San Francisco's Winterland auditorium, a concert hall decorated with a set hired from the San Francisco Ballet Company, including massive crystal chandeliers that had been used in *Gone with the Wind*. The dinner menu featured 220 turkeys, 400 pounds of fresh salmon (provided by Bob Dylan, who didn't like turkey), 2,000 pounds of candied yams, 800 pounds of pie, 6,000 dinner rolls, 90 gallons of gravy, 400 gallons of apple juice, and more.[3] During the meal, an orchestra played while professional waltzers twirled about the floor. These framing events signaled that the event would be something more than a traditional rock concert, the sheer scale and theatricality hinting at some larger meaning. As Robertson commented in retrospect, "We wanted one last statement, and it was more than I expected it to be" (epigram in Hoskyns 332).

If we think of the actual concert as one text, the documentary film is something else altogether. Scorsese distills the evening from a seven-hour concert into a two-hour narrative through three notable strategies. First, he changed the sequence of artists and eliminated many of the musical performances so that no guest artist beside Bob Dylan performs more than once. Next, additional musical performances were filmed on a separate soundstage, Emmylou Harris and the Staples Singers being added to represent the country rock and gospel traditions. These first two changes cast into greater relief the notion of the Last Waltz event as a testament to

[3] For full range of information on the feast, see Hoskyns (339-41), Fricke, and Grogan.

various influences on 1970's rock music while continuing to punctuate the notion that The Band deserved its reputation as the quintessential musical assemble because it melded such a wide range of North American folk and rock music traditions.

Scorsese's third innovation was a series of interviews with members of The Band to highlight their commitment to music and the attendant lifestyle of a touring musician. The interviews are intercut with the musical performances to develop a loose theme that The Band was not merely imitating its influences in some mechanical way, but rather living their ethos, and in fact, the group had been consumed with that which it was nourished by, sacrificing the energy of its members for the greater good of the musical world. By drawing this diversity into what is construed as a "**last** waltz" [emphasis added], the message was that this earlier era was drawing to a close, not only for The Band but for all musicians who played in these traditions. Robertson later cast the event as the end of a political era as well:

> If the 1950s were about 'rebels without a cause,' then the '60s and '70s were about rebels with a cause. But by the time The Last Waltz came out, that revolution was over. It had served its purpose, and everybody was moving on. (Preface to box set)

The concert also proved to be the end of The Band. The announcement that this would be the last live concert implied that The Band would continue as a studio group, but the concert and film were the last performances by The Band in its original incarnation.

Just as Scorsese deconstructed and reconfigured the musical program, he also transforms the Chaucer element. To appreciate the extent of this transformation, we must return to other records of the original Thanksgiving event. Scorsese followed a fairly traditional

documentary strategy. Before the concert began, he developed an elaborate shooting script that imagined the concert as a movie compiled from disparate shots.[4] To collect these parts, he arranged for seven 35mm cameras in a variety of configurations: a stationary camera concealed in a specially constructed gazebo next to the stage, aerial cameras on cranes, and rolling cameras on tracks. In addition to collecting this series of short, discrete clips from the multiple perspectives, Scorsese also used smaller stationary cameras loaded with black-and-white film to record the entire event. This so-called timing film was later used to synchronize sequences from the other cameras when it was time to edit the parts into an artistic whole.

The raw footage captures two useful interpretive perspectives that were available to audience members at the original event but not to film viewers. The first is the unedited footage of McClure's performance. Poet Lenore Kandel has just completed reading a series of short pieces before introducing McClure: Clip 2 (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2opjCeVhQ7I).

This clip leads to several important observations. First, McClure's reading was not initially sandwiched between musical performances. Instead, the original event included a sequence of seven San Francisco poets. Each poet enters the stage, reads a poem or two, and then introduces the following poet. The entire poetry reading takes about 10 minutes and occurs during a break announced as the Band closes "Arcadian Driftwood," its final song of the first set. Of the seven poets who read in 1976, only McClure and Lawrence Ferlinghetti appear

[4] For discussion and examples of Scorsese's shooting diagrams, see the booklet for the Last Waltz box set and the "Revisiting the Last Waltz" documentary on the 25 anniversary DVD.

in the film (and, frankly, Ferlinghetti's rambling parody of the Lord's Prayer has not held up well): Clip 3 (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9dmIt81JkAg).

The second observation is that in the original performance, McClure starts at the very beginning of the General Prologue and gets through the entire first sentence, omitting only the line with the reference to palmers seeking "straunge strondes." A few prepositions and conjunctions differ from those in the canonical text, perhaps because McClure recites from memory rather than reading like the other poets.

McClure does not mention Chaucer at all before or after his recitation. Presumably he expects the audience to recognize the piece. At the end of the segment, he makes a wry face and flips up his hands as if to acknowledge some sort of inside joke. His entry to and exit from the stage are casual, lacking the confidence seen in the film.

Finally, although McClure's website highlights a rave from the *Georgia Poetry Review* that claims the performance "lilted, rolled, and seduced the audience into the lyric tonality of Middle English," the crowd response here is less enthusiastic than in Scorsese's film. Still when one contrasts McClure's reception with that afforded the other poets, he seems the best received, especially by the end of his recitation.

The second important segment of raw footage is the introduction for the entire poetry interlude, a speech that does not appear in the film. Fellow poet Emmett Grogan, one-time leader of the hippie activist collective called The Diggers, explained elsewhere that he intended his introduction to "draw a kind of frame around the poets, explain who they were and what they meant to our generation" (Grogan). If poets are, as Grogan suggests, visionary "wizards" who record the "pulse and breath" of culture, no celebration of rock and roll's second age

would be complete without including representatives who "bring back to ourselves tonight our elders, our own voices, and our purest vision." Grogan's complete introduction may be seen here: Clip 4 (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=isGqnHbppno).

Keeping in mind our three views of the Chaucer text – the lines in academic culture, the lines at the concert, and the lines in the movie – we may now appreciate how each context skews the significance of the Chaucer performance. First, when one merely recognizes the lines as Chaucer, especially if those lines represent a person's sum total knowledge of Chaucer, the reading simply calls to mind old, academic poetry familiar from one's school days, an echo of the "elders" referenced in Grogan's introduction. A person a bit more familiar with literary history could go further and recall Chaucer's perhaps most-widely-known persona, father Chaucer, the august fountainhead of English poetry. In either case, Chaucer then becomes important at the Last Waltz, not as a witness to modern American life, but as a shout out to literature in general, another one of those important spokes in the wheel of rock music. Chaucer establishes a beginning point for the spectrum of English verse and subtly elevates rock lyric to high-culture poetry. One familiar elder poet might be interchangeable with another for this purpose.

Considering the lines from the perspective of The Last Waltz concert complete with Grogan's introductory frame, those familiar with Chaucer's keen power of observation and subtle satire will recall his role as a social critic who was not afraid to speak out against perceived wrongs of his age. If we consider Chaucer as social critic, it is easier to enlist him in the ranks of what David Fricke calls the "army of San Franciscan poets" that Grogan assembled for the event (Fricke). The military metaphor suggests coordinated and defiant purpose in

support of a common cause, rather like the "rebels with a cause" that Robertson had referenced. Chaucer was witness to the pulse and breath of his own culture, willing to acknowledge its foibles, just as the other poets were prepared to take on the 1960s and '70s' establishment culture.

By contrast, Scorsese's film removes Chaucer from the context of the other poets and trims out the most recognizable opening couplet of McClure's recitation. In the 1970s, the opening of the Canterbury Tales was standard school fare even in the U.S., and many more people might have nodded knowingly and said, "Chaucer," had they heard the familiar "Whan that Aprille …" beginning the original performance. Scorsese's editing, however, requires viewers to confront the lines on their own, neither as part of a group of poets nor with easy identification of Chaucer as the lines' author. For those not familiar with Chaucer, the detached poetry simply signals the presence of verse in any form. For those who do recognize Chaucer, however, the documentary offers the most generous way of approaching the Chaucer performance. Even if he didn't mean to – and there is evidence that he didn't – Scorsese represents Chaucer in a way almost closest to the modern critical view, an ironic and enigmatic storyteller.

Finally, if the few lines from Chaucer become sign and symbol for the entire Canterbury Tales, one is invited to find a connection between the notion of the Canterbury Tales and The Last Waltz. One possibility is to see the musicians as a band of pilgrims who are diverse in their separateness but tied together in their common purpose. Rock critic Barney Hoskyns hints at this notion in *Across the Great Divide: The Band and America*, describing McClure's recitation as something that draws "a loose parallel between Chaucer's motley band of pilgrims and the

gathering of celebrities at Winterland" (348). Hoskyns, a British journalist whose credentials include an English degree from Oxford, clearly has no trouble recognizing the performance as Chaucer. His response picks up on the notion of the Canterbury Tales as assembling a cross-section of medieval English society. In a similar vein, critic Greil Marcus speculates that because the General Prologue launches a journey, the effect of the Chaucer recitation is the reminder that while The Band's time on the road may be coming to an end, other travels begin other journeys await. Every ending is a beginning.

I agree that we might find a loose parallel between the Chaucer performance and the Last Waltz, but it is not between the pilgrims and the musicians. Rather, a better comparison would be between Chaucer as author and Scorsese as teller of tales. Just as Chaucer crafted a work in which seemingly disparate parts compose a larger whole with implications about medieval society and literary culture, so too does Scorsese combine the musical performances and individual reminiscences to capture some truth about American rock music culture in the mid-1970s. Both texts include thematic treatment of pilgrimage of moving toward some meaningful unknown. While such a comparison might have been developed more clearly, it never was. Scorsese's decision to wrench the Chaucer piece from its performative context undercuts the potential value of the passage to suggest fully a parallel between the film and Chaucer's masterwork. A generous spirit might credit Scorsese with recognizing the potential link and choosing to understate it, just as Chaucer understates so many subtle points, but further evidence says, probably not.

In audio commentary for the 25th anniversary DVD edition of *The Last Waltz*, Robertson explains that Chaucer was included in the movie as a deliberate strategy of dislocation: When

McClure "recites from the Canterbury Tales in Old [sic] English, at first people were like what, what is this man saying? … Everybody was really baffled by it at first and Marty pretty much enjoyed that." If the intention is simply to baffle, then a little Chaucer foisted on an unsuspecting cinematic audience can go a long way. Robertson's comments make clear that Scorsese did not count on people recognizing Chaucer, or if they did recognize his words, they were deprived of any sort of interpretive framework in which to fit them.

Robertson's easy dismissal of Chaucer calls attention to Chaucer's general debasement in modern culture. At the 2015 Northern Plains Conference on Early British Literature, Lynn Arner's plenary address explored uses of Chaucer in movies of the 1930s and '40s. The trends she noticed then are equally apparent in the 1970s. For many, Chaucer has become the sort of literary figure who it is important to know about, but less important to know intimately through study of his works.

Robertson's remarks also leave us with a conundrum worthy of Chaucer himself. We have the Chaucer performance, presented with a straight face as part of grandiose rock spectacle. Scorsese's manipulation of the material gives readers a choice. It is as easy to dismiss the recitation as a colorful, but largely meaningless, soundbite of the event as it is to read the performance as a tantalizing key to Scorsese's narrative strategy in the documentary. Tempting though it may be to imagine Scorsese including the Chaucer performance to promote the preservation of Middle English poetry, we have no reason to doubt Robertson's characterization of the performance as a joke on the audience. Both, either, or neither – perhaps Chaucer himself would tell us to stint our clappe and "nat maken ernest of game."

David Sprunger
Concordia College

Works Cited

Adams, Sam, et al. “40 Greatest Rock Documentaries.” 15 Aug. 2014. Rollingstone.com. Web. 15 May 2016.

The Band. *The Last Waltz*. 4-CD box set. Rhino R2 78278, 2002. Audio.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The Riverside Chaucer*. Ed. Larry D. Benson et al. 3rd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987. Print.

Ebert, Roger. *The Last Waltz* (Review). 19 Apr 2002. Web. 15 May 2016. <http://www.rogerebert.com/reviews/the-last-waltz-2002>

Fricke, Daniel. Introductory Essay. In The Band, *Last Waltz* CD box set.

Grogan, Emmett. “The Band's Perfect Goodbye: A Behind-the-Scenes Report.” *Oui* 1976/77. Web. 15 Jan. 2016. <theband.hiof.no/articles/lw_oui_grogan.html>

Hoskyns, Barney. *Across the Great Divide: The Band and America*. New York: Hyperion, 1993. Print.

Last Waltz script/transcript. Drew’s Script-o-rama. Web. 15 Jan 2016. <http://www.script-o-rama.com/movie_scripts/l/last-waltz-script-transcript-band.html>

Marcus, Greil. Commentary track on 25th Anniversary DVD. Film.

Maslin, Janet. “The Last Waltz (1978) Film: Scorsese and the Band: Final Fling” (Review). *New York Times*. 26 Apr 1978. Web. 15 Jan. 2016. < http://www.nytimes.com/movie/review?res=9404E0DB1231E632A25755C2A9629C946990D6CF>

McClure, Michael. Biography. 2016. Web. 15-Jan-16. <http://michael-mcclure.com/>

Revisiting the Last Waltz. Documentary on 25th Anniversary DVD. Film.

Robertson, Robbie. Commentary track on 25th Anniversary DVD. Film.

---. Preface. In The Band, *Last Waltz* CD box set.

Sahagian, Jacqueline. "7 of the Greatest Rock and Roll Documentaries of All Time." 8 Jan. 2016. Cheatsheet.com. Web. 15 May 2016.

Scorsese, Martin, director. *The Last Waltz*. 1978. 25th Anniversary Edition. United Artists 1003426. Film.

"Fatal Destiny": Fortune and Skepticism in *Soliman and Perseda*, *The Spanish Tragedy*, and *Dido, Queen of Carthage*

Thomas Kyd's plays *Soliman and Perseda* and *The Spanish Tragedy* and Christopher Marlowe's *Dido, Queen of Carthage* share a skeptical understanding of human autonomy, and they are similar as well in their use of allegorical characters who observe, comment on, and orchestrate the ensuing action of their respective plays.[1] *Soliman and Perseda* is less well known than the other two plays, so a brief synopsis may be useful. The Soliman of the play's title is the emperor Suleiman 1, or Suleiman the magnificent, who conquered Rhodes in 1522, although the events of the play have no historical accuracy whatsoever. At the beginning of the play Erastus loses a jeweled necklace, a special gift from his lover Perseda. Recovering it leads to a fight in which Erastus kills one of his fellow knights and flees to Constantinople to escape punishment. There Soliman, aware of Erastus's martial prowess, makes him one of his lieutenants. Perseda follows Erastus to Constantinople, and Soliman immediately falls in love with her. However, learning that she and Erastus love each other, Soliman nobly represses his own feelings of love and sends the couple back to govern Rhodes, which has just been conquered by the Turks. Unfortunately, Soliman still longs for Perseda and recalls Erastus to Constantinople and executes him so that he can have Perseda to himself. Soliman returns to Rhodes, where Perseda tricks Soliman into killing her while she kills him with a poisoned kiss.

[1] The anonymous *Soliman and Perseda* has long been attributed to Kyd. Lukas Erne summarizes the evidence in *Beyond the Spanish Tragedy* (pp 160-162) and in the introduction to his facsimile edition of *Soliman and Perseda* (pp. ix-xi). The texts cited throughout are the modern spelling editions of Kyd's *Soliman and Perseda* by Flutes and Brazil, Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy* by Mulryne, and Marlowe's Dido, Queen of Carthage by Burnett.

The dying Soliman then kills everyone else who is still alive, including the play's two comic relief characters. No major character remains alive.

Fortune, Love, and Death provide the induction to *Soliman and Perseda* and subsequently reenter at the end of each act to comment on and argue over which of them is most responsible for the actions that the play has just presented. Their initial contention in the induction is over which of them is best fitted to serve as chorus to the tragedy that is about to unfold, but more broadly their dispute is over which of the three is most truly the arbiter of human destiny. However, as the play progresses it becomes clear that it is not possible to assign ultimate responsibility to any one of the three. The claims and counterclaims of the disputants invariably invite us to see their actions as intertwined. Thus, at the end of the first act, when the three sum up the events that we have just seen, Love maintains that all that has happened stems from the exchange of love tokens by Perseda and Erastus. Fortune, however, sees the key event as being Erastus's unlucky loss of the jeweled necklace that Perseda had bestowed upon him. Death avers, on the other hand, that the true turning point will be that the lost necklace will very shortly lead to the slaying of Ferdinando when he fights Erastus over the necklace. Rather than being persuaded by any one of these assertions, the audience most likely agrees with Erastus. Though he is completely unaware of their onstage presence, the fleeing Erastus equally accuses "fell Fortune, Love, and Death; / For all these three conspire my tragedy" (II.1.260-1).

The personification of Death, it should be stressed, is not merely to remind us that humans are mortal. Were that the point, Death would always have the last word over Love and Fortune. Rather, death in *Soliman and Perseda* is always surprisingly sudden and unexpected.

The uncertainty of when death comes, together with uncontrolled outbursts of passion and surprising twists of fortune, is thus shown to control the direction of one's life. We mortals, would like, of course, to believe that our own wills are what give our lives direction, but Love, Fortune, and Death deny that this is so. Are they then the arbiters of Fate? Not quite. The play suggests that a greater force lies beyond Love, Fortune, and Death. Thus, in their dispute at the end of Act 1, Love boasts of causing a fool "to presume to arms," and Fortune retorts that the fool was then "over-thrown / By Fortune's high displeasure" (1.6.30-2). Death then adds that he could have intervened at that point, but was not allowed to: "Aye, and by Death / Had been surprised, if Fates had given me leave" (I.6.32-3). In short, a larger plan controls the actions of Love, Fortune, and Death. The controlling role of Fate is repeated in the play's rather strange closing compliment to Elizabeth, whom Death says he must not harm, "For holy fates have graven it in their tables / That Death shall die, if he attempt her end" (5.5.39-40). Perhaps this awkward praise of Elizabeth, who is identified as "Cynthia's friend" (5.5.37), should not count as one of the play's thematic assertions, but it clearly reiterates that Fortune, Love, and Death are constrained by a larger plan or force. This is not to say that that the mortal characters in *Soliman and Perseda* reflect on what gives meaning and direction to life. They do not, beyond an occasional bemoaning of bad luck. Nonetheless, the audience is lead to such questioning through the claims and counterclaims of Fortune, Love, and Death. The outcome of this tragedy, one may add, is known in advance. In their initial appearance, Love asserts a preexisting familiarity with "the history / Of brave Erastus and his Rhodian dame" (1.1.13-14). Mortals may not know the outcome, but it is no mystery to these three. And if the outcome is set in advance, there is no free will.

The roles of *Soliman and Perseda*'s Love, Fortune and Death are fulfilled in *The Spanish Tragedy* by the ghost of Don Andrea and Revenge, both of whom are far more intriguing characters. They are onstage throughout (perhaps above) instead of merely reentering after each act. More importantly, their ongoing conversation reflects the clear difference between mortal and divine perspectives. Though now a ghost, Don Andrea was and is human. His death has not given him a larger perspective from which to understand himself or human destiny or what his life either means or has meant. His position is brought out by his opening monologue, which describes a classically pagan vision of the afterlife. Once his burial rites have been completed by his friend Don Horatio, Don Andrea crosses the Acheron, pacifies Cerberus with "honeyed speech" (1.1.30), and approaches Minos, Aeacus, and Rhadamanth, the judges of the underworld, to learn what his lot will be in the afterlife. The judges cannot agree on his fate since Don Andrea was both lover and soldier, so they pass the buck and send him on to Pluto to make the decision. When he finds Pluto, he kneels, which begets a mysterious reaction from Pluto's consort Proserpine:

> Whereat fair Proserpine began to smile
> And begged that only she might give my doom.
> Pluto was pleased, and sealed it with a kiss.
> Forthwith, Revenge, she rounded thee in th'ear,
> And bade thee lead me through the gates of horn,
> Where dreams have passage in the silent night.
> No sooner had she spoke but we were here,

I wot not how, in twinkling of an eye.

(1.1.78-85)

The entire first speech is richly fraught. Focusing just on the first eleven lines, Timothy Rosendale's "Agency and Ethics in *The Spanish Tragedy*" urges that the depiction of Don Andreas's journey through the underworld poses "a foundational uncertainty about body and soul, action and quietism, merit and grace—in short, whether humans earn what they get, and get what they deserve, or whether simply get what they get by logic inscrutable and arbitrary" (7). The seven lines depicting Proserpine's decision are equally problematic, raising far more questions than we in the audience can answer. What causes Proserpine to smile when Don Andreas kneels before Pluto, and why is Pluto so pleased to agree to allow Proserpine to make the judgment. Is it mere husbandly indulgence, or as a god does he know and approve the doom she will impose on Don Andreas? Moreover, what decision does she make, and is there any meaningful reason for it. Rosendale argues that Proserpine "in fact renders no decision but sends Andrea to watch a play with a new friend" (5). Now, it is true that no decision is announced to one and all within the play; neither Don Andrea nor the audience knows what was rounded in Revenge's ear. However, that is not the same as saying that no decision was made. The point would seem to be that while the gods may indeed have plans and intentions concerning the lives that mortals live, they remain mysterious to humanity.

Once they have been translated back to earth, Revenge tells Don Andrea that they have come to see Bel-Imperia kill Don Balthazar, the man who killed him. The thought of such a direct and he assumes immediate revenge pleases Don Andrea, but of course, events in *The Spanish Tragedy* are not so straightforward. The idea of revenge should imply some sort of

equity, a balancing of rights and wrongs. However, between the death of Don Andrea and Balthazar lies a trail of bodies: Horatio, Isabella, Serberine, Pedringano, Lorenzo, Castille, Bel-Imperia, and Hieronimo. It is hard to understand how or why the carnage should please the smiling and amorous gods of the underworld, and the feeling of exultation Andrea displays at the end as he contemplates the tortures he will assign to his enemies suggests the process has cost him something of his humanity. Moreover, to cite Rosendale once again, each of "the actors in this play may think of and conduct themselves as fully autonomous agents, but the frame suggests that their apparently self-generated actions are subject to the authorial and directorial will of at least one supernatural agent within the world of the play" (14). The human sense of autonomy cannot be reconciled with the secret doom of Proserpine, and Kyd's skepticism is directed against the feeling of autonomy. In a paper I delivered at the International Marlowe Conference three years ago, I argued that the scene of central symbolic importance in *The Spanish Tragedy* is when Pedringano jests himself to death under the mistaken belief that Lorenzo's page is holding a box containing his pardon for the murder of Serberine. The scene has generated much discussion about what the box might represent, but clearly in one way or another it represents an empty promise of salvation. Maus suggests that it may be "a comment on the hollow promises of a Christianity" (66), while Rosendale maintains that it portrays an "almost complete inversion of Calvin's doctrine of grace" (13). However, we need not relate the box narrowly to any specific religious doctrine. Throughout the play the characters speak and act as if they had agency, but their autonomy is denied by the judgment of Proserpine and the chain of events leading to Balthazar's death. What *The Spanish Tragedy* asserts is that the box is *always* empty (Brandt).

In *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, the Roman gods function in the same way as Fortune, Love and Death and Don Andrea and Revenge in their respective plays. They exert control over human destiny, and their control is at odds with the human characters' own sense of autonomy. In 2003 I had the privilege of seeing a production of Marlowe's *Dido, Queen of Carthage* at The Globe Theatre in London. The play opened with the stage set up as a children's playground, with the gods sitting or playing on a large slide and a swing set. The costuming reinforced this depiction of divine childishness. The mortals were in modern dress, wearing their own everyday clothing, but the clothing of the gods, to quote the playbill, made them look "like children dressed up in their parents' clothes" (Shakespeare's Globe 24). The presentation responded to Marlowe's depiction of the frivolous behavior of the gods, which begins with Jupiter dandling Ganymede on his knee and begging him to indulge in some amorous play. Jupiter's behavior is completely irresponsible. He has, for example, stolen his wife Juno's wedding jewels as a gift for Ganymede, and offers to allow him to "Control proud fate, and cut the thread of time" (1.1.29). Whether or not Jupiter would actually have yielded any control over Fate to Ganymede is an entirely hypothetical question, but clearly he himself embodies such power. Challenged by Venus for wasting his time "playing with that female wanton boy" (1.1.51) while her Aeneas is in danger, Jupiter makes it clear that it he who establishes human fate:

> Content thee, Cytherea, in thy care,
>
> Since thy Aeneas' wand'ring fate is firm,
>
> Whose weary limbs shall shortly make repose

In those fair walls I promised him of yore.

(1.1.82-85)

In short, once Jupiter has promised this outcome, it becomes unchangeable and inevitable.

As in the first two plays discussed, the human characters in *Dido, Queen of Carthage* will behave throughout as if they possessed agency and could freely choose the path that their lives will take. However, at each point where the behavior desired by humans' conflicts with the outcome ordained by the gods, it is the divinely fated path that prevails. It is as if Marlowe were showing us what humans would do if they actually possessed agency and could choose freely. Since the play denies the possibility of human choice, this is a hypothetical possibility, but because the human alternative is invariably happier from a human perspective, Marlowe thus emphasizes the human cost of a fate that remains blind to human desire.

This dichotomy is most clearly exploited in the play's depiction of love, especially in the scene in which Cupid, disguised as Ascanius, sits on Dido's lap and forcibly switches her affections from Iarbus to Aeneas. Dido has had many suitors, but at this point it appears that Iarbus will prevail. Then, in the short space of twenty lines, she four times dismisses him only to immediately call him back. The fifth dismissal is not reversed (3.1.35-54). The human side of Dido has been extinguished to further Aeneas's firm fate. Others also feel what Anna calls the "sour of love" (3.1.61), and Cupid's comic debasement of the elderly nurse mirrors Dido's debasement. *Dido, Queen of Carthage* overtly asserts that the gods assign a destiny for human beings, but the frivolity of the gods calls into question its true merits. Humanity, it suggests, deserves more than the gods accord it.

Since the fated result is so clearly spelled out, the message of *Dido, Queen of Carthage* is perhaps a bit closer to that of *The Spanish Tragedy* than to *Soliman and Perseda*, although the inscrutability of fate from a human perspective is the same in all three. No discernible purpose can be seen in the multiple deaths of *Soliman and Perseda*. Avenging Andrea's death with Balthazar's takes eight other deaths intertwined in a pattern that no one who was not sitting as a spectator with Revenge would be able to see. The deaths of Dido, Iarbus, and Anna are no more than collateral damage of the fate promised to Aeneas. The human-centered question posed in Anna's final lament thus pertains throughout all three plays, as does the lack of a meaningful answer: "What fatal Destiny envies me thus…?" (5.1.322).

Bruce E. Brandt
South Dakota State University

Works Cited

Brandt, Bruce. “Shared Riches in a Little Room? Skepticism and Comedy in Kyd and Marlowe.” Conference paper presented at the 7th International Marlowe Conference held in Staunton, Virginia, June 25-28, 2013.

Erne, Lukas. *Beyond The Spanish Tragedy: A Study of the Works of Thomas Kyd*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2001. Print.

-----, ed. "Introduction." *Soliman and Perseda [1592/93]*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2014. Print. Malone Society Reprints, Vo. 181

Kyd, Thomas. *The Spanish Tragedy*. Ed. J. R. Mulryne. New Mermaids. 2nd ed. London: A & C Black/New York: Norton, 1989. Print. New Mermaids.

-----. *The Tragedy of Soliman and Perseda*. Transcribed by B[arbara] F[lutes] and edited for the Web by Robert Brazil. Elizabethan Authors, 2002. Web. April 28, 2016

Marlowe, Christopher. *Dido, Queen of Carthage*. In *The Complete Plays*. Ed. Mark Thornton Burnett. London: J. M. Dent, 1999. Print. Everyman.

Maus, Katharine Eisaman. *Inwardness and Theater in the English Renaissance*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1995. Print.

Rosendale, Timothy. "Agency and Ethics in *The Spanish Tragedy*." *Early Modern Literary Studies* 18.1-2 (2015): 1-19.

Shakespeare's Globe Theatre. The Season of Regime Change 2003. *Dido Queen of Carthage*, by Christopher Marlowe. Playbill. Pp. 1-36. Print.

Religion in the Early Brit. Lit. Classroom: The Challenges of Teaching Religion and Literature to Students of Faith

Religion in the Early British Literature classroom is unavoidable, though a great deal of energy has been spent in an attempt to ignore it. Two scenes from my graduate experience, long ago, I admit, will illustrate. In the first, an eminent professor drapes herself over the podium on the first day of class, declaring, "I hate Milton" (the subject, if you haven't guessed, of the class). One could hate Milton for a variety of reasons, I suppose, but hers was pretty clearly the poet's theology which, in her view, left humankind very little wiggle room. In the other, I had just finished my prelim presentation on that beloved poet George Gascoigne when a long-standing member of the Renaissance area at my university leaned back in his chair, tossed his pen onto his pad and declared over his half glasses (I'm not making this up!), "I just don't see what all this fuss over Protestantism is about!" The academy has to some degree shifted in the intervening years, so that sessions at national conferences on, say, "Shakespeare and Religion" overflow into the halls; it's hard to determine whether this is the effect of a post-modern openness to various voices (though the terms "openness" and "post-modern" are oddly juxtaposed) or rather just one sweep of a pendulum.

One might also consider the university English classroom where, since the New Critics (who were not all oblivious to religion) the goal has often been to shake the metaphorical (if not the literal) hayseeds out of the hair of students, replacing their provincial notions regarding religion, politics, and morality with more urbane ones. We've tried to make students more

sophisticated, more skeptical, more secular.[1] In its more recent manifestations, this means, in Mark Edmundson's characterization, that "The student is taught not to be open to the influence of great works, but rather to perform facile and empty acts of usurpation, in which he assumes unearned power over the text" (45). The "disciplines discipline," as Edmundson, citing Foucault, points out, and Edmundson fears that the contemporary humanities classroom is shaping students in ways that do not serve them well:

> The sense of superiority that current liberal arts education often instills rhymes with some of the least creditable trends in our culture. It rhymes with a superior and exploitative relation to the natural world, with condescension to the poor, with a sense that nothing in the world matters unless it matters to Me. (46).

If that sounds a bit like a religious critique of current culture, you understand why Edmundson, my guru in these matters, suggests that "Religion is the right place to start in a humanities course" (25) both because the subject matter of, especially, literature classes is full of questions and answers about life and because students, as Edmundson puts it, "are full of potent questions; they want to know how to navigate life, what to be, what to do. Matters of faith and worldliness are of great import" to them (28). Thus we neglect religion in our classrooms to our peril; more to the point, we neglect it to the peril of our students, who long to answer the questions religious inquiry asks: who am I? Where do I fit in the big scheme of things? To what

[1] Mark Edmundson relates a conversation with a humanities professor who explains, "'every generation of humanities teacher has worked, subtly and quietly, to make students into more progressive people. We've encouraged them to be skeptical about religious belief. We've helped them to be more open-minded. . . .'" (85).

do I commit myself? How do I live—and why? As we know, these are precisely the questions that are embedded in the great literature we teach.

But aren't all these difficulties solved in the classrooms of a Christian college where, presumably, we share "one faith, one hope, one Lord" (or "one Lord, one faith, one baptism," if you prefer Ephesians to the choral anthem), where we put off worldly things and might even pray before we begin class (I don't, by the way)? Let me say at the outset that a shared worldview has tangible advantages for both professor and student. It's one of the things I most enjoy about teaching at a religiously-affiliated college. Community in the classroom may be formed in many ways, but a classroom, even a curriculum, that is grounded in a shared worldview may constitute an effective discourse community, where shared meaning emerges out of shared commitments and mutual understanding. As Flannery O'Connor writes about her fiction, "When you can assume that your audience holds the same beliefs you do, you can relax a little and use more normal means of talking to it" (34). And we may share a stock of stories—from the Bible, especially—as well as some shared reading practices, a matter to which we will return. It has been a serious responsibility and a deep delight for me to teach students whom I run across not just in the grocery store but also in church. These communal connections are not a feature only of Christian colleges, but they do form an important aspect of the Christian college experience.

Yet you may be surprised to learn that students at a religiously-based institution may resist reading literature in terms of religion. Like many of us, they tend to compartmentalize—they read the Bible one way (for meaning; for instruction) and literature for another (for

enjoyment; for critique and analysis). Neglecting the interdependence of these two, they read the Bible literally and literature figuratively. Part of my goal for them is a bit of transference: to invite them to read Scripture using the tools of analysis they learn in their classes and to explore the religious implications of the literature they read, even when the subjects are not explicitly religious. A second issue is this regard is that students who choose to attend a Christian college tend to be more settled in their beliefs than the average college student. They've been churched, schooled, and catechized, many of them, into a fairly determined set of beliefs, and there are pressures—from parents, from constituents, from boards, from administration, even from themselves—to protect those beliefs rather than allowing them to be challenged, adapted, or expanded. This is good—they know where they are coming from—and bad—they tend to scribe narrow circles. Don't get me wrong, I'm not trying to play the role I critiqued above and prompt my students to question their faith. Rather, I want to invite them into a deeper understanding of the implications of their beliefs for their academic inquiry and for their lives. I have a colleague, a wonderful, gentle teacher of philosophy about whom students on evaluations regularly ask, "Is this guy really a Christian?" mostly because he asks open-ended questions about beliefs and actions. Appearing not to know, or not dispensing wisdom, is suspect. Is this why I usually find a way to tell my students I'm a seminary drop out? One year of seminary training and I "saw the light," abandoning Greek and hermeneutics for Early Modern English and literary criticism. I leave it to them to figure out how far I've come.

To take just one example, many of my students are most happy to recur to a medical or psychological explanation of Margery Kempe's spirituality rather than to see her as touched by

God. Of course, hers is a complicated case, and surely psychology and sociology are not irrelevant to them. But Margery offers a challenge not only to the religious status quo of her contemporaries, but also to that of my students. And so we talk about the power and autonomy Margery gains through her religious expression but also about debates in their own churches about the role of women. And we consider, to invoke the gospel song, that "Maybe God's Tryin' Tell you Somethin.'"

So I have attempted to describe in general terms the situation of religion in the Early British Literature classroom. Let me use the time I have left to suggest three models for approaching the topic. These models are not discrete boxes—they overlap and complement each other. They are: religion as *context;* religion as *framework*, and religion as *response*.[2]

Few would dispute that religion forms an essential *context* for reading and understanding much of Early British Literature. Indeed, Brian Cummings declares, "Without reference to religion, the study of early modern writing is incomprehensible" (6). The same could be said of all Early British Lit. Thus it is illuminating to recognize that the Venerable Bede is writing a sort of Acts of the Apostles for the English church, and that when he incorporates the story of Caedmon, he is using him to describe—maybe even influence—the transition from pagan to Christian in his own context. Also, it is crucial to measure Chaucer's portraits of the clergy against his own religious setting. In my experience, Chaucer's methods of comparison,

---

[2] David I. Smith, whose formulations influence my own, explores four "models of Christian reading": allegorical, perspectival (my "framework" model), charitable, and responsive (10).

juxtaposition, and gradation do most of this work for us—it's hard to miss the rich context he invokes (though my students tend to bring an anti-Catholic bias to the table). Furthermore, it's not at all irrelevant to put passages from Calvin next to Sidney's description of the poet's "erected wit" and "infected will," and Hamlet's Lutheran leanings are worth exploring. Finally, uncovering the fault lines between Milton's God and the Gospels'—but also the deep scriptural engagement of the writer—form the work of reading *Paradise Lost*. By the way, it takes my students between 1 and 3 books to get over feeling that they are reading something very close to blasphemy. Religion as context, then, while it may elicit the "duh" response as being unremarkably what we do to explore literature in an era where Christianity and literature inevitably overlap, is a fruitful and necessary aspect of Early British Literature. It can be applied as a thin wash or as a thick plaster, I suppose, but it is certainly part of the décor.

Things get more interesting when we consider religion a *framework* for studying literature. Let's be clear first about what I am not talking about. I'm not talking about measuring literature against a religious yardstick. Nor am I talking about prioritizing certain kinds of literature that "fit" a framework. I occasionally get asked by a prospective student (more likely, her parents) whether we read only "Christian literature" or "other kinds." I have to listen carefully to decipher the assumptions behind the question, not that this changes my answer. Those that expect a curriculum that focuses on C.S. Lewis and John Bunyan (both of whom I teach on occasion) at the expense of, say Chaucer and Shakespeare (good Christians, both, I'd say) usually thank me very much and move on.

By framework, I mean a way of seeing, a perspective, a point of view—a worldview. In other words, it comprises a set of assumptions—call them beliefs—about reality and (especially relevant to studying literature) human beings. These may be summarized in a catechism or a statement of faith; they may be expressed in a scripture; they may be deeply held or merely what one has been told. But mostly, they are the set of beliefs that are foundational to how one lives. For you see, most persons of faith—with all due attention to history, context, and culture—hold to some fundamental beliefs which are unchanged over time and space. These include the nature of God as, in the Christian faith, a being both Three and One, for instance; they also include a belief that humans are radically fallen but redeemable through grace; and they include an understanding that death is not the end and that the universe has a *telos*—not an end but a goal. Please note that this is not the same as fundamentalism, a static approach to the 'fundamentals" which means that history, context, culture have virtually nothing to do with belief.

So one important way that religion functions in my classroom as a framework is that I invite my students to put their belief in conversation with what they read. I encourage that process to be generative: that is, I ask students to be alert for ways in which their understanding of human beings—fallen but graced, let's say—show up in Shakespeare. As Nicholas Wolterstorff puts it, "our narrative identities lead us to notice things and believe things which otherwise would almost certainly go unnoticed or unbelieved" (quoted in Smith 56). David I. Smith, who is explicating Wolterstorff, calls this "perspectival reading, in which the

meaning of texts is weighed against the backdrop of Christian convictions" (10).[3] I'm not looking for confirmation so much as discovery, for students to be on the lookout not only for the truths to be found in literature and the arts but also for the truths and assumptions they bring to their reading. So, for instance, if Augustine is right that we are restless until we rest in God, what does that mean for a fictional character who seems quite content? At the risk of reifying dualistic assumptions, I sometimes prompt them with Frederick Buechner's observation that "The world speaks of the holy in the only language it knows, which is a worldly language." Traversing that ground is a way to bring one's worldview to light—to run it up against the power of imaginative literature to get it right.

I do not wish to neglect devotional reading—reading poetry or prose, as in a sonnet or sermon by Donne or an essay by Annie Dillard—for the purpose of spiritual reflection and instruction. I suppose anything can be read in this way: after all, the theologian Karl Barth declared, "God may speak to us through Russian Communism, a flute concerto, a blossoming shrub, or a dead dog. We do well to listen to Him if He really does" (CD I.i.55). I tend to avoid greeting card poetry and cereal boxes, but I would hate to put parameters around devotional reading (or walking or seeing or hearing). Much of what we consider great literature was written out of devotional motives and for devotional ends: we think of Julian of Norwich, "The Second Shepherd's Play," Wyatt's Psalm translations, Donne's sonnets, sermons, and

---

[3] Smith adds,

> This does not mean that no one else could ever see what the Christian notices, or that the Christian will be unfailingly perceptive, or even that the Christian might not be less likely to perceive some things; it merely suggests that is becomes more likely, all other things being equal, that certain things will be noticed and believed by readers who bring Christian expectations to bear in their reading. (56)

Devotions. These texts were written, at least in part, as acts of devotion and they are, like other forms of religious art, designed to evoke a devotional response. Donne's "Good Friday, 1613. Riding Westward" is my usual classroom reading on the occasion mentioned; among my goals is that it reminds us of other ways to read. And if you are an unrepentant Calvinist like me, believing all life is religious, then seeking the spiritual dimension of any text is a natural move. In addition, our literature is full of potent reading moments, from Augustine's "*Tolle, legere*," to Luther's discovery of grace while reading Romans,[4] to Bunyan's Christian "clothed with Raggs, standing in a certain place, with his face from his own House, a Book in his hand, and a great burden upon his back" (10).

However, the kind of "spiritually engaged reading" I wish to focus on is broader than purely devotional reading, and here I rely on the interesting work of David I. Smith, John Shortt, and Alan Jacobs as represented in the collection of essays titled *Teaching Spiritually Engaged Reading*, as well as on Jacobs's book, *A Theology of Reading*. As Smith and Shortt point out, the Christian tradition has encouraged reading, particularly as a means to reading Scripture well: the story of Protestantism is closely tied to the story of reading—reading printed texts, reading aloud, reading to one's family. It has also focused on what is appropriate reading. Less attention has been paid to what is perhaps the most important aspect of reading—how we read (5). Here is how Smith and Shortt put it:

[4] Cummings says of Luther, "The story of his religion is a story of reading and writing" (9).

> Believers grow in, clarify, inform, and correct their faith through acts of reading, whether of Scripture or of other texts in which orientation is sought or found and the qualities that characterize those acts of reading (hurried, reflective, nuanced, careless, self-serving) can both result from and contribute to the shape of a person's faith. (5)

First the claim: readers may put their reading to the use of spiritual formation or growth. They may read not only to know but to grow. The challenge of inviting ourselves and our students to this kind of reading are deep, and not all of them are religious. Coverage of texts, eras, and movements competes with engaging writers both on their own terms and on ours. Breadth versus depth—the old song. So does the desire to impart and receive information (Do your students prefer to learn about a text rather than to engage it? Is it easier to lecture than to give discussion over to students?). Furthermore, the answers our culture teaches us to seek tend to be scientific or technological (there must be an app for that!), rather than literary, artistic, or spiritual.

Yet we all know that deep engagement with literature is formative, and it important for us not to let the pressures of coverage and analysis overwhelm these effects. One approach is to encourage repeated reading. In one of my classes, we re-read Donne's "Holy Sonnets" at least five times. And while it is true that analysis is the goal (there's a paper involved, and on different days the focus is on text and order, say, or secondary readings), I do encourage students to read the sonnets in different ways and in different orders, hoping they will engage the poems on various levels.

As Smith and Shortt point out, particular reading practices lend themselves to "spiritually engaged reading":

> Qualities such as humility, charity, patience, and justice are goals of Christian maturation, basic ways of approaching the world whose scope and validity extend to how we approach the written words of others. . . . Encounter with texts can therefore be a place where such virtues are practiced, and perhaps also where they can be developed. Reading itself can be a form of spiritual discipline . . . . (6)

This is what Alan Jacobs (Baylor U via Wheaton) means by the "hermeneutics of love," the subtitle of his book, *A Theology of Reading*. Beginning his approach with Augustine's dictum that any interpretation of Scripture which points to love of God and neighbor is valid,[5] and invoking both Bakhtin and Wayne Booth (the latter with reservation), Jacobs suggests

> It is [a] commitment to faithfulness that we must bring to our lives as readers if we would govern our reading by the law of love. This is a debt that we owe to all the books we read, because those books become, for the duration of our reading

[5] Augustine writes,

> Whoever, therefore, thinks that he understands the diving Scriptures or any part of them in such a way that does not build the double love of god and of our neighbor does not understand at all. Whoever finds a lesson there useful to the building of charity, even though he has not said what the author may be shown to have intended in that place, has not been deceived, nor is he lying in any way. (On Christian Doctrine)

> and perhaps long afterward, our neighbors—as do, in subtly differing ways, the books' characters and authors. (64)[6]

Thus for Jacobs (and friends), reading is attuned to living—one reads as one attempts to live, and indeed one may practice (in the full sense of the word) one's beliefs in the approach one takes to reading. What if we treat books, and their authors, as neighbors, say like someone who shows up on our doorstep with a pear pie, saying, "Here; I made this for you." The virtues of love (*agape*, to use the New Testament word), which comprise humility, selflessness, and believing/acting in the best interest of the other put us in a position to receive what we read. This approach does not make us passive recipients (we may enjoy, tolerate, or even dislike the pie), nor does it invite us to appropriate texts solely for our use (we don't, I hope, hoard the pie, or re-gift it as our own). As C.S. Lewis puts it, "The first demand any work of any art makes upon us is surrender. Look. Listen. Receive. Get yourself out of the way" (19).

And so I am back to Mark Edmundson's thesis. Edmundson, who calls himself "a longtime agnostic" (27), argues that "A liberal [arts] education uses books to rejuvenate, reaffirm, replenish, revise, overwhelm, replace, in some cases (alas) even help begin to

---

[6] Jacobs's perspective is familiar to anyone who has read C.S. Lewis's *An Experiment in Criticism*:

> Good reading, therefore, though it is not essential an affectional or moral or intellectual activity, has something in common with all three. I love we escape from our self into one other. In the moral sphere, every act of justice or charity involves putting ourselves in the other person's place and thus transcending our own competitive particularity. In coming to understand anything we are rejecting the facts as they are for us in favour of the facts as they are. The primary impulse of each is to maintain and aggrandize himself. The secondary impulse is to go out of the self, to correct its provincialism and heal its loneliness. In love, in virtue, in the pursuit of knowledge, and in the reception of the arts we are doing this. Obviously this process can be described either as an enlargement or as a temporary annihilation of the self. But that is an old paradox; "he that loseth his life shall save it." (138)

generate the web of words that we're defined by" (31). Spiritually engaged reading does not need to be confined to classrooms on Christian college campuses. Wherever we allow—rather, encourage—using literature to prompt questions about who we are, whose we are, and where we are going, we are engaged in in the kind of formation that religion calls for. This used to be called Christian Humanism, and while these two words have gone their separate ways, perhaps setting them down for a long talk together, let's day with Erasmus as moderator, is not such a bad idea.

Robert J. De Smith
Dordt College

Works Cited

Augustine. *On Christian Doctrine*. Trans. and Introd. D.W. Robertson, Jr.. Indianapolis: Bobbs, 1958. Print. Library of the Liberal Arts.

Barth, Karl and George Thomas Thomson. *The Doctrine of the Word of God: Prolegomena to Church Dogmatics, Being Volume I, Part 1.* New York: Scribner, 1936. Print.

Buechner, Frederick. "Emmanuel—a Christmas Article." *Frederick Buechner Blog.* Frederick Buechner Center. n.d. Web. 10 March 2016.

Bunyan, John. *The Pilgrim's Progress*. 1678. Ed and intro. W. R. Owens. New Ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008. Print.

Cummings, Brian. *The Literary Culture of the Renaissance: Grammar and Grace*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002. Print.

Edmundson, Mark. *Why Read*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2004. Print.

Jacobs, Alan. *A Theology of Reading: The Hermeneutics of Love*. Boulder: Westview-Perseus, 2001. Print.

Lewis, C.S. *An Experiment in Criticism*. 1967. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2013. Print. Canto Classics.

O'Connor, Flannery. *Mystery and Manners: Occasional Prose*. Ed. Sally Fitzgerald and Robert Fitzgerald. New York: Farrar, 1969. Print.

Smith, David I., John Shortt, and John Sullivan. *Teaching Spiritually Engaged Reading*. Spec. issue of *Journal of Education and Christian Belief* 11.2 (2007) 1-112. Print.

Fortune and Forgiveness in *The Tempest*

Prospero's remarkable act of forgiveness of his enemies Alonso, Sebastian, and Antonio in Act 5 of Shakespeare's *The Tempest* has long fascinated readers and watchers of the play. It has also occupied critics, who have scoured the play looking for the reasons that might lie behind Prospero's virtuous turn. This is a man, after all, who spends much of the play in diverse states of wrath, aggravated by or infuriated with not only Alonso, Sebastian, and Antonio, but also, at various times, Caliban, Ariel, Ferdinand, and even his daughter Miranda. This fury has been amply demonstrated by Joseph Summers in his article "The Anger of Prospero." Some scholars have attributed Prospero's willingness to forgive his enemies in Act 5 to Montaigne's influence on Shakespeare—in particular, by Arthur Kirsch in his essay "Virtue, Vice, and Compassion in Montaigne and *The Tempest*." A contrary position taken by Amanda Mabillard is that Prospero's forgiveness is not truly a full act of Christian pardon but only the appearance of it. This latter sentiment—that Prospero is not a genuinely virtuous, forgiving person—is also echoed in much of the Post-Colonial and New Historicist interpretations of the play, interpretations that, in Kirsch's words, attempt to "falsify Prospero's ostensible motives and to signify his intractably tyrannical, if not colonialist, mentality" (342).[1] I shall argue that, not only is Prospero's

[1] Kirsch gives a good summary of the main promulgators of the colonialist viewpoint on page 351, note 8. Harold Bloom, in his book *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human*, gives an even harsher critique of the colonialist reading of the play:

> [I]deology drives the bespoilers of *The Tempest*. Caliban, a poignant but cowardly (and murderous) half-human creature [. . .], has become an African-Caribbean heroic Freedom Fighter. This is not even a weak misreading; anyone who arrives at that view is simply not interested in reading the

forgiveness authentic (something, in fact, that I shall treat that as a given), but also that what enables Prospero to forgive is something quite other than what has heretofore been recognized in the scholarship: the influence of fortune and the stars.

To begin with, there is no doubt that Prospero's position on the wheel of fortune is at its apex. We find this out from Prospero himself quite early in the play, during the long exposition in the second scene of Act 1, when Prospero is, after twelve years, finally divulging to Miranda where she and Prospero came from and how they ended up on the island. During the exposition, Prospero explains to Miranda that Prospero's brother, Antonio, and the King of Naples and his brother, Alonso and Sebastian, conspired to strip Prospero of his Dukedom and then tried to murder him and Miranda by putting them in a rotting boat and floating it out to sea. Because these men are returning by ship from North Africa, where Alonso's daughter has been married off, Prospero takes advantage of the fact that they are passing nearby to raise a storm and bring them ashore. Miranda asks her father, "And now I pray you, sir, / For still 'tis beating in my mind, your reason / For raising this sea-storm?" (Shakespeare 1.2.175-177). Prospero responds as follows:

> By accident most strange, bountiful Fortune
>
> (Now my dear Lady) hath mine enemies
>
> Brought to this shore; and by my prescience

> play at all. Marxists, multiculturalists, feminists, *nouveau* historicists—the usual suspects—know their causes but not Shakespeare's plays. (662)

Burton Raffel goes so far as to say that the fashionable post-colonialist readings by critics such as Stephen Greenblatt and Eric Cheyfitz are "quite simply [. . .] defective thinking" (Raffel xxii).

I find my zenith doth depend upon

A most auspicious star, whose influence

If now I court not, but omit, my fortunes

Will ever after droop. (1.2.177-184)

In his famous book *The Elizabethan World Picture*, E. M. W. Tillyard explains that the stars and fortune are inextricably bound together in the Elizabethan mind: "Though the images used to express the sway of the stars and of fortune are different, the two influences on the world are the same. For the sway of fortune the image of the wheel is constant both in literature and in picture. . . . [I]t was quite taken for granted that the stars dictated the general mutability of sublunary things, and that fortune was a part of this mutability applying to mankind alone" (52-53).

Keeping this in mind, a close reading of Prospero's speech reveals much. First, we notice in the first line that "Fortune" is capitalized, telling us that he is referring to the goddess Fortune, or *Fortuna,* to use the Latin term. This helps to explain why he refers to her as his "Lady" in the next line—and not just Lady, but "dear" Lady, implying that she is working to his advantage at this point, but will only continue to do so if he metaphorically "court" her rather than "omit," or neglect, her.[2]

[2] This allusion to the medieval courtly love tradition further shows how Prospero is under the sway or power of fortune, for, as C. S. Lewis has pointed out, the lover in the courtly love tradition becomes the vassal of his lady, creating a situation in which the lover engages in "*Frauendienst,*" or "the service of ladies" (Lewis 9). It should also be mentioned that the word "dear" can be taken several ways. I have suggested that Prospero calls Fortune "dear" because she is at this point in time working to Prospero's advantage. But "dear" could also relate specifically to his metaphorical courtly love-attachment to her as his "lady."

The connection between fortune (or Fortune) and the stars is made very clear by Prospero in his description of how he has found himself at the "zenith," the high point of his fortunes, a high point provided by "a most auspicious star." The star is as favorable as his high point in his fortunes. As we have seen, Tillyard suggests that the effect of fortune and the stars are really one and the same, and thus positive influence is flowing from both for Prospero at this point in time. However, Prospero is aware that he must seize the moment of this high point in his fortunes and the auspiciousness of his star or the wheel will keep turning and he will lose his opportunity to act; as he puts it, he will lose this "influence" if he does not woo the goddess Fortune *now* by disregarding her, and his fortunes will "ever after droop," or descend.[3] The stars are in alignment for him; Fortune's Wheel is at the perfect point. He must act immediately, during the four-hour period in which the play takes place, or lose the chance he has been given.[4]

But what is he going to do? If his enemies have been brought to his shore, it is hard for any audience (including, perhaps, Miranda herself) not to assume that vengeance will be his course—especially after hearing him describing to Miranda his enemies' "treacherous" (1.2.128) actions—actions that he also calls at one point "unnatural" (5.1.79). As the play winds about toward its climax in Act 5, we witness the fact that Prospero is in an excellent position to exact revenge on his enemies because of the magical power that he maintains over them, with the help of the spirit Ariel. Indeed, Prospero—through Ariel—places a magic spell on them in Act 3:

---

[3] I am indebted to Burton Raffel for much of this glossing, page 21, notes 195, 198, 199, 200, 201, and 202.
[4] The fact that Prospero is under the influence or power of the stars and fortune suggests that he is not quite in as much *total* control of the situation on the island as is often assumed by critics.

"My high charms work, / And these, mine enemies, are all knit up / In their distractions. They now are in my power; / And in these fits I leave them" (3.3.88-91). Furthermore, his reasons for vengeance and punishment only increase as the play progresses, for Antonio and Sebastian plot—and attempt to complete—the murder of Sebastian's brother Alonso, the king of Naples (and Gonzalo as well) at the end of Act 2. Ariel makes it clear that Prospero is aware of the plot when he states "My master through his art foresees the danger" (2.1.293).[5]

So by the time the play reaches its final act, Prospero has more than ample cause for retribution. And yet it is in Act 5 where Prospero's turn occurs, and he makes the conscious decision to forgive his enemies. Burton Raffel reminds us that forgiveness is "the final and, for a Christian, the basic reformatory act" (xxviii), and Shakespeare expresses Prospero's forgiveness in these important lines:

> Though with their high wrongs I am struck to th' quick,
> Yet with my nobler reason 'gainst my fury
> Do I take part. The rarer action is
> In virtue than in vengeance. They being penitent,
> The sole drift of my purpose doth extend
> Not a frown further. (5.1.25-30)[6]

[5] This "Foreseeing," along with the "Providence" and "prescience" to which Prospero refers in Act 1 (1.2.159, 179), is a part of an important theme of foreknowledge and foresight within the play (remembering that "providence" comes from Latin *pro* + *videre*, "to see before").

[6] It is worth noting that line 25, the first line of the quotation, is quite a metrical *tour de force*, for the iambic pentameter line is made up of all monosyllabic words. And there are, in fact, eleven monosyllabic words, the penultimate word "th'" apparently being intended to elide with "quick" to make one syllable; with the stress obviously on "quick," we can assume it is not intended to be read as an eleven-syllable line with a feminine ending.

But by what agency does Prospero find the power and the will to perform this basic reformatory act of forgiveness? Prospero reveals the answer himself: He is able to temper his passion toward his enemies and his desire for revenge by exercising his reason. And reason, as every good Elizabethan in the audience would have known, is superior to passion, it is "nobler" as Prospero puts it, because reason was believed to be God-given and what separates humans from the beasts. Indeed, one has a natural moral obligation to temper passion with reason, for if one does not, one becomes mere beast, as is evident in so many of Shakespeare's plays.

But despite the fact that one is under moral obligation to temper passion with reason, it is far easier said than done—again as is evident in so many of Shakespeare's plays. The fact is that Shakespeare's characters do *not* always temper passion with reason. Prospero's ability to do so takes us back again to Tillyard, who writes the following in regards to Elizabethan thought:

> It is undoubted that the stars sway the mind to certain states by acting on our physical predispositions. If a man is weak in will and naturally choleric, for instance, the stars may greatly influence him. Such a man may forget that reason should rule the passions and, prompted by stellar influence, may give way to them. (57)

But this does not happen to Prospero; he does *not* give way to his passions. He rather rules his passions—his "fury," as he calls them—by exercising his "nobler reason." And why? Because he is not under malign influence of the stars but under favorable influence, as we saw in Act 1, where he asserts that he has reached the apex of his fortunes and is currently existing under a "most auspicious star" (1.2.182). So while it may seem as though he is, for instance, naturally

choleric, which might explain his irritability throughout much of the play, he is in fact not weak in will so as to give way to his anger but strong in will because of the auspicious nature of the stars in their influence on him at this particular moment in his life, this very day especially. It is therefore the alignment of the stars and his being at the high point in his fortunes that allow him to temper his passion with his reason and thus forgive his enemies. I would argue even further that what therefore keeps *The Tempest* a comedy and not cascading into tragedy is that Prospero finds in the stars the power to have the will to forgive and not give in to the temptation of retribution. Surely it is harder to forgive our enemies than to punish them, and on this particular day, Prospero's position on the Wheel of Fortune has enabled him to lift himself—and thus the play—above tragedy by giving him the strength to forgive. Had his enemies arrived on any other day, the outcome may have been different. Scholars assert that *The Tempest* is, of course, not a straight comedy but a tragi-comedy, meaning that it has elements of both comedy and tragedy in it.[7] But what I shall call Shakespeare's Will-to-Comedy has its genesis in providing Prospero with auspicious stars on this one special day. There are, of course, many ways in which the play could have lapsed into tragedy—the various murder plots could have come to fruition, such as Antonio and Sebastian's over Alonso; Caliban, Stephano, and Trinculo's over Prospero; and then there are Caliban's and then Stephano's plans to capture, rape, and impregnate Miranda. But coming out of the devastation of the period of the great tragedies—which scholars such as Stephen Greenblatt suggest very well may represent a dark time in Shakespeare's own

[7] Harold Bloom, for instance, asserts this (Raffel 137).

life[8]—Shakespeare clearly wanted to end his career on a note of reconciliation and forgiveness, as is seen in the late romances including *The Tempest* but also *Cymbeline, Pericles,* and *The Winter's Tale*. To make sure that *The Tempest* ultimately came out as comedy and not tragedy, Shakespeare made sure that Prospero's position on the Wheel of Fortune was not star-crossed, thus giving Prospero the will and the power to rise above his very palpable fury before it overwhelmed and poisoned his reason.

Nicholas Wallerstein
Black Hills State University

[8] See, for instance, chapters 10 and 11 in *Will in the World*.

Works Cited

Bloom, Harold. *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human*. New York: Riverhead, 1998. Print.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Will in the World: How Shakespeare Became Shakespeare*. New York: Norton, 2004. Print.

Kirsch, Arthur. "Virtue, Vice, and Compassion in Montaigne and *The Tempest*." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 37.2 Tudor and Stuart Drama (Spring, 1997): 337-352. *JSTOR*. Web. 23 May 2015.

Lewis, C. S. *The Allegory of Love*. New York: Galaxy, U of Oxford P, 1963. Print.

Mabillard, Amanda. "Forgiveness and Reconciliation in Shakespeare's *The Tempest*." *Shakespeare Online* 15 Dec. 2010: n. pag. Web. 31 May 2015.

Raffel, Burton, ed. *The Tempest*. By William Shakespeare. New Haven: Yale UP, 2006. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest*. Norton Critical Edition. Ed. Peter Hulme and William H. Sherman. New York: Norton, 2004. Print.

Summers, Joseph H. "The Anger of Prospero." *Michigan Quarterly Review* 12 (1973): 116-35. *Michigan Publishing*. Web. 26 May 2015.

Tillyard, E. M. W. *The Elizabethan World Picture*. New York: Vintage, 1959. Print.

Blind Hary's *Wallace* and Scottish Identity

One thing is clear: Neither the thirteenth-century hero William Wallace nor Blind Hary's poem composed sometime in the 1470s created Scottish identity. Identities arise from shared notions of ethnicity, language, class, religion, history, kingship, government, folklore. Literary texts (and criticism) can and do, however, play a role in identity construction.[1] Identities are not like hats: one can wear several at a time without looking silly. Blind Hary's poem survives in only one manuscript, a copy by John Ramsay in 1488, and it was apparently heard or read by members of the court of James IV. Chepman and Myllar printed the poem in 1508 or 1509, making it one of the first books ever printed in Scotland, and its popularity has hardly waned since then.[2] The opening lines of the poem reveal Hary's nationalist agenda:

> Our antecessowris that we suld of reide
> And hald in mynde thar nobille worthi deid
> We lat ourslide throw werray sleuthfulnes,
> And castis ws euir till vthir besynes.
> Till honour Ennymyis is our haile entent.

---

[1] See the introduction and chapter 1 in Hall, *The Role of Medieval Scottish Poetry in Creating Scottish Identity*.

[2] See William Beattie's facsimile edition of *The Chepman and Myllar Prints.* See also the surviving Chepman and Myllar fragments of *The Wallace* which Sir William Craigie prints in *The Actis and Deidis of Schir William Wallace. 1570*.

It has beyne seyne in thir tymys bywent,

Our ald Ennemys cummyn of Saxonys blud,

That neuyr ȝeit to Scotland wald do gud . . . . (Hary I.1-8)

Hary's hero fights what he calls a "righteous" war, for which he shall be honored in heaven:

He is Wallace, defendour off Scotland,

For rychtwys wer that he tuk apon hand.

Thar rychtwysnes is lowyt our the lawe,

Tharfor in hewyn he sall that honour hawe. (Hary XII.1285-88)

For Hary, Scottish and English blood clash in essentially racist terms: "It was his lyff and maist part of his fude / To se thame sched the byrnand Sothroun blude" (Hary II.9-10). As R. James Goldstein has argued, Blind Hary seems obsessed with blood as a signifier of race: "The perpetual enmity between Scot and Saxon, based on the difference of blood, is viewed as a constant of history, something beyond argument" (Goldstein *The Matter of Scotland* 233).[3] Even Hary's pronoun usage highlights racial differences between Scots and English: when an Englishman calls Wallace "Thow Scot," he winds up dead; while Wallace calls Englishmen (including Edward I) "thow" and backs his language up with martial superiority. Hary's Wallace sends Edward I a rhetorically brilliant letter, villainizing him as a false, thieving usurper:

Thow reyffar king chargis me throw cas

That I suld cum and put me in *thi* grace.

[3] See also Goldstein's "Blind Hary's Myth of Blood."

Gyff I gaynstand *thow* hechtis till hyng me.

I wow to God and euir I may tak *the*

Thow sall be hangyt, an exempill to geiff

To kingis off reyff als lang as I may leiff.

Thow profferis me *thi* wage for till haiff.

I *the* defy, power and all the laiff

At helpis *the* her off this fals nacioun.

Will god *thow* sall be put off this regioune,

Or de tharfor, contrar thocht *thow* had suorn.

Thow sall ws se or ix houris to-morn

Battaill to gyff magra off all *thi* kyn,

For falsly *thow* sekis our rewme with-in. (Hary 6.381-94; my italics)

Hary, himself, was not a member of the landed gentry, but he had friends (Sir William Wallace of Craigie and Sir James of Liddale whom he names in the poem) who were ambitious nobles and Scottish patriots during James IV's reign (Hary XII.1443-44). William Dunbar mentions Blind Hary in his "Lament for the Makaris" (line 69), and Hary recieved a small paycheck along with other entertainers according to the Lord High Treasurer's records of James IV's court, all testaments to Hary's popularity in Scotland even within his own lifetime.[4] It was the theologian and philosopher John Mair in his *Historia Majoris Brittaniae* (published in 1521

[4] See 1: xxvi-xxix in McDiarmid's introduction to *Hary's Wallace*.

in France) who established Hary's identity as a sort of Scottish Homer and first identified him as the author of a great vernacular poem on Wallace:

> There was one Henry, blind from his birth, who, in the time of my childhood, fabricated a whole book about William Wallace . . . . I however can give but a partial credence to such writings as these. This Henry used to recite his tales in the households of the nobles, and thereby got the food and clothing that he deserved. (270)

Mair discredits the blind, vagrant bard's "fabricated" history; nevertheless, he relies on Hary's poem as a source for several chapters (Book IV, chapters13-15), following Hary's account of Wallace's invasion of England and Edward I's refusal to engage in battle with him. Mair also includes his own account of Hary's sensational meeting of Bruce and Wallace after Falkirk in which Bruce urges Wallace to submit to Edward in exchange for title and lands, an urging which Wallace refuses. Blind Hary has Wallce scold Bruce:

> "Throuch thi tresson, that suld be our rycht king,
> That willfully dystroyis thin awn off-spryng."(Hary XII.457-72)
>
> "Schamys thow nocht that thow neuir ȝet did gud,
> Thow renygat deuorar off thi blud?" (Hary XII.491-92)

Bruce returns after this exchange to the English camp and eats dinner without washing up:

> Bludyt was all his wapynys and his weid.
> Sotheroun lordys scornyt him in termys rud.

Ane said, “Behald, ȝon Scot ettis his awin blud.” (Hary XII.534-36)

“This blud is myn. That hurtis most my thocht.”
Sadly the Bruce than in his mind remordyt
Thai wordis suth Wallace had him recordyt.
Than rewyt he sar. Fra resoun had him knawin
At blud and land suld all lik beyn his awin. (Hary XII.540-44)

The conversation between Wallace and the young Robert Bruce, yet another of Hary’s fabrications, expresses his own patriotic feelings about Scottish blood and sovereignty, with the righteous Wallace inspiring Bruce to embrace his royal duty to the Scottish people, their people.[5]

John Mair, however, is more interested in the idea of Wallace’s “just war,” rather than a war between two races. Matthew McDiarmid calls Mair a “patriotically biased historian” (Hary 1.xxxii), but while Mair clearly loved his native country, his *History of Greater Britain* is a “unionist” work, emphasizing “common ‘British’ character” (Williamson 101). Mair’s “‘Greater Britain’ is the united kingdom of Scotland and England” (Broadie, *Tradition* 22) which would eventually become a political reality with the Union of Crowns in 1603. Mair lectured in Paris for twenty years before returning to Scotland in 1518 to take over as Principal of Glasgow University where he wrote his *History* before once again returning to Paris three years later to

[5] The younger Bruce (later Robert I) did not fight at Falkirk. See Nicholson’s or Barrow’s accounts.

have his *History* printed. Mair's lectures in France were highly acclaimed and influenced numerous sixteenth-century thinkers and Reformers: Calvin, Loyola, Rabelais, Buchanan, Knox, and Erasmus are all known to have attended.[6]

Arthur Williamson believes that "In part," Mair's *History* "clearly intended to justify the Scottish wars of independence, but, it also seems, he intended to justify political changes he sought in contemporary Scotland" (98). Mair writes, "I do not forget that it may be lawful to fight when the cause is just; but every war must give occasions of excesses of all kinds of sins, and make them as if they had not been. I will not insist on the point whether in his [Wallace's] resistance to Edward he acted aright" (4, ch.15). This last statement, however, runs counter to Mair's own statements concerning Wallace's "Scottish courage," though he tries to suggest that courage was "not uniquely Scottish but characteristic of 'both the British kingdoms' . . . " (Williamson 100). For Mair, Wallace stood not against England as a whole, but aginst the tyrrany of Edward I. Nations, and the kings and nobles who governed them, Mair believed, were subject to natural law and divine will (Williamson 98). Wallace was simply a man chosen to fulfill this divine will and to defy the tyrrany of Edward I. He had, in fact, "acted aright" by Mair's own definition. Hary's Scottish racist or nationalist sentiments were necessarily downplayed in Mair's own work which sought a closer friendship between Scotland and England.[7] Individual national sentiments might still exist, but the English and Scottish nations could unite and become an even "greater Britain."

---

[6] See Broadie *Tradition* 22 and Broadie *George Lokert* 13.
[7] See Broadie *George Lokert* 14-15 and 18-19.

Following Mair's lead, other Scottish historians of the sixteenth century also used Hary's poem as source material. In his verse history, *The Buik of the Croniclis of Scotland*, William Stewart (1535) refers to "Blind Hareis buke" as a reliable historical source apart from one or two minor errors. Both Boece and Bellenden silently borrow from Hary's poem, as did Mair's pupil George Buchanan.[8] Blind Hary's anti-English sentiments, however, progressively eroded, replaced as much as could be managed by a focus on Wallace's righteousness. Likewise, claims of English feudal superiority in the mid-1500s began to give way to demands that England and Scotland should unite under one true religion. Works such as *A Declaration, Conteynyng the Just Causes and Consyderations, of this Present Warre with the Scottis* printed by Thomas Berthelet in 1542, which sought to justify English military aggression against the Scots, were followed by statements of Anglo-Scottish harmony and the common bonds of race, language, geography, and religion found in *A Declaration of Christe and His Offyce* by John Hooper in 1547 and Somerset's *An Epistle or Exhortacion, to Unitee & Peace* in 1548. Also in 1547, Edinburgh merchant James Henrisoun printed *An Exhortacion to the Scottes to Conforme themselves to the Honourable, Expedient & Godly Union betweene the Realmes of England and Scotland*, citing, once again, racial, geographical, and religious bonds between Scotland and England.[9] Still, in 1605, two years after James VI had become James I of England and Scotland, historian David Hume of Godscroft felt compelled defend the positives of the union in his *De Unione*

[8] See Alford.
[9] Ibid.

Insulae Britannicae. Clearly, Scottish nationalism remained firmly rooted in some minds even after the Union of Crowns.

In 1570 or 1571, Robert Lekpreuik printed his edition of *The Actis and Deidis of Schir William Wallace* for Edinburgh bookseller Henrie Charteris.[10] Lekpreuik published more works than any other printer in Scotland in the sixteenth century, including collections of ballads and poetry, broadsides, and theological writings, and Colin Clair notes that Lekpreuik "received considerable assistance from the leaders of the reformed church, and the General Assembly of December, 1562, awarded him, 'for printing of the psalms . . . twa hundreth pounds . . . ' In 1569-70 he received a further fifty pounds for 'the great zeale and love he beares to serve the Kirk at all times'" (Clair 123). It was for "political and religious reasons," that Lekpreuik made certain alterations in his text of *The Wallace*, especially the Protestant editorial in Book 12:

> Becaus that the mair part of thir thingis followand, ar altogidder superstitious and not agreabill to þe treuth of Goddis word, we haue thocht it expedient to admonische the (gude Reidar) that albeit we haue Insert þame efter the forme of our Copie, it notwithstanding we do na thing les than allow or appruie thame for ony treuth, bot rather on the ane part we haue retenit thame still to schaw the blyndnes and errour of that tyme, quhairin men wer (as it wer) enforcit to beleif sic vaniteis and leis: þat now that may be steirit vp to gif thankis to the Eternall

[10] In 1566, he was appointed the King's printer for twenty years. See Clair 123. He was imprisoned "in 1573 for printing Davidson's *Dialog* without a license" (Kenneth 180). The unique copy of Lekpreuik's *Wallace* is "said to have belonged to Queen Elizabeth" and is "now in the British Museum" (Craigie vii).

> our God that hes oppinnit thair eyis and deliuerit þame from Ignorance, þat þai may cleirly discerne betuix licht and mirknes, richt and wrang. (Craigie vi-vii)

Looking at Lekpreuik's edititorial, we see a printer apologizing for "superstitious" and non-Protestant content, and yet he states that he wants to remain faithful to the original text. If some things therein are not entirely "agreeable" to Protestant sensibilities, at least the "gude reidar" can see an example of his unelightened ancestors and thank God for delivering people from that state of ignorance. Lekpreuik makes no attempt to apologize for Hary's nationalism or racism. Alisdair MacDonald admires Lekpreuik's ability to "steer between the Scylla of patriotism and the Charybdis of Catholicism" (MacDonald 415), one way, at least, of stating the printer's dilemma in dealing with contradictory sentiments of Scottish nationalism and the ecumenical, pro-union-with-England desires of many of the Reformers for whom Lekpreuik worked.

Overwhelming demand encouraged Henrie Charteris to re-publish *The Wallace* on his own in 1594, while his son reprinted his father's edition in 1601.[11] The poem was obviously selling well even as England and Scotland united under King James a mere two years later. In Charteris's concluding paragraphs of his preface, he says that he has already heard criticism for his decision to print such an inflamatory, anti-English poem:

> I wald haue put ane end to this prolixt Prolog gif I had not alreddy hard þe injust offence & murmuring of mony againis the present furthsetting of this volume:

[11] See Aldis.

sayand, þat heirby men ar steirit vp rather to þe remembrance of auld injuries, then to the desire of peice & quyetnes, vnto the quhilk we all suld studie, lest we suld seme vnthankfull towardis God, & inhumaine towardis our nichtbouris, out of quhais handis we haue laitly ressauit sa a[m]pill benefitis. Bot quhat wil not conceptiue & contentious persons calumniat? God (quha is the searcher of mens hartis) dois knaw how far that is from my mynde. Althocht that in the dayis of Wallace, Ingland did vehementlie oppres this Realme, quhairthrow maist justlie he did oppose him selfe to them: Yit I esteme it a thing not impossibill bot þat auld enmies may becum new and perfite freindis: & againe auld freinds becum new & plaine enemies, as it befell betuixt the Scottis and Pichtis. Yit I mene nathing les, then to steir vp the hartis of ony men againis ony Nation, Realme, or countrie. My intent & chief scope is this in generall, to muse all men (eftir the exempill of Wallace) to the defence of their natiue Realme, & commoun welth: to hazard quatsaeuer they haue in this earth, for the maintenance thairof, aganis ony Natioun, French, or Inglis, Spanish, or vtheris quhatsaeuir þat wald inuad the samin. And alswa that the vailyeant actis and deidis of sic as hes spent & geuin their trauellis and lyfes thairfoir, suld neuir cum into oblivioun, but remain in fresche & recent memorie to the perpetuall glorie of their name & fame, during all ages & posterities vnto þe warldis end.

Quhairfoir (gude Reidar) as I with simple eye & intentioun haue of new again publischit this delectabill Historie: Swa thow will in the samin maner reid,

> & peruse it: & in perusing it, thow will giue hartlie thanks vnto þe Eternall God, quha for þe deliuerance of þis afflicted and oppressed countrie, did steir vp þis our Wallace, having sure confidence, þat gif we sall leind vpon him, & from our haill hartis in all our necessities and afflictionis convert vs till him, he sall not only rais vp ane Wallace, bot mony: be quhome he sall michtelie delyuer & releif vs of all þe scurgis and oppressions of our enemies quhatsaeuir, how feirce, how cruell or potent sa euer they be: his hand is not schortenit, but þat he baith will and can help. (Criagie vi-vii)

The English did oppress the Scots in the past, for which Wallace rightly opposed them, yet Charteris argues that old enemies can become friends. Charteris believes every man ought to fight against injustice. God raised up Wallace to fight against the tyranny of Edward I, and, as long as we trust in God, He can raise up many other righteous men as well.

A certain caginess abounds in both Lekpreuik's and Charteris's apologies. Both avoid directly mentioning that Scottish nationalism influenced their decisions for printing the poem, and both declaim the Catholicisms in Hary's poem, but Hary's burning hatred for the English was left essentially untouched in their editions. During the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries twenty-some-odd editions of *The Wallace* were published in Scotland.[12] Despite sixteenth-century desires that the two countries be united in "Godly amity" and perhaps even one day could be united politically in one glorious Great Britain, *The Wallace*'s popularity in Scotland

[12] See Aldis.

only increased as Scotland and England united. So, while Lekpreuik and Charteris attempted to reform *The Wallace* religiously, its expression of Scottish identity remained largely resistant to reform in a time when a Greater British identity was coming into being.

This tension between and coexistence of Scottish and British identities in Scotland continued even after the Act of Union in 1707. It continued, indeed, after failed Jacobite rebellions of the eighteenth century, and one could easily argue it continues even to this day--witness the contested independence referendum two years ago. William Hamilton of Gilbertfield's 1722 translation of *The Wallace* was, for instance, one of the most popular books on Scottish shelves next to the King James version of the Bible.[13] And this was *The Wallace* which Robert Burns read. In his poetry, Burns frequently laments the lack of Scottish patriotic spirit and love of freedom which William Wallace had embodied. There are numerous references to Wallace and Bruce in Burns's poetry apart from the well-known "Robert the Bruce's speech before the Battle of Bannockburn" (1793). In "Scots Prologue," for Mrs. Sutherland's Benefit Night, Spoken at the Theatre, Dumfries, March 3rd, 1790 (lines 11-16), Burns reminds us,

> There's themes enow in Caledonian story
> Wad shew the Tragic Muse in a' her glory.
> Is there no daring Bard will rise and tell
> How glorious Wallace stood, how hapless fell?

[13] See Elspeth King's introduction in Hamilton xvi.

Where are the Muses fled, that could produce

A drama worthy o' the name of Bruce? (733)

In lines 55-66 of "To William Simson, Ochiltree," Burns suggests that "Scottish blood . . . boils up in a spring-tide flood" at the very mention of Wallace's name (143). Loud echoes of Blind Hary's and John Mair's ideas about Wallace's righteous war against the tyrrany of Edward I can be heard in the last stanza of Burns's "The Cotter's Saturday Night":

O THOU! who pour'd the patriotic tide,

That stream'd thro' WALLACE'S undaunted heart,

Who dar'd to, nobly, stem tyrranic pride,

Or nobly die, the second glorious part:

(The Patriot's GOD, peculiarly Thou art,

His friend, inspirer, guardian, and reward!)

O never, never SCOTIA'S realm desert;

But still the Patriot, and the Patriot-bard

In bright succession rise, her Ornament and Guard! (92)

But while Burns zeroes in on the Scottish rebel's resistance to English tyranny in particular, Jane Porter and Sir Walter Scott, while deeply interested in and sympathetic to the struggle against Edward I, both employ Wallace in their expressions of British unionist ideology, one in which a greater British identity could (or perhaps should) be embraced by Scots despite the troubled Anglo-Scots relations of the past. Blind Hary's "righteous war," but not his racism, found new expression in 1810 in Jane Porter's *Scottish Chiefs*, with Wallace himself pointing out

that not all Englishmen were bad guys. In Porter's Wallace's own words, the only reasons he fights against the English (and only certain Englishmen at that) are because one corrupt Englishman killed his wife and because some (but again not all) of the English want to oppress the Scots (190). For Porter, as for Scott, belonging to a Greater Britain was not a bad thing, if this Great Britain allowed Scots and Englishmen to live in harmony under one just, democratic government which respected Scottish and English rights and recognized the specific and unfortunate circumstances in which past enmities between Scotland and England had arisen. Wallace as champion of Scotland against the English becomes more generally righteous champion struggling against tyrrany. "All warfare that is not defensive, is criminal," Porter's Wallace argues, "he who draws his sword to oppress, or merely to aggrandize, is a murderer or robber" (372). Porter's Wallace, like Mair's or Charteris's, severs righteousness from a purely Scottish nationalism.

Sir Walter Scott puts this very ideology into the mouth of the English minstrel Bertram in his final novel, *Castle Dangerous*. Bertram argues that Edward I "raked up a claim to the throne" (38), and claims, as the narrator in Scott's *Tales of a Scottish Grandfather* also does,[1] that "in wishing that Scotland and England each knew their own true interest, I am bound to wish them both alike well; and they should, I think, desire to live in friendship together. Occupying each their own portion of the same island, and living under the same laws, and being at peace with each other, they might without fear, face the enmity of the whole world" (42).

[1] See Scott's *Tales of a Scottish Grandfather* 4-5.

Scott is able to admire the righteous spirit of Wallace, while still embracing the good which he sees in the union of Scotland and England and the resulting Great Britishness that emerged from this union.[2] Scott values Great Britain and goes so far as to criticize Edward I for fomenting national enmities and thus postponing the natural and mutually beneficial union of Scotland and England:

> [T]he happy prospect that England and Scotland would be united under one government, was so far from being brought nearer by Edward's unpricipled usurpation, that the hatred and violence of national antipathy which arose betwixt the sister countries, removed to a distance almost incalculable, the prospect of their becoming one people, for which nature seemed to design them. *(Tales of Scottish Grandfather* 49)

One can be Scottish or English and still be British and live in peace. One can look back upon the Middle Ages to a time when Scots like Wallace laudably struggled against injustice inflicted upon them by the English without wanting to abandon the greater idea, Scott might claim the reality, of a harmonious Great Britain with a "free constitution, which protects and preserves those who live under it from all oppression, or arbitrary power. We owe this blessing to our brave ancestors, who were at all times ready to defend these privileges with their lives . . ." (*Tales of a Scottish Grandfather* 113).

---

[2] In *Tales of a Scottish Grandfather*, the narrator claims that "Wallace's defence was a good one, both in law and in common sense (for surely everyone has not only a right to fight in defence of his native country, but is bound in duty to do so)" (60).

So it was that within a half century of Blind Hary's death, his hero, the "Flower of Scotland" who loved spilling the blood of the English race, became the embodiment not only of Scottishness but of righteousness and, ultimately, of true Britishness. Edward I and his nobles who tried to oppress the Scots had become, in essence, anti-British, tyrants un-naturally forcing their Englishness on the Scots who simply wanted to live in peace with England, as they might now do in the sixteenth or nineteenth century. Without looking silly, one could wear the Scottish and British identity hat at the same time. Interpreted as a hero who fought against the injustices of his time, the post-Blind-Harian Wallace could represent what was best about medieval Scottish identity and modern Great British identity as well.

Stefan Thomas Hall
University of Wisconsin–Green Bay

Works Cited

Aldis, Harry G. *A List of Books Printed in Scotland before 1700.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh Bibliographical Society, 1904.

Alford, Stephen. "Knox, Cecil and the British Dimension of the Scottish Reformation." *John Knox and the British Reformations*. Ed. Roger A. Mason. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999. 201-19. 202-08.

Barrow, G. W. S. *Robert Bruce and the Community of the Realm of Scotland*. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1965.

Beattie, William. Ed. *The Chepman and Myllar Prints: Nine Tracts from the First Scottish Press, Edinburgh, 1508, Followed by the Two Other Tracts in the Same Volume in the National Library of Scotland: A Facsimile.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh Bibliographical Society, 1950.

Broadie, Alexander. *George Lokert: Late-Scholastic Logician*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1983.

---. *The Tradition of Scottish Philosophy: A New Perspective on the Enlightenment*. Edinburgh: Polygon, 1990.

Burns, Robert. *The Canongate Burns*. Eds. Andrew Noble and Patrick Scott Hogg. Edinburgh: Cannongate, 2003.

Clair, Colin. *A History of Printing in Britain*. London: Cassell, 1965.

Craigie, Sir William, intro. & ed. *The Actis and Deidis of Schir William Wallace. 1570.* New York: Scholars' Facs. & Repr., Scottish Text Society, 1939.

Dunbar, William. 1508. *The poems of William Dunbar.* Ed. James Kinsley. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.

Goldstein, R. James. “Blind Hary's Myth of Blood: The Ideological Closure of *The Wallace*.” *Studies in Scottish Lierature* 25 (1990): 70-82.

---. *The Matter of Scotland: Historical Narrative in Medieval Scotland*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1993.

Hall, Stefan Thomas. “‘Quham dowis thow Scot?’: Scottish Identity in Blind Hary’s *Wallace*.” *Studies in Scottish Literature* vols.33-34 (2004-05): 177-94.

---. *The Role of Medieval Scottish Poetry in Creating Scottish Identity: “Textual Nationalism.”* Edwin Mellen Press: Lewiston, NY, 2006.

Hamilton, William (of Gilbertfield) 1722. *Blind Harry’s Wallace*. Edinburgh: Luath, 1998.

Hary. *Hary’s Wallace (Vita Nobilissmi Defensoris Scotie Wilelmi Wallace Militis)*. 2 vols. Ed. Matthew P. McDiarmid. Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society, 1968-69.

Hume, David. *The British Union: A Critical Edition and Translation of David Hume of Godscroft’s De Unione Insulae Britannicae.* (1605) Trans. Paul J McGinnis and Arthur H. Williamson. London: Ashgate, 2002.

Kenneth, Brother. “The Popular Literature of the Scottish Reformation.” *Essays on the Scottish Reformation. 1513-1625.* Ed. David McRoberts. Glasgow: Burns, 1962. 169-84.

MacDonald, Alisdair A. “Poetry, Politics, and Reformation Censorship in Sixteenth-Century Scotland.” *English Studies* 5 (1983): 410-21.

Mair (Major), John. *A History of Greater Britain as Well England as Scotland. Compiled from the Ancient Authorities by John Major, by Name Indeed a Scot, but by Profession a*

Theologian. 1521. Trans. Archibald Constable. Edinburgh: T. and A. Constable, Edinburgh UP for the Scottish History Society, 1892.

Nicholson, R. G. *Scotland: The Later Middle Ages*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1974.

Porter, Jane. *The Scottish Chiefs*. (1810) Ed. Fiona Price. Toronto: Broadview, 2007.

Scott, Sir Walter. *Castle Dangerous* (1831). The Sir Walter Scott Digital Archive of Edinburgh University Library. http://www.walterscott.lib.ed.ac.uk/etexts/catledang-0074.htm

---. *Tales of a Scottish Grandfather (1827) vol.1: From Bannockburn to Flodden.* Nashville, TN: Cumberland House, 2001.

Williamson, Arthur H. *Scottish National Consciousness in the Age of James VI: The Apocalypse, the Union and the Shaping of Scotland's Public Culture*. Edinburgh: John Donald, 1979.

Failed Chrisitianity:
The Unredeemed Schedoni in Ann Radcliffe's *The Italian*

As Frederick Garber has suggested, *The Italian* is Radcliffe's most memorable work, and Schedoni her most unique character creation, in his words, "the only one of her characters who ever really lives" (xiii). When I began working on *The Italian* in the late 1990s, I was analyzing elements of Mrs. Radcliffe's craft that seem to have influenced Charlotte Bronte. However, Ms Bronte seems not to have been too fond of *The Italian*, a book she critiques through the words of a character in the novel *Shirley*, Caroline Helstone, who says the work ends in "disappointment, vanity and vexation of spirit" (299). Since Radcliffe's last chapter is a "giorno felice" of marriage, and Bronte also used the "comedy" genre to conclude *Shirley* as well, one wonders what she meant. However, if Caroline was recalling 'the Italian" himself, Schedoni, and the murder/ suicide with which the book ends, it makes more sense. He seems like an awful guy: how could Schedoni's end be other than poetic justice? All can be explained if we presume that Caroline identifies with Ellena, who presumes Schedoni to be her father. Perhaps Bronte's dismay stems from the fact that Schedoni ruins his redeemed soul by adding new crimes upon his very deathbed! This, I think, is what makes Schedoni memorable and interesting.

Bronte herself shows that she likes her Byronic heroes to become redeemed, reformed, and manageable, like Mr. Rochester or the brothers Robert and Louis in *Shirley*. These, however, are like fairytale romances. How often is reform actually possible? In fact, the clear

predecessor to Schedoni is Milton's Satan in *Paradise Lost*. There is a scene in *Paradise Lost*, in which when Satan sees Eve, he is so struck with her that he forgets evil all together:

> . . . her every Air
> Of gesture or least action overaw'd
> His Mailce, and with rapine sweet bereav'd
> His fierceness of the fierce intent it brought:
> That space the Evil one abstracted stodd
> From his own evil, and for the time remain'd
> Stupidly good, of enmity disarm'd. . . . .

It doesn't last long; Satan soon is riling himself, "Save what is in destroying, other joy/ To me is lost" (PL Book 9: lines 459-479). Satan has a specific role in the Bible that he must fulfill for Milton, regardless of Milton's efforts to depict the shades of his evil.

With Schedoni, Radcliffe is more free—he is her creation; she can write about him however she wants. Let us review how Schedoni is presented in the book. In Volume 1, Schedoni makes brief and mysterious appearances: one page 35, he is introduced as" the secret advisor" of Vivaldi's mother; he is said to be more fond of abstruse arguments than of truth (34) and he is "subtle," which is a word often used to describe the snake (35). In chapter 4, when Vivaldi has a conversation with Schedoni, the narrator tells us that Father Schedoni "felt neither respect nor kindness for the good . . . indeed, [he] saw only evil in human nature" (52). In Chapter 9, Vivaldi accuses Schedoni of being his enemy, and this seems to cause a huge reaction from Schedoni is Chapter 10—he is not eating or sleeping, and only his fear of the

Vivaldi family prevents him from seeking to kill Vivaldi (109). Early in Volume 2, chapter 3, the Marchesa tells Scehdoni her son is missing, and he is pleased—he manipulates Vivladi's mother to conclude that Ellena is bad and deserves to die (168); in fact, in chapter 4 Schedoni sees the Marchesa at church and suggests she can be given absolution for Ellena's planned murder (173). Chapter 8 of Volume 2, or about half-way through the book is where the narrator switches from Ellena and Vivaldi to Schedoni for a while. Here, Ellena and Schedoni meet, for the first time, on the beach (220). Schedoni knows who she is, and finally addresses her: "Whither go you, and who are you?" This particular question is reminiscent of story of St. Peter, who is asked, when walking away from Rome, where he is going, and returns there to be crucified. Ellena says she is "an unhappy orphan" and that she fears for her life (221-222). Schedoni accuses Ellena of being a wanton seducer, and she conveniently faints (224). It is this moment that reminds me of the Milton passage: "he, who had hitherto been insensoible to every tender feeling, who, governed by ambition and resentment had contributed, by his artful instigations, to fix the baleful resolution of the Marchesa di Vivladi, and who was come to execute her purpose, --even he could not now look upon the innocent, the wretched ellena, without yielding to the momentary weakness, as he termed it, of compassion" (223). He considers killing Ellena, and then decides to carry her back to the house (224). At the beginning of Ch 9, Schedoni is astonished at himself: the situations had "drawn forth traits, of which, till now, he had no suspicion" (225). It is at this point that the history of Count di Marinella is recounted. Like Satan, he tries to flee the new feeling: "an emotion new and surprising to him, had arrested his arm, and compelled his resolution to falter. But this emotion was transient, it

disappeared almost with the object that had awakened it" (228). He decides to get Spalatro to kill her [Ellena], and his confederate suddenly balks. Schedoni is then left to sneak into Ellena's bedroom and kill her himself. Just when about to kill the sleeping Ellena, Schedoni sees a locket around her neck, containing a likeness of himself! He wakes her to ask about it (235), and then must tell Spalatro NOT to kill her after all. Ellena thinks the best of Schedoni, and Schedoni himself is beset by the massive irony it is that he has been trying to kill his own daughter! Schedoni immediately (though with some teeth gnashing) changes his plan. He tries to shift his role to father=protector. He is a murderer and perhaps a rapist, but he doesn't want to be guilty of killing his own child. Even Satan draws the line somewhere--apparently.

It is from this point in the story onward that I am interested, for it would appear that despite Schedoni's long list of crimes (which comes to about 10, I believe), he seems to be inspired by Ellena to turn over a new leaf. Let us consider this:

1. he tells Ellena he is her father. He didn't have to do this. He was the only one who would have known.

2. he doesn't kill her.

3. he is very worried about his identity being revealed, but though he might have worried about that for 20 years, he now has to worry about what his daughter will think of that.

4. he plans to un-do his previous crimes by a.) presenting Ellena as his daughter

    b.) rescuing Vivaldi from the Inquisition

5. yes, he does kill Father Nicolo and himself—but why? Revenge? To remove himself and Nicolo from Ellena's life?

The remainder of Volume 3 in large measure discusses Schedoni's sense of guilt. It would appear that his initial confession at the Santa Maria della Pianto had been sincere, but it sounds like Schedoni lacked belief that he could receive any forgiveness, whether it was because he ran away before the priest responded or because he seems to have reverted to evil-doing despite his fasting and other self-abusing acts. It seems he is addicted to the idea of power and manipulation, which is what makes him decide to use the Marchesa for his own ends. It does seem that Schedoni's life as a monk is motivated at least in part by his guilt, and while his activities are often temporal and manipulative, it is not entirely evident why that provides him with any satisfaction. In fact, if he had never told anyone about his past, he would not be so paranoid or need to kill more people!

Schedoni and his daughter travel together back to Naples in Chapters 1-2; this begins with a dramatic scene if which Schedoni tries to shoot Spalatro with a pistol. Ellena intervenes upon Spalatro's behalf, and Schedoni has to recognize that without Spalatro, he would have killed his own daughter (267). Schedoni then hires a very talkative guide, who drives him completely batty in his penchant for discussing a long-past case of homicide—(268-287). Schedoni, instead of getting acquainted with his daughter, has to keep wondering if everyone knows that he and the Count di Bruno are one and the same, and whether he will have to answer for those crimes. The endless talking of the peasant guide keeps those crimes at the forefront of the guilty man's thoughts.

In Chapter 3, Schedoni must confront the Marchesa and say he did not commit murder—in fact, he is now in a position to realize and feel disgust for her, which is a kind of

disgust for himself and the plan he had made against Ellena (292). Soon after, Schedoni sets out for Rome to release the incarcerated Vivaldi from the Inquisition. Prior to this, Vivaldi is visited by a mysterious stranger in his cell, who reveals what Schedoni has done (306-309).

During the Inquisition scenes, Radcliffe's writing enacts a "last judgment" motif in its attempt to make the sins of people manifest, and in turn, punish these. However, to the Protestant view, such a scenario shows man presuming to take on the judgment of God; the tribunal is guilty of hypocrisy because they blame Schedoni for his sin and reward Nicolo when they both seem to be living out the life the Catholic Church has authorized. Furthermore, the insistence of the Inquisition is designed to "correct" the excesses of the not-so-faithful since it arrives at the "correct" result (Vivladi is released and Schedoni imprisoned), it APPEARS to be a mechanism of God's judgment. However, I see Radcliffe using the Inquisition to create a false sense of justice: Catholicism may not be the "truth" to Radcliffe, but God has intervened in conducting punishment. The overall religious theme in the book seems to be that Schedoni never had faith and was always just pretending—as perhaps anyone who puts on religious garb in the book is just a pretender, even Olivia and Ellena. However, Schedoni's actions after the scenes with Ellena suggest otherwise. They suggest a man who wanted to make amends, but who was still angry (wanting to kill Spalatro), paranoid (wanting to listen to the peasant, then hope he killed himself with the poisoned stiletto), proud (wanting to marry his daughter into the house of Vivaldi not because she loved Vivaldi, but because it created status), and wanting to avoid the consequences of his long-ago crimes (by not revealing his identity as Count di

Bruno). However, Schedoni's best action may be to help save Vivaldi's life, and in this respect, he is a precursor to characters like Sydney Carton (*Tale of Two Cities*).

The scene in which Vivaldi trades places with Schedoni as a prisoner of the Inquisition is quite interesting as a reversal of fortune. Analysis of the surviving parents is relevant here. The Marchese di Vivaldi still is proud and self-important. He still idolizes class and position, much as the now-disappeared Count di Bruno felt. If Schedoni had actually been Ellena's father, the story would have been a tragedy, for the Marchese would not have allowed the marriage of his son to Ellena. Like the Count, he is a worldly man. Olivia, though she loves the peace of the convent, doesn't have forgiveness towards the Count. She wears the habit, but like Schedoni, her religious life may be all pretense.

There is a basic problem here: if Ellena, Olivia and Vivaldi were always "good" and Count di Bruno and the Marchesa di Vivaldi were always bad, what influence did Christianity ever have on any of them? Is Radcliffe simply saying that Catholic thought is so bad that it actually worsens people by giving them false ideas? certainly, that is possible. There was a lot of anti-Catholic sentiment during the time of Radcliffe. At times, it seems that the saving grace of Ellena is her sensibility and innocence—she feels kind ness even towards Spalatro. Is Schedoni bad and Ellena good because she is part of the "elect"? No actions that Schedoni has done as a monk seem to have really helped him much. It is these long-ago crimes that get him incarcerated by the Inquisition, and it is the testimony of a former servant that convicts him as being one and the same as the Count di Bruno.

Olivia reveals, in a rather trite device, that Schedoni's brother, not himself, is Ellena's father, and thus it seems he is irrelevant. Schedoni, as the Count di Bruno, killed his brother to gain power, position, and his brother's wife. However, he seems not to have actually benefitted from any of that. e was forced to hide his name and be secretive as a monk.

Schedoni is not the Count di Bruno. He may have that DNA, and he may have been disguised and a secretly unrepentant murderer for most of the book, but when he sees his own face on Ellena's locket, he becomes someone else. The man who killed his own brother quits his scheme of killing Ellena immediately. While we may see his grumpiness and anger as fear of being found out, it is also possible that Father Schedoni for the first time realized that he hadn't lived up to that image, and he is angry with himself. Yes, he is worried that Ellena will find out about his crimes, but he reveals his identity to her right away. He cancels the murder plot, deserts the Marchesa, tries to make amends with Vivaldi, and protects Ellena. For her part, Ellena is startled, but takes the whole story at face value. She sees her "father" as the one who saved her from Spalatro.

Does Schedoni kill himself and Nicolo to show he is basically the villain we always thought he was, unworthy to be (and actually not) Ellena's father?

He cannot be forgiven. He cannot be cured of sin. I think Radcliffe makes the point that Schedoni, for a confessing penitent, is rather lacking in penitence. He cannot be redeemed. Since he is bad, he can try to make amends, but as he is already damned, he finally decides to trust self over God and eliminates Nicolo and himself. However, this completely corrupted man catches one glimpse of his own face in Ellena's locket, and this requires he revise everything

about his life. It is Radcliffe's project to show us his internal conflict, but then, as an unretrievable bad guy, he has to die.

The end of *The Italian* suggests that the price of evil is high and that true forgiveness and redemption are not possible. Schedoni kills himself and another, compounding his previous sins. Either this tells us that a change of heart only makes one want to destroy oneself and one's evil, or the works of his Catholicism have not changed him, and his sudden gift of grace he ultimately does not accept.

The actions of Schedoni identify him as a Byronic hero. He took charge of his sins, he tried to confess them, but his ultimate faith in himself, as opposed to God, makes him kill himself and Nicolo. In a twisted way, this makes amends to his daughter by removing himself, but the ultimate irony of Radcliffe is that he is only hurting himself. Ellena was not really his daughter, and her "giorno felice" is built upon that.

I think I do not agree entirely with Caroline Helstone. True, Schedoni may be a vexing character in the way that human nature always is. We readers of Radcliffe, like Vivaldi, are encouraged to see Schedoni as a disturbing, ambiguous, and flawed figure because that is what human evil is. He chose to DO, rather than trust God, and that is the first and most common human flaw.

Susan H. Wood
Midland University

Works Cited

Brontë, Charlotte. Shirley. (1849). Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986. Print.

Garber, Frederick. "Introduction" to The Italian. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986. vii-xv. Print.

Milton, John. Paradise Lost. The Longman Anthology of British Literatue, Vol. 1. NY: Longman, 2010.

Radcliffe, Ann. The Italian (1797). Oxford: Oxford U P, 1986. Print.

Surveillance of the Body: Women in *Caleb Williams*

Written at a time when the historical and political atmosphere invokes egalitarian ideas from two sources close to William Godwin—Mary Wollstonecraft's *Vindication of the Rights of Women* (1792) and his own *Enquiry Concerning Political Justice* (1793)—as well as the impossible to ignore revolution in France, *Caleb Williams* (1794) would certainly appear to be positioned to take some potentially radical stands on the issue of women's rights. Ian Bell comments that Godwin's novel operates within a frame of literary works, often regarded as "Jacobin" novels, whose radicalism extended the ideas of reforming society through "abstract institutional critique" (14). However, Bell's analysis is limited to the ways in which Caleb's close scrutiny of his employer Falkland leads to the revelation of Falkland's murderous secret and the ensuing efforts by Falkland, by means of his own determined surveillance, to silence Caleb (15). However unintentionally, Bell's argument appears to limit Godwin's desire for societal reform only to characters like Falkland and Caleb Williams. In addition, tracing numerous historical efforts—sometimes, but not always, unsuccessful—to institute increased levels of police presence and power in late 18th C. London, Quentin Bailey recounts the several ways that Caleb Williams is subjected to the increasing control over individuals by the state, especially in the third volume of the novel. Neither Bell nor Bailey consider the early plot of the novel, wherein several female characters are subjected to various means of surveillance for the purpose of controlling and silencing them, even to the point of death. The novel may have fallen short of its reformist politics and some modern readers may find the novel's lack of overt feminism disappointing. Yet I contend that, despite the relatively essentialized role of women in the novel, Godwin subverts

this apparent conventionalism. The effect of the subversion of women's roles in the novel is to serve as both a precursor to the novel's main plot of surveillance and to permit a link from the powerful ending of the novel to the less-commonly critiqued first volume.

Clearly, as a model for the new paradigm moving from feudalism to a modicum of enlightenment, Ferdinando Falkland expresses some of the ideals of the revolutionary age. Speaking to his nemesis, Barnabas Tyrrel, about an injustice Tyrell had laid upon one of his tenants, Falkland declaims, "We that are rich, Mr. Tyrrel, must do every thing in our power to lighten the yoke of these unfortunate people. We must not use the advantage that accident has given us, with an unmerciful hand. Poor wretches! They are pressed almost beyond bearing as it is; and, if we unfeelingly give another turn to the machine, they will be crushed into atoms" (77). Falkland straddles the space between rationalism and romanticism, between thinking and feeling. Although the term "atom" had been used in rather inexact ways from the time of the Greek thinker Demokritos, it was in the latter half of the 18th C.—a time closely corresponding to Godwin's day—that chemists Daniel Bernoulli and Antoine Lavoisier, in developments which may be accurately described as scientific, led the way for the work of John Dalton and the age of modern atomistic theory (Stenger 23-26; 71-84). Godwin uses the word several times in the novel and, in this passage, Falkland's employment of the word suggests destruction to the lowest known particle level. At the same time the passage is loaded with both emotional and tactile language. Falkland seems to say that people need to be treated equally, or else they will be destroyed and those in power will have been the reason for that destruction. This potential atomization of the body indicates the level of control that those in power had over those in their purview, a view consistent with William Godwin's theories of justice in an Enlightened world.

It is, therefore, supremely ironic, as Michel Foucault cogently points out, that "The 'Enlightenment,' which discovered the liberties, also invented the disciplines" (222). Theorizing the mechanics of the disciplined state and illustrating the nearly invisible pervasiveness of that discipline, Foucault contends that the "panoptic modality of power" (221)—the level of discipline that would constitute domestic control and, if needed, surveillance—is both enabled by the system of jurisprudence that created and legitimated the fundamental authority of the state and is, at the same time, a "sort of counter-law." This paradoxical relationship permits the disciplined state to claim a role in the promotion of liberty and accounts for the need to subject some members of society to the control and, very often, the controlling gaze of other, privileged members of the society. To allow the privileged within society to exercise their freedom to its maximal limits, the mechanisms of discipline were placed at their disposal. To quote Foucault, "panopticism constituted the technique, universally widespread, of coercion" (222).

It is unclear whether Falkland would include women among the people to whom he refers as "poor wretches," but as non-privileged persons they are certainly under surveillance and the control it implies in this novel. The episode that showed Falkland's early and youthful equanimity in Italy, wherein he diplomatically reestablishes the bond between the possessive Count Malvesi and the coy Lady Lucrecia Pisani, also illustrates the state of women when their lovers feel threatened. The lady is "imperious[ly]" "catechized" by her "insolent . . . questioner" (13); is made subject to Malvesi's judgment as though his mere suspicions were proof of any indiscretion. The episode reads rather like a description of a police interrogation, except for the fact that Lucrecia rebuffs Malvesi's boorish behavior. Godwin indicates his willingness to introduce subversion of the essentialized position of women. Lady Pisani first treats Malvesi's

"folly and presumption" with "ludicrous sarcasm," and later forbade his presence on the grounds that "she was determined never again to subject herself to so unworthy a treatment." Lucrecia Pisani even seemed briefly happy that her suitor "had at length disclosed to her his true character" (13). While this episode ends well enough, the naturalness with which it is resolved only when Falkland himself assumes some of the blame for the misunderstanding between the lovers shows that male surveillance of the female body is the order of things. Thus, the lovers are reunited, yet it is clear that Malvesi's disposition toward Lucrecia is within the bounds of a man's right to control a woman. While the Lady is provided a voice to protest her ill treatment, ultimately, Malvesi's concerns are attenuated, not by the Lady's protests but by Falkland's explanations.

Surveillance and its control as also the order of things for Emily Melvile. Her character is positioned so as to be almost completely in the eye of her cousin, Tyrrel. Despite her blood relationship to Tyrrel and her presence in his home, Emily is almost immediately inserted into a sort of non-space, "neither precisely that of a domestic, nor yet marked with the treatment that might seem due to one of the family" (38). Conveniently, this spatial position enables her to be watched from two sides, the domestic and the familial. As the novel proceeds, we learn that, in fact, even the very food Emily eats is monitored; at least that is the effect of the suit Tyrrel levies upon her for "board and necessaries" (81). Catharine A. MacKinnon argues in the Introduction to her book on second wave feminism that money as a form of power has been masculinized, a concept clearly recognized by Tyrell as he imposes this form of material oppression upon Emily. MacKinnon further remarks that the goal toward gender equality is one whereby all persons understand "how women experience and respond to being second class," as they progress "from

unconsciousness and denial and collaboration to consciousness and resistance and confrontation" (2).

Emily Melvile's efforts to progress from unconsciousness, denial, and collaboration to consciousness, resistance, and confrontation is illustrated by her willingness to speak on her own behalf. When Tyrrel informs Emily that she is to be made wife to a man named Grimes who is the son of a tenant farmer and who lacks the finer sensibilities to which she aspires, she was "for a moment silent with astonishment" (48). Indeed, Tyrrel repeatedly admonishes Emily to "Be silent" (48; 53), and threatens her directly should she dare resist or confront: "Do you think I will be contradicted and opposed for nothing? When did you ever know any body resist my will without being made to repent? And shall I now see myself brow-beaten by a chitty faced girl" (57). Tyrrel invocation of the word "contradict" is of particular significance here. *The Oxford English Dictionary* offers what it regards as a now obsolete meaning: "To speak against or in opposition to; to oppose in speech." Rather than simply implying that a contradiction is an inconsistency, Tyrrel clearly recognizes that Emily intends to resist and confront his desires, a position that he will not abide from her or from anyone else. Therefore, when it is in his power to do so, he removes from Emily any small comfort or support that may have been available. Mrs. Jakeman, the woman to whom Emily appeals as surrogate mother, seems at first to enjoy relative freedom of movement and of discourse with Emily, even while Emily is limited by Tyrrel. When it is discovered, however, that she supports Emily's resistance, Mrs. Jakeman, too, is surveyed and removed from the scene, thereby both isolating Emily and effectively silencing Mrs. Jakeman (55).

Tyrrel's choice of Grimes for Emily's husband seems uniquely calculated to place the object of her affection, Falkland, all the more in relief. It is important to note, however, that while Falkland resides in Emily's dreams, there is no evidence that she is in his. Therefore, Tyrrel's declaration to force Emily to marry Grimes is taken with little thought to punish Falkland, except for his presence in Emily's heart. It is Emily whom Tyrrel wishes to control; it is her body over which he wishes to exert power.

Because Falkland is not an active suitor for Emily, Tyrrel may have been able to avoid Emily's resistance to his scheme had he chosen for her a partner more of her social position and sensibility, as well as one without abject repugnancy. Instead, Tyrell seems determined that she should show her disapproval as he manifests his own power over her body. He baits Emily with his assessment of her as Grimes's equal rather than his own. Tyrrel's conviction that Emily is his to dispose of as he wishes comes through when he says, "You had rather be Mr. Falkland's miss, than the wife of a plain downright yeoman. But I shall take care of you.—Aye, this comes of indulgence. You must be taken down, miss. You must be taught the difference between high flown notions and realities" (49). Tyrrel all but states the alternate title of Godwin's novel—*Things As They Are.* Eventually, Emily musters the courage to respond, arguing that were she to marry Grimes she "could never hope to be [her] own but by the death of a person [she] ought to love" (53). Here is the crux of the debate. To whom does each person belong? Perhaps betraying her naïveté, Emily asserts that she would be her own, given the chance. Not surprisingly, when this assertion violates Tyrrel's ear, he moves from the abstract to the concrete in his drive not only to survey but to control by imposing lock and key to Emily. The ignominy of this experience is increased by the fact that Tyrrel employs a lower class woman to effect the

confinement, a woman who is complicit in and sympathetic to Tyrrel's plan because of her own expectation of assuming Emily's place as mistress of the house once Emily has been married to Grimes. Emily can look neither to class nor gender to comfort her. Things look bleak for this heroine—and, indeed, for all women in the novel.

Tyrrel proves his expert employment of the controlling power of the mechanism of surveillance when he contrives a way to allow Emily to believe she will be free of Tyrrel's fate for her and, at the same time, seal that fate even more tightly. Working with Grimes to get him to appear to be assisting Emily in her escape from her jailers, Tyrrel has actually placed Emily in the dangerous and rapacious hands of the man she most loathes. When Grimes attempts to consummate his desire for Emily, she intrepidly makes a break for safety and, when it appears a gate will bar her passage, she is rescued once more by Falkland.

As indicated above, Tyrrel, having been temporarily stymied in his goal of controlling Emily's body, determines to serve her with a writ for the cost of his providing for her while she lived with him. Tyrell's suit against his cousin, a young woman younger than the age of majority, coincides with her grievous illness, a situation that causes those whom Tyrrel commands to carry it out to resist his action. Tyrrel's steward, a man named Barnes who had previously no compunction about doing Tyrrel's bidding protests: "Arrest her! Why, she does not owe you a brass farthing; she always lived upon your charity!" Tyrrel counters with the argument he had not owned before and against which there could be no resistance: "The law justifies it.—What do you think laws were made for?—I do nothing but right, and right I will have" (82). Here Foucault's comments on the mechanisms of power and control as functions of observation and

surveillance are instructive. He concludes his section on the panoptic modality of power as follows:

> . . . the prison, with all the corrective technology at its disposal, is to be resituated at the point where the codified power to punish turns into a disciplinary power to observe; at the point where the universal punishments of the law are applied selectively to certain individuals . . . at the point where the law is inverted and passes outside itself, and where the counter-law becomes the effective and institutionalized content of the juridical forms. What generalizes the power to punish, then, . . . is the regular extension, the infinitely minute web of panoptic techniques. (224)

When Tyrrel finds that he no longer is positioned to control Emily through surveillance without the structures of the law to validate these observations, he invokes the law to regain the panoptic capacity. As befits the plot of a text whose primary aim is to call for the reform of practices intended to invade the sanctity of persons and thus deprive them of their human justice, it takes no more than two days for Emily to die in the jail to which she had been remanded. Despite her efforts to claim her voice and to consciously resist and confront, Emily is ultimately silenced because of those efforts.

There are several suggestions, however, that surveillance, confinement, removal, and silencing are neither reserved for women as the text seems to convey, nor are they the necessary lot of women. Men also are subjects of control by means of surveillance. Tyrell's plot with Grimes to allow Emily to believe that she is being released from her fate with him is not just Tyrell's way of controlling Emily but also of controlling Grimes. In like fashion, though the first

volume's principal controller seems to be Tyrell, Falkland is unable, by way of his progressive philosophy, to resist the temptation to place himself in control of Tyrell and his private concerns. This imposition results in even Tyrell being ostracized from the rest of the community as a result of the publication of his actions toward Emily. Later in the novel, Caleb spends significant time both being surveyed and surveying, not to mention his confinement which is reminiscent of Emily's to the degree that it comes in part from his self-assertion of will. Even within this first volume, there are some indications that women might, sometimes to their peril, speak somewhat freely. Perhaps the best example of this is seen in the character of Mrs. Hammond. Although she is ultimately ineffectual as Emily's protector, being unable to prevent her arrest, Mrs. Hammond is permitted the opportunity to shame Tyrell with impunity for the death of Emily. Her words comprise the first silencing of Tyrell, but not the last as the assembly's repudiation of him as well as his death effect the same outcome.

Though certainly the surveillance of the female body demonstrates as a theme in the early part of the novel, it should not be seen as an absolute fate of women. As much of the rest of the novel will illustrate, the practice of control through surveillance and its resultant silencing are human considerations and belong to no gender exclusively. Given the expected views of women and of non-elite males in Godwin's day, he seems to have imbued into many of these characters a kind of resistance which questions the hegemony of power in both the public and the domestic spheres.

Wesley J. Hellman
University of Mary

Works Cited

Bailey, Quentin. "'Extraordinary and dangerous powers': Prisons, Police, and Literature in Godwin's *Caleb Williams.*" *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 22.3 (2010), 525-48. *MLA Inter. Bib.* Web. 6 Apr. 2016.

Bell, Ian. "Eighteenth-Century Crime Writing." *The Cambridge Companion to Crime Fiction.* Ed. Martin Priestman. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 2003. 7-17. Print.

"Contradict." Def. 1a. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 1989. Print.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. 1975. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage-Random, 1995. Print.

Godwin, William. *Caleb Williams.* 1794. Ed. and Intro. David McCracken. New York: Norton, 1977. Print.

MacKinnon, Catharine A. *Feminism Unmodified: Discourses on Law and Life.* Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1987. Print.

Stenger, Victor J. *God and the Atom.* Amherst: Prometheus, 2013. Print.

REVENGE!
A Neuropsychological Interpretation of Grendel in *Beowulf*

Introduction

Grendel, the elusive fiend who preys on Hrothgar's Danes in *Beowulf*, is a mysterious creature, and a wide variety of critical and interdisciplinary approaches have been employed to interpret aspects of his behavior and character in the poem. In particular, scholars have regularly made two different arguments over the motivations behind Grendel's actions. The first is that Grendel exhibits predatory aggression against the Danes. In essence, this argument postulates that Grendel is a predator who seeks out prey for nourishment, and the Danes function as that prey. The second argument is that Grendel envies the Danes and kills them to satisfy his revenge. Although the two motives are apparently contradictory—indeed a cat hunting a mouse is not envious at his prey, nor does a revenge-seeker devour his or her victim—, nevertheless there is strong enough evidence to support both motives in the text. This paper will use neuropsychological principals to unite these two seemingly disparate motivations into a unified model that explains Grendel's behavior. This paper is not the first attempt to use neuropsychology to interpret Grendel's behavior. Ward Parks in 1993 used findings from neuropsychology as part of his argument that Grendel's aggression display is predatory in nature. Parks' use of neuropsychology is intriguing and meritorious, but ultimately incomplete. Truly, there is more insight that we can glean from Grendel's behavior by applying neuropsychological principles, particularly given the tremendous advances in the study of the neurosciences over the past twenty years. We can use recent findings in the neurosciences not

only to strengthen Parks' initial conclusion, but also to incorporate the second motive, that Grendel is driven by envy and revenge to destroy the Danes and their society. Consequently, in this paper I will be employing contemporary principals from neuropsychology to demonstrate that Grendel is manifesting both predatory and revenge aggression in his attacks against the Danes. The key to this argument lies in the application of a branch of neuropsychology called "affective neuropsychology," developed by the neuroscientist Jaak Panksepp, to the behavior of Grendel in order to demonstrate that both revenge and predation behavior utilize the same neural system of the brain, the SEEKING system, to enact aggression.

The Case for Predatory Aggression

The idea that Grendel acts as a predator and that the Danes function as his prey is prevalent in scholarship. For example, Judy White argues that one of the possible meanings of *Heort* in line 78 is "hart," and that the reference to this prey animal suggests that Heorot functions as prey for Grendel, who acts as predator (1993, 138).[1] James Phillips argues that Grendel is the apex predator in the region, supplanting the humans in the role, and it is the Danes that he has selected as his prey, reversing the natural order ordained by God at creation. He writes, "Cain's descendants are predators in an aggravated sense. They prey not only on animals but also on humans. They are cannibalistic, although this cannibalism simultaneously differentiates them from human beings, establishing them as monsters. They are not stewards of nature, and nor do they respect any pact among apex predators to prey solely on other

[1] White writes, "Certainly Heort does mean "hart" in one reading; Grendel preys upon the hall and revels in the destruction of its inhabitants in the same way that men prey upon the hart and glory in the kill."

species" (2008, 43). Parks, studying the behaviors of both Grendel and Beowulf, finds two distinct forms of aggression enacted by the two adversaries. He argues that Grendel acts on predatory aggression while Beowulf acts on agonistic aggression: "The fundamental ambivalence that Grendel embodies and that Beowulf must resolve relates to the distinction between predatory and agonistic aggression. In brief, Grendel wants to ravage like a predator, whereas Beowulf insists on contesting with him like a conspecific adversary" (1993, 2).[2] Parks advances three arguments to support the theory that Grendel demonstrates predatory aggression: "objective" (Grendel eats his victims), "style" (Grendel acts in stealth), and "interrelationship of the adversaries in terms of biological species" (Grendel is not the same species as the humans) (1993, 3).

The most compelling argument to support the predatory aggression theory is Grendel's objective to eat the victims he kills. The first time we encounter Grendel, the text indicates that he kills thirty thanes and brings them back to his abode for slaughter:

> Wiht unhælo,
> grim ond grædig, gearo sona wæs,
> reoc ond reþe, ond on ræste genam
> þritig þegna; þanon eft gewat
> huðe hremig to ham faran,
> mid þære wælfylle wica neosan.

[2] Parks later reinforces this argument, saying, "When he [Grendel] enters Heorot he sees not prospective worthy adversaries by whom he might enhance his glory but only the 'expectation of a plentiful meal'" (1993, 6).

The unholy creature,

grim and ravenous, was ready at once,

ruthless and cruel, and took from their rest

thirty thanes; thence he went

rejoicing in his booty, back to his home,

to seek out his abode with his fill of slaughter (120b-125) [3]

Although this passage does not directly state that Grendel will consume the thirty thanes, the implication is certainly present. Later, during his raid on Heorot on the night of Beowulf's arrival, Grendel kills and eats one of Beowulf's warriors, Handscioh, right on the spot:

swefan sibbegedriht samod ætgædere,

magorinca heap. Þa his mod ahlog;

mynte þæt he gedælde, ær þon dæg cwome,

atol aglæca, anra gehwylces

lif wið lice, þa him alumpen wæs

wistfylle wen. Ne wæs þæt wyrd þa gen,

þæt he ma moste manna cynnes

ðicgean ofer þa niht. Þryðswyð beheold

mæg Higelaces, hu se manscaða

under færgripum gefaran wolde.

Ne þæt se aglæca yldan þohte,

[3] The Old English follows the Klaeber (2008) edition of the text. All translations into modern English are those of R.M Liuzza (2012).

ac he gefeng hraðe forman siðe

slæpendne rinc, slat unwearnum,

bat banlocan, blod edrum dranc,

synsnædum swealh; sona hæfde

unlyfigendes eal gefeormod,

fet ond folma.

He saw in the hall many a soldier,

a peaceful troop sleeping all together,

a large company of thanes—and he laughed inside;

he meant to divide, before day came,

this loathsome creature, the life of each

man from his body, when there befell him

the hope of a feast. But it was not his fate

to taste any more of the race of mankind

after that night. The kinsman of Hygelac,

mighty one, beheld how that maneater

planned to proceed with his sudden assault.

Not that the monster meant to delay—

he seized at once at his first pass

a sleeping man, slit him open suddenly,

bit into his joints, drank the blood from his veins,

gobbled his flesh in gobbets, and soon

had completely devoured that dead man,

feet and fingertips. (728-745a)

In this passage the image of Grendel as predatory hunter is explicit and undeniable. A final passage solidifies the image of Grendel as predator. After defeating Grendel's mother, Beowulf searches for Grendel to avenge the slaughter of the Danes. Beowulf is minded to kill Grendel on account of the creature's slaughter of and feasting on Hrothgar's companions:

ac he hraþe wolde

Grendle forgyldan guðræsa fela

ðara þe he geworhte to West-Denum

oftor micle ðonne on ænne sið,

þonne he Hroðgares heorðgeneatas

sloh on sweofote, slæpende fræt

folces Denigea fyftyne men,

ond oðer swylc ut offerede,

laðlicu lac.

but he quickly wished

to pay back Grendel for the many battle-storms

which he had wrought on the West-Danes

much more often than on one occasion,

when Hrothgar's hall-companions

he slew in their beds, devoured sleeping

fifteen men of the Danish folk,

and made off with as many more,

a loathsome booty. (1576b-1584)

These three passages clearly portray Grendel as a predatory hunter who has efficiently and frequently slaughtered and consumed the warriors of Heorot over the years. These examples alone present a fairly firm basis to categorize Grendel's aggression from a neuropsychological perspective: Grendel is portrayed as acting on predatory aggression against the Danes.

Predatory aggression as the motive for killing the Danes is also supported by the style or method Grendel uses to kill. Parks notes that predators generally engage in stealth to stalk and kill their prey and that Grendel likewise uses stealth to kill his victims. He writes, "He [Grendel] inhabits an inaccessible, underwater den and stalks the misty moors beyond the margins of human community outreach. Possessed of overpowering strength, he nonetheless prefers not to attack frontally but to 'ensnare' (*besyrwan*, l. 713) through stealthy nighttime assaults, carrying off in his *glof* (l. 2085) what he does not devour at the time" (1993, 6). Corroborating textual evidence can be found in two passages. The first occurs in the beginning of the poem when we are introduced to the menace of Grendel:

ac se æglæca ehtende wæs,

deorc deaþscua, duguþe ond geogoþe,

seomade ond syrede; sinnihte heold

mistige moras;

but the wretch was persecuting

—the dark death-shade—warriors old and young;

he lay in wait and set snares, in the endless night he held

the misty moors. (159-162)

The two verbs *seomade* ("lay in wait/lurk") and *syrede* ("set snares/ambush") and the idea that Grendel uses the night (*sinnihte*) strongly imply a nocturnal predator hunting his prey. The second passage occurs on the night of Grendel's encounter with Beowulf:

Com on wanre niht scriðan sceadugenga.

In the dark night he came creeping, the shadow-goer. (702-703)

Here, as with the previous passage, the presence of night (*niht*) and shadow (*sceadu*) indicate stealth. Grendel clearly makes no attempt to display the intentions or the results of his violent aggression, and thus does not appear to be seeking fame, glory, or honor. Parks theorizes that if the intention of Grendel's aggression acts were as a display of intimidation or a form of contest, the act would have been more conspicuous (1993, 3). Rather, Grendel acts secretly, in the cover of night, while the Danes and Geats are sleeping, and he seems more than once to have snatched away victims to devour them in the safety of his lair (120b-125, 1580-1584). This behavior is typical of a predatory animal.

Parks also postulates a third argument: Grendel's aggression acts are interspecific, that is, not against the same species. Parks writes, "the aggressive mode [of Grendel and Beowulf] correlates significantly (though not absolutely) with comembership or lack of comembership in a species; that is, predators usually prefer victims from other species whereas agonistically styled duels generally match conspecifics" (1993, 3-4). As part of this argument he notes that

predatory animals generally are not concerned with or affected by the weapons used by their prey in conspecific combat. Likewise, Grendel is not concerned with or affected by the spears and swords of the Danes.

These three arguments, first that Grendel consumes his victims, second that Grendel acts in stealth, and third, that Grendel's aggression is interspecific, are sufficient to justify the case that Grendel's aggression is predatory. But predatory aggression as a means to attain sustenance is insufficient to complete the picture; Grendel is acting on more than just a drive to satisfy hunger when he attacks Heorot. There is enough textual evidence to suggest that the aggression exhibited by Grendel is also based on revenge.

The Case for Revenge Aggression

While the case for predatory aggression is strong, many scholars have used the argument that Grendel is motivated by a form of envy or revenge, rather than predatory instincts, in his hostilities against the Danes.[4] As far back as 1912 Frederick Klaeber argued this very point.[5] Likewise, Oliver Farrar Emerson states, "It was then, as our poet conceives, because Grendel was of devilish origin that he was prompted, by envy of the Danes in their happiness and innocent pleasures, to make his earliest attack, and to become their persistent enemy until the hero Beowulf comes to the rescue" (1921, 119). Kathryn Hume identifies two motives, one being envy against the Danes, the other being an innate twist of character. She writes,

[4] Psychologists have documented ample evidence that connects the emotion of envy to revenge behavior (e.g., Daniels 1969, Rosen 2007, and Shapiro 2014). Therefore, even though some scholars talk about Grendel being motivated by envy while others talk about Grendel's revenge, they are essentially making the same case.

[5] Klaeber writes, "Die Veranlassung seines feindlichen Verhaltens ist…das ihm verhasste fröhliche treiben in Heorot, 86ff.; das motiv des neides ist nur zwischen den Zeilen zu lesen" (1912, 257).

> Grendel is driven by two intertwined motives. The first is a kind of envy—the envy of one *dreamum bedoeled* for those living in *wynn*, of the dweller in darkness for those in light, of one from the lonely moors for those of the hall. He may envy their more harmonious relations with the Creator, even as Cain envied Abel. Such differences fill him with a lust to destroy. The second motive, less easily described but arguably more important, is the twist of character which leaves him untouched by all the usual social restraints and inhibitions against violence toward others. Not only does he kill freely, he even enjoys the act; his eyes light up (ll.726-7), his mod ahlog (l. 730), he lust wigeð (l. 599). For whatever reasons of heredity or environment, he has the killer mentality which characterizes most of the deliberate troublemakers in heroic narrative (1975, 6).

Interestingly and perhaps unintentionally, Hume's second motive is strikingly similar to a neuropsychological definition of predatory aggression. Another scholar, William Perry Marvin, postulates that Grendel's revenge is aimed at all of humanity represented by the Danes. He writes, "Motivated by enmity and envy (*heteniðas*, 152b; *niþgrim*, 193a) of the Danes' 'prosperous' mirth, Grendel seeks to level them and, in that they represent human achievement, all humankind by means of carnivorous depredations" (2006, 41). Ruth Johnston connects Grendel's actions to revenge, saying "Grendel's motivation for raiding Hrothgar's hall is given in simple terms in lines 86-90: when he hears the poet in the hall praising God's act of Creation, he suffers. Miserably angry at the joy of Heorot's community, he must spy on them and take his private revenge for what seems not to be even his business" (2005, 16). Phillips comes out definitively in support of the revenge aggression argument instead of predatory aggression, writing, "Cain's descendants bear God a grudge for his favouritism. What triggers

Grendel's onslaught in the poem is not the standing invitation to predators that is protein and fat, but the sound reaching him in his lair of a recital in the hall of the Danes of the song of the Creation" (2008, 43). And Sandner raises the most intriguing case of all in support of revenge aggression as a motive for Grendel's attacks. He notes that Grendel is strategic in his attacks on Heorot as he sneaks past all the other out-buildings to attack specifically the mead-hall (1999, 171). If Grendel were acting on predatory aggression, he would likely choose to enter and attack either the first building he encounters or one he knows to contain easier pickings. The fact that he chooses to attack the mead-hall, which functions as the head and heart of the community, and kill the warriors night after night indicates that Grendel is acting on another form of aggression other than predatory aggression.

Turning to the textual evidence, several passages support the argument that Grendel is motivated by envy or revenge to kill the Danes. The first passage occurs in beginning of the poem, when Grendel is introduced:

> Ða se ellengæst earfoðlice
> þrage geþolode, se þe in þystrum bad,
> þæt he dogora gehwam dream gehyrde
> hludne in healle; þær wæs hearpan sweg,
> swutol sang scopes. Sægde se þe cuþe
> frumsceaft fira feorran reccan,
> cwæð þæt se Ælmihtiga eorðan worhte,
> wlitebeorhtne wang, swa wæter bebugeð,
> gesette sigehreþig sunnan ond monan

leoman to leohte landbuendum,

ond gefrætwade foldan sceatas

leomum ond leafum, lif eac gesceop

rynna gehwylcum þara ðe cwice hwyrfaþ.---

Swa þa drihtguman dreamum lifdon,

eadiglice, oð ðæt an ongan

fyrene fremman feond on helle;

wæs se grimma gæst Grendel haten,

mære mearcstapa, se þe moras heold,

fen ond fæsten; fifelcynnes eard

wonsæli wer weardode hwile,

siþðan him Scyppend forscrifen hæfde

in Caines cynne--- þone cwealm gewræc

ece Drihten, þæs þe he Abel slog;

ne gefeah he þære fæhðe, ac hehine feor forwræc,

Metod for þy mane mancynne fram.

Þanon untydras ealle on wocon,

eotenas ond ylfe ond orcneas,

swylce gigantas, þa wið Gode wunnon

lange þrage; he him ðæs lean forgeald.

A bold demon who waited in darkness

wretchedly suffered all the while,

for every day he heard the joyful din

loud in the hall, with the harp's sound,

the clear song of the scop. He said

who was able to tell of the origin of men

that the Almighty created the earth,

a bright and shining plain, by seas embraced,

and set, triumphantly, the sun and moon

to light their beams for those who dwell on land,

adorned the distant corners of the world

with leaves and branches, and made life also,

all manner of creatures that live and move.

--Thus this lordly people lived in joy,

blessedly, until one began

to work his foul crimes—a fiend from Hell.

This grim spirit was called Grendel,

mighty stalker of the marches, who held

the moors and fens; this miserable man

lived for a time in the land of giants,

after the Creator had condemned him

among Cain's race—when he killed Abel

the eternal Lord avenged that death.

No joy in that feud—the Maker forced him

far from mankind for his foul crime.

From thence arose all misbegotten things,

trolls and elves and the living dead,

and also the giants who strove against God

for a long while—He gave them their reward for that. (86-114)

In this passage we learn of Grendel's origin and the motivation of his violence. The passage correlates Grendel's aggression against the Danes of Heorot with their happiness and spiritual connection to the Creator. Grendel is an outcast from the community of God, being descended from Cain, and is miserable having to listen to the scop's joyous song about Gods creation. Grendel's isolation from the group and the constant reminder of this through the Danes' song sets him off on a personal vendetta.[6] Another passage occurring a few lines later in the text supports the revenge argument. Here Grendel's acts are portrayed as a feud or war rather than a hunt:

ylda bearnum, undyrne cuð

gyddum geomore, þætte Grendel wan

hwile wið Hroþgar, heteniðas wæg,

fyrene ond fæhðefela missera,

singale sæce; sibbe ne wolde

wið manna hwone mægenes Deniga,

[6] Being excluded or outcast from the community can deeply affect an individual's personality and many psychologists posit deprivation or humiliation hypotheses for the origin of vindictiveness. See Searles (1956) and Akhtar (2014).

feorhbealo feorran, fea þingian,

ne þær nænig witena wenan þorfte

beorhtre bote to banan folmum;

it became known, and carried abroad

in sad tales, that Grendel strove

long with Hrothgar, bore his hatred,

sins and feuds, for many seasons,

perpetual conflict; he wanted no peace

with any man of the Danish army,

nor ceased his deadly hatred, nor settled with money,

nor did any of the counselors need to expect

bright compensation from the killer's hands, (146-158)

The key word in this passage is *heteniðas*, translated as "hatred, hostility, or spite." These are not emotions associated with predatory aggression, but rather are hallmarks of revenge. A third supporting passage occurs just a few lines later:

Swa fela fyrena feond mancynnes,

atol angengea, oft gefremede,

herdra hynða; Heorot eardode,

sincfage sel sweartum nihtum;---

no he þone gifstol gretan moste,

maþðum for Metode, ne his myne wisse.---

Thus the foe of mankind, fearsome and solitary,

often committed his many crimes,

cruel humiliations; he occupied Heorot,

the jewel-adorned hall, in the dark nights—

he saw no need to salute the throne,

he scorned the treasures; he did not know their love. (164-169)

In both this and the previous passage, the verbal choice of "*fyren*" ("crime," 149, 164) portrays Grendel as an enemy of the state and implies that Grendel is consciously aware that he is committing some moral or social impropriety.

These passages portray Grendel as an outcast from the society of men and God, who harbors envy and hatred toward them and whose strategic and lethal displays of aggression serve as a means to satisfy a personal vendetta. The preponderance of scholarship, along with the textual evidence, overwhelmingly justifies the argument that Grendel's aggression is motivated by revenge. And yet the evidence is also quite strong to support predatory aggression. We are thus faced with a difficult question: how can Grendel be acting on revenge and predation simultaneously, since these two forms of aggression are generally exclusive? To solve this riddle, we can turn to science, specifically neuropsychology. Neurologically speaking, revenge is quite similar to predatory aggression in one major way; both types of aggression utilize the same neural system, the SEEKING system.

Affective Neuropsychology: the SEEKING and RAGE systems[7]

The branch of science that studies how intense emotional feelings, called *affects*, arise from the brain is called *affective neuroscience.* According to Jaak Panksepp affects arise from neural networks in regions below the neocortex.[8] Panksepp writes, "those ancestral neural territories below the neocortex constitute our ancestral mind—the affective mind, which is evolutionarily specialized and that we share with many other animals. It is 'archaeological treasure,' for it contains the sources of some of our most powerful feelings" (2012, x). Panksepp discovered that these subcortical regions of mammalian brains contain at least seven basic affective systems, three of which can trigger aggression: SEEKING, FEAR, and RAGE.

The SEEKING system is the biggest of the seven basic affective systems and is crucially important for the other emotional systems to operate.[9] According to Panksepp, the SEEKING system essentially acts as a mental goad to our neocortex to fulfill our needs and desires and is characterized by a persistent exploratory inquisitiveness (2012, 103). He writes, "it [the SEEKING system] engenders energetic forward locomotion—approach and engagement with the world … When in the service of positive emotions, the SEEKING system engenders a sense of purpose, accompanied by feelings of interest ranging to euphoria" (2012, 34-35), and "SEEKING generates energetic exploration and foraging, along with affects that can be better described as euphoric excitement rather than reward or pleasure—the feeling is one of

[7] The brain and its systems are incredibly complex, and for the purposes of this paper I will focus on only on the most pertinent emotions and responses of the SEEKING and RAGE systems. Although not mentioned, other emotions and responses, as well as other brain systems are certainly at play.
[8] The neocortex is the region of the brain involved in complex cognitive abilities, such as learning and thought.
[9] The SEEKING system of the brain is located in the Medial Forebrain Bundle, which runs through the hypothalamus and connects many regions of the lower brain stem and midbrain to higher regions of the brain, including the medial frontal cortex (Panksepp and Biven 2012, 96).

anticipatory-expectant eagerness and, at a more cognitive level, the engendering of discrete expectancies" (2012, 83).[10] The SEEKING affect is not goal-oriented; it is simply the goad that motivate us accomplish the goal. Since many other neurological systems are involved in defining the goal, the SEEKING system plays a key role in many our conscious and subconscious mental processes.

Analysis of the motivations, thoughts, and actions of Grendel from a neuropsychological perspective suggests that he is portrayed as a character with an aroused SEEKING system. He displays all of the typical traits: the engagement of SEEKING system would allow Grendel to perform his task with focused energy, all his mental and physical energies would be bent on finding ways to accomplish his goal, and the encouraging sense of purpose that emanates from the arousal of the SEEKING system creates a sense of euphoric expectancy. The question thus remains, what is Grendel's goal?

Is it to satisfy hunger? According to Panksepp, hunger is a homeostatic affect, one of the three general types of primary-process affects (2012, 18). Primary-process affects are the instinctual emotional or basal responses coded in the sub-neocortical regions of the brain that generate raw affective feelings. Primary-process affects influence secondary-process learning mechanisms, including classical conditioning, instrumental and operant conditioning, and behavioral and emotional habits,[11] and then these both combine with higher cognitions, such as cognitive executive functions of the frontal cortex and the emotional ruminations and

[10] See also Panksepp and Biven 2012, 85-86.

[11] Secondary-process learning mechanisms occur via the Basal Ganglia and are unconscious like primary-process affects. Regarding secondary-process learned mechanisms, Panksepp writes, "upon this 'instinctual foundation' [of primary-process affects] we have a variety of learning and memory mechanisms, which we here envision as the *secondary process of the brain; … we believe these intermediate brain processes are deeply unconscious" (2012,* 9).

regulations of the medial frontal regions of the brain, into a tertiary-process mental landscape (Panksepp and Biven 2012, 9, 20).[12] In applying Panksepp's paradigm to the behavior of predatory aggression, hunger is one of the basic primary-process affects which stimulates the SEEKING system and drives predatory aggressive behavior. At the secondary-process level, through learning and interaction with its environment, the sight, smell, or sound of a certain prey animal can trigger predatory behavior, even if the predator is not necessarily hungry. The primary-process affect of hunger and the secondary-process learning mechanisms combine with certain higher neo-cortical functions and become the complex tertiary process of the behavior of predatory aggression.

In revenge behavior the SEEKING system works in a different way. Revenge is a tertiary-process behavior, and it is a combination of the stimulation of multiple affective systems, as well as multiple primary- and secondary- process emotions, combined with higher cognitive tertiary-processes. According to Panksepp, "Hatred and revenge are tertiary processes that reflect our capacity to think about the wrongs that we have experienced and to devise detailed schemes for retribution" (2012, 146). When someone inflicts mental or physical pain upon an individual, or robs an individual of a physical or emotional treasure, this act initially stimulates the RAGE system, another one of those seven basic affective systems, generating the emotional affect of raw anger. According to Panksepp, when the RAGE system is stimulated "we experience an intense desire to reach out and strike someone—not just anyone, but the

[12] On tertiary-process social emotions Panksepp writes, "at the top of the brain, we find a diversity of higher mental processes—the diverse cognitions and thoughts that allow us to reflect on what we have learned from our experiences—and we call them tertiary processes" (2012, 9). For a helpful visual aid on the three-process brain model, see Solms and Panksepp (2012).

individual who we believe is responsible for unleashing our fury" (2012, 145). RAGE (the affect) is the primary-process, but this affect has no object. Directed anger, as a secondary-process learned feeling, always has some object that is perceived to be the cause of the RAGE. RAGE is an emotionally negative affect; individuals do not enjoy it and desire to eliminate it. If the wronged individual is not able to immediately lash out at his/her object or a representative of that object and so give satisfaction to the RAGE, the inability to eliminate the negative affect often leads the RAGE system to handoff to the SEEKING system—SEEKING being an emotionally positive affect.[13] In a 2004 study Dominique de Quervain and his colleagues found that part of the striatum, the part of the core of the SEEKING system, plays a large part in pondering revenge.[14] Referencing this same study, Michel McCullough hypothesized that the Seeking system created a satisfying and rewarding psychological state in the participants of the study as they observed the suffering of the people who had treated them unfairly. He writes,

> People who have been harmed by another person are goaded into revenge by a brain system that hands them a promissory note certifying that revenge, when it comes, will make them feel good. Upon receipt of this promissory note, the left frontal cortex goes to work to develop a plan for obtaining revenge. When avengers actually see their transgressors experiencing the pain they've planned for them, they get the pleasurable jolt that the seeking system had promised. A hard truth of human nature is that it's often pleasant to watch our enemies suffer, and it's a pleasure that we'll sometimes go to great lengths to acquire (2008, 46).

[13] The neural pathways of the RAGE and SEEKING systems are in close proximity to each other, and this close proximity likely allows for communication and hand-offs between the two systems.
[14] Steven Pinker also states that the greater the desire, the more the Striatum is activated (2011, 531).

In essence, when we *plot* revenge against those who have irritated us, it is the SEEKING system that prompts us to devise these plans, energizing the neocortex to put in motion plans for revenge and carry them out to fulfillment (Panksepp and Biven 2012, 98). The pleasurable anticipation of inflicting pain offsets the negative feelings of envy and injury (Panskepp and Biven 2012, 99). The evolutionary theorist Steven Pinker sums up well the neuropsychological interpretation of revenge, saying,

> The neurobiology of revenge begins with the Rage circuit in the midbrain-hypothalamus-amygdala pathway, which inclines an animal who has been hurt or frustrated to lash out at the nearest likely perpetrator. In humans the system is fed by information originating from anywhere in the brain, including the temporoparietal junction, which indicates whether the harm was intended or accidental. The Rage circuit then activates the insular cortex, which gives rise to sensations of pain, disgust, and anger. … But then the brain can slip into a different mode of information processing. … They [Neuroscientists] predict that patterns of activity in the brain can shift from an aversive anger to a cool and pleasurable seeking, the kind that guides the pursuit of delectable food (2011, 530-531).

The key for our purpose in this paper is that in revenge behavior, the SEEKING system is applicable to the appetitive phase of the action—the search and acquisition of a desired outcome, the satisfaction of the initial RAGE stimulation—, and is not triggered by the homeostatic affect of hunger, as it is in predatory aggression.[15]

[15] Panksepp believes that the RAGE system may also play a small role in predatory aggression, but warns against over-emphasizing it: "The RAGE affect is a negative feeling, whereas the SEEKING affect is a positive feeling. Hunger likely stimulates the RAGE system to a small extent—as hungry animals are more likely to lash out—while

A Neuropsychological Interpretation of Grendel's Behavior

Taking these findings from neuropsychology and applying them to the textual evidence, I have devised the following neuropsychological interpretation of the Grendel episode in *Beowulf.* As a descendent of Cain, Grendel is outcast from God's community, a community which includes the Danes, and the inclusion into which the Danes are joyously celebrating in song. This celebratory song triggers a number of complex third-process social emotions such as envy and a sense of personal injury as Grendel feels the mental anguish of being separated from the community. These tertiary-process social-emotions involve secondary-process learning mechanisms, such as directed anger, as well as the primary affect of RAGE as part of the RAGE system, but they also trigger the SEEKING system. With the SEEKING system engaged, Grendel plots and carries out revenge. His behavior as he stealthily approaches Heorot is, in essence, the result of the SEEKING system, which gives him the euphoric sense of focus to accomplish his desires. This in turn triggers other, more complex secondary-process learned behaviors and tertiary-process complex social behaviors that govern the specific conscious and subconscious behaviors of stalking and strategizing. When he bursts through the gates of Heorot, his SEEKING system is fully engaged, as he is entirely focused on committing revenge crimes. Hence, his demonic glee at the depredation he is about to cause. However, some aspect of the act or the environment, possibly the sight, smell, and sound of Heorot or the warriors, triggers secondary-process learning mechanisms that kick-start his predatory aggression, which

---

at the same time it primarily stimulates the SEEKING system—as it prompts the animal to seek a means of satisfying its hunger. But it is important to reinforce that predatory aggression is governed by SEEKING system rather than the RAGE system" (2012, 165).

explains why he eats his victims. The devouring thus serves two roles, revenge and predation, as the same neural system, the SEEKING system, is able to govern both types of behavior. Clearly, the SEEKING system is not yet satisfied, though, as he continues with his revenge and predation. But, when he encounters Beowulf, the entire situation changes. This prey/revenge object fights back. A sudden unfulfillment of the SEEKING triggers the RAGE system, and Grendel lashes out, or at least attempts to, in battle with his foe. At this time, revenge and predation are out of his mind and survival, through flight, against an equal or greater adversary becomes his focus.

Conclusion

Grendel is a unique character, man-like but not quite man, who is in a situation in which he can accomplish two fundamentally disparate goals, revenge and predation, in a single act. Grendel is a predator but the text is clear that he harbors ill-will against the Danes. A large motivation for his killing the Danes is to get revenge, but his consumption of the humans satisfies his predatory urges. The key to understanding how revenge aggression and predatory aggression work simultaneously in Grendel lies in neuroscience, which reveals that both acts rely upon the same neural system of the brain, the SEEKING system. Grendel had in his past consumed the Danes as part of his nourishment, and, given the nature of secondary-process learning mechanisms that relate to predatory aggression, the sight, sound, and smell of the Danes would likely trigger predatory aggression. This is entirely consistent with the textual material in the poem, but it does not explain Grendel's motivation for coming to Heorot in the first place. However, if we view Grendel's aggression as motivated by revenge, this explanation

is consistent not only with our knowledge of the SEEKING system of the brain, which is utilized in the appetitive phase of revenge behavior, but also with the textual evidence that correlates Grendel's anger and violence with the suffering caused by listening to the joyous song in Heorot. The dual nature of his aggression truly accords with the Danes description of him as one who manifests "his terrible and mysterious violence, *shame* and *slaughter*" (276b-277a).

Michael Holstead
University of Wisconsin-Green Bay

Works Cited

Akhtar, Salman. “Revenge,” in Salman Akhtar and Henri Parens, eds. *Revenge: Narcissistic Injury, Rage, and Retaliation*. Lanham, Maryland: Jason Aronson, 2014.

Daniels, Marvin. “Pathological Vindictiveness and the Vindictive Character.” *Psychoanalytic Review* 56 (1969): 169-196.

de Quervain, D.J., U. Fischbacher, V. Treyer, M. Schellhammer, U. Schnyder, A. Buck, and E. Fehr. “The Neural Basis of Altruistic Punishment.” *Science* 305 (2004): 1254-1258.

Emerson, Oliver Farrar. “Grendel’s Motive in Attacking Heorot.” *The Modern Language Review* 16 (1921): 113-119.

Fulk, R.D., Robert E. Bjork, and John D. Niles, eds. *Klaeber’s Beowulf*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.

Hume, Kathryn. “The Theme and Structure of “Beowulf.” *Studies in Philology* 72 (1975): 1-27.

Johnston, Ruth. *A Companion to Beowulf*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2005.

Klaeber, Frederick. “Die Christlichen Elemente im Beowulf,” *Anglia* 35 (1911): 249-270.

Liuzza, Roy M. *Beowulf*. Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press, 2012.

Marvin, William Perry. *Hunting Law and Ritual in Medieval English Literature*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2006.

McCullough, Michael. *Beyond Revenge: The Evolution of the Forgiveness Instinct*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2008.

Panksepp, Jaak and Lucy Biven. *The Archaeology of Mind: Neuroevolutionary Origins of Human Emotions*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2012.

Parks, Ward. “Prey Tell: How Heroes Perceive Monsters in ‘Beowulf’.” *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 92 (1993): 1-16.

Phillips, James. “In the Company of Predators Beowulf and the Monstrous Descendants of Cain.” *Angelaki* 13 (2008): 41-52.

Pinker, Steven. *The Better Angels of our Nature: Why Violence has Declined*. New York: Viking 2011.

Rosen, I.C. “Revenge—the Hate that Dare not Speak its Name: a Psychoanalytic Perspective.” *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association* 55 (2007): 595-619.

Sandner, David. “Tracking Grendel: The Uncanny in Beowulf.” *Extrapolation* 40 (1999): 162-176.

Searles, H.F. “The Psychodynamics of Vindictiveness,” in H.F. Searles, ed. *Collected Papers on Schizophrenia and Related Subjects*. New York: International Universities Press, 1956.

Shapiro, Barbara. “Revenge and Reparation: Thoughts About the Treatment of a Boy and His Family.” In Akhtar, Salman and Henri Parens, eds. *Revenge: Narcissistic Injury, Rage, and Retaliation*. Lanham, Maryland: Jason Aronson, 2014.

Solms, Mark and Jaak Panksepp. “The ‘Id’ Knows More than the ‘Ego’ Admits: Neuropsychoanalytic and Primal Consciousness Perspectives on the Interface Between Affective and Cognitive Neuroscience.” *Brain Sciences* 2 (2012): 147-175.

White, Judy. “‘Beowulf,’ line 78.” *The Explicator* 51 (1993): 138.

Monstrous Bodies and Transformation in Marie de France's "Bisclavret" and Chaucer's "The Wife of Bath's Tale"

Chaucer's loathly lady in "The Wife of Bath," tells the knight to "Cast up the curtyn" as she transforms from a hideous old woman into a lovely, beautiful (and faithful) wife (1249).[1] Stories that contain transformed bodies, whether into animals or other humans, appear in various medieval texts and are a motif of the romance genre. Both Marie de France's "Bisclavret" and Chaucer's "The Wife of Bath's Tale" use this motif of bodily transformation and they both contain characters whose physical bodies take monstrous forms. These two texts share major thematic elements regarding magic and shapeshifting through the characters of Bisclavret and the loathly lady. Both of these "monstrous" beings, while containing physically altered bodies, display innate noble qualities that overshadow the morals of the other characters in their respective tales. Furthermore, female agency can only be obtained through manipulating magic, either by exploiting the magical condition of others (as in the case of Bisclavret's wife) or using magic to transform the self (as in the case of the loathly lady). As Jeffery Jerome Cohen states in his foundational essay "Monster Culture (Seven Theses)," a monster serves as "the abjected fragment that enables the formation of all kinds of identities—personal, national, cultural, economic, sexual, psychological, universal, particular (even if that 'particular' identity is an embrace of the power/status/knowledge of abjection itself)" (19-20). Thus, monsters, such as Bisclavret and the loathly lady, not only function as creatures of intrigue, but they are also important symbols through which to access the complexity of human

[1] All references to the primary texts of "Bisclavret" and "The Wife of Bath's Tale" are provided in line numbers. All other citations contain page numbers, unless otherwise noted.

identity, or more specifically in the case of "Bisclavret" and "The Wife of Bath's Tale," issues of gendered power. Considering the work of Jeffrey Jerome Cohen regarding Monster Theory and Caroline Walker Bynum's *Metamorphosis and Identity* (2005), among others, this paper demonstrates how monstrous bodies serve as tools to subvert traditional notions of gendered agency and identity in the Middle Ages, and in turn, shows that the truly monstrous characters are those who commit sexual transgressions against cultural expectations.[2]

Monstrous Bodies and Metamorphoses

In considering both Bisclavret as werewolf and the loathly lady as containing "monstrous bodies," it first seems pertinent to outline a few points of Jeffrey Jerome Cohen's Seven Theses regarding monsters. His first thesis, that "the monster's body is a cultural body," stresses that the monster exists "as an embodiment of a certain cultural moment—of a time, a feeling, and a place. The monster's body quite literally incorporates fear, desire, anxiety, and fantasy (ataractic or incendiary), giving them life and an uncanny independence. The monstrous body is pure culture" ("Monster" 4). Cohen asserts here that monstrous bodies serve as a projection of cultural ideas. Monsters, as literary constructs, serve as signs that contain symbolic value derived from their specific historical, cultural, and social contexts. For "Bisclavret," this means that the monstrous body of the werewolf serves as a reflection of the anxiety and fantasy of feudalism and chivalry in the late twelfth century on the cusp of the Late Middle Ages. Similarly, Chaucer's loathly lady serves as a reflection of many of these same

[2] For the purposes of the conference proceedings, this paper has been condensed and excludes the major discussion of Chaucer's "The Wife of Bath's Tale."

anxieties surrounding feudal knights, but as feminist scholarship on "The Wife of Bath" has shown, also the changing roles of women and gender politics in the fourteenth century.

Gender politics plays a central role in both narratives. Cohen's fourth thesis, that "the monster dwells at the gate of difference," says that "Monsters are never created *ex nihilo* but through a process of fragmentation and recombination in which elements are extracted 'from various forms' (including—indeed, especially marginalized social groups) and then assembled as the monster, 'which can then claim an independent identity'" ("Monster" 11). For a medieval audience, women are certainly a "marginalized social group," and any transgressions against patriarchal expectations or an overindulgence in female sexuality is faced with severe consequences that often become reflected in the physical bodily transformations of female characters.

These physical transformations, or metamorphoses, as Caroline Walker Bynum refers to them in her book *Metamorphosis and Identity*, "expresses a labile world of flux and transformation, encountered through story . . . Metamorphosis is about process, *mutatio*, story—a constant series of replacement-changes, or, as Bernard of Clairvaux puts it, little deaths" (30). This process or change of the body manifests itself in narrative of, as Bynum refers to it, Western high culture, as a way to explore issues of identity. Sexual identity and gender roles in the Middle Ages were largely predetermined by social forces of church governing, laws, and the roles of men. This contrasts with the modern concept of individualism as a dialectical creation that pits society against that of the self. Thus, sexual identity and gendered power within a medieval context needs to be considered in relation to the social status of the characters and the historical religious context. For "Bisclavret" as a twelfth-

century text, this means examining how the medieval religious context clashes with renewed interest in the classical notions of bodily transformation. In order to highlight this point further, Bynum discusses that

> Orthodox attacks on heretics for metempsychosis—that is, body-hopping, body-exchange or body erasure—came, I argued, at the height of Western understanding of resurrection as materialist and literal. Scholastic and monastic discussions of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries saw an embodied self as locus of identity and connected this identity with triumph over change, over physical process and decay. Bodily resurrection was thus both supernatural and natural . . . Only God can sustain the "same" body through death, decay, and resurrection. (79)

Thus, this emphasis on resurrection and orthodox religious views informs 12th and 13th century views of bodily transformation as overcoming the natural progression of human life. The body serves as a "locus" of identity, but also as a physical manifestation of the inner self. In general, one can often see outer beauty as a signifier of inward beauty and noble virtues in the medieval courtly literature genre.

Bisclavret

However, Marie de France's "Bisclavret" provides a more complicated look into human identity and the dual nature of the human/beast. "Bisclavret" tells the story of a knight of Brittany who was "close to his lord, / and loved by all his neighbors" (19-20). However, every week he disappears for three days, and not even his wife knows where he goes. His wife finally convinces him to tell her his secret, and he reveals that he is a werewolf. While naked in

werewolf form, he cannot change back into a human unless he has his clothes. The lady becomes so "terrified of the whole adventure" that she decides to find a way to rid herself of her husband (99). Seeking help, she convinces a knight "who had loved her for a long time," but whom "she'd never loved" to help her steal her husband's clothes (104, 107). Her husband, trapped in werewolf form, does not return home, and the wife goes on to marry the knight. A year later, the king happens to go hunting and Bisclavret, still in wolf form, befriends him in the forest. Astounded, the king takes Bisclavret to live at the castle. When Bisclavret comes across his former wife, he attacks her and rips off her nose. The court finds this behavior odd, considering that Bisclavret has never been prone to acts of aggression before. Bisclavret's former wife is then tortured, in which she reveals how she and the knight stole Bisclavret's clothing. After regaining his clothes, the king restores his lands and exiles the lady and the knight. In the concluding lines of the lai, it gruesomely recounts how the wife's lineage is forever "born without noses" (313).

As many scholars have noted, Marie's werewolf story remains unique in several respects. Traditionally, the ancient werewolves of classical literature, coming from Ovid, Pliny, and Petronius, are depicted as violent, hairy, bloodthirsty monsters who often feed on humans. Contrastingly, the werewolves of twelfth and early thirteenth century romances are what many scholars have deemed "sympathetic werewolves." Bynum notes that these "sympathetic werewolves" are "victims who are changed into wolves, usually by evil women, but who retain the 'intelligence and memory' of rational human beings" (94-95). Or to put it another way, Cohen refers to them as "humans encased in lupine skin, awaiting liberation" ("The Werewolf" 352). Bisclavret certainly falls into this category of the "sympathetic werewolf," and there

seems to be little doubt that Marie's sympathies lie with the man turned wolf, rather than his wife. For all intended purposes, the wife's actions seem entirely reasonable. Knowing the dangers of werewolves, she takes action to ensure that Bisclavret no longer sleeps in her bed. Her recruitment and marrying of the knight who helps her steal Bisclavret's clothing results from fear and the need for protection—not from any preconceived notion of adultery. She doesn't even love the knight, but realizes that he can serve as a convenient solution to her problem. In this respect, the wife shows a great deal of agency in working to find a solution to her problem. Yet, in exerting this agency, she betrays her husband, a character who the lai has already established as a noble and worthy lord.

Regardless of how sympathetic Bisclavret may seem, scholars have contested the reading of the "sympathetic" werewolf. David B. Leshock, in his article "The Knight of the Werewolf: Bisclavret and the Shape-Shifting Metaphor," argues that

> Even if we accept that the narrator presents a sympathetic Bisclavret without any qualifications, the fact alone that the wife betrays her husband does not necessitate that Bisclavret is a noble character, although the wife displays many negative qualities, Bisclavret is a werewolf, an association that carries overwhelmingly negative implications. There is in fact no completely moral character in this lay, yet critics continually focus on the sympathetic treatment of Bisclavret. (157)

Leshock's reading comes into direct contrast with Bynum's historical justification for the "sympathetic werewolf" that appears in literature surrounding twelfth century. His article goes on to make the claim that the metaphor of the werewolf cannot be contained, and thus, the

story must be read as a social critique on knighthood. While Leshock's discussion of knighthood has its merits, his assertion that "we must assume that werewolves will be werewolves and that Bisclavret continues to eat humans and cause great harm" remains a tenuous argument at best and lacks any contextual evidence to support this claim (158).

However, Leshock's refusal to concretize a reading of the werewolf does reflect some of the textual tension in "Bisclavret" to establish an identity for the lord. In the problematic opening to the lai, Marie writes: "I don't want to forget Bisclavret; / In Breton, the lai's name is Bisclavret— / the Normans call it *Garwaf* [*The Werewolf*]" (2-4). After describing the werewolf of "old days" (5) as a "savage beast," (9) she says, "But that's enough of this for now; I want to tell you about the Bisclavret" (13-14). The distinction that Marie makes between Bisclavret as a proper noun and the Bisclavret as a common noun appears is not an anomaly of translation, but it also appears in the original Old French. Matilda Bruckner writes that this reflects "the textualization of Bisclavret's problematic identity: he is caught in the redundance of common and proper nouns; he lacks the distinction conferred by a name which does not simply coincide with a general category; his difference can only be suggested in the subtle play with the definite article" (255). This play with language at the beginning of the lai, sets up Bisclavret as having a contested identity. Whereas, the traditional werewolf, or *bisclavret* as a common noun, serves as a savage and dangerous creature, it contrasts with the *Bisclavret* as a proper noun, a character that deviates from the traditional werewolf lore. Lucas Wood highlights this point by stating that "The problem of the werewolf is the problem of too many surfaces, of a scandalous plurality of bodies" (9). Just as the name identifies two distinct versions of a werewolf, Bisclavret himself must also struggle with the plurality of his own physical body—that of both

beast and man. Furthermore, one might also consider this plurality of bodies in relation to Chaucer's "Wife of Bath's Tale." As shall be discussed later, the loathly lady also contains another example of the plurality of bodies and the inability to establish a fixed identity.

Perhaps Bisclavret's identity becomes most established in his interactions with the king. Upon the king's dogs cornering Bisclavret during a hunt, he tells his lords to "Chase the dogs away, / and make sure no one strikes it. / This beast is rational—he has a mind" (157-159). Once the king takes Bisclavret to his castle, he never wants to "be separated from him" (182) and the king "became very much aware that the creature loved him" (184). In his relationship with the king, Bisclavret finds the missing companionship that his wife failed to provide him. The husband/wife relationship becomes replaced with a feudal knight/king homosocial bond. As Cohen states, "Well fed and watered, full of proper submission but also ready to unleash proper violence, he is at once like a favorite hunting dog and like a good household knight. He learns the equivalence between two forms that seemed mutually exclusive, learns their indifference" ("The Werewolf" 356). However, Bisclavret does not seem entirely indifferent as Cohen asserts, for he certainly wants to be returned to the status of the knight at the end of the tale, but he does fulfill his role as knight to the best of his ability while in wolf form. It remains impossible to assert that Bisclavret undergoes some kind of high moral transition in his time as the king's hunting dog. Marie has already established him as a noble lord, and the text provides no evidence to the contrary, regardless of the fact that he seems to be an unwilling victim to his lycanthropy.

Leshock further explores Bisclavret's role as a part man, part wolf as a social critique on role of the knight in feudal society. He says "The metaphor of the werewolf is apt for the

knight's dual role as a loyal supporter at court and a fighter in the field. The knight must devote a certain amount of time to military pursuits as well as be a loyal servant to a lord and act within the social boundaries of courtly behavior. In the role of the fighter, the knight could easily become the vicious beast that the werewolf represents" (160). Leshock continues on to say that "Even in beastly form, Bisclavret is able to participate in the feudal bind. His lack of a complete humanity does not disqualify him from the role of the knight" (162). Bisclavret exhibits the dual role of the knight as both loyal supporter and fighter within his courtly interactions with the king and his vicious attack on his former wife while in wolf form. Yet, Bisclavret does not seem to show a "lack of complete humanity" while in wolf form. In fact, the point seems to be the opposite. Bisclavret shows the most humanity not in human form, but in his friendship and loyalty to the king as a wolf.

Even his vicious attack upon his former wife and the severing of her nose does not seem all that out of place given the historical context. Within a medieval context, this action may indeed fall within, as Bruckner says, "the limits of human justice" (262). Leslie Dunton-Downer provides further historical context:

> Historical approaches have discovered in the episode evidence of contemporary practice of punishing adulteresses by cutting off their noses, so that Bisclavret's violence acts within a recognizable judicial discourse. And philological observations have drawn on the acoustic proximity of *lupa* (a she-wolf or prostitute) or *lepra* (female leper) who were often co-identified during this period as lascivious marginal, or even outlaws. So tearing off the nose makes the wife, as figurative *lupa* look like a *lepra* and exposes her bestial nature while, by

> contrast, Bisclavret's wolf shape conceals (even as it invites people to marvel at) his human nature. (209)

Just like an adulteress, her nose is severed as punishment. Thus, the wife becomes punished for her sexual transgressions and marriage to the knight, and her "bestial" nature becomes transcribed in her physical appearance. As Emma Campbell states, "The severing of the wife's nose in *Bisclavret*, in addition to suggesting inappropriate sexual behavior, is a dehumanizing gesture that serves physically to expose an inhumanity that she has supposedly kept hidden up to this point" (100). From a psychoanalytic standpoint, the nose also serves as a phallic signifier, therefore in the severing of the wife's nose, she becomes stripped of her power over the body of Bisclavret—a reversal from the typical male power over the female body. Not only does she lose her power over Bisclavret's appearance in the return of his clothes, but she also goes "into exile with the knight / with whom she had betrayed her lord" (307-308). In her realized bestial status, the wife no longer deserves to live in the civilized court of the king—not because of her now physical deformity but because of the inner monstrous behavior that it symbolizes. A symbol so powerful, that even her lineage must bear the weight of her disgraceful behavior.

In light of this analysis of Marie's "Bisclavret," the wife's treatment does not appear to be a misogynistic medieval tale that unjustly delights in the mutilation of the female body, but rather, the intention here seems to be a tale that explores the duality of human nature and the ability to tame the inward beast. Bisclavret, despite his transformation into a wolf, remains a loyal and noble character, and consequently becomes rewarded with the return of his human physical body. As Bruckner states, Bisclavret's return to his former self can be interpreted as

"as an achievement of harmony, untroubled by his continued identity as a werewolf, the exaggerated form of 'normal' human duality" (263). The wife however, abandons her husband, either out of fear or disgust, and fails to tame the bestial side of her identity. In marrying the knight, she further betrays her husband and commits adultery. Therefore, even though Bisclavret contains a physically altered body that shifts from man to wolf, it is the wife who reveals herself to be truly monstrous.

Jacob Herrmann
University of Kansas

Works Cited

Bruckner, Matilda Tomaryn. "Of Men and Beasts in 'Bisclavret.'" *Romantic Review* 82.3 (1991): 251-269. Print.

Bynum, Caroline Walker. *Metamorphosis and Identity*. Brooklyn, NY: Zone Books, 2001. Print.

Campbell, Emma. "Political Animals: Human/Animal Life in 'Bisclavret' and 'Yonec.'" *Exemplaria* 25.2 (2013): 95-109. *Taylor & Francis Online*. Web. 3 Mar. 2016.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. "The Wife of Bath's Tale." *The Canterbury Tales*. Eds. Robert Boenig and Andrew Taylor. Peterborough, Ont: Broadview Press, 2008. 314-319. Print.

Cohen, Jeffrey Jerome. "Monster Culture (Seven Theses)." *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*. Ed. Jeffrey Jerome Cohen. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996. 3-25. Print.

---. "The Werewolf's Indifference." *Studies in the Age of Chaucer* 34 (2012): 351-56. *Project Muse*. Web. 24 Mar. 2016.

Dunton-Downer, Leslie. "Wolf Man." *Becoming Male in the Middle Ages*. Eds. Jeffrey Jerome Cohen and Bonnie Wheeler. New York: Garland Publishing Inc, 1997. 203-218. Print.

Leshock, David B. "The Knight of the Werewolf: Bisclavret and the Shape-Shifting Metaphor." *Romance Quarterly* 46.3 (1999): 155. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 13 Mar. 2016.

Wood, Lucas. "The Werewolf as Möbius Strip, or Becoming Bisclavret." *The Romantic Review* 102.1-2 (2011): 3-25. *EBSCO*. Web. 24 Mar. 2016.

Somewhere Between Fact and Fiction: The Historical Value of Vortigern and the *Adventus Saxonum* as presented in *Historia Brittonum*

King Arthur stirs up images and ideas that resonate with millions of people. He is a legendary leader, a valiant warrior, a doomed hero, a savior, a sacrifice, a promise - due in large part to the literary and imaginative licenses of Geoffrey of Monmouth, Chretien de Troyes, and Sir Thomas Malory. With every incarnation, the stories change, but the idea of Arthur remains constant. Arthur defends, protects, and unifies. He is the model for Christian kingship and a reminder of human fallibility. He is the intersection between the Christian world and the mythical, magical past.

It is then no wonder why so many have sought to uncover the historical Arthur. The consistent undercurrents throughout Arthurian legend may have been the spark that drove early modern scholars to trace Arthur as a historical figure who defended, protected, and unified his people in times of crisis. Historians in search of Arthur initially turned to Geoffrey of Monmouth's *History of the Kings of Britain* written in 1136. Widely considered an imaginative work of fiction, *History of the Kings of Britain* does offer some clues to the historical Arthur. Geoffrey's claim that his text was in part a translation of a text given to him by Walter, Archdeacon of Oxford, led historians on their own quest for these sources (Geoffrey 51). Years of work by numerous scholars have produced a general consensus that one of these historical sources is most likely the ninth century *Historia Brittonum* attributed to the Welsh monk Nennius.

Today many scholars consider *Historia Brittonum* a historical touchstone of the Arthurian legend; however, the factual validity of the work and thus the works based off of it, continue to be questioned. As historical evidence of a heroic Arthur who repelled a Saxon invasion in the fifth century, the text falls short for several reasons. First, battle names and places do not correlate to fifth century Britain. While there are theories that Nennius' battles and locations overlay conflicts in Northern Britain in the second century, this shines light on either Nennius' poor research or his misinterpretation of the information provided to him (Matthews and Matthews 18). Second, the text structure mimics biblical genealogical listings and traces British ancestors to legendary figures of ancient Greece and Rome suggesting a stronger tie to the mythical than the historical. Finally, Nennius presents fantastic events that can only be explained by divine intervention and his characters behave in ways so unbelievable, historians have done just that - disbelieve. As a result, *Historia Brittonum*'s value as a historical account of Arthur has diminished.

Yet these same elements, as part of the fifth century "history" presented by Nennius, increase the text's literary value. The central "history" focuses on Vortigern as a Briton chieftain, whose poor decisions and sinful ways leave the island exposed to the invasion of the Saxons. This tale provides the context for the invasion and the foundation for the Arthurian legend, including the prophecy of Merlin and a glimpse of Arthur himself. At the close of Vortigern's tale, events bring readers to meet this *dux bellorum*, who leads the charge to expel the Saxon hoards from island. Despite providing a solid foundation to the legend, historians have found few viable clues to the historical Arthur in this work and a large consensus suggests Arthur is a character compiled from a variety of mythical and historical figures, spanning from

the 2nd to the 9th century, and appearing in different versions of familiar legends Matthews and Matthews 52). If this is the case, where does this leave Nennius as a historian and *Historia Brittonum* as a historical work?

Just as the *Historia Brittonum* focuses on figures and events largely outside of Arthur, its historical value goes beyond battlefields, genealogical lists, and chronicle of fifth century events. Analyzed as a ninth century historical artifact in its own right, Nennius' work provides evidence of religious, political, and cultural ideas found in the ninth century Anglo-Saxon world and shared at large with the Christian world. In particular, the chapters focused on Vortigern, the *Adventus Saxonum,* and the subsequent introduction of Arthur, when considered in a ninth century context, reveal more historical insight than the contested fifth century events themselves. The inclusion of the legendary events of the fifth century in a ninth century text illuminates the progress, process, and purpose of writing history.

Nennius as a historian reveals himself to be just as complex as his text. Nennius may be a compilation of anonymous historians based on the different voices presented in the prologue and the apology (Dumville 17-19). However, just like Homer and the *Iliad* provide insight into ancient Greece, so too can Nennius and the *Historia* provide insight into the ninth century view of the process and purpose of history. Most scholars agree the approximate date of the work falls around 829-830 CE. The date, along with the reference to Gwynedd in northern Wales and the fact the text was written in Latin, suggest the author was indeed a ninth century Welsh monk. As such, Nennius would have had access to a variety of Church documents, histories, and local oral traditions compiled and recorded by the Church. He indicates he made a "heap of all he could find," and based his history on these works (Matthews and Matthews 48). In his

prologue and his apology, he identifies “writings and monuments of the ancient inhabitants of Britain,” Roman annals, Church chronicles written by “sacred fathers,” and the histories from the Scots and Saxons as his source material (Nennius 1). In addition, modern scholars have identified the *Kentish Chronicle* and the *Life of St. Germanus* as works utilized by Nennius (Matthews and Matthews 49). Seeking out and utilizing a variety of texts, Nennius follows the historical tradition of the Greeks and Romans. Greek and Roman histories like those of Herodotus, Thucydides, and Polybius all stress the importance of accumulating information from a variety of sources; thus making a heap of all the sources he could find was an established and necessary practice in the writing of history (Burrow 34, 75).

Nennius also focuses heavily on chronology, another characteristic of Greek and Roman histories (Matthews and Matthews 53). It is essential for Nennius to establish the chronological sequence of events not only in in relation to his own time, but also within the context of Church history, ancient history, and biblical history. His incorporation of Church and biblical events reinforces his own place in society and the Britons’ place in Christendom. He is after all, most likely a monk and making the connection between the Church, God, and the people will serve to strengthen the bonds between Britain and Rome. His attempts to strengthen the British ancestral connection to ancient Greece and Rome through his imitation of their histories, serves to elevate the cultural importance of the Britons and differentiate them from the other invading groups (Nennius 6). Thus his focus on chronology serves not only to imitate his historical fore-fathers, but also as an indication of identity.

This idea of identity drives Nennius’ work. Nennius stresses his purpose in writing history when speaking in the prologue to his readers, “This history therefore has been compiled

from a wish to benefit my inferiors, not from envy of those who are superior to me" (2-3). While the identity of his "inferiors" is unclear, what is clear is Nennius' view that preservation of British history can benefit others as indicated earlier in the prologue, "I have lispingly put together this history from various sources, and have endeavored, from shame, to deliver down to posterity the few remaining kernels of grain [*sic*] about past transactions, that they may not be trodden under foot, seeing that an ample crop has been snatched away already by the hostile reapers of foreign nations"(1). The hostile reapers may be the Saxons who came to dominate eastern Britain in the fifth century. Nennius himself calls the Saxons enemies in his prologue, when describing some of his source material which includes "...the histories of the Scots and Saxons, although our enemies" (1).

His assertion that the "past transactions" or early history of the Britons will be appropriated or buried by Saxon history is supported by the lack of a definitive British history since, as he points out, "teachers had no knowledge, nor gave any information in their books about this island of Britain" and by his having to rely on a variety of outside sources including those of the enemy (Nennius 3). His deep concern that Saxon history should engulf or extinguish British history surfaces again in the prologue: "I bore about with me an inward wound, and I was indignant, that the name of my own people, formerly famous and distinguished, should sink into oblivion, and like smoke be dissipated" (Nennius 2). Nennius' need to preserve British identity which is repeated throughout the prologue becomes the central theme of the entire work.

However, the prologue and apology provide little insight into why identity is so important to him. He clearly identifies with both Wales and the Christian Church (Nennius 1-2),

neither of which were trampled by Anglo-Saxon culture in the 400 years between the *Adventus Saxonum* and Nennius' *Historia* (Campbell 20). Thus his view of Saxons as enemies or foreign invaders seems out of place and extreme. One could argue he may be channeling the fifth century view of Saxons in order to set the stage for the history he presents. However, I would argue that as a Welsh monk, his bias against the invading others may be indicative of his own cultural milieu. The early ninth century world was a turbulent time both within the confines of the British Isles and Western Europe as a whole. Threat of another invasion, loss of autonomy, and/or cultural domination were real threats in Wales and reminiscent of the story of the *Adventus Saxonum:* a story that describes how an alliance between a Briton ruler and a small band of foreigners opened the floodgates to waves of Germanic people and a shift in the culture of the entire island. Thus Nennius focuses his work on the story of the *Adventus Saxonum* and the subsequent glorious victory over the Saxons led by a superhuman war leader; Arthur serves as a warning and projection of hope.

The Britain of Nennius shared many similarities with the fifth century events he wrote about. The island of Britain in the early ninth century was a violent and fractured region according to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. The entries for the years just preceding the *Historia Brittonum* indicate conflicts between varieties of groups. The entry for the year 825 begins:

> This year a battle was fought between the Welsh in Cornwall and the people of Devonshire, at Camelford; and in the course of the same year Egbert, king of the West-Saxons, and Bernwulf, King of Mercia, fought a battle at Wilton, in which Egbert gained the victory, but there was great slaughter on both sides (*Anglo Saxon Chronicle* 47).

King Egbert is also attributed with sending his son, Ethelwulf to conquer Kent and bring Surrey, Sussex and Essex into the fold (*Anglo Saxon Chronicle* 47). By 829, King Egbert had "conquered the Mercian kingdom, and all that is south of Humber" and "led an army against the Northumbrians as far as Dore" (*Anglo Saxon Chronicle* 47-8). This unsettlement is an echo of the fifth century troubles that preceded the *Adventus Saxonum*. The Venerable Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of England,* which was based in part on the fifth century history of Gildas, notes that during this period "the Britons, being for a time delivered from foreign wars, wasted themselves by civil wars, and then gave themselves up to more heinous crimes" (Miller 83).

Nennius' account acknowledges the civil upheaval and directs attention to the results of an internally besieged Britain, "After the Saxons had continued some time in the island of Thanet, Vortigern promised to supply them with clothing and provisions, on condition they would engage to fight against the enemies of his country" (20). This agreement between Vortigern and the Saxon leaders, Hengist and Horsa, sets the stage for the large scale migration or invasion of the Germanic tribes. Nennius points out Hengist's plan to send for reinforcement springs from the weak leadership and fractured nature of Britain. "Hengist, in whom united craft and penetration, perceiving he had to act with an ignorant king, and a fluctuating people, incapable of opposing resistance," offers to send for more Saxons to help defend Britain from the Picts (20). When Nennius wrote his *Historia Brittonum*, Britain was fractured among competing dynastic kingdoms. The consolidation of territory by Egbert in the early part of the ninth century did not unify the region, thus once again leaving it susceptible to foreign invasion (Campbell 139). In presenting and developing the story of Vortigern, Nennius reminds ninth century readers of the consequences of civil unrest.

At the dawn of the ninth century, Britain also faced a new external threat: the Danes. Like the Saxons before them, the Danes made their way to Britain in relatively small numbers at first. In the entry for 787, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* records:

> This year King Bertric took Edburga the daughter of Offa to wife. And in his days came first three ships of the Northmen from the land of robbers...These were the first ships of the Danish men that sought the land of the English nation (42).

The attacks on Britain would continue as documented in the entry for 793 as "harrowing inroads of heathen men made lamentable havoc in the church of God in Holy-island" (*Anglo Saxon Chronicle* 43). This entry identifies the first documented raid on a monastery in Britain at Lindisfarne. This may have posed two potential threats to the mind of the Welsh monk: the threat to Christianity and the threat to Britain. The connection between the Church and Britain is clearly established by a near contemporary of Nennius, the scholar and cleric from York, Alcuin. In his letter to the king of Northumbria, written after the Lindisfarne attack, Alcuin draws a line establishing a clear connection between the Church and Britain, "We are fellow-citizens by a two-fold relationship: sons of one city in Christ, that is, of Mother Church, and natives of one country" ("From Alcuin to Ethelred" 185-88). For Alcuin, there is no separation between these relationships; the failing of one has deep implications for the other (186). It is his assertion that Britain is experiencing divine retribution for its sinful ways, "Behold, judgement has begun, with great terror, at the house of God, in which rests such lights of the whole of Britain" ("From Alcuin to Ethelred" 187). Nennius echoes this idea in his history, "And let him that reads this understand, that the Saxons were victorious, and ruled Britain, not from

their superior prowess, but on account of the great sins of the Britons: God so permitting it" (27).

While this ninth century world view may seem bleak and condemning, it also provides hope. Alcuin advises the king of Northumbria to repent and model good Christian kingship, "Nothing defends a country better than the equity and godliness of princes and the intercessions of the servants of God" (188). In *Historia Brittonum*, Nennius develops this idea and provides two clear examples of hope. The first is given at the death of Vortigern. Vortigern's death rids Britain of its sinful ruler and allows for the Britons to rally behind other leaders who attempt to repel the Saxon onslaught. The second example takes the form of one of these leaders: Arthur. "Then it was, that the magnanimous Arthur, with all the kings and military force of Britain, fought against the Saxons," which according to Nennius turned the tide for Britain (30). Arthur was not only a celebrated commander, "though there were many more noble than himself, yet he was twelve times chosen their commander," but he was clearly affiliated with God (Nennius 30). In his eighth battle, "Arthur bore the image of the Holy Virgin, mother of God, upon his shoulders, and through the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the holy Mary, put the Saxons to flight, and pursued them the whole day with great slaughter" (Nennius 31). Similarly, in his twelfth battle, most often associated with the battle of Badon Hill, Nennius' Arthur is able to accomplish superhuman feats and acquire a British victory because of divine sanction, "In this engagement nine hundred and forty fell by his hand alone, no one but the Lord affording him assistance. In all these engagements the Britons were successful. For no strength can avail against the will of the Almighty" (Nennius 31). Through Arthur, Nennius reaffirms the power of Christianity and its connection to earthly kingdoms.

For even more affirmation of this idea, our historian had to look no further than Gaul in the very human form of Charlemagne. The rise of Christian kingship and the bloodshed that accompanied it in Gaul was likely known to Nennius by the late 820s. Charlemagne wrote a letter to Offa, king of Mercia, who was often at odds with Wales around 796. The letter was preserved in the papers of Alcuin of York. This same Alcuin, who so deftly articulates the same theme of interconnectedness of religion and politics found in Nennius' history, was, "a central figure in the Carolingian Renaissance" and bridge between late eighth/early ninth century Britain and Carolingian world (Campbell 106). In addition, Charlemagne's death is recorded in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* in the entry for the year 812 (46). If Charlemagne's reign, words, and death were recorded in a variety of British sources, is entirely plausible Nennius could have infused his reaction to what Charlemagne represented into his work.

So just what did Charlemagne represent in a ninth century context? According to his biographer, Einhard, in *The Life of Charlemagne,* written between 829-836, he was the "most distinguished and deservedly most famous king" (51). His accomplishments were so great, Einhard was spurred to record them for posterity, "rather than allow the extraordinary life of this most remarkable king, the greatest man of all those living in his own period, to sink into the shades of oblivion" (52). Charlemagne consolidated power and brought the prestige associated with the old Roman Empire to his kingdom. He was a champion of the Church (Einhard 79-81). He was responsible for the conversion of barbarians and served as a protector of the Holy See (Einhard 63). Anointed by the pope, Charlemagne was the embodiment of the Arthur myth - Christian soldier, leader in war, and repeller of the barbarian hoard of Saxons and Danes. Can we definitively state that Nennius' Arthur was modeled on Charlemagne - no, no more than we

can definitively state that Einhard's Charlemagne is imbued with essence of Arthur? However, the similarities between the two characters are most likely constructed from elements of the same cultural milieu.

Nennius' *Historia Brittonum* cannot be considered solid, historical evidence of a fifth century Arthur. It does, however, provide a foundation for the literary lore associated with the king, and its value reaches beyond that. *Historia Brittonum* reveals the importance of identity in the process and production of history. It provides insight into the ideas, beliefs, and perspectives operating within Wales, Britain, and the Church in the ninth century. It suggests an interconnectedness among these regions Western Europe - a connection often overlooked or minimized during this time. Finally, it suggests medieval historians did not simply record history, but intentionally shaped history. In choosing to preserve and promote the stories of Vortigern, the *Adventus Saxonum,* and Arthur, Nennius reminds us that even during the darkest times, there is hope.

Kathleen M. Walkner, M.A
Silver Lake College of the Holy Family

Works Cited

"The Anglo Saxon Chronicle." Translated by James Ingram.1823. Red and Black Publishers, 2009.

Burrow, John. *A History of Histories: Epics, Chronicles, Romances and Inquiries from Herodotus and Thucydides to the Twentieth Century*. Vintage Books, 2009.

Campbell, James, ed. *The Anglo Saxons*. Penguin Group, Inc, 1991.

Castleden, Rodney. *King Arthur The Truth Behind the Legend*. Routledge, 2000.

de Troyes, Chretien. "Arthurian Romances." Translated by William W. Kibler. Penguin Group, Inc, 1991.

Dumville, David. *The Textual History of the Welsh-Latin Historia Brittonum*. University of Edinburgh, 1975.

Einhard and Notker the Stammerer. "The Life of Charlemagne & Charlemagne." In *Two Lives of Charlemagne*, Translated by Lewis Thorpe. Penguin Group, Inc, 1969.

"From Alcuin to Ethelred, King of Northumbria." In *The Anglo-Saxon World: An Anthology*, 185-88. Translated by Kevin Crossley-Holland. Oxford University Press, 1999.

"From Charlemagne to Offa, King of Mercia." Translated by Kevin Crossley-Holland. University of Oxford Press, 1999.

Geoffrey, of Monmouth. "The History of the Kings of Britain." Translated by Lewis Thorpe. Penguin Group, Inc, 1986.

Hadley, Dawn M., and Julian D. Richards, eds. *Cultures in Contact: Scandinavian Settlements in England in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*. Brepols Publishers, 2000.

Hill Miller, Helen. *The Realms of Arthur*. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969.

Matthews, John, and Caitlin Matthews. *King Arthur*. The Folio Society, 2008.

Nennius. *Historia Brittonum*, Translated by J.A. Giles. 1844. Reprint, Kessinger Publishing, LLC, 2010.

Riche, Pierre. *Daily Life in the World of Charlemagne*. University of Philadelphia Press, 1978.

Thomas, Charles. *Britain and Ireland in Early Christian Times, A.D. 400-800*. Thames and Hudson Limited, 1971.

"Englishing" A Spanish Romance: Cultural Translation in Margaret Tyler's *Mirror of Princely Deeds and Knighthood*

Margaret Tyler's *Mirror of Princely Deeds and Knighthood* (1578) translates book one of *Espejo de Príncipes y Cavalleros* by Diego Ortúñez de Calahorra (1555).[1] Tyler's translation was enormously popular in its day and sparked a revival of continental romances in England. One reason for this success is that Tyler does not merely translate Spanish words into English (Boro 3). Rather, she adapts both the vocabulary and the content of Ortúñez's Spanish tale, appealing to a distinctively English audience. Thus, Tyler participates in the medieval and Renaissance ideal of *translatio* (*translatio studii, translatio imperii*), the transfer of cultural knowledge through linguistic translation (see Nederman 177-89, Carron 565-66). Tyler's *Mirror* thus becomes, as Joyce Boro says, "an English romance, rather than the English translation of a foreign text" (1). In this paper, I explore the several methods by which Tyler completes her project of *translatio*—which she calls "Englishing."

Tyler uses the term "Englishing" in her preface "To the Reader." This piece draws scholarly attention for its lively defense of Tyler's entry into the male-dominated romance genre (see Agorni, Arcara 182-83, Mentz 125). Tyler's radical conclusion, based on existing print-culture practices, states, "it is all one for a woman to pen a story as for a man to address his story to a woman" (50.72-73). As a result of this preface, Tyler is sometimes labeled "the first English feminist" (Mackerness 112, McGovern 681; see also Krontiris 45, Hutson 92). In addition to a defense of her ability to write, however, Tyler also uses her preface to discuss her

[1] Winston, Lucas, and Budra all expand helpfully on the "mirror" genre, in which Tyler's *Mirror* participates. Uman and Bistué discuss the mirror metaphor in Tyler's work (315, 318). For the *Mirror*'s major genre, romance, Mentz and Hackett are particularly helpful.

method of translation. Tyler writes, for instance, of the hope that her "travail in Englishing this author may bring thee to a liking of the virtues herein commended" (49.19-20). Tyler continues to emphasize the work's foreign origins throughout her preface, calling its author "a stranger" (49.33) and "this Spaniard" (51.81). By referencing the work's Spanish heritage, Tyler suggests that her work with this "stranger" is not just a transfer of words. Rather, Tyler effects a deeper mediation between these works in order to present the *Mirror* as a thoroughly English tale.

The Spanish *Espejo* is actually more continental than Spanish as far as its characters and setting are concerned. The main character, Trebatio, is a Greek knight. He secretly marries a Hungarian princess, Brianna. Their twin sons, Rosicleer and the Knight of the Sun, travel in the prescribed romance manner to enchanted islands inhabited by giants. However, the *Espejo* also features English characters: Brianna is originally betrothed to an English prince, Edward. Trebatio actually assumes Edward's identity in order to marry Briana. (More on that in a minute.) Later in the tale, Trebatio and Brianna's son Rosicleer travels to England to fight in a great tournament. The English king Oliverio (a Spanish version of the English "Oliver," which Tyler retains) along with his daughter, Olivia, feature heavily in these scenes. If Tyler went looking for a tale that could be easily adapted for English readers, she found one. The *Espejo* provides much of the necessary groundwork for such an adaptation with its English characters and settings.

Despite these references to England, Tyler makes significant changes in her linguistic and cultural translation, creating a particularly English tale. Tyler's translation is generally direct and accurate (Boro 1). However, Tyler's changes the Spanish to text effect what Boro calls a "national transposition" (1). In doing so, Tyler participates in the sixteenth-century surge in

British nationalism, to which writers like Shakespeare and Spenser also contributed.[2] Tyler's nationalism is evident throughout the *Mirror* as she projects a more complimentary vision of Britain than the one Ortúñez depicts.

I will now turn to concrete examples of Tyler's "Englishing." I will review a few of Tyler's linguistic adaptations, where she uses English literary techniques and vocabulary. I will then turn to several scenes where English characters take center stage. First, Tyler's protagonist, Trebatio, does battle with the English prince, Edward. Although Edward loses the battle, Tyler creates sympathy for this character, who in the Spanish text is unlikable and arrogant. Next, I will examine Tyler's references to the English princess, Olivia, which reflect English rather than continental attitudes toward inheritance. My final area of focus is the central tournament, set in Britain. This British tournament has the most modifications to the Spanish text of any scene in the *Mirror*. I argue that these concentrated changes demonstrate Tyler's commitment to creating an "English" tale. Thus, through the use of English vocabulary, positive portrayals of English characters, and patriotic compliments, Tyler makes her English characters and settings central to her project of cultural translation.

The most obvious aspect of Tyler's "Englishing" is her use of English literary techniques. For example, she employs alliteration that does not appear in the Spanish text, such as when she foreshadows Prince Edward's defeat by noting that he is "ignorant of the sour sauce and woeful wedding which was in providing" (58.20-21). Tyler also includes metaphors and imagery

[2] Recent scholarship on early modern British nationalism often complicates this national identity with regards to the variety of identities taking shape in early modern Britain as well as the relationship of nationalism to a sense of loss; Maly discusses the "Irish Question" and the "British Problem," two ways of complicating national identities, in his introduction (1-3). Philip Schwyzer draws attention to the "British" rather than "English" character of Tudor nationalism (3). Both Schwyzer (2, 10) and Escobedo (3) emphasize the role of historical loss, the sense of displacement from a historical national identity, in early modern British nationalism.

that suggest particularly English cultural events. For example, she adds theatrical imagery to the description of one of the *Mirror*'s many giants, calling him "rather…a tyrant in a tragedy than a jester in a comedy" (150.54-151.55). Likewise, Tyler regularly uses the language of "humours" (see 161.180), which Ortúñez does not employ. This language reflects the early modern (English) understanding of bodily humors and their role in emotions. For instance, Tyler adds a reference to "melancholy" in describing the lovesick Trebatio (63.7).[3] In addition to these incorporations of imagery, Tyler also uses English phrases such as "how now" (157.13), "hurly-burly" (167.54), and "God save you" (227.7). Tyler further substitutes English measurements like the "bowshot" (66.75), "yard" (80.49), and "finger" (93.81) for Spanish ones. Boro notes, for example, that where Tyler uses "bowshot," the *Espejo* uses "trecho" ('stretch'). Such vocabulary, spread throughout the *Mirror*'s hundreds of pages, is not overwhelming. However, Tyler's consistent addition of English vocabulary and imagery throughout the *Mirror* demonstrates her commitment to "Englishing" this work. Her linguistic translation contributes to the more extensive cultural translation regarding English settings and characters.

The first English character in Tyler's *Mirror* is Prince Edward, who is betrothed, sight unseen, to the Hungarian Princess Briana. Trebatio, the hero, falls in love with Briana and kills Edward in order to take the English prince's place in the wedding. In the Spanish text, Edward is an unattractive character whose role is to be replaced by Trebatio. Although Tyler does not change this sequence of events, she alters Edward's characterization in positive ways. For example, Tyler describes Edward as "strong, and valiant" (54.30) when Ortúñez merely calls him

[3] Boro details these at length in her introduction, 18-25; Uman and Bistué particularly note Tyler's "colloquialisms" and "alliteration" (300).

proud (54n33). Similarly, she translates the Spanish "sobervio" ('haughty') as "stout" (59.63), which has more positive connotations (59n46). Tyler admits that Edward uses "somewhat less modesty in his talk than behoved such a prince" (59.63-64). However, she insists that Edward is "a very valiant and strong knight, such a one as neither in Great Britain, neither in the Kingdom of Hungary, was thought to have his peer" (59.65-66). Tyler thus mitigates the terms that emphasize Edward's pride and focuses on his valor and prowess, creating a more positive view of the English prince than in Ortúñez's text.

Although Edward is ultimately defeated by Trebatio, Tyler stresses the English prince's valor throughout their battle.[4] When Edward confronts Trebatio, Tyler describes his "immeasurable pride" (59.77). This pride actually has a positive effect, however, for it increases Edward's valor in facing Trebatio, who is "so great and so big made that he seemed to be a giant" (59.78-79). Tyler's main characters are oversized—Trebatio, for example is "eight foot in height" (52.33). However, Boro notes that Tyler often "omits…references to the heroes' size, thereby distancing these heroic, large creatures from the evil giants typical of romance" (Boro 11). The *Mirror* has many examples of these evil giants, and Tyler generally avoids implying that her hero is giant-like. In this scene, however, Trebatio appears to be a giant whom Edward tries to defeat, as any romance hero would. Edward is thus a valiant figure even though he dies at Trebatio's hand. Furthermore, Trebatio is "disquieted" by Edward's death (60.132) and weeps over "the loss of so great a prince slain out of his own country in the beauty of his age" (60.117-

[4] Boro ultimately portrays this scene as a failed attempt by Tyler to anglicize the text, since "Trebatio's gruesome actions" in the "shocking scene" of Edward's defeat produce conflicting emotions without a moral center (22, 23).

119).[5] Trebatio's sorrow makes the Emperor a more sympathetic character, but it also acknowledges Edward's greatness within this tale. Tyler's more positive portrayal of Edward does not save the English prince from Trebatio's heroic spear. However, this brief scene prefaces other points in the *Mirror* where Tyler improves the language describing England in order to create a more English tale for her readers.

A second major English character is Edward's younger sister, the Princess Olivia. She functions primarily as the love interest of one of Tyler's main characters, Rosicleer. However, Tyler's descriptions of Olivia consistently make use of the specific term "inheritrix," which emphasizes Olivia's role as the female heir to the British throne. Focusing on heirs and succession could be a tricky proposition for the Elizabethan writer, although such topics lay within the purview of the romance. Romances often involve a plot containing lost or disguised heirs (as in Shakespeare's *The Winter's Tale*).[6] However, plots revolving around succession grew increasingly tense as Elizabeth's reign progressed. It became apparent that, in Helen Cooper's words, "The heir to Elizabeth is not lost and awaiting recovery, but not there at all" (353). Thus, addressing succession issues could be uncomfortable for romance writers of the time. Tyler's treatment of Olivia, however, pays homage to England's reigning queen by strengthening Olivia's position as a future English monarch.[7]

---

[5] Of course, Trebatio's disquiet does not stop him from raiding Edward's body for armor and documents, consigning Edward and his troop to an unmarked grave, a turn of events that Boro emphasizes (23).

[6] Cooper describes one of the objectives of English romance as "to promote the well-being of the realm"; English romances typically do so by condemning tyrants and restoring lost heirs to their proper kingdoms (340). Tyler's version of the restored-heir plot is necessarily truncated, since her translation is only of the first part of Ortúñez's *Espejo* and thus does not resolve the plots of the lost heirs, Rosicleer and the Knight of the Sun.

[7] One intervening passage discusses English succession in terms of male heirs, but, as Boro demonstrates, Tyler clarifies Ortúñez's language in order to remind English readers of cultural differences. As Briana and Clandestria discuss her new pregnancy (at a time when both believe the baby's father to be the missing Prince

Tyler's language with respect to Olivia reflects the British princess's secure position as heir to the throne. Tyler twice chooses the term "inheritrix" to describe Olivia's position. In fact, the first mention of Olivia states, "She was brought up as being inheretrix to the state with great care by the king her father" (77.35). Similarly, Tyler notes that Oliverio's tournament is particularly attractive to young knights because "the King Oliverio had a daughter named Olivia, the only inheritrix of his kingdom" (139.9-10). Ortúñez's term in both passages is "heredera," literally "heiress." However, the *Oxford English Dictionary* records "inheritrix" as the most "technical" and formal of the related English terms *inheritrix*, *inheritrice*, and *inheritress* ("inheritrix, n").[8] By choosing the legal, formal term Tyler emphasizes the absolute legitimacy of Olivia's succession. This English princess will not have a contested inheritance if Tyler can help it. Tyler's choice of "inheritrix" enhances Olivia's authority as heir.

In addition to this formal language, Tyler alters a conversation between Olivia and her father in order to decrease the power assigned to Olivia's future husband. Oliverio advises his daughter to accept her suitor, Don Silverio, "both for mine own liking and the common profit of my subjects" (235.77-78). In the *Espejo*, the text then explains what this "common profit" is:

Edward of England), Clandestria advises Briana, "if God give you a man-child, Prince Edward thus perishing, as we know no other [Trebatio has indeed disappeared], this your child is lawful inheritor of Great Britain in the right of his father, the king now living having no issue male" (73.28-30). Boro notes that Tyler adds the phrase "in the right of his father" in order to clarify the progression of inheritance, "essential for English readers because whereas in Britain matrilineal inheritance was possible, such is not the case in this society" (73n104). Boro does not clarify whether "this society" is Clandestria and Briana's Hungary, Ortúñez's Spain, or both; however, the need to clarify male succession shows that Tyler is aware of potential discrepancies that might confound her readers. Furthermore, she adds another clarifying sentence to Clandestria's speech: "Wherefore me thinks you should do him wrong, seeing as he hath lost his father, to deprive him also of his lawful succession" (73.30-32). While Clandestria focuses on the fate of the child as successor, her scenario also suggests the dubious prospects awaiting a kingdom with no heir. By adding to Clandestria's speech, Tyler clarifies issues of succession for her readers and also heightens the tension of an heirless kingdom.

[8] Tyler also uses "inheritress" to describe Claradiana (209.156).

that Olivia's husband will "inherit and defend the kingdom" ("y que pueda defender este reyno y estado" 235n679). Tyler omits this emphasis upon the need for a king to defend England, avoiding the implication that Olivia's husband would rule. Tyler is not so careful with all female heirs. In an earlier episode, Rosicleer declares a woman, Liverba, "mistress" of the Valley of the Mountains (141.140). However, he immediately declares it necessary "to match her with the chiefest inheritor of land and sea amongst them" (131.140-41). However, when the inheritance in question is the English throne—in Tyler's day firmly occupied by Queen Elizabeth—Tyler prudently avoids this preference for male rule. By lessening the power of Olivia's future husband, Oliverio may indicate a preference for his daughter to marry. He does not, however, suggest that the kingdom is jeopardized by her single status. By omission rather than addition, Tyler makes room for a royal female heir, reflecting England's current reality.

Tyler's language with regards to the English royal siblings Edward and Olivia reflects Tyler's emphasis on "Englishing" the entire *Mirror*. In her portrayals of these two characters, Tyler consistently provides more positive descriptions of Edward and Olivia than the Spanish text contains. In particular, Tyler reduces Edward's original haughtiness while emphasizing Olivia's position as "inheritrix" to the British throne. These positive portrayals of English characters are but dim reflections, however, of the patriotic alterations Tyler makes to the depiction of England itself. One of the *Mirror*'s central scenes is a tournament held by King Oliverio of England. It is attended by knights from all corners of the Continent. At this tournament, Rosicleer, one of the *Mirror*'s heroes, defeats his first giant and falls in love with Olivia. This scene is central to the plot, but it is also central to Tyler's program of "Englishing" her text. According to Boro's careful comparisons in her 2014 edition, the English tournament

has the most concentrated alterations of any scene in the *Mirror*. Tyler changes nearly every sentence of this scene to provide greater accuracy, higher praise, or more culturally-appropriate vocabulary for her readers. This scene is thus central to any study of Tyler's translation methods, particularly as they demonstrate Tyler's nationalism.

The *Mirror*'s first portrait of England demonstrates its need for chivalric rehabilitation. After years of searching for the "missing" Prince Edward, England is "very naked of able knights to defend it, whereas before it was best known in all the world for knighthood and chivalry" (133.81-82). Tyler reminds her readers of England's former glory; she then shows King Oliverio taking immediate action to restore that glory. The king recalls his knights from foreign lands. Tyler adds to the Spanish text a description Oliverio's "solemn triumphs" at finding his country once again "sufficiently furnished" of knights (133.92, 133n351). With the return of his English knights, Oliverio's kingdom is once again restored to dignity. Although this passage ends by describing the grand tournament, Tyler's text emphasizes that England is "sufficiently" (133.92) restored with only its native knights. No foreign warriors are required. Tyler thus emphasizes England's strength and sufficiency with her additions to the Spanish text.

Tyler continues this positive portrayal of England when she expands definitions of England's wealth. First, Tyler increases the value of the tournament prize: "a massy crown of gold, all set with pearls and precious stones, valued by all men's deeming at the price of a great city" (133.99-100). Such a valuable prize enhances England's reputation (133n352). Similarly, King Oliverio is willing to pay "more than London is worth" (142.116) to rid himself of an interfering giant. Tyler adds the reference to London and its "great worth," emphasizing England's positive qualities even at moments when the country is in trouble (142n381). In both

of these passages, Tyler's references to England's wealth suggest that her readers should be proud to belong to such a country.

Tyler most obviously demonstrates her national pride with this declaration: "never England more flourished of knights, nor never nation was like to England" (140.41). In her annotation of this passage, Boro notes the added "sense of patriotism" that Tyler brings to this moment with an emphasis on her country's supremacy (140n372). Far from the country stripped of its knights by its prince's disappearance, England has become a hub for great knights and knightly deeds. In fact, it surpasses all other nations, none of which can compare to it. Tyler's nationalistic additions to the *Espejo*'s Spanish text reflect her desire to "English" the *Mirror* by providing a positive portrait of her native country.

In addition to these compliments, Tyler refers to a specific figure representing England's great tradition of knighthood: Sir Gawain. Tyler describes one of the English knights, Brandidarte, as "a brave knight and as bold as Gawain" (141.112). Ortúñez's text describes Brandidarte only as "one of the best knights…in Great Britain" ("vno de los mejores caualleros…en la gran Bretaña"). Tyler adds the specific reference to Gawain. This knight's fame is established in pieces such as *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. Unfortunately, as with the case of Prince Edward and Trebatio, Tyler's true hero is the Greek-Hungarian Rosicleer. Poor brave British Brandidarte is easily overthrown by the current giant. Perhaps this makes the reference to Gawain even more fitting, since in the later tales of Arthur's court (such as those of Sir Thomas Malory), Gawain, formerly the greatest of the English knights, is less competent than the new-model French knight, Lancelot. However, by comparing an English knight to the famous Sir Gawain, Tyler evokes a long tradition of excellent English knighthood.

This tournament scene, then, by appealing to English national pride, plays a central role in Tyler's "Englishing" of the *Mirror*. Tyler carefully employs Oliverio's tournament to demonstrate how her skill as a translator creates a tale that a particularly English audience would embrace. This central tournament scene is supported, of course, by Tyler's other translation techniques. These include her consistently positive portrayal of English characters (Edward, Olivia), as well as her employment of idiosyncratically English vocabulary ("bowshot"). All of these strategies demonstrate Tyler's facility in the cultural project of *translatio* that frames so much of early modern work. Moreover, having examined Tyler's methods for "Englishing," I posit that the *Mirror*'s position as a harbinger of English interest in continental romance is no accident. By choosing a work with English characters and settings, and by applying the framework of *translatio* in such a way as to appeal to English readers' cultural suppositions as well as their national pride, Margaret Tyler deliberately shapes the Spanish *Espejo* into a tale that captured the attention of English audiences. As critics grant more attention to translation as a creative practice (perhaps especially for women writers), Tyler's skill in choosing the *Espejo* as well as "Englishing" it into the *Mirror* should be acknowledged as a particularly foundational example of creative translation. Tyler's English *Mirror*, and its success with English audiences, results from careful attention to both literary and cultural translation.

Rachel M. De Smith Roberts
Baylor University

Works Cited

Agorni, Mirella. “The Voice of the ‘Translatress’: From Aphra Behn to Elizabeth Carter.” *The Yearbook of English Studies*, vol. 28, 1998, pp. 181-95.

Arcara, Stefania. “Margaret Tyler’s *The Mirrour of Knighthood*: Or how a Renaissance translator became ‘the first English feminist.” *inTRAlinea*, vol. 9, 2007, n.p.

Boro, Joyce. Introduction. *Margaret Tyler’s Mirror of Princely Deeds and Knighthood*. Edited by Joyce Boro, MHRA, 2014, pp. 1-36.

Budra, Paul. “The *Mirror for Magistrates* and the Politics of Readership.” *SEL*, vol. 32, no. 1, Winter 1992, pp. 1-13.

Carron, Jean-Claude, “Imitation and Intertexuality in the Renaissance.” *New Literary History*, vol. 19, no. 3, Spring 1988, pp. 565–579.

Cooper, Helen. *The English Romance in Time: Transforming Motifs from Geoffrey of Monmouth to the Death of Shakespeare*. Oxford UP, 2004.

Escobedo, Andrew. *Nationalism and Historical Loss in Renaissance England: Foxe, Dee, Spenser, Milton*. Cornell UP, 2004.

Hackett, Helen. *Women and Romance Fiction in the English Renaissance*. Cambridge UP, 2000.

Hutson, Lorna. *The Usurer’s Daughter: Male Friendship and Fictions of Women in Sixteenth-Century England*. Routledge, 1994.

“inheritrix, n.”, “inheritrice, n.”, and “inheritress, n.” *OED Online*. Oxford UP, March 2015.

Krontiris, Tina. *Oppositional Voices: Women as Writers and Translators of Literature in the English Renaissance*. Routledge, 1997.

Lucas, Scott. "The Consolation of Tragedy: *A Mirror for Magistrates* and the Fall of the 'Good Duke' of Somerset." *Studies in Philology*, vol. 100, no. 1, Winter 2003, pp. 44-70.

Mackerness, E.D. "Margaret Tyler: An Elizabethan Feminist." *Notes and Queries*, vol. 190, no. 6, 1946, pp. 112-13.

Maly, Willy. *Nation, State and Empire in English Renaissance Literature: Shakespeare to Milton*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

McGovern, Barbara. "Tyler, Margaret." *British Women Writers: A Critical Reference Guide*. Edited by Janet Todd, Continuum, 1989, pp. 680-81.

Mentz, Steve. *Romance for Sale in Early Modern England: The Rise of Prose Fiction*. Ashgate, 2006.

Nederman, Cary J. "*Translatio imperii*: Medieval and Modern," in *Lineages of European Political Thought: Explorations Along the Medieval/modern Divide from John of Salisbury to Hegel*. Catholic U of America P, 2009, pp. 177–189

Ortúñez de Calahorra, Diego. *Espejo de Príncipes y Cavalleros [El Cavallero del Febo]*, edited by Daniel Eisenberg, 6 vols, Espasa-Calpe, S.A., 1975.

Schwyzer, Philip. *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory in Early Modern England and Wales*. Cambridge UP, 2004.

Tyler, Margaret. *Margaret Tyler's Mirror of Princely Deeds and Knighthood*. Edited by Joyce Boro, MHRA, 2014.

Uman, Deborah, and Belén Bistué. "Translation as Collaborative Authorship: Margaret Tyler's *The Mirrour of Princely Deeds and Knighthood*." *Comparative Literature Studies*, vol. 44, no. 3, 2007, pp. 298-323.

Winston, Jessica. "*A Mirror for Magistrates* and Public Political Discourse in Elizabethan England." *Studies in Philology*, vol. 101, no. 4, Autumn 2004, pp. 381-400.

The Double-Edged Sword of Romance in Aphra Behn's *Oroonoko*

While the author Aphra Behn has been known for centuries, scholars have seemingly "rediscovered" her work in the last 25 years or so as interest in gender studies and cultural criticism has swept through academia. In particular, Behn's most famous work, *Oroonoko: or, The Royal Slave* (1688) has received increased scholarly attention focused on gender, race and politics of the Restoration era. Much of this recent scholarship has focused on the oscillation of contradictory viewpoints regarding slavery within the novella, which has led to an "utter lack of critical consensus" about its true intentions (Margaret Ferguson 218). Most early analyses of the novella saw it as a nascent example of sentimental, abolitionist literature that became popular in the eighteenth century (Brown 181). However, Behn's use of the romantic genre complicates this reading, because it both elevates and alienates the African noble from the plight of the common slave, as evidenced by several textual inconsistencies within the story. Nevertheless, while *Oroonoko* is not an abolitionist text outright, Behn's use of romantic tropes unconsciously encourages identification with the racial Other in Western ideology, thereby laying the literary groundwork for sentimental abolitional literature as a genre itself.

As a professional playwright, romance was perhaps Behn's most natural and available tool for telling her story. There are several romantic tropes we can examine within the novella, most notably, Oroonoko's physique, which makes him at once recognizable as the hero yet distinguishable from the slave. He is described as being tall and uncommonly handsome, such that "the most famous Statuary cou'd not form the Figure of a Man more admirably turn'd from

Head to Foot" (Behn 271). Beyond his physical description, the narrator also takes great care in describing his mental prowess, saying he is "ready, apt, and quick of Apprehension" and that,

> The most Illustrious Courts cou'd not have produc'd a braver Man, both for Greatness of Courage and Mind, a Judgment more solid, a Wit more quick, and a Conversation more sweet and diverting. (270)

These attributes make it quite clear that we are to see Oroonoko as a classical hero, and that, "bating his color," (271) he "embodies an ideal Reformation courtier" (Andrade 202). Indeed, in her work on the use of romance in *Oroonoko*, Laura Brown acknowledges that despite her argument that the text should be read outside of a traditional binary between colonist and slave, these descriptions allow it to be read as such (186). In short, Oroonoko's physique and intelligence mean "his Otherness [is] domesticated for European consumption" (Andrade 195).

The concept of honor, which motivates most of Oroonoko's actions, could be seen as the epitome of the romantic tropes found within the novella. In the first half of the story, honor is the reason he rebels against his grandfather, the Old King. Upon hearing that Imoinda, his new bride, has received the Royal Veil and gone into the king's harem, Oroonoko reflects,

> His [own] Case was not the same [as others]; for Imoinda being his lawful Wife, by solemn Contract, 'twas *he was the injur'd Man*, and might, if he so pleas'd, take *Imoinda* back, the Breach of the Law being on his Grand-father's side. (275, emphasis mine)

Laura Rosenthal notes that this scene sets up the "classic conflict between love and honour," paralleling "the (often exoticized) heroes of Restoration tragedies" (158), where two lovers are usually parted by an aggressive, jealous third party. Honor is also at the heart of

Oroonoko's rebellion against the colonists in Surinam, in the second half of the novella. Certainly his suspicions that the colonists will enslave his unborn child instead of keeping their promise to free his family (Behn 293) are reason enough for his actions. However, when inciting the slaves to rebel, he cries out,

> Have they Vanquish'd us Nobly in Fight? Have they Won us in Honourable Battel? And are we, by the chance of War, become their Slaves? This wou'd not anger a Noble Heart, this wou'd not animate a Soulders Soul; no, but we are Bought and Sold like Apes, or Monkeys, to be the Sport of Women, Fools and Cowards. (302)

This rhetoric reflects courtly speeches of abused honor, and was also a common tactic employed by leaders of the English government during the Restoration. Joanna Lipking writes that dying for Liberty "was a familiar trope that Behn's readers would have recognized, invoked in political speech by royalists as well as republicans" ("'Others,' slaves and colonists" 176). Anita Pacheco agrees that the statement exemplifies "the psychology of honor — a regard for human dignity rooted not in compassion, but in pride" (498). In this light, the speech's appeal to honor reflects adherence to heroic models of greatness (Gallagher 239).

Therefore, if *Oroonoko* is a proto-abolitionist work, Behn's use of romance as her genre works because it elevates those people traditionally seen as subhuman to a human and even noble level. Oroonoko's larger-than-life personality identifies him as the "Herculean hero" (Brown 188) we are meant to root for. History supports this idea, as this elevation of a slave to hero became a common tactic used by anti-slavery advocates during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries (Brown 188). For example, in his preface to Frederick Douglass's narrative, William Lloyd Garrison writes of Douglass, "There stood one [Douglass], in physical proportion

and stature commanding and exact — in intellect richly endowed — in natural eloquence a prodigy — in soul manifestly 'created but a little lower than the angels' — yet a slave" (viii). This characterization elevates Douglass, like Oroonoko, to a heroic and thus empathetic stature, such that Garrison comments that he had "never hated slavery so intensely" as when he hears Douglass talk about the injustices of his past (viii). Moreover, Garrison's lament that such an illustrious person was "yet a slave" mimics the sentiment of Oroonoko's injured honor.

However, we cannot stop here, because the overuse of such literary conventions can also have the effect of what Brown calls "reductive normalizing" (189). While heroic romance will likely draw readers and solicit empathy from them, it can also reduce the message to just that, a story of literary proportions as opposed to historical ones. Several textual incongruities within the novella reveal the problems of relying on romantic tropes to tell the story of emancipation. The first example can be found in the contradictory tonalities of the two halves of the story. The first half, set in Africa, resonates with a strong romantic paradigm that takes the reader on a heroic, exotic adventure. The second half that emerges in Surinam, however, takes on a more realistic and sober tone, one that includes "a huge overload of [historical] details" such as the presence of William Byam, the Deputy Governor of Surinam from 1654 to 1667; Great Britain's loss of the colony to the Dutchin 1667, which is much lamented by the narrator; and detailed descriptions of the slave trade (Lipking, "Confusing Matters," 267).

The description of Imoinda's body tattoos is a good example of this tonal dissonance. Within the romantic first half of the story, Imoinda has been characterized as a "Black Venus," that is, a smooth-skinned goddess of beauty and modesty. Suddenly, as we behold her in Surinam, the narrator inserts the following post-script:

> I had forgot to tell you, that those who are Nobly born of that Country, are so delicately Cut and Rac'd all over the fore-part of the Trunk of their Bodies, that it looks as if it were Japan'd; … those who are so Carv'd … resemble our Ancient *Picts* that are figur'd in the Chronicles, but these Carvings are more delicate (293).

Likening Imoinda's tattooed body with those of the Scottish Picts — a long-time historical and figurative enemy of the English — creates a separation from romantic Beauty to alienated Other. Why were these tattoos, allegedly commonplace in the lovers' African society, not mentioned before? Rosenthal postulates that were they mentioned in the first half, they "would be more likely to stand out as [too] exotic to an English observer" (159) and thus perhaps alienate the reader from the hero and heroine. However, now that we have felt the injustice of capture and taken the Middle Passage with Oroonoko (and Imoinda), we are in more of a position to accept the reality of how these "barbarians" actually looked.

In spite of this jarring realism, Oroonoko and Imoinda remain idealized figures in Surinam, as evidenced by their "slavery." This is the second problem the romance genre brings to reading the novella as a call for abolitionism. As opposed to the common slaves, they live "in a storybook slavery of polite visits, hunting, and exploration" (Lipking, "'Others,' slaves and colonists," 175). The narrator writes that though Oroonoko was assigned "his Portion of Land, his House, and His Business, … it was [more] for Form, than any Design, to put him to Task, [and] he endur'd no more of the Slave but the Name" (Behn 290). This treatment certainly contrasts with accounts described in the autobiographical slave narratives of Olaudah Equiano, or a bit later, Frederick Douglass. For example, Oroonoko's relationship with his master, Trefry, is anything but historical. Almost from the moment he buys Oroonoko, Trefry "began to

conceive so vast an Esteem for him, that he ever after lov'd him as his dearest Brother, and shew'd him all the Civilities due to so great a Man" (288). Such a description seems a gross exaggeration; while it was certainly true that not all slaveholders were evil tyrants, one does not purchase economic capital simply to let it sit idle.

Moreover, Oroonoko's lack of duties can be partially blamed for his downfall. He is not forced to work like the other slaves due to his noble mien, and "that [fact] was sufficient to render him Uneasy; and *he had been too long Idle*, who us'd to be always in Action, and in Arms" (Behn 294, emphasis mine). It would almost seem that Oroonoko's rebellion arises not just because of his suspicions of the colonists' duplicity, but also out of sheer boredom.

The slave's rebellion also proves problematic for abolitionists because it is in this scene that Oroonoko truly departs from being a slave to becoming a "royal slave." After the slaves abandon him when the colonists offer them clemency, Oroonoko vents his frustration in trying "to make those Free, who were by Nature *Slave*, poor wretched Rogues, fit to be us'd as *Christians* Tools; Dogs, treacherous and cowardly, fit for such Masters." (305). In speaking thus, this "European aristocrat in blackface" departs entirely from the narrative of the common slaves (Brown 187). Oroonoko's denouncement of the slaves' faithlessness thus fully identifies him with the colonists, who also exercise superiority over the slaves. The tone of the passage can hardly be taken as a sympathetic to those who would so abandon their leader at the first sign of danger. This leads Moira Ferguson to assert, "*Oroonoko* does not sustain an emancipationist reading. … Oroonoko's commitment to general emancipation lasts only as long as his personal freedom depends on revolt" (35). She goes on to point out that by turning his back on the slaves and instead arranging a suicide pact with Imoinda, he mollifies the British

bureaucracy and natural order where the slave is perpetually in servitude to the master (43). Such identification also underscores the narrator's struggle in trying to make her royal slave the hero. Unlike his successful knightly acts in Africa, succeeding in Surinam would "fundamentally threaten the political and economic order" that the narrator herself participates in and depends upon for stability (Andrade 196).[1]

This in turn leads us to the final textual complication in reading *Oroonoko* as an abolitionist text. It suffers from the unreliable narrator. I should note that it would be imprudent to read the first-person narrative as the words of the historical Aphra Behn. Though she asserts her tale is based on personal experience in the dedication (Behn 266), the fact that she relates events to which she couldn't possibly have witnessed — both the scenes in Africa and certain events in Surinam — leads to a "subtle and unstable" distinction between the narrator and the author (Rosenthal 157). This instability creates ambiguity regarding the objective truth of the events related.

Furthermore, though feminist critics have identified the kinship of sorts that develops between the narrator and Oroonoko as the result of their mutual oppression within a white, male-dominated society, this camaraderie is short-lived as Oroonoko's quest for freedom becomes more and more hostile (Margaret Ferguson 216). Up until the slave rebellion, the narrator has emphasized his aristocracy, honor, and heroism, but when "his subordinate position as slave … threatens her as mistress, … she begins to depict him as volatile, excessive, and distances herself from him" (Andrade 197). Here the clash between the two modes of

[1] See Susan Andrade's article "White Skin, Black Masks: Colonialism and the Sexual Politics of *Oroonoko*" for a superb analysis of Oroonoko's transformation from Reformation courtier to a "savage and uncontrollable creature" (192) as a product of his proximity to the narrator.

romantic and real begin to truly interfere with the narration. For however much the narrator sympathizes with the "royal slave" and wishes her readers to do so as well, his agency in seeking freedom through the traditional means — that of revolt — complicates her message and leads her to make, as Susan Andrade says, "increasingly convoluted rhetorical twists which only expose even more her ultimate allegiance to the [colonists]" (200).

The best examples of the narrator's unreliability are the scenes of Oroonoko's torture and his death. On both occasions, the narrator is conspicuously absent. In the first instance, upon hearing of Oroonoko's flight with the slaves, she and the other women flee to the river because they are "possess'd with extream Fear, … that he wou'd come down and Cut all our Throats" (Behn 306) — this fear despite the fact that earlier in the text, Oroonoko had promised her that "Whatsoever Resolutions he shou'd take, he wou'd Act nothing upon the White-People" (294). This incongruity is particularly striking given the insistence the narrator has thus far placed on Oroonoko's honor. What cause could she have not to trust him if he truly was her friend?

It would seem, then, that the narrator has written herself into a corner, in that by attempting to depict a truly noble hero, his actions upon that nobility end up threatening her mores. As long as Oroonoko behaves like a courtly gentleman, she is content; but, once he acts in his heroically characteristic manner, "she abandons him to his fate" (Moira Ferguson 38). In this "real" section of the novella, heroism becomes problematic. Therefore, the narrator's absence during these scenes of torture "both [decry] the cruelty of slavery while evading the onus of having to act against it" (Andrade 200).

All of these textual problems thus obscure whatever sympathy is gained for the plight of slaves in general by placing all of that sympathy upon a mighty yet tragic hero. Many critics have pointed to Oroonoko's practice of selling his captured enemies to the traders along Africa's coasts as further evidence that the novella should not be read strictly as an abolitionist text. Oroonoko's own participation in the slave trade, described so matter-of-factly (Behn 269, 290), point to the notion that it is not slavery itself that is so heinous, only the enslavement of certain, privileged individuals (Andrade 194). The textual ambiguities brought forth by the tonal dissonance between the two halves of the story, Oroonoko's denouncement of the slaves' faithless abandonment, and the narrator's unreliability allow Eurocentric readers to suppress any desire to free slaves, if not ignore it outright. The confusion created from writing the story in high romantic style, with one clear hero and a clear villain in each story arc, allows readers to do as Lipking suggests: "settle back in their chairs; slaves were not Romans or Englishmen but a dependent, naturally servile people led this way and that" (Lipking, "'Others,' slaves and colonists, 177).

One may still be tempted to argue that the very act of Europeanizing Oroonoko is what embeds abolitionist sentiment within the text. There is some truth to this claim, because a culture that had heretofore seemingly accepted the use of slaves to grow industry would not necessarily know how to tell such a story from any other point of view than that of romance. The genre of slave narration and antislavery rhetoric had yet to really take shape in 1688. Thus, the very act of writing *Oroonoko* brings to light a serious problem in a "world that would never have received or believed first-person accounts by Africans themselves" (Moira Ferguson 48).

Therefore, at Aphra Behn's time, when such sentiments were just beginning to take shape, Behn's use of romance is a double-edged sword. As Pacheco writes, if Behn's goal was emancipation, the identification of Oroonoko as a European aristocrat

> …endows the African with human stature while simultaneously assuming that human stature is by definition European, [and this] makes it possible for a text to establish identification with the "Other" while at the same time remaining complacently Eurocentric. (492)

This sort of half-way identification keeps the "true meaning" of the text ambiguous. It is evident that Behn is calling for action of some kind, but to what exactly? One cannot claim abolitionism upon fully examining the layers within the text, but one can see that by writing about a slave in a heroic way, Behn lays the groundwork for abolitionist sentiment to take hold. Indeed, this ambiguity is the main reason why the novella continues to produce such contradictory readings. Though I would not go as far as Lipking does in asserting that modern readers are naturally in a better position to analyze how *Oroonoko* confronts slavery (Lipking, "Confusing Matters," 279), as the field of cultural and colonial studies continues to look at the novella, we may yet be able to find some reconciliation within this complex story.

Kaari Newman
University of St. Thomas

Works Cited

Andrade, Susan Z. "White Skin, Black Masks: Colonialism and the Sexual Politics of *Oroonoko*." *Cultural Critique,* vol. 27, no. 2, 1994, pp. 189-214. *JSTOR,* doi: 10.2307/1354482. Accessed 09 May 2015.

Behn, Aphra. *Oroonoko: or, the Royal Slave. The Norton Anthology of Western Literature,* edited by Martin Puchner et al. W. W. Norton & Company, 2014, pp. 266-314.

Brown, Laura. "The Romance of Empire: *Oroonoko* and the Trade in Slaves." *Aphra Behn: Contemporary Critical Essays,* edited by Janet Todd, St. Martin's Press, 1999, pp. 180-208.

Ferguson, Margaret. "Juggling the Categories of Race, Class and Gender: Aphra Behn's *Oroonoko*." *Aphra Behn: Contemporary Critical Essays,* edited by Janet Todd, St. Martin's Press, 1999, pp. 208-233.

Ferguson, Moira. "*Oroonoko*: Birth of a Paradigm." *From Subject to Others: British Women Writers and Colonial Slavery, 1670-1834.* Routledge, Chapman and Hall, 1992, pp. 27-49.

Gallagher, Catherine. "*Oroonoko's* blackness." *Aphra Behn Studies,* edited by Janet Todd, Cambridge UP, 1996, pp. 235-258.

Garrison, William Lloyd. Preface. *The Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass,* edited by Stanley Applebaum, Dover Publishing, 1995.

Lipking, Joanna. "'Others,' Slaves and Colonists in *Oroonoko*." *The Cambridge Companion to Aphra Behn,* edited by Derek Hughes and Janet Todd, Cambridge UP, 2004, pp. 166-187.

—. "Confusing Matters: Searching for Backgrounds of *Oroonoko*." *Aphra Behn Studies,* edited by Janet Todd, Cambridge UP, 1996, pp. 259-284.

Pacheco, Anita. “Royalism and Honor in Aphra Behn’s *Oroonoko*.” *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900,* vol. 34, no. 3, 1994, pp. 491-506. *JSTOR,* doi: 10.2307/450878. Accessed 08 May 2015.

Rosenthal, Laura J. “*Oroonoko*: Reception, Ideology, and Narrative Strategy.” *The Cambridge Companion to Aphra Behn,* edited by Derek Hughes and Janet Todd, Cambridge UP, 2004, pp. 151-165.

"Examining the Foreign and the Fine": The Role of the East for Early Eighteenth-Century Women Authors

For two years, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu traveled the eastern Levant territories recording an in-depth account of her extraordinary experiences in the intimate spaces of Turkish high-society life through beautifully crafted letters (Van Renen 1). In her journey into the Levant, Montagu recounts exquisite architecture, lavish multi-course dinners, and intimate encounters with affluent, radiant women through The Turkish Embassy Letters. Through their selfless hospitality and innate beauty, the women invalidate Western stereotypes of barbarianism lurking in the East, far surpassing stiff, European aristocratic practices with grace. In order to explain in more detail how Montagu rejects eastern stereotypes, I use Mary Barber's poem "An Unanswerable Apology for the Rich," a selection from her most widely distributed work, *Poems on Several Occasions* (1734). Barber was an Irish poet known for her "modest and retiring" disposition; however, she was involved in political controversy several times throughout her life, and was "arrested for attacking the government of Robert Walpole" ("Mary" 2446). While these works are not usually discussed in tandem, I insist that putting them in conversation reveals Montagu's perception of the Eastern realm as a place of moral rectitude compared to the degeneracy of Barber's European society characterized by excessive materialism. Specifically, Mary Barber illustrates European corruption through the persona Castalio from Italy. His home serves as a crossroads for exchange between the West and the East. Barber refers to Castalio's bride through "brocades and jewels" which adorn her (18-19). The poet links the woman with her surroundings and the superfluous possessions of the house. Instead of surrounding the Italian bride in youthful vigor, her belongings bespeak an absence of

life; they are unnatural, inhuman, and void of all abundance. In this paper, I assert that one way to examine the difference between Eastern and Western high-class society is by thinking through different versions of opulence. On the one hand, in an environment lush with fertility and beauty, Montagu's personal travel narrative of the East serves as a model for the West. On the other, for Barber, the West functions as a place of reprehensible moral degradation. Through these oppositional perspectives, the oriental realm beckons with the promise of grace, civilized life, and prosperity. Intrinsic and extrinsic opulence ultimately transcends and proves incomparable to the insubstantialities of Western life.

I begin with Montagu's travels. Her letter to her sister, the Countess of Lady Mar, recounts the traveler's experience visiting and dining with two affluent Eastern women: first, the Grand Vizier's lady, Haci Halil Pasha, quickly followed by Kahya's lady, Fatima (Heffernan & Quinn 131; Montagu 132). Upon arrival at the Grand Vizier's domestic quarters, she is courteously greeted and led inside. Yet she quickly observes the unimpressive design of her surroundings: "I was surprised to observe so little magnificence in her house, the furniture being all very moderate, and, except the habits and number of her slaves, nothing about her that appeared expensive" (Montagu 131). Her hostess, lady Pasha "guessed at my thoughts, and told me she was no longer of an age to spend either her time or money in superfluities that her whole expense was in charity, and her employment praying to God" (131). For Montagu, her renunciation of life suggests her transcendence from the frivolities of material significance. The modest woman spoke without the intent to impress: "both she and her husband are entirely given up to devotion" (131). The Grand Vizier, overtly morally righteous, resolutely refuses Montagu's husband, house-warming present, rejecting his gift until persuaded of its

customary significance. Aside from the couple's meager amenities, Montagu is continually impressed by Lady Pasha's hospitality, civility, and gracious mannerisms throughout the night. The hostess provided a fine multi-course dinner and concluded the meal with "coffee and perfumes, which is a high mark of respect" (132). In the place of material extravagance, the Pasha's selfless and considerate entertainment characterized the visit. Examination of her plain—for Montagu—exterior presentation clearly expresses the woman's humble disposition. Srinivas Aravamudan inspects Turkish aristocratic women and their conservative wardrobe, specifically in reference to their veiled public attire, which "magically exempt[s] [them] from the gradations of class within female identity" (80). In support of his argument, Aravamudan recalls Montagu's description of the veiled women: "there is no distinguishing the great Lady from her Slave" (qtd. in Aravamudan 80). When the master and slave are indistinguishable, a great equalizing effect occurs between the superior and subordinate. Though Lady Pasha is not illustrated as veiled, her simple appearance endeavors to the home, replicate how women dress in public life.

Moreover, her "she-slaves" are "finely dressed," clearly surpassing the physical presentation of their master (Montagu 131). Lady Pasha's basic fashion, both her wardrobe and her home décor, serve as a physical manifestation of her innermost virtuous nature. The matured woman's generous hospitality and modest living arrangements characterizes the hostess as an honest and deeply content woman void of worldly desires and shallow vices. By outwardly presenting herself in a lower position than her servants and devaluing the significance of substantial wealth, Lady Pasha seemingly transcends materialistic pettiness of classed society; however, covertly woven within the Pasha's humble lifestyle, hints of privilege

simmer beneath the surface. Surreptitiously placed between commentary of her inexpensive belongings and moderate household, a fleeting mention of her wealth blends into the passage; "except the habits and number of her slaves" (131). So covertly tucked away, this brief mention smoothly slides by the audience's perception, overwhelmed by the Pasha's humbling humility. Also, later during the evening, further indication of their affluence appear as servants bring in a fine, multicourse dinner. Although the Pasha's obviously possess ample fortune, they, nonetheless, exhibit virtuousness, and extend selfless hospitality towards their European guests. Eastern affluence consequently emerges as one of morally righteous modesty and intrinsically prosperous. While Denys Van Renen argues that this encounter "disappoint[s]" Montagu because "the vizier's lady treats her as a proxy for a hostile Europe" (21), I observe the civility of the encounter. Luxury, as we will see, debases European culture, but cannot degrade social relations in the East.

Her famed encounter with Fatima, though, represents a youthful perspective of Eastern affluence. After the Montagu's dinner at the Pasha's, they visit the grandiose establishment of Fatima, the wife of the second officer to the Grand Vizier. Immediately upon their arrival, they are greeted by a glorious entryway lined by two ranks of exquisitely clad girls (132). Beautiful servants accompany the guests through a lush pavilion teeming with "jessamins and honey-suckles that twisted round [trees] trunks" emitting a "soft perfume" (132). A four-basined white marble fountain sweetly flowed in the background, and a magnificent painting of an eclectic assortment of flowers tumbled out of gilded baskets above (132). With rich, luxurious diction, Montagu elaborately illustrates the breath-taking entryway of Kahya's lady. Elizabeth Bohls explores the extravagant diction utilized by the traveling woman: "[t]he eighteenth century saw

an unprecedented proliferation of discourse on aesthetic topics: taste and sensibility; the beautiful, the sublime, and the picturesque; the appreciation and evaluation of painting, architecture, gardens and natural scenery" (181). Montagu wholly relishes in the radiance of her hostess's establishment, activating all of her senses, and absorbing every minute detail to later reconstruct the stimulating experience into the pages of her letter. The lady's entryway is "beautiful…sublime… and picturesque" teeming with life and fertility (181). Both organic life and manmade creations are celebrated in Montagu's passage which evoke two coordinating themes: fertility and life through natural scenery combined with sublime opulence and splendor through architectural aesthetic. The reader is introduced to both old wealth—associated with the Pasha's—and new wealth—seen in Fatima: "All things here [at Fatima's] were with quite another air than at the Grand Vizier's, and the very house confessed the difference between an old devotee and a young beauty" (Montagu 132). A tasteful generational gap surfaces where the former environment is one of virtue and intrinsic modesty and the latter combining youthful vitality with Eastern grandeur and sensibility. Shifting perspectives to the West, a stark juxtaposition of Eastern affluence is introduced with Barber's Castalio and his costly Persian looms. European society emerges as a region entirely void of moral rectitude, teeming with materialistic vices.

Through a Western lens, Barber's Castalio, an extravagant and gluttonous upper class European man, floods his life with spoils and riches, only adorning his home with "buys [that] must be the best" displaying Persian looms that are both "costly" and prideful (Barber 23). The alliterative "pride of Persian" highlights the phrase with crisp bilabial "p" stops associating pride with imported creations attaching haughty materialism to the wealthy man and his exorbitant

life. A tangible level of pompous, high-society status results from possessing Persian looms woven with unfamiliar exoticism and novelty. The upper-class association with Persian creations encompasses, on a grander scale, the entirety of eastern civilization, a region rich with unspoiled treasures. Nonetheless, rugs are made to adorn the floor, trodden and under-foot. The mysterious Eastern lands simultaneously acquire a complicated inferior position to Western civilization where lavish, Persian goods are merely obtained and utilized as superficial status symbols. A common stereotype perpetuated by Western culture of the east as "a country we call barbarous," a view in which Montagu resolutely disagrees and speaks against, further solidifies the perceived inferior position of the Levant (Montagu 133). The Persian looms thus symbolize a far greater idea than the physical, decorative rugs: lavish, excessive finery of the upper class suggesting the deterioration of European society through superfluous materialism. In a recent essay, Alexis Mcquigge investigates one of Montagu's letters recounting an allergic reaction to a popular Turkish cream she undergoes while in the company of aristocratic Englishwomen. Mcquigge equates the distress the writer experiences for her complexion to her bout with smallpox, and associates upper-class English society, specifically regarding women, with an "overemphasis on beauty and sartorial excesses [which] becomes like smallpox itself" (191). Barber's Castalio epitomizes Western aristocratic culture and grounds his identity in riches and finery. His obsession with wealth proves fundamentally corruptive further encompassing and reflecting the entirety of European high-class society. His haughty pride spreads like an epidemic. Catalio's materialistic lifestyle starkly contrasts to the Pasha's who define their existence through humbleness, faithfulness, and virtuousness, straying far from the West's uncivilized preconceived perceptions. Though both Castalio and the Pasha's

possess notable riches, the Eastern household, by devaluing earthly possessions, morally rises above the Italian man's gluttony and the corruptive affluence of Western society.

Castalio continues recounting his inventory of exorbitant household finery: "And Guido [Reni's] paintings, grace his rooms" (Barber 24). Ornate and gaudy, the early Baroque Italian painter's portraits often portray ostentatious biblical scenes. The aristocratic man's entire establishment becomes saturated in wealthy splendor; every minute detail yet another gesture of his affluence. Examining alliteration once more "Guido" and "grace" are emphasized in the line "And Guido's paintings, grace his rooms" (24). According to the OED grace is "the feature of something which imparts beauty or evokes admiration; the part or aspect of something from which its beauty derives; an adornment… grace and ornament" ("grace"). The level of extravagancy increases with Guido's painting representing an object of envy and admiration. Tasteful irony simmers in Barber's poem, with an alternative connotation of grace "as something received from God by the individual… to impart spiritual enrichment or purity, to inspire virtue, or to give strength to endure trial and resist temptation" ("grace"). "Notoriously pious," Reni is remembered by his intense devotion to God, and his specialization in classical style ("Guido"). Though his paintings he undoubtedly attempted to embody "spiritual enrichment [and] purity"; but, displayed inside of Castalio's gluttonous estate, the images are presented as ironic and humorous ("grace"). The European aristocrat exists in bottomless indulgence, quite oppositional to both the artist's morale and the Pasha's lifestyle. Created by Reni to depict scenes of holiness, the works of art are paradoxically flaunted on the walls of Castalio's mansion to evoke shallow veneration. Through the irony that Guido's paintings foster, Barber comments on the corrupt nature of European high-class society revolved around

selfishly acquiring status-boosting possessions. Western aristocratic life is thus construed as void of virtue and grace ultimately incomparable to both Reni's piousness and, moreover, Eastern refined opulence exhibited by the Pasha's and Fatima.

Barber briefly mentions Castalio's wife, a poignant commentary on women, appearing among his other worldly belongings. He speaks of her through the "brocades and jewels" which adorn her, and of her other lavish belongings. The gaudy woman fades into her surroundings becoming indistinguishable from the riches of the house. Remaining nameless furthers her individual insignificance, and is simply referenced as Castalio's bride. Women transform into a blank canvas, analogous to an empty wall or an uncarpeted floor, posing as another medium to display one's riches, solely defined by the "sums of her lace and linen" (20). Instead of surrounding the European bride in rich imagery, the gaudy décor infiltrates her being producing an unnatural creature void of fertility. Norbert Elias analyzes the dehumanizing effect and identifies it as the "civilizing process: a polite courtly behavior that indicates social status and is marked by 'vigilant self control' and 'a constraint on the affects'" (qtd. in Van Renen 3). Through binding societal expectations, upper class status robs Europeans of humanity leaving behind an empty shell adorned "with embroidery and lace," the antithesis of Eastern prosperity and fertility (Barber 22). Montagu attributes this trend to "there being no other 'diversions' than the assemblies and court rituals that involve women dressing in elaborate and ridiculous costumes to show off their bodies as their only assets" (Mcquigge 189). European aristocratic women, seen in the figure of Catalio's bride, fundamentally lack purpose and meaning in their lives exhibiting the hollow nature of their existence. Their attire becomes an integral element of their identity. Van Renen's dissection of the monumental significance of women's wardrobes in

European society help to inform Barber's representations. Vivid images like "brocade, and jewels," "lace and linen," and clothes that "[s]hine" solely describe the mannequin-like woman (Barber 18 & 20-22). Moreover, she is identified as Castalio's "person," further solidifying her objectification as an interchangeable object in his life (21). His sumptuous wife supplements the civilizing process where an overwhelming amount of material possessions trap and barricade women in an idle, shallow existence.

Returning to Montagu's travels, a cumulative comparison between Eastern and Western society reaches a pinnacle with the scene of the fair Fatima, Kahya's lady. Montagu's depiction, flooded with stunning imagery, enhances the subject's "natural beauty with exotic jewelry and makeup" dressed in a "caftan of gold brocade flower[ing] with silver" (Van Renen 19 & Montagu 133). Fabrics of the finest material colored in pale green, pink, silver, and white grace Fatima's natural curves and beautiful shape; her arms "adorned with bracelets of diamonds," and half of her face shimmering with "bodkins of jewels" (133). The essence of loveliness itself, Montagu struggles to express adequately the woman's character; "I did not think all nature could have furnished such a scene of beauty" (134). In Montagu's eyes, Fatima's grace transcends the magnificent artificiality of courtly behavior, and she becomes one with the natural world. Robed in flowering colors, the exquisite lady—"lovely bloom of complexion unsullied by art!"—emulates an aura of natural fertility and life (133). Fatima is a symbol of growth and bounty, the physical embodiment of Eastern opulence. Through splendid, vivid imagery, the narrator ignites Westerns curiosity and imagination alluring her fellow countrymen to also explore, learn, and grow from Eastern society; "every turn of [Fatima's] face discovering some new charm" (133). Montagu disproves Western stereotypes of barbarianism

lurking in the East: “[Kahya’s lady] born and bred to be a queen” (133). Fatima far surpasses stiff, European aristocratic practices with an intrinsic and natural grace “no court breeding could ever give” (133). The charming hostess transcends the West’s insubstantial, unnatural lifestyle.

Eastern and Western worlds emerge as starkly opposite realms: in the east, opulence is a sign of internal and external prosperity; in the west, refinement is synonymous with superficial status and allure. With European aristocratic society fundamentally corruptive and barren, Western civilization needs a place for renewal found in the fertile lands of Montagu’s travels. Dehumanized and indistinguishable from their material excess, European upper class has stagnated trapped in archaic civilities. Through the scenes of lady Pasha and Fatima, the orient transcends Western measures of class and surpasses their lowly sense of beauty. Instead, the elevated women radiate virtue, loveliness, and life, representative of the lands as a whole. Where wealth decays Europe, prosperity in the East flourishes with natural life, a beacon for Western civilization.

Anna Wagemann
University of Nebraska at Kearney

Works Cited

Barber, Mary. "An Unanswerable Apology for the Rich." *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. Gen. ed. Stephen Greenblatt. 9th ed. Vol. 1. New York: Norton, 2012. 2446-47. Print.

Bohls, Elizabeth A. "Aesthetics and Orientalism in Lady Mary Wortley Montagu's Letters." *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 23.1 (1994): 179-205. *Project MUSE*. Web. 14 Dec. 2015. <https://muse.jhu.edu/>.

"grace, n." *OED Online*. Oxford University Press, September 2015. Web. 4 December 2015.

"Guido Reni." *The J. Paul Getty Museum*. The J. Paul Getty Trust, n.d. Web. 13 Dec. 2015.

"Mary Barber." *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. 9th ed. Gen. ed. Stephen Greenblatt. Norton, 2011. 2446. Print.

McQuigge, Alexis. "“They Give No Cordials to Heighten the Fever”: Lady Mary, Corruption, and the Problem of Royal Influence." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 27.2 (2014): 181-200. *Project MUSE*. Web. 14 Dec. 2015. <https://0-muse.jhu.edu.rosi.unk.edu/>.

Montagu, Mary Wortley. *The Turkish Embassy Letters*. Ed. Teresa Heffernan, and Daniel O’Quinn. Ontario: Broadview Editions, 2013. 131-34. Print.

Srinivas, Aravamudan. "Lady Mary Wortley Montagu in the Hammam: Masquerade, Womanliness, and Levantinization." *ELH* 62.1 (1995): 69-104. *Project MUSE*. Web. 14 Dec. 2015. <https://muse.jhu.edu/>.