JOURNAL OF

The Wooden O

Volume 16 and 17

Published by

Southern Utah University Press
in cooperation with the
Gerald R. Sherratt Library and the
Utah Shakespeare Festival

EDITORS

Editor-in-Chief — Dr. Diana Major Spencer, *Emeritus, Snow College*

Layout & Design — Sheri Butler, *Southern Utah University*

EDITORIAL BOARD

Michael Don Bahr — *Utah Shakespeare Festival*
Dr. Curtis Bostick — *Southern Utah University*
Dr. Tom Flanigan — *Miami University*
Dr. James Forse — *Bowling Green State University*
Dr. Chikako D. Kumamoto — *College of DuPage*
Dr. Todd M. Lidh — *The Catholic University of America*
Dr. Kate McPherson — *Utah Valley University*
Dr. Kathryn Moncrief — *Washington College*
Matthew Nickerson — *Southern Utah University*
Dr. John Pendergast — *Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville*
Dr. Jessica Tvordi — *Southern Utah University*

WOODEN O SYMPOSIUM
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Michael Don Bahr
Dr. Curtis Bostick
Shauna Mendini
Matthew Nickerson
Dr. Jessica Tvordi

Copyright © 2018 Southern Utah University Press.

The *Journal of the Wooden O* (ISSN 1539-5758) is published annually by the Southern Utah University Press in cooperation with the Gerald R. Sherratt Library and the Utah Shakespeare Festival on the campus of Southern Utah University, Cedar City, Utah.

Subscription rates are $15.00 plus postage for individuals and libraries. Subscriptions and correspondence should be sent to: Southern Utah University Press, 351 W. University Blvd., Cedar City, UT 84720, or by e-mail to press@suu.edu.

The *Journal of the Wooden O* is published annually by Southern Utah University Press in cooperation with the Utah Shakespeare Festival and the Gerald R. Sherratt Library. Submissions should be addressed to the Editor at *Journal of the Wooden O*, Gerald R. Sherratt Library, 351 W. University Blvd., Cedar City, Utah 84720. Select papers from the annual Wooden O Symposium are also included.

The Wooden O Symposium is a cross-disciplinary conference that explores Medieval and Renaissance studies through the text and performance of Shakespeare's plays. The symposium is held annually in August in Cedar City, Utah, and coincides with the Utah Shakespeare Festival's summer season. Plays from Shakespeare's canon are performed each summer in the Englestadt Shakespeare Theatre, a unique performance space modeled after the Globe Theatre, Shakespeare's own "Wooden O."

Table of Contents

Volume 16

Volume 17

Cry Me a River: Tears and the Dissolution of Boundaries in *Titus Andronicus*

Nicholas Brush
University of Central Oklahoma

Morbid curiosity, the concept of bloody and violent spectacle, first led me to *Titus Andronicus*. I just HAD to read the play that Edward Ravenscroft called "a heap of Rubbish,"[1] that T. S. Eliot criticized as "one of the stupidest and most uninspired plays ever written,"[2] and that Harold Bloom referred to as "a howler . . . a poetic atrocity . . . an exploitive parody . . . an explosion of rancid irony."[3] On my first reading I realized that, yes, *Titus* lacks many things that make Shakespeare "Shakespeare"—whatever that means. However, multiple readings revealed an interesting pattern: these characters mention crying, a lot. In fact, the word *tear*, the singular, and the plural *tears*, appears a whopping forty-two times; Titus himself says it twenty-three times. *Romeo and Juliet* contains the second-highest number, recording a paltry twenty-one occurrences.

In Donald Jellerson's article, "Tears and Violence in *Titus Andronicus*," he argues, "At the center of *Titus Andronicus,* there are only tears," and these tears "threaten an apocalyptic dissolution of boundaries, a drowning flood."[4] Jellerson

Journal of the Wooden O. Vol 16, 1-7
© Southern Utah University Press
ISSN: 1539-5758

doesn't spend much time with this idea, so slowing down and illuminating tears and boundaries help explain what they mean for the play. In *Titus Andronicus*, tears mark the dissolutions of three thematic, plot-centric boundaries, as well as a fourth, metatheatrical boundary.

Understanding Titus's tears requires we first understand tears in our literary heritage. Noted psychologist Ad Vingerhoets points out that tears have been used as a common theme throughout the world's literature, saying that sometimes these tears represent "virtues and good character," and other times they're a "sign of weakness."[5] In Homer's *Illiad* and *Odyssey*, "crying was considered . . . an essential part of the behavioral repertoire of heroes." In Sophoclean and Euripidean tragedies, "the shedding of tears by men is much more accompanied by feelings of shame and embarrassment and associated restraint." Even Plato weighed in on tears, calling crying "a mere rhetorical trick." However, in *Titus Andronicus*, tears are so much more. Like *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, Titus features tears that "mark a crucial psychological turning point,"[6] in this case, three turning points, to be exact.

Boundary One: Country and Family. In act 3, scene 1, Titus's sons Martius and Quintus stand trial, falsely accused of murder. Up to this point, Titus has always been loyal to Rome. James Calderwood says, "Titus is the one character in the play whose conduct is dominated by a sense of authority and tradition."[7] Sylvan Barnet argues that Titus's "inflexible conception of honor alienates him even from those he loves" and that he remains "silent when lesser men would weep."[8] Titus confirms this when he says, "For pity of mine age, whose youth was spent / In dangerous wars whilst you securely slept; / For all my blood in Rome's great quarrel shed . . . / For two-and-twenty sons I never wept" (3.1.2-4,10).[9] Titus's Roman loyalty never falters until now. He continues, "And let me say, that never wept before, / My tears are now prevailing orators" (3.1.25-26).

Jellerson suggests that Titus's shifting identity matrix reveals that his "former sense of national identity as a Roman begins to collapse as he retreats into pleading for the integrity of his familial identity" and his family's survival.[10] After all, Titus has only three living sons, two of whom may not survive much longer should Saturninus get his way. The first time Titus weeps, Jellerson contends, he becomes "divested of his sense of belonging to Rome and left with only his family as a matrix for identity."[11] As Titus's tears fall, so does the boundary that separated his Roman identity from his familial identity. Titus no longer considers himself Roman, only an Andronici. His family is the only thing he has left.

Boundary Two: Civility and Barbarism. As Titus cries, his identity matrix shifts. His overall demeanor also changes. He says, "All the tears that thy poor eyes let fall . . . / Drown the lamenting fool in sea-salt tears" (3.1.18, 20). Many scholars agree that, in *Titus Andronicus,* Rome represents civility. Here, the lamenting fool represents civility, too. Since Rome represents civility, and since Titus's boundary between Roman identity and familial identity no longer exists, his boundary between civility and barbarism also dissolves. A barbaric, vengeful savage replaces the civil, lamenting fool.

In the latter part of act 3, scene 1, Aaron the Moor convinces Titus that sending Saturninus the hand of an Andronici will save the lives of Martius and Quintus. However, in act 3, scene 2, when Titus receives again his own severed hand, along with the heads of Martius and Quintus and an angry letter from the emperor, his tears end. Titus says he has "not another tear to shed. / Besides, this sorrow is an enemy" (3.2.267-68). Emotions like sorrow and emotional expressions like weeping have no place in Titus's new world; those concepts belong to the civilized.

Jellerson believes that "the end of Titus's tears means he can take up the revenge plot . . . The pitch of violence,

in other words, overtakes and effaces mourning as a viable response."[12] Calderwood discusses something similar: "'Thou are a Roman,' [Titus] was admonished in Act 1, 'be not barbarous.' Such an easy distinction between Roman and barbarian is no longer available since the noble Roman has indeed 'o'erreached them in their own devices'"[13] (that is, has surpassed the Goth's brutality) and has become as savage as his enemies. The end of human emotions creates an inhuman brute.

Boundary Three: Sanity and Madness. This inhuman Titus no longer obeys civilized social norms, and his new-found barbarism manifests itself as madness; his tears washed away what sanity he had left. Marjorie Garber argues that, like Lear's kingdom, the Rome of Titus "turn[s] all too quickly into the spectacle of a weeping storm and a heath full of madness."[14] Following his brutish transformation, his brother Marcus kills a housefly. Titus's response and the ensuing argument between brothers reveal just how mad Titus has become:

Titus: What dost thou strike at, Marcus, with thy knife?

Marcus: At that that I have killed, my lord – a fly.

Titus: Out on thee, murderer! Thou kill'st my heart;
Mine eyes are cloyed with view of tyranny.
A deed of death done on the innocent
Becomes not Titus' brother. Get thee gone!
I see thou art not for my company.

Marcus: Alas, my lord, I have but killed a fly.

Titus: But how if that fly had a father and a mother?
How would he hang his slender gilded wings
And buzz lamenting doings in the air.
Poor harmless fly,
That with his pretty buzzing melody
Came here to make us merry, and thou hast
Killed him. (3.2.52-65)

Titus mentions innocence, beauty, family, and music, four concepts that, at least on the surface, appear antithetical to a household pest. Titus himself says that his heart is "mad with misery" and that "no man should be mad but I" (3.2.9, 24).

However, some scholars argue whether Titus succumbs to madness or not. Titus tells Tamora he is not mad, and he tells the audience that the Goths only "suppose" him mad (5.2.142). Like Hamlet's insanity, Titus's madness can be interpreted multiple ways. Interestingly, even those scholars who believe Titus fakes his insanity understand that "he has suffered enough to make the onset of madness plausible."[15] What more could we expect from, as Barnet describes Titus, "a tragic hero pushed beyond the limits of human endurance?"[16]

Boundary Four: Characters and Audience. But do tears belong to Titus alone? One could argue that another boundary lies within *Titus*: the boundary between characters and audience. *Titus Andronicus,* as metatheatre, "becom[es] a kind of anti-form in which the boundaries between the play as a work of self-contained art and life are dissolved."[17] Tears belong not only to Titus; they belong to us, as well. Unfortunately, so does his suffering. Calderwood says, "The most acute suffering occurs among the audience."[18] H. T. Price explains that unlike Shakespeare's other tragedies, "we hope that Titus," our tragic hero, "will succeed against his enemies; at the end we wish that he had not."[19]

Why do we, as an audience, react negatively? Why do we wish that Titus had not successfully carried out his revenge? Barnet suggests that "in many ways *Titus* is a play of its age, but in our age of horrors we can see that it is also a play for our time."[20] *Titus* affects us the way it does because it reveals our own ruthlessness, our own responses to vicious and unspeakable tragedy.

The first time I read *Titus Andronicus*, I found myself astonished that Shakespeare could write such a grisly, gore-filled extravaganza. I agreed with many of the play's worst

critics. What purpose does Titus serve except trying to outrevenge the bloodiest revenge plays written by Shakespeare's contemporaries? As I've argued, a closer reading reveals that *Titus* contains much, much more than simple, mindless slaughter.

Remember the quote, "At the center of *Titus Andronicus,* there are only tears"? Jellerson's remark proves accurate, both metaphorically and literally. We can easily understand the metaphorical aspect. Repetition, all forty-two examples, makes it simple. Literally, though? Those three plot-centric, thematic boundaries, Country and Family, Civility and Barbarism, and Sanity and Madness, all dissolve in act 3, the play's center, and Titus's tears mark those dissolutions.

So, while *Titus* lacks much of what makes Shakespeare "Shakespeare," the play still contains the Bard's spirit, albeit a young and inexperienced version. When we approach *Titus Andronicus* differently, setting the hyperviolence aside, we find the one thing many critics suggest is not there: a play worthy of Shakespeare's name.

Notes

1. Edward Ravenscroft, *Titus Andronicus, Or, The Rape of Lavinia Acted at the Theatre Royall: A Tragedy, Alter'd from Mr. Shakespears Works* (London: printed by J.B. for J. Hindmarsh, 1687). Accessed at Early English Books Online: http://name.umdl.umich.edu/A59525.0001.001.

2. T.S. Eliot, "Seneca in Elizabethan Translation," *Essays on Elizabethan Drama* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1956), 26.

3. Harold Bloom, *The Invention of the Human* (New York: Riverhead Books, 1999), 77-86; 83.

4. Donald Jellerson, "Tears and Violence," *On the Verge of Tears: Why the Movies, Television, Music, Art, Popular Culture, Literature, and the Real World Make Us Cry,* ed. Michele Byers and David Lavery (Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2010), 182.

5. Ad J.J.M Vingerhoets, *Why Only Humans Weep* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 2.

6. Ibid., 238-41.

7. James L. Calderwood, *Shakespearean Metadrama: The Argument of the Play in Titus Andronicus, Love's Labour's Lost, Romeo and Juliet, A*

Midsummer Night's Dream, and *Richard II* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1971), 39.

8. Sylvan Barnet, introduction to *The Tragedy of Titus Andronicus,* in William Shakespeare, *Titus Andronicus and Timon of Athens,* ed. Sylvan Barnet (New York: New American Library, 2005), 7.

9. William Shakespeare, *Titus Andronicus,* ed. Russ McDonald (New York: Penguin Putnam, 2000). In-text act, scene and line references are to this edition.

10. Jellerson, "Tears and Violence," 177.

11. Ibid., 179.

12. Ibid.

13. Calderwood, *Shakespearean Metadrama,* 40.

14. Marjorie Garber, *Shakespeare After All* (New York: Anchor, 2005), 82.

15. Isaac Asimov, *Asimov's Guide to Shakespeare* (New York: Avenel, 1978), 412.

16. Barnet, introduction to *Titus Andronicus,* 12.

17. Calderwood, *Shakespearean Metadrama,* 4.

18. Ibid., 23.

19. H. T. Price, "Construction in *Titus Andronicus," Shakespeare: The Tragedies: A Collection of Critical Essays,* ed. Alfred Harbage, (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1964) 26.

20. Barnet, introduction to *Titus Andronicus,* 15.

"Peace, Count the Clock": Shakespeare's Humanist Usage of Anachronism in *Julius Caesar*

Chikako D. Kumamoto
Emeritus, College of DuPage

Shakespeare is known to have included anachronisms in his work. For instance, Hamlet is attending the Martin Luther-connected University of Wittenberg (1.2.119), which was established in 1502 and not existent in the play's source, Saxo Grammaticus's twelfth-century *Denmark*; Bedlam, known as the Priory of St. Mary of Bethlehem (from which sprang the variant spellings Bedlam and Bethlem), was a mental institution founded in the early thirteenth century, but is depicted as operating in legendary King Leir's Britain (2.3.13-19); the medieval Richard, when he was still Duke of York, quotes Renaissance figure Machiavel to characterize his enemy Alençon as well as himself (*Henry VI, I*, 5.4; *III*, 3.2); Cleopatra wants to play a game of billiards, invented in fifteenth-century northern Europe (2.5); Theseus is dignified as the duke of Athens in a mythic Athens, though the Duchy of Athens emerged only in the early thirteenth century,[1] while in English history, the highest-ranking hereditary title of duke was not used until the Black Prince was created Duke of Cornwall in

Journal of the Wooden O. Vol 16, 8-27
© Southern Utah University Press
ISSN: 1539-5758

1337;[2] Puck's hearing a gun report is also incongruous since the gun was a ninth-century invention (3.2). The most often quoted anachronism is the striking clock, unknown in 44 B.C., the year of Caesar's assassination (2.1.206).[3]

The *OED* records the word "anachronism" as first mentioned in John Gregory's 1649 religious tract, *De Aeris et Epochis*.[4] In it, Gregory, Chaplain of Christ Church, Oxford, notes that "an error committed herein [in a Synchronism] is called Anachronism." He is commenting on the term in relation to "Synchronism," which in history means a chronological, usually tabular, list of historical persons and events, arranged to show parallel or synchronous occurrence. In another tract, *A Discourse of the LXX Interpretations*,[5] Gregory also scrutinizes Hebrew-to-Greek translations of *The Book of the Law* of Moses and notices chronology-related geographical inaccuracies occurring in the course of the book's making. His reference to anachronism appears where Gregory remarks on the location of the Isle of Pharos, which in Old Testament times was not connected by a causeway to the mainland of Alexandria. Finding fault with Aristaeas, who was allegedly a royal officer at the court of King Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285-246 BC) and who (pseudepigraphically) narrates how the king came to possess the Hebrew-to-Greek translated books of the Old Testament,[6] Gregory writes, "But if our Information be rightly given, we should find this to be a notorious *Anachronism*; for at the days of the Translation Pharos was an Isle, and therefore they (i.e., seventy Hebrew translators) could not pass over thither by Lands"; ". . . therefore it holdeth still that *Pharos* remains an Isle till the days of Cleopatra, and we are sure that Aristaeas was dead long before; therefore for him to make mention of the *Hepstadium* (i.e., causeway) is an inexcusable *Anachronism*."[7]

Shakespeare wrote his plays before Gregory's tracts appeared.[8] As if by a prophetic insight, however, he already seemed to have foreseen Gregory's censure when he gave Hamlet the line, "The time is out of joint" (1.5.215;

published 1600-1).[9] In the play's action, Hamlet here confirms Marcellus's fear upon the Ghost's reappearance that "something is rotten in the state of Denmark" (1.4.100). But equally, this line might reveal Shakespeare's insight to be both dramatic and writerly because he makes a profound narrative and stylistic connection between time and truth. Shakespeare first links Hamlet's line to the idea of the organic body politic inherited from classical and medieval political thinking,[10] for Hamlet here employs bodily dislocation, "out of joint" ("a bone displaced from its articulation, dislocated"—*OED*, s.v. or sb. "joint"), to mean a corporeal disorder (clarifying Marcellus's adjective of "rotten") in the organic body politic of Denmark (the "state" in Marcellus's line). Further, Shakespeare expands Hamlet's corporeal metaphor to represent a temporal dislocation and connotes "the time" to be a metaphor for truth. Time out of its temporal order, then, is like truth out of its proper order, since, proverbially, "Truth is the daughter of time"; time provides knowledge and reveals truth. What "the time" provides Hamlet in this scene is the knowledge that in Denmark, the present (Claudius's, and in turn Gertrude's, bodies) has rendered the past (King Hamlet's and Hamlet's bodies) "out of joint" (i.e., incest, regicide, disinheritance), while the past persists in and works through the present and future of Hamlet's corporeal body to be shaped by the Ghost's commandment of revenge. Understood under this temporally dominant epistemological dimension in Hamlet's line, his following lament, "O cursed spite / That ever I was born to set it right!" (1.5.215-16), also expresses Shakespeare's dual insight. It sets Hamlet's filial duty of revenge in motion toward the tragic endpoint of Denmark's dislocated past time that he must set right. At the same time, Shakespeare might also be subtly applying these lines to himself, who must set chronological times right when writing his plays truthfully.

M. W. MacCallum finds Shakespeare's stance toward history to be combining "a pious regard for the assumed facts

of History, with complete indifference to critical research."[11] In actual practice, Shakespeare tends to exhibit more of MacCallum's latter assessment and writes deliberately against himself, as above-noted examples will attest. In fact, his pointedly sheer use of anachronisms seems to re-form, albeit predictively, Gregory's understanding of anachronism into his other ways of relating to history where past, present and future times would tellingly conjoin.[12] As encapsulated in a triple historicity personified in Hamlet's epistemic being, Shakespeare in effect enriches the idea of anachronism by imparting an additional cognitive capacity to it. This premise becomes fruitful for me as I focus on the clock (2.1) and other anachronistic objects in *Julius Caesar*, composed in 1599. Retrospectively building on my above-noted premise about Hamlet's triple-time being a mediating apparatus of time and truth, I obtain a new reading: first, in *Julius Caesar* Shakespeare illustrates his humanist use of anachronism as his conscious style of epistemic ability, anticipating the notion of what Gianbattista Vico calls "poetic chronology";[13] further, Shakespeare's use of anachronism is his ingenious hypothesis of history, which is reimagined as an ongoing quest to locate the truths about the moral character of the Roman conspirators and their factionalism. In the end, his epistemic art of anachronism subtly acquires the hint of the political and social scenes of the late Elizabethan age and thus unites different historical eras by similar or common human events and experiences.

To assist me in this reading, I first revisit contemporary thoughts and practices of history and history writing as Shakespeare and his contemporaries would have known and used them. Shakespeare's intellectual milieu, as suggested by Gregory's work, was one where the idea of anachronism was becoming generally noticeable. A growing recognition of chronological and other anomalies in and by historians, as well as textual commentators and antiquarians, was occurring. As the historian F. J. Levy traces it from the time of

Caxton to that of Bacon, such a trend meant changes in the intellectual orientation of historical thinking in England. In particular, the influences of continental humanism, the new Protestantism, and an increased national consciousness led to new ways of investigating and using the past.[14] Earlier, the study of the past was justified on utilitarian grounds, and the purpose of history writing was didactic in that the common use of history was to teach personal morality. Inherent in people's ethos was the traditional connection between microcosm and macrocosm analogy, seeing the universe not only as divinely ordered, but also as comprehensible based on such cosmic harmony and divinely ordered hierarchy.[15] The purpose of most writing—theological, historical, and even scientific—was to make man more aware of his place in the great scheme and workings of God. People's moral benefit came from reading the examples of people's good and bad conduct. Accordingly, the purpose of the historian was to demonstrate how people could improve themselves. History was meant to teach personal morality by learning from the past.[16]

As the sixteenth century progressed, changes occurred as to what history was to teach because the idea of what made a man good was undergoing change. In particular, humanist thinking emphasized the public, political aspects of man by dividing a man's public and private character. By adding to man new, more secular virtues, such as a virtue of practical, public statecraft, humanist thinking made the active citizen an ideal "in the temporal sphere."[17] This new thinking also led to new methods for understanding the past and writing history. Instead of discussing what people, in particular princes or rulers, ought to do in moral terms, historians sought to understand what they did in fact, how and why they did it, and how effective their measures were, in light of not moral examples, but of practicable maxims, rules, and examples of political wisdom and public administration they collected.[18] This new thinking also led to new methods for understanding

the past and writing history, conceptually providing a new sense of perspective and periodicity previously lacking in medieval chronicle texts. Among the new methods was the concept of anachronism, which Petrarch supposedly recognized first and which Lorenzo Valla notably worked out in detail. For the late medieval chronicle writer, all history, namely past and present events or persons, is present history.[19] The concept of an anachronism, however, showed "that the past differs from the present and that the various periods of the past differ from one another,"[20] proving the decisive factor in rewriting the record of the past. With this new kind of history writing being practiced by such historians as John Stow (an antiquarian detailing the realistic topography of the City of London under Queen Elizabeth), John Hayward and Francis Bacon (both "politic" historians setting out the causes of events and rulers without imparting morality, but while conjecturing probable causes),[21] the consequent view of history as truth was to reject most of the imaginative devices of literature.

But Shakespeare purposefully uses anachronism as his potent imaginative, epistemic device in Julius Caesar. Specifically, he does so by linking the play's actions to physical objects out of their temporal order and staging a series of linked scenes as his both original and epistemic moments of triple history[22] as the artist[23]: the Roman past (North-translated Plutarch) linked to Shakespeare's present, with his audience in the first Globe Theatre opened in 1599, his role-performing actors and their bodies clad in contemporary costumes and stage props familiar to his audience; Shakespeare's present in turn is linked to the play's trans-epochal, inter-theatrical status as the source of future actors, audiences, and historians.

Caesar's Rome and 1599's London are thus conjoined as Shakespeare works such Elizabethan objects as the "sleeve" (1.2.189), "nightcaps" (1.2.256), and the "doublet" (1.2.276) into the plot of act 1, scene 2, where actions surrounding

the presentation of the crown to Caesar are the focal point.[24] These anachronistic material irruptions into the plot remind his audience that great historical time has elapsed between their present and the past (or between inherited facts and dramatic narrative) that they are witnessing on stage. For the Roman toga has no "sleeve" by which Cassius tells Brutus to tug Casca as Caesar passes by. The contemporary corroboration of sleeveless toga worn by ancient Rome's ruling-class is the Peacham drawing in the "Longleat manuscript" depicting a scene from *Titus Andronicus*.[25] In the center of it is Titus, clad in toga over a short-sleeved tunic, facing the beseeching Tamora. Befitting his status as the general in his triumph, his toga seems striped with color of possible purple or purple and white. The "nightcaps" that the crowds toss up as Caesar refuses the crown Anthony offers the third time are late fourteenth century items; the "doublet," which Caesar is said to wear when offered the crown is a man's short close-fitting padded jacket, commonly worn from the fourteenth century to the seventeenth century. In all these instances, Shakespeare knowingly incorporates the passage of time to help his audience in the newly built Globe Theatre to gain an instant affinity with the people of times long past.

At the same time, by showing how his audience's lives are tangled with "the cognitive life of things" (John Sutton's terms for physical artifacts, including anachronistic objects),[26] these items help Shakespeare to shorten time's passage so as to heighten the threefold sense of time: his audiences are supposed to be in ancient Rome while the ancient Romans are supposed to be at the Globe as the actors role-play Roman characters and enact political events, surrounded by contemporary theatre props; this in turn is linked to Shakespeare's keen sense of his status with the future audience which will look upon his play as part of their past, as well as a source of historical knowledge of his time. More importantly, Shakespeare enfolds into his deceptively simple placement of anachronisms the disquieting truth about the

conspirators. First is the crown-presentation scene that he causes to take place entirely offstage, so that his audience learns of it secondhand and after the fact. Only the ordinary citizens' cheers that accompany Caesar's multiple refusals of the crown are audible, and such cheers are misunderstood by Brutus: "What means this shouting? I do fear the people / Choose Caesar for their king" (1.2.85-86) and "I do believe that these applauses are / For some new honours that are heaped on Caesar" (1.2.140-41). Like Brutus, other conspirators, as well as the theatre audience, hear of the events from Casca only afterward. By not showing this pivotal political moment on stage before the audience, but instead, placing the story of the crown in Casca's reporting, Shakespeare sets up a pregnant situation in which the theatre audience's only knowledge of Caesar's desire for kingship comes solely from the single vision of Casca, who is already prejudiced against Caesar and who is later to be seduced by Cassius to join the republican conspiracy (1.3.120-24). Why does Shakespeare have Cassius make sure that Brutus will "pluck Casca by the sleeve," and no one else, to learn what has happened? Plutarch tells of Caesar's explicit desire to be king directly, presenting Caesar's desire to be "the people's" "just cause," while provoking his republic-minded enemies' "illwill":

> But the chiefest cause that made him mortally hated, was the covetous desire to be called king: which first gave the people just cause, and next his secret enemies honest colour, to bear him illwill.[27]

But Shakespeare chooses to moderate the source and adopts indirection to create an undercurrent of ambiguity about the reliability and accuracy of Casca's account, which the conspirators are already predisposed to believe. Moreover, Shakespeare heightens the effect of ambiguity by making his audience see Caesar's kingly desire only through the lens of Casca's eyes and then the other conspirators' hatred and "illwill" toward Caesar. Thus, Shakespeare's anachronistic

use of the sleeve has the effect of leading his audience to question if Caesar's desire for kingship—the conspirators' primal motive against Caesar—may be less a reality than the conspirators want to believe. Shakespeare helps to further his audience's uncertainty also by the fact that it is only after Caesar's death that anyone else (especially Antony) connects kingship to Caesar.[28]

Casca's description of the people's reaction to Caesar's kingship by tossing their "nightcaps" also reflects another side of the conspirators' republican morality, hinting at the actual difference between their political platform for "the people" (the plebeians, commoners) and the republicans' actual views and treatment of "the people." The tone of social difference is already set as the play opens. Marullus and Flavius, Roman Tribunes who are supposed leaders and whose official task was to protect people against oppression, come upon a group of commoners in the street and find that they are on the way to "make holiday to see Caesar and to rejoice in his triumph" over his rival Pompey and Pompey's son (1.1.33-34). Being friends of Brutus and Cassius, Marullus and Flavius rebuke them, calling them "blocks," "stones," and "worse than senseless things" (1.1.39-40), and telling them that rather than celebrate his victory, they should fall on their knees and pray against "the plague" that will come from Caesar (1.2.41-60). During his report on Caesar's potential kingship, Casca, a patrician and senator like Brutus and Cassius, disparages the hooting commoners as "rabblement" (1.2.254-55), their "nightcaps" as "sweaty," and their breath as "such a deal of stinking breath" and "the bad air" (1.2.256-57, 261). By such disparagement, the ruling class separates themselves from those who are not patrician;[29] they form a distinct social and political order, perhaps Shakespeare reflecting his own hierarchal society. Ironically, they justify their political actions in the name of the people, Rome, Romans, and "the commonwealth" (3.2.45), all of which culminates in Brutus's eulogy where he asks whether the people "may the

better judge" of the conspirator's assassination of Caesar: "Romans, countrymen, and lovers . . . Censure me in your wisdom . . . Who is here so rude that would not be a Roman? Who is here so vile that will not love his country?" (3.2.14-35). In the end, however, the conspirators' lofty protestations and self-images ("the most boldest and best hearts of Rome," [3.1.136]) turn out to be their own self-interested stratagem to maneuver the people to their factional advantage. For, once committed to the conspiracy, Brutus tells his associates how the killing should appear to "the common eyes": it should look as an aristocratic, "gentle" "thing" and "our purpose necessary," not the crude hacking to death of ignoble prey, so that the people will call them "purgers" [of "the plague"], not "murderers" (2.1.185-93). Or he counsels them for the need for duplicity: hide our true "purposes" from the people and perform it like "Roman actors" (2.1.244-46). Against Cassius's objection after the assassination, Brutus allows Antony to speak, which in the people's eyes, "shall advantage more than do us wrong" (3.1.267). Connecting the "sweaty" "nightcaps" to "the rabblement," the conspirators not only betray their idealist's claims for the people to be suspect, but also shed light on the nature of their republican "common-wealth" to be formed by the political factionalism comprised of the class of patricians.

Caesar's "doublet" likewise underscores Casca's and other conspirators' enmity against Caesar, while undercutting the veracity of Caesar's ambition. A doublet being a tight-fitting, buttoned, high-necked double jacket, it is rather unwieldy for Caesar, in a theatrical gesture, to pluck open quickly so that the crowd would "his throat to cut" (1.2.276-77), a gesture which Casca interprets as Caesar's attempt to prove his lack of kingly ambition. Casca knows that Caesar's dramatic use of his doublet and his fainting spell are just his stratagems to win over the "hoot[ing]" and "clap[ping]" crowd (2.1.269-72). Thus, these material things in Casca's reporting add to the audience's skepticism, while they are meant to promote

the conspirators' conviction of Caesar's threat to the political structure of the state. And striking still about the doublet is its truth that the only characters who speak of Caesar's potential kingship are the conspirators, whereas other characters—Antony, especially—speaks of it only after Caesar's death.

Equally telling of the suspect value that directs the conspirators' behavior is Shakespeare's anachronistic "hats" in act 2, scene 1. Lucius, Brutus's page, tells his master that the conspirators have arrived. "Their hats are pluck'd about their ears," he says. "And half their faces buried in their cloaks / That by no means I may discover them / By any mark of favor" (2.1.81-83). Shakespeare did not know anything about Roman headgear, as Dover Wilson suggests.[30] But having "dressed his Romans in the slouch hats of his own time"[31] in such an illicit, furtive manner, Shakespeare causes the hats to take on the material signs of the conspirators' lawlessness and illegitimacy, adding to the morality of the scene.[32] This is confirmed by Brutus's soliloquy (83-93), which, prompted by Lucius's announcement, reveals his keen awareness that he and his associates are now driven to stealth ("O conspiracy, / Sham'st thou to show thy dang'rous brow by night" [84-85]) and hypocrisy ("Hide it in smiles and affability" [90]) to succeed in their undertaking.

In the play that is preoccupied with the threefold manifestations of time, the anachronistic clock (2.1.255-59), which strikes during the final stage of the assassination plan, is also aptly chosen. In Shakespeare's time, there were three ways to tell time: hourglasses, sundials, and mechanical striking clocks. The prototype mechanical clocks appeared during the 13th century in Europe (Dante refers to a clock striking the hours in *The Divine Comedy*),[33] and such a device was installed by King Edward III in the 1350s in England,[34] but not in ancient Rome. Why then does Shakespeare use the clock in *Julius Caesar*? An hour by the hourglass was seldom a literal hour; even when hourglasses were supposedly accurate,

their construction always left them subject to error. Sundials were "accurate" because they did not tell the time, but found it; and they worked only when the sun was out and had to be placed in unshaded spaces in order to be useful. Mechanical clocks, on the other hand, were attached to public clock towers, churches, cathedrals, palaces, and might have been placed somewhere even in the theatre. Recall "the two hours' traffic of our stage" in *Romeo and Juliet's* Prologue. Most significantly, they can be heard and counted. Recall sonnet 12: "When I do count [count the chimes] the clock that tells the time." The sound of the clock is thus dramatically used, first, to enhance the swift passages of time in act 2: night (2.1.96) when Brutus was "awake all night"; the break of dawn (2.1.111) that Decius notices; the hour of 3 in the morning (2.1.206) when the clock chimes; 8 o'clock (2.1.230) when Brutus suggests meeting with Caesar; the coming of morning (2.1.238-40) by which Cassius tells his conspirators to disperse; all of which will culminate in the soothsayer's prophetic mention of 9 o'clock (2.4.27) when Caesar will be assassinated. Placed amid their inexorable conspiratorial activities, the striking of three o'clock has the effect of urgent necessity to quicken their killing plan, compelling the plot to evolve rapidly at the linear and thus inexorable pace within a day. This sense of urgency suggests that their killing plot is an ill-conceived, hastily assembled plan, not well thought out over a period of time. Another interesting aspect to the play's time scheme is a biblical dimension to Caesar's death, for according to the *Gospel of Mark* (Chapter 15, verse 25), the crucifixion took place at the third hour (9:00 am) and Christ's death at the ninth hour (3:00 p.m.), paralleling those of Caesar's death. Unlike the conspirators' preoccupation with Caesar, who is an aspiring king about to suppress the wishes of Roman citizens, is he to be understood as a political martyr?

Audiences' moral disquiet about the conspirators' actions deepens when Shakespeare associates Brutus with

the "book." Brutus has just persuaded Cassius to wait until Antony and Octavius wear out their own armies with travel to Philippi. After the meeting, the wakeful Brutus sits up reading a "book" in his tent: "Look, Lucius, here's the book I sought for so. / I put it in the pocket of my gown" (4.3.293-94); "Let me see, let me see; is not the leaf turned down / Where I left reading" (4.3.315-16). Shakespeare's description of Brutus's book suggests perhaps a codex with leaves, though Brutus is a reader of a scroll culture. Historically, the codex was not widely used until the second century AD, beyond Brutus's time. Moreover, Brutus says he had placed his book in the pocket of his gown, suggesting that his is small enough to put in the pocket, something like an octavo size book (5x8 to 6x9.5 inches),[35] perhaps like our paperback book. According to Martin Lowry, it is the Renaissance humanist, Aldus Manutius, who began to print in pocket-sized, portable octavo format, which revolutionized reading.[36] Also anachronistic is the "pocket," which is a mid-fourteenth-century item, though Brutus's putting the book in his pocket suggests his accustomed reading habit.

The morality of the book, then, can be sought in its possible subject matter embedded in the vicissitudes of Cato the Younger and his suicide and Brutus's own suicide later in the play. Brutus's upbringing was attributed to Cato the Younger and, according to Plutarch, Cato was the one whom Brutus "studied most to follow of all the Romans.[37] Cato favored the Stoic philosophy of Antiochus and Ariston, and these philosophers in turn became one of the dominant influences on Brutus.[38] It seems reasonable to suppose that the book he is reading is one of these philosophers' thoughts. It seems also reasonable that Shakespeare casts the Cato-Brutus relation in a favorable light, Cato being Brutus's uncle, mentor, and political model. A political parallel can be drawn especially because Cato revolted against Caesar. Unwilling to live in a world led by Caesar and refusing even implicitly to grant Caesar the power to pardon him, he committed suicide in April 46 BC. For many Romans, Cato was regarded as the

leading symbol of republicanism, foreshadowing Brutus and his conspirators.

And yet, when Cassius asks Brutus what he is determined to do if they lose the impending battle, Brutus replies:

> Even by the rule of that philosophy
> By which I did blame Cato for the death
> Which he did give himself—I know not how,
> But I do find it cowardly and vile,
> For fear of what might fall, so to prevent
> The time of life—arming myself with patience
> To stay the providence of some high powers
> That govern us below. (5.1.110-17)

Brutus describes his mentor's philosophy and his stoic death as "cowardly and vile" despite the great respectability of suicide among the predominantly Stoical Romans. For instance, Cicero justifies suicide more often than not. He argues that when "God Himself has given a valid reason as He did in the past to Socrates, and in our day to Cato, . . . then of a surety your true wise man will joyfully pass forthwith from the darkness here into the light beyond";[39] he regarded Cato's suicide as sanctified by God. If, against their close blood, schooling, and political ties, Brutus is not a committed stoic like Cato, what philosophy does Brutus actually follow? Plutarch says, "Now touching the Graecian philosophers, there was no sect nor Philosopher of them, but he heard and liked it: but above all the rest, he loved Platoes sect best."[40] It is interesting that Plato—both in the *Phaedo* and the *Laws*—seems to regard suicide in general as unlawful, with exceptions only for judicial suicide and for men whom God summons [like Socrates] and in cases of extreme and intolerable suffering.[41] Brutus's rejection of the manner of Cato's death and Plutarch's description of Brutus's adherence to Platonism therefore characterize not only Brutus's apparently contradictory and shifting relationship between nephew and uncle, but also, by extension, his lack of steadfast political conviction and

the uncompromising decision of Cato. This reading may be supportable since he later commits suicide so as not to "go bound" and "led . . . / Through the streets of Rome" (122, 119-20). Perhaps through the anachronistic insertion of the book, Shakespeare also wants to show the inadequacy of any philosophy, or more specifically, just reading and studying a philosophy book—whether that of Cato's Stoicism, Brutus's Platonism, or Cassius's Epicureanism—as a realistic, enduring guide to human conduct or solace when faced with crises. By making Brutus's own suicide also look a "cowardly and vile" moral compromise (his avoidance of public humiliation and disgrace), Shakespeare, as possible monarchist, may be conveying his reluctance to present the arch-republican Brutus favorably. Shakespeare's final view of Brutus can be seen in Brutus's inadequate philosophy of history he expresses before his quarrel with Cassius (4.3.249-55):

> There is a tide in the affairs of men
> Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
> Omitted, all the voyage of their life
> Is bound in shallows and in miseries.
> On such a full sea are we now afloat,
> Or lose our ventures.

Certain that he is in full command of the tide of time, Brutus commits his forces at Philippi to the fatal results for their cause, proving the unreliability of his conviction as well as the fickleness of destiny which seems to follow only the fortunate. Destiny or a moment in history ("a tide in the affairs of men"), has a moral significance, belatedly showing Brutus vagaries of existence that will thwart his military plans and undercut his faith in his own philosophy.

Act 3, scene 1, encapsulates Shakespeare's sense of triple historicity I have been tracing. The conspirators have just assassinated Caesar. As they perform a ritual of smearing their hands and swords with Caesar's blood,

Cassius proclaims, "How many ages hence / Shall this our lofty scene be acted over / In states unborn and accents yet unknown!" (124-26). Cassius exalts his and his associates' action, because Plutarch's story of Julius Caesar will be told as a "lofty scene,"[42] the events the play is enacting at the 1599 Globe will become an enduring source of a period of English history. They will also be repeated in "ages hence" and in states that not yet created and in languages "yet unknown," ostensibly establishing the conspirators' historical action as a noble deed against tyranny, not as the futility of political factionalism.

However, unlike the conspirators who took "the current when it serves" but lost their venture, Shakespeare as a humanist writer takes the current of anachronism as his epistemic and stylistic focus and succeeds in suggesting that the flawed understandings about Caesar on which the conspirators have acted is but an unpleasant reflection of the conspirators themselves. Shakespeare wins his writerly "ventures" with his own philosophy of time and history by foregrounding the ability of anachronistic objects to draw attention to, partake in, and mediate time's triple periods, conjoining disparate audiences, places, and temporalities in his play. Indeed, Shakespeare's dramatic "ventures" in *Julius Caesar* may be said to lie in the large truth that Cassius's and Brutus's speeches convey: time is inexorable in its forward movement, and yet, in the process, time negotiates what Jonathan Harris terms "untimely matter"[43] that creates "the past and present, less in the sense of making them up than of persistently transforming the web of relations that tether the past to us—and us to it [in the future time]"[44] through physical things, audiences, places, and temporalities in its final truth-telling about human actions like the conspirators'. Like his later creation, Hamlet, on *Julius Caesar* Shakespeare inscribes himself as an historic agent of the epistemic dramatic art born on the cresting tide of a triple historicity concentrated in anachronism.

Notes

1. Dominic Green, "The Bard Beyond Borders," *History Today* (April 2016), 43.

2. Mark Ormrod, "Got a Question?" *History Today* (March 2016), 94.

3. Acts and scenes of the plays referred to here are drawn from the texts by Folger Shakespeare Library, edited by Barbara A. Mowat and Paul Werstine.

4. This title is one of eight separately titled tracts composing Gregory's book, *Gregorii Posthuma: Or, Certain Learned Tracts*. The full name of this tract is: *De Aeris et Epochis; Shewing the Several Accounts of Time among all Nations, from the Creation to the Present Age*.

5. The full title is, *A Discourse of the LXX Interpretations: The Place and Manner of their Interpretations*.

6. His contemporaneity with the king is disputed by biblical scholars. See the introduction to *The Letter of Aristeas*, trans. with an appendix of ancient evidence on the origin of the Septuagint, by H. St. J. Thackeray. Accessed April 1, 2016. https://archive.org/stream/theletterofarist00unknuoft/theletter ofarist00unknuoft_djvu.txt.

7. John Gregory, M.A., *Gregorii Posthuma, or Certain Learned Tracts* (London: 1683), 27, 31-32. Accessed April 1, 2016. https://books.google.com/books/about/Gregorii_Posthuma_Or_Certain_Learned_Tra.html?id=_fJbAAAAQAAJ. Aristaeas represents himself as one of the officers of the guard to Ptolemy Philadelphus (309-246 BC)

8. His last play (collaborated with John Fletcher), *The Two Noble Kinsmen,* was written in 1613-14.

9. William Shakespeare, *The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*, The Folger Library General Reader's Shakespeare, ed. Louis B. Wright and Virginia A. LaMar (New York: Washington Square Press, 1977.

10. In his *Republic* (Book 4), Plato discusses the ideal city-state or the human soul in terms of the organic notion of the body politic: for each to function in harmony, the various parts of the body supported one another in mutual interdependency, reflecting cosmic harmony and divinely sanctioned hierarchy. Medieval thinkers, such as John of Salisbury (in the *Polycraticus*) and Marsilius of Padua (in the *Defensor pacis*), presented their political ideas within this framework. Refer to David Hillman, "Staging Early Modern Embodiment," in Chapter 4 of *The Cambridge Companion to The Body in Literature*, ed. David Hillman and Ulrika Maude (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 41-58, in particular, 48-50. Hillman, however, observes that in early modern times, "the dysfunctional relationship between the various members of the body politic was becoming a growing topic of debate" (49).

11. M. W. MacCallum, *Shakespeare's Roman Plays and Their Background* (London: MacMillan and Co., 1925), 86. Accessed April 4, 2016 via https://archive.org/details/cu31924013159706.

12. This is the kind of thinking Margreta De Grazia recommends that our contemporary historians have: "As a way of loosening chronology's hold on historical thought, we were to remove the stigma from anachronism or turn that stigma to advantage." See her "Anachronism," Chapter 2 of *Cultural Reformations: Medieval and Renaissance in Literary History*, ed. James Simpson and Brian Cummings (Oxford University Press, 2010), 32.

13. Giambattista Vico, *The New Science of Giambattista Vico, translated from the Third edition (1744)*, trans. Thomas Goddard Bergin and Max Harold Fisch (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1976). Particularly illuminating for my argument is Vico's third and fourth types of anachronism of *coniunctio* and *disiunctio*: "when times are connected that should be separated," and "when times are separated that should be connected," 279-84.

14. For much background information for this section of my paper, I am greatly indebted to: F. J. Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought*, (San Marino, CA: The Huntington Library, 1967). Direct quotations from his volume are noted by page numbers, as in 203 here. On the subject of anachronism in the Renaissance, I am indebted to Margreta De Grazia's work noted in Note # 11.

15. Hillman, "Staging Early Modern Embodiment," 49.

16. Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought*, 5-6.

17. Ibid., 238.

18. S. L. Goldberg, "Sir John Hayward, 'Politic' Historian," *The Review of English Studies*, 6.23 (July, 1955), 234.

19. Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought*, 21.

20. Ibid.

21. Goldberg, "Sir John Hayward," 234-35.

22. *OED*: "a written narrative, constituting a continuous methodological record in order of time, of important or public events, especially those connected with a particular country, people, individuals, etc."

23. Alexander Nigel, and Christopher S. Wood, "Toward a New Model of Renaissance Anachronism," T*he Art Bulletin* 3 (September 2005), 404. The authors discuss the importance of an artist, as an author, an auctor, a founder, or a legitimate point of origin in the late medieval and early modern periods.

24. All quotations cited come from Folger Shakespeare Library *Julius Caesar*, ed. Barbara A. Mowat and Paul Werstine (New York, London, Toronto, Sydney: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 1992).

25. Setting aside the critical debates on the direct connection between the Peacham drawing and Titus Andronicus, I refer to the drawing simply as a reliable artefact showing the contemporary notion of Roman togas. In the drawing, Titus wears toga over a short-sleeved tunic (ancient Roman culture deemed a long-sleeved tunic effeminate). Refer to the following on Roman costumes: Article by Philip Smith, B.A., of the University of London on pp1134 1137 of William Smith, D.C.L., LL.D.: A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities, John Murray, London, 1875. Accessed June 3, 2016, via http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/secondary/SMIGRA*/Toga.html.

26. John Sutton, "Porous Memory and the Cognitive Life of Things," in *Prefiguring Cyberculture: An Intellectual History*, ed. Darren Toft, Annemarie Jonson, and Alessio Cavallaro (Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technogy Press, 2002), 130-31.

27. Italics are mine. Sir Thomas North, *Plutarch's Life of Caesar*, ed. Rev. Walter Skeat. Accessed June 2, 2016, via http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.03.0078%3Atext%3DCaes. In another version of the translation, The *Life of Julius Caesar*, in the Appendix to the play in The Arden Shakespeare, edited by David Daniell, the relevant passage goes like this: "But the chiefest cause that made him mortally hated, was the covetous desire he had to be called king (323)."

28. Antony confirms a version of Casca's story: "I thrice presented him a kingly crown, / Which he did thrice refuse" (3.2.105-6).

29. Critics have noted, however, the commoners in the play are not subjugated plebeians: they show contempt of the law (1.1) and don't seem to have particular grievances, nor feel themselves victims, like those in *Coriolanus*. See the introduction to the Arden *Julius Caesar* edited by David Daniell, 11.

30. *Julius Caesar: The Cambridge Dover Wilson Shakespeare*, ed. John Dover Wilson (Cambridge University Press, 2009), 127.

31. Ibid.

32. While agreeing with Jonas Barish's comments on the hats in this section of my paper, I attempt to respond to his comment that "They [hats] cannot therefore simply be brushed aside, but must either be shown or their absence somehow accounted for" (34). It is my hope that my paper's thesis will be understood as my way of "accounting for" the hats' and other anachronisms' presence in the play, following Barish's advice to understand the "wisdom that the playwright is unmistakably eager for us to acquire" (36). See his article, "Hats, Clocks and Doublets: Some Shakespearean Anachronisms," in *Shakespeare's Universe: Renaissance Ideas and Conventions: Essays in Honor of W. R. Elton* (Brookfield, VT: Ashgate Publication, 1996), 29-36.

33. Gerhard Dohm-van Rossum, *History of the Hour: Clocks and Modern Temporal Orders*, trans. Thomas Dunlap (Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 1996), 92.

34. Alasdair Hawkyard, "Sir John Fastoff's 'Great Mansion by Me Late Edified': Caister Castle, Norfolk," in *Of Mice and Men: Image, Belief and Regulation in Late Medieval England*, ed. Linda Clark (Woodbridge, UK: The Boydell Press, 2005), 45.

35. *American Library Association Glossary of Library and Information Science*, eds. Michael Levine-Clark and Toni M. Carter, 4th ed. (Chicago: American Library Association, 2013), 38.

36. Martin Lowry, *The World of Aldus Manutius* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1970), 137-67.

37. Plutarch, *Brutus*, trans. Thomas North, ed. Rev. Walter W. Skeat. Accessed 5 April 2016 at http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.03.0078%3Atext%3DBrut.

38. Ibid.

39. Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations*, trans. G.E. King (London and New York, 1927), 87.

40. North, see Note 27.

41. Plato, *The Dialogues of Plato*, trans. Benjamin Jowett, 4 vols., 4th ed. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1953), I:410-14, 441-42.

42. Unlike Cassius's elevated view, Brutus devalues their assassination act as a "sport" (3.1.127), adumbrating the critical rift to emerge between them.

43. This expression comes from the title of Jonathan Gil Harris's work, *Untimely Matter in the Time of Shakespeare* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), in which he considers the relation of physical objects to history, 18-19.

44. Ibid, 174.

How Shakespeare Lost the American West

Merlyn Q. Sell
Independent Scholar

Shakespeare was among the first European settlers in the American West. He first hitched rides in the packs of fur traders in the 1830's and then stuck around, hanging out through the cattle drives of the 1890s. Considering Shakespeare's large role in the Wild West of history, his absence from the Wild West of popular culture is glaring. While fictions of the Wild West are not beholden to the facts, the reasons a particular fictitious narrative has dominated the genre deserves interrogation—particularly when that narrative forms a cornerstone of national identity. A key reason for Shakespeare's disappearance, or erasure, from the myth of the Wild West is his association with upper-class women and their civic reforms. As the "wildness" of the west became idealized, Shakespeare was remembered as a sign of refinement and his wilder and woollier past forgotten.

In the mining camps of the West the same pattern emerged time and again. Shakespeare was an integrated part of these rough and rowdy communities from the start. His works were performed alongside variety acts, circuses, and boxing matches for a mostly working class, mostly male audience.[1]

Journal of the Wooden O. Vol 16, 28-37
© Southern Utah University Press
ISSN: 1539-5758

As railroads linked these once isolated communities to the trends of the East, Shakespeare's place within the community transformed. Older versions of Shakespeare performance were not suitable for the changing demographics as cities once dominated by single males saw an influx of women and families.[2] While women did not introduce Shakespeare to Western communities, they did employ him in different ways. They attended his works only when they were staged in a respectable theatre; they performed his works as benefits for charitable causes; they taught Shakespeare to their children; and they studied him as members of literary clubs.[3] Along with Shakespeare, many of these clubs were interested in political movements, such as temperance and women's suffrage, and through these organizations women had the influence to effect actual changes in their communities.[4] As such, Shakespeare became associated with, not the wildness, but the reformation of the West.

This association made Shakespeare incompatible with the myth of the Wild West, which took hold even before the settlement of the West was complete. As early as 1833, *Western Monthly Magazine* published a plea for a national literature that reflected American struggle and triumph in the West.[5] In 1860, publishing house Beadle and Adams was established and would go on to specialize in Western dime novels;[6] by 1864 the company posted aggregate sales of five million books.[7] Wild West shows brought the West to the East, and the wild west portrayed by Buffalo Bill Cody and his colleagues would go on to influence novels and, later, films.[8]

Shakespeare posed a threat to a key figure in this Wild West myth, in part because his growing association with intellectual pursuits put him at odds with the Western hero, who was typified, not by his eloquence or education, but by his primitive and decisive actions.[9] Shakespeare posed an even greater threat to the myth through his association with the other great civilizing force in the mythological west: women.

As Richard White points out, "The West of Remington, Roosevelt, and Wister was an unabashedly masculine and nasty place,"[10] and if the frontier was masculine, femininity was then its antithesis. The perception of Shakespeare and his female accomplices as the vanguards of the advance of Eastern civilization was popularized in literature and film. In Owen Wister's novel *The Virginian*, a schoolteacher ultimately pacifies the titular hero, with Shakespeare being her most effective tool.[11] In the *Bonanza* episode "Spotlight," the women of Virginia City suggest a Shakespeare play as an addition to the town's founder's day celebration, only to be admonished by a town official that "you'll ruin the whole shebang with your high falutin' ideas."[12] Keep in mind that in its early days as a mining camp, Virginia City was able to support five theatre companies producing Shakespeare at the same time.[13] In the 1993 film, *Tombstone,* the Shakespearean performer, Mr. Fabian, is heckled by the outlaws, cowboys, and gunslingers in his audience, while the one viewer moved by his performance is the effeminate Billy Breckinridge.[14] Arguably, by the time these mythological versions of Shakespeare and femininity have put an end to violence and brought artistic endeavors to a community, the community ceases to be a part of the mythological and masculinized west. Shakespeare, then, became a means of civilizing and effeminizing the frontier instead of a part of it.

Deadwood, South Dakota, one of the most infamous cities of the Wild West, and, as it happens, my home town, provides an ideal case study for this phenomenon. In 1877, newspapers across the country promoted Deadwood as "the wickedest spot this side of the infernal regions."[15] First in the Deadwood Dick dime novels of the 1870s and later in films such as *Calamity Jane* and the 2004-2006 HBO series *Deadwood*, Deadwood has persisted as an idealized embodiment of the Wild West mythos. As early settler John S. McClintock mused, it would be difficult to imagine another Western

town that "would so vividly open to the mind a panorama of revelry, wild ruffianism and tragedy."[16]

Shakespeare was a part of everyday life in early Deadwood. The local paper quoted him constantly. Local merchants used him to shill their wares. "He who steals my purse steals trash," began one ad in the *Black Hills Daily Times* before continuing, "but he who gets away with that fine bottle of beer or demijohn of whiskey purchased of Herrmann & Treber commits an offense against the lover of 'ould rye' that will long be remembered."[17] *The Black Hills Daily Times* reported that a local lawyer named John had been spotted "perusing a copy of Shakespeare" in a barbershop.[18] In 1877, James Leary filed a claim for the Coriolanus lode, tying Shakespeare to Deadwood's most prominent industry: gold.[19]

In addition, Shakespeare productions frequently graced Deadwood's stages. *The Daily Hornet* of Cheyenne reported in April of 1878 that a local actor known as "Mac" or "McDaniels" had given six performances of *Hamlet* in Deadwood.[20] An amateur production of *Hamlet* was attempted in August of 1878.[21] Deadwood's resident legitimate theatre troupe under the supervision of Jack Langrishe produced *Othello* in June of 1879.[22] Alice Cochran lists an 1879 performance of *Richard III* in her timeline of Deadwood theatre productions as well.[23] And a later benefit for actors Emma Whittle and J.P. Clark at the Metropolitan Theatre included scenes from both *Richard III* and *Hamlet*.[24]

Besides the few legitimate theatres, certainly Shakespeare's works had plenty to contribute to what the *Black Hills Daily Times* called the "numerous scenes, sketches, refrains, droll doings, and diversions that go to make up a first class variety performance."[25] When Tom Miller opened the Bella Union in 1876, the variety company included "Chas. Stacey,"[26] most likely the same Stacey referred to later in local papers as Deadwood's "erstwhile Hamlet."[27] It seems likely then that Stacey's variety act was a burlesque of *Hamlet*. The Opera

House hosted one potentially Shakespeare-related variety performance in 1888, with the appearance of the "Edwin Booth Dramatic Club," a traveling troupe of pre-teen little people.[28]

But as the population of Deadwood changed, so did its Shakespeare. In 1880, the ladies of the Episcopal Church hosted a benefit production of *The Merchant of Venice*.[29] A review of the entertainments emphasized the femininity of the event, saying "When the ladies of Deadwood undertake anything it is sure to be a success."[30] In 1890, a benefit for the fire department included performances from several young ladies of Deadwood's finest families. Miss Hamill appeared in a scene from *Hamlet*, and Miss Jean Cowgill and Mrs. Williams performed as Juliet and the Nurse respectively.[31] Less formal performances also occurred. An afternoon of ice cream among Deadwood's finest young people in 1890 was followed by spontaneous recitations, including "Pyramus and Thisbe."[32]

A select number of Deadwood's ladies used Shakespeare as a means to self-improvement via the academically minded Round Table Club established in 1887.[33] Membership in this club was limited to upper class ladies with the necessary free time and education to participate in its course of study, and Shakespeare occupied a great deal of the club's time and interest.[34] Members provided inspirational quotes for the club's edification at each roll call, and quotes from Shakespeare were a popular choice.[35] The club's first anniversary banquet featured escalloped oysters labeled, "Why then the world's my oyster (Shakespeare)."[36] In September of 1887, Mrs. Gaston even went so far as to provide a character sketch of Lady Macbeth, while in April of 1888 Mrs. Coe asked the group questions regarding Stratford–on–Avon.[37] That year the club chose to focus all their studies on the works of William Shakespeare and Nathaniel Hawthorne.[38] In her diary, Irene Cushman noted a pending meeting in January of 1891, when she was to present on *As You Like It* and referred

to the topic as a "lesson," which she was dreading.[39] In 1904, a marketing publication for the Black Hills area mentioned the club in conjunction with "the study of Shakespeare and the histories of the countries in which his plays are located."[40] The club founded the Deadwood Public Library and chose the books for its collection for many years;[41] it can be assumed Shakespeare's works figured prominently in the library's initial inventory. As recently as 2004, the club remained active, with nine members still promoting education and providing books and donations to various local libraries and literacy programs.[42]

Even this limited review of Deadwood's Shakespearean activity illustrates a community actively engaging with his works from the very beginning, yet he seems to have no place in the lucrative myth of Deadwood recreated today. Starting with the Deadwood Dick dime novels of the 1870s, Deadwood has been represented as a haven for criminals, violence, and corruption. The City of Deadwood website claims that today's visitor to Deadwood will experience "a careful, accurate restoration of a historically significant city," emphasizing the town's "colorful, violent, and lawless beginnings."[43] Six nights a week during the summer, historical re-enactors stage the murder of Wild Bill Hickok and the subsequent trial of Jack McCall (a show which has been in constant seasonal production in Deadwood since the mid-1920s).[44] The focus of this production is an incident that by its very nature occurred only once—far less than the purported six performances of *Hamlet* by McDaniels or even the more modest, yet better substantiated, performances of Langrishe's *Othello*. Deadwood's 1876 Theatre provides dinner theatre featuring melodramas written by local playwrights, but does not recreate Deadwood's historical theatre of Shakespeare and variety.[45] None of Deadwood's historical marketing makes mention of The Round Table Club, despite its one hundred and seventeen-year history and the long-lasting contributions by its members. This trend has

continued through David Milch's television series *Deadwood*, which combined Deadwood's lawless reputation with heightened language that drew comparisons to Shakespeare. Addressing his use of early modern cadence in an interview, Milch himself claimed that his characters were speaking in "someone else's language."[46] Here again the juxtaposition of these supposedly conflicting elements was noted, even though historical newspapers indicate Deadwood's citizens were quite comfortable with Shakespeare's words. While Al Swearengen and the Gem figure largely in the series, Milch's fictional Gem is a saloon and brothel only, not the variety theatre it was historically. Milch even included Jack Langrishe in the third season, but Langrishe is portrayed as an agent of civilization, a harbinger of changing times. He and his company are set apart from the rest of the camp by nature of their language, extravagant wardrobe, and overall cleanliness. In "Amateur Night," Langrishe opens his theatre by inviting Deadwood locals to perform for each other, saying, "All the world's a stage, and all the men and women merely players."[47] The acts performed by the Deadwood amateurs include singing, dancing, and balancing acts, but no Shakespeare.[48] In reality, Deadwood amateur readings and performances of Shakespeare were more common than Langrishe's professional Shakespeare productions. While the complexity of the series' language may be compared to early modern texts, *Deadwood* does nothing to reclaim Shakespeare's place in historical Deadwood. These popularized images of Deadwood's past only contribute to long held beliefs about the crudity of its first settlers, subjecting them to a blunt binary of wildness *or* civilization, and not providing for the ambiguous reality.

The reinstatement of Shakespeare in the West not only changes perceptions of the time and place, but also perceptions of American culture. Understanding why Shakespeare has been erased from the popular concept of the Wild West reveals what values have been privileged in the

creation of American history. Re-evaluating Shakespeare's place in our past may reshape his place in our future, opening new avenues for scholarship, new performance possibilities for his works, and new audiences to experience them.

Notes

1. Elliot West, "Heathens and Angels: Childhood in the Rocky Mountain Mining Towns," *The Western Historical Quarterly* 14.2 (1983), 146. Accessed May 8, 2014. http://jstor.orgstable/10.2307/968813?ref=search-gateway:f6d2770cc0c2685a535cb0100780ebdb

2. Paula Petrik, "Capitalists with Rooms: Prostitution in Helena, Montana, 1865-1900," *Montana: The Magazine of Western History* 31.2 (1981), 13. Accessed March 22, 2015. http://jstor.org/stable/10.2307/4518564?ref=no-x-route:8d7b80c8ab4e8eb06f5a411fe34b576b

3. Katherine West Schiel, *She Hath Been Reading: Women and Shakespeare Clubs in America* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 2012), 1.

4. Ibid, xi.

5. Daryl Jones, *The Dime Novel Western* (Bowling Green, OH: Popular Press, Bowling Green State University: 1978), 1.

6. Henry Nash Smith, *Virgin Land: The American West as Symbol and Myth* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950), 90.

7. Jones, *The Dime Novel Western*, 8.

8. Michael L. Johnson, *Hunger for the Wild: America's Obsession with the Untamed West* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2007), 232.

9. Martin Nussbaum, "Sociological Symbolism of the 'Adult Western,'" *Social Forces* 39.1 (1960), 26.

10. Richard White, "Frederick Jackson Turner and Buffalo Bill," in *The Frontier in American Culture* (1994), 52.

11. Owen Wister, *The Virginian: A Horseman of the Plains* (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1911).

12. "Spotlight" *Bonanza*, season 6, episode 33, directed by Gerd Oswald, aired May 16,1965 (New York: National Broadcasting Company).

13. Richard A. Orman, "The Bard in the West," *The Western Historical Quarterly* (1974), 35-36. Accessed May 08, 2014. http://jstor.org/stable/10.2307/967188?ref=search-gateway:b04f9e38ab960e9a875a998225a58353

14. *Tombstone*, directed by George P. Cosmatos (1993; Burbank, CA: Hollywood Pictures Home Video, 1997).

15. "The Wickedest City in the World," *Chronicling America: Historic Newspapers*. Accessed September 5, 2014: http:chroniclingamerica.loc.gov.

16. John S. McClintock, *Pioneer Days in the Black Hills: Accurate History and Facts Related by One of the Early Day Pioneers* (Norman, OK: Universitiy of Oklahoma Press, 2000), 37.

17. "He Who Steals My Purse," *The Black Hills Daily Times*, April 18, 1880, Deadwood (SD) Public Library microform. All citations from *The Black Hills Daily Times* are from this source.

18. "News from Lead City," *The Black Hills Daily Times*, February 8, 1879.

19. "New Locations" *Black Hills Champion* (Deadwood, SD), December 23, 1877, South Dakota Historical Preservation: History Newspapers, roll #12561. All citations from the *Black Hills Champion* are from this source.

20. "MAC" *The Daily Hornet* (Cheyenne, WY), April 7, 1878, Wyoming Newspapers http://newspapers.wyo.gov.

21. Lawrence Stine, "A History of Theatre and Theatrical Activities in Deadwood, South Dakota, 1876-1890" (PhD diss. State University of Iowa, 1962), 132.

22. "Othello First Shakespeare in the Hills," *The Black Hills Daily Times* (Deadwood, SD), June 10, 1878.

23. Alice Cochran, "The Gold Dust Trail: Jack Langrishe's Mining Town Theaters," *Montana: The Magazine of Western History* 20.2 (1970), 312. Accessed September 5, 2014: http://jstor.org/stable/10.2307/4517455?ref=search-gateway:1bea115ee37cc97df918759bfd285811.

24. "The Metropolitan," *The Black Hills Daily Times*, July 13, 1879.

25. "The Gem," The Black Hills Pioneer, April 21, 1877.

26. "The Bella Union Varieties," *The Black Hills Pioneer*, September 9, 1876.

27. "It is Town Talk," *Black Hills Daily Times*, (Deadwood, SD) August 9, 1879.

28. "Midgets Draw Fair, But Not Large, Crowd," *Black Hills Daily Times,* May 6, 1888.

29. "Judge's Rendition of Shylock Very Convincing," *Black Hills Daily Times*, February 22, 1880.

30. Ibid.

31. "Department Benefit," *Black Hills Daily Times,* (Deadwood, SD) April 18, 1890.

32. Irene Cushman, *Diary of Irene Cushman, February 1890 to September 29, 1891: With Additions to April 23, 1908* (HARCC [*Homestake Adams Research and Cultural Center*] transcript), 32.

33. Carol A. Bishop, *The Round Table Club, 1887-1897: The Other Ladies of Deadwood* (Deadwood, SD: Deadwood Historic Preservation Commission, 1993), 3.

34. Ibid.

35. Round Table Club Minutes 1887- Dec. 5, 1888, Deadwood Public Library Archives.

36. Bishop, *The Round Table Club 1887-1897*, 11.

37. Round Table Club Minutes 1887-Dec. 5, 1888.

38. Bishop, *The Round Table Club 1887-1897*, 12.

39. Cushman, *Diary of Irene Cushman*, 93.

40. George Partridge Baldwin, *The Black Hills Illustrated: A Terse Description of Conditions Past and Present of America's Greatest Mineral Belt* (Philadelphia: Baldwin Syndicate, 1904), 66.

41. Cushman, *Diary of Irene Cushman*, 108.

42. Tim Velder, "Women Keep the Tradition of Round Table Club Alive," *Rapid City Journal*, August 23, 2004.

43. *City of Deadwood*, accessed March 15, 2015. http://cityof deadwood.com.

44. "Trial of Jack McCall" *Deadwood Alive*, accessed March 15, 2015. http://www.deadwoodalive.com/trial-of-jack-mccall.

45. *Deadwood 1876 Theater*, accessed March 15, 2015. https://www. deadwood 1876theater.com/.

46. John Mack Faragher, "HBO's *Deadwood*: Not Your Typical Western" *Montana: The Magazine of Western History* 57.2 (2007), 61.

47. "Amateur Night," *Deadwood*, season 3, episode 9, directed by Adam Davidson, aired August 6, 2006 (HBO Home Video, 2014), DVD.

48. Ibid.

ACTING SHAKESPEARE: A Roundtable Discussion with Artists from the Utah Shakespeare Festival's 2016 Production of *Much Ado About Nothing*

Michael Don Bahr
Utah Shakespeare Festival Education Director

Featuring: David Ivers (Director), Leslie Lank (Hero), Ben Livingston (Benedick), Karen Martin-Cotton (Beatrice)

Bahr: Welcome to the 2016 Actors' Roundtable session of the Wooden O Symposium. We are grateful to have with us—as we do every year—the director of our featured production. David Ivers directed this year's *Much Ado About Nothing*. We're also very grateful for Leslie Lank, who is playing Hero; Ben Livingston, who plays Benedick; and Kim Martin-Cotton, this production's Beatrice. One of the advantages of an intimate setting like this is that we have a chance to talk about how the production was put together and about their processes of creating memorable characters and relationships. I'm going to pass the microphone to David, then we'll open this session for questions from you, the audience. I'd like to start, though, with a question directed to our guests, starting with David.

Several years ago, David Ivers presented a paper at the Wooden O Symposium, in which he talked about the

Journal of the Wooden O. Vol 16, 38-55
© Southern Utah University Press
ISSN: 1539-5758

importance of scholarship and research in the roles of actor and director. I'd love to hear about his perspective, and you other actors' perspectives, on your own personal processes as you prepared for this production.

Ivers: I hope you don't expect me to remember why I thought scholarship was important. It was so long ago. I love that we do Wooden O here. I think it's an essential ingredient in the relationship between the plays and studying the plays. Of course, most of us up here believe that the plays were meant to be heard and seen, not necessarily read and debated—an emphasis on the performance element. However, I say that because that's the discipline we're in. I don't expect you to feel the same way, but I have always felt—especially the actor part of me—that structure in classical plays, particularly Shakespeare, is the key to unlocking meaning. Because of that, all actors worth their salt carry a bit of the dramaturg in them, sometimes to an overwhelming extent. John Oswald, who is playing the Friar in *Much Ado About Nothing* and has his PhD, is a man I went to school with. He wrote his dissertation on "nothingness" in Shakespeare. We were in grad school together and used to go to Buffalo Wild Wings in Minneapolis and play Shakespeare trivia, where he'd pulverize me, and when we weren't playing trivia, we'd debate the finer points of "nothingness" in Shakespeare. Currently, building a production as the director of *Much Ado,* we still did that in the middle of rehearsals. I welcome it and love it because what I believe, and what I believe the Wooden O does, is to teach us the value of exploring meaning. *Much Ado About Nothing* was really pronounced, and probably received, as *noting*. So what does that mean? And how does that inform this production, and how does that inform the actor? I spoke a great deal in my paper here about *The Tempest*. I happened to be playing Caliban at that time.

My feeling while I was studying Caliban was, "Why all the *M's* with Caliban?" Why *mother, murder, Miranda?* Why? Over and over? When you start to analyze the history of

that character and what's most important to him, you figure out that's really what's on his mind—his mother, Miranda, and murder. That became a very active thing for me, and I stuttered on those letters. That was an active choice based on scholarship, then based on interpretation, then based on character.

Bahr: Leslie, would you please talk about the importance of scholarship based on Hero in the creation and connection to Hero? What type of work you did to prepare for Hero?

Lank: I think that Shakespeare always comes down to the text and figuring out that puzzle. That's what I like about it, in those initial stages delving through the text and figuring out why—as David was saying—why these word choices? Why is this scene in verse and the other one in prose, and all these questions that we talk about during the initial text read-through. Everyone is their own little dramaturg, and it's really fun to bring it all together during rehearsal when we exchange ideas. What's fun about Shakespeare is that it's all right there.

Livingston: As an actor its crucial to get the research you need in terms of playing a character. Sometimes we rely on different types of research. There's research in the literary sense and there's research in the performance sense. A lot of actors will do a lot of performance-based research on other people who have played the role, how it's been done before. I tend to shy away from that because I don't find it helpful to me. But the literary research is absolutely essential to someone like me, who just wasn't a very good student as a kid. I was a biology major in college, and I should have spent more time studying plays and books. But since I didn't, I rely on people like David. We have an awesome dramaturg on this show—Isabel Smith-Benstein. A lot of this research will inform your character. On the basic level, you have to know what you're saying and what it means—not just what it means on the surface, but what it meant to Shakespeare, perhaps, and what it would have meant to Shakespeare's

audience, which can sometimes be very different from what it means to our audiences today.

So you have to know what you're saying, and then you have to figure out why you're saying it. In most modern plays you can figure out, for example, that I'm saying this because I'm jealous or I'm this or that; but because Shakespeare is usually deeper and more complex and written in a language that's a little different from our own, it does take some scholarly help to say why am I saying this. Also, as an actor, listening to what other characters say and how you hear what other characters say—is crucial. I'll give an example in the wedding scene: When Don Pedro calls poor Hero "a common stale," I thought, "That's kind of a lame insult, 'a common stale.'" But our dramaturg told us that that's probably the harshest thing said about Hero in that entire scene, among some very harsh things said. So that informs you as an actor; if I didn't know that, I would just watch him and go, "Oh, common stale, sure, yeah," but thanks to people smarter than I, I now know to listen for that.

Martin-Cotton: Once I have a good understanding of what I'm saying, one of the kinds of investigation I do is what the language does to me physically and emotionally. As David was saying, if it's about *M's* or about a particular consonant or a particular kind of vowel, to me that's a huge amount of information. A lot of what my process looks for is, once I know what I'm saying and what other people are saying, how to activate it in my body so that I'm not just having an intellectual experience about it. I need to know why in a particular section—why, for example, after saying nothing in the wedding, Beatrice launches into an outpouring of language—what does that do to my body and what does that do to this relationship. So a lot of the focus in my study is to find out what the language does—what information there is in the sounds of the language and the structure of the language.

Bahr: Great. Any questions from the floor specifically about the production?

Audience Member: I'm not as familiar with *Much Ado* as I am with some of the other plays, but one of the things I really enjoyed about the performance was how physical the comedy is, even a bit of slapstick. So, for David, and then the actors too, was that something you had already had in mind going into it, or was that something that you added in as you went through?

Ivers: I think it's a bit of both. By design I had it in my mind that that's the fabric of this production. It seems to me that it's the fabric of many productions of *Much Ado,* not something that would be identified specifically with me. But it certainly developed, mostly through the grace and generosity and great skill of this cast. My job is to be open to the room, lay a foundation, and say I don't know, what are we doing? The manure and all that stuff came from the actors. That's just brainstorming and trying to figure it out. All I knew is that the set was meant to locate us in a very specific place, and I wanted to make sure that anything that happened in the play, physically or otherwise, tried to come out of that place. It was born of the soil of this, what I call now, my farm-to-table restaurant. If you stand back, without preconceptions, and just look at the set, my hope was that there's a small hint that this could be a tree fort, this is like a jungle gym. That was definitely part of my thinking. How it manifests itself was a terrific collaboration between me having some ideas and the cast coming with some ideas. But we weren't shying away from a physical production at all. I think it's necessary.

Bahr: Anybody else want to comment on the physicality?

Livingston: I'll just say that this space [t*he Englestadt Shakespeare Theatre*] is quite large visually, and I don't think this space accommodates a physically subtle performance. You have to be expansive, both vocally and physically, for

people to get across that space. Also, I've known David for a long time. We both have a kind of goofy sensibility, and I knew from the beginning that as an actor doing a comedy, I always worry, is it going to be funny enough? And I knew, well its David, so he'll make it funny. I know he will!

Ivers: That's a lot of pressure.

Livingston: Exactly. And then as David said, we get in the room and say, what if we did this, what if we did this, and there were a lot of different choices for things. But it was the kind of room, the kind of cast, the kind of collaboration where anything was possible—including being buried in manure.

Martin-Cotton: David also said something before we even started that was sort of a launching place in my thinking that helped create a robust sort of world. Here is this group of women, older men, younger men, who've been waiting for everybody else to come back from the war. At the moment the play begins, the information arrives that everybody is returning and safe. So it was like a cork—like something being uncorked and releasing this passionate outpouring of emotion and celebration, which let us go to the highs and the lows of this play. I do think that entirely informs this physical world that then gets built on that joyful relief.

Audience Member: How early in the process did the tree become integrated in the set? Was that from the very beginning?

Ivers: There were two features about the design of the tree that I was very clear about early in the design process. It's going to end with a swing. That I knew. The entire production for me was predicated on this kind of daydream I had about Beatrice swinging over the audience. Worked backwards, I started researching Messina, Sicily—the whole region. I found a picture in my research of an olive tree; a lot of olive trees wind themselves around each other like an embrace. I thought, that's Beatrice and Benedick and Claudio and Hero and Dad in a way. All of a sudden, it made sense

to me that this was Leonato's orchard. If we're going to have a swing, we have to have a tree. Then I started thinking, a tree! Kids climb on trees. From there it started to develop very quickly. The two things I said to the design teams were, "Budgets are tight, so I'm just asking for a tree and a swing." Originally, I wanted the tree to go through the roof, to find its way through the O, and through that little top window up there. But we didn't have a theater at this point—it was still being built—so we didn't dare engineer that. Then the new theater got behind and the tree wasn't completed for the first preview—I mean, there was pink foam on the tree. But this cast, particularly these two [*indicating Livingstone and Martin-Cotton*] were such stalwarts, just discipline and joy. In the rehearsal room we had a six-foot A-frame ladder, and when we'd work these scenes, everything, literally, was predicated on my saying, "Now, in theory." Outside of run-throughs, we ended up with maybe 12 hours of rehearsal—total—with all that climbing action on the tree. These two just went for it! We had big ideas for the tree that just weren't physically possible, but still, I think, we got a lot out of it.

Audience Member: I thoroughly enjoyed the play. The scene of Beatrice swinging is something I will remember for the rest of my life. I also enjoyed the choice to have Beatrice and Benedick sit silently in the space throughout the play. I've never seen that before. That was beautiful. It's also during the scene when they talk about when they fell in love with each other, I wanted to ask the actors who play these characters, do you have an opinion about when Benedick falls in love with Beatrice and vice versa?

Livingston: It's an excellent question. It's kind of *the* question for these two characters in rehearsal. I'll let you go first.

Martin-Cotton: We talked a lot about what's referred to in the earlier scene, about "You've lost the heart of Signior Benedick": "Indeed, my lord, he hath lent it me a while and I gave him use for it." The reference to the relationship

obviously had some history. We talked about what it was that went wrong, because clearly something did go wrong: "He won it of me with false dice." We talked a lot about what that could be because it could be so many different things. Did one of us really do something that upset the other? Did one of us do something that made the other feel not chosen. What we ended up talking about was that these are two very prideful people and, just as we see in other moments of the play, their "skirmish of wits" can escalate. David talked a lot about that hurt, what is underneath there, what is the thing that lingers with them. There is this wonderful skirmish of wits the first time they encounter each other that ends with something rather sharp at the end. We talked about the idea that something happened where both were so prideful that, instead of giving way to any kind of coming together on whatever it was that happened, they both stormed off and held a grudge—which I think is pretty human, not being able to admit any allowance for the other person's perspective. For me, though, I am still in love with him at the top of the play. Even if I think he's an impossible person that no one should ever try to be in a relationship with, I do think I'm still in love with him because when I see him, when I hear that he is alive, that ignites something in me that's relief; and then when I see him, I think, "Oh my God, there he is!" and I have a kerchief on my head and I'd better get myself together before I can approach. But I think it takes the wedding scene, where everything is completely falling apart, to plant the idea that the other person is in love with you or me. When I hear that, that also ignites something; but it isn't until things are falling apart that there is room for the admission of love in both directions. [*To Livingstone*] Okay, now you.

Livingston: It's about the same with Benedick, I think. I think they definitely are in love with each other from the beginning; otherwise, they wouldn't be so passionate about their skirmishes. I think Benedick is one of those people that we probably all know, who had a love go wrong and

decided to harden his heart and go through the world not trusting anyone. More than Beatrice—Beatrice gets talked about a lot in terms of pride—I get talked about a lot in terms of not trusting women, and I say some awful things about women in the first part of the play. It's that gulling, that incredible gift—one of the things I love about the play is the people who construct the gulling—it's a lark for them. It's an entertainment for them, and it's a complete game-changer to us. Being gulled, there's a line that always sticks out after the gulling where Shakespeare writes these very, very short, simple sentences that make it timeless; he just says, "Love me." That, to me, for my interpretation of the character, is a watershed moment of, "Wow! I haven't allowed anyone to love me for so long," and it just kind of cracks his heart open and allows all those old feelings to come up. That's my interpretation.

Bahr: I want to consider the wedding because you talk about how important it is. I would love to hear from you, Hero—Leslie—about why can you go back to loving that man after what he did.

Lank: That's the question I've always had. It's the question that everyone has about Hero. Certainly the first question I ask is why she chooses to go back. It's hard to reconcile our modern sensibility with that choice. The wedding is tragic and there's not much I can say about that. It's just a horrible event. I think that Hero is the personification of heart. She's this extremely good and forgiving person. In terms of choosing to forgive Claudio, it's like this universal experience we've all encountered. Someone you love is hurt and because they're hurt they act out. You can either choose to hit them back or to forgive them. Hero, after all of the initial shock, anger, and heartbreak, in those scenes where we don't see her for a long time, and especially after she witnesses the tomb scene, I think she's a good enough person that she can step back from the situation and see that Claudio is wounded and extremely hurt—and mistaken—and that's why he behaves

so badly. That's why she is able to forgive him instead of holding a grudge.

Bahr: Where in the rehearsal process did the choice of having Hero onstage during that scene first come in?

Lank: I think that was always what we were going to do, right? That's quite common in productions for a modern audience to have Hero witness the ritual. Hero isn't onstage for most of the second part, so to have her witness Claudio's grieving and mourning and regret builds her character and also helps the audience to understand her choice.

Ivers: There's another component of this issue that I've spoken about over the summer at other seminars, and it's coming clear to me that it absolutely does not help the actor in terms of trying to figure out that sticky situation for a modern audience with a different world view from when it was written. Here's what I find fascinating and contradictory—which I relish—about the irresponsibility of our human nature: Hero is a willing participant in using the same device on Beatrice that was used when Claudio receives the information about her own honor. Hero says, "I will help perpetuate hearsay. I will be a purveyor of hearsay in order to effect change." Claudio has come apart at his wedding because of what? Hearsay. How is it okay to sit in an audience and be a willing participant in the very same device that makes you feel so lovely about a comedy, and yet you reject it when it comes to Borachio and Hero and Margaret? They're operating under the very same device. Shakespeare knows it—he's a genius—and he throws the mirror back to you when a director points it out, or if you've already discovered it for yourself. But if you go back to the play, *Much Ado about Noting,* nothing is said in the action, but it would be an exception if these men arrived home without someone saying, "I heard the prince. . .," or "Did you hear she's. . ." The inference is not direct. It only becomes direct in the second instance. I think it doesn't help the actor because then you'd have a meta-performance. But it helps structurally in

understanding and directing. I think I was a broken record on the noting thing because having been part of this play several times, but never directing it before, I found it surprisingly immediate for me this time. It's something to think about because there's a great contradiction there. Especially now when you think about Hero saying, "I'll do anything. I'll do anything to help my cousin."

Audience Member: This part was great fun. I think what made it so interesting, though, was your emphasis on the body of Hero's relationship. We all love Hero, but your emphasis on the Claudio and Hero relationship, just jumped out at me.

Ivers: I'm so glad to hear that. Thank you. It's mostly because of Leslie and Luigi [*Sottile, who plays Claudio*]. I'm grateful for the comment because it is something we talked about from the get-go—that it's their play. This is sub-plot over here [*indicating Beatrice and Benedick*]. It's a good one, but it's sub-plot. What Leslie and Luigi brought to their story was such heart and conflict—and generosity which is great because I feel the play doesn't receive its whole balance without that.

Bahr: Other questions?

Audience Member: I want to ask how you arrived at the age difference. Very often Benedick and Claudio are not that different in age, but in this production its stark, which I think is wonderful because it justifies a lot of the language in the play. He has been a bachelor for a long, long time, so this is really a celebration of long deferred love, which is especially terrific. Did that offer any gifts to you—challenges—as you were producing it?

Ivers: You just said it all. Truly, that's how I feel about it. From the outset I said I wanted a mature Beatrice and Benedick. I wanted a generation between them and Claudio and Hero because I think there's something about the younger two witnessing what happens to love at first sight, which Beatrice and Benedick must have experienced, and

how it can go in a direction that makes one say, "Do we really want to—do we really want to be on that path?" Also, I'm at a certain place in my life: It wasn't just about the generation thing; it was also about these two actors whom I love and wanted to work with, and it all just seemed to make sense—the approach to the production and what it meant for people "of a certain age" to be climbing over trees and climbing up ladders.

Audience Member: I thought they were a lot younger.

Livingston: As an actor, you can't really play age. I can only play the play and be my own age. I would like to think that these roles are timeless. There have been a lot of famous productions, James Earl Jones and, and—

Bahr: It was Vanessa Redgrave.

Livingston: Anyway, he did it in his 70s. There was a famous Derek Jacobi production, when he was in his late 40s. He probably dyed his hair; I don't. Still, I can't worry about the age or play into it in any way, but I hope that there's something poignant about people *this* age, that it's never too late to allow yourself to be in love.

Audience Member: Could you talk about how Margaret functions in this production? It seems to me that that added moment, that reconciliation, changed the women's relationship, and I wondered if you could talk a about that.

Ivers: Changed the women's relationship? How?

Audience Member: Margaret was included in the wedding scene, and she's not always. I think that moment where she tries to speak and Leonato stops her was very revealing. I wondered about what that does for Hero in that scene.

Ivers: There's no prescription for Margaret being in the scene or not. There's no road map there. I think it's seriously troubling if she's not, actually. If she's not, one notices that it's completely obvious who isn't there. Then one wonders, if you start to put two and two together, if Margaret escaped. Then what happens when she comes back? What if she doesn't appear at all later in the play? Kelly Rogers, who plays

Margaret, felt very strongly that we should find a moment for her to have a chance to say, "Whoa, this thing, like all the other things, all the other devices, went too far." It's all the same kind of idea: people overseeing, over-hearing. That that might go a long way with a modern audience to validate this larger family. After all, the whole play is about watching how information affects people to change or not. I have to believe in the choice because I believe it gives someone voice, potentially, that doesn't have one.

Lank: Kelly and I have also found a moment at the end where Leonato says that Margaret was a part of the deception, but she didn't know what was happening. Then Kelly comes over to me and we have a little silent moment of forgiveness. I love it. We kind of just hold each other, and sometimes she says, "I'm sorry." If that moment didn't exist at the wedding, if she stood away from me, and I obviously don't know what's happening and why she's avoiding me, it might be harder for me to forgive her. After all, the girls always have each other's backs, and that's a truly important relationship.

Martin-Cotton: I also love that in this production, David has Margaret woven in closely as one of the girls who are almost part of the family. This is a play that talks a lot about women's chastity, and Margaret clearly is not living that life, but she's still entirely part of the family. I like the dynamic of a world in which women can live different ways. For some women, it is part of what they're expected to do to be chaste, but other women certainly can make their own choices.

Ivers: We talked early on about what it means for these characters to live with reckless abandon. If you think about the track that you took the characters on and you imbed that into the performance of Don John, what does it mean for him to live fully in three dimensions of reckless abandon? It means he is on this train and people are going down. What does that mean for Hero? What does that mean for Beatrice and Benedick? This notion of uncorking at the top of the play—bringing that three-dimensional technicolor

into existence—ends up with a pastiche of family that has different versions of loud voices and the need to speak and the desire to be heard. And we're in Italy, right? So a certain amount of fire and passion comes culturally from the depth of family relationship and the relationships of the land and commerce and everything else. That informs some of these choices as well.

Audience Member: Along that same line, did you ever consider putting in the scene where Benedick and Claudio and Don John view Borachio and Margaret?

Ivers: It was never an option for me. Never would I even consider it, and the reason is this: This, right here [pointing], in your brain, in your mind's eye, is far more potent than what I can stage about those kinds of events. Thank you, every great film maker. Thank you to the Greeks, thank you to violence off stage. What you can conquer in your mind's eye will immediately take you to a place of context and understanding in your life about scenes like that, that is far more potent than anything I can create for you. Not to mention, I'm not going to stop the play and say, "Here comes a dumb show!" I'm sure there are better directors than I who can create that, but I never considered it.

Audience Member: I think the genius of not doing the scene is that it makes the audience complicit in the hearsay. Now we are also buying into that Facebook idea of anonymity: When you say things anonymously, you have no accountability. Is that a fair statement?

Ivers: I think you're essentially supporting what I just said, which is that you have the ability—you will find a place of context immediately. And I think you're right.

Livingston: Leonato doesn't see it.

Ivers: The play is contingent on people believing on both sides of the equation very quickly. If you don't do that, it's not going to go well.

Audience Member: We've been told from the beginning of the play that Don John is going to set up this betrayal, and

we also know that Borachio has volunteered that he knows Margaret and can arrange for her to come to the window and blah blah blah. That's a done deal. And then we have those magical nincompoops who capture the villains. We see that before the wedding scene, so—

Ivers: Yes, if Leonato were to listen to that first scene, before the wedding, there'd be no problems. It'd be a much shorter evening.

Bahr: We haven't talked about the magical nincompoops.

Ivers: There's only one. And he founded the theatre [*referring to Fred C. Adams*].

Bahr: Do you want to talk about the role of Dogberry and the Constables?

Ivers: Yes, it's a great device. What I love about this group is that they push it just enough for me. It doesn't go over-the-top stupid. It's got enough humor, enough bite, and I think they're great together. I'll tell you my original idea, and someday I'll work in a theatre that has the resources to do it. I had hoped, at one point very early on, along with a 50-foot tree, that the watch would be entirely made up of 70- and 80-year-olds. My reasoning is that the generation that should be in it are gone. Where? At the war. The only people left here are women, children, and —Fred Adams! May it be ever thus! We just couldn't afford, frankly, to do that. My thinking, again, was, how do you locate this group? Are these migrant workers? Are they olive pickers? Who are they? The watch was a real thing, volunteer fire department, made up of the community. We took our watch-word from the old adage in the theatre, KISS: Keep it Simple, Stupid. They are a great device to set the world right. They are the chaos that turns chaos into order. That's not an old device, but it's employed in an especially nifty way here.

Livingston: An observation I've heard is that the great thing about being an actor and doing a run of a show is getting to hear the show multiple times. There's never a night where you don't hear something and say, "Oh, yeah, I've

never noticed that before." One of the things I've always thought was that Dogberry was one of those clown roles that make you go, ugh, as an actor. These arcane jokes. John Plumpis is amazing because, if you can make that role work, you are an amazing actor. I was listening to something in the watch where he's instructing his men, and they say, "Well, if this happens what do you do?" At every turn, Dogberry is the antithesis of a hard cop. He says, "Just let him be." If you find somebody drunk, just let 'em drink enough to go to sleep. Or if somebody does this, what do you do? And it's the opposite of what all the "smart" characters do. The smart characters get a piece of information, and they overreact to the point of endangering people's lives. Then there's that Shakespearean wisdom in the dummies. If everybody had a little more Dogberry and just chilled out a little bit and forgave people for their faults, none of this Much Ado could happen. It's interesting that Shakespeare puts that with a guy who can't even string a sentence together.

Audience Member: In my experience with the show, I've found that in this production the characterizations of some of the supporting characters, especially Don Pedro and Don John, were delightfully different and fantastic. I was just wondering how much of that was directorial? How much of that came from the actors? Also, did that radically change the way any of you approached your characters with what they were giving you, or were you surprised by it.

Livingston: I like to do theatre because I think it's the most collaborative art form. You're not sitting in a garret painting a painting by yourself. The joy of collaborating is the people you work with, and the great thing about David and the great thing about this theatre is—I've worked here five separate times over the span of 27 years, and every time I come back it's better and better in terms of looking to your left and right and the people you're working with. This cast is one of the best casts yet, when you get down the cast list and have actors like J. Todd Adams. Don John is a great part,

but I've known J. Todd forever and you couldn't find anyone better for that part. Then you look around at Margaret, for instance. Usually in summer Shakespeare festivals, you're down to student interns with some of those roles. But here you have someone like J. Todd . . .

Ivers: Our Boy is a student intern—Keaton. He's a student at SUU and he's amazing.

Livingston: Yes, but here you have people playing Don John who can play Benedick at other theatres. You have people playing Margaret who can play Beatrice at other Shakespeare theatres. Just the depth of the company here makes doing plays so much more satisfying and fun.

Martin-Cotton: I think when David was thinking about how to put this cast together, he picked some wonderful people who can, in a position of being unleashed and uncorked, run fully with the idea into Don Pedro's delight in becoming cupid. Larry Bull, whom you see as the Chorus in *Henry V* doing a beautiful and sober job, is delightfully wicked in a variety of ways that you don't always get to see in Don Pedro, and I do think David knew what he was doing.

Ivers: I love this cast so much and I love Larry. I've directed him before, and that experience was the one thing that convinced me I should cast him as Don Pedro. It's against type in the way he has moved with it, but I directed him in a production of *Twelve Angry Men* here a few years ago. The secret about that play was that you knew everyone's profession; and if you know their professions and what they do, it tells you everything you need to know about where to go. For instance, a guy owns a messaging service, so everything is in service to somebody else; of course, he's the loudest guy in the room. Larry Bull, Juror #1, gets picked as the foreman. He gets picked as the guy who's got to lead. He said, "How do I do this?" I originally said, "What's your job?"—you know, what's your job in life? He said, "Football—football coach." I said, "Ah. Assistant." That's what he is in the play. He's not the head coach; he is the assistant head coach. So

I said, "Now, you're the head coach." With Don Pedro, if we can find that same entrance, his light goes on. This isn't me imposing a role on him; this is me saying, "Oh, you're cooking with cilantro. I love cilantro. More cilantro! Load it up with cilantro." I'd see him get this goofy stance and say, "That. That guy." It lets us in, and it speaks to a prince who has done his duty for over two years in the war and has come home and does not have to be in that leadership position anymore. He's allowed to be in a place to serve others rather than lead others. There's a different kind of service there. I'm glad that it spoke to you because I find it delicious and suiting to my humor. I also find it oddly real, you know? When those guys are mucking around, and the ladies are mucking around, and they're in a place of sheer delight, you can't beat that.

Bahr: In prior years, the play selected for discussion has been the Henry V, which is a great production, or *Richard II,* the *Lear*, the *Hamlet* —the serious play, because we want to get that type of discussion into the ether. But a year ago, the board got together and said, "I want to talk about *Much Ado*"—because it has some genuinely remarkable depth. Why do we think that the comedies don't have that same beautiful depth? Look again. Those wonderful moments of darkness intensify the lighter scenes, and the glorious light helps us go deeper on the other side.

I'm very grateful for your comments, your questions, and for what you brought for this production. So, thank you very, very much. Please give a round of applause for this great *Much Ado* community. [*Applause*]

"Masculine Margaret?": Margaret of Anjou's Gender Performance in Shakespeare's First

Charles Bell
University of Alabama

Although Margaret is not one of the most popular female characters in Shakespeare's canon, she is without a doubt one of the most interesting. In her 2015 book, *Women of Will: Following the Feminine in Shakespeare's Plays,* Tina Packer, an actor, director, and teacher of Shakespeare, relays the story of directing *The Third Part of King Henry VI* and telling the actress playing Margaret to castrate a male character on stage.[1] Indeed, Packer found Margaret's character so compelling that she "was the first woman in the canon [she] ever wanted to play."[2] Packer is not alone in realizing the appeal of Margaret. Scholar Charles Boyce describes her as "surely the greatest female part in Shakespeare."[3] Shakespeare's Margaret has earned this admiration due to her ferocious actions as she leads an army into battle and personally executes one of her political enemies. Despite these striking actions that many would call "masculine," Margaret manages to retain her femininity throughout the plays by performing both the masculine and feminine

Journal of the Wooden O. Vol 17, 56-71
© Southern Utah University Press
ISSN: 1539-5758

genders depending on which would benefit her most at the time.

Scholarship concerning Margaret of Anjou today is not widely varied, as most scholars tend to concentrate on a perceived inversion of Margaret's gender roles. Of course, there is an older strain of criticism that seeks to determine Shakespeare's historical accuracy when portraying Henry VI's queen as demonstrated by the work of Patricia-Ann Lee.[4] At the same time, other scholars, like Roy E. Aycock, examine the character of Margaret in Richard III, asserting that she is the harbinger of doom.[5] These critics tend to compare her to figures like Nemesis from ancient literature. This older line of criticism still receives occasional attention as evidenced by M.L. Stapleton's article comparing Margaret with characters from Senecan tragedy;[6] however, most recent scholarship can be summed up in the words of Theresa Kemp: "Margaret is presented throughout the play as a vision of cursed and unnatural—even monstrous—masculinity."[7] Kemp's words echo the words of Angela Pitt, who argues that Margaret has developed from a feminine character in the earlier plays of the tetralogy into a monstrous, masculine character who defies all social conventions in *The Third Part of King Henry VI* and *Richard III*.[8] Phyllis Rackin, however, avoids using the word "masculinity," instead examining how Margaret oversteps the bounds of femininity.[9] Despite small differences in terminology, the vast amount of research recently published focuses on Margaret's lack of femininity and how that would have been perceived in Shakespeare's day. While Margaret's actions make her an excellent character to closely examine for gender criticism, the conclusion at which most scholars arrive paints far too simple a picture of Margaret and of the Early Modern conception of gender. A closer look at the text shows that although Margaret does perform masculine gender roles at times, she is not ultimately an overtly masculine character. Rather, Queen Margaret of Anjou is a vastly complex

character, who performs both the masculine and feminine genders in order to accomplish her goals.

Of course, scholars like Angela Pitt and Theresa Kemp are quite justified in their assertions that Margaret acts in a masculine manner. From the first scene of *The Third Part of King Henry VI,* Margaret acts in a distinctly unfeminine manner by openly berating and disobeying her husband. As Theresa Kemp demonstrates in her book *Women in the Age of Shakespeare,* Early Modern wives were expected to be silent and obedient to their husbands like a military lieutenant was to act towards his general.[10] However, Margaret acts in direct opposition to these social mandates the first time she enters the stage. After Henry promises to name York his heir, rather than his son Edward, Margaret speaks bold, rebellious words to her husband:

> Ah, wretched man! Would I had died a maid
> And never seen thee, never borne thee a son,
> Seeing thou hast proved so unnatural a father!
> (*3H6* 1.1.216-18)[11]

This acerbic exclamation does not portray Margaret as an obedient wife, who silently accepts her husband's word as law. Indeed, after hearing Henry's excuse that York and Warwick forced his hand, Margaret furthers her disobedience by giving Henry an ultimatum. Until Henry repeals the law that makes York heir to the throne, Margaret vows, "I here divorce myself / Both from thy table, Henry, and thy bed" (*3H6* 1.1.246-47). Both Margaret's acid tone and the ultimatum she gives to her husband place her in a position of rebellion. Rather than being the meek and mild wife, she takes command, usurping the place of the domestic general and dominating her weak husband in a manner unbecoming for a woman of the Early Modern era. Indeed, Margaret's mutiny against her husband and general even entices Henry's son to disobey him. When Henry asks Edward to stay with him, Edward replies, "When I return with victory from the field, / I'll see Your Grace. Till then, I'll follow her" (*3H6*

1.1.261-62). Margaret's disobedience and flagrant disregard for the gender hierarchy result in an entire inversion of the family dynamic where all members of the family are to obey the patriarch.

Margaret's outburst in this first scene could be attributed to a momentary feminine outburst of passion if she had not proceeded to take up the role of the military general as well. As Mary Beth Rose acknowledges in the prologue to her book *Gender and Heroism in Early Modern English Literature,* activities like adventure, rescue, conquest, and war were viewed as forms of masculine heroism.[12] She goes on to argue that heroism in the Early Modern era can also encompass a patient, enduring woman;[13] however, Margaret places herself in a category much closer to the male warrior than the dutiful wife. Just before Margaret leaves her husband's side, she formulates a plan, exclaiming, "The northern lords that have forsworn thy colors / Will follow mine, if once they see them spread" (*3H6* 1.1.251-52). Margaret makes good on her word, leading soldiers onto the field of battle. The reactions of York and his sons are telling as to their view of a woman's competency as a soldier. They laugh and mock Margaret's army even though they are outnumbered, as Richard (later Richard III) derisively states, "A woman's general. What should we fear?" (*3H6* 1.2.68) They all agree that victory shall be theirs, but Margaret is not acting like a normal woman. Rather, as one of the conquering male generals that littered Renaissance literature, she oversees the utter destruction of York's army, making her seem masculine.

Not content with merely winning the battle, Margaret feels the need to take revenge on those persons responsible for disinheriting her son, and the cruelty she displays in doing so highlights an absolute breach of female conduct. When York is captured, Margaret brutally murders him in a way that is "jarring" and "completely repulsive."[14] As York stands bound before her, Margaret begins to taunt him by explicitly pointing out that his son Rutland has already died.

She gives York a piece of cloth stained with Rutland's blood and exclaims,

> Look, York, I stained this napkin with the blood
> That valiant Clifford, with his rapier's point,
> Made issue from the bosom of the boy;
> And if thine eyes can water for his death,
> I give thee this to dry thy cheeks withal. (*3H6* 1.4.79-83)

The fact that Margaret, who has a son of her own, can stand before this man and bid him wipe his tears with a cloth soaked in the blood of his young, defenseless son is grotesque, and this grotesqueness can be explained by women's roles in the Early Modern era. As Kemp points out, in Shakespeare's time, "it was assumed that marriage would be the path taken by all women,"[15] and one of the primary purposes of marriage was legal procreation.[16] In fact, one of the primary genres of writing by women of the Early Modern era was books for their children, in which mothers provided "educational and life advice."[17] Therefore, since motherhood was such an important aspect of femininity in this period, one would expect Margaret to show some pity for the fallen child of York. However, she revels in Rutland's death, bringing to mind the same type of macabre image of violence against innocents that Henry V paints when he threatens to have the "naked infants spitted upon pikes" (*H5* 3.3.38) if the governor of Harfleur does not surrender. Margaret seems to be emulating the masculine warrior-king, not a soft, nurturing, mother.

While Margaret's husband, Henry, is not able to see that her behavior is unnatural, other men in the play are eager to point out Margaret's unnatural behavior. After Margaret taunts York with the bloody napkin, he lists her faults saying that she is without beauty, without virtue, and without self-control, all of which he claims women should have. Towards the end of his invective, York culminates his argument against her femininity:

> Oh, tiger's heart wrapped in a woman's hide!
> How couldst thou drain the lifeblood of the child,

> To bid the father wipe his eyes withal,
> And yet be seen to bear a woman's face?
> Women are soft, mild, pitiful, and flexible;
> Thou stern, obdurate, flinty, rough, remorseless.
> (*3H6* 1.4.137-42)

York attacks Margaret's femininity by questioning her maternal instinct—which has been traditionally viewed as a necessity for women in the Early Modern era.[18] Thus, when York tells her that she lacks the essential qualities mothers must possess, he is attempting to take away her very womanhood, turning her into a masculinized monster; moreover, York is not the only one to realize Margaret's cruel, vindictive streak. After seeing the Queen's cruel taunts, Northumberland, Margaret's own ally in this scene, says, "Had he been slaughterman to all my kin, / I should not for my life but weep with him" (*3H6* 1.4.169-70). Northumberland's response gives Margaret's actions a darker edge. While she stabs York, soaking her hands in her enemy's blood, Northumberland weeps for York's plight, which inverts the genders of the characters in the scene. The man weeps, while the woman soaks herself in the blood of her enemies, making Margaret appear more masculine and less maternal than the men with whom she fights.

Thus, with such damning evidence, it is quite easy to see why Theresa Kemp would say that Margaret is "a vision of cursed and unnatural—even monstrous—masculinity."[19] In only the first act of T*he Third Part of King Henry the Sixth,* Margaret takes on the role of a man, leading an army to victory and brutally taunting and executing her enemy. However, before coming to the conclusion that Shakespeare was depicting the dangers of a woman acting outside the constraints of her gender roles, one must consider the time in which this play was written. At the latest, Shakespeare wrote *The Third Part of Henry the Sixth* in 1592, during the height of Elizabeth's reign and a scant four years after the Spanish Armada crisis.[20] It is difficult to believe that a

neophyte playwright would risk offending his reigning monarch by portraying a powerful Queen of England in a negative light. Therefore, categorizing Margaret merely as a masculine character perhaps paints far too simple a picture of Margaret's character. As M.L. Stapleton says, "Hers [Margaret's] may well be the most multifaceted female role in Shakespeare."[21] Margaret's role is multifaceted because she is forced to negotiate her gender performance in order to act as she finds necessary.

Margaret begins to step out of the conventions of femininity by openly rebelling against her husband; however, Margaret's rebellion is staged to protect her feminine, familial relationships. She defies her husband due to the insecure position in which Henry places their entire family. Patricia-Ann Lee speculates of the historical person of Margaret: "With a husband who was strong and dominating, or at least one who was capable of effective rule, she might well have become a conventional wife and popular queen consort."[22] The same conjecture applies to Shakespeare's depiction of Margaret. She recognizes that when Henry proclaims York his adopted heir, her entire family is in mortal peril, and she acts accordingly. During her invective against her husband, Margaret emphasizes the fact that Henry has doomed his family:

> Thou hast undone thyself, thy son, and me,
> And given unto the house of York such head
> As thou shalt reign but by their sufferance.
> To entail him and his heirs unto the crown,
> What is it but to make thy sepulcher
> And creep into it far before thy time?
> (*3H6* 1.1.232-37)

While Henry's primary regret in naming York his heir is that he "unnaturally shall disinherit" (*3H6* 1.1.193) his son Edward, Margaret is able to see a much larger danger. She knows that York will not be satisfied to wait for Henry's natural death. Rather, York would gladly help Henry to an

early grave. She also knows that York's claim to the throne will be exponentially weakened if Edward were allowed to live. Therefore, her natural feminine response is to protect her family from that perceived danger, even if it means that she must disobey her husband.

Margaret's duty to protect her entire family, however, is dwarfed by her duty to protect her son, and her maternal tendencies prompt her to take up arms like a man in order to defend her son and his inheritance at all costs. Indeed, her maternal feelings are epitomized when she tells Henry how unnatural disinheriting his son is by using explicit language about her pregnancy and Edward's birth. She tells him that if he had "felt that pain which I did for him once, / Or nourished him as I did with my blood" (*3H6* 1.1.221-22), Henry would not disinherit his son. This explicitly gendered language, which gives the audience the mental picture of Edward's birth, displays the maternal sacrifice Margaret already made for Edward before the events of the play, and, as a loving mother, she is quite willing to make more. As Phyllis Rackin explains, motherhood in the Early Modern Era was sometimes equated to a "special vocation" due to its necessity and thankless nature.[23] Margaret of Anjou holds her "special vocation" so dear that she is willing to sacrifice her good name and outward, perceived femininity in order to protect her son Edward.

Although Margaret's detractors claim that she does not possess the softness and pity required of a woman, her reaction to the death of her son makes a convincing argument to the contrary. The scene of Edward's death, described by Stapleton as a type of *"pietá"* requires the actor playing Margaret to invoke a vast amount of pathos if the scene is to be at all believable.[24] As Margaret cradles the bloody, lifeless body of her son, she cries out her grief telling Edward, Gloucester, and Clarence that they are worse men by far than those who murdered Caesar because "He was a man; this, in respect, a child, / And men ne'er spend their fury on a child" (*3H6*

5.5.56-57). After decrying the men as villains, she then begs for them to kill her as well as she weeps over her son's lifeless corpse: "Dispatch me here! / Here sheath thy sword. I'll pardon thee my death" (*3H6* 5.5.69-70). Her invocation of pathos and weeping place her firmly on the feminine side of gender performance. In this scene, she performs as a woman affected by the ravages of war. Bereft of both her husband and her son, Margaret cannot function in the world without these familial relationships that define females of the Early Modern era.

Thus, the triumphant, competent Queen, having lost a husband and a son, also loses her vivacious nature and spends the rest of her days speaking words rather than performing against her gender in such a lively way as she once did. In *Richard III,* Margaret is no longer leading armies or killing those audacious enough to wish harm to her son. Rather, she is, as Kemp describes her, "a ghost haunting the castle as she curses Richard."[25] With the death of her son, Margaret loses both her security and her drive. Instead she focuses all of her wrath on Richard in the form of curses because he has slain her son. As she brings up her son's death she begs God to give her justice, exclaiming, "O God, that see'st it, do not suffer it! / As it is won with blood, lost be it so!" (*R3* 1.3.271-72). In *The Third Part of Henry VI,* one would expect Margaret to attempt to achieve justice by actively seeking Richard's life; however, Margaret is through performing as a man. Instead she begs for favors from God because she has lost one of the most defining features of her femininity—her motherhood. In fact, in the two scenes in which Margaret appears in *Richard III,* she explicitly refers to her son's murder thirteen times. Her obsession with her son's murder is evident in the fact that she speaks incessantly of it, and this fixation on the fruit of her womb dramatically changes her from the vivacious, active Queen to a common, cursing hag.

Interestingly enough, although Kemp and others point to Margaret's actions in *The Third Part of King Henry III*

when they attempt to point out her masculinity, Margaret performs a much more masculine role in *The First Part of King Henry VI* and *The Second Part of King Henry VI.* Indeed, her actions in the earlier plays may have troubled Early Modern audiences much more than her actions in the subsequent plays. Of course, in the earlier plays, her performance is much more subtle than personally executing York; however, the implications of her actions are more masculine than her most bloody moment.

As Theresa Kemp notes, Margaret's part in *The First Part of King Henry VI* is only to capture the imagination and heart of Suffolk so that he will woo her for King Henry.[26] However, Margaret already begins to show an unhealthy affection for the married Suffolk when she believes herself to be set-aside for Henry. Indeed, Suffolk is largely to blame as he continues asking her if she will send a "loving token to His Majesty" (*1H6* 5.3.181). Margaret's reply is at first modest and honorable, one becoming to an Early Modern maiden: "Yes, my good lord: a pure unspotted heart, / Never yet taint with love, I send the King" (*1H6* 5.3.182-83). At these words Suffolk kisses her, saying that he will also send that to the king. However, Margaret refuses, saying, "That for thyself. I will not presume / To send such peevish tokens to a king" (*1H6* 5.3.185-86). By giving the kiss to Suffolk rather than to Henry she is hovering close to the line of adultery, even though she is not fully in a position of power in this scene.

Margaret crosses that line fully in *The Second Part of King Henry VI.* There are many indications that Margaret and Suffolk are having an affair towards the beginning of the play. For example, when some petitioners mistake Suffolk for the Lord Protector, one complains about his neighbor taking his house, lands, and wife. Suffolk, alone in the company of Margaret, immediately responds, "Thy wife too? That's some wrong, indeed" (*2H6* 1.3.21). Small hints such as these lead up to the definitive scene in which the audience is certain

that Suffolk and Margaret are lovers. When Gloucester is murdered, Henry decides to take action:

> For, sure, my thoughts do hourly prophesy
> Mischance unto my state by Suffolk's means.
> And therefore, by His majesty I swear,
> Whose far unworthy deputy I am,
> He shall not breathe infection in this air
> But three days longer, on the pain of death.
> (*2H6* 3.2.283-88)

After Henry's bold proclamation of Suffolk's exile, the audience realizes that Henry's action has come too late. Suffolk and Margaret are left alone on the stage, and what unfolds is a love scene that could have come out of Romeo and Juliet. As they are forced to part, Margaret and Suffolk begin to speak freely. Suffolk boldly says to his king's wife,

> For where thou art, there is the world itself,
> With every several pleasure in the world,
> And where thou art not, desolation" (*2H6* 3.2.362-64).

After many impassioned speeches from the two of them, Suffolk finally departs, and Margaret tells him, "Take my heart with thee" (*2H6* 3.2.409). Margaret and her lover are parted, never to meet more.

Of course, scholars have noted the inappropriateness of Margaret and Suffolk's relationship. Phyllis Rackin describes Margaret as a "bloodthirsty adulteress,"[27] but she claims that her infidelity is not her primary transgression.[28] Rackin is referring to Margaret's disobedience and violence as the greater of her faults, but, to the Early Modern audience, that might not have been the case. As Katherine Henderson and Barbara McManus make extremely clear in their book *Half Humankind,* one of the most popular stereotypes of Early Modern Women was that of the seductress, "the image of woman as enticing, sexually insatiable, and deceitful in the service of her lust."[29] Indeed, Angela Pitt argues that Margaret is fulfilling that stereotype from the moment that she gives

her kiss to Suffolk rather than to Henry.[30] She seems to be hazarding her most precious chastity, the feminine ideal for women in the Early Modern Era,[31] in order to opportunistically gain power and prestige. Of course, this stereotype may apply extremely well in that one scene; however, there is a slight complication to the stereotype in the subsequent play. In *The Second Part of King Henry the VI,* Margaret comes from the position of power that the man usually held in these adulterous relationships, as she is Suffolk's Queen. Therefore, the power dynamic in the relationship is reversed. Margaret acts like a king with a consort, while Suffolk takes a more submissive role.

Indeed, the submissive role that Suffolk takes is rather shocking when rereading the scene in which they must part. Immediately after Henry declares Suffolk's exile, Margaret begins heaping curses upon her husband and Warwick. Suffolk tells her to stop and let him take his punishment in peace. Margaret perceives this as weakness and reprimands him saying, "Fie, coward woman and softhearted wretch! / Hast thou not spirit to curse thine enemies?" (*2H6* 3.2.307-8). Suffolk does not bristle at being called a woman by Margaret. On the contrary, he immediately obeys her and begins hurling bitter curses to his malefactors. In fact, he curses for twenty-nine lines until Margaret commands him to stop, which he does in the middle of his sentence. Indeed, Suffolk does not leave until Margaret commands him to do so, and when he does, he cries out in a manner that invokes *pathos* rather than displaying the strength, courage, and unmovable nature required of men:

> If I depart from thee, I cannot live,
> And in thy sight to die, what were it else
> But like a pleasant slumber in thy lap?
>
> * * *
>
> To die by thee were but to die in jest;
> From thee to die were torture more than death.

> Oh, let me stay, befall what may befall!
> (*2H6* 3.2.388-90, 400-2)

Suffolk's weakness and dependence upon Margaret may have been acceptable in an Early Modern woman, but certainly not in a man. Indeed, Margaret's response lacks the melodramatic tone of Suffolk's exclamation. She again commands him with strength and courage, "Away! Though parting be a fretful corrosive, / It is applièd to a deathful wound" (*2H6* 3.2.403-4). Margaret has taken the man's part, issuing commands and remaining pragmatic even in the face of a serious crisis. Suffolk, meanwhile lets his emotions control his actions and only acts in obedience to Margaret's imperatives—an obedience that was expected of Early Modern wives.[32]

Margaret's masculine performance does not end after she must part with Suffolk. On the contrary, her masculine behavior becomes even more pronounced after she becomes aware that Suffolk has died. After Suffolk was beheaded, an unnamed gentleman brings Suffolk's body and unattached head to Henry and Margaret. When the scene begins, Margaret is carrying Suffolk's head, grieving over him. However, Margaret once again displays a pragmatism that one would expect from a man. She tells herself,

> Oft have I heard that grief softens the mind
> And makes it fearful and degenerate.
> Think therefore on revenge and cease to weep.
> (2H6 4.4.1-3)

Rather than being ruled by her emotions, Margaret hardens her heart and begins to think about revenge. She actively pushes away the feminine action of crying and resolves herself into a bone-chilling plan for revenge. However, Margaret's masculine performance is intensified by the visual spectacle she presents while bearing Suffolk's head. Usually, in Shakespeare's plays when a head unattached to the trunk of the body appears on stage, it is a trophy of war. For example, after Macduff kills Macbeth, the stage directions

read *"Enter Macduff, with Macbeth's head"* (*Mac.* 5.8.53). Later in the very same play in which Margaret enters carrying Suffolk's head, Iden enters the scene bearing the head of Cade to Henry as a war trophy. Rather than grieving over Suffolk's lifeless body like Juliet grieves over Romeo's, Margaret holds his gory, trunkless head in her hands like a man displaying his war trophy and tells herself not to weep. She detests any type of weakness in herself, which would have struck the Early Modern audience as rather strange and masculine. Margaret is not performing the part of a grieving woman as she does over the body of her son, but the part of a vengeful man.

The Margaret of Anjou that Shakespeare presents is an astounding woman, and there is little doubt as to why scholars like Charles Boyce and Tina Packer treat her with such reverence. She is one of the only women in Shakespeare's canon able to actively shape the plot of a play without fooling those around her into thinking she is a man. Throughout the four plays in which she appears, she does not don a disguise. She rather uses her own person and vitality to achieve her goals. Despite her lack of disguise, however, she still performs masculine actions with reasonable success. Therefore, we are not left with the impression of a masculine Margaret. We have instead a wonderfully vivacious, intricate character who continually has to negotiate her gender due to her circumstances. This new reading of Margaret of Anjou's gender performance opens up the entire canon of Shakespeare to new interpretation. Rather than simply labeling characters "masculine" or "feminine," scholars can now revisit not only the scholarship surrounding female characters like Margaret of Anjou, Lady Macbeth, and Juliet, but also masculine characters like Romeo, Henry V, Hamlet, and Macbeth. Rather than generalizing these characters into masculine and feminine categories, one can now more comprehensively explore the complex gender performances these characters put forth in the plays.

Notes

1. Tina Packer, *Women of Will: Following the Feminine in Shakespeare's Plays* (New York: Knopf, 2015), 30.
2. Ibid., 23.
3. Charles Boyce, *Shakespeare A to Z: The Essential Reference to His Plays, His Poems, His Life and Times, and More* (Warwick: Roundtable Press, 1990), 399.
4. Patricia-Ann Lee, "Reflections of Power: Margaret of Anjou and the Dark Side of Queenship," *Renaissance Quarterly* 39, no. 2 (1986):183-217.
5. Roy E Aycock, "Dual Progression in *Richard III,*" S*outh Atlantic Bulletin* 38, no. 4 (1973): 70-78.
6. M. L. Stapleton, "'I of Old Contemptes Complayne': Margaret of Anjou and English Seneca," *Comparative Literature Studies* 43, no. 1 (2006): 100-33.
7. Theresa D. Kemp, *Women in the Age of Shakespeare* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2010), 101.
8. Angela Pitt, *Shakespeare's Women* (New York: Barnes & Noble Books, 1981), 150-52.
9. Phyllis Rackin, *Oxford Shakespeare Topics: Shakespeare and Women,* ed. Peter Holland and Stanley Wells (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 12, 49.
10. Kemp, *Women in the Age of Shakespeare,* 29, 42.
11. All references to Shakespeare's plays come from *The Complete Works of Shakespeare,* ed. David Bevington, 7th ed. (London, Pearson, 2014).
12. Mary Beth Rose, *Gender and Heroism in Early Modern English Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), xi.
13. Ibid., xii.
14. Stapleton, "'I of Old Contemptes Complayne,'" 113.
15. Kemp, *Women in the Age of Shakespeare*, 33.
16. Ibid., 40.
17. Ibid., 55.
18. Barbara Lewalski, "Writing Women and Reading the Renaissance," *Renaissance Quarterly* 44, no. 4 (1991): 792-821; Rackin, *Oxford Shakespeare Topics,* 8-10; Kemp, *Women in the Age of Shakespeare,* 37-40.
19. Kemp, *Women in the Age of Shakespeare,* 101.
20. David Bevington, "Canon, Dates, and Early Texts," in *The Complete Works of Shakespeare,* A-7.
21. Stapleton, "'I of Old Contemptes Complayne,'" 105.

22. Lee, "Reflections of Power," 187.
23. Rackin, *Oxford Shakespeare Topics,* 129.
24. Stapleton, "'I of Old Contemptes Complayne,'" 125.
25. Kemp, *Women in the Age of Shakespeare,* 102.
26. Ibid., 100.
27. Rackin, *Oxford Shakespeare Topics,* 49.
28. Ibid., 23.
29. Katherine Henderson and Barbara McManus, *Half Humankind: Contexts and Texts of the Controversy about Women in England, 1540-1640* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1985), 47.
30. Pitt, *Shakespeare's Women,* 153.
31. Henderson and McManus make the argument that chastity is the ideal for women in their book *Half Humankind,* 19.
32. Kemp, *Women in the Age of Shakespeare,* 55.

"Not of Woman Born": Lady Macbeth's Cesarean Section

Helen Companion
Jacksonville State University

At first glance, the plot of Shakespeare's *Macbeth* is a simple one: the thane Macbeth receives a prophecy from a group of witches that contains a riddle: he will become king, but it will be another man's children who will carry the line. Armed with this news, he then spends the play killing, first to secure the throne, and then to protect his position. Yet under this relatively simple framework is a profoundly psychological drama; Macbeth unexpectedly reacts to the witches' news, not with excitement, but with fear, and he never seems to want or enjoy the throne once he has it. Instead, he focuses on that series of murder plots, and with each successive killing he becomes both more resolute and more horrified at his own actions. Intertwined within these plots is a series of repeated—and seemingly unrelated—concerns: trauma, mental illness, children, and witchcraft. Late in the play, an additional concern is added: what does it mean to be not "of woman born" (4.2.80-81)?[1]

A handful of scholars have commented on the motif of children in *Macbeth*, a motif that seems out of place in a play that appears to be about the perils of unbridled

Journal of the Wooden O. Vol 17, 72-85
© Southern Utah University Press
ISSN: 1539-5758

ambition to attain sovereignty. Most of these focus on Lady Macbeth and often involve an exploration of her invoking of sterility—her desire to be "unsex[ed]," for example, and her assertion that she has "given suck" (1.5.40; 1.7.54)—and her threats of infanticide. Following this line of thought, Stephanie Chamberlain and Jenijoy La Belle both argue that Lady Macbeth wishes to suppress her femininity in order to become more masculine and take the throne for herself.[2] Other discussions combine this motif with that of grief, which in this play is as enigmatic as the imagery related to children. Lynne Dickson Bruckner, who analyzes the play's treatment of grief in act 4, scene 3, starts with the acknowledgment that "the dynamic between Macbeth and Lady Macbeth may also be driven by the loss of a shared child," but ends her discussion of the Macbeths by saying that "the problem Macbeth suffers from is the one that he, in fact, has created. There is no time to mourn," thus abandoning any exploration of how grief might serve as a motivation for this couple.[3] Christine Couche, in "The Macbeths' Secret," goes a little further, establishing that there is an "unspoken" "obsession with a dead child" in the play; however, her study focuses more on proving the existence of a child than exploring how grief affects motivation in *Macbeth*.[4] I believe that both Bruckner and Couche are correct in their assessments: that the Macbeths had, and lost, a child, and that the grief over that loss is a driving force in *Macbeth*.

Early in the play, Duncan and Banquo are approaching Macbeth's castle, Inverness.[5] Duncan comments about how pleasant it is, and Banquo responds with an anecdote about a bird living within:

> This guest of summer,
> The temple-haunting martlet, . . .
>
> * * *
>
> Hath made his pendent bed and procreant cradle:
> Where they most breed and haunt, I have observed,
> The air is delicate. (1.6.3-10)

It's an odd and haunting moment: the Macbeths are childless, and yet Banquo focuses on a "pendent bed" and a "procreant cradle" that is "haunt[ed]." Banquo certainly was present during Macbeth's earlier encounter with the witches, and after Duncan's murder he will express concerns that Macbeth "play'dst most foully for [the crown]" (3.1.3.). Lady Macbeth enters before Banquo can continue his thought, but perhaps it is a warning to Duncan that the air is not so much "delicate," but fragile. Banquo, who sees through Macbeth from the start, quite possibly is explaining his history to Duncan, a history that involves a lost child whose presence still continues to affect those living at Inverness.

Of equal importance to an understanding of loss and grief is the matter of how the loss happened. *Macbeth* was written during a time of cultural upheaval in which many debates were occurring in essentially every sphere of human experience. Issues of female reproduction were, of course, part of the cultural discourse: ailments and events typically ascribed to witchcraft were being rebranded as medical conditions, complete with a revision of Galen's humoral theories. In *Distracted Subjects: Madness and Gender in Shakespeare and Early Modern Culture,* Carol Thomas Neely explains how there was a cultural need to "distinguish bewitchment from the distraction caused by the uterine disease, suffocation of the mother, or wandering womb."[6] However, while this debate about female reproduction was occurring, another arose surrounding the topic of the Caesarean section, which was intimately connected in the early modern mindset with witchcraft. These discourses regarding female reproduction—discourses which involved mental illness and bewitchment, and natural and unnatural birth—are some of the same concerns as are dramatized in Macbeth. Studies about hysteria and witchcraft in the play abound, but I'm not aware of any that explore the possibility that the play is a commentary on Cesarean sections, despite the explicit reference by Macduff that he was "from his

mother's womb / untimely ripp'd" (5.8.15-16). For us, the connections between Lady Macbeth and a potential Cesarean section may seem like little more than an undercurrent, but for those dealing with the realities of childbirth and infant mortality and the discussions of female reproduction, Shakespeare's commentary in *Macbeth* likely would have been much clearer to early modern audiences than our own.

Although they were not referred to as such until the sixteenth century, Cesarean operations have been performed since antiquity. Our current name for such a procedure derives from the belief that Julius Caesar was delivered in such a manner. During the Middle Ages, Cesareans were performed exclusively by midwives—men were not allowed in the delivery room until the eighteenth century except in very rare circumstances—and the goal was not to save the mother, but instead to ensure the baptism, and thus salvation, of the infant. Given this intent, according to Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski, in *Not of Woman Born: Representations of Caesarean Birth in Medieval and Renaissance Culture,* midwives not only came to be seen as walking the line between life and death, but were also in charge of knowledge not condoned by the church, such as abortifacients and contraceptives.[7] Over time, the midwives who performed these operations became associated with witchcraft in the popular mindset: an Inquisition document, which was far more popular in secular courts than in religious ones, *Malleus Maleficarum,* even dedicated an entire chapter to "midwife witches," and asserted that such individuals sacrificed infants to their demonic patrons to sustain their powers.[8]

In 1500, we see the first reference to a Cesarean performed on a living woman by Jakob Nufer in Switzerland. It was a dramatic affair: Nufer, who was a pig gelder, had to obtain permission from both the local government and the church, as well as enlist the services of midwives who would be willing to risk their careers should the operation fail. As a result of the anticipation surrounding the operation, which

was successful—both the woman, who was Nufer's wife, and the child survived—news spread and a debate began, which culminated in 1581 with Francois Roussett's publication of *The Hysterotomotokie or Caesarian Birth,* which argued that in particularly difficult deliveries, a woman might have a better chance of surviving surgery than childbirth, and so surgical intervention should be considered as a viable option.[9] Roussett's work was not well-received: a contemporary of his, and preeminent French surgeon, Jacques Marchant, said of his work, "How easy it is to hallucinate, . . . and thus to become the source of all errors. And this is what you have become, the creator of this plague which is sweeping Europe."[10] The debate soon reached England, it would seem; Simon Forman, a contemporary of Shakespeare who is reputed to have slept with his "Dark Lady," and known to have reviewed several of his plays, including *Macbeth*, speaks of the womb as a country that must be colonized in his 1596 gynecological essay, "Matrix, and the Pain Thereof."[11] It seems possible, then, that Shakespeare might have heard discussions or rumors of Cesarean sections and chosen to comment on them in *Macbeth*.

Notably, Cesarean sections—and the related concerns pertaining to the witches—are a concern in *Macbeth*, something which is explored both explicitly and implicitly. Towards the end of the play, the second apparition utters a strange part of the prophecy: "None of woman born / Shall harm Macbeth" (4.2.80-81). In the final scenes, Macbeth repeats this line four times, and most scholars seem content to conclude that he is just trying to work through the riddle. However, it is notable, I think, that Shakespeare did not invent the phrase: it was a term used to refer to a child born of a corpse, and in this period, likely born of a Cesarean section.[12] Language pertaining to Cesarean sections appear elsewhere; Ross, speaking of Scotland, says "Alas poor country! / . . . It cannot be called our mother but our grave" (4.3.164-66), comparing Scotland to a mother dying

in childbirth and its inhabitants as the children of such a corpse. While less explicit, the Sergeant's description of Macbeth having "unseam'd [Macdonwald] from the nave to the chops" (1.2.22) is also potentially a very early reference to a Cesarean section.[13] While such procedures typically involved a horizontal incision across the lower abdomen, the illuminations in the Middle Ages and Renaissance were imprecise, and generally showed a large vertical incision, out of which the child was lifted.[14] Additionally, a woman who had undergone such a procedure would naturally have to have the incision sutured, which would look much like a seam. Each of these sets of lines—the witches' warning to Macbeth, Ross's concerns about his country, and the description of Macbeth's defeat over Macdonwald—all evoke descriptions of the unnatural or supernatural. Scotland—where "fair is foul, and foul is fair," and where witches take the place of the expected religious authorities—is a country of reversals, where the unnatural supersedes the natural, and where potentially a mother survives an operation in which she should have died, and the child dies instead. Like Forman's matrix, Scotland is a "wordle of yt selfe," which "by the helpe of arte . . . cast[s] out all filthiness that is in her," a process that can only be achieved when one "joine[s] arte and nature together."[15] This perhaps explains why Malcolm refers to Lady Macbeth as "fiend-like" and why only Macduff, who was not "born of woman" can defeat Macbeth and restore the "grace of Grace" to Scotland (5.8.82, 85).

At the grim banquet, Macbeth, in a moment of panic, says that "murthers have been performed / Too terrible for the ear" (3.4.76-77). It is unlikely that he is referring to the murders of either Duncan or Banquo, as Macbeth speaks at length about each of those, and thus the "murthers" here must refer to something else. However, if the witches were the midwives present at Lady Macbeth's delivery, then that might explain the murders to which Macbeth refers; notably, after the banquet, Macbeth seeks out the witches, and not

the counsel of his kinsmen, implying that he believes that the witches would have a unique solution to his problem unavailable elsewhere. Moreover, his letter to his wife starts with a pronoun, implying familiarity with the witches to whom he refers:

> **They** met me in the day of success: and I have learned by the perfectest report, **they** have more in **them** than mortal knowledge. When I burned in desire to question **them** further, **they** made themselves air, into which **they** vanished. Whiles I stood rapt in the wonder of it, came missives from the king, who all-hailed me "Thane of Cawdor"; by which title, before, these weird sisters saluted me, and referred me to the coming on of time, with "Hail, king that shalt be!" (1.5.1-13, emphasis added)

It is as if Macbeth cannot bring himself to name the witches, but equally importantly, the use of pronouns suggests that Lady Macbeth would know of whom he was speaking, even before referring to them as the "weird sisters."[16] Such familiarity would make sense if the witches were the midwives present for Lady Macbeth's delivery. Earlier, in his "fatal vision," Macbeth says that "witchcraft celebrates / Pale Hecate's offerings, and wither'd murder," which very well could be a reference to the murder of infants to sustain the powers of witches, and Macbeth's "eternal jewel" has already been "given" to the witches "to make them kings—the seed of Banquo kings" (3.1.68, 70). If Lady Macbeth was the survivor of a Cesarean section, the experience would have been immensely traumatic for her, as such operations would obviously have been performed without anesthesia, and as such would have been painful in the extreme. But, worse yet, the uterus would not have been removed during the operation, meaning that if she were to become pregnant again she would likely have had to undergo a similar operation, just as is the case today. As such, her request for sterility would have been quite understandable, and her threatened infanticide could

be an attempt to separate herself from her fertility, which would have been a mortal threat to her. For Macbeth's part, watching his wife recover would also have been traumatic, as would the lack of closure—as a man, he would not have been allowed in the delivery room, and thus would not have had the opportunity to meet his child, nor would he have had the chance to say goodbye, and he would have had to face the reality that he could never have the child that he so desired. Moreover, the repeated reminders of children—Duncan's children, the "sleepy grooms"(2.2.49), Fleance, and Macduff's children, the "lily-livered boy" (5.3.15), and Young Siward—as well as his exposure to the witches, would only serve as painful reminders of his loss.

Undoubtedly, a Cesarean section would have been traumatic—not only for Lady Macbeth, who would have been conscious during the surgery—but also for Macbeth, who would have had to deal with both the death of his child and the threatened death of his wife. Cathy Caruth, whose *Unclaimed Experience* is considered the basis for trauma theory, writes of the paradoxical nature of trauma, explaining how the mind is often unable to deal with the trauma directly, and so "the return of the traumatizing event appears in many respects like a waking memory . . . it can nonetheless only occur in the mode of a symptom or a dream," and yet the mind "can do nothing but repeat the destructive event over and over again."[17] Such symptoms might be somnambulism or hallucinations, both of which are experienced by the Macbeths. This creates a vicious cycle in which life is a living nightmare of repetitions and flashbacks of a trauma that the mind cannot handle.

If she had undergone a Cesarean operation, then we should expect that elements of the operation would be unconsciously recreated by Macbeth and his wife. Cesarean sections, as they were portrayed in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, often showed a woman lying on a table, with a large vertical incision (or a hole) in the abdomen out of

which the child was removed. Such a procedure would have been completed, again, without anesthesia, and so Lady Macbeth would have been conscious and would have had a very limited view of what was happening. What she likely would have been able to see would have been things that were raised above her abdomen and into her line of sight: the bloody infant, the knife used for the operation, and the bloody hands of the midwife.

Bloody children are twice explicitly portrayed in the play. The first time is Lady Macbeth's threatened infanticide, where she says that she would have "dash'd [the infant's] brains out" (1.7.58), an image that is impossible to imagine without blood. The second occurrence comes when Macbeth visits the witches after the banquet and they summon an apparition of a bloody child, which seems to affect Macbeth viscerally. While Cesareans were performed using surgical tools, all of the illuminations of the late Middle Ages and early Renaissance illustrated daggers and knives as being used in such operations.[18] It is notable, then, that in his "fatal vision," Macbeth envisions a "dagger" with "gouts of blood" (2.1.35, 38, 46); that Lady Macbeth, at the end of her "unsex me" speech, speaks of a "keen knife" (1.5.42, 53); and that daggers are used to kill Duncan and the grooms. Additionally, after Lady Macbeth leaves to "gild the faces" of the grooms, she comments that her hands are as bloody as her husband's, recreating the bloody hands that she would have seen during her operation. And, of course, bloody hands are a focus of Lady Macbeth's sleepwalking scene, where even in sleep, she is haunted. While this speech portrays her guilt at being complicit in Macbeth's stream of murders, it also re-imagines elements of her operation, not only with bloody hands, but with the pen used to (presumably) write her confession, which would be shaped much like a dagger. Finally, much of her speech in this scene seems to be directed at a child, rather than her husband: she gives the advice that he should "wash [his] hands; put on [his] nightgown; [and] look not so pale"

(5.1.64-65), advice that sounds much like a bedtime ritual for a scared child. Her final lines perhaps demonstrate this sense of a parent speaking to a child even more clearly: "To bed, to bed! there's knocking at the gate. Come, come, come, come, give me your hand," she says; "What's done cannot be undone.—To bed, to bed, to bed!" (5.1.67-70). The repetition of simple imperatives and the gesture of intended comfort increase the sense that the end of her sleepwalking scene is meant for a child, tying together the three likely things she would have seen during the operation.

Earlier, I mentioned how Roussett's *Hysterotomotokie* was not well received by contemporaries or by Europe in general. If an experienced surgeon was admonished for advocating or intervening in a difficult delivery before the mother had passed on, then one can only imagine the backlash that individuals might face should the mother survive the child after such an operation. Given the already contemptuous view of midwives and their association with witches, it's not hard to imagine how a couple might be perceived by the community after such an experience; in addition to the loss of a child and the very real possibility of the woman dying from the operation, the couple would likely have been seen as having convened with unnatural forces, if they were not themselves seen as unnatural. This perhaps explains why the Macbeths shy away from their community after they take the throne and why they go to such lengths to maintain a role that they seem not to want; if they're already positioned outside the community as a result of circumstance, then the best place to be is on top.

Early moderns generally viewed grief as dangerous, precisely because it could cause madness, which was often called *distraction*—perhaps the most well-known example of which is in *Hamlet*, where Hamlet refers to his mind as a "distracted globe" and where Ophelia is notably "distract"—a condition in which sufferers lost their humanity and were reduced to their baser selves. According to Erin Sullivan

in *Beyond Melancholy: Sadness and Selfhood in Renaissance England,* unlike other passions or forms of sadness in the Renaissance, grief could not be treated medically: physicians of the time "stressed the limitations of physical remedies."[19] Malcolm's suggestion that they should "weep [their] sad bosoms empty" (4.3.2) also would have been ill-advised by most physicians, since many believed that expressions of "excessive and prolonged" grief could have dire consequences.[20] Instead, treatment focused on managing the condition through reason, diversion and counsel; in essence, the medical advice for grief was very similar to the advice that the Scottish doctor gives to Macbeth: "Therein the patient / Must minister to himself" (5.3.45-46). Given the nature of the Macbeths' loss, it is unlikely that they could properly express their grief, nor would they be able to find counsel for a tragedy without precedence, compounding an already impossible situation.[21] Perhaps then, two of Shakespeare's most notorious villains are best understood not so much as seeking sovereignty over a country, but instead over their own minds and lives.

Notes

1. Unless otherwise indicated, all quotations from Shakespeare's plays are from *The Arden Shakespeare Complete Works,* ed. Ann Thompson, David Scott Kastan, Richard Proudfoot, rev. ed. (London: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2011).

2. Stephanie Chamberlain, "Fantasizing Infanticide: Lady Macbeth and the Murdering Mother in Early Modern England," *College Literature* 32, no. 3 (2005): 72-91, accessed October 25, 2016, http://jstor.org/stable/25115288; and Jenijoy La Belle, "'A Strange Infirmity': Lady Macbeth's Amenorrhea," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 31, no. 3 (1980): 381-86, accessed October 24,2016, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2869201>.

3. Lynne Dickson Bruckner, "'Let Grief Convert to Anger': Authority and Affect in *Macbeth,*" *Macbeth: New Critical Essays,* ed. Nick Moschovakis (New York: Routledge, 2008), 196, 199.

4. Christine Couche, "The Macbeth's Secret," in *"Rapt in Secret Studies": Emerging Shakespeares,* ed. Daryll Chalk and Laurie Johnson (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010),

163. Couche's argument is very similar to an earlier draft of this study, although I read hers after completing my own. However, I think that our arguments differ in two crucial ways. First, early on in her study, she says that her approach is historical, rather than psychological, whereas my approach is cross-disciplinary with a heavy psychological slant. Second, her focus is on proving the existence of the lost child—for which I am indebted to her—and mine looks more at how the grief stemming from that loss, a repressed grief, serves as a form of motivation in Macbeth. However, because the two studies are similar, I wanted to take a moment to acknowledge this fact. It is my hope that they complement and support each other, rather than compete.

5. In the First Folio, as in Holinshed, Inverness is spelled "Enuernes," potentially pronounced as "inwardness." Shakespeare, being the lover of puns that he was, might have been commenting on the necessity of looking inward, an interpretation that would further support the notion that the castle is, in a sense, their heart and soul.

6. Carol Thomas Neely, *Distracted Subjects: Madness and Gender in Shakespeare and Early Modern Culture* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004). See also Joanna Levin, "Lady Macbeth and the Daemonologie of Hysteria," *ELH* 69, no.1 (2002): 21-55, accessed October 25 2016, http://www/jstor.org/stable/30032010, which explores Macbeth through the lens of both witchcraft and hysteria to show how one essentially replaced the other. Hysteria, which was also referred to as "The Suffocation of the Mother," was thought to be caused by either unsatisfying sex, or more often, a lack of children. As the language of illness was shifting, apparently "suffocation of the mother" was eventually shortened colloquially to "The Mother." This means that in early modern England, "mother" could refer either to a woman who had borne a child, or to one who had not.

7. Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski, *Not of Woman Born: Representations of Caesarean Birth in Medieval and Renaissance Culture* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press,1990).

8. Heinrich Kramer and James Sprenger, *Malleus Maleficarum,* trans. Montague Summers (Digireads, 2009), quoted in Blumenfeld-Kosinski, 93-115. Kramer's work was first published in 1486 and went through 20 editions by 1520. Summers's translation dates from 1928.

9. François Roussett related the Nufers' experience in The *Hysterotomotokie of Caesarian Birth,* ed. Thomas F. Baskett, trans. Ronald M. Cyr (London: Cambridge University Press, 2010), quoted in Blumenfeld-Kosinski, *Not of Woman Born,* 39-43.

10. Ibid. 45.

11. Because of the differences in Forman's review and the F1 version of *Macbeth*, his review has long been discredited as unreliable. However,

two recent articles in Notes and Queries by Ingrid Benecke Stuttgart argue compellingly that Forman's accounts are likely accurate, and that Forman saw a different version of the play than the one with which we are familiar. If true, this is exciting news for Shakespearean scholarship, as it would provide evidence into how revisions of plays might have been handled on the Jacobean stage. Ingrid Benecke Stuttgart, "Simon Forman's Notes on Macbeth—The Alternative Reading," *Notes and Queries,* 57.3 (2010): 389-93, doi:10.1093/notesj/gjq101, and Ingrid Benecke Stuttgart, "The Shorter Stage Version of Shakespeare's *Macbeth* as Seen through Simon Forman's Eyes," *Notes and Queries,* 61.2 (2014): 246-53, doi:10.1093/notesj/gju068. Forman's entire essay is quoted in Barbara H. Traister, ""Matrix and the Pain Thereof": A Sixteenth-Century Gynaecological Essay," *Medical History* 35, no. 4 (1991): 436-51.

12. Blumenfeld-Kosinski, *Not of Woman Born,* 1.

13. Shakespeare borrowed this "unseaming" image from an early play of Marlowe's, *Dido, Queen of Carthage,* where the context is a rather dramatic description of Priam's murder (2.1.56). This image, then, is one that would have been associated with Pyrrhus, who is at least partially credited with the fall of Troy.

14. Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski, *Not of Woman Born.*

15. Shakespeare, of course, will mimic Forman's phrasing in *The Winter's Tale,* also in a moment discussing reproduction, at least in a sense. The full quotation pertaining to art and nature is as follows: "But yf any of the vaines or ceells of the matrix be stopte then againste this tyme youe muste labor to vnstop them that nature maie haue his course that when the course dothe com, the matrix and nature by the helpe of arte may thorowely exempte her selfe and cast out all filthines that is in her. . . . Ther is alsoe a purging of the matrix by medison which is done violently and artifically. The other 3 manners of the purging of the matrix is naturally, but this artificially. Therfore we oughte wisly to ioine arte and nature together." Barbara H. Traister, ""Matrix and the Pain Thereof": A Sixteenth-Century Gynaecological Essay," *Medical History* 35, no. 4 (1991): 442-44.

16. For a much more thorough discussion of naming, particularly moments in which Macbeth cannot name people or things, see Carmine G. Di Biase, "'I Am as I have Spoken': The Act of Naming in *Macbeth*," *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance Et Réforme* 25, no. 1 (2001): 23-44, *MLA International Bibliography,* EBSCO *host* (accessed September 30, 2017).

17. Cathy Caruth, *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), 60, 63.

18. Blumenfeld-Kosinski, *Not of Woman Born.*

19. Erin Sullivan, *Beyond Melancholy: Sadness and Selfhood in Renaissance England* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2016), 23.

20. Lynne Dickson Bruckner, "'Let Grief Convert to Anger': Authority and Affect in *Macbeth*," *Macbeth: New Critical Essays,* ed. Nick Moschovakis, (New York: Routledge, 2008), 193.

21. An exploration of the early modern concept of grief and how it informs this interpretation of *Macbeth* is the topic of another essay of mine, which is currently unpublished: "'To Cure this Deadly Grief': Grief and Loss in Early Modern England."

The London Theatre Scene in William Hazlitt's Dramatic Criticism

Cristina Consiglio
University of Bari (Italy)

The English drama and literary critic William Hazlitt (1778-1830) made criticism a kind of creative writing. His style is fascinating and completely free from pedantry and didacticism. What he brought to the criticism of Shakespeare was a highly imaginative and poetic mind, a very uncommon power of expression, and an enthusiasm never turning into sentimentality. Hazlitt was always a creative writer, even as a critic. His greatest gift was an ability to convey to the reader his own eagerness for Shakespeare's mastery. He had uncommon taste and judgment and never suffered from timidity, yet never indulged in sweeping generalizations.

Hazlitt was enchanted by Shakespeare's genius, as he declares in every chapter of his *Characters of Shakespeare's Plays* (1817). It was the first of his book-length literary studies, the outcome of a long critical exercise and one of the most complete accounts of the plays of Shakespeare to have appeared at that time. Hazlitt opens the way to a new understanding of Shakespearean characters when he replies to Dr. Johnson—who in his *Preface to Shakespeare*

Journal of the Wooden O. Vol 17, 86-94
© Southern Utah University Press
ISSN: 1539-5758

wrote that "in the writings of other poets a character is too often an individual; in those of Shakespeare it is commonly a species"—with these unforgettable words: "every single character in Shakespeare, is as much an individual, as those in life itself; it is as impossible to find any two alike." His comments on the plays' dramatic structure and poetry, and on their central themes, laid the groundwork for later critics' more elaborate interpretation, especially in the late nineteenth century.

Hazlitt's lectures and articles on theater tend to focus not on the aesthetic design of the plays on the printed page—as Coleridge was doing in his London lectures on Shakespeare—but on dramatic character in relation to both audience and performers. Hazlitt thought that what principally attracted playgoers was the ability of the performer onstage to establish empathy between performers and audience, and among spectators. Hazlitt constantly relates the characters on the page to performances in an attempt to show how the players' physical and emotive presence on stage links the literary work to the social awareness of the spectators.

His lively reviews of performances of plays published in newspapers and popular magazines—then collected in *A View of the English Stage, The Round Table* and *Dramatic Criticism*—led him to investigate the nature of Shakespeare's characters, and thus to question the style of the actors. Hazlitt rereads the most famous passages of the works of Shakespeare, exploring and comparing the different acting techniques of the most acclaimed actors on the London scene: David Garrick, Philip Kemble, Sarah Siddons, and Edmund Kean.

Examining some of his reviews reveals the development of his opinions about the Shakespearean actors he was interested in. The essays collected in *Characters of Shakespeare's Plays* (1817) often echoed thoughts and remarks first expressed in the reviews published from 1814 on the pages of T*he Morning Chronicle, The Examiner, The Times,* and *The Edinburgh Review,* for instance, his reflections on Hamlet.

In an article published on March 14, 1814, entitled "*Mr. Kean's* Hamlet," Hazlitt begins by examining "the wonderful variety and perfect individuality" of Shakespeare's characters, "as if they were living persons, not fictions of the mind," and goes on to assert, a few lines later, that "his characters are real beings of flesh and blood; they speak like men, not like authors."[1]

When the critic begins to write about Hamlet, he admits that his character "is probably of all others the most difficult to personate on the stage." Nevertheless, Edmund Kean performed the role successfully, though in some scenes he displayed more energy than was required, perhaps because he tended to imitate the style he used when performing Richard III, one of his first Shakespearean characters, as he would also do in his Macbeth. Yet, the "striking beauties" of his acting exceeded the defects, as in the fifth scene of the first act, when Hamlet first sees the Ghost and follows him with "filial confidence."

Hazlitt here focuses his attention on the new reading introduced by Kean—as he will do for Mrs. Siddons' *handwashing* as Lady Macbeth. Every actor could follow or re-interpret the tradition of his predecessors, and the audience was very attentive in recognizing the similarities or the differences. Hazlitt had a keen eye for these details and his review of Kean's Hamlet ended with a description of a sequence of scenes. To begin, here is the new reading: "In the scene where he breaks from his friends to obey the command of his father, he keeps his sword pointed behind him, to prevent them from following him, instead of holding it before him to protect him from the Ghost."[2] Then we read that "Hamlet's speech in describing his own melancholy, his instructions to the players, and the soliloquy on death, were all delivered by Mr. Kean in a tone of fine, clear, and natural recitation." The most impressive scenes were "the closet scene with his mother, and his remonstrances to Ophelia."

In particular, in the first scene of the third act, Hamlet has already pronounced the well-known "To be or not to be"

monologue when he sees Ophelia coming. He tells her, "I did love you once," in the next line, "I loved you not," and then "believe none of us," and ends by inviting her, three times, to get herself to a nunnery. Immediately afterwards the actors who played Hamlet used to leave the stage at this point. Kean, on the other hand, suddenly stopped, went back to the girl, took her hand and kissed it, once more, for the last time. "It had an electrical effect on the house," Hazlitt remembers, because "it explained the character at once (as he meant it), as one of disappointed hope, of bitter regret, of affection suspended, not obliterated, by the distractions of the scene around him!"[3]

Macbeth was another tragic Shakespearean character that Hazlitt wrote about at great length. His reflections on the king of Scotland inspired interesting comparisons with another king, Richard III. At the end of the eighteenth century, as demonstrated by a number of essays published between 1787 and 1817,[4] it was common to see a resemblance between the two characters' stories and evil natures: both were tempted into murder to further their ambition to the throne, and both their deaths were followed by the advent of new ruling dynasties—in *Richard III* Richmond unifies the houses of York and Lancaster when he assumes the throne as Henry VII and marries Elizabeth; in *Macbeth* the Banquo line will unify the kingdoms of England and Scotland.

In the chapter devoted to *Macbeth* in his *Characters*, Hazlitt tackles and develops this comparison when he writes, "Both are tyrants, usurpers, murderers, both aspiring and ambitious, both courageous, cruel, treacherous. But Richard is cruel from nature and constitution. Macbeth becomes so from accidental circumstances."[5] Even the supernatural elements play a significant role: Richard is haunted by the vision of his victims when he sleeps; they're nightmares to him. Macbeth is awake when he sees Banquo's ghost, which is invisible to rest of the company. A note by David Garrick about this scene survives:

> The first appearance of the spirit overpowers him more than the second; but even before it vanishes at first, Macbeth gains strength. "If thou canst nod, speak too" must be spoke with horror, but with a recovering mind; and in the next speech with him, he cannot pronounce "Avaunt, and quit my sight!" without a *stronger exertion* of his powers. I certainly recollect a degree of resolution, *but I never advanced an inch;* for, notwithstanding my agitation, my feet are immovable. My idea is this: Macbeth is absorbed in thought, and struck with horror of the murder, though but in idea; and it naturally gives him a slow, tremulous undertone of voice. I stopped at every word in the line because my intention was to paint the horror of Macbeth's mind and keep the voice suspended a little.[6]

In Hazlitt's opinion, it is extremely hard to play Macbeth. He has met the Witches on the heath and believed their prophecy. His life will never be the same, and a good interpreter of his character should make the spectators feel that in every act, in every word, in every thought, he continuously and silently goes back to that very moment. "We can conceive a common actor to play Richard tolerably well; we can conceive no one to play Macbeth properly, or to look like a man that had encountered the Weird Sisters. All the actors that we have ever seen, appear as if they had encountered them on the boards of Covent-garden or Drury-lane, but not on the heath at Fores, and as if they did not believe what they had seen."[7]

Hazlitt published a fine article four years earlier in *The Champion,* then collected it in *A View of the English Stage.* Here he anticipates the comparison between Richard III and Macbeth that we will find in *Characters*, yet he reminds his readers that "those [Shakespeare characters] that are the most alike, are distinguished by positive differences, which accompany and modify the leading principle of the character through its most obscure ramifications, embodying the

habits, gestures, and almost the looks of the individuals."[8] Here the purpose of the comparison between the two kings is designed to introduce and support the description of the way Mr. Kean performed them. It seems to the critic that Kean was not able to distinguish them so completely as he could have done and that his Macbeth resembled his Richard too much: "His Richard comes nearer to the original than his Macbeth. He was deficient in the poetry of the character. He did not look like a man who had encountered the Weird Sisters. There should be nothing tight or compact in Macbeth, no tenseness of fibre, nor pointed decision of manner. He has, indeed, energy and manliness of soul, but 'subject to all the skyey influences.' He is sure of nothing. All is left at issue."[9]

Hazlitt then quotes the beautiful soliloquy delivered by the king of Scotland in the third scene of the fifth act, beginning, "My way of life is fallen into the sear, the yellow leaf," to declare that Kean was "unsuccessful" in that part, while Mr. Kemble's recitation of these lines characterized it with a "fine thoughtful melancholy." Kemble's voice was like "an echo of the past," and he really seemed to embody a Scottish chieftain of the eleventh century. Kean's movements were "too agile and mercurial" and "he fought like a modern fencing-master."[10]

At the end of the review Hazlitt admits that, in spite of all the faults, there is a scene that is one of "the two finest things that Mr. Kean has ever done." The first is his recitation of the passage in Othello, "Then, oh, farewell the tranquil mind"; the second is the scene in Macbeth after the murder: "The hesitation, the bewildered look, the coming to himself when he sees his hands bloody, the manner in which his voice clung to his throat and choked his utterance, his agony and tears, the force of nature overcome by passion—beggared description. It was a scene no one who saw it can never efface from his memory."[11]

> Another unforgettable performance for Hazlitt was Mrs. Siddons' Lady Macbeth: It was the first character

> in which we ever saw her, and the recollection of the impression which she then made upon us is not strengthened by its having been also the last in which we saw her. To have seen her in that character but once, was never to forget her afterwards. It was no more possible to forget her than if we had seen some more than mortal vision. It was as if the Muse of Tragedy had descended to awe us into wonder. Her voice was power: her form was grandeur. Her person was the mould which her lofty and gigantic spirit alone could fill. Her face lightened with awful beauty. We forget many things one after another; year by year takes away from the list of our remembrances; but the impression which Mrs. Siddons first made on our minds can never wear out.[12]

"In coming on in the sleeping scene, … she was like a person bewildered and unconscious of what she did. Her lips moved involuntarily—all her gestures were involuntary and mechanical. She glided on and off the stage like an apparition."[13] Hazlitt is talking about the first scene of the fifth act, when Lady Macbeth reappears on the stage after the long absence and silence of the fourth act. In actual fact, during the fourth act no one even speaks her name. She has a chandelier in her hand, and she is lost in a fearful, restless sleep. The first scene of the fifth act is a very short scene, only eighty lines. It is her last appearance in the tragedy. Only six scenes remain to the end when Malcolm will be king.

In order to imagine her appearance, one might take a look at the beautiful portrait in the National Portrait Gallery in London called *Sarah Siddons in Lady Macbeth*. It shows the actress barefoot, wearing a long white dress, her hair loose and covered by a white veil. In the painting are two other figures, a doctor and a young lady, the ones who appear on the stage with her in the scene mentioned above. When observing the portrait, another important detail we should notice is Lady Macbeth rubbing her hands together, still trying to wash away the blood of the murders committed—

as she says, "Out damned spot! Out, I say!" This is the scene all the critics underline when they talk about Mrs. Siddons's Lady Macbeth, who, it seems, created the legendary gesture of the handwashing, subsequently imitated by generations of actresses.

Hazlitt's most distinctive characteristic is the way he cleverly mixes the stage fiction with the reality of human passions, providing the reader with a portrait gallery of rare truth and beauty. His expectations may be literary in that he believes the whole drama to be already present on the page, but this means that he is thrilled when an actor fulfills his expectations well or brings to a scene more than he was expecting: for instance, as I have tried to show, Kean's Hamlet coming back to silently kiss Ophelia's hand or his Macbeth seeing the blood on his hands. When emotion overwhelms him, Hazlitt records the experience with complete frankness. In this way, his readings of Shakespeare's plays often render imperceptible the line between the theatrical fiction of the texts and the reality of the performance.

Notes

1. William Hazlitt, *Lectures on the English Poets and A View of The English Stage,* vol. 5 of T*he Complete Works of William Hazlitt,* ed. Percival Presland Howe (London and Toronto: J.M. Dent, 1930-4), 185.
2. Ibid., 188.
3. Ibid.
4. George Steevens, *On Richard III and Macbeth* (1787); Thomas Whately, *Remarks on Some of the Characters in Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1785); John Philip Kemble, *Macbeth and Richard III: An Essay in Answer to Remarks on Some of the Characters of Shakespeare* (London, 1817).
5. William Hazlitt, *The Round Table and Characters of Shakespeare's Plays,* vol. 4 of *The Complete Works of William Hazlitt,* ed. Percival Presland Howe (London and Toronto: J.M. Dent, 1930-4), 192.
6. Percy Hetherington Fitzgerald, *The Life of David Garrick* (London: Simpkin, Marshall 1899), 259.
7. William Hazlitt, *The Round Table and Characters of Shakespeare's Plays,* 194.

8. William Hazlitt, *Lectures on the English Poets and A View of The English Stage,* 205.
9. Ibid., 206.
10. Ibid., 207.
11. Ibid.
12. William Hazlitt, *Art and Dramatic Criticism,* vol. 18 of *The Complete Works of William Hazlitt,* ed. Percival Presland Howe, (London and Toronto: J.M. Dent, 1930-4), 227.
13. William Hazlitt, *The Round Table and Characters of Shakespeare's Plays,* 189-90.

A Strange-disposed Time: *Julius Caesar* and Fascism

Elisa Fortunato
University of Bari (Italy)

Censorship is a practice undertaken by a given society at a given moment in time. It materializes either through repressive cultural, aesthetic and linguistic measures or through economic pressure.[1] In my paper, I will discuss a less blatant form of control, that peculiar phenomenon of self-censorship which took place in Italy during the first decade of Fascist domination, before the promulgation of racial laws (1938), when censorship became overt and coercive. In particular, I analyze the reception through translations of the full text of *Julius Caesar* by William Shakespeare, which, interestingly, was translated several times during the regime, but put on stage only once, in 1935.

Two important facts made this play easily "translatable": Caesar embodied the myth of Roman spirit, and Shakespeare's work was a classic and "universally recognized as such" (as we read in a circular from the Minister of Popular Culture, Dino Alfieri, to the prefects).[2] On the other hand, the dangerous question about power portrayed in the play, which materializes when Caesar's corpse, covered with blood, is shown on the stage, is likely to have acted as a powerful

Journal of the Wooden O. Vol 17, 95-107
© Southern Utah University Press
ISSN: 1539-5758

reminder to the audience of the possibility of rebellion. It is precisely for this reason that I believe the play was not produced on stage until 1935.

During the Fascist regime, translations became a political issue and were framed in terms of a trade war. The common political discourse made reference to the import and export of intellectual products and to a "trade balance," which needed to be redressed in favor of Italian intellectual production. In general, the regime was "disturbed by the idea of Italy being an excessively *receptive* culture,"[3] with an exaggerated enthusiasm for all things coming from abroad and with translations being a threatening sign of this very weakness. Available data show that Italy published more translations than any other country in the world at the time, and that between 1933 and 1934 translations from English tripled.[4] Despite these concerns, however, the regime was unwilling to stop the translation industry because it could have triggered the exclusion of Italy from the international debate and from a growing business.

The Italian Fascist dictatorship, therefore, had an ambiguous attitude towards translations. According to the famous magazine of the publishers' association (*Il Giornale della libreria*), the three pillars of the Italian autarchy were "to give value and power to books and magazines, to exclude things carefully in defence of the national interest, and to absorb all activities, including those coming from abroad, which could contribute to the creation of a modern society"[5] Translating novels became one means to "absorb" and "include" the *other* into Italian culture, a way to "cannibalize" it (using Bassnett's term).[6]

Broadly speaking, it is possible to divide the period from 1929 to 1943 into two phases: an initial phase when, although with some disapproval vis-à-vis the influx of foreign literature, the regime neither cared enough about nor was organized enough to attempt to inhibit the increasing influx; and a second phase, from 1935 onwards, when the

Press Office became the Ministry for Press and Propaganda, and censorship and repression of freedom became more and more common practice, a phase which culminated in 1938 with the introduction of the Fascist Racial Laws. Yet, as Nancy Eisenberg notes, Shakespeare's work proliferated: "Between 1924 and 1925 at least thirteen new translations of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* appeared in print throughout the Italian peninsula, and at least forty editions, including new translations and reprints published during Mussolini's twenty-year rule, have survived."[7]

The fact that Shakespeare's work might find a place in Italian Fascism's program of cultural propaganda is not in itself remarkable, being part of the jingoistic use of the Bard during the regime. Eisenberg continues: "Youngsters with their impressionable minds fired up by all the glorified facts about the Regime's radiant legacy would read Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* and, according to plan, come to adore the legendary Roman hero and through him their current day ruler."[8] Shakespeare's play was read as a way to glorify Roman qualities, voluntarily forgetting the dangerous questions about power and conspiracy that the play contains. This superficial reading explains why, although *Julius Caesar* translations increased precisely during Fascism, the play was performed only once during this period (in 1935 by Tamberlani).

The act of translating is by definition an act of manipulation,[9] while on stage, the "props" are not concealable (i.e., Julius Caesar's corpse). Scholars find a deep and complex relationship between theatre and cultural memory. In her introduction to *Shakespeare and the Second World War,* Irena R. Makaryk explains, "Theatre, as a simulacrum of the cultural and historical process itself, seeking to depict the full range of human actions within their physical context, has always provided society with the most tangible records of its attempts to understand its own operations. It is the repository of cultural memory, but, like the memory of each individual, it is also subject to continual adjustment and

modification as the memory is recalled in new circumstances and contexts."[10] From this point of view, the history of the accuracy and adequacy of the translations of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* released during Fascism could therefore be quite revealing as they help us understand that an apparently contradictory system of surveillance and punishment was in place under the Fascist Regime.

During the two decades of the Regime, Mussolini used the "'Caesarean model' of leadership as the background for his political project of establishing a 'Modern Roman Empire' and of becoming himself a 'Modern Caesar.'"[11] Mussolini formally came to power with the march to Rome, which took place from October 22 to 29, 1922. It was thought to mirror, even in its itinerary, Julius Caesar's crossing the Rubicon in 49 BC. Mussolini looked at ancient Rome with its *romanitas* and its powerful armies as models of strength, discipline, and skill. As a consequence of this "appropriation," the study of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* was included in the middle school curriculum as part of the study of Roman history.[12] Furthermore, *Julius Caesar* "was considered one of Shakespeare's most accessible plays with its seemingly stylistic simplicity, and its lack, in comparison to other Shakespeare's plays, of lasciviousness and obscenity. . . . But more important in the context at hand were *Julius Caesar*'s roots in great Latin texts and its recreation of a chapter in the life of the greatest of Roman heroes."[13]

The web of institutes of censorship failed to understand the true meaning of the play, getting lost in the complexity of the characters' relationships among themselves and of each character with History. In this play, every character, from Brutus to Cassius, from Caesar to Antony, is torn between public and personal motives. A pervasive sense of divergence lies between the image every character, obliged by the force of circumstances, presents to the world and the reality of what he is in fact (this is true in particular for the male characters). Caesar and Brutus are the most troubled

and intense male characters, both of them crushed by the mechanism of History, which determines their historical role and which they cannot stop or change. For example, Caesar's physical vulnerability inversely mirrors, in most of the Italian translators' notes and critical introductions of those years, his moral grandeur.[14] As a consequence, the words of Cassius in act 1, scene 2, when he begins manipulating Brutus with his negative account of Caesar, were not perceived as a way of belittling Caesar's image,[15] but rather as Cassius's invention to accomplish his malignant plan.

> I know that virtue to be in you, Brutus, (90)
> As well as I do know your outward favour.
> Well, honour is the subject of my story.
> I cannot tell what you and other men
> Think of this life; but for my single self
> I had as lief not be as live to be (95)
> In awe of a such a thing as I myself.
> I was born free as Caesar, so were you;
> We both have fed as well, and we can both
> Endure the winter's cold as well as he.
> For once, upon a raw and gusty day, (100)
> The troubled Tiber chafing with her shores,
> Caesar said to me, "Dar'st thou, Cassius, now
> Leap in with me into this angry flood
> And swim to yonder point?" Upon the word,
> Accoutered as I was, I plunged in (105)
> And bade him follow; so indeed he did.
> The torrent roared, and we did buffet it
> With lusty sinews, throwing it aside,
> And stemming it with hearts of controversy.
> But ere we could arrive the point proposed, (110)
> Caesar cried, 'Help me, Cassius, or I sink!'
> I, as Aeneas, our great ancestor,
> Did from the flames of Troy upon his shoulder
> The old Anchises bear, so from the waves of Tiber
> Did I the tired Caesar: and this man (115)
> Is now become a god, and Cassius is
> A wretched creature, and must bend his body

If Caesar carelessly but nod on him.
He had a fever when he was in Spain,
And when the fit was on him I did mark (120)
How he did shake. 'Tis true, this god did shake:
His coward lips did from their color fly,
And that same eye, whose bend doth awe the world,
Did lose his lustre: I did hear him groan:
Ay, and that tongue of his that bade the Romans (125)
Mark him, and write his speeches in their books,
"Alas," it cried, "give me some drink, Titinus,"
As a sick girl. Ye gods, it doth amaze me
A man of such a feeble temper should
So get the start of the majestic world (130)
And bear the palm alone." (1.2. 90-131)[16]

It is particularly interesting to underline how Avancini and Piccoli, who both translated Julius Caesar in 1925, failed to render the high poetical language of Shakespeare, giving the Italian reader two plain, unemotional translations of this passage. What is even more interesting is that they both felt the urge to add several explanatory notes. Avancini, for example, glosses lines 97-99 with this explanation: "There is in Cassius, beyond his love for freedom, a sinister and deep envy toward Caesar."[17] Similarly, Piccoli provides an explanation for lines 110-15, revealing that "this race between Cassius and Caesar is an invention of the poet, for the historians record how Caesar had saved his own life and his *Commentari*, by swimming in the port of Alexandria."[18]

Moreover, in all the critical introductions to the translations issued in these years of Fascism, the tyrannicide is called *murder* or *assassination* and Caesar is a hero, not a tyrant, while Brutus is an assassin, not a patriot. The translators are all voluntarily blind to the text's complexities and to the world it creates, a world where all who rule are weak or ill. The image of illness and the theme of disease run continuously through the play: Caesar suffers from the "falling sickness," "fever," "deafness"; his wife Calphurnia is "sterile"; Cassius suffers from "shortsightedness," Casca and

Caius Ligarius from "ague"; Brutus cannot sleep at night, and his wife Portia fears he is ill; Portia herself is running a high fever from the wound she has inflicted on herself.

As Cicero remarked to Casca, "Indeed it is a strange-disposed time. / But men may construe things after their fashion / Clean from the purpose of the things themselves" (1.3.33-35). In the *strange-disposed time* of Fascism, the readers of *Julius Caesar* were guided through the text in order to appreciate "the ruling force of Caesar.[19] Muccioli, in the introduction to his translation published in 1924, goes one step further, explaining that the true hero of the play is "Caesar's spirit which powerfully dominates the entire drama" and highlights the way in which Caesar "saved" and "consolidated" the empire. The translator continues by recognizing the weaknesses and frailty in Shakespeare's Caesar, but carefully confutes all of them: "The Poet shows a man fully/totally different from the true/actual Caesar."[20] Muccioli levels the character's complexity and in doing so gives the Italian reader a flat character, who lacks interior dilemma and inner world.

Within the 130 lines he speaks, the speech of Shakespeare's Julius Caesar is always elevated, even when he talks to his wife. He is authoritative, imposing and speaks in aphorisms;[21] "in a play given almost wholly to oratory and persuasion, the titular hero does not persuade."[22] He depicts himself as "constant as the northern star, / Of whose true-fixed and resting quality / There is no fellow in the firmament" (3.1.60-62); but his constancy does not survive his wife's pleading that he not go to the Senate house, nor Decius's counter-plea (2.2). Act 2, scene 2, in which Caesar is persuaded, against his deepest will, to go to the Capitol is indeed revealing. As Calpurnia, shaken by premonitions which the elements confirm, presses him to stay at home, he clings obstinately to his determination, repeating the sentence, "Caesar shall go forth" three times (2.2.10, 28, and 48); but then, after less than eight lines, he acquiesces ("Mark

Antony shall say I am not well" [2.2.55]). Even if he adds the excuse that it is the frailty of others that has imposed this change of plan ("And for thy humour I will stay at home" [2.2.56]), he reveals himself to be less "constant"than he intends to be. The arrival of Decius, who will change the interpretation of Calpurnia's ill-fated premonitions—turning them propitious—is even more revealing of Caesar's inner war, torn as he is between his ambition to be crowned and his inner uncertainty.

Brutus's rhetoric is also a key aspect of the text. Brutus is the counterpart of Caesar as Shakespeare gives him the same, or even more, depth and calibre. His language mirrors his inner dilemma, which is even more excruciating than Caesar's. All the translations released during the Fascist Regime largely failed to render his being "with himself at war" (1.2.46). His inner world in conflict with itself, he fights the *shadow* shown in Cassius's lines, "And it is very much lamented, Brutus, / That you have no such mirrors as will turn / Your hidden worthiness into your eye, / That you might see your shadow" (1.2.55-58). The *shadow* Cassius creates here means *reflection*, according to a subsidiary and not infrequent use cited in the *Oxford English Dictionary:* "Shadow . . . 5. A reflected image." Cassius is not projecting Brutus's inner world out, but is rather creating a new Brutus, as if he were Brutus's mirror returning him a new image of himself. Muccioli, Cesareo, Piccoli and Ricci translated *shadow* with the Italian *ombra*,[23] thus losing the mirror metaphor, and Angeli and Avancini chose the Italian *imagine*, which also does not render Shakespeare's metaphor. They all soften the role Cassius plays in the conspiracy, and in doing so, increase Brutus's.

In act 2, scene 1, Brutus has come to a decision and speaks his famous twenty lines:

> It must be by his death: and for my part (10)
> I know no personal cause to spurn at him
> But for the general. He would be crowned:
> How that might change his nature, there's the question.

It is the bright day that brings forth the adder,
And that craves wary walking. Crown him—that, (15)
And then I grant we put a sting in him
That at his will he may do danger with.
Th'abuse of greatness is when it disjoins
Remorse from power; and to speak truth of Caesar
I have not known when his affections swayed (20)
More than his reason. But 'tis a common proof
That lowliness is young ambition's ladder
Whereto the climber upward turns his face;
But when he once attains the upmost round
He then unto the ladder turns his back, (25)
Looks in the clouds, scorning the base degrees
By which he did ascend. So Caesar may.
Then, lest he may, prevent. And since the quarrel
Will bear no color for the thing he is,
Fashion it thus: that what he is, augmented, (30)
Would run to these and these extremities.
And therefore think him as a serpent's egg
Which hatched, would as his kind grow mischievieous,
And kill him in the shell. (2.1.10-34)

Here, Muccioli misrepresents many words. For example, he translates *remorse* with the Italian *rimorso* (Italian *rimorso* is "moral anguish arising from repentance for past misdeeds"), and not the more accurate *compassione* or *coscienza*.[24] In so doing he misses the high quality Brutus is recognizing in Caesar of being deeply aware of the suffering of another accompanied by the wish to relieve it. As a consequence, he is belittling the intensity of Brutus's resolution. Moreover, Muccioli translates *turn his face* with the Italian *muta sembianze,* but Brutus is not saying that Caesar will become someone else; rather he is saying to himself and to the audience that Caesar *may* change his attitude, and *then, lest he may, prevent.*

It is also interesting to underline that Muccioli lacks completely the performability and speakability of the text as his translation seems to have been written only to be read.

Moreover, he adds several notes highlighting the lack of cause supporting Brutus's decision.[25] Piccoli, Ricci, and Avancini, on the other hand, produce plain and quite accurate translations, even if the latter uses the notes to repeatedly stress Caesar's leadership qualities.[26] Cesareo and Angeli translate *sting* respectively with *arma* and *dardo* (respectively: *weapon* and *arrow*), losing the adder's metaphor which is crucial in Brutus's words. Brutus cannot resolve to kill Caesar without creating an image, without thinking about the adder instead of Caesar himself, he needs this metaphor to act; for this reason, Cesareo chooses not to translate the modal verb, "So Caesar *may*." In Shakespeare, Brutus's language shows his inner dilemma, which does not fade out with this soliloquy, but will bring him, through the "interim," to the final breakdown, which will culminate in his committing suicide. His *shadow* will destroy him.

In the construction of the myth of the Duce, it seems that Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* was seen as a useful "tool," but only as a written text, not on stage. Issuing plain, often blunt, translations combined with critical introductions which bend the complexity of *Julius Caesar* to an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target culture, the Italian readers would have certainly seen themselves as the direct heirs of ancient Rome and Mussolini as their Caesar.[27]

In 1935 Nando Tamberlani directed the one and only *Julius Caesar* staged during the Regime. The "stage" was not a theatre, but the Basilica of Maxentius; the "mis-en-scene was no pictorial reconstruction of ancient Rome, but the very ruins that survived from the ancient city, and were now newly revealed and restored."[28] The ideological plan was to create a juxtaposition between the fascist Italy and the Roman empire (the play was staged just before the Italo-Ethiopian war) and, in so doing, neutralize the subversive and "dangerous" subjects of the play.

In conclusion, by analyzing *Julius Caesar*'s translations during the fascist regime I have tried to bridge the gap between

linguistic analysis and the study of paratextual elements and cultural history. Ideology emerges as an implicit component of the translation process, residing at the root of self-censorship. *Julius Caesar*'s translation can be therefore seen, in tune with the latest theoretical debate, not only as a historical object but also as an approach to interpret historical subject (in our case study it could cast light on Italian cultural history and may provide fascinating insight into fascist policy).[29]

Notes

1. Francesca Billiani, "Censorship and Translation: An Introduction," in *Modes of Censorship and Translation: National Context and Diverse Media,* ed. Francesca Billiani (London: Routledge, 2007), 2.

2. *"I. A datare dal 1o aprile c.c. soltanto questo ministero potrà autorizzare la diffusione in Italia delle traduzioni straniere; II. Gli Editori possono inviare a questo Ministero direttamente o a mezzo della Prefettura, nella lingua originale, i libri che intendono tradurre in italiano; III. Questo Ministero farà conoscere all'Editore—tramite la Prefettura competente—il suo giudizio nel termine più breve; . . . V. Sono esclusi dalla preventiva approvazione i trattati puramente scientifici (medicina-ingegneria-matematica-astronomia-botanica-zoologia) e i classici universalmente riconosciuti";* translation: "I. Dating from 1 April of this year only this Ministry may authorize the diffusion of foreign translations in Italy; II. Publishers may send those titles they intend to translate into Italian in the original language directly to this Ministry or through the Prefecture; III. The Minister will notify the Publisher—through the appropriate Prefecture—of its decision with the shortest possible delay; . . . V. Purely scientific treaties (in medicine, engineering, mathematics, astronomy, botany and zoology) and classics universally recognized as such are exempt from such prior approval"; here and elsewhere, unless otherwise specified, all translations from Italian are mine. See Giorgio Fabre, "Fascism, Censorship and Translation," in *Modes of Censorship and Translation: National Context and Diverse Media,* ed. Francesca Billiani (London and New York: Routledge, 2007), 27-28.

3. Christopher Rundle, *Publishing Translations in Fascist Italy* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2010), 5.

4. Christopher Rundle, "Translations as a Threat to Fascism," in *Translation and Opposition,* eds. Dimitri Rogers and Margaret Rogers (Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2011). See also Guido Bonsaver, *Censorship and Literature in Fascist Italy* (Toronto: University of Toronto

Press, 2007); David Forgacs, *Mass Culture and Italian Society from Fascism to the Cold War* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008); Giorgio Fabre, "Fascism, Censorship and Translation," in *Modes of Censorship and Translation: National Context and Diverse Media*, ed. Francesca Billiani (London: Routledge, 2007), 27-59.

5. "Il Giornale della Libreria," 1932. http://emeroteca.braidense.it/eva/indice_volumi. PageSel=1, (accessed 08/01/2015).

6. Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi, ed., *Post-Colonial Translation: Theory and Practice,* (London: Routledge, 1999).

7. Nancy Isenberg, "'Caesar's Word against the World': Caesarism and the Discourses of Empire," in *Shakespeare and the Second World War: Memory, Culture, Identity,* ed. Irene R. Makaryk and Marissa McHugh (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), 85. In my paper I analyze the six most interesting translations from a linguistic point of view and for their notes and critical introductions. In chronological order: Guglielmo Shakespeare, *Giulio Cesare,* versione e testo a fronte di Aldo Ricci (Firenze: Sansoni, 1924); Guglielmo Shakespeare, *Giulio Cesare,* trans. G. A. Cesareo (Messina-Roma: Principato, 1924); Guglielmo Shakespeare, *Giulio Cesare,* in *Teatro di Guglielmo Shakespeare,* trans. Diego Angeli, (Milano: Treves, 1924); Guglielmo Shakespeare, *Giulio Cesare,* trans. Avancinio Avancini (Milano: Vallardi Editore, 1925); Guglielmo Shakespeare, *Giulio Cesare,* trans. Raffaello Piccoli (Firenze: Vallecchi Editore, 1925); Guglielmo Shakespeare, *Giulio Cesare* in *Opere Complete di Guglielmo Shakespeare* trans. Alessandro Muccioli (Firenze: "La Nuova Italia" Editrice, 1925).

8. Nancy Isenberg, "Caesar's Word gainst the World," 86.

9. See Susan Bassnett's *Translation Studies* (London: Routledge, 2013), *The Translator as Writer* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2008), and, with André LeFevre, *Constructing Cultures* (Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 1998). See also André Lefevere's *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame* (London: Routledge, 2016) and *Translating Literature: Practice and Theory in a Comparative Literature Context* (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1992), as well as Lawrence Venuti's *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation,* (London: Routledge, 2008).

10. Irena R. Makaryk, "Introduction: Theatre, War, Memory and Culture," in *Shakespeare and the Second World War: Memory, Culture, Identity,* ed. Irena R. Makaryk and Marissa McHugh (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), 3.

11. Nancy Isenberg, "Caesar's Word against the World," 83.

12. See Maria Wyke, "Sawdust Caesar: Mussolini, Julius Caesar, and the Drama of Dictatorship," in *Uses and Abuses of Antiquity,* ed. Michael D. Biddiss and Maria Wyke (Oxford: Peter Lang, 1999), 176-79.

13. Nancy Isenberg, "Caesar's Word against the World," 86.

14. See for example the interesting introduction by Ricci to his translation, in Guglielmo Shakespeare, *Giulio Cesare,* trans. Aldo Ricci (Firenze: Sansoni, 1924).

15. The peculiar Shakespearean way of humanizing the historical figure of Caesar, the "northern star," on which all the Fascist critics agree.

16. All quotations from *Julius Caesar* are taken from William Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar,* ed. David Daniell, The Arden Shakespeare, Third Series (London: Bloomsbury, 2015).

17. "In Cassio, oltre all'amore per la libertà, c'è un bieco e profondo sentimento d'invidia verso Cesare" in Guglielmo Shakespeare, *Giulio Cesare,* trans. Avancinio Avancini (Milano: Vallardi Editore, 1925), 56.

18. "Questa gara tra Cesare e Cassio è invenzione del poeta: gli storici antichi narrano come Cesare salvasse sé e i suoi *Commentari* a nuoto nel porto d'Alessandria, onde si deduce la sua perizia di nuotatore" in Gugliemo Shakespeare, *Giulio Cesare,* trans. Raffaello Piccoli (Firenze: Vallecchi Editore, 1925), 32.

19. "Le creazioni di Shakespeare sono tutte in funzione dell'ispirazione originaria, la potenza dominatrice del genio di Cesare. Perché in questa singolare tragedia, se Cesare muore in principio dell'atto terzo, e prima non apparisce che in una breve scena del primo e in un'altra, un po' più lunga, del secondo atto, pure la sua figura gitta la propria ombra vasta da un capo all'altro della tragedia: egli è presente sempre, anche più quando è assente: non si parla che di lui, non si combatte che per lui, si vince o si muore per lui, i suoi stessi nemici sono costretti, pur dopo averlo trafitto, a confessare ch'egli è sempre vivo, ch'egli è augusto ed eterno come l'anima stessa di Roma," in "Notizia Preliminare," in Guglielmo Shakespeare, *Giulio Cesare,* trans. G. A. Cesareo (Messina-Roma: Principato, 1924), 4. Translation: "Shakespeare's characters are all devoted to his first flair: the ruling power of Caesar's genius. In this peculiar tragedy, even if Caesar dies at the beginning of the third act . . . his figure permeates the whole play: he is always there even when he is out of the scene . . . He is august and immortal as Rome itself."

20. Alessandro Muccioli, introduction to Guglielmo Shakespeare, *Giulio Cesare* in *Opere Complete di Guglielmo Shakespeare* trans. Alessandro Muccioli (Firenze: "La Nuova Italia" Editrice, 1925).

21. For example, "Cowards die many times before their deaths; / The valiant never taste of death but once. / Of all the wonders that I yet have heard, / It seems to me most strange that men should fear, / Seeing that death, a necessary end, / Will come when it will come" (2.2.32-37).

22. David Daniell, introduction to William Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar*, The Arden Shakespeare, Third Series (London: Bloomsbury, 2015). 47-48.

23. *Ombre* signifies the darkness caused by interception of light, a tract of partial darkness produced by a body intercepting the direct rays of the sun or other luminary.

24. *Oxford English Dictionary:* "Remorse: Compassion with an older sense of conscience."

25. For example, "Non solo Bruto non aveva alcuna particolare ragione d'odio verso Cesare, ma, al contrario, aveva ragione di gratitudine, avendogli Cesare risparmiata la vita dopo Farsaglia; inoltre lo nominò prima pretore nella Gallia Cisalpina, l'anno 46 a.c., e poi in Roma, l'anno 44," in Guglielmo Shakespeare, *Giulio Cesare, in Opere complete di Shakespeare,* trans. Alessandro Muccioli (Firenze: "La Nuova Italia" Editrice, 1925), 56-57.

26. See Guglielmo Shakespeare, *Giulio Cesare. Tragedia in cinque atti,* trans. Avancinio Avancini (Milano: Vallardi Editore, 1925), 71-71.

27. See Nancy Isenberg, "Caesar's Word against the World," 88.

28. Graham Holderness, "Julius Caesar: Shakespeare and the Ruins of Rome," in *Shakespeare and the Visual Arts: The Italian Influence,* ed. Michele Marrapodi (London: Routledge, 2017), 343.

29. See Jeremy Munday, "Using Primary Sources to Produce a Microhistory of Translation and Translators: Theoretical and Methodological Concerns," *The Translator* 20, no.1 (2014): 64-80; see also Christopher Rundle, "Theories and Methodologies of Translation History: The Value of an Interdisciplinary Approach," *The Translator,* 20, no. 1 (2014): 2-8.

Shakespeare for Women? Margaret Cavendish and Judith Drake on Seventeenth-century Theatre, Pleasure and Education

Kitamura Sae
Musashi University (Tokyo)

Many female political writers who attempted to promote feminist causes in seventeenth-century England were famously pious. Accordingly, they tended to regard theatre and other vernacular entertainments as vulgar or rarely expressed interested in them. *Womens Speaking Justified, Proved, and Allowed of by the Scriptures,* a pamphlet written by Quaker leader Margaret Fell and published in 1666, defends women's right to preach in public, but never mentions actresses' on-stage speeches, which were authorised in 1662.[1] Another Quaker leader, George Fox, whom Fell would marry in 1669, opposed theatre, and it is possible that Quaker antitheatricalism also influenced her.[2] Bathsua Makin, a scholar who taught several noblewomen, including Princess Elizabeth, the daughter of Charles I, derides play-going as an idle pastime in a 1673 pamphlet promoting women's education: "Persons of higher quality, for want of this Education, have nothing to imploy themselves in, but are forced to Cards, Dice, Playes, and

Journal of the Wooden O. Vol 17, 109-137
© Southern Utah University Press
ISSN: 1539-5758

frothy Romances, meerly to drive away the time."[3] Despite this antitheatrical tendency, Makin uses a *theatrum mundi* metaphor to describe God's creation: "But the Earth, the Theater on which we act, abideth forever."[4] This expression illustrates how deeply theatre was embedded in the culture of intellectual women in seventeenth-century England.

Mary Astell, famously dubbed the "first English feminist," never hid her dislike for theatre.[5] Ruth Perry states that Astell "did not enjoy drama in an age when most educated people thought at least some plays or playwrights worthy of serious attention"; indeed, she alludes to only one play, George Villiers's *The Rehearsal,* in her works.[6] Although Astell also makes a vague reference to Thomas Wright's *The Female Virtuoso's* in *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies,* it is highly unlikely that she knew theatre well.[7] Without mentioning the titles of plays in her works, she repeatedly criticises theatre in general as an example of the narrow range of female education. She sees little value in popular entertainments, asking "how can she possibly detect the fallacy, who has no better Notion of either than what she derives from Plays and Romances?"[8] These entertainments symbolise male oppression of women's education: "They allow us Poetry, Plays, and Romances, to Divert us and themselves."[9] Astell highlights their harmful effects on women.

> There is a sort of Learning indeed which is worse than the greatest Ignorance: A Woman may study Plays and Romances all her days, and be a great deal more knowing but never a jot wiser. Such a knowledge as this serves only to instruct and put her forward in the practice of the greatest Follies. (*A Serious Proposal to the Ladies,* Part I, 81)

For Astell, popular fiction, including dramatic works, provides women with false knowledge and fails to helps them achieve wisdom. According to her, if women seek to improve themselves by "real Wisdom," they will never "pursue those Follies," but instead recognise the difference

between *"true Love* and that *brutish Passion* which pretends to ape it."[10] Astell's view appears to be influenced by the antitheatricalism, or fear of the power of imitation "to forge a false identity between external image and internal reality."[11] Despite this generally negative attitude towards drama, like Makin's metaphor of theatre, Astell makes references to drama, demonstrating the infiltration of theatre culture into the seventeenth-century English society of intellectuals, including those with antitheatrical tendencies.[12]

Countering this trend, however, some female writers, prominently Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle, and Judith Drake, attempted to defend theatre in the educational context. They emphasised the value of English theatre, particularly the works of William Shakespeare, as educational material providing people, especially women, with pleasure. Pleasure has been a significant concept in thinking about the relationship between literature and readers and has been explored by critics, including Roland Barthes, but it has often been overlooked in the discussion of canonisation.[13] As Frank Kermode points out, "pleasure and the canon may seem uneasy bedfellows" in literary studies.[14] This paper discusses how Cavendish and Drake's critical approaches treated theatre as an important source of pleasure and an essential element of Englishwomen's learning, focusing on their patriotic intent to canonise seventeenth-century English playwrights' works, as exemplified by Shakespeare.

Margaret Cavendish's Promotion of Pleasure for the Commonwealth

Margaret Cavendish was herself a playwright, as well as a philosopher, critic and novelist. Possessing abundant knowledge of English drama, she wrote Letter 123 in *Sociable Letters,* or the earliest extant substantial review of Shakespeare's plays.[15] Katherine M. Romack links Cavendish's praise of Shakespeare to her anti-feminist tendencies, while

other scholars interpret her critical analyses as much more feminist.[16] This section focusing on pleasure, politics and education discusses Cavendish's critical review of Shakespeare in relation to her other works.

Cavendish has a complicated relationship to feminism and antifeminism. In her early work *The Worlds Olio* (1655), she repeatedly makes misogynist comments mixing insecure, anxious politeness and acrimonious, even desperate laments, declaring that "there is great difference betwixt the Masculine Brain and the Feminine, the Masculine Strength and the Feminine."[17] However, as Miriam Wallraven suggests, such a sentiment "not only conflicts sharply with Cavendish's own life, aims and self-representation, but most notably with her other texts."[18] Her fictional works, such as *The Blazing World,* are argued to deeply explore the political and philosophical issues surrounding gender in a uniquely feminist manner.[19] Perhaps James Fitzmaurice's comment on anti-feminism in Introduction to *Sociable Letters* most accurately describes her seemingly contradictory attitude: "Cavendish rarely makes a point without some sort of irony involved."[20] She has a distinctly wry sense of humour, which sometimes baffles readers.

Cavendish's attitude toward pleasure is far more clear-cut: it is one of her major concerns in writing. In *Sociable Letters,* she defines herself as a pleasure-seeker with "a Love to Peace, Ease, and Pleasure, all which you Enjoy."[21] She places little value on "Constraint," regarding pleasure and love as goals in everyday life following the philosophy of Epicureanism.[22] This is clearly shown in her closet drama *The Convent of Pleasure,* a play about women's search for genuine pleasure. Lady Happy decides to "live incloister'd with all the delights and pleasures that are allowable and lawful" against those who "bar themselves from all other worldly Pleasures," but ultimately, she discovers the necessity of the pleasure of love.[23]

Literary activities stand as significant sources of pleasure in Cavendish's critical theory. In the first dedication to her

Playes in 1662, she declares the importance of pleasure, or delight, in reading:

> To Those that do delight in Scenes and wit,
> I dedicate my Book, for those I writ;
> Next to my own Delight, for I did take
> Much pleasure and delight these Played to make[.][24]

She advocates not only the readers' pleasure but also the author's pleasure. Pleasure is her foremost motivation for writing, and she does not shy away from asserting her own right to pleasure or from defining herself as a provider of pleasure for readers. Royalist and anti-Puritan playwrights in the Restoration, such as Aphra Behn and George Etherege, often regarded pleasure as a feature of cavalier culture.[25] Writing closet drams, Cavendish was no professional playwright, but her pleasure-loving literary aesthetics was part of the theatre culture in this era.

Cavendish considers pleasure and educational quality to be two of the most important criteria for evaluating literary works. According to *Sociable Letters,* a poem is worth reading when it is "Pleasant" or "Profitable."[26] Pleasure or delight in reading derives from "Probabilities," the touch of "Truth" presented vividly and naturally as "not beyond the Power of Men, nor Unusual to their Practice."[27] Profit from reading depends on the educational quality of the work, whether it can provide readers with the "Actions" to be "Practised" or "Imitated."[28] In another letter, Cavendish equates "Profit" and "Pleasure" with "any Probability to Increase your Knowledge, or to Inrich your Understanding."[29] In *Sociable Letters,* Cavendish emphasises the readers' profit from gaining knowledge and their pleasure of activating their own imaginations through reading.

Cavendish's promotion of pleasure is inseparable from her political dedication to the benefit of the commonwealth.[30] In *The Worlds Olio*, influenced by Thomas Hobbes, she defines her commonwealth, or Britain, as an entity of people of various social backgrounds ranging from "Nobility" to "Labourers"

under "The Contracts betwixt the King and people."[31] In this commonwealth, "People shall have set times of Recreation, to ease them from their Labours, and to refresh their Spirits."[32] In Letter 169 of *Sociable Letters,* Cavendish compares the art of war with the art of poetry and associates the poet's work with nationalism, or the defence of the commonwealth. Soldiers, who provide security through their courage, and writers, who provide recreation through their poems and plays to "Grace their Triumphs" and to "Please their Eyes and Ears," are important components of the commonwealth. These two classes of professionals are ill-treated, "although a Commonwealth neither have Pleasure nor Security without them."[33] She even argues that "all Natural Poets shall be honored with Title, esteemed with Respect, or enriched for the Civilizing of a Nation . . . by Soft Numbers, and pleasing Phansies."[34] In this context, Cavendish champions English as a language that provides pleasure to the nation. Although it is inappropriate to "condemn another Language," she maintains that "our natural English Tongue was significant enough without the help of other Languages."[35]

The Blazing World connects pleasure and education in a patriotic promotion of vernacular poetry and theatre. The leading character, the Duchess, tells the Emperor that she "shall endeavour to order your Majesties Theatre, to present such Playes as my Wit is capable to make" in order to fill the need for "such a Theater as may make wise Men."[36] Theatre must provide both pleasure and education for the public. The fictional Duchess' determination "to establish a new national theatre" in the Blazing World, an imagined utopian realm, can be interpreted as Cavendish's "focused critique of England's (to be deplored) lack of quality imagination."[37] *The Blazing World* also condemns the "Artificial Rules" adopted by contemporary dramatists: "the natural Humours, Actions and Fortunes of Mankind, are not done by the Rules of Art."[38] The "Rules of Art" satirically refers to the rules of three unities, which were imported from France and became

popular in Restoration England, and caricatures the French influence on English drama.[39] The patriotic promotion of drama in *The Blazing World* was influenced by the Anglo-Dutch war of the mid-1660s, and the descriptions of the female monarch in the text reflect "Cavendish's imperial dreams concerning England's future role as world leader."[40] In the state of Cavendish's ideal commonwealth, citizens enjoy vernacular poetry and drama with abundant pleasure and high educational quality. Unlike other female writers in this period, Cavendish strongly believed in the educational value and pleasure of English drama for the nation.

Cavendish's praise of Shakespeare should be analysed in conjunction with her political vision of the commonwealth. Letter 123 of *Sociable Letters* marks an attempt to canonise Shakespeare, defending him against those who give little credit to his plays because of the playwright's coarse humour. The letter praises Shakespeare's natural wit "to Express to the Life all Sorts of Persons, of what Quality, Profession, Degree, Breeding, or Birth soever" and "to Express the Divers, and Different Humours, or Natures, or Several Passions in Mankind."[41] Cavendish asserts that "a fluent Wit" enabled him to write plays "by Natures light," implying that nature requires the art of wit to be properly represented in poetry.[42] As Michael Dobson points out, Restoration playgoers in the 1660s commonly ascribed art to Ben Jonson, nature to Shakespeare and wit to John Fletcher, enshrining these three as "the Triumvirate of wit."[43] Shakespeare was famous for his "Nature," whereas Cavendish closely linked nature with wit in appreciating the playwright, who never relied upon the "Rules of Art."

Cavendish's efforts to canonise Shakespeare came as part of her project to promote pleasure for the benefit of the commonwealth. As a commonwealth under a king, Britain needed a "Natural Poet" to evoke national pleasure, and according to Cavendish, Shakespeare's widely acclaimed ability as "a Natural Orator, as well as a Natural Poet" made

him a leading candidate for the national poet.[44] Furthermore, her imagined commonwealth was composed of various kinds of people ranging from royals to peasants, and Shakespeare was exceedingly skilled at portraying "all Sorts of Persons" or any given member of the commonwealth.[45] In addition to many "Clowns, Fools, Watchmen, and the like," he could describe women of every social background, from the Queen of Egypt to poor female commoners in London:

> One would think that he had been Metamorphosed from a Man to a Woman, for who could Describe Cleopatra Better than he hath done, and many other Females of his Creating as Nan Page, Mrs. Page, Mrs. Ford, the Doctors Maid, Bettrice, Mrs Quickly, Doll Tearsheet, and others, too many to Relate?[46]

The metaphor of metamorphosis connotes two modes of representation. Shakespeare could represent, or portray, any kind of women in his plays, and he could also represent, or symbolically become, every woman in the commonwealth. In Cavendish's argument, Shakespeare possessed three advantages: he was a "Natural Poet" unaffected by artificial pedantry or French influence, his generous wit enabled him to represent all types of people and nature in his plays, and he created theatrical masterpieces in English, the most important vernacular language in Cavendish's imagined commonwealth.

For Cavendish, nominating Shakespeare as the national poet also helped justify her status as a woman writer. As scholars point out, her praise of Shakespeare stemmed in part from her literary strategy of refuting the criticism that her gender caused her want of learning. As she wrote in *Sociable Letters,* her early education was not sophisticated enough for a woman with a passion for learning as she "never went to School, but only Learn'd to Read and Write at Home, Taught by an Antient Decayed Gentlewoman."[47] By praising Shakespeare, she circuitously compared herself to him because both lacked

knowledge of Latin, Greek and military science but actively wrote in English.[48] In Cavendish's argument, though, such a lack of knowledge did not greatly matter as English should be used in the commonwealth. This commonwealth that she imagined, whose national poet was Shakespeare, recognized poets who entertained others with writings in English and whose ranks could include women writers such as herself. In addition, Shakespeare's historical status as a slightly old-fashioned Elizabethan dramatist also contributed to her appraisal of him as the national poet. Cavendish tended to idealise the reign of Elizabeth I as a model for the reign of Charles II, and as suggested by *The Blazing World,* a utopian novel featuring a female monarch, she had nostalgic feelings for the Elizabethan era.[49] Shakespeare, a dramatist who wrote vernacular plays under a powerful female monarch, could easily be incorporated into her patriotic and self-serving pro-woman arguments.

Cavendish's promotion of vernacular theatre and Shakespeare was, in a sense, pro-women, because she tried to defend women writers including herself. It does not necessarily mean that she aimed to defend women in general. As Lisa T. Sarasohn states, "Cavendish certainly was not a feminist if feminism is taken to mean the empowering of all women."[50] Cavendish recognised herself as a uniquely and proudly ambitious female writer during the Restoration, when it was rare for women, especially aristocratic women, to publish their own writings on natural philosophy and literary criticism. Her literary strategy only worked for exceptionally talented women, such as herself, Elizabeth I, and her favourite historical female character, Cleopatra, whom she defended as a "Great Person her self, and born to have Power."[51] Aphra Behn, the first professional female playwright in the English commercial theatre, adopted a similar strategy. Behn claimed Shakespeare, who lacked "Learning," as her predecessor in the dedication to "Good, Sweet, Honey, Sugar-candied Reader" in *The Dutch Lover,* a play published in 1673.[52] As Stephen

Orgel argues, Behn suggested that "since the uneducated Shakespeare wrote better plays than the learned Jonson, and since the only intellectual advantage men have over women derives from their education, women ought to be as good playwrights as Shakespeare."[53] Both Cavendish and Behn attempted to defend their lack of education by associating themselves with Shakespeare; however, their vindication was applicable only to intellectually active female writers such as themselves, not to all women. Unlike other female writers with pro-women attitudes in the Restoration era, Cavendish highly appreciated the pleasurable and educational value of vernacular theatre but did not discuss it within a wider feminist context. This would be done by Judith Drake, around thirty years after Cavendish published her works.

Judith Drake on Drama and Education

> I mean the many excellent Authors of our own Country, whose Works it were endless to recount. Where is Love, Honour and Bravery, more lively represented, than in our Tragedies? Who has given us nobler or juster Pictures of Nature, than Mr. *Shakespear*? Where is there a tenderer Passion, than in the Maid's Tragedy? Whose Grief is more awful and commanding, than Mr. *Otway's*? Whose Descriptions more beautiful, or Thoughts more gallant, than Mr. *Dryden's*? When I see any of their Plays acted, my Passions move by their Direction; my Indignation, my Compassion, my Grief, are all at their Beck. Nor is our Comedy at all inferior to our Tragedy; for, not to mention those already nam'd for the other Part of the Stage, who are all excellent in this too, Sir *George Etherege* and Sir *Charles Sedley,* for near Raillery and Gallantry, are without Rivals; Mr. *Wycherley* for strong Wit, pointed Satyr, sound and useful Observations, is beyond Imitation; Mr. *Congreve*, for sprightly genteel, easy Wit, falls short of no Man. These are the Masters of the Stage.[54]

As the preceding quotation clearly demonstrates, Judith Drake's *An Essay in Defence of the Female Sex,* a feminist pamphlet written as a letter from one woman to another and first published in 1696, contains a considerable number of theatrical references, including a panegyric of Shakespeare. Although Drake's work has recently attracted scholars' interest, her references to drama have rarely been studied thoroughly and have been given only passing mention.[55] This section explores how Drake incorporated her theatrical interests into feminist arguments about women's education and discusses her use of seventeenth-century drama, including Shakespeare.

Little is known about Drake's life, and *An Essay in Defence of the Female Sex* was ascribed to her only recently. Astell was long considered to have written it, and there has been much confusion about the author's identity since scholars began to cast doubt upon Astell's authorship. In 2001, Hannah Smith identified Judith Drake, wife of a doctor and political writer James Drake, as the author, although Judith's birth name and birth date are still unknown.[56] The couple may have married before Judith wrote *An Essay in Defence of the Female Sex* as its front matter contains James's commendatory verse and letter to the author. After James died on 2 March 1707, Judith edited and posthumously published his work *Anthropologia Nova, or, A New System of Anatomy.*[57] It is also known that after her husband's death, she practised medicine and defended herself against the accusation of unauthorised medical practice in 1723.[58] Nothing is known about her educational background, but like other British women writers in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, such as Astell, Drake read John Locke, Thomas Hobbes and René Descartes.[59]

A prominent characteristic of Drake's writing is her intensive use of theatrical imagery with a sense of pleasure. She frequently compares her work to a stage performance with no negative connotations, treating readers as pleasure-

seeking theatregoers. She commences and ends *An Essay in Defence of the Female Sex* by using expressions which remind readers of theatre. In her dedication to Princess (later Queen) Anne, she employs words related to the theatre to praise her patron: "Madam, Tho' the World may condemn my Performance, it must applaud my Choice in this Address." Such addresses to literary patrons were relatively common in Restoration England.[60] In concert with this address at the beginning of this essay, she concludes with an apology for her poor performance: "Which if I have in any measure satisfied, I have my Ambition, and shall bee nothing further, than that my ready Obedience may excuse the mean Performance of."[61] This essay has a structure similar to seventeenth-century English plays, whose prologues and epilogues often humbly beg for the audience's favour.[62]

After this dedication, strong theatrical imagery, especially that involving puppet shows, continues throughout the preface, suggesting that Drake had familiarity with popular entertainments and targeted readers with some knowledge in this field: "Prefaces, to most Books, are like Prolocutors to Puppet-Shews; they come first to tell you what Figures are to be presented, and what Tricke they are to play." Drake also mentions *"Smithfield at Bartholomew-Tide,"* where readers can enjoy "*S. George's, Bateman's, John Dorie's, Punchinello's,* and the *Creation of the World*."[63] As Jonson writes in his play *Bartholomew Fair,* Bartholomew Tide was famous for puppet shows. The names mentioned were popular subject matters in puppet shows. "S. George's" refers to St. George plays.[64] "Bateman's" means *Bateman, or the Unhappy Marriage,* a puppet show perhaps based on William Sampson's *The Vow Breaker* or the old ballad "A Warning for Maidens, or Young Bateman" and performed around September 1694 at the latest.[65] "John Dorie" likely is a show based on the popular ballad "John Dory" (The Child Ballads Index 284).[66] Punchinello, a prototype of "Punch," and stock character in Italian puppet shows, became popular in England after the

1660s.[67] The "Creation of the World" also became common subject matter of puppet shows.[68] By sprinkling this preface with puppet-show titles popular in the latter half of the seventeenth century, Drake acts as a puppeteer determined to please the audience and speak a prologue to win their attention.[69]

Throughout the essay, Drake compares everyday life to the stage and understands social behaviours as role playing. One striking example of her theatrical knowledge is her satire "beaux," or "fops," oft-used terms to refer to excessively fashion-obsessed men. Drake criticises those who act poorly due to vanity and declares that "the first Rank of these is the *Beau*," saying that "so prevalent are our Vanity, and this apish Humour of imitation, that we persuade ourselves that we may practise with Applause, whatever we see another succeed in."[70] This criticism of vanity indicates Drake's familiarity with the satires of fop characters, caricatured for their theatricality in various types of literary works and frequently staged as stock characters on the Restoration stage.[71] The most famous examples of fops on the Restoration stage were Sir Foppling Flutter in George Etherege's *The Man of Mode* (1676) and Sir Novelty Fashion in Colley Cibber's *Love's Last Shift* (1696) and John Vanburgh's *The Relapse* (1696). Restoration drama distinguished between genuinely sophisticated men and fops or beaux. In *The Relapse,* Berinthia ascribes intelligence, decency, health, love for his lover and care for reputation to the former and states that fops have none of these attributes.[72] Drake also makes a distinction between "Wits" and "Buffoons," which recalls Berinthia's.[73] Under the influence of Restoration comedy, she argues that people should carry out their appropriate roles in society, following "the Intent of our Nature."[74]

As Drake ends her analysis of vain people including beaux and moves on to newsmongers, she relies on the traditional "all the world's a stage" metaphor solely to assert that she has already written enough about vain people in this essay,

comparing her writing to a stage play and the targets of her satire to theatrical characters: "Not to call the *Beau* or *Poetaster* on the *Stage* again, whose whole Lives are one continued Scene of Folly and Impertinence."[75] Drake's metaphor of life as a scene of folly likely reminded her contemporary readers of the humanist concept of the *theatrum mundi,* exemplified by Erasmus' *The Praise of Folly,* which was widely read in the latter half of the seventeenth century.[76] White Kennet's 1683 English translation of *The Praise of Folly,* entitled *Witt against Wisdom,* states that "the whole proceedings of the world are nothing but one continued Scene of Folly, all the Actors being equally fools, and mad-men."[77] Drake's expression is very similar to the English version of Erasmus. However, differing slightly from Kennet's translation of Erasmus, who describes all people as fools, Drake chooses to mock foppish people in particular. She applies the Erasmian *theatrum mundi* concept to the context of the theatrical conventions of Restoration comedy caricaturing fops' comical behavior.

Another explanation of vanity by Drake not only attests to her understanding of general theatrical conventions in the seventeenth century, but also hints at her knowledge of Shakespeare's plays. She does not mention the titles of specific plays, but her analysis of vanity seems to echo *Hamlet*, a tragedy frequently performed during the Restoration:[78]

> The other is mean-spirited and fearful, and seeks, by false Fire, to counterfeit a Heat that may pass for genuine, to conceal the Frost in his Blood, and, like an ill Actor, over-does his Part for want of understanding it. . . . Nature is our best Guide, and has fitted every Man for some things more particularly than others. (*An Essay in Defence of the Female Sex,* 58–59)

> Suit the action to the word, the word to the action, with this special observance–that you o'erstep not the modesty of nature. For anything so o'erdone is from the purpose of playing, whose end, both at the first and now, was and is, to hold as 'twere the mirror up to Nature[.] (*Hamlet*, 3. 2. 17–19)[79]

Drake praises Shakespeare's plays as exemplars of "our Tragedies," especially his "Pictures of Nature."[80] In the preceding quotation, she offers the example of "an ill Actor" who overdoes his role to support her argument that people should perform their appropriate roles according to "Nature." Her language suggests that she knew Hamlet's criticism of "anything so overdone" and his focus on the importance of "Nature," which was often cited as a useful lesson for players by the beginning of the eighteenth century.[81] Furthermore, her reference to "False fire," I suspect, indicates that she read *Hamlet* in folios or saw the performance based on them. Hamlet describes Claudius as "frighted with false fire" in the scene of the play-within-a-play appearing soon after the "mirror up to Nature" speech in the folio texts, although many published Restoration texts were based on quarto versions which lack the line about "false fire" (with the exception of the first quarto).[82] Considering the popularity of *Hamlet* in the late seventeenth century, Drake likely considered it to be among "our Tragedies" by Shakespeare, and her targeted readers understood this.[83]

Drake's intensive use of drama stemmed not only from her personal interest in the genre but also her patriotic purposes in the promotion of women's education. She argued for the importance of English education and often associated English language and literature with "sense." She was critical of xenophilia, especially beaux obsessed with French fashion: "His [a beau's] Improvements are a nice Skill in the Mode, and a high Contempt of his own Country, and of Sense."[84] Furthermore, a man who neglects education "has such a Fear of Pedantry always before his Eyes, he thinks it a Scandal to his good Breeding and Gentility, to talk Sense, or write true *English*."[85] Drake believed that English-speaking people did not need to learn other languages, such as Greek, Latin and French, as part of a humanistic education for English was a suitable language for "talking sense" in every aspect of life:

> Now I can't see the Necessity of any other Tongue beside our own, to enable us to talk plausibly or judiciously upon any of these Topicks [such as Love, Honour, Gallantry, Morality, News, and Raillery]. Nay, I am very confident, that 'tis possible for an ingenious Person to make a very considerable Progress in most Parts of Learning, by the help of English only. (*An Essay in .Defence of the Female Sex,* 36–37)

According to Drake, English-speaking people had sufficient vocabulary and sophisticated rhetoric to discuss complex "Topicks," and if those who could read only English sought to understand non-English culture, they could access "Translations for the Use of the Unlearned."[86]

Drake's emphasis on English education was closely linked to promotion of women's education, the main subject matter of *An Essay in Defence of the Female Sex.* She argued that women had more skill in English than men, who spent too much time studying Latin and Greek. Her emphasis on the vernacular language was similar to that of Cavendish and Behn, but Drake attached great importance to the pedagogical context. For her, women's ability to use English proved that when properly taught, women were not inferior to men:

> I have often thought, that the not teaching Women *Latin* and *Greek*, was an Advantage to them, if it were rightly consider'd, and might be improv'd to a great Height. For Girls, after they can read and write, (if they be of any Fashion) are taught such things as take not up their whole Time; and not being suffer'd to run about at liberty as Boys, are furnish'd, among other Toys, with Books, such as *Romances, Novels, Plays* and *Poems*; which though they read carelesly only for Diversion, yet, unawares to them, give 'em very early a considerable Command both of Words and Sense. (*An Essay in Defence of the Female Sex,* 51)

It is notable that Drake recommended "*Romances, Novels, Plays,* and *Poems*" for young women as other feminist writers

often condemned such popular fiction. Drake credited these popular entertainments as important sources of both pleasure and education for women. Seemingly, they only provided women with "Diversion," but in fact, they could improve their "Words and Sense" through pleasure. Some Restoration male writers who had little interest in women's education, such as Richard Flecknoe, Charles Gildon, John Dryden, and John Dennis, also emphasized the value of English language and literature partly to counter French influence. However, as Jean I. Marsden summarises, they were "often fuelled by nationalism" and contrasted "the 'servile' nature of the French with the more 'manly' British."[87] In contrast, Drake did not praise the presumed "manliness" of English Restoration drama but, rather, relied on the presumed "femininity" of English.

As discussed in the previous section, vernacular English was sometimes associated with the talents of women, who were excluded from formal higher education but actively wrote in English or translated non-English works.[88] For example, Wentworth Dillon, fourth Earl of Roscommon, panegyrised Katherine Philips as a female poet "Whose Eloquence from such a Theme deters / All Tongues but English, and all Pens but Hers" in the prologue of the first performance of her translation of *Pompey* in Dublin.[89] He regarded Philips's achievement in English poetry as a success for all the "Ladies," writing, "By the just Fates your Sex is doubly blest, / You Conquer'd Caesar, and you praise him best." Dillon's prologue elevates English above French, the original language of the play (and perhaps the local Irish language, too) and regards mastery of English as the national language as a skill shared by all the women in Britain, not limited to Philips. Drake, with some help from her husband, also ascribed mastery of English to women and attempted to impress her readers with the image of women as skilled users of the vernacular. She praises "the deservedly celebrated Mrs. *Philips*" and the "Incomparable Mrs. *Behn*."[90] Her husband James also refers to "the fam'd Orinda's praise" in his

dedicatory poem to *An Essay in Defence of the Female Sex*.[91] Shakespeare, who lacked formal education but was skilled in vernacular English, served as a suitable example for Drake's feminist pamphlet.

Drake praised plays, novels, poems and other critical works written in English as fruits of the development of the English language. Through drama and other popular fiction in English, women's linguistic skills are linked to Englishness. The first quotation in this section reveals Drake's efforts to form a canon of English drama as she makes a reading (or watching) list of canonical playwrights for female learners. She states that English tragedies inspire sense, and those by Shakespeare, Beaumont and Fletcher (the authors of *The Maid's Tragedy*), Thomas Otway and Dryden describe "Love, Honour and Bravery" most skilfully and evoke "my Passions," or "my Indignation, my Compassion, my Grief."[92] As for comedies, she recommends George Etherege, Charles Sedley, William Wycherley and William Congreve.[93] After cataloguing these names, Drake states that "there are others, who, though of an inferior Class, yet deserve Commendation."[94] She thus indicates her awareness of the significance of establishing evaluative standards and distinguishing between first- and second-class dramatic works in the canonisation of English drama.

An Essay in Defence of the Female Sex is unique in its strong support for popular entertainment. Unlike other feminist writers who believed that English vernacular fiction, especially drama, adversely affected women, Drake considered these works to give women an educational advantage over men. More overtly feminist than Cavendish's thinking, Drake argued that good command of English was open to all women. In her argument, women were already well educated as they studied English effortlessly and pleasantly through reading fiction instead of wasting their time on Greek and Latin. To Drake, women did not have to be ashamed of their lack of knowledge of the classics.

Conclusion

Margaret Cavendish and Judith Drake can both be regarded as pioneering female writers who argued for the pleasure and educational value of theatre in defence of women. Their focus on pleasure separated them from other "serious" female writers, who did not approve the entertaining quality of popular fiction. In contrast, both of these women saw theatre as a source of pleasure and education for the nation. Cavendish envisioned a national theatre under a female monarch, and Drake advocated theatre as an educational resource for women. They both praised Shakespeare, partly as it was relatively easy to align him, a poet with little formal education but mastery of English, with women.

It is also notable that both Cavendish and Drake closely connected their defence of drama to patriotism. Appreciating English drama, exemplified by Shakespeare, meant appreciating the vernacular entertainment created in their "own" language. Although not mainstream in the seventeenth century, such patriotic, pro-women claims became more popular in the eighteenth century. The Shakespeare Ladies Club, which actively requested performances of Shakespeare in London around 1736–38, also regarded his plays as valuable educational material for the nation.[95] Elizabeth Boyd, an Irish writer and a member of the club, praised Shakespeare in an attached prologue to her play *Don Sancho: Or, the Students Whim, a Ballad Opera of Two Acts, with Minerva's Triumph* in 1739.[96] Emphasizing "*Englands* Pride," she likens Shakespeare to a "Soul-Soothing Shade, rouz'd by a Woman's Pen / To Check the impious Rage of lawless Men."[97] Boyd "feminises" Shakespeare by ascribing "Soul-Soothing" tenderness, a purportedly "female" virtue, and suggesting that he is the favourite dramatist of women more temperate and morally well balanced than men. Mary Cowper, another member of the club and the daughter of William Cowper, MP, also wrote the poem "On the Revival

of Shakespear's Plays by the Ladies in 1738."[98] She is more favourably inclined towards pleasure seeking, asking her readers to "See happy *Britain* raise her drooping *Head* / Supported by the *Fair Ones* friendly *Aid*," as the revival of Shakespeare brings them "a real, solid *Pleasure*."[99] These women's works connect intensive, triumphant pleasure to the feeling of patriotism. This historical process suggests the complex union of patriotism and English feminism.

Cavendish and Drake foresaw another complex union of patriotism with defence of English theatre. In early 2017, playwright David Hare criticised the European influence on English theatre, saying "all that directorial stuff that we've managed to keep over there on the continent is now coming over and beginning to infect our theatre."[100] Hare's comment sparked a heated criticism and discussion among playgoers.[101] Such patriotic defence of English theatre, as shown in this paper, can be traced to the seventeenth century. In analysing Margaret Cavendish and Judith Drake, it is possible to find clues to understand both current and historical debates on English theatre.

* The research presented in this paper is funded by The Fukuhara Memorial Fund for the Studies of English and American Literature. This paper is partly based on the presentation titled "Feminism and the Canonization of Drama in Seventeenth-Century England: Judith Drake's 'An Essay in Defence of the Female Sex'" given on 3 March 2012 at the 14th Annual Women's History Conference: Women, The Arts and Activism at Sarah Lawrence College, the other presentation titled "Promoting Pleasure for the Commonwealth: Margaret Cavendish's Introduction to Shakespeare" given on 4 September 2014 at the Gender, History and Society Conference at the University of Winchester, my PhD thesis "The Role of Women in the Canonisation of Shakespeare: From Elizabethan Theatre to the Shakespeare Jubilee" (unpublished PhD thesis, King's College London, 2013), and part of the Japanese monograph *Shakespeare geki wo tanoshinda josei tachi: Kinsei no kangeki to dokusho [Women Who Enjoyed Shakespeare: Early Modern Playgoing and Reading]* (Tokyo: Hakusuisha, 2018).

Notes

1. Margaret Fell, *Womens Speaking Justified, Proved, and Allowed of by the Scriptures* (London: Pythia Press, 1989).

2. George Fox, *The Works of George Fox* (Philadelphia: Gould, 1831), 1:413 and 2:107.

3. Bathsua Makin, *An Assay to Revive the Antient Education of Gentlewomen* (Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, University of California, 1980), 26.

4. Makin, 7.

5. Mary Astell, *The First English Feminist: Reflections upon Marriage and Other Writings,* ed. and intr. Bridget Hill (Aldershot: Gower, 1986).

6. Ruth Perry, T*he Celebrated Mary Astell: An Early English Feminist* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 73.

7. Mary Astell, *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies,* ed. Patricia Springborg (Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press, 2002), Part I, 78.

8. Astell, *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies,* Part I, 64.

9. Mary Astell, *The Christian Religion, as Profess'd by a Daughter of the Church of England* (London, 1705), 292.

10. Astell, *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies,* Part I, 74–75.

11. Anthony B. Dawson, "Props, Pleasure, and Idolatry," in *The Culture of Playgoing in Shakespeare's England: A Collaborative Debate,* ed. Anthony B. Dawson and Paul Yachnin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 131–58, 133.

12. Springborg argues that Astell recalls the lyrics "Where the bee sucks, there suck I" (5.1.88) from Arial's song in *The Tempest* when she writes: "Indeed this Living *Ex Tempore* which most of us are guilty of, our making no Reflections, our Gay Volatile Humour which transports us in an Instant from one thing to another, e're we have with the Industrious Bee suck'd those Sweets it wou'd afford us, frequently renders his gracious Bounty ineffectual" (*A Serious Proposal to the Ladies,* Part II, 175). Astell's writing is similar to the lyrics, but I cannot conclude that she knew *The Tempest* itself. Robert Johnson's "Where the Bee sucks" was a popular song reprinted in John Wilson's *Cheerfull Ayres or Ballads* (Oxford, 1660) and perhaps sung independently of the context of the play. It is possible that Astell did not see or read the play but still heard the song. Quotations from *The Tempest* refer to William Shakespeare, *The Tempest,* The Arden Shakespeare 3rd Series, rev. ed. Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan (London: Bloomsbury, 2011).

13. Roland Barthes, T*he Pleasure of the Text,* trans. Richard Miller (London: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1976) [*Le Plaisir du Texts* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1973)].

14. Frank Kermode, *Pleasure and Change: The Aesthetics of Canon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 20.

15. Margaret Cavendish, *Sociable Letters,* ed. James Fitzmaurice (Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press, 2004), Letter 123, 176–78.

16. Katherine Romack, "Margaret Cavendish, Shakespeare Critic," in *A Feminist Companion to Shakespeare,* ed. Dympna Callaghan (Malden: Blackwell, 2000), 21–41. Mihoko Suzuki voices a different view on the relationship between Shakespeare and Cavendish in "Gender, the Political Subject, and Dramatic Authorship: Margaret Cavendish's Loves Adventures and the Shakespearean Example", in *Cavendish and Shakespeare, Interconnections,* ed. Katherine Romack and James Fitzmaurice (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 103–20, 104.

17. Margaret Cavendish, *The Worlds Olio Written by the Right Honorable, the Lady Margaret Newcastle* (London, 1655), "The Preface to the Reader," A4r.

18. Miriam Wallraven, *A Writing Halfway Between Theory and Fiction: Mediating Feminism from the Seventeenth to the Twentieth Century* (Königshausen & Neumann, 2007), 234.

19. Rosemary Kegl, "'This World I Have Made': Margaret Cavendish, Feminism and The Blazing World," in *Feminist Readings of Early Modern Culture: Emerging Subjects,* ed. Valerie Traub, M. Lindsay Kaplan, and Dympna Callaghan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 119–41, 120.

20. James Fitzmaurice, "Introduction," in *Sociable Letters,* Margaret Cavendish, ed. James Fitzmaurice, xi–xxii, xiii.

21. Cavendish, *Sociable Letters,* Letter 29, 80.

22. Cavendish, *Sociable Letters,* Letter 29, 80. See also Lisa T. Sarasohn, *The Natural Philosophy of Margaret Cavendish: Reason and Fancy during the Scientific Revolution* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010), 179 and 239.

23. Margaret Cavendish, *The Convent of Pleasure, in The Convent of Pleasure and Other Plays,* Margaret Cavendish, ed. Anne Shaver (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1999), I.2.

24. Cavendish, *The Convent of Pleasure and Other Plays,* Appendix A, 253.

25. Richard Lewis Braverman, *Plots and Counterplots: Sexual Politics and the Body Politic in English Literature, 1660–1730* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 82; and Robert Markley, "The Politics of Masculine Sexuality and Feminine Desire in Behn's Tory Comedies," in *Cultural Readings of Restoration and Eighteenth-Century English Theater,* ed. J. Douglas Canfield and Deborah C. Payne (Athens, Ga: University of Georgia Press, 1995), 114–40, 127–30.

26. Cavendish, *Sociable Letters,* Letter 127, 183.

27. Cavendish, *Sociable Letters,* Letter 127, 183. The "probability" of literature was a significant critical criterion for the eighteenth-century novel, and some later critics, such as Charlotte Lennox, did not regard Shakespeare's plays as probable. For this point, see also Jesse Molesworth, *Chance and the Eighteenth-Century Novel: Realism, Probability, Magic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).17–54.

28. Cavendish, *Sociable Letters,* Letter 127, 183.

29. Cavendish, *Sociable Letters,* Letter 131, 189.

30. For Cavendish's nationalistic writings, see also Cecile M. Jagodzinski, *Privacy and Print: Reading and Writing in Seventeenth-century England* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1999), 102; Shannon Miller, "'Thou art a Moniment, without a Tombe': Affiliation and Memorialization in Margaret Cavendish's *Playes* and *Plays, Never before Printed,*" in Romack and Fitzmaurice, 7–28, 3; and Vimala C. Pasupathi, "Old Playwrights, Old Soldiers, New Martial Subjects: The Cavendishes and the Drama of Soldiery," in Romack and Fitzmaurice, 121–46, 131.

31. Cavendish, *The Worlds Olio,* 205–06. For Hobbes's influence on Cavendish, see Sarah Hutton, "In Dialogue with Thomas Hobbes: Margaret Cavendish's Natural Philosophy," *Women's Writing* 4 no. 3 (1997): 421–32, 422; and Sarasohn, 100–25.

32. Cavendish, *The Worlds Olio,* 209.

33. Cavendish, *Sociable Letters,* Letter 169, 233.

34. Cavendish, *The Worlds Olio,* 212.

35. Cavendish, *The Worlds Olio,* 212 and 115.

36. Margaret Cavendish, *The Description of a New World, Called the Blazing World* (hereafter The Blazing World), ed. Sara Mendelson (Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press, 2016), 160.

37. Brandie R. Siegfried, "Anecdotal and Cabalistic Forms in Margaret Cavendish's *Observations upon Experimental Philosophy,*" in *Authorial Conquests: Essays on Genre in the Writings of Margaret Cavendish,* ed. Line Cottegnies and Nancy Weitz (Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2003), 59–79, 77.

38. Cavendish, *The Blazing World,* 159–60.

39. According to Jean I. Marsden, "Tragedy and Varieties in Serious Drama," in *A Companion to Restoration Drama,* ed. Susan J. Owen (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), 228–42, 229, the three unities were referred to as the "Rules" during the Restoration.

40. Claire Jowitt, "Imperial Dreams? Margaret Cavendish and the Cult of Elizabeth," *Women's Writing* 4, no. 3 (1997): 383–99, 393.

41. Cavendish, *Sociable Letters,* Letter 123, 177.

42. Cavendish, "A General Prologue to all my Playes," in *The Convent of Pleasure and Other Plays,* Appendix A, 265.

43. Michael Dobson, *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare, Adaptation and Authorship, 1660–1769* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 30.

44. Cavendish, *Sociable Letters,* Letter 123, 178.

45. Cavendish, *Sociable Letters,* Letter 123, 177.

46. Cavendish, *Sociable Letters,* Letter 123, 177. Cleopatra seems to have been Cavendish's favorite female character. See Kitamura Sae, "The Good, the Bad and the Beautiful: Women Writers' Difficult Relationships with the 'Bad Woman' Character in Antony and Cleopatra," *Lilith Rising: Perspectives on Evil and the Feminine,* ed. Cathleen Allyn Conway (Inter-Disciplinary Press, 2016), 29–42.

47. Cavendish, *Sociable Letters,* Letter 175, 241.

48. Rhonda R. Powers, 'Margaret Cavendish and Shakespeare's Ophelia: Female Role-playing and Self-fashioned Identity', *In-between Essays & Studies in Literary Criticism* 9, no. 1–2 (2000): 108–15, 109; and Paspathi, 135.

49. Jowitt, p. 393; and Brandie R. Siegfried, "*Bonum Theatrale:* The Matter of Elizabeth I in Francis Bacon's *Of Tribute* and Margaret Cavendish's *Brazing World,*" in *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-century England,* ed. Elizabeth Hageman and Katherine Conway (Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2007), 185–204, 196–97.

50. Sarasohn, 191.

51. Cavendish, *The Worlds Olio,* 132.

52. Aphra Behn, *The Dutch Lover, in The Works of Aphra Behn,* Aphra Behn, ed. Janet Todd, Vol. 5 (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1996), 162.

53. Stephen Orgel, "The Renaissance Artist as Plagiarist," *English Literary History* 48, no. 3 (1981): 476–95, 483.

54. Judith Drake, *An Essay in Defence of the Female Sex,* in *The Pioneers: Early Feminists,* ed. Marie Mulvey Roberts and Tamae Mizuta, (London: Routledge, 1993), 42–43. The quotations from Drake are drawn from this edition. This book was first published in 1696, but the edition referred to here is the facsimile version of the fourth edition published in 1721.

55. Gary Taylor devotes a few lines to Drake but does not discuss other references to drama in her work in *Reinventing Shakespeare: A Cultural History from the Restoration to the Present* (London: Vintage, 1989), 92. Sasha Roberts treats Drake similarly in *Reading Shakespeare's Poems in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 56. In "The Ladies: Female Patronage of Restoration Drama, 1660–1700(Book Review)", *Review of English Studies* 41, no.164 (1990): 573–74, Derek Hughes suggests that David Roberts should have used Drake's

An Essay in Defence of the Female Sex in his monograph *The Ladies: Female Patronage of Restoration Drama, 1660–1700* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989). Springborg, editor of Mary Astell's *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies,* occasionally mentions Drake's interest in drama in the introduction and footnotes.

56. Hannah Smith, "English 'Feminist' Writings and Judith Drake's 'An Essay in Defence of the Female Sex' (1696)," *The Historical Journal* 44, no. 3 (2001): 727–47. A. H. Upham first cast doubt upon Astell's authorship in "English Femmes Savantes at the End of the Seventeenth Century," *Journal of English and German Philology* 12, no. 2 (1913): 262–76, 273–74. Florence Smith later ascribed the work to James Drake's 'sister' Judith in *Mary Astell* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1916), 173–82. For the confusion about Judith's identity, see also John Harrison and Peter Laslett, *The Library of John Locke* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 197), 76; Hill, 59, n56; Perry, 490, n25; and Robert W. Uphaus and Gretchen M. Foster, ed., *The Other Eighteenth Century: English Women of Letters, 1660-1800* (East Lansing: Colleagues Press, 1991), 23. More recently, EEBO ascribed *An Essay in Defence of the Female Sex* to Astell as of 10 October 2017. Johanna Devereaux, in "'Affecting the Shade': Attribution, Authorship, and Anonymity in *An Essay in Defence of the Female Sex," Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature,* 27, no. 1 (2008), 17–37, discusses co-authorship and collaboration by Judith and James Drake and others around them and acknowledges Judith's hand in *An Essay in Defence of the Female Sex*. However, Devereaux's focus on James's contribution is problematic for two reasons. First, as Joanna Russ points out in *How to Suppress Women's Writing* (London: Women's Press, 1984), "she wrote it, but she had help" (book cover) has been a common refrain to depreciate women's writing talent—especially that of married women with educated husbands. Devereaux seems oblivious to the possibility of repeating this rhetoric. In particular, the Preface to *An Essay in Defence of the Female Sex* complains that some readers will attempt to attribute the work to a male author: "THERE are some Men (I hear) who will not allow this Piece to be written by a Woman . . . I see no Reason why our Sex should be robb'd of the Honour of it" (ix–x). The author decries the suppression analysed by Russ; therefore, to put great stress on James' help undermines the message of this Preface. Second, Devereaux overemphasises the collaborative nature of authorship in the Restoration, given that such collaboration in writing is also not uncommon in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Devereaux states that "manuscript circulation and the concurrent process of revision, correction, and addition by a number of authors and readers mean that to ascribe a text to a single author can be an anachronistic impulse" (33). However, "manuscript circulation" with "revision, correction, and addition" also

happens frequently in academic and fiction publishing today, especially since the emergence of the Internet. The situation surrounding literary collaboration in the Restoration period is less different from the twenty-first century than Devereaux argues. For the co-authorship on the Internet, Joe Moxley and Ryan Meehan, "Collaboration, Literacy, Authorship: Using Social Networking Tools to Engage the Wisdom of Teachers," *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy,* 12.1 (2007), http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/12.1/binder.html?praxis/moxley_ meehan/index.html [accessed 9 October 2017].

57. Bridget Hill, "Drake, James (bap. 1666, d. 1707)," in Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004; online ed., 2011, https:// doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/8026, [accessed 9 Oct 2017]

58. BL Sloane MS 4047, British Library, ff. 38–39.

59. Erica Harth, "Cartesian Women," in *Feminist Interpretations of René Descartes,* Susan Bordo (Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999), 213–31, 241; Gordon Schochet, "Models of Politics and Place of Women in Locke's Political Thought," in *Feminist Interpretations of John Locke,* ed. Nancy J. Hirschmann and Kirstie Morna McClure (Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2007), 131–54, 145; and Astrid Wilkens, "'Reason's Feminist Disciples': Cartesianism and Seventeenth-century English Women," (PhD diss, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, 2008), 59.

60. For example, John Savage writes in his dedication to Thomas Coke in the 1695 translation of Carlo Moscheni's *Brutes Turn'd Criticks, or Mankind Moraliz'd by Beasts:* "but even those that shall despise my Labour, and condemn my Performance, 'twill approve my choice in you."

61. Drake, 136.

62. For women and prologues and epilogues in early modern English plays, see Richard Levin, "Women in the Renaissance Theater Audience," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40, no. 2 (1989): 165–74.

63. Drake, The Preface.

64. See also a puppeteer Peter Charlton's explanation of the play in "For England and Saint George!," *English Dance & Song* 62, no. 1 (2000): 2–3.

65. See Ethel Seaton's transcription of the *Diary of Thura in Literary Relations of England and Scandinavia in the Seventeenth Century* (1935; New York: Blom, 1972), 339, and Alfred Harbage, S. Schoenbaum, and Sylvia Stoler Wagonheim, *Annals of English Drama, 975-1700: An Analytical Record of All Plays, Extant or Lost, Chronologically Arranged and Indexed by Authors, Titles, Dramatic Companies & c,* 3rd ed (London: Routledge, 1989), 198.

66. Francis James Child, The English and Scottish Popular Ballads, vol. 5 (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1882-98), 131.

67. Samuel Pepys twice saw Italian puppet shows, at Covent Garden in May 1662 and then Punchinello at Moorefields on 22 August 1666. See Scott Cutler Shershow, *Puppets and "Popular" Culture* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), 113–14.

68. See Geoge Speaight, *The History of the English Puppet Theater,* 2nd ed (London: Robert Hale, 1990), 64 and 325; and Margaret Rogerson, "English Puppets and the Survival of Religious Theater," *Theater Notebook,* 52, no. 2 (1998): 91–111, 91. A song entitled "Bartholomew Fair," which includes a reference to "World's Creation," was printed in Philip Jenkins' anthology of popular poems, *Wit and Drollery Jovial Poems: Corrected and Amended with New Additions* (London, 1682), 304, and in an appendix to John Playford's *The Musical Companion* with Henry Purcell's music in *An Additional Sheet to the Book Entituled, The Musical Companion* (London, 1673), 4.

69. William Makepeace Thackeray read *An Essay in Defence of the Female Sex* before writing Vanity Fair in 1848 and T*he History of Henry Esmond* in 1852. As well, it is said that he was interested in Drake's imagery of puppetry. See Michael M. Clarke, *Thackeray and Women* (DekKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1995), 121–26, and Joseph Grego, *Thackerayana: Notes and Anecdotes* (first published in 1901. New York, Haskell House, 1971), 197–206.

70. Drake, 59–60.

71. Andrew P. Williams, "The Centre of Attention: Theatricality and the Restoration Fop," *Early Modern Literary Studies* 4, no. 3 (1999): 5.1–22, 8.

72. John Vanburgh, *The Relapse,* II. i. 35–36 in T*he Relapse and Other Plays* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004). See also Robert B. Heilman, "Some Fops and Some Versions of Foppery," *English Literary History* 49, no. 2 (1982): 363–95, 377–78.

73. Drake, 59.

74. Drake, 59.

75. Drake, 77.

76. Gregory D. Dodds, *Exploiting Erasmus: The Erasmian Legacy and Religious Change in Early Modern England* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), 234.

77. Desiderius Erasmus, *Witt against Wisdom, or, a Panegyrick upon Folly Penn'd in Latin by Desiderius Erasmus,* trans. White Kennet (Oxford: 1683), 32 – 33.

78. For the performance history of Hamlet in the Restoration, see Barbara A. Murray, *Restoration Shakespeare: Viewing the Voice* (Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2001), 63–67.

79. Quotations from Hamlet refer to William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, The Arden Shakespeare 3rd Series, ed. Ann Thompson and Neil Taylor (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2006).

80. Drake, 42.

81. For example, see Charles Gildon, T*he Life of Mr. Thomas Betterton* (London, 1710), 82 and Richard Steele's article on 29 June 1709 in *The Tatler or Lucubrations of Isaac Bickerstaff, Esq,* vol. 1 (London, 1709): 255. For the reception of Hamlet's stage directions, see James Hirsh, "Hamlet's Stage Directions to Players," in *Stage Directions in Hamlet: New Essays and New Directions,* ed. Hardin L. Aasand (Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2003), 47–73.

82. Compare the First Folio, 3.2.257 with the First Quarto, 9.174 in *Hamlet: The Texts of 1603 and 1623,* The Arden Shakespeare 3rd Series, ed. Ann Thompson, and Neil Taylor (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2007), a supplementary volume of the Arden *Hamlet*. See also Thompson and Taylor's main volume of the Arden *Hamlet*, Appendix 2.

83. *An Essay in Defence of the Female Sex* contains another possible reference to Shakespeare. Analyzing a bully, Drake states that "he fawns, like a Spaniel, most upon those that beat him" (56). This line is similar to Helena's speech in *A Midsummer Night's Dream:* "The more you beat me, I will fawn on you. / Use me but as your spaniel" (2.1.204–05). However, the metaphor of the spaniel was far too popular to say that Drake specifically refers to Shakespeare's play. The metaphor was almost proverbial in the late sixteenth century, and other playwrights, including John Lyly and Thomas Dekker, also used it. Quotations from *A Midsummer Night's Dream* refer to William Shakespeare, *A Midsummer Night's Dream,* The Arden Shakespeare 3rd Series, ed. Sukanta Chaudhuri (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2017). See Chaudhuri's footnote to the Arden edition, 163.

84. Drake, 61.

85. Drake, 31.

86. Drake, 37.

87. Jean I. Marsden, "Tragedy and Varieties in Serious Drama," in *A Companion to Restoration Drama,* ed. Susan J. Owen (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), 228–42, 230.

88. Russ, 122–32.

89. *Pompey: A Tragedy,* Prologue, in Katherine Philips, T*he Collected Works of Katherine Philips, the Matchless Orinda,* ed. Germaine Greer and R. Little (Stump Cross: Stump Cross Books, 1993), vol. 3.

90. Drake, 50.

91. Drake, xii.

92. Drake, 42–43.

93. Drake, 42–43.

94. Drake, 43.

95. For the Shakespeare Ladies Club, see Emmet L. Avery, "The Shakespeare Ladies Club," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 7, no.2 (1956): 153–58;

and Fiona Jane Ritchie, "The Influence of the Female Audience on the Shakespeare Revival of 1736 –1738: The Case of the Shakespeare Ladies Club," in *Shakespeare and the Eighteenth Century,* ed. Peter Sabor and Paul Yachnin (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 57–69, 61.

96. For Elizabeth Boyd, see D. J, O'Donoghue, *The Poets of Ireland* (Dublin: Hodges Figgis, 1912), 33; and Rolf Loeber, Magda Loeber, and Anne Mullin Burnham, *A Guide to Irish Fiction, 1650-1900* (Dublin: Four Courts, 2006), 169.

97. Elizabeth Boyd, *Don Sancho: Or, the Students Whim, a Ballad Opera of Two Acts*, with *Minerva's Triumph* (London, 1739), Prologue

98. BL Add MS 28101, British Library, 93v and 94v.

99. BL Add MS 28101 93v. For the transcription, I follow Dobson, 150.

100. Jeffrey Sweet, *What Playwrights Talk About When They Talk About Writing* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017), 69.

101. For the debate precipitated by Hare, see Dalya Alberge, "David Hare: Classic British Drama Is 'Being Infected' by Radical European Staging," *Guardian*, 29 January 2017, https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2017/jan/29/david-hare-classic-british-drama-infected-radical-european-staging [accessed 9 October 2017] and Lyn Gardner, "Why David Hare Is Wrong about the State of British Theater," *Guardian*, 20 January 2017, https://www.theguardian.com/stage/theaterblog/2017/jan/30/david-hare-state-of-british-theater-europe, [accessed 9 October 2017].

Shakespeare's Problem Wars

Maria Valentini
University of Cassino and Lazio Meridionale (Italy)

> We go to gain a little patch of ground
> That hath in it no profit but the name
> (*Hamlet*, 4.4.18-19)[1]

Shakespeare's representations of war and peace have been the object of much critical debate, but it was difficult, until recently, to find a study that tackled the problem as a whole. There seemed to be two trends that have tried for an overall analysis: one, expressed by Paul Jorgensen, which claims that "it is war rather than peace that is the clear dominant force" and that "the philosophy of war and peace that we now refer to as pacifism is espoused by not a single admirable character in Shakespeare";[2] the other, represented above all by Theodor Meron and Steven Marx, finds in Shakespeare's works a development leading essentially to pacifist positions.[3] Meron identifies a trend towards "the pacifist scepticism about war and its motivations" as early as *Henry V*,[4] while Marx sees a change in Shakespeare's positions, particularly in the years between 1599 and 1603, reflecting a change in English foreign policy culminating in James I's accession to the throne, which brought with it a "pacifist" culture. In this

Journal of the Wooden O. Vol 17, 138-164
© Southern Utah University Press
ISSN: 1539-5758

view, it was partly the close relation Shakespeare's company enjoyed with the new king that dictated the choice of a work like *Troilus and Cressida*—significantly, from 1603—which questions the lofty justifications for war, bringing out all its futility and corruption.

It may be possible to identify as early as this first cycle some utterances on military action that were to be developed in the later plays, which suggest that "the endless violence of factious emulations, challenges, and warfare is ultimately meaningless."[5] In the last decade the question of Shakespeare's representation of war has attracted new attention, and two new studies have approached the issue from the point of view of the "just war theory": Paola Pugliatti, in *Shakespeare and the Just War Tradition,*[6] dedicates the first half of her book to the history of this tradition from its Christian roots and the second half to Shakespeare's depiction of war in his plays, with special emphasis on *Henry V,* proposing acute parallels with doctrines current in our times. Franziska Quabeck provides an extraordinarily detailed analysis of the various plays focusing on the evaluation of just and unjust wars and refusing the idea that "it is possible to decide between pacifism and realism, between an absolute rejection of violence or glorification of war,"[7] claiming instead that interpreting the Shakespearean canon through the lens of just war theory offers new insights into the plays. Reflections on "just war" seem an appropriate starting point for an approach to Shakespeare's wars.

In *De Civitate Dei,* St Augustine raises the question of the "just war," arguing that warfare is legitimate when it acts as a corrective to injustice, a punishment for sins, and a means of restoring equity and peace and, with it the moral order that has been violated. War in these cases is authorized by God, or, rather, becomes the expression of the divine will, on condition that there is a just cause: "And therefore those men do not break the commandment which forbiddeth killing, who do make war by the authority of God's command, or being in some place of public magistracy, do put to death

malefactors according to their laws, that is, according to the rule of justice and reason."[8] A just war, however, also requires those who wage it to behave justly, which means there should be no gratuitous violence, murdering of prisoners, women and children, and that the defeated should be treated with mercy. For Augustine, then, the *jus ad bellum* requires a corresponding *jus in bello:* once the legitimacy of a war has been established, the legitimacy of the conduct of the war should be respected too.

Augustine's theories were taken up by Aquinas, who regarded the just war as a means of punishing those who deserved it and of retrieving what had been unjustly taken away, while those who took up arms without just cause would be punished with eternal damnation.[9] A Christian tradition at that time absolved those who resorted to violence to right injustice, fighting in God's name, and we shall see that it is precisely in God's name that Shakespeare's Henry V, the "mirror of all Christian kings" (Chorus 2.6), declares war on France."[10]

The debate on the legitimacy of war was central to the humanist movement with a distinction between martial and more peace-loving positions. Militarists like Machiavelli invoked an ideal of the prince as a soldier whose activity was essential both for his personal ends and for achieving social order, while "pacifists" like Erasmus or More condemned recourse to arms as immoral and irreligious. This debate not only conditioned the attitudes of sovereigns, but also influenced works of art in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[11]

War, as we know, has a place, to a greater or lesser extent, in most of Shakespeare's works, and we shall attempt to trace a development in its representation. In the first cycle of history plays, though there are critical positions on acts of war, a substantially heroic vision of war emerges, partly designed to support the patriotic cause of the Tudors. A tendency to scepticism emerges in the second cycle—with

Falstaff mocking martial honor and Hotspur exaggerating its importance—to the point that the validity of the very grounds for war is questioned, with an emphasis on the cruelties that inevitably derive from it. With *Troilus and Cressida,* the noble reasons behind the recourse to arms are in the end described as futile and unjustifiable, and the depiction of war shifts from the epic to satire. We might speak in broad terms of a transition from a realistic, Machiavellian conception to an idealistic, Erasmian one.

As is generally known, the three parts of *Henry VI,* written around 1592, open with the funeral of Henry V, whose history is dramatized by Shakespeare around six years later. As Steven Marx notes, we are witnessing a "glorification of chivalric battle and English victory over France,"[12] partly dictated by the enthusiasm of the populace for their country's military capacities, a result of their victory over the invincible armada and of the ongoing campaign in France, in which the English forces were fighting under the command of the Count of Essex. But, though "the *Henry VI* plays hardly touch on the religious debate about the nature of war,"[13] as early as *1 Henry VI* (presumably written after the two other parts), which presented the clash between English and French mainly through the figures of Talbot and Joan of Arc, we see both sides claim God's blessing on their victories: Talbot tells the king that he "Ascribes the glory of his conquest got / First to my God and next unto your grace" (3.4.11-12), and the French Reignier asks his men to "feast and banquet in the open streets / To celebrate the joy that God hath given us" (1.6.13-14)—expressions that, though uttered in very different contexts and atmospheres, already invite us to wonder with Troilus, "When right with right wars who shall be most right!" (*Troilus and Cressida,* 3.2.173). In *2 Henry VI* we also find expressions that indicate a variety of different positions on the justification for war: "O war, thou son of hell, / Whom angry heavens do make their minister,"exclaims the young Clifford, a member of the House of Lancaster,

recognizing, as Jorgensen notes, "both the divine sponsorship of war and its diabolical aspects."[14]

War in these three works is, above all, the civil War of the Roses, and we witness a gradual breakdown in family relations, contrasted with the power struggles that will lead to *Richard III,* whose protagonist immediately decides to get rid of his elder brother Clarence. It is above all in this light that we should interpret the poignant scene in *3 Henry VI* in which a soldier recognizes his victim as his own father, while another, uncovering the face of the enemy he has killed, realizes he has murdered his only son and, wracked with grief, exclaims, "What stratagems, how fell, how butcherly, / Erroneous, mutinous, and unnatural, / This deadly quarrel daily doth beget!" (2.5.89-91). The deliberate emphasis on the cruelty of the *jus in bello,* like the questioning of its theoretical justifications, may not be foregrounded, as it is later in *Henry V,* but it indicates a desire to present a celebratory vision of the English cause and military action as merely heroic in a more problematic light.

King John deals with historical events that took place between 1199 and 1216, long before the events covered by the two cycles. Its dating is uncertain, but it was presumably written between 1591 and 1598, perhaps around 1595.[15] It contained themes dear to Elizabethan audiences, such as the struggle with the papacy, the dangers of invasions, and the debate over the legitimacy of the sovereign. The most memorable character is the Bastard, Faulconbridge, a sort of positive version of Edmund in *Lear*, who ends up embodying the authentic spirit of the English nation, and in this sense seems to echo the figure of the noble, courageous Talbot in *1 Henry VI.* The theme of the just war authorized by God can be seen in the words of the Duke of Austria, who is fighting in France for the rights of Arthur, King John's nephew ("The peace of heaven is theirs that lift their swords / In such a just and charitable war" [2.1.34-35]), and also in those of the king himself, who presents himself as "God's wrathful agent"

(2.1.87), though it is immediately clear that individual interests take precedence over noble patriotic causes.

This is the theme of the Bastard's monologue on "commodity": it is only out of interest and personal advantage that King John renounced most of his French possessions and that the French, in turn, decided to switch "From a resolved and honourable war / To a most base and vile concluded peace" (2.1.585-86). Jorgensen observes that generally "treaties of peace have a curiously unpleasant role in Shakespeare's plays, being almost always viewed as deceptive or humiliating";[16] but in this case it is purity, "honorable war," that Faulconbridge regards as superior to the snares lying in negotiations and agreements born out of words, to the "policy" that is usually a negative feature of those who speak up for it. The Bastard's pragmatic ideals are contrasted with the opportunism and speciousness of the arguments of the English and French courts, but the horrors of war burst in, imposing their own reclassification. The episode in which the Bastard enters with the Duke of Austria's head is an "emblem of the brutal violence of warfare" that "exposes the horrific limitations of a preference for war over diplomacy."[17]

A work that begins with grand dynastic claims justifying recourse to arms ends with "an awareness of the hypocrisy and meaninglessness of claims of a just war,"[18] but we do not yet find theoretical reflections on what makes warfare legitimate. It is, above all, with *Henry V* that the relations between power and war are examined more deeply and become more complex, but already in the two parts of *Henry IV* the conduct of war and the honor linked to it come to the fore. As Foakes puts it, it is as if the Bastard Faulconbridge split in two, becoming two separate figures: Hotspur on one side and Falstaff on the other.[19]

The second cycle of history plays was written between 1595 and 1599, a period in which the English military campaigns successfully carried out by Essex created an atmosphere of enthusiasm. Essex became a "glorious and

chivalrous youth . . . the personification of England at war . . . the people's darling."[20] The sense of public adulation for the person of the brave conqueror is staged in the two parts of *Henry IV*—in the exaltation of Hal's victory over the rebels in the first part, and in the coronation scenes in the second, for example—and above all in the speeches of the Chorus in *Henry V.* But, alongside the glory that accompanies military conquest, there is also a stronger and more theoretical criticism of acts of war than anything we have seen so far. Towards the end of the second part of *Henry IV,* the dying king stresses to his son his sense of guilt at how he acceded to the throne—a guilt that has accompanied him throughout his reign—and expresses the hope that this guilt will not fall on his successor. To distract the populace's attention from the fact that his crown bears the weight of his usurpation, he advises Hal to "busy giddy minds / With foreign quarrels, that action hence borne out / May waste the memory of the former days" (4.5.212-15). The technique of declaring war on foreign countries to distract attention from problems at home—one that has lost none of its topicality—can also be found in other works by Shakespeare, but, as Jorgensen notes, it may be significant that only Henry IV, "Shakespeare's master of *Realpolitick,* actually formulates the principle in words. Others may silently put it in action; he alone seems to understand it as a philosophy."[21] Clearly a justification of this kind—one we might call "utilitarian"—is far from the idea of war as just and authorized by God to re-establish a violated order; at the opening of *1 Henry IV,* too, the king proposes to expel war from his land in an attempt to put an end to the rebellions and civil wars, and yet during the work he will find himself exclaiming: "And God befriend us as our cause is just!" (5.1.120).

As we have said, the theme of war is linked to the idea of honor—central in *1 Henry IV,* where it takes on various meanings: for the arch-warrior Hotspur it is identified with success on the battlefield, for King Henry it represents the

wellbeing of the people and the legitimacy of the sovereign, while for the amoral Falstaff honor is no more than an empty word that is no use in saving one's life: "What is honour? A word. What is in that word honour? What is in that honour? Air . . . Honour is a mere scutcheon" (5.1.134-41). Prince Hal, the future Henry V, is at first associated with dishonour by his father, who sees "riot and dishonour stain the brow / Of my young Harry," contrasting him with Hotspur, who is "the theme of honor's tongue" (1.1.84-85, 80). As we know, Hal spends his time in Falstaff's company, carousing, merry-making, and ignoring his duties. He is redeemed by his transformation into a warrior: he saves his father's life and finally kills Hotspur in the battle of Shrewsbury. We might want to say that honor is identified with success in war, and in this sense defines it, but we should not forget that Hotspur at times seems to become almost a caricature,[22] with his excessive eagerness for battle—"O, let the hours be short / Till fields and blows and groans applaud our sport" (1.3.301-2)—and that Falstaff's actions and words, wholly lacking in military spirit, also act as a background to the events. When Falstaff rises after feigning death in battle, he says, "The better part of valour is discretion, in which better part I have saved my life" (5.4.119-20).

Significantly, the discourse on war in *2 Henry IV* develops in some ways around the figure of Falstaff. Though Hal has taken over Hotspur's honour, he does not take part in any combat here and we do not see any battles on stage. Falstaff, however, has become an officer with the job of enlisting men to fight for the king. If this reflects a similar episode in the previous play, in which Falstaff humorously described how those men were picked who did not have enough money to corrupt him, here it is staged through the acute presentation of the wretchedness of war for ordinary people who know nothing of the rivalries of the great.[23] When Hal becomes king he must further dissociate himself from his former companion if he is to offer himself as the model of a

sovereign, while "the very idea of war may be contaminated by associating it and valour with Falstaff."[24]

Freed of his bad company and purified of his vices, the "warlike Harry" (*Henry V,* Chorus 1.5) is presented by the Chorus of *Henry V* as the model of chivalry. Long regarded and used as the play *par excellence* celebrating English nationalism, more recent critics—especially New Historicists and Cultural Materialists—have brought out the ambiguity of Henry V himself and the "ideological discourse" intrinsic to the work as a whole.[25] Here, more than in any other work, the question of the *jus ad bellum* is repeatedly posed in the terms described above—as a war that is an expression of divine will. Now that the conflicts between Church and State have been settled in the previous works, King Henry, who is described by the two archbishops in the first scene as so true to the church as to make one wish he could become a priest, turns to them for reassurance over his intention to make war on France: "May I with right and conscience make this claim?" (1.2.96). His "right" is sanctioned by the complex explanation of the Salic law given by the Archbishop of Canterbury, who guarantees the king's right to claim the French throne. Henry then asks Canterbury to absolve him of any blame for the bloodshed that he knows will be the result of his campaign, and, once he is convinced, defines his mission as authorized by God; in his dialogue with the French ambassadors he constantly insists on "by God's help," "by God's grace," "within the will of God" (1.2.223, 264, 290). It is therefore Canterbury, invested with the authority to give the war moral and legal justifications, who makes this "just" war a Christian war. Yet, Shakespeare, following his source Holinshed, displayed the motives of the archbishops in the previous scene: we know that opportunistic reasons are hidden behind these reassurances, as they fear that a proposed law that is about to be applied will strip the church of important possessions and weaken it economically. The archbishops have therefore planned strong financial support

for this war as well as morally legitimizing it for the king, with a view to preventing this law being applied. The "just cause" endorsed by the prelates, to which Henry appeals in every phase of his military expedition, is therefore put under strain by these personal interests.

In *King John* Austria had spoken of a "just and charitable war," but the question of what determines if a war is just or not was not considered; here Henry tells us, "We doubt not of a fair and lucky war" (2.2.184), suggesting that, if it is "fair" it will also be victorious ("lucky"), as, in consulting the church's highest representatives, he has already made sure there could be no doubt over his claims. The *jus ad bellum* is, then, examined theoretically, except that, as we have just seen, behind the detailed arguments the real ends were wholly personal. Once again, alongside the justifications for the English prerogatives presented by Exeter in the name of King Henry to the King of France and corroborated by a genealogical tree demonstrating the English rights on French soil, images of war as it is fought come powerfully to the fore, images of blood and of a "hungry" war that devours and destroys. If the French do not accept Exeter's ultimatum, what awaits them will be "the widows' tears, the orphans' cries, / The dead men's blood, the privy maidens' groans, / For husbands, fathers, and betrothed lovers / That shall be swallowed in this controversy" (2.4.106-9). Henry himself repeats these images even more vehemently in his speech before the Battle of Harfleur:

> The gates of mercy shall be all shut up,
> And the fleshed soldier, rough and hard of heart,
> In liberty of bloody hand shall range
> With conscience wide as hell, mowing like grass
> Your fresh fair virgins, and your flowering infants.
> * * *
> The blind and bloody soldier with foul hand
> Defile the locks of your shrill-shrieking daughters;
> Your fathers taken by the silver beards,

> And their most reverend heads dashed to the walls;
> Your naked infants spitted upon spikes,
> Whiles the mad mothers with their howls confused
> Do break the clouds, as did the wives of Jewry
> At Herod's bloody-hunting, slaughtermen.
> (3.3.10-14, 34-41)

It is true that he is trying to convince the French to surrender, avoiding the loss of human life, but what has become of the *jus in bello* that, as we have seen, was part of Augustine's theory and that so concerned Henry in his speeches to the archbishops? Legitimate conduct in war precludes maltreatment, pillage, and the massacre of the innocent, and requires mercy for prisoners; here we have images of the old and the young butchered and virgins raped. Dollimore and Sinfield observe, "Here and elsewhere, the play dwells upon imagery of slaughter to a degree which disrupts the harmonious unity towards which ideology strives."[26]

Although the massacre announced here is avoided (unlike in the sources), the English king will later order his soldiers to kill their prisoners, falling short of another principle of the "just war." But on other occasions he seems to be quite clear as to the need for ethically exemplary behaviour: he thinks it right that his friend Bardolph has been executed for a theft in a church and then insists to Fluellen, "We give express charge, that in our marches through the country there be nothing compelled from the villages, nothing taken but paid for, none of the French upbraided or abused in disdainful language; for when lenity and cruelty play for a kingdom, the gentler gamester is the soonest winner" (3.6.107-12).

One of Henry V's characteristics noted above is that, though, as we have seen, he is particularly concerned with the problem of responsibility and the legitimacy of his actions, he is actually always trying to "shift the burden—to Canterbury, for inciting him to war; to the Dauphin, for sending him the tennis-balls; to the French king, for resisting his claim; to the citizens of Harfleur, for presuming to defend their town."[27] These elements seem to justify an overall vision of *Henry V* as

a work that undoubtedly celebrates martial heroism, offering itself as a flag-waving epic, but also show that these claims contain objections to the idea of a just, noble war and actually undermine from within the very principles that they seem to be propounding.[28] A further example of this uncertainty we can find in the dialogue between the disguised king and the soldiers Williams and Bates: when, on hearing Henry's declaration that the English king's war is "just and his quarrel honourable" (4.1.128), the two ask him what will happen if the cause proves not to have been just, Henry can only repeat his claim that the war is God's will: "War is His beadle, war is His vengeance" (4.1.169). The Battle of Agincourt would seem to confirm God's protection, as it is won by the English, despite their disadvantage, with just twenty-nine dead against 10,000 French losses, a disparity Shakespeare wanted; Holinshed, though he gives this figure, also says that other sources mention around 600 English dead. With such a discrepancy in casualties, this battle also seems to be a divine pardon for the sins that Henry is burdened with after his father's usurpation: "Not today, O lord, / O not today, think not upon the fault / My father made in compassing the crown" (4.1.293-94), he had prayed before battle, and, on winning it, he proclaims himself several times as God's agent: "O God, Thy arm was here!," "Take it, God, / For it is none but Thine," "take that praise from God / Which is His only" (4.8.106, 111-12, 115-16).

The conflict will bring peace, a peace that is also sanctioned by marriage between the English king and the French princess, but whose costs are still established by Henry, and they too are, in his view, "just," as were his motives: "You must buy that peace / With full accord to all our *just* demands" (5.2.70-71, my italics). Apart from the inevitable bloodshed, which is described with a wealth of detail and bloody images, the real costs of the war are perhaps expressed by Burgundy in a calmer, more reasoned speech on the virtues of peace:

> Why that the naked, poor and mangled peace,
> Dear nurse of arts, plenties, and joyful births,
> Should not in this best garden of the world
> Our fertile France, put up her lovely visage?
> * * *
> Even so our houses and ourselves and children
> Have lost, or do not learn for want of time,
> The sciences that should become our country,
> But grow like savages—as soldiers will
> That nothing do but meditate on blood—
> To swearing and stern looks, diffused attire,
> And everything that seems unnatural. (5.2.34-37, 56-62)

War, even when it is noble and just, has effects on the arts, on the education of one's children, and on the sciences; the soldier becomes barbarous and thinks only of blood, and war is something "unnatural." As we shall also see later, it is often when war is mentioned in broader contexts that the criticism of it is apparently less harsh, but actually illustrates the long-term effects of the upheaval it brings.

Even the enthusiasm of both sides for the marriage between King Henry and the French princess Catherine, which will ensure an heir who is sovereign of the two countries, is subverted by the words of the Chorus in the epilogue:

> Henry the Sixth, in infant bands crowned King
> Of France and England, did this King succeed,
> Whose state so many had the managing
> That they lost France, and made his England bleed.
> (Epilogue, 9-12)

The heir's reign is not destined to last long; the peace that has been bought with so much blood will not guarantee long-term stability and wellbeing, and England—as we have seen in the short analysis of the three parts of *Henry VI*—will soon become a battlefield once more.

Meron claims that "Shakespeare's patriotic play served the cause of Essex's mobilization for the campaign against

Ireland. But even in this play, the war excitement is balanced by the Chorus' allusion to the loss of France during Henry VI's infancy, and thus to the futility of this bloody war,"[29] while Foakes considers, more generally, that "Shakespeare was troubled by issues that remained unresolved for him."[30] Steven Marx offers an interpretation of this work that concentrates on the glorifying, celebratory aspect of war, while recognizing, following Greenblatt, its "pragmatic rationales for war, not to attack militarism itself, but to support it with pragmatic rationales for war that recognize, answer, and contain the pacifist objections that keep cropping up."[31] In the light of what has emerged so far, I think we can see a growing interest on Shakespeare's part in the foundations of the theories of the *jus ad bellum* and the *jus in bello,* filtered through the speeches of the various characters, particularly in *Henry V,* theories that end up expounding the contradictions between what is most opportune politically and what is ethically desirable. While it is true that political calculation proves effective only in the short term and that warlike rhetoric is tainted by the descriptions of the injustices that beset ordinary people, it is equally undeniable that the "pacifist" objections are contained in a framework that, if only verbally, presents recourse to arms as a wholly legitimate action that transcends personal pain and suffering by virtue of a common good, for which the sovereign is, or should be, responsible; the "justice" that is being fought for seems to him, in the last resort, a divine emanation.

Though Jorgensen sees no real change in Shakespeare's attitude towards war with James I's succession to the throne—"the year 1603 marks no radical change in Shakespeare's attitude toward war and peace"—he admits that "it is only natural that he should have paid tactful heed to one of his sovereign's most deeply felt convictions" and that the work *Troilus and Cressida* offers "the most disagreeable picture of war to be found in Shakespeare."[32] In analyzing the transition from *Henry V* to *Troilus and Cressida,* Marx observes, "Instead

of glorifying, it condemns war and those who make it . . . In reducing war from a providential tool to an instrument of chaos, he [Shakespeare] inverts the rhetorical strategies of *Henry V* and also shrinks the proportions of epic to the distortions of satire."[33]

Usually regarded as a "problem play," *Troilus and Cressida* is difficult to classify: it contains tragic elements that mark in particular the long speeches of the Greeks and Trojans, but the events we are shown, including the death of Hector—killed not by his antagonist, but by a band of killers—are presented in a way that comes close to satire. The satirical aspect is emphasized by the figure of Thersites, whose comments on war and its combatants ("All the argument is a whore and a cuckold," [2.3.73]) emphasize the mood of corruption and disintegration, while the action moves towards an essentially sterile ending. The great Homeric heroes are ridiculed and ideals reduced to personal motives dictated by the urge for conquest or vengeance. The rules of knightly honour that had inspired the late-medieval and modern versions of the story of Troy on which Shakespeare had drawn are here negated, and from the prologue on, the value of the subject is disavowed, a mood of uncertainty and instability conditioning the play.

The question of the *jus ad bellum,* which Henry V had discussed at length and in detail with his Council, seeking the foundations for his warlike intentions in the complex Salic law which justified his claims on the French throne, is also tackled by the Trojan Council, which discusses the validity of its own cause: the advisability of keeping Helen, who has been seized by Paris from her legitimate husband Menelaus. Hector seems certain at first, and, following Priam's speech repeating the assurances of the Greeks that if Helen is restored the war can be brought to an end at last without reprisals, expresses himself in these terms:

> Let Helen go.
> Since the first sword was drawn about this question,
> Every tithe soul 'mongst many thousand dismes

> Hath been as dear as Helen; I mean, of ours,
> If we have lost so many tenths of ours,
> *To guard a thing not ours, nor worth to us,*
> Had it our name, the value of one ten,
> *What merit's in that reason which denies*
> *The yielding of her up?*
> * * *
> Brother, *she is not worth what she doth cost*
> *The keeping.* (2.2.17-25, 51-52, my italics)

Troilus, who had initially declared to Pandarus that he could not "fight upon this argument: / It is too starved a subject for my sword" (1.1.96-97), questions his brother's case, claiming that it is the king's honour that should prevail, rather than Hector's materialistic considerations; and even in the face of the objections of his other brother, Helenus, who supports Hector's arguments and accuses Troilus's of being essentially "empty," insists on the advisability of keeping Helen and continuing with the war. Actually, though, personal reasons alone make Troilus enter the battlefield after his Cressida is courted by the Greek Diomedes. Surprisingly, though Hector insists on the total lack of any *jus ad bellum* in the Trojan cause, he agrees with the majority and accepts the continuation of the war. His words, however, bring out all the absurdity of this political decision and it seems beyond doubt that the just war here is the one conducted by the Greeks: seeking to get back property or persons taken by the enemy and demanding reimbursement or restitution enter into the criteria of the just war. To his brothers Troilus and Paris, Hector says,

> The reasons you allege do more conduce
> To the hot passion of distempered blood
> Than to make up a free determination
> 'Twixt right and wrong; for pleasure and revenge
> Have ears more deaf than adders to the voice
> Of any true decision. Nature craves
> All dues be rendered to their owners. Now,

> What nearer debt in all humanity
> Than wife is to husband?
>
> * * *
>
> If Helen, then, be wife to Sparta's king,
> As it is known, *these moral laws*
> *Of nature and of nations speak aloud*
> *To have her back returned. Thus to persist*
> *In doing wrong extenuates not wrong*
> *But makes it much more heavy.*
>
> (2.2.168-76, 183-88, my italics)

The war between Greeks and Trojans will continue until Cassandra's prophecy comes true and Troy is defeated; but, as Meron observes, "In Homer, the malice of the gods frustrates the settlement; in Shakespeare, it is the foolishness of men."[34] It is clear, then, that what we are shown here is the fragility of the principles of the just war; these principles are expounded clearly and coherently, only to be overturned for reasons that are anything but moral. As Quabeck observes, "Hector's convincing argumentation makes it impossible to regard this as one of the greatest wars of all time."[35]

The Trojans are also less than perfect with regard to the *jus in bello.* In their meetings with the Greeks and in the duels they seem to be following a knightly code, and the noblest of them, Hector, spares a tired Achilles during battle. He thinks nothing, however, of killing a Greek warrior simply because he is attracted by his armor. Achilles repays Hector's chivalry by avoiding a direct clash and having him brutally killed by his myrmidons. Even before this act, Achilles is shown in an utterly anti-heroic manner, preferring to loll in his tent with Patroclus than go into battle, while Ulysses and the other Greeks set about scheming to encourage him to take up arms again, creating a climate of rivalry with Ajax, who is presented in the play as vain and obtuse. The scurrilous commentator on the action, Thersites, plays the role of a satirical chorus, and his offensive, irreverent remarks debunk the classical Greek heroes. Thersites declares in the last act,

"Lechery, lechery! Still wars and lechery! Nothing else holds fashion" (5.2.193-94), linking the theme of war with that of lust. Indeed, the images in this play are all linked to infection, contagion, corruption, rotten food, and disintegration. If the religious mythologies of military cultures show war as a struggle against chaos in the attempt to give order and protect the value of sense,[36] a pacifist culture associates war with the loss of sense and the triumph of chance. As Marx, too, observes, "This process of metaphysical decomposition is a central preoccupation of *Troilus and Cressida,*"[37] a decomposition and uncertainty that is also expressed in the very form of the play, where neither the battles nor the stories of love and vengeance seem to proceed straightforwardly or have genuine resolutions precisely because they reflect this decay and the underlying futility of their basic causes. This is a further reason, as we have said, for the "problematic" nature of this work, which "marks a new departure in Shakespeare's treatment of war, one that echoes Hamlet's meditation on Fortinbras' expedition to Poland to fight over a worthless patch of ground 'for a fantasy and trick of fame.'"[38]

While the English history plays still recognized a Machiavellian order in which warfare seemed necessary and justified, both to consolidate the role of the sovereign and to establish social order (however fragile and precarious that order might be and however cruel the process might be), in the only work Shakespeare took from Homeric epic, in which the heroes and their wars had become legendary, he chose to highlight precisely the lack of valid principles to justify the continuation of the war between Greeks and Trojans, as well as behaviour by the main characters that is very far from the ideals of martial heroes. Jacobean drama in general contains many works displaying critical and sometimes satirical attitudes towards militarism, partly, as Jorgensen observed, out of respect for the "pacifist" convictions of the new king, but also, perhaps, because the fall of Essex left the English less certain of their military capability. This climate encouraged

the circulation of the works of Christian humanists such as Erasmus, More, and Castiglione, who condemned military action as immoral and irreligious. War, however, continued to be a feature of Shakespeare's works, but, as is well known, particularly from the great tragedies onwards, attention shifts towards the personality and inner life of the characters, their inner conflicts and their uncertainty as to what they should do. It is true that *Antony and Cleopatra* and, above all, *Coriolanus*, for example, present battles and deal with questions of power, including military power, but I cannot see in them any theoretical reflection on the validity of the causes behind the decisions to go to war or not, at least in the sense we have seen so far.

Caius Marcius, who went down in history as Coriolanus after the conquest of the Volscian city of Corioli, is presented by Plutarch as naturally bellicose and as having handled weapons from boyhood. Unlike his source, Shakespeare makes his mother, Volumnia, responsible for Coriolanus's warlike disposition: she sent him when young "to a cruel war" (1.3.14) to guarantee him a worthy fame, which, in her view, could be obtained only on the field of battle. She says to Coriolanus's wife, "Had I a dozen sons, each in my love alike, and none less dear than thine and my good Martius, I had rather had eleven die nobly for their country than one voluptuously surfeit out of action" (1.3.23-27). Shakespeare's Coriolanus has been subject to various interpretations—by conservative critics as an attack on the mob who destroy a noble patrician out of mere selfish opportunism, and by more progressive critics as a denunciation of the aristocracy for its exploitation of the proletariat. However, there is no doubt that for Coriolanus war represents an end in itself, the one true means of obtaining honour, and right from the start we are immersed in a world in which the state of war is a given, a natural state of affairs. Coriolanus becomes a genuine war machine, permanently drenched in blood, who kills as "butchers killing flies" (4.6.96) and, as Wilson Knight

observes, "War is here violent, metallic, impactuous . . . it is very much a thing of blood and harshness" and "His wars are not for Rome: they are an end in themselves."[39] War as an expression of a code of honour can blind men to other values and be actually preferable to peace.

A servant of Aufidius speaks the following words: "Let me have war, say I. It exceeds peace as far as day does night. It's sprightly, walking, audible, and full of vent. Peace is a very apoplexy, lethargy; mulled, deaf, sleepy, insensible; a getter of more bastard children than a war's a destroyer of men" (4.5.231-36). But, as Marx observes, they are words attributed "to characters who, if not villains, evoke the least of the audience's sympathy,"[40] and they are part of a context in which a frenzied glorification of militarism produces satirical effects. Foakes observes, "The play contains Shakespeare's most powerful critique of the heroic code and of war."[41] *Coriolanus* is a historical and political play, often staged for purposes of propaganda, and at the same time it contains a personal tragedy[42] that arouses interest for the character of the protagonist, who acts "to please his mother and to be partly proud" (1.1.39-40)—this mother-son relation having been seized on by modern psychoanalytic criticism.[43] In the world of this play, war has no need of justifications, and peace, too, which is finally obtained by Coriolanus's conversion, is presented as the result of his mother's insistence rather than as a political decision.

As we have already noted, war also accompanies the great Shakespearean tragedies without being their focus. In *Macbeth* the image of blood, real or imagined, permeates the whole work, and Macbeth himself is presented as a warrior who seems to enjoy the violence inflicted on the enemy. Still, we are a long way from the reflections on the *jus ad bellum* or *jus in bello* we looked at earlier, and in *King Lear* the English soldiers who go to Dover to face the French threat are of little interest in the tragedy. The experience of war has a certain value in Othello's personal history, when in his speech to the

Senate he excuses himself for his unsophisticated language, explaining,

> For since these arms of mine had seven years' pith
> Till now some nine moons wasted, they have us'd
> Their dearest action in the tented field;
> And little of this great world can I speak,
> More than pertains to feats of broil and battle (1.3.83-87)

The martial virtues and experiences on the battlefield are Othello's world, the only terrain on which he is able to move with certainty; and, as he himself says, it was the accounts of his exploits that conquered Desdemona. But this very past which has formed his identity proves wholly inadequate when he has to deal with Iago's lies and understand the innocence of his wife. In the civilian world in which he now finds himself, Othello has no weapons that allow him to understand duplicity, envy, and hypocrisy, and the great military hero is manipulated and tricked, partly because he is extraneous to this society.[44] At the moment of his suicide he recalls the services he has performed and the killing of the Turk who threatened the Venetian republic, almost as if he wanted to make his personal tragedy one with his public role. We might conclude, with Marx, that the defeat of the military hero comes about "not through the triumph of superior arms, but through failures of insight, compassion, and self-control attributable to an identity forged in battle."[45]

For Meron, "Of all the plays, *Hamlet* unquestionably offers the most powerful statement of the futility of war."[46] War, or rather its symbol, makes its entry in the first scene via the Ghost of the former king, dressed in the very armor he wore when he fought against the King of Norway and the Poles. The world of Hamlet *père* was one of violent wars, but Denmark is in danger now, too, threatened by the young Fortinbras. The armor of Hamlet's father not only takes us back to the past, but marks the cultural difference with his son, a student in Lutheran Wittenberg, called back to the court by his father's death. It is Hamlet himself who insists

on this difference, idealizing his father as a warrior king and seeing him as a classical divinity compared with his uncle Claudius, his mother's husband, "so excellent a king that was to this / Hyperion to a satyr" (1.2.139-40). Notoriously, Hamlet often meditates on his failure to carry out the revenge his father's ghost has ordered; in the fourth scene of act 4, the captain of Fortinbras's army, questioned by Hamlet on the mission of the soldiers who are crossing the kingdom, answers in these terms:

> Truly to speak, and with no addition,
> We go to gain a little patch of ground
> That hath in it no profit but the name.
> To pay five ducats, five, I would not farm it.
> Nor will it yield to Norway or the Pole
> A ranker rate should it be sold in fee. (4.4.17-22)

It is a war for a piece of land of no value that is fought only for a principle and that will lead, as Hamlet himself observes, to the death of men. In the soliloquy that follows he naturally recognizes even more his own inadequacy in bringing to completion his mission of revenge, comparing himself to these brave soldiers:

> Witness this army of such mass and charge,
> Led by a delicate prince,
> Whose spirit with divine ambition puffed,
> Makes mouths at the invisible vent
> Exposing what is mortal and unsure
> To all that fortune, death, and danger, dare,
> Even for an egg-shell. Rightly to be great
> Is not to stir without great argument,
> But greatly to find quarrel in a straw
> When honour's at stake. How stand I, then,
> That have a father killed, a mother stained,
> Excitements of my reason and my blood,
> And let all sleep, while to my shame I see
> The imminent death of twenty thousand men
> That, for a fantasy and trick of fame,

> Go to their graves like beds, fight for a plot
> Whereon the numbers cannot try the cause,
> Which is not tomb enough and continent
> To hide the slain?

Hamlet, like the other tragedies we have mentioned, does not have war as its central theme, either in its futile or its glorious aspects, and yet they all speak of war. This soliloquy clearly poses the problem of killing for reasons of honor: 20,000 men will die for "a fantasy and trick of fame," while he is unable to act in accordance with honor. But, as Meron concludes, "Hamlet's shame lies in failing to kill Claudius for honor's sake, not in being a part of a world that kills for honor alone."[47] Hamlet's words on war are nevertheless extremely severe: men die for a useless piece of land, an eggshell. One of the dilemmas that torments Hamlet is precisely the difficulty of killing for revenge, of believing that this would re-establish a violated order. After his death it will be Fortinbras, a prince and military leader, a representative of this world which Hamlet has been unable to become a part of, who treats him as a soldier—"Bear Hamlet like a soldier to the stage / . . . and for his passage / The soldier's music and the rites of war / Speak loudly for him" (5.2.403, 405-7)—including him in his culture of war and violence, a culture associated with Hamlet's father rather than with the young prince himself.

In *Othello* and *Hamlet*, then, the experience of war has negative connotations: in one case a life spent on the battlefield has helped incapacitate Othello from understanding problems in the social and private sphere; in Hamlet's case, however much he may admire the soldiers' bravery, he brings out the futility of the enterprise.

It is now a commonplace to consider Shakespeare's works as being in some way "open." As Manfred Pfister, among others, observes, "The structural openness and indeterminacies of Shakespeare's texts and their self-deconstructing potential have been a crucial prerequisite for their transcultural and European canonization";[48] and it is unfeasible—as well as

unnecessary—to identify Shakespeare's point of view on war as on almost anything else. As we have seen, the history plays certainly pose the question, theoretical and otherwise, of the legitimacy of war, but it is hard to deduce a favoured position from this. Perhaps, among the plays analyzed, only *Troilus and Cressida* shows us a war that is the expression of values that are now tainted without offering a real glorious counterpart. But, though the signs do not point in one direction alone, we have seen, as indicated at the outset, a development in which, with the passage of time, "pacifist" considerations strengthened and increased. And in the tragedies mentioned, in which Shakespeare does not need to pose questions of the *jus ad bellum* and the *jus in bello,* we can notice attitudes that see war and its effects not as something ennobling, but harmful for the individual and the common good.

The last Shakespearean king, Henry VIII, is presented as the bearer of pacifist values. In the play bearing his name—which was probably written in collaboration—the rebels are not killed, but pardoned. Cranmer's prophecy that concludes the work, celebrating the birth of the future Elizabeth I, foresees a serene and peaceful future: "In her days every man shall eat in safety / Under his own vine what he plants, and sing / The merry songs of peace to all his neighbours" (3.5.33-35). This is seen by Jorgensen as a simple ideal, unattainable and actually unacceptable, just like Gonzalo's speech in *The Tempest,* which imagines a place without "treason, felony, / Sword, pike, gun or need of any engine" (2.1.161-62).49 They are essentially utopias or ideals that recall the words of Burgundy cited above in *Henry V,* in which he denounced the barbaric effects—social, artistic, and otherwise—of war. But it is also true, and perhaps superfluous to recall, that in the last plays, the theatre of war is replaced by images of fertility and prosperity, which in iconographic tradition are associated with Irene, the Greek goddess of peace.

Notes

1. William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, Norton Critical Edition, ed. Cyrus Hoy (New York: Norton and Company: 1992), 4.4.18-19. Line references to *Hamlet* are from this edition.

2. Paul A. Jorgensen, *Shakespeare's Military World* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956), 176, 197.

3. Theodor Meron, *Bloody Constraint: War and Chivalry in Shakespeare* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), see p. 46 in particular; and Steven Marx, "Shakespeare's Pacifism," *Renaissance Quarterly* 45, no. 1 (1992): 49-95.

4. Meron, *Bloody Constraint*, 21.

5. R. A. Foakes, *Shakespeare and Violence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 43.

6. Paola Pugliatti, *Shakespeare and the Just War Tradition* (Farnham, Surrey, UK: Ashgate Publishing, 2010).

7. Franziska Quabeck, *Just and Unjust Wars in Shakespeare* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013), 9.

8. St. Augustine, *De Civitate Dei* [The City of God], trans. John Healey, 2 vols. (London: J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1945; rept. 1973), 1.21); see also 7.30 and 12.19. On Augustine and the problem of war, see R.S. Hartigan, "Saint Augustine on War and Killing: The Problem of the Innocent," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 27, no. 2 (1966), 195-204.

9. See St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae,* secunda secundae, quaestio XL, *De Bello.* For an exhaustive account of the theory of the just war, see Pugliatti, *Shakespeare and the Just War Tradition.*

10. *The Riverside Shakespeare*, ed. G. B. Evans (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1974). Except as noted, all Shakespeare quotations and line references are from this edition.

11. Two examples are Machiavelli's *The Prince* (1532), particularly the opening of Chapter 14 on the duties of the Prince in military matters, and Erasmus's *Querela Pacis* (1517), which claims that the most unjust peace is still less harmful than the most just war. On this subject, and on Erasmus in particular, see *La pace e le guerre. Guerra giusta e filosofie della pace,* ed. Annamaria Loche (Cagliari: CUEC, 2005), especially Marialuisa Lussu, "Erasmo: la pace come valore assoluto," 23-43.

12. Marx, "Shakespesare's Pacifism," 63.

13. Foakes, *Shakespeare and Violence,* 50.

14. Jorgensen, *Shakespeare's Military World,* 191.

15. For questions of the dating of *King John*, see Giorgio Melchiori, Introduction to *Re Giovanni*, in *Teatro completo di William Shakespeare, I drammi storici,* I Meridiani, vol. 3 (Milan: Mondadori, 1991), 3:3-4.

16. Jorgensen, *Shakespeare's Military World*, 174.

17. Foakes, *Shakespeare and Violence,* 87.
18. Meron, *Bloody Constraint*, 36.
19. Foakes, Shakespeare and Violence, 90.
20. J. E. Neale, *Queen Elizabeth I* (New York: Jonathan Cape, 1934), 355.
21. Jorgensen, *Shakespeare's Military World,* 185
22. See Quabeck, *Just and Unjust Wars in Shakespeare,* 209-11.
23. Giorgio Melchiori, Introduction to *Enrico IV, Parte II, in Teatro completo di William Shakespeare, I drammi storici,* I Meridiani (Milan, Mondadori, 1991), 1:528.
24. Foakes, *Shakespeare and Violence*, 96.
25. See Norman Rabkin, *Shakespeare and the Problem of Meaning* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 33-62; Stephen Greenblatt, *Shakespearean Negotiations* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), particularly the chapter "Invisible Bullets," 21-65; Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield, "History and Ideology: The instance of *Henry V,*" in *Alternative Shakespeares,* ed. John Drakakis (London: Methuen Publishing, Ltd., 1985), 206-27.
26. Dollimore and Sinfield, "History and Ideology," 226.
27. Alexander Leggatt, *Shakespeare's Political Drama* (London: Routledge, 1988), 133.
28. See Greenblatt, *Shakespearean Negotiations;* and Marx, "Shakespeare's Pacifism."
29. Meron, *Bloody Constraint,* 28.
30. Foakes, *Shakespeare and Violence,* 105.
31. Marx, "Shakespeare's Pacifism," 68.
32. Jorgensen, *Shakespeare's Military World*, 200, 207.
33. Marx, "Shakespeare's Pacifism," 70-71.
34. Meron, *Bloody Constraint*, 69.
35. Quabeck, *Just and Unjust Wars in Shakespeare*, 186.
36. See J. A. Aho, *Religious Mythology and the Art of War: Comparative Religious Symbolism of Military Violence* (Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1981), 9-11.
37. Marx, "Shakespeare's Pacifism," 73.
38. Foakes, *Shakespeare and Violence,* 171.
39. G. Wilson Knight, *The Imperial Theme* (1931; London: Routledge, 1989), 157, 161.
40. Marx, "Shakespeare's Pacifism," 81.
41. Foakes, *Shakespeare and Violence,* 180.
42. See Richard Ambrosini,"*Coriolanus*: dalla storia alla tragedia," *Memoria di Shakespeare 3*, ed. Agostino Lombardo (Rome: Bulzoni, 2003), 141-56.

43. See, for example, Janet Adelman, "'Anger's My Meat': Feeding, Dependency and Aggression in *Coriolanus*," in *Representing Shakespeare: New Psychoanalytical Essays,* ed. Murray M. Schwartz and Coppelia Kahn (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980), 129-50.

44. See Ros King, "'The Disciplines of War': Elizabethan War Manuals and Shakespeare's Tragicomic Vision," in *Shakespeare and War,* ed. Ros King and Paul J. C. M. Franssen (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 18-19.

45. Marx, "Shakespeare's Pacifism," 78.

46. Meron, *Bloody Constraint,* 38.

47. Ibid, 40.

48. Manfred Pfister, "'In States Unborn and Accents Yet Unknown': Shakespeare and the European Canon," in *Shifting the Scene: Shakespeare in European Culture,* ed. Ladina Bezzola Lambert and Balz Engler (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2004), 62.

49. See Jorgensen, *Shakespeare's Military World,* 170, 197.

A Natural Transformation: Shakespeare's Reimagining of Fairies as a Social Critique and an Observation of Ecological Anxiety

Caitlin Waits
Collin College

The figure of the fairy[1] dances through the literary and oral history of the British Isles: goblins writhe around tithes to the Devil, and children battle fairy kings for freedom. Listed in Middle English law alongside witches, fairies took the blame for the inexplicable or unspeakable acts of humans and natures. These dark, demonic fay, not the kindly flower fairies or the petulant pixies popular in current children's media, peppered the tales of rural England into the Early Modern Period, and here William Shakespeare likely first encountered the magical, liminal creatures. As Shakespeare moved from rural life to the urban stage, he brought the fairies with him and turned their devilish deeds to human-like antics, replacing menace with merriment and ill omens with good will. In his works, Shakespeare consistently returns to the folklore and legends of his youth, leaving "hardly a play which does not have allusions to some branch of folklore."[2] In many of his works, Shakespeare employs witches and the occult, as characters metamorphosize and omens shape

Journal of the Wooden O. Vol 17, 165-181
© Southern Utah University Press
ISSN: 1539-5758

narrative, thus driving action. Fairies themselves feature most prominently in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (c. 1595) and *The Tempest* (c. 1610), as Oberon, Titania, Puck, and Ariel all appear on stage. Meanwhile, a colorful description of Queen Mab in *Romeo and Juliet* (c. 1591) also provides useful fodder for Shakespeare's transformation of the fairy folk and later interpretations of the fay. In commercializing, shrinking, and then disembodying his fairies, Shakespeare comments on the excess wealth of the nobles and upper-class Elizabethans, as well as the growing disconnect with nature, while opening up the fairy world for future writers and poets.

As Shakespeare began writing, Queen Elizabeth ruled over England, with uncertainty and change following her every step. Elizabeth espoused religious tolerance while persecuting Catholics, aware of the slippage between the national religion and personal beliefs. She spent money quickly, leaving an immense debt upon her death, yet bolstered the economy, fostering a merchant-capitalist society as England explored Asia and the Americas and drifted further from feudalism. Markets expanded, trade flourished, and a new socioeconomic system rose as urban populations thrived. Many rural people sought wealth in the city and hoped to join the burgeoning middle class. The anxieties growing around a swiftly urbanizing and commercializing nation set the stage for Shakespeare's reinterpretation of England's mythology. In strange times, Shakespeare presented even stranger fairies—tiny and ethereal, but driven by mortal consumption and greed.

The country people of Medieval England would have considered fairies fearsome creatures, likely to steal children, tangle hair, rape women, and blight cattle. They were quick to blame fairies for the unexplainable and the unknowable. Townspeople labeled children born with disorders or abnormalities "changelings" and would abuse or even kill these children since authorities considered them fairies without eternal souls. A woman who bore a child out of

wedlock might say she was "taken by the fairies" to avoid charging a fellow townsperson of rape or to avoid penalties for premarital sex.[3] Fairies and dark magic supposedly caused diseases that swept through herds or crops. In most stories, fairies either embraced wickedness or appeared entirely amoral. They did not feel as humans feel, nor care about morality, ethics, or general kindness. These selfish fairies lived only for entertainment and lacked a soul with which to know virtue. Considered powerful, pernicious, and unpredictable, fairies were not invoked lightly, and euphemisms like "The Good Neighbors" or "The Little People" gained popularity.

Not only wicked, fairies also faced charges of popery and demonism; strict English laws prohibited fairies and any contact with them.[4] Oft accused of witchcraft and devilry, those who consorted with fairies faced death and eternal damnation. As Protestantism gained prominence in England, more and more church writings mentioned fairies, casting them as demons and witches' familiars and painting Fairyland as a place of beauteous deception, reflecting popular perceptions of the Catholic Church. A wise person guarded against fairies with crosses, holy water, iron, and salt, although others believed fairies no longer inhabited England, driven out by the coming of Christianity many centuries before. The laws remained, however, just in case.

The scary fairies lacked the diminutive size often associated with fairies now, although texts featuring tiny witches in England have surfaced.[5] The size of a human, the fairy queen of "Thomas the Rhymer" marries a mortal man.[6] Meanwhile, the fairy king in the "Child Rowland" ballads stands and fences with the boy Rowland as an equal. Although the fairies in many tales appear child-sized, they also have the ability to change, growing from about three feet tall into the giant found in Sir Gawain's adventures with the green knight. Tiny fairies would hardly invoke fear. Instead, creatures large enough to kidnap children, steal cows, and take maidens lurked in the superstitions of England.

Despite the fears they created, the fairies also carried mystical commercial value. While few records of the actual stories remain, fairies known as brownies, similar to Shakespeare's Puck, appear in stories and gossip throughout the Middle English periods, later collected in folklore studies and diaries. In these incarnations, in addition to helping with chores, fairies might bring fortune to a serf doing well in his or her allotted role in life. Good housekeepers, clean dairymaids, and kindly farmers could find a hidden gold piece or have a particularly fertile year. On the other side of the coin, slatternly girls and lazy men could find their hair tied in knots, wake with black and blue bruises from pinches in the night, or face a blight on cows or crops. In rewarding good workers and punishing the bad, fairies mystified commercial exchange: rather than seeking a new lot in life, wise serfs should continue to do their jobs well—excellently—in hopes of gaining supernatural reward.[7] Pre-Shakespearean fairies left coins out of an enigmatic reservoir, but these fairies had nothing to do with actual economic transactions. For the Medieval listener, fairy stories gave reason to mysteries unexplained by religion and to keep serfs content in their social strata.

In addition to oral tradition, ballads, and references in regional texts, fairies existed in literature primarily as allegorical, courtly creatures, surfacing largely in Arthurian romances.[8] These stories existed in lore and oral tradition long before reaching the written record, and they likely influenced Shakespeare's concept of fairy. However, these courtly fairies did little more than direct quests, befuddle knights, and provide a backdrop to adventures far removed from the mortal coil. Roger Lancelyn Green, claims in his article "Shakespeare and the Fairies," that "there was not great fairy literature" before Shakespeare,[9] and while fairies do appear in literature prior to *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Shakespeare metamorphosed the fairies of lore with his own fertile imagination to create a new kind of fairy, one

recognizable to modern audiences and free from the taint of witchcraft and demons.

We can trace Puck's lineage to Robin Goodfellow, a famous retainer of the fairy monarchs featured in his own ballad, "The Mad Merry Pranks of Robin Good-Fellow." In this text, Robin engages in many of Puck's own favorite activities, including listening to gossip, knocking over stools, and causing general mayhem.[10] This ballad also mentions Oberon as the king of fairies, establishing Robin in the role taken by Puck in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Meanwhile, Shakespeare's version of Oberon and the fairy queen Titania come "partly from medieval romance, partly from classical mythology, and partly from the theory that [fairies] were pagan deities who had survived the Christian era."[11] Prior to Shakespeare, the Queen of Fairy bore various names; Shakespeare chose his own names with new significance.[12] Queen Mab first entered literature riding her miniature coach into Mercutio's dream, and Titania, whose name comes from Greek mythology, debuted in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Shakespeare shrank the fay as well, using names and descriptions to convey their trifling size: Mustardseed, Peaseblossom, and Mote, who dance with Titania in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, drip dew on flowers, build coats of bat wings, and fight away threatening bugs and beetles.[13] Meanwhile, Ariel, the airy sprite from *The Tempest*, functions more like the sylphs of Paracelsus, who were themselves drawn from the nymphs of Greek mythology. Ariel is more air than matter, and while apparently more powerful than many of Shakespeare's earlier fairies, is also bound to the whims and wants of a man. While these fairies may not seem terribly different from the lore and ballads from which Shakespeare drew them, shrinking the fairies allowed Shakespeare to critique the new social and economic norms of the Elizabethan world, using the doubly liminal fairies on stage to embody concerns regarding conspicuous consumption and humanity's divorce from natural cycles. Furthermore, by ensuring their general

benevolence and inability to harm men, Shakespeare opened the door to Faerie for later comic and romantic writers.

As people moved from the countryside to newly-burgeoning cities in droves, beliefs about fairies moved and shifted with them. The social and economic purpose of fairies "extended outwards to take on new and unfamiliar purposes."[14] No longer would a cosmopolitan city-dweller blame fairies for knotted hair or stolen children, but he or she might just look to the fairies for monetary gain. As fairy beliefs faded, the fay lost their places in households and wild glens, but found a new home in the poems and plays of the Early Modern period.

Queen Mab, Titania, and Oberon engage economically in trade and consumerism, new ideas to fairykind. Marjorie Swann explores how fairies, while previously part of "precapitalist economic transactions," now began to venture into the capitalist domain.[15] In *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Oberon and Titania's verbal exchanges hinge on physical exchange: Oberon wants Titania's foster child, yet the fairy monarchs arrive at an impasse as Oberon holds nothing Titania desires. The foster child himself represents the world of commercial trade as his mother, once one of Titania's handmaidens, used to sit with Titania to observe the trade and merchant economy of India. Titania describes the scene: "[She,] Marking th'embarked traders on the flood . . . / Would imitate and sail upon the land, / To fetch me trifles, and return again / As from a voyage, rich with merchandise."[16] The traders pay homage to the fairy queen; they also amass plenty of money on their trips. The fairy queen's fascination with commerce and trade will be her downfall, and "[the fairies] suffer by the touch of the earthy and actual" as Titania and Oberon play very human games with commerce.[17] Titania originally rejects capitalistic transaction as she clings to the child. However, Titania cannot escape the exchange, as Oberon soon plays a cruel trick that forces her to capitulate

to the capitalism invading her fairy kingdom, exchanging the foster child to regain her reason and status.

In lore, the fairy kingdom often symbolizes Nature, as fairies live in mounds underground, dance among mushrooms, and inhabit the wild lands beyond human development. The fairies thus embody humanity's fear of Nature and Nature's own agency to fight back against human dominance, as the fairies will kidnap those who venture too far into the wildlands and may reap revenge on overzealous harvesters. Medieval Europeans held little regard for protecting the environment and instead sought to tame and cultivate the wild world through farms, parks, and curated forests. However, slippage between human desires and human abilities ensured people could not completely control the natural world. Farmers and serfs found themselves bound to Nature, working in response to weather, crop cycles, animal needs, and seasons in general. Yet in the city, natural seasons and crop cycles had less bearing on everyday life.[18] And as cities grew and the natural world came more and more under humanity's dominance, Early Modern people looked back on nature with nostalgia (consider the scenes of pastoral bliss in many Shakespearean works).[19] However, in order to feel this nostalgia, the dangers of nature had to cease. In the same way that humans had tamed most of the wild spaces of England by the late 1500s, so fairies gradually came under the taming influence of the urbanized Shakespeare.

Titania and Oberon do engage in natural—traditionally fairy—activities: their squabbles raise storms all over Athens, and they revel and sleep in the forest, surrounded by flowers and on guard against forest creatures. Yet the guard *against* the mice, bats, hedgehogs, and owls marks a separation between the fairies and the natural world. In much of lore, fairies ride animals or keep wild creatures as pets, signifying their place in the wild. Yet in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, the fairies war with Nature. They think of natural things in a way humans might: as beds, clothes, and nuisances.

In addition to stepping outside their place in the natural order, the fairy monarchs also display a new benevolence towards humans, beyond the leaving of money or gold, which mirrors new attitudes towards the natural world. Titania and Oberon come to Athens in order to bless the marriage bed of Theseus and Hippolyta. Rather than steal babies, they want to bless the rulers with children. Furthermore, Titania befriends a human woman and adopts her child when the woman dies. She did not steal a child and leave a changeling; instead, the human woman entrusts Titania with her son. The fairies do sport with the rustics and Athenian youth, but at the end of the evening, all the mortals find themselves returned to their proper shapes, restored to their proper loves, and on their respective ways to a happy life, their only damage an odd dream dancing in the back of their minds. Titania and Oberon reflect Shakespeare's first, largest change to fairies: mortal benevolence. In the same way, the Early Modern people lost their fear of the natural world and began to look upon the tamed land with a nostalgic eye, thinking only of what they could receive from nature rather than the frightening wilds which once prompted nightmares.

Although Queen Mab does not offer the kindness we see in Oberon and Titania, she does not wield the malice of the fairies in lore. Furthermore, miniscule Mab ("no bigger than an agate stone"[20]) cannot physically engage with humans, but is relegated only to their sleeping minds, where she dispenses justice in the form of sweet dreams or nightmares. Mab does not even appear on stage; instead, audiences learn of her existence in Mercutio's speech. Mab softens the traditional fairy lore and also gleefully rides into capitalism, flaunting new ideas about consumerism. Fairy queens traditionally bring economic gain to brave knights, but Queen Mab revels in her own riches. The miniature fairy queen gleefully navigates the Veronan reflection of the "Elizabethan urban Jungle"; as Swann writes, "Mab races through the world of avaricious professionals, not householders for whom a coin

is windfall."[21] He does so in the most luxurious manner available, driving the newly invented vehicle owned only by the richest and most powerful Elizabethans, a coach. A coach's decorations also conveyed status, and in *Romeo and Juliet*, Shakespeare spends a good amount of time describing Mab's ride:

> Her wagon-spokes made of long spinners' legs,
> The cover of the wings of grasshoppers,
> The traces of the smallest spider's web,
> The collars of the moonshine's wat'ry beams,
> Her whip of cricket's bone; the lash of film,
>
> * * *
>
> Her chariot is an empty hazelnut.[22]

Mab arrives, a cutting-edge consumer, in a highly-detailed coach. The emphasis Shakespeare places on her smallness highlights her difference from fairies of rural lore; and her coach made of and decorated with natural refuse daintily criticizes Elizabethan socioeconomics. Unable to harm humans, she no longer represents humanity's fear of Nature.

Mab's small size and lack of agency soon carried tiny, essentially harmless fairies into the early modern literary scene. Michael Drayton's "Nymphidia," published in 1627,[23] features Queen Mab and King Oberon as insect-sized fairies caught up with their own jealousies and intrigues as they mimic humans with coaches and jewels made from snail shells and insect pieces. William Browne, in the mid 1620's, published a description of one decadent fairy feast featuring "crammed grasshopper," "two hornets legs," "a batt [sic] . . . serv'd with the petty-toes," "three fleas in souse," and "the udder of a mouse."[24] The grotesque feast mocks the Spanish court, which had tried to impress King Charles just before the composition of the poem, and reiterates the idea that fairies lived in miniaturized versions of English court life. Robert Herrick wrote of miniature fairies in the mid-1600s in his "Oberon" poems, telling-tales of tiny things

which featured consumerist fairies. The stories pay lavish attention to the accessories, furniture, and other possessions of the fairies, echoing those often accumulated by wealthy Elizabethans.[25] Though Early Modern poetry mocked the consumerist lifestyles characteristic of the wealthy, the fairies also reinforced the right to power and riches, deferring to those interested in climbing social ladders. Swann notes that fairies "naturalize[d] the elaborate feasts, clothing, and houses of the genteel," and poets clouded the world of social and economic change which created the glittering opulence of the Stuarts and their court.[26] By the mid-1600s, miniscule and ridiculous fairies no longer held sway over the populace in fear, but rather reinforced society's rules through humor, again normalizing and mystifying the practices of the extremely wealthy, even as they parodied excess. While they returned to immoral, intemperate, and hedonistic ways, the fairies written after Shakespeare seem entirely too mortal to frighten as did the haunting creatures of rural superstition.

In addition to shrinking down to a harmless size and entering mortal commerce, Queen Mab further steps away from the natural world, exchanging commune with nature and living flowers for a coach made of dead bugs, nut hulls, and other detritus. Although created from natural ingredients, Mab's coach represents death and decay, partially to mock the fleetingness of wealth, but also to highlight the English consumers' divide from Nature and natural cycles.[27] The city of London exemplified the disconnect with nature sweeping through England, and Shakespeare, raised in the country, found himself optimally placed to observe changing attitudes. By the time he wrote *The Tempest*, Shakespeare returned fairies to the natural world, but he placed them so under the control of people that they lost their wildness all the same.

Shakespeare drew fairies into the mortal realm, and the fairies could not escape the taint of mortality. As Shakespeare again brings fairies on stage in *The Tempest* in 1610, the

fay can almost feel human emotions—a burden no fairy before ever received. Intrinsically powerful, Ariel wields more power than Titania, Oberon, and Mab combined. He creates storms, dreams, and illusions of feasts and masques on Prospero's island. Yet humans completely bind Ariel. When Prospero arrives on the island, he finds Ariel trapped in a tree, imprisoned by the dead witch Sycorax. Prospero himself enslaves Ariel, augmenting his own magic with that of the slippery sprite.[28] In *The Tempest*, fairies and demons hold little agency, as humans control magic, that control extending to Ariel and the other sprites of the island. This change reflects the growing human dominance over nature as explorers took English interest to new, untamed worlds and returned from those worlds with riches and rich tales. Furthermore, in controlling the representation of folkloric creatures, Shakespeare again ensures his creations feature enough differences from fairy lore to open them up for later writers.

Nature and fairies no longer held sway over the Early Modern English imagination by 1610. In fact, in *The Tempest*, the role of "monstrous other" has moved from the fairy Ariel to the native man, the unfortunate Caliban. Beyond the liminal space of the theater, European explorers and merchants established colonies, solidified trade routes, and pushed forward with exploration of "new worlds." Europeans now nursed little fear of nature, and for the most part, found nature conquerable. The new danger lay in the Natives, brown-skinned folk who may offer food to the explorers or attempt to kill the pale Europeans. Shakespeare likely read various travel logs and journals, and readers find a reflection of those exotic texts in *The Tempest*. In this play, nature no longer influences the characters; Prospero can control storms and rain on the island via Ariel. While the storm Ariel creates sinks a ship and washes men ashore, Prospero guides every breeze. Instead of Nature, Prospero feels anxiety about Caliban, who represents the barbaric natives found in many

Early Modern travel tales, as fairies lost their hold over the European imagination in the face of new worlds and strange exploits.

Ariel's lack of body also indicates humanity's rise over nature. The fairies prior to Ariel shrank and lost the ability to harm humans; Ariel cannot even touch humans and only influences them through storms, songs, and visions. In *The Tempest*, fairies lost the ability to directly interact with the physical world and found themselves shunted to the in-between dream space of imagination and lost islands, where later writers discovered them, added wings, and set them to bedazzling flowers and simpering for children. Ariel, completely under Prospero's control and without weight or heft, represents the perfect fairy creature for literature: magical and enchanting, but non-threatening to mortals. Ariel also represents humankind's idealized version of nature: again, magical but thornless, existing for people to use and set aside, admire and retire at will.

Shakespeare both changed and standardized fairies more than any writer before him. Though Shakespeare first wrote about small fairies, the tradition of miniature and benevolent fey had grown so ingrained by the eighteenth century that Samuel Johnson in his notes on Shakespeare remarks "[Ariel] and his companions are of the fairy kind, an order of Beings to which tradition has always ascribed a sort of diminutive agency, powerful but ludicrous, a humorous and frolick controlment of nature."[29] These fairies, once too frightening to speak of, were laid out for writers, ready for allegory, satire, pedantry, and kitsch. Later Renaissance writers used Shakespeare's mini, decadent fairies to satirize the new social order as they competed to create the tiniest metaphors. In these tiny tales, the fairies represented humanity's undying longing for a life of fun, filled with belongings and endless entertainment. From the Restoration period and into the Victorian period, fairies entered nurseries and children's stories, gaining wings through William Blake's etchings for

A Midsummer Night's Dream. Fairies lost their connection to the wildness of nature, instead posturing as the sweet spirits of domestic gardens, reflecting the Restoration and Victorian fascination with cultivated wildness, gardens designed to look "natural." Meanwhile fairy stories no longer explained the darker side of Nature, but took on didactic purposes in the school room. In the Romantic period, poets began to restore fairies to roles found in traditional lore with poems like Keats' "La Belle Dame sans Merci," just as the Romantic poets sought a return to nature. Yet the fairies, like the poets, could never return to the full wildness of a world before domestication as Industrialism pulled society into a steam and smoke-filled future.

J.M. Barrie found fairies in Kensington Garden in *The Little White Bird*, and he gave fairies an origin in *Peter Pan.* Born from babies' laughs, Barrie's fairies prove far too small to hurt humans, even when they try.[30] Barrie's fairies first reflect the tameness of nature in the public gardens of London, and then inhabit the wild jungle of Neverland. However, Neverland proves less wild than it appears, as Peter controls the island, bending it to his whim and imagination. Barrie relies heavily on Victorian ideas of fairies and nature, continuing to show a natural world subservient to humans, similar to the magical island of *The Tempest*. Furthermore, as fairies continued to fascinate popular culture, in 1917 Elsie and Polly Write claimed to have encountered fairies while wandering the glen in Cottingley, England. The girls did not run as sensible medieval girls would have done when encountering the fay, but instead they took photos of the creatures. People flocked to the area, determined to acquire their own fairies, and invading the glen in Cottingley to do so. By the turn of the century, the role of fairies in culture had irrevocably shifted; no longer fearsome or mystical, they only existed to delight and enchant.

From the enduring plays of Shakespeare to *Peter Pan,* fairies managed to remain in popular culture despite dramatic

shifts in values, norms, and beliefs. Perhaps this phenomenon has something to do with humanity's continuing fascination with and fear of otherness in nature. Although Victorian poets could not return to natural fairies, tides seem to be turning as twenty-first century anxieties about the environment invade cultural consciousness and humans again attempt to restore and preserve wild spaces. Current trends in fiction split fairies between dainty, winged ballerinas in flowers—popular in children's books—and darker, lore-based fairies in young adult and adult literature. Holly Black, in her *Tithe* series, draws heavily on old fairy lore with merciless, selfish fay trafficking with the devil and offering a tithe of blood. In many other recent novels and short stories, fairies lurk below human society—dark fairies preying on the weak, the lonely, and the unfortunate, while "good" fairies either attempt to stop them or at least ignore their chilling antics. These oft-frightening fay reflect the current tension with nature, yet struggle to find a way back to nature through the layers of domestication which humans have spent the last millennium constructing.

William Shakespeare experimented endlessly in his plays, mixing old stories, Early Modern thinking, and new words to create entirely unique ways of considering age-old human questions. His advances in folklore set the stage for a new way to think about fairies and reflected changing attitudes towards the natural world. Rather than let fairy beliefs fade as society modernized, Shakespeare "saw the inherent beauty of the popular mythology, and then presented it to the world with all the gorgeousness and beauty which he alone could give it."[31] By collecting folklore and combining it with a dash of his own inventiveness, Shakespeare drew fairies into the new consumer culture narrative, changing the weft of Fairyland as he disembodied and commercialized its denizens. From Blake to Barrie to Black, readers continue to feel Shakespeare's influence on the world of Faerie. Although many of us stopped looking for fairies in the garden long

ago, we cannot help but be enchanted by the delightful and sometimes dangerous fairies who fly across screens, nudge into our nightmares, and dance across pages today.

Notes

1. This paper uses the terms "fairies" and "fay" interchangeably, as Early Modern texts use a variety of spellings on the word. Spellings to denote otherworldly, fantastic beings include "fayry," "fairy," "faery," "faerie," "fey," "fae," and "fay." Modern fiction writers have not selected one spelling as standard, many preferring more creative or archaic spellings as current fairy stories twist back to lore. Furthermore, the term "fairy" will be lowercase to refer to the beings, while the uppercase refer to Fairyland, sometimes called Faerie.

2. Kenneth Muir, "Folklore and Shakespeare," *Folklore* 92, no. 2 (1981), 231, http://www.jstor.org.library.collin.edu/stable/1259478.

3. Mary Ellen Lamb, "Taken by the Fairies: Fairy Practices and the Production of Popular Culture in *A Midsummer Night's Dream,*" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 15, no. 3, (2000), 286, doi:10.2307/2902152.

4. Dale M. Blount, "Modification in Occult Folklore as a Comic Device in Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream*," *Fifteenth Century Studies* 9 (1984): 1.

5. While tales from Wales, discovered in the early 2000s, include fairies small enough to live in flowers, these fairies likely did not influence Shakespeare. First, no written record of these inches-tall fay exists prior to Shakespeare. Second, in a time when many people did not read and most people did not travel far from their birthplace, local legends often did not move far beyond local boundaries. If he did hear of these miniscule fay, Shakespeare aptly used them in his writing to create a new political statement.

6. Arthur Quiller-Couch, ed., "Thomas the Rhymer," *The Oxford Book of English Verse: 1250–1900*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1919), http://www.bartleby.com/101/367.html.

7. Fairies also received blame for local theft.

8. Mentions of fairies and Fairyland in Arthurian legends include Sir Gawain's bright green adversary in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight,* Arthur's sometime-sister Morgan le Fay, and the fairy island of Avalon, to where many stories send a dying king Arthur to heal and hopefully return to England someday.

9. Roger Lancelyn Green, "Shakespeare and the Fairies," *Folklore* 73, no 2 (1962), 89, http://www.jstor.org.library.collin.edu/stable/1258609.

10. "The mad merry pranks of Robin Good-fellow. To the tune of, Dulcina," London: Printed for F. Coles, T. Vere, and J. Wright.,

[between 1663 and 1674], http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.baylor.edu/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:47012524.

11. Muir, "Folklore and Shakespeare," 237.

12. Edmund Spenser, *The Faerie Queene*, ed. Carol V. Kaske (Indianapolis/Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 2008). Edmund Spenser wrote about fairies in his epic *Faerie Queene*, first published in 1590, and he employed courtly fairy lore, drawing on medieval romances to flatter Queen Elizabeth by portraying her as the just, beautiful, and wise fairy queen Gloriana. His piece is almost purely allegorical, and his mortal-sized fairies feature little agency. Spenser ensured his fairy poetry upheld the ideals of Elizabethan society; fairies offer moral lessons. Spenser's fairies do not engage in commerce, nor do they comment on humanity's changing relationship with the rural and natural worlds.

13. William Shakespeare, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, in *William Shakespeare Complete Works*, ed. Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen (New York: The Modern Library, 2007), 376, 382.

14. Lamb, "Taken by the Fairies," 302.

15. Marjorie Swann, "The Politics of Fairylore in Early Modern English Literature," *Renaissance Quarterly* 43, no. 2 (2000): 452, doi:10.2307/2901875.

16. Shakespeare, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, 382.

17. Ronald F. Miller, "*A Midsummer Night's Dream:* The Fairies, Bottom, and the Mystery of Things," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 26, no. 3 (1975), 263.

18. For a more complete discussion on how weather and environmental events affected Medieval England, see Bruce M. S. Campbell, "Nature as Historical Protagonist: Environment and Society in Pre-industrial England," *The Economic History Review*, New Series, 63, no. 2 (2010): 281-314. http://www.jstor.org.library.collin.edu/stable/27771614.

19. Sylvia Bowerbank, *Speaking for Nature: Women and Ecologies of Early Modern England* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2004).

20. William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*, in *William Shakespeare Complete Works,* ed. Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen (New York: The Modern Library, 2007), 1690.

21. Swann, "Politics of Fairylore," 457.

22. Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*, 1690.

23. Roughly 35 years after *Romeo and Juliet*.

24. Gordon Goodwin, ed., *The Poems of William Browne of Tavistock: Edited by Gordon Goodwin, with an Introduction by A.H. Bullen, Vol. II,* London: Lawrence & Bullen, 1893.

25. John Masefield, ed., *The Poems of Robert Herrick* (London: E. Grant Richards, 1906), 81-86, 107–9, 146–50.

26. Swann, "The Politics of Fairylore," 469.

27. Nothing other than people can come to the city to grow and thrive: instead of flourishing gardens, teeming pools, and fields ranged with lively calves, the city features bustling markets hawking wilting vegetables, dead fish, and hunks of meat. Many men, single or living as bachelors with wives in the country, frequented inns and common houses, taking another step away from the natural world as they only engaged with cooked food. In London, the Thames river, a small source of wildness running through the city, carried foul, polluted water from further upstream into the city and soon deposited ten-fold pollution into the murky harbors of London. In addition to polluting, the people of London exerted dominance over the Thames river in the form of bridges, building so many in the 1400s that the Thames river actually froze twenty-four times in four hundred years. England, as an island nation, typically enjoys temperate weather, and the freezing of the Thames is entirely a human-made phenomenon.

28. Swann, "The Politics of Fairylore," 469.

29. Walter Raleigh, ed., *Johnson on Shakespeare: Essays and Notes Selected and Set Forth with an Introduction.* (London: Henry Frowde, 1908): 66.

30. J.M. Barrie, "Chapter 3: Come Away, Come Away!" *Peter Pan* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1987), 23.

31. Henry B. Wheatley, "The Folklore of Shakespeare," *Folklore* 27, no. 4 (1916): 378.

UNDERGRADUATE PAPER

Marriage, Credit-Worthiness, and the Woman Chained in *The Comedy of Errors*

Jessica Huhn
Mount St. Mary's University

In his belief that Shakespeare's *The Comedy of Errors* is "a legitimate farce in exactest consonance with the philosophical principles and character of farce, as distinguished from comedy," Samuel Taylor Coleridge claims that the play is more reliant on situational slapstick than on the communication of a moral.[1] However, those who embrace Coleridge's labeling do not appear to discern that the play's illustrations of mistaken identity and debt, including its patriarchal resolution, are meant to criticize structures resembling what Craig Muldrew calls elsewhere "econom[ies] of obligation."[2] Literally, Muldrew's "economy of obligation" refers to the early modern English capitalist structure of commodity exchange. One's level of credit determined his or her credit-worthiness, or reputation, within society; a single accusation of failure to pay a debt often led to permanent damage to one's social status and economic power.[3]

Muldrew's concept is clearly in circulation in financial and social forms within *The Comedy of Errors*.[4] The legal accounting dilemma of the literal chain faced by the

Journal of the Wooden O. Vol 17, 182-212
© Southern Utah University Press
ISSN: 1539-5758

Antipholi and Angelo parallels the difficulty that Adriana faces in preserving her reputation as a woman of her time. After all, in order to maintain a reasonable social status, Adriana is bound to pay a perpetual debt of obedience to her husband through deference and chastity.[5] She is bound by the contract of her marriage vows, which functions in a similar manner to an economic contract formed by an exchange and verbal promise.[6] As shown through the dilemma of the chain and the character of Adriana, the problematic societal construct of female reputation is synonymous with the credit-worthiness construct of accounting; a woman may instantly lose her credibility if others judge that she has stepped outside of the traditional female role or if her husband has violated the marriage-bond through infidelity. Shakespeare draws parallels between the commercial and marital bonds to criticize the fact that one's reputation, within both economies, is dependent on others' actions and judgments. Also, he reminds his audience that these economies, in their ideal forms, should not equal each other in method. While commercial transactions of credit are naturally one-sided in their government of the exchange of goods, with creditor and creditee defined through each respective exchange, marital transactions must be enacted with a mutual obligation of faithfulness between husband and wife in which both parties constantly fulfill roles as givers and receivers of credit.

Before analyzing the structures of debt and reputation within the play, I must discuss the concept of "economy of obligation" as outlined by Craig Muldrew. This structure of exchange based on credit preceded the modern institution of banking and was essential in an environment where cash-on-hand was scarce.[7] Credit, which gained its name from the Latin word *credo*, meaning "I believe" or "I trust," was defined by a trust in another's faithfulness to monetary promises. In fact, the words "credit" and "trust" were usually considered to be synonymous in this economic context.[8] If one granted credit to another, it "meant that [he or she was]

willing to trust someone to pay [him or her] in the future." Meanwhile, one who possessed credit-worthiness "could be trusted to pay back . . . debts" within his or her society.[9] As this system was grounded on the Christian God as the epitome of moral order, high credit-worthiness translated to a strong reputation and a formidable societal standing.

Conversely, if one was taken to court, arrested, or otherwise subject to legal consequence for defaulting on one's debts, he or she faced permanent damage to his or her social status and economic power, regardless of his or her previous reputation. Sadly, the "economy of obligation" depended on the judgment of others, often punished the innocent for acquired debts, and offered few to no opportunities for the publicly accused debtor to be redeemed. Even if debt was seen as a violation of God's law, reconciliation was rarely available; earthly forgiveness of debts in the spirit of Christ's mercy was usually not offered.[10] In one example, William Chaytor was "allwaise under a cloud and never [able to] appear publickly to make [his] fortune" after being arrested for failure to pay a single debt out of his several outstanding obligations.[11] None of these debts were self-incurred, though, as all were "inherited from his father."[12] These acquired debts weighed so heavily on him that, while he was being transferred from prison to prison, he dreamed of being violently pursued by the debtee who pressed charges against him; this debtee sought to "castrate him with a penknife while he slept."[13] As Chaytor's experience unfortunately shows, one's identity in this economy was subject to the opinion of peers within society. In addition, sanctioned, credit-based identity acquisition, or even condoned identity theft, could have disastrous consequences for the inheritors of debt.

In Shakespeare's adaptation of his original source material, Plautus's comedy *Menaechmi*, the dramatist eschews an anarchy-filled Epidamnum in favor of an Ephesus where the economy of obligation reigns without restraint. Within this Ephesus, individuals' interpretations of society's

harsh laws unjustly condemn the innocent through mistaken assumptions. As Colette Gordon explains, the Plautine Epidamnum is rife with thievery. From the start, everyone in this source play expects to steal and be stolen from, even before the non-native twin arrives. Distrust runs rampant, especially since no consequences are threatened for deceptions or other credit violations. The play ends with the same chaos, as the native and non-native twins escape responsibility for their numerous acts of theft; no debts or other penalties are incurred by either.[14]

In a reversal of the Plautine structure, Shakespeare frames his Ephesus in *The Comedy of Errors* as an environment where the law will be enforced at all costs. In this thinly veiled London, Shakespeare criticizes, rather than glorifies, the credit structures of society. The play opens with Duke Solinus sentencing the merchant Egeon to death because Egeon has violated the law that prohibits Syracusians from setting forth in Ephesus. This law prevails over compassion and even morality. As Solinus maintains, "Were it not against [Ephesus's] laws, . . . [his] soul would sue as advocate for [Egeon]" (1.1.142-45). Such strict interpretations of the law, caused by cases of mistaken identity, result in individuals' acquisition of debtors' roles.[15] In the most prominent example, Antipholus of Ephesus falls into debt after refusing to pay the goldsmith Angelo for a chain that he never received. Angelo assumes that the Ephesian twin is violating commercial trust in his refusal to pay because Angelo had mistakenly handed over the chain to Antipholus's twin, the Syracusian Antipholus. The judgment of Angelo is seen as binding and severely threatens the Ephesian Antipholus's marked reputation. It does not matter that the Ephesian Antipholus is innocent or that Angelo's accusation was motivated by his own need to pay an outstanding debt and protect his standing.[16] Angelo's erroneous assumption causes the blameless Ephesian Antipholus much suffering, as Antipholus cannot prove his innocence in the force of Angelo's case against him and as

the exchange of the chain stands as a legal contract and receipt. Antipholus thus forfeits all control of his credit-worthiness to a single external mistake.[17] Therefore, despite the common belief that the play's implausible twin plot is yet another mechanism of farce, Shakespeare did not enact such a reversal of legal structures from the Plautine source purely for comedic purposes. The same errors of mistaken identity in improbable situations that generate humor may simultaneously create situations in which the innocent are obviously wronged, and thus highlight systematic problems with debts created by assumptions. In his own characters' unjust plunge into debt, Shakespeare questions the seemingly immovable elements of credit-worthiness and the law, especially that of debt's permanent threat to one's reputation through others' accusations.

Shakespeare not only criticizes this commercial economy of obligation, but also draws parallels between this economy and societal expectations for married women, which form a formal credit structure in their own right. He observes that society can condemn a betrothed woman under its strict laws for any supposed violation of her marriage-bond and criticizes the idea that a woman can so easily be framed as a permanent debtor through the wrongful judgment of those who surround her. Shakespeare's decision to situate his work in Ephesus, rather than the Epidamnum of Plautus's play, is ideal for the exploration of problematic aspects of the legal-marital institution of obligation. According to Laurie Maguire, Ephesus's mythical origins were with the Amazons, domineering warrior women who refused to marry or otherwise submit to men. St. Paul was likely concerned that Ephesian women of his own time modeled their behavior on that of their mythical pagan ancestors, in opposition to the Christian way, which equated marital submission with human submission to God. Thus, St. Paul's directives on the woman's proper role in Christian marriage appear in his letter to the Ephesians.[18] Most notably, in Ephesians 5, St. Paul

admonishes wives to "be subject to their husbands as to the Lord . . . as the Church is subject to Christ," and insists that the husband and wife become joined as "one flesh."[19] Since Christ both reigns over and serves the church, though, St. Paul asserts that the husband must not subjugate his spouse, just as the wife must not dominate her husband. Instead, husbands must serve their wives and maintain complete devotion to them, in return for their wives' willing acquiescence.[20]

Also, in the same chapter, St. Paul maintains that anyone, male or female, who "indulges in sexual immorality" will not "inherit the kingdom of God." Thus, St. Paul advocates for a marital economy of obligation in which the wife and husband are joined in a responsibility to remain sexually faithful to each other and to submit themselves entirely to each other, out of profound love.[21] However, in the English conception of St. Paul's instructions, the "one flesh" union of marriage was understood as a moment when only the wife lost an independent identity. After all, while wives were under divinely enforced obligation to obey their husbands, husbands were to "love their wives as they love their own bodies," a directive that seemingly endorsed possession of the wife as if she were nothing more than an object.[22] With the above interpretation, the Ephesian letter supported and informed the flourishing Elizabethan concept that "love goeth downward [while] duty goeth upward." This idea established that a man must rule over those in his household with love, while the wife, as his submissive helper, must prioritize duty towards her husband over love for him.[23] In fact, ministers such as Robert Cleaver perpetuated the idea that "the husband ought not to be satisfied that he hath robbed the wife of her virginity, but in that he hath possession and use of her will."[24] Thus, the husband had absolute mastery in marriage, as God had full control over humankind; the "one flesh" was the male body. For these reasons, Shakespeare chose the location to which St. Paul first gave these directives for female marital duty for his own portrayal of marital economy.

In the early modern period, such Pauline directives had been retained as an integral part of English rules for ideal female deference, and social and Christian laws were linked. The state-sanctioned "Homily on the State of Matrimony," as well as the 1559 *Book of Common Prayer's* recommended sermon to be read after the sacrament itself, paired St. Paul's admonition with that of St. Peter, who stated, "Let wyves be subject to their owne housbandes." Furthermore, the homily reminded married individuals that "God," rather than Peter or Paul, "hath commanded that [the wife] should acknowledge the authoritie of the husband."[25] In addition, the "Homily on the State of Matrimony" asserted that the wife, as the "weaker vessel," must be treated with moderation, as love brings the wife's "heart in[to the husband's] power and will." Again, however, the wife was given the greater burden: she was directed to "obey [her husband], and cease from commanding, and performe subiection," as being "ready at hand at her husband's commandement . . . apply[ing] her selfe to his will . . . [and] seek[ing] his [contentment]" was thought to create an environment of concord.[26] The vows of marriage were explicitly viewed as a contract by the Anglican church, which further supported this idea of a nuptial credit structure.

To at least some degree, the marriage-contract was a mutual verbal promise of fidelity, and it suggested that the "one flesh" construction granted the wife and the husband equal power over each other's bodies.[27] However, the wife was also contractually bound to obey the specific female rules for deference mentioned above, which were considered to hold greater importance.[28] These Protestant ideas were in accord with the Catholic concept of matrimony, which also held marriage as a contractual bond with the greater obligation given to the wife. Notably, though, the Catholic sacrament contained a blessing directed towards the bride alone. This prayer named the woman as an "inseparable helpmate" to man "joined in . . . a yoke of love and peace,"

who must be "faithful and chaste," "fortify her weakness by firm discipline . . . be graceful in demeanour and honoured for her modesty. . . [and] fruitful in offspring."[29] While the Anglican rite redirected the nuptial prayer towards both spouses, it nevertheless retained the Catholic language in its references to ideal *godly* women. In both cases, a wife was directed to love her husband like Rachel and use wisdom like Rebecca. Notably, though, the Anglican prayer added explicit language of deference not present in its source. The phrase "long-lived and faithful like Sara" became "faithful and obedient like Sara."[30] That said, during the playwright's time, the significance of the one-sided interpretation of these rules had decreased.

In his exploration of these socially constructed bonds, Shakespeare establishes two firmly stratified spheres based on gender roles within the setting of *The Comedy of Errors,* the commercial world of obligation for men and the marital domain of obligation for women. The female "business" is firmly confined to the home and allows only for private transactions between the husband and wife. Meanwhile, the "business" which "lies out o' door" (2.1.11) is permitted to men alone, for only they may conduct commerce in public and build their reputation through the marketplace.[31]

Each of these gender-based spheres holds a corresponding bond. Men are bound by agreements enacted through the exchange of goods, exemplified by the obligation that binds Antipholus of Ephesus to pay Angelo for the chain and Angelo to pay the merchant.[32] Likewise, a man's loss of credibility in the sphere of the play can occur through a failure to pay a mercantile debt, but not through a failure to uphold marital fidelity.[33] In contrast, women in the drama are bound by the behavioral expectations of femininity and marriage. Perceived transgression of these rules alone poses a risk to a woman's station.[34] Through his decision to stratify each of the play's main obligation economies based on gender roles rather than to acknowledge the fact that each economy applied to

both genders, Shakespeare emphasizes the interrelatedness of domestic and commercial affairs by drawing parallels between the marital and mercantile economies of obligation. By this means, he exposes the traditional construct of male superiority, as well as problems facing the falsely accused in a society dependent upon following the letter of the law and seemingly predicated on commercial exchange. For Shakespeare, London should not become an Ephesus!

The playwright's focus on the marital economy of obligation and the perpetual debt it imposes on the wife is highlighted through the drama's portrayal of Adriana, who must constantly submit to her husband, Antipholus of Ephesus, to retain her social standing. Meanwhile, though, her husband can be as lustful as he desires without owing her any honor.[35] Shakespeare's focus on the female plight in the marital economy is highlighted through the simple yet powerful act of naming the wife Adriana, whereas Plautus calls his own wife character *Uxor* ("wife" in Latin) and denies her viewpoint in favor of those males around her.[36] Shakespeare allows for Adriana to state her own beliefs concisely in the face of patriarchy. Adriana resents having to ascribe to the binding regulations of wifehood, as she perceives no reason that men should have greater "liberty" (2.1.10) than women. Although she recognizes that her husband is to blame if she loses relevance in his eyes, she still realizes that he has full power over her "state" (2.1.96), which refers to her social position that is defined only by her marital status and sexual purity.[37] As a betrothed woman, Adriana is "consecrate[d]" (2.2.125) to her husband in the eyes of society, and will thus be "contaminate[d]" (2.2.126) by any act of divorce or adultery that he willingly commits against her, including those enacted as punishment for perceived failure to pay her marital debt.[38] At the time, a husband's break of faith with his wife and the rape of a woman were regarded as nearly equal to a woman's intentional sexual act outside of marriage. Antipholus of Ephesus's power as a

marital debtee can be compared to Angelo's mercantile power to indict the Ephesian himself for failure to pay.[39] Adriana, in a renunciation of the construct of wifely deference, asserts that it is "not [her] fault" (2.1.96) if Antipholus is attracted to other women, and simultaneously laments that Antipholus's position of male "master[y]" (2.1.96) unjustly places the guilt for his unfaithfulness on her. Despite Adriana's wishes for a mutual relationship of love and an equal relationship of marital-economic status, her husband is not required to repay Adriana's fidelity with his affection.

Through this unequally yoking relationship of Antipholus and Adriana, the playwright criticizes the misconstrued idea of "one flesh" that grants complete sexual freedom to the husband while fully absorbing the wife's agency. Antipholus is not obligated to maintain sexual relations exclusively with Adriana, even though Adriana must only perform the sexual act with him. Instead, he can use her as yet another "stale" (2.1.102), or means to obtain pleasure, without legal penalty.[40] This objectifying construct establishes that the married woman is not her own person, but an offshoot of her husband's body, as greatly subject to his will as the rest of his parts were. In an echoing of Ephesians 5's misinterpreted language, the wife may be of the same "flesh" (2.2.136), or body, as her husband, but "flesh," or sexual desire and control, is permitted to him alone.[41] Consequently, Adriana must keep her husband from lust to the best of her ability, but simultaneously must watch that she does not overstep the confines of society in doing so.

Within this credit-worthiness analogy, Antipholus of Ephesus cannot lose his credit if he violates his wife's trust, but has legal mastery of Adriana's account of reputation. Despite Adriana's protest, he can freely offer the chain, representative of marriage and the sexual act, to a courtesan, even though the commitment was meant for Adriana.[42] As a result, he can easily defile Adriana's previously blameless credit of social standing. Meanwhile, Antipholus's own credit

as a husband is protected by society. As Adriana observes, he is like a "drop of water" (2.2.119) who will lose no part of his own reputation even after mixing with a sea of women.[43] Thus, Antipholus of Ephesus is able to commit a sanctioned act of identity theft at Adriana's expense, since society has established that he has full power over her.

Error causes the chain to find its way to Antipholus of Syracuse, and thus prevents it from reaching the courtesan, but convention dictates that the chains of marriage permit the husband to be free while the wife remains bound. Richard Henze claims that the chain of "status quo" binds both Antipholus of Ephesus and Adriana, but he does not recognize the liberty afforded to Antipholus within the play's marital construct.[44] Yes, Shakespeare's chain is meant to pass from husband to wife, despite the Ephesian's decision to award the chain to the courtesan. When Adriana reminds her sister that Antipholus "promised [her] a chain" (2.1.107), it becomes a symbol of marital bonds, as she wishes that it would bind him to "keep fair quarters with his bed" (2.1.109). Henze claims that social conventions indeed restrain the married Antipholus in this way, since the literal chain "never gets into the prostitute's hands, and finally helps to rejuvenate [his] and Adriana's marriage."[45] However, Henze does not consider that the chain illustrates the husband's sexual authority, echoing the husband's exchange of the "wife's mantle" with the prostitute in the Plautine source. Thus, what matters is that the husband has the power to give the chain to the prostitute, and not whether it reaches her.[46] In addition, at the play's conclusion, Antipholus of Ephesus never enacts marital reconciliation by awarding the chain to, or by engaging in any sort of dialogue with, Adriana. Instead, he converses with the courtesan and returns her ring.[47] This action appears to signal that he will cease his affairs with the courtesan, as it cuts off the courtesan from receiving the chain. Even so, he could begin another sexual relationship outside of marriage with no penalty, as he has already visited the courtesan several times

without consequence.[48] A renewal of marriage, then, does not necessarily equal full reconciliation between Antipholus and Adriana, since Adriana is aware that her binding marriage still threatens her reputation. Through his ability to award the chain to anyone he chooses, Antipholus of Ephesus shows the true significance of marriage for a husband, as opposed to marriage for a wife.

Although the Antipholi and Dromios experience their own legal loss of identity and entrance into debt, Adriana's loss of self in debt is enacted by custom in another key difference from the debt of the males around her. While Antipholus of Ephesus experiences a loss of identity in the commercial world, his loss and debt are the result of error. After all, the Ephesian's refusal to pay for the chain he did not receive, and consequential entrance into debt, occurs because the chain was accidentally granted to his twin.[49] The Dromios also experience identity loss through error. As servants, their obedience to their masters is required, placing them in ongoing debt to their respective Antipholi. However, they are able to pay their debt temporarily with each act of obedience. In spite of their faithful intentions, though, they end up failing to obey their masters because they confuse their masters' identities, and because their own identities are also mistaken. As a result, they are beaten through no fault of their own. Their experience can be compared to Adriana's suffering of neglect at Antipholus's hands, despite her love for him.[50] This equates the chained woman with chained servants, a dynamic that is especially evident when female actors play these male roles.[51] In addition, the Antipholi and Dromios are restored as holding separate identities at the play's resolution.[52] Adriana, however, remains in debt and continues to experience identity loss. She is bound to her husband by marital regulations and cannot recover an independent identity. In both of the twin instances, two males become one through the error of mistaken identity, but then regain their selves. Adriana, though, is denied the

chance to reestablish her own person. While the Antipholi, the Dromios, and Adriana are all chained by debt and a context of identity theft, only Adriana cannot escape.

Even worse, the Ephesian society glorifies the economy of female obligation and the commodification of women at extreme expense to a woman's agency. The pervasive mentality of womanly deference is particularly evident through Adriana's female counterparts, who have internalized the mindset that the wifely debt to the husband is divinely ordained. In Adriana's society, as well as that of early modern England, the patriarchy was viewed as the epitome of order for a marriage, because it mirrored monarchy. As monarchy was thought to model divinity, patriarchy was also seen as synonymous with the order of God.[53] In her promotion of patriarchal regulations, Adriana's sister Luciana provides an example of the time's ideal woman. Luciana sees constant deference to a husband as God's will for all married women, established when God granted "man" power over all other creatures due to "man's" superior knowledge.[54] In fact, Luciana echoes the early modern English interpretation of the biblical directive given through St. Paul's letter to the Ephesians. While St. Paul equates "husbands" with "Christ," Luciana names men as the "divine . . . master" over creation (2.1.20); both draw parallels between God's subordinate creation and the ideal wife.[55] In fact, within the same translation of Ephesians, "Christ" is referred to as the "head of the church" in relation to the "body" of Christians. This evokes the model of monarchy in which the ruler served as the head, or intellectual controller, of his body of subjects, who needed their king's orders in order to conduct themselves with reason. The patriarchal analogies which equate divine creation and king's subject with a married woman intensify further in light of Ephesians 5, which states that the members of a married couple become "one flesh."[56] Within this analogy, the husband was clearly the rational, kingly head, while the wife was the subordinate body.

Adriana is equated with her husband's doors, an object and mere part of the household that he owns economically and socially. Again, society frames her as only a portion of the male whole, the subordinate body to the head. Eric Heinze points out that contrasting dominant and oppressed roles, even when coupled with error, almost always results in a reinforcement of the play's societal norms. Once the twin-based errors are recognized, custom allows the Ephesian Antipholus to escape the debt incurred through his brother's erratic acceptance of a chain not intended for him, and his own refusal to pay for a good that he did not receive.[57] After all, Antipholus of Ephesus is dominant in every sense of the word. He is a married man native to Ephesus with great riches and economic influence. Thus, he possesses "very reverend reputation" and "credit infinite" (5.1.5-8) within an economy where credit equals currency. In contrast, Adriana's *exclusus amator* [shut-out lover] error, or inadvertent denial of her husband's entry into their home, leads to disastrous consequences for her under custom.[58] Adriana knows well that the wife's serving of dinner to the husband is a crucial component of her duty, and that her refusal to do so may undermine her quest for a reciprocal relationship of love.[59] Her error of admitting the wrong Antipholus leads her to witness what appears to be her husband's denial of their marriage in favor of courting her sister.[60] This mistake also results in the Ephesian Antipholus's visit to the courtesan "out of spite" towards Adriana, as he believes that Adriana purposely shut him out. According to Candido, Antipholus's view that "[his] own doors refuse to entertain [him]" (3.1.121) carries the connotation that Adriana has denied her husband sexual pleasure, in violation of marital norms.[61] Antipholus of Ephesus likely believes that Adriana took this action as a froward form of punishment. After all, Adriana is incensed that her husband has been visiting the courtesan.[62] The entrance denied to the Ephesian Antipholus is not as important as the husband's belief in his wife's intentional

denial. Even if Antipholus did not seek intercourse from Adriana at the time of the shutting-out, he is irate that his wife has asserted a control over him in violation of marital customs.

The Comedy of Errors contains several allusions to Antipholus of Ephesus's damaged reputation as a consequence of his marital unfaithfulness, which ironically evokes the more equal early modern English economy of marital obligation. The play's gender stratification of obligation, though, does not allow for a man's reputation to be sullied in the marital sphere. When Antipholus of Ephesus prepares to visit the courtesan, his friend Balthazar warns him that he "war[s] against [his own] reputation" (3.1.87) as well as his wife's, as word of his affair might spread and taint his credit even after his death.[63] This potential threat is never realized, though, as Aemilia affixes all of the blame for his unfaithfulness on Adriana.[64] More strikingly, Adriana's assertions that Antipholus will be corrupted because of his affair suggest potential contempt for Antipholus in the eyes of his society. Adriana advises Antipholus that his extramarital affair will both suffocate her and "infect" (2.2.173) him.[65] In fact, her assertion that she would be "contaminate[d]" (2.2.126) by his affair carries the sense that he would already have lasting "poison" in his "flesh" (2.2.136) upon his transgression, and will not escape "undishonoured" (2.2.139). This stands in direct opposition to her "drop of water" (2.2.119) metaphor mentioned immediately prior, which carries the idea that Antipholus can corrupt Adriana's purity with no consequence to himself.[66] This "contagion" (2.2.137) of unfaithfulness carries implications for Antipholus's marital credit beyond any private agreement between husband and wife, and beyond internal moral guilt, yet is reduced to a private matter of no weight due to the uneven social enforcements of marital obligation based on gender.

The notoriously difficult jewel passage further illustrates the paradoxical nature of the play's marital economy.

Especially within a construct in which one debt or other transgression can tarnish an individual severely, the "jewel best enameled" (2.1.110), or Antipholus of Ephesus with his spotless credit, should still "lose his beauty" (2.1.111), or reputation, if he is unfaithful to Adriana. His act should at least raise internal concerns about his wife's response. However, "[his] gold" (2.1.111) remains untarnished despite "often touching" (2.1.112), or having repeated affairs outside of his marriage; hence his lack of concern about his reputation. When coupled with the lines directly preceding this passage, along with the interpretation of Larry Weiss, the "jewel" metaphor appears to illuminate Adriana's worry that her husband will not return the love she offers, as well as her concern for both of their reputations. After all, she loves him enough to consider him a "jewel" and "gold," and is distraught that Antipholus no longer views her as having similar beauty.[67]

Adriana is also aware of the differences in obligation for females and males within the sphere of marriage and the sharp consequences of such a stratified economy. She asserts that both husband and wife must be concerned about their marital credit in order to build lasting public and private trust in their relationship and to cultivate sustained mutual love. Meanwhile, however, she realizes that her worry about a male's reputation, which itself will surely not be sullied, will likely damage her own credit if she takes action. Adriana's warnings to her believed spouse are ironic in that they carry an awareness that equal marital obligation between husband and wife is necessary for mutual love and forgiveness, but end up being reduced to an admonition that she alone will suffer from a breach of marital contract.

Instead of an equally binding relationship between wife and husband, the institution of marriage in the play creates a dichotomy similar to that of subhuman beings and humans. After all, Luciana equates women with "beasts . . . fishes, and winged fowls" (2.1.18) in her argument for God-given male

superiority.[68] In addition, when Adriana compares herself to a "vine," her husband is equated with an "elm" (2.2.167), as she depends on him for the small amount of status that she holds. She must be attached to him to flourish socially and retain her growth. This language evokes the Psalm used during the period's sanctioned marriage homilies, which likens the wife to a fruitful vine nurtured by a well-ruling husband.[69] "[Her] weakness, married to [his] stronger state" (2.2.168), an explicit reference to the marriage vows, binds the wife to have no power or voice except through him. Meanwhile, any sexual relations between Antipholus and another woman would violate Adriana's space to thrive as a wife, as well as suffocate Adriana's social credit instantly and permanently, like a fast-growing parasite. Of course, the husband, as the master of the marriage, must first sanction this disempowerment. He may also be "infect[ed]" (2.2.173) by this wrong, as mentioned above, but in the play's sphere, this contamination is reduced to a private moral matter.[70] Most strikingly, the Dromios and Adriana are all compared to "asses" who suffer abuse as they are forced to perform their masters' wills.[71] Through Adriana's assertion that "none but asses will be bridled" (2.1.14) in absolute submission to a husband, the "ass" metaphor is coupled with a pun on the "bridle" of animals and the figurative "bridal . . . bridle" with which the husband leads the wife. This construct of the "bridle" is comparable to the literal and figurative restraint of the chain, as both operate on the mechanics of debtee and debtor.[72] To Luciana, and to the society in which she lives, the woman who does not submit to a man is little more than a wild animal, as she does not have sufficient reason to rule herself.

In conjunction with this patriarchal construct, and despite regulations that granted women some permission to participate in economics, the social continuum of maid, wife, and widow defined a woman in terms of her relationship to men, without consideration of her financial standing.

A woman held the status of a maid and was subject to the will of her father until marriage when she became the wife, bound to her husband until her death or her widowhood.[73] Camilla R. Barker extends this idea further, as she reminds readers that economic status determined no part of a woman's social standing, even for a wealthy woman such as Adriana. While Adriana had to bind herself in the chains of marriage to progress socially, from the role of maid to that of wife, Antipholus of Ephesus increased both his freedom and social standing through the same marriage, due to Adriana's riches.[74] Even worse, Adriana's affluence cannot protect her reputation if Antipholus chooses to end the marriage. After all, according to Barker, "[Any] unmarried woman" was considered "a social pariah."[75] Just as even the richest man could become a debtor, a woman's wealth could not free her from the economy of obligation. Instead, a woman's affluence made her more likely to be viewed as a tool for the betterment of male livelihood.

Through the character of Aemilia, a woman's overstepping of boundaries is framed as a cause of societal chaos, while an acceptance of female submission is required for a return to order. As a result, the patriarchal view of Luciana is shown to win out over Adriana's will. Aemilia, the city's abbess and the seemingly widowed wife of Egeon, does not blame Adriana's husband for his alleged madness and break of faith with his wife. Instead, she chastises Adriana for acting in an animalistic way that does not harmonize with female deference, and vows that womanly "jealous[y]" (5.1.69) must have caused Adriana's husband to have lost his reason. This further perpetuates the notion that women who fail to submit to men demonstrate irrationality.[76] Adriana is now the one who "poisons" (5.1.70) her husband by failing to submit to him, instead of the one affected by the "venom" of her husband (5.1.69). Only when Adriana is willing to rededicate herself to following her husband's will does the play reach its resolution and untangle the confusion of the

twins' mistaken identities.[77] However, in this submission, Adriana cannot establish herself as her own person. Instead, she must willingly adopt the identity of her husband and lock herself into a loss of agency. In other words, she must become "compact of credit" (3.2.22), or place herself within a state of full trust in her husband, despite her husband's unfaithfulness.[78] After all, her violation of society's economy of marital obligation has made her an outsider and has supposedly caused disorder.

Adriana's status as a woman in the overall economy of obligation must be examined in light of the golden chain's symbolism, coupled with the lenses of "consideration" and "*assumpsit*," two structures enacted with the intention of making debt accusations more objective. Andrew Zurcher defines "consideration" and "*assumpsit*" as near opposites within legal evaluations. "Consideration" can be defined as the "witnessable expression of [a given] promise," or the binding proof of said promise. Within the economy of obligation, "consideration" was presented to court as the motivation for legally punishing a debtor. Without "consideration," an accusation of one's failure to pay a debt had no weight.[79] Meanwhile, "*assumpsit*" refers to an implied promise with no proof, as well as the legal "action" taken against a breach of this implied promise. This concept, which required no concrete contract, was introduced as an efficient alternative to "consideration" and overtook "consideration" in its frequency of use in sixteenth-century England.[80] Marriage itself provides a key example of "consideration," as the oath taken on the female end is proof of the vow of wifely obedience. However, a husband's promise of faithfulness in marriage is far more similar to "*assumpsit*," as the marital contract does not bind him to fidelity. Thus, his promise is only implied. Unfortunately for a wife, this promise is not truly actionable under "*assumpsit*," as proof of her husband's infidelity would cause a breach of her own faith under "consideration." As a married man, Antipholus

of Ephesus oversteps theoretical boundaries of faith through his relationship with the courtesan.[81] However, there are no true sexual boundaries for Antipholus, as any sexual act he participates in with another woman indicts Adriana and does not penalize him, thanks to societal regulations. As a symbol of marriage, the chain functions as a "consideration" that binds Adriana to deference and that can be invoked in an accusation against her reputation. Despite also serving as the object of Antipholus's promise on a literal level, though, it does not even require his faithfulness through the force of "*assumpsit*."

In addition to Antipholus of Ephesus's established power to give the chain to the courtesan without the binding of "consideration" or "*assumpsit*," one must also examine the courtesan's own power to bind Antipholus to his promise under the "consideration" structure. Her ability to enforce conventions of the law sharply contrasts with Adriana's lack of power as a wife. The courtesan holds that Antipholus of Ephesus is bound to give her the chain through her own exchange of a ring.[82] The use of the ring, itself a symbol of marital and sexual commitment, implies that she possesses knowledge of the "consideration" structures, as the token of exchange functions as proof of a promise: "for the same [ring] he promised [her] the chain" (4.3.76). One must note that an exchange itself is not sufficient for a promise to be designated "consideration" rather than "*assumpsit*"; however, these lines imply that the exchange was accompanied by verbal pledge and could thus solidify the oath.[83] Thus, the courtesan's use of oath is indeed actionable based on "consideration."

Ironically, the courtesan stands outside the maid-wife-widow continuum of social status, yet occupies the position with the greatest potential for female agency, especially in comparison with the married Adriana, who holds weak influence as a wife. Although the courtesan lacks named identity in comparison with Plautus's prostitute Erotium, and although her time onstage is limited in comparison to

Adriana's plight, her function is not as "reduced" as Levin claims.[84] After all, the courtesan's situation is meant to contrast with Adriana's in terms of control and social standing, yet harmonize with Adriana's in terms of womanly debt. The labels that Dromio of Syracuse attaches to the courtesan, "devil's dam" (4.3.44) and "wench" (4.3.45), connote that she is a prostitute rather than a submissive maid, wife or widow. Her willingness and ability to have sexual relations with the married Antipholus further demonstrate a lack of care for social standing. This indicates that she is a female debtor, with no status to lose or chance to regain any trace of former status.[85] Therefore, even though this courtesan holds a drastically different societal position to that of Adriana, her debt paradoxically places her in parallel with the Adriana who faces the Abbess, since both are framed as disobedient in light of female conventions.[86] Ironically, though, only the more innocuous female debtor, the courtesan, can ensure that the debt Antipholus owes her is paid. The chain does not fall into the courtesan's hands, but she does receive her ring back from the Ephesian upon her demand at the play's conclusion. As the return of her proof of promise ensures that the courtesan has no monetary loss, this demonstrates that she has bound Antipholus of Ephesus to be faithful to his word with at least some degree of success, and has thus enforced "consideration." Because of this, despite possessing no social standing, she carries the greatest power available to women. A maid, wife or widow, in contrast, would struggle to enforce a similar contract without overstepping boundaries of deference to men.[87] Adriana demonstrates this phenomenon within her own plight, as she has no legal authority to ensure that she receives the promised chain from her husband.

It may appear to some that Adriana could enforce Antipholus's promise to give her the literal chain, but she cannot invoke "consideration" or "*assumpsit*" against her husband in the literal or figurative sense. In Zurcher's conception, Adriana can supposedly claim the literal chain

through verbal contract, even though she cannot require her husband to be faithful to their marriage.[88] After all, in a normal circumstance, Antipholus's explicit promise of the chain would function as "consideration."[89] Unfortunately, though, this promise carries no legal weight when one considers the chain's symbolism as the conventional bonds of marriage. As stated above, marriage itself is a relationship of "consideration," because the vow itself contains clear verbal promises and is ratified by written contract. Since marital conventions require Adriana's obedience to her husband, Adriana's contract with Antipholus is also a contract between herself and society. Meanwhile, Antipholus's own promise, unbound by any marital restraint of obedience, is only between individuals. If Adriana were to demand the literal chain from her husband, he would not be forced to obey her. Instead, he could easily invoke the marriage vow, instrument of the symbolic chain, to nullify his words and the "consideration" they would otherwise hold. Subsequently, if Adriana were to press court-based charges under "consideration," her basic legal right would be denied, and she would place herself in permanent social debt.

Without a recognition of marriage as an equally binding obligation between husband and wife, rather than a debt that chains the wife alone, true reconciliation cannot and does not occur. The play's resolution reveals that actions to require payment of individual debts would mitigate problems with the commercial economy of obligation, but not the marital economy as it appears in the play. More importantly, it suggests that forgiveness of a debt between husband and wife is only a possibility when both recognize an equal obligation and still desire mutual love. In the sphere of commercial economy, individuals' debts are quickly paid off and forgiven when error is realized, which nullifies the chance that the debts will permanently destroy one's credit, as they might have if error was not found.[90] As Zurcher explains, this forgiveness of reputation upon payment of individual debts

"was seen as a more equitable response to real transactional problems."[91] After all, this merciful structure of debt forgiveness did not pose an absolute threat to one's reputation regardless of previous credit or force fatal consequences on an innocent individual who was falsely accused of holding outstanding debts. In other words, an individual such as the Ephesian Antipholus would not be in danger of losing his own reputation through another's false assumption.[92]

While the commercial economy defines each transaction's debtor and debtee according to the individuals who are granted and give credit, the play's marital economy does not allow for fluctuation in positions of credit between husband and wife. As a result, the play allows for multifaceted forgiveness within economics alone, while its reconciliation within marital exchange becomes painfully one-sided. Adriana still loves her husband despite his record of waywardness. She forgives him for this straying through the dinner she prepares, a joyful acceptance of which would serve as Antipholus of Ephesus's apology.[93] Of course, this ideal is never realized, due to Adriana's accidental shutting-out of her husband, Antipholus of Ephesus's visit to the courtesan out of "spite" (3.1.119), and Adriana's resulting claim that her husband is insane.[94]

Rather than allowing for mutual reconciliation between husband and wife, though, Aemilia and the Duke, representing their patriarchal society, force Adriana's one-sided apology and submission; they do not allow for even a remote possibility that Antipholus shares Adriana's blame. In order to regain her husband, Adriana must profess that he is "lord of all [she] had" and "master of [her] bed" (5.1.136-37). Otherwise, she acknowledges, she has no chance to restore reputation or mutual love. However, this action subjects Adriana to a position as sole debtor, and the "action" taken to mitigate her individual, accidental debt of shutting-out forces her back into a state of perpetual debt.[95] Adriana does not want to submit herself to her husband and society; she only does so as a last resort. After all, she has previously

likened the state of submissive women to that of "asses" (2.1.14) and has questioned why men should be allowed greater "liberty" (2.1.10) than women in marriage. Also, she wants Antipholus of Ephesus to be held accountable for his guilt, to the extent that she has upbraided him constantly but modestly, in appeals to his conscience.[96] Unfortunately, with equal obligation denied, her reputation may remain relatively intact, but her chance to receive equal love disappears. As mentioned previously, no reconciliation between husband and wife, including the exchange of the chain, explicitly occurs. Instead, Adriana's witnessing of the transaction between her husband and the courtesan serves as an indication that he has behaved and will behave as society allows him to, without recognition of even a private obligation to his marriage.[97] In his own eyes as well as the eyes of his society, Antipholus is still the head of his female property, rather than an individual who possesses a duty equal to his wife in the cultivation of marital love.

Shared reconciliation between Antipholus and Adriana remains impossible without a structure of mutual obligation within marriage, even though marital forgiveness may seem to be implied within the resolution through the play's status as a comedy. In a traditional sense, the term "comedy" connotes a play in which all social tensions, including marriage difficulties, are resolved by the play's conclusion. However, since marital forgiveness ironically does not occur for Antipholus and Adriana amidst characteristic resolutions of economic forgiveness and family reunion, the label of comedy on its own is a misleading categorization for *The Comedy of Errors*. After all, according to the observations of Samuel Johnson, the play marks the start of a consistent Shakespearean pattern in which the commonly accepted labels of dramatic genre are refuted through genuine human relationships: "Shakespeare's plays are not in the rigorous and critical sense either tragedies or comedies, but compositions of a distinct kind; exhibiting the real state of sublunary

nature . . . and expressing the course of the world, in which the loss of one is the gain of another."[98] A more accurate genre for the drama, then, is "problem comedy," the purpose of which is to illuminate social complications as they exist outside the dramatic sphere. Lack of resolution or ambiguous resolution is crucial within this genre, to reflect the gravity of societal problems in a more realistic manner.[99] Thus, the lack of dialogue between Antipholus and Adriana in act 5, coupled with the absent exchange of the chain between the married parties, indeed connotes a lack of shared reconciliation—such forgiveness is never implied, not even through the eponymous label of *Comedy*. In characteristic problem comedy fashion, *The Comedy of Errors* illustrates the consequences that result from a lack of mutual marital obligation by refusing to grant Adriana the forgiveness and love that she so desires, thereby denying a completely comedic outcome in the traditional sense.

Although inconsistencies in patterns of forgiveness may appear to illustrate that the economies of commercial and marital obligation are not interrelated, one must consider the alternative to the above, an application of forgiveness of these marital debts under a principle of shared obligation. If both parties had had the chance to recognize that their debts in the marital economy were caused by a mutual error, forgiveness would have been the likely conclusion, as shown through the economic reconciliation that the play allows for. Yes, if only one party was actually at fault, payment of debt in even a mutually binding marital economy may not equal a full reconciliation as it does in the commercial economy. After all, marital transactions govern human relationships rather than goods, and thus the two economies are not equal in substance. Mutual marital forgiveness must always be denied without an affirmation of marriage as an equally binding obligation between husband and wife.

Within *The Comedy of Errors*, Muldrew's structure of the economy of obligation circulates not only in its original form

relating to financial exchange, but also in the parallel structure of marital relations. Each respective economy is associated with the duty of a single gender role; mercantile obligation is the sphere of men alone, while behavioral-marital obligation solely regulates women. In the play's marital economy of obligation, a married woman such as Adriana is chained by the perpetual debt of deference owed to her husband and restricted in opportunities to exercise her free will. After all, Adriana's society frames her as no better than an animal when she is accused of any unfaithfulness to the bond of marriage, including mere failure to defer to Antipholus. Even concerns about one's husband's possible extramarital affairs on a private obligatory and moral basis are classified as female disobedience. Just as a male debtor was sent to prison and stripped of reputation by the society that accused him of debt, the female debtor lost her credit-worthiness if society judged that she had violated the norms of womanly conduct in a way that did not permit her to be a maid, wife, or widow. Even if a man was allowed to usurp a woman's identity and ruin her credit, as Antipholus of Ephesus does at Adriana's expense, Adriana's society threatens the female debtor with a permanent loss of reputation, while her husband's account remains unstained. After all, Antipholus could bring the force of "consideration" against Adriana and claim that it holds greater weight, based on the one-sided maxims on female obedience explicitly included in the marriage-vow. Thus, the institution of reputation-based accounting and the woman's maintenance of her credit-worthiness are identical. While forgiveness of individual debts is presented as a sufficient solution to the problematic capacities of these economies to damage one's reputation permanently, Adriana realizes that a mutual relationship of love is necessary for any possibility of a reconciliation of marital debt. This reciprocal relationship, however, cannot exist without a shared sense of obligation in marriage, cultivated by society. If wives are continually valued as property and are denied equal economic rights in favor of a

behaviorally defined social status, while husbands apparently do not deprive themselves of their own credit-worthiness through extramarital affairs, any attempt at forgiveness of a single marriage-debt would instead result in a reminder that the woman is chained as the perpetual debtor.

Although Shakespeare contends that patriarchal constructs must either be fought against or abolished in favor of marital mutuality, he does not articulate a solution for wives to achieve a mutual marital relationship within patriarchy as it is illustrated in *The Comedy of Errors.* However, his failure to establish such grounds does not indicate a belief that early modern English women must abandon all hope. After all, *The Comedy of Errors* is only Shakespeare's first play. He might not have found an ideal method for a woman to achieve agency and shared obligation in marriage at the time of *The Comedy of Errors,* but he poses frameworks for the potential establishment of such mutuality in later plays, including *The Taming of the Shrew* and *Much Ado About Nothing*.[100] Thus, the lack of solutions in *The Comedy of Errors* is by no means equal to a lack of available solutions for combating an unequal economy of marital obligation.

Notes

1. Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Literary Remains,* ed. Henry Nelson Coleridge, 4 vols. (London: William Pickering, 1836-39), 2:114-15.

2. Craig Muldrew, *The Economy of Obligation: The Culture of Credit and Relations in Early Modern England* (New York: St. Martin's, 1998), 3.

3. Ibid., 3, 98-102, 108-109, 274-277.

4. All Shakespeare citations are from *The Bedford Shakespeare edition of The Comedy of Errors* (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2015). Quoted lines are cited parenthetically in the text; lines illustrating my thesis are cited among the notes.

5. Sarah Scott, "Maid, Wife, Widow" (lecture, Mount St. Mary's University, Emmitsburg, MD, January 2016.)

6. See *The Comedy of Errors* (*CoE*) 2.1.7, 10-13, 30-31; Andrew Zurcher, "Consideration, Contract, and the End of *The Comedy of Errors*," *Law and Humanities* 1, no. 2, (2007): 154-59.

7. Muldrew, *The Economy of Obligation,* 3, 98-102, 108-9.

8. Ibid., 3, 129-30.

9. Ibid., 3.

10. Ibid., 3, 98-102, 108-9, 129-30, 274-77.

11. *The Papers of Sir William Chaytor of Croft*, quoted in Muldrew, *The Economy of Obligation,* 276-277.

12. Ibid., 277.

13. Ibid.,183.

14. Colette Gordon, "Crediting Errors: Credit, Liquidity, Performance and *The Comedy of Errors,*" *Shakespeare* 6, no. 2 (2010): 169-70.

15. Ibid., 169.

16. See *CoE* 3.2.155-75; 4.1.1-13, 67-84; 4.3.1-11; 5.1.5-8.

17. See *CoE* 4.1.1-84.

18. Laurie Maguire, "The Girls from Ephesus," in *The Comedy of Errors: Critical Essays,* ed. Robert Miola (New York: Routledge, 2012), 365, 378-379.

19. *New Jerusalem Bible,* Eph. 5:21-24.

20. Michael G. Lawler, "Marriage in the Bible," in P*erspectives on Marriage: A Reader,* ed. Kieran Scott and Michael Warren (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 13-14.

21. *New Jerusalem Bible,* Eph. 5:3, 5; Lawler, "Marriage in the Bible," 13-14. Maguire, therefore, is mistaken in her assertion that St. Paul desires "to establish domestic harmony through [the] domestic hierarchy" of male superiority (379). St. Paul's concern that Ephesian women would emulate the Amazons' failure to submit, which Maguire correctly identifies, is not synonymous with advocacy for patriarchy, since he equally disapproves of males' domineering.

22. Ibid., Eph. 5:28.

23. Russ McDonald and Lena Cowen Orlin, "Families," in *The Bedford Shakespeare* (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2015), 400; Robert Cleaver, *A Godly Form of Householde Gouernement* (London: Felix Kingston, 1598), accessed via *Early English Books Online,* 80-81; "Homily on the State of Matrimony" (n.d.), ed. Ian Lancashire, *Renaissance Electronic Texts,* University of Toronto, 1997.

24. Cleaver, *A Godly Form of Householde Gouernement,* 166-67.

25. "The Forme of Solempnization of Matrimonye," in *The Book of Common Prayer* (1559), accessed via Society of Archbishop Justus; "Homily on the State of Matrimony"; McDonald and Orlin, "Families," 402.

26. "Homily on the State of Matrimony."

27. Cleaver, *A Godly Form of Householde Gouernement,* 112-15.

28. Ibid.; "Homily on the State of Matrimony"; "The Forme of Solempnization of Matrimonye."

29 Kenneth Stevenson, *Nuptial Blessing: A Study of Christian Marriage Rites* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 36-37, 245-46.

30. Ibid., 246-47.

31. See *CoE* 2.1.1-13, 5.1.5-8.

32. See *CoE* 3.2.155-75; 4.1.

33. See *CoE* 2.1.7, 10-13, 30-31; 3.2.155-75; 4.1.1-14, 67-84; 4.3.1-11; 5.1.5-8.

34. See *CoE* 2.1.7, 10-13, 30-31.

35. See *CoE* 2.1.7, 10-13, 30-31.

36. Harry Levin, "Two Comedies of Errors," in *The Comedy of Errors: Critical Essays,* ed. Robert Miola (New York: Routledge, 2012), 123. According to Levin, the *Uxor's* father "judges her from a one-sidedly masculine point of view," while her husband has several extended affairs with a named "prostitute" and even "auction[s] . . . his wife" as yet another one of his many possessions.

37. See *CoE* 2.1.83-96.

38. See *CoE* 2.2.123-26, 135-36.

39. See *CoE* 4.1.1-14, 67-84; 4.3.1-11; 5.1.5-8.

40. See CoE 2.1.95-109.

41. See CoE 2.2.112-16, 135-39; *New Jerusalem Bible*, Eph. 5:28, 31; McDonald and Orlin, "Families," 400.

42. See *CoE* 3.1.118-20, 4.3.73-77.

43. In the above situation's traditional economic parallel, the Syracusian Antipholus incurs debt on behalf of the Ephesian Antipholus when he receives the chain from Angelo. Despite later being confronted by Angelo and the Second Merchant for his failure to pay, the Syracusian is never penalized for damaging the Ephesian's account, as the twins are assumed to be the same person (as seen in 3.2.157-75; 4.1.62-69; 5.1.10-32).

44. Richard Henze, "*The Comedy of Errors:* A Freely Binding Chain," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 22, no.1 (1971): 38.

45. Ibid.

46. Henze contrasts the chain with the Plautine source's object of exchange, the wife's mantle, which successfully passes from husband to prostitute. As the mantle already belonged to the wife before becoming the prostitute's property, it cannot symbolize the promises or restraints of marriage with the same force as Shakespeare's chain (Henze 38). More importantly, though, both mantle and chain signal a departure from marital structures and a construct in which the husband possesses sexual freedom, as both can be awarded to the prostitute with no penalty to the husband. Thus, Shakespeare retains the use of the exchange-object as a device that shows the husband's authority.

47. See *CoE* 5.1.390-91.

48. See *CoE* 3.1.118-20.

49. See *CoE* 3.2.155-75; 4.1.

50. See *CoE* 2.1.44-86, 88-116; 2.2.7-62; 4.4.8-39.

51. Cambridge Shakespeare Festival, *The Comedy of Errors,* live performance, August 13 and 18, 2016.

52. See *CoE* 5.1.330-425.

53. See *CoE* 2.1.15-25; McDonald and Orlin, "Families," 400-1.

54. See *CoE* 2.1.13, 15-25.

55. *New Jerusalem Bible,* Eph. 5:22-24; Maguire, "The Girls from Ephesus," 378-79.

56. *New Jerusalem Bible,* Eph. 5:31.

57. See 5.1.330-425; Eric Heinze, "'Were it Not Against Our Laws': Oppression and Resistance in *The Comedy of Errors,*" *Legal Studies* 29, no.2 (2009): 237-38, 260.

58. See *CoE* 2.2.211-12, 3.1.27-85, 108-22; Scott, "Maid, Wife, Widow."

59. See *CoE* 2.2.103-212; Joseph Candido, "Dining Out in Ephesus: Food in *The Comedy of Errors,*" in T*he Comedy of Errors: Critical Essays,* ed. Robert Miola (New York: Routledge, 2012), 211, 213-15.

60. See *CoE* 4.2.1-28; Candido, "Dining Out in Ephesus," 214-15.

61. See *CoE* 3.1.108-22; Candido, "Dining Out in Ephesus," 211-12.

62. See *CoE* 3.1.108-22.

63. See *CoE* 3.1.86-107.

64. See *CoE* 5.1.64-95.

65. See *CoE* 2.2.166-73.

66. See *CoE* 2.2.118-39.

67. See *CoE* 2.1.104-16; Larry Weiss, "A Solution to the Stubborn Crux in *The Comedy of Errors,*" *Shakespeare* 12, no. 2 (2016): 148-50.

68. See *CoE* 2.1.15-25.

69. See *CoE* 2.2.166-73; "Homily on the State of Matrimony."

70. See *CoE* 2.2.166-73.

71. See *CoE* 2.1.13-14, 2.2.193-95, 4.4.27-35; Maguire, "The Girls From Ephesus," 360, 375-76.

72. Maguire, "The Girls From Ephesus," 360.

73. Scott, "Maid, Wife, Widow."

74. Camilla R. Barker, "Shackles in Shakespeare: On the Falsity of Personal Liberty in Renaissance England," *Liverpool Law Review: A Journal of Contemporary Legal and Social Policy Issues,* 35, no.1 (2014): 27.

75. Ibid., 28.

76. See *CoE* 5.1.45-48, 62-86.

77. See *CoE* 5.1.98-101, 114-17, 137, 159-60.

78. See *CoE* 2.1.100-2; 3.2.21-24; 4.3.

79. Andrew Zurcher, "Consideration, Contract, and the End of *The Comedy of Errors,*" *Law and Humanities* 1, no. 2 (2007): 148.

80. Ibid., 156-57.

81. See *CoE* 3.1.118-20, 4.3.73-77.

82. See *CoE* 4.3.60-62, 75-77.

83. Zurcher, "Consideration, Contract and the End of The Comedy of Errors," 154-59.

84. Levin, "Two Comedies of Errors," 123.

85. See *CoE* 3.1.118-20, 4.3.73-77.

86. See *CoE* 5.1.68-79.

87. See *CoE* 5.1.391-92; Zurcher, "Consideration, Contract and the End of *The Comedy of Errors,*" 160.

88. Zurcher, "Consideration, Contract and the End of *The Comedy of Errors,*" 158-59.

89. See *CoE* 2.1.104-9; Zurcher, "Consideration, Contract and the End of *The Comedy of Errors,*" 158-59.

90. See *CoE* 5.1.190-425.

91. Zurcher, "Consideration, Contract and the End of *The Comedy of Errors,*" 164.

92. See *CoE* 3.2.155-75; 4.1; Zurcher, "Consideration, Contract and the End of *The Comedy of Errors,*" 164.

93. See *CoE* 2.1.377-89; Candido, "Dining Out in Ephesus," 211, 213-15.

94. See *CoE* 2.2.211-12; 3.1.27-85, 108-22; 4.4.40-108.

95. Zurcher, "Consideration, Contract, and the End of *The Comedy of Errors,*" 164.

96. See *CoE* 5.1.57-67.

97. Zurcher, "Consideration, Contract, and the End of *The Comedy of Errors,*" 160.

98. Samuel Johnson, "Preface to the Plays of William Shakespeare," in *Selected Poetry and Prose [of] Samuel Johnson,* ed. Frank Brady and W. K. Wimsatt (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978), 304-5.

99. Dorothea Kehler, "*The Comedy of Errors* as Problem Comedy," *Rocky Mountain Review of Language and Literature* 41, no. 4 (1987): 229-31, 236.

100. Kehler, "*The Comedy of Errors* as Problem Comedy," 229-30, 236.