JOURNAL OF

The Wooden O

Volume 20

Published by

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

EDITORS

Editor in Chief	Dr. Stephanie Chamberlain
Copy Editor	Dr. Catherine Fleming
Layout & Design	Sheri Butler
	Southern Utah University

EDITORIAL BOARD

Dr. Dana Aspinall	*Alma College*
Michael Don Bahr	*Utah Shakespeare Festival*
Dr. Curtis Bostick	*Southern Utah University*
Dr. Tom Flanigan	*Miami University*
Dr. James Forse	*Bowling Green State University*
Miranda Giles	
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	Matthew Nickerson
Dr. Curtis Bostick	Dr. Jessica Tvordi
Shauna Mendini	

Copyright © 2021 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 a peer-reviewed academic publication focusing on Shakespeare studies. It is published annually by Southern Utah University Press in cooperation with the Gerald R. Sherratt Library and the Utah Shakespeare Festival.

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

"Your shape and making": Christopher Moore's Shakespearean *Fool* Trilogy

Sheila Cavanagh
Emory University

Adaptations and appropriations are common in the Shakespearean world, as well as in numerous other fictional realms. Until recently, there have often been unofficial divides between such works emanating from professional writers and those crafted by enthusiastic amateurs. As Johnathan H. Pope remarks, Shakespeare appears in many adaptive realms, including a wide range of fan fiction constructs:

> Authors rewrite Shakespeare according to the widespread conventions, tropes, and genres of fan fiction: Shakespearean slash, het, hurt/comfort, fluff, crossover, alternate universe, PWP, body swap, genderswap, podfic. . . there are Shakespeare drabbles, flashfic and Yuletide challenges, gift fics, 5+1 things, and Real Person Fics (RPFs).[1]

The boundaries between fan fiction and professional creations are increasingly becoming more permeable, however. Christopher Moore, for example, who frequently writes "cross-over" novels that share characters much in the way that television shows sometimes do, has created a trilogy of Shakespearean-based narratives that utilize features associated with fan fiction.[2] These features include allusions to several contemporary theoretical, literary, and cosplay constructs, including magical realism, picaresque narratives, and variations of what Sara K. Howe and Susan E. Cook identify as "kink" or "fringe sexuality and textuality," such as boisterous

Journal of the Wooden O. Vol 20, 1-20
© Southern Utah University Press
ISSN: 1539-5758

public masturbation and sexual activity between a wide range of characters, including some—a sea serpent and a fairy/squirrel, for instance,—that lead these texts into regions parallel to the erotic territory associated with "animal roleplay."[3] In their collection of essays, Howe and Cook indicate that "kink denotes a break from the mainstream."[4] Sexual activity of many kinds serves as a refrain throughout these volumes. Moore's prose is not circumscribed within any particular theoretical model, however. Instead, he continually presses against the kinds of boundaries that also appear in Shakespearean drama and borrows motifs from a range of literary styles. He questions, for example, differentiations between species, which appear in the backgrounds of characters such as Caliban. He investigates spaces merging realism with fantasy, which we encounter in *The Winter's Tale* and elsewhere, and he highlights liminal areas unclearly situated between life and death, reminiscent of *Romeo and Juliet, Cymbeline,* and other plays. Moore's narratives extend far beyond Shakespeare's stories, but often remain attuned to them and use similar philosophical configurations.

Moore's *Fool* Trilogy, which includes *Fool* (2009), *The Serpent of Venice* (2014), and *Shakespeare for Squirrels* (2020), seems designed both for students of literature and fan-fiction aficionados, many of whom will recognize and revel in his numerous allusions to Shakespeare, and other writers and who will understand the interlocking theoretical underpinnings of his fiction. As a review in the *Dallas Morning News* remarks about *Fool*, it is: "Often funny, sometimes hilarious, always inventive, this is a book for all, especially uptight English teachers, bardolaters and ministerial students of the kind who come to our doorstep on Saturday mornings."[5] The author of *Lamb: The Gospel of Biff, Christ's Childhood Pal* (2004), Moore has already demonstrated his ability to interact irreverently with iconic characters and themes. He continues in this vein during these three novels, which follow several Shakespearean characters through adventures often diverging broadly from the events portrayed in the early modern dramas they invoke. Central to these works is the Fool, Pocket Dog Snogging, who wends his fictive way from Lear's kingdom to the Venice of *Othello* and *Merchant of Venice,* and finally ends up in what Moore calls "a very mythical fourteenth-century Athens and the forest and mountains around it," for an encounter with

numerous figures from *A Midsummer Night's Dream*.[6] Some of Pocket's activities coincide with places and events occurring in Shakespeare's plays, while others veer wildly into an environment resembling the "worlds" of fan fiction.[7]

"Traditional" fan fiction, which is produced by deeply invested amateurs, is distributed outside professional publishing entities and commonly sidesteps the financial structures associated with for-profit creation. As Karen Hellekson and Kristina Busse indicate, there are two overarching categories for fan fiction:

> Affirmative fans tend to collect, view, and play, to discuss, analyze, and critique. Transformative fans, however, take a creative step to make the worlds and characters their own by telling stories, cosplaying the characters, creating artworks, or engaging in any of the many other forms active fan participation can take.[8]

While Moore does not fit within the formal category of unprofessional writer, being published by HarperCollins under their William Morrow imprint, his novels correspond with the creations of transformative fans. He is a prolific, professional novelist, whose oeuvre appears to be designed for a well-educated audience of "nerds," as defined by the Urban Dictionary which claims this term refers to "An individual who: 1. Enjoys learning 2. Does not adhere to social norms." This electronic resource offers a further note about "nerds":

> If you are reading this article to determine whether you are a nerd or not, you are not. Nerds do not need to look up the definition of "nerd": it is a label with no consequence whatsoever, and nerds have better things to do than play along with societal stereotypes. That being said, if you merely want to see what people think of when they think of the word "nerd", because human thought processes, societal constructs, and philosophy are so interesting, consider yourself a nerd."[9]

Nerds not only enjoy learning, they are often quite adept at acquiring and expanding their knowledge. It is likely no coincidence, therefore, that nerds and some of those producing fan fiction in Shakespearean domains exhibit the practices key to "transfer of learning," which are believed to be fundamental to educational success. As Viviene C. Cree and Cathlin Macaulay note:

> Knowledge is not given but is actively acquired and interpreted by the individual. In this context, transfer of learning will be facilitated by creating a suitable climate for learning, acknowledging that the feelings and attitudes of the learner are as important as their cognitive strategies in dealing with the learning task, enhancing their capacity for self-direction, and allowing time for reflection and making connections between prior and present experience Collaborative or andragogic models facilitate this kind of learning.[10]

Fan fiction occupies a wide territory and takes many forms. Shakespearean fan fiction is equally diffuse. Since there are no "rules" governing this genre, reductive definitions should not apply; nevertheless, there are characteristics shared by Moore's creations and other transformative adaptations of Shakespearean drama. The dense, capacious texts attracting fan fiction in the current context appear likely to engender significant learning transfer, which may be an identifying characteristic of "nerds" and which might indicate why Shakespeare would be appealing to this cohort.

Francesca Coppa describes fan fiction in a way that supports the notion that the contingent of amateur authors fashioning and absorbing this brand of fan fiction are engaged in significant transfer of learning:

> A fanfiction-reading fan would come to see how one fanfiction story was reacting to another, how one narrative idea was building on another. They'd know what was *canon* (that is, a fact or piece of information from the original source) and what was *fanon* (a fan-authored idea or interpretation that is so perfect, so convincing, or fun that other fan-authors simply adopt it wholesale) in the story. . . A fan would likely be immersed in a whole universe of fanfiction—not just within the fandom of the story, but across a whole series of fandoms.[11]

As Coppa suggests, fan fiction often emanates from an intellectually rich environment, that takes full advantage of previous texts in order to create new artifacts. In addition, Ann K. McClellan notes that such practices have characterized fan fiction for a long time, creating works which range:

> from Homer's collections of the *Odyssey* and *Iliad* stories to Shakespeare's reimagining of Thomas Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy*

> in *Hamlet,* or more recently, to the late nineteenth-and early twentieth-century Sherlock Holmes pastiches, parodies and comics.[12]

Also, as Sheenagh Pugh reminds us:

> Shakespeare, his contemporaries and successors happily plundered Classical, English and European history for plots and characters. But they don't seem to have regarded the "original" plots and characters of other writers as sacred either.[13]

McClellan further describes the strategies associated with these writing techniques in terms that resonate with both Moore's writing and unprofessional, contemporary instances of fan fiction:

> authors adopt the main characters, geography and major plot elements of an already established fictional world and create new narratives that then exist outside the original text. Fanfic can provide backstory and individual characters, fill in gaps left within original storylines, create new plotlines, extend the world and its characters beyond the boundaries of the original source, place the characters into new situations or worlds, and more.[14]

While McClellan here describes the output of many fan fiction writers, her remarks correlate closely with Moore's interaction with Shakespearean drama. In a recent email exchange, Moore describes his plans for engaging with his audience:

> There are lots of "inside" Shakespeare jokes, but I try to make the stories work in such a way that they're funny even if you don't know Shakespeare. The inside stuff usually comes from allusions to plays other than the one that particular novel is based on. (e.g., There are Hamlet jokes in all my books, yet none of [the books] are based on *Hamlet*).[15]

He further discusses his interest in drawing attention to characters who may get less stage time in Shakespeare's plays:

> I like to develop characters that don't get much script time in Shakespeare, but who are interesting. In *Serpent*, I think Portia's maid Nerissa and Iago's wife Emelia [sic] are the most clever characters in the book, and Jessica is a lot more strident, while Portia is revealed to be a bit of a brat. . . some of the minor characters really don't have anything to do in the

> plays (like the fairies or the servants) but in my books they get their own agendas.[16]

As he explains, Moore draws readers' attention to a range of characters in the plays, just as theatrical practitioners can shift audiences' focus in numerous directions.

In much transformative fan fiction, writers employ a variety of stylistic techniques as they craft alternative versions of favorite texts, including alterations to locations, gender identifications, narrative arcs, and other facets of the textual or audiovisual artifact which serve as the source for the new creation. Some of the stories fashioned remain closely aligned with elements contained within their narrative starting points; others incorporate significantly disruptive details, characters or issues not appearing in the origin texts. McClellan, for example, describes Sherlock's popularity in fan fiction contexts in ways that correspond with the Fool trilogy's interaction with Shakespeare's plays:

> The openendedness of the television show, however, provides fans with ample opportunities to speculate on character and relationship arcs, conflict and cliffhanger resolutions, and broader plot developments while still remaining within the constructs of the original world.[17]

With regard to Shakespearean fan fiction, moreover, Valerie M. Fazel and Louise Geddes note that fans are not always attracted by the drama, since some:

> are incidental tourist, visitors whose interest in something other than Shakespeare—an actor, a new film adaptation, an adjacent discipline, or a culturally eclectic website—drives them circuitously to the [Shakespearean] corpus.[18]

As noted above, Moore's writing is designed for readers who approach the novels from similarly diverse routes. Shakespeare's ambiguity and cultural role support innumerable narrative arcs.

Accordingly, Moore does not always constrain himself within "the constructs" of Shakespeare's "original world." Nevertheless, he uses a number of maneuvers similar to those McClellan describes above as he crafts his novels. Pocket, for instance, is introduced in the first installment of Moore's trilogy as the famous character from *King Lear,* but unlike Shakespeare's Fool, he does not die, as Lear reports in the play: "My poor fool is hanged" (*King Lear*,

5.3.3494). Instead, he engages in a lengthy series of episodic adventures that intersect with additional Shakespearean narratives. At the same time, Moore avoids the obscurity sometimes associated with unpaid fan fiction, such as works described by Coppa:

> a lot of the best works of fanfiction are not comprehensible to a general reader, just as a lot of the best poetry depends on you having a fairly deep knowledge of the traditions and history of poetry, and the better you know Homer's Odyssey, the better you'll understand Joyce's *Ulysses*.[19]

As he acknowledges, however, Moore typically fashions his narratives to appeal to both kinds of readers. Accordingly, while his novels do not depend upon prior knowledge, he often encourages his audience to "find the Shakespeare." After naming some of the sources for *Shakespeare for Squirrels,* for instance, he invites his readers to flaunt their own expertise, saying: "There have been lines and phrases drawn from the other plays as well, but as I forgot to make note of them, you may bask in your own cleverness if you recognized a line."[20] He further rewards more knowledgeable readers with a variety of verbal "Easter eggs."[21] He wryly alludes, for instance, to Nahum Tate's popular *The History of King Lear* (1681), which offers viewers a happy ending to Shakespeare's tragedy whereby Cordelia and Lear both live. Cordelia then marries Edgar.[22] Moore's Cordelia also survives in Fool, but she weds the eponymous jester, rather than Gloucester's exonerated son. This nod to Tate offers another bonus to astute readers, however, since they will know that the character of the Fool does not appear in this seventeenth-century tragicomedy. Moore includes these kinds of allusions often, offering insider status to those who notice them without alienating readers who lack information that might signal a subtext. Thus, he can gesture at the common double casting of the Fool and Cordelia, by intertwining their narratives, but readers without any background in theatrical history will not be confused.

Although fan fiction emanates from diverse sources, responses to Shakespeare's writing align closely with responses to a particular cluster of texts, films, and television programs. This branch of fan fiction emerges from texts that are popular, complicated, and both emotionally and intellectually compelling to their audiences. Notably, many popular culture media attracting the attention of

fan fiction creators feature some of the most prominent actors of modern Shakespearean productions, including (among others), Patrick Stewart (*Star Trek*); Benedict Cumberbatch, Martin Freeman, and Andrew Scott (*Sherlock*); Ian McKellen (*Lord of the Rings*); David Tennant, Christopher Ecclestone and Catherine Tate (*Dr. Who*); Gwendeline Christie (*Game of Thrones*); and Maggie Smith, Kenneth Branagh, Fiona Shaw, Emma Thompson and Ralph Fiennes (*Harry Potter*). Interconnections between these kinds of actors and texts create a fertile environment for novels such as Moore's Shakespearean Trilogy. The audiences likely to be attracted to these works will understand and appreciate the clever interplay between genres and theoretical frameworks that characterize Moore's fiction.

Moore expands the theoretical frameworks of Shakespeare's plays by fashioning storylines that primarily include characters found in Shakespeare's plays but then putting these figures in situations that alternately reflect and diverge from events represented in Shakespeare. There are three regularly recurring characters, Pocket, Drool (an apprentice fool, given to frequent, often public, masturbation), and Pocket's monkey, Jeff. Pocket is the only one of these emanating directly from early modern drama, although Jeff presumably corresponds with the monkey Jessica purportedly acquires in *Merchant of Venice* (3.1.1350). Other figures, many from Shakespeare, appear intermittently, commonly in the novel coinciding with "their" play. Typically, those drawn from Shakespeare offer exaggerated versions of their dramatic forebears. The portrayals of Goneril and Regan in Fool, for instance, correspond with many of the qualities they display in *King Lear,* but they channel the vigorous libido exhibited in Shakespeare into extensive sexual involvement with Pocket, with allusions to "kinky" animal play. When Regan, for instance, resents Goneril's carnal dalliances with the fool, she demands equal measure, which he willingly offers:

> And oh it led to many months of clandestine monkey noises: howling, grunting, screeching, yipping, squishing, slapping, laughing, and no little bit of barking. (But there was no slinging of poo as monkeys are wont to do). Only the most decent, forthright monkey sounds as are made from proper bonking.[23]

Desdemona and Portia, two of the main characters from Shakespeare's Venetian plays, *Othello* and *Merchant of Venice,* transform into siblings in Moore's rendition of their stories, a detail that presumably leads to the author's decision to send Othello, his wife, and his soldiers to Corsica rather than Cyprus, so that they will remain in closer geographical proximity to Venice.[24] Shylock's daughter Jessica's fate also deviates from Shakespeare's storyline. Instead of eloping with Lorenzo as she does in *Merchant of Venice,* her story partially merges with that of *Pericles*' Marina, as Jessica participates in various adventures accompanied by pirates. Pocket also introduces Jessica to Marco Polo, who plays a key role in their escapades, and the tale sometimes converges with Edgar Allan Poe's "Cask of Amontillado.[25] These changes and other variations from Shakespeare's texts facilitate audiences' abilities to encounter fresh narratives, while appreciating the insider knowledge that helps them understand and value these frequently eccentric or raunchy alterations to the source materials.

Moore does not create his novels solely using the techniques associated with fan fiction, however. Instead, as noted above, his narrative frequently alludes to diffuse literary, critical, and cultural perspectives. Drawing in part from the picaresque literary tradition, for instance, Moore's trilogy offers a first-person account, told by an idiosyncratic protagonist who gets entangled in innumerable, episodic escapades and who seems most noteworthy for his unusually small stature, his voracious sexual appetite, and his ambiguous ethical stances. Moore is not bound by formal definitions of the picaresque, but Pocket's adventures accord with this literary tradition, which Ligia Tomoiagā describes:

> In the older stories, the picaroon is an isolated individual, "thrown" in a state of crisis, very often an orphan who is forced to face a hostile society. After a series of events, he will soon discover that he has to find a social role, that he cannot just be an outsider, that society cannot be ignored. Thus, he will try to find a role to play, even though this means cheating, lying, deceiving etc. He is not only urged by the need to belong to a certain social group, but also by the even more urgent material needs, which make him be even more vigilant and a keener observer of social realities.[26]

Pocket's history, which is presented at length in *Fool*, closely conforms with Tomaigā's account. A child on his own, he falls

under the care of the suggestively whiskered, presumably male nun, "Mother" Basil, who sends him to bring food to the mythologically-named Thalia, who lives as an anchoress, enclosed in a convent wall. During their extensive encounters, the young Pocket takes his first steps into what could be termed kink by developing a torridly sexual relationship with incarcerated Thalia, which incorporates a barrier between the lovers resembling the wall between Pyramus and Thisbe in *A Midsummer Night's Dream.* As a consequence, Mother Basil is forced to order his hanging "since you shagged the anchoress, Pocket."[27] In Pocket's telling, "The sisters pulled me away, tied my hands, and took me to the barn where I was hanged," but this incident becomes one of the Shakespearean feigned deaths discussed below.[28] Pocket subsequently leaves to find his way in the world, where he engages in the kinds of roguish activities associated with the picaroon, especially including those involving physical intimacy of the unsanctioned sort as Pocket notes: "I am such an accomplished horn-beast and eloquent crafter of cuckoldry."[29] The Fool's picaresque isolation is also noted by Pocket himself, "Am I to be forever alone?" and by the anchoress, who says, "You're gifted with wit, Pocket, but to cast jibe and jest you must stand separate from the target of your barbs. I fear you may become a lonely man, even in the company of others."[30] While Pocket is often surrounded by people, the solitariness noted here generally remains with him during the trajectory of these novels, except possibly during his short, but happy, marriage with Cordelia.

Pocket's singularity is often signaled by his physical appearance. In *Fool*, for instance, he is frequently said to be physically smaller than average, but his size is rarely described with specificity. Much to Pocket's displeasure, for instance, Cornwall refers to his stature early in the book: "Don't worry, little one, the king'll keep your hide whole."[31] Readers are not usually given sufficient information to know what "little one" means, other than to realize that while his diminutive height is noticeable, it does not interfere with his sexual desirability or prowess, which he references regularly. In *Fool*, for instance, he trades bawdy barbs with Lear's kitchen staff:

> "Back, Fool," said, Bubble, the head cook. "That's the king's lunch and I'll have your balls before I'll let you at it."
> "My balls are yours for the asking, milady," said I, "Would you have them on a trencher, or shall I serve them in a bowl of cream, like Peaches?"[32]

While Pocket's physicality receives regular mention and draws attention from those he encounters, it does not seem to have significant influence on the array of mishaps he meets in these novels. Instead, he alternates between stumbling into adverse circumstances and making deliberate choices destined to wreak havoc in his life and the lives of those around him, even when he is trying to assist his often-hapless companions, including Drool and Jeff. His vexed circumstances also appear when he is trapped in the company of the *Serpent of Venice*'s attentive sea monster (which was imported by Marco Polo), who prefigures the further nods to sexual animal play found in *Shakespeare for Squirrels:*

> The creature in the dark had left fish for me, scored it for me, saved me from hunger if not delirium. What rough beast knows charity? What shark's cold eye shines with kindness? None! These are human things, but even as a man can act a beast, can a monster show the character of a man? A woman?[33]

Since this encounter involves Pocket, it inevitably includes sexual congress. From Drool's perspective, "Pocket shagged a dragon."[34] Predictably, the fool offers Marco Polo a more complicated account of these events:

> I told my tale of being drugged, chained in the dungeon, of the creature coming to me in the dark, doing the dark deed upon me, and its subsequent murders and mutilations. I left out the bits about being able to project my thoughts to the serpent, to receive what appeared to be return messages on the dark canvas of my eyelids, and my plans for revenge.[35]

While these stories are ribald and entertaining, Pocket's hijinks reach a further narrative peak in *Shakespeare for Squirrels,* where the fool and his entourage encounter the reimagined characters from the complex world presented in *A Midsummer Night's Dream.* Here, the picaresque fan fiction of the first two novels morphs into homages to animal play, magical realism, and the World of Warcraft spell Feign Death.[36] Keeping with the trilogy's ongoing investment in "kink," moreover, there is also a significant amount of sexual activity that is not constrained to unions between those of the same species.

A Midsummer Night's Dream is generally classified as a comedy, but it contains many dark episodes, including a father's threat to

have his daughter put to death for refusing to marry according to the Athenian laws that guarantee patriarchal prerogatives (1.1.45-6). There are numerous physical and social distinctions between the characters in the play, where some of those portrayed are humans with varying degrees of societal status, while others are categorized as fairies or sprites. Productions of this play are frequently highly sexualized. The Bridge Theatre *Dream*, a prominent recent production disseminated widely through National Theatre Live, for example, presented a range of sexual proclivities and activities. Even though this drama frequently ends up in the curricula of younger students and "family friendly" performances abound, the implications of a fairy queen falling in love with a human wearing an ass head, a fairy king and queen purportedly cavorting sexually with humans; a pair of sexually alert young couples; a juvenile "Indian boy" who may attract the erotic attention of Oberon, even though he does not appear physically in the text; and an often maliciously mischievous "Robin Goodfellow," leave ample room for highly-charged, sexually complicated productions. *A Midsummer Night's Dream* may boast a cast of many fairies, but those figures are not always benign, and the play also contains innumerable "adult" situations that Moore capitalizes on throughout his novel.

In addition, this play, even in its early modern form, closely corresponds to many of the features modern criticism refer to as "magical realism," where, according to Lois Parkinson Zamora and Wendy B. Faris, "For the characters who inhabit the fictional world, and for the author who creates it, magic may be real, reality magical."[37] In early modern England, of course, fairies, witches, and other supernatural beings frequently seemed to inhabit liminal spaces between reality and imagination. Like the Oracle in *The Winter's Tale* and Ariel in *The Tempest,* mystical figures here coexist with humans. These fungible spaces are not straightforward, however. Accordingly, Bottom is perplexed after he returns from his sojourn with Titania:

> Methought I was—there is no man can tell what. Methought I was, and methought I had—but man is but a patched fool if he will offer to say what methought I had. The eye of man hath not heard, the ear of man hath not seen, man's hand is not able to taste, his tongue to conceive, nor his heart to report what my dream was. (4.1.1769-76)

Nevertheless, audiences are given little reason to be confused as the play introduces some characters who are clearly human, some who are fairies, and some, such as Titania/Hippolyta and Oberon/Theseus, who inhabit different realms, but are often played by double cast actors. In the domain of the play, the characters who represent adjacent worlds do not always confront each other knowingly, but there are indications that they are aware of each other and that they sometimes interact unconsciously, including when Robin Goodfellow/Puck uses his ability to shape shift in order to wreak havoc on humans:

> And sometime lurk I in a gossip's bowl
> In very likeness of a roasted crab,
> And when she drinks, against her lips I bob
> And on her withered dewlap pour the ale. (2.1.415-8)

In the plays and in early modern folk traditions, it is not always easy or possible to distinguish between reality and fancy.

Moore takes advantage of the permeability between these realms, then twists things even further. He includes fairies who fulfill many roles that are congruent with their parts in the drama, but in *Shakespeare for Squirrels,* they only spend part of their time as fairies and several of them also have extended contact with Pocket. Cobweb, in particular, becomes emotionally attached to the fool, unsuccessfully endeavors to seduce him on numerous occasions, ultimately convinces him to engage in physical intimacy, and leaves the forest with him at the end of the narrative, although Pocket tries and fails to dissuade her:

> "There probably won't be other fairies. You won't be able to frolic." "I've frolicked before." "But you're a squirrel." "Not all the time." "But a crashing lot of the time. The time when it's not dark." "In the day I shall ride on your shoulder and listen to you tell tales of wonder and adventure. Besides, you fancy me, Pocket of Dog Snogging." "Fuckstockings," said I, defeated. "Come along, then."[38]

These kinds of interactions bring aspects of magical realism into view, since they enable fairies and humans to interact closely, but Moore does not stop at that boundary. Instead, possibly recognizing that there is a growing body of criticism devoted to Animal Studies, exploring the complex relationships between human and

non-human living beings, Moore leaps into a similar territory, by creating personified (or fairyfied) animals, such as Cobweb, with unusual abilities. His venture into animalized realms introduces questions corresponding with other investigations emerging from fan fiction, as Paul Waldau suggests in his description of Animal Studies:

> Contemporary developments in Animal Studies reveal that many people today desire to learn about nonhuman animals—some seek to recover lost perspectives; others work to ignite creative thinking and artistic sensibilities regarding other other living beings; and many work through one or more of the impressive sciences that our species has nurtured.[39]

Moore does not focus in depth on animals, but his inclusion of significant, but unexpected, squirrels in *Shakespeare for Squirrels* and of a sea monster in *The Serpent of Venice* who straddles human, animal, and supernatural realms suggests that his fiction gestures to this emerging critical area in addition to more long-standing literary traditions.

Moore also investigates boundaries between life and death and beings who inhabit spaces between these states. Tales about unworldly characters, such as vampires, often place constraints upon those figures' ability to range freely during daylight hours. Similar limitations are also found in Shakespeare, as we learn in *A Midsummer Night's Dream:*

> And we fairies, that do run
> By the triple Hecate's team
> From the presence of the sun,
> Following darkness like a dream,
> Now are frolic. (5.1.2232-6)

Otherworldy creatures, it seems, cannot freely roam through human territories when they might be seen, even though it appears as though Oberon and Titania have been able to engage in sexual dalliances with people who attract their interest (2.1.385; 428-546). In Moore's rendition, the fairies also need to depart human territories when the sun rises, but they do not slink away into secret hiding places or magically disappear. Rather, these mysterious beings leave the realm of the supernatural, moving instead into the trees, where they hide in plain sight by presenting

themselves as squirrels. For much of the novel, the fairies keep their duality a secret from everyone, including Pocket, but their complex identities are eventually revealed, and the fool resumes his sexual relationship with Cobweb:

> The fairies dropped naked out of the trees, at dusk, and Cobweb immediately leapt into my arms and snogged me mercilessly, breathing her nutty breath on me, her skin redolent of bark and leaves from her squirrely day out and about.[40]

Pocket is not terribly pleased to discover that Cobweb switches between fairyland and the realm of the squirrels, but it doesn't interfere with their lovemaking, although Bottom takes great delight in mocking Pocket as a "squirrel shagger" until the fool reminds Bottom that he bears an animal shape that will keep him from performing in the play: "*you* have a tail. And a long snout. And nostrils like teacups. You, sir, are an ass."[41] In Moore's recreation of Shakespeare's comedy, sex between species is consistently widespread and complicated.

By exploring the narrative and sexual complexities emerging from fairies or humans who become animals, Moore expands the range of identity-marking signals and physical boundaries his fiction examines and often undermines. While humans and fairies already share close contact between humans and fairies in this environment, placing the fairies in a position where they alternate between species extends these considerations even further. As Waldau indicates, there is a

> definition of Animal Studies that focuses on the ways human individuals and cultures are now interacting with other-than-human animals, have in the past interacted with species beyond their own species, and in the future might interact with them.[42]

The fairies turned squirrels can easily be counted as "other-than-human-animals," and Moore takes full advantage of the comic implications of that status, while creating a possible space for more philosophically attuned readers as well.

Throughout the trilogy, Moore investigates how to manipulate narratives so that they offer readers the opportunity to examine their understanding of different kinds of beings and to consider,

often through comedy or satire, the ways their beliefs are formed, modulated, or fiercely protected. Such tactics also encompass his apparent dual "fan fiction" references to supernatural series such as *Twilight* and contemporary electronic games, including World of Warcraft, when he interrogates borders between those who are dead, "undead," or captured in some liminal space between. As mentioned, Moore introduces incidents from these and similar realms in the first two volumes of the trilogy. Then, in *Shakespeare for Squirrels,* he incorporates related questions in segments focusing on two key characters, namely, Pocket and Robin Goodfellow or "Puck," and briefly suggests that Hermia has died, although she apparently just fainted at the sight of Nick Bottom in his guise as an ass.[43] This death is related to *Feign Death,* a "spell" associated with World of Warcraft, a complex series of games, books, manga, and associated merchandise. This spell is designed to help those in dangerous situations to defuse the threat surrounding them by distracting their enemies, at least temporarily, with the erroneous belief that whoever is under siege has died.[44] Shakespeare and other early modern authors use similar strategies to help characters such as Juliet evade unwanted people and events. Pocket's seeming demise in *Shakespeare for Squirrels* occurs early in the book, when the book's protagonist faces angry, armed assailants. In typical Moorean fashion, however, this narrative shift becomes more complicated before it is resolved. For part of this novel, Pocket also believes that he has died, although he is not impressed with death:

> Well, Death was a darkling dollop of dog wank. Neither paradise nor perdition as promised. No shining gates to welcome me into the bosom of those I had loved, nor pit to pull me onto the pikes of mine enemies.[45]

Pocket is particularly annoyed because the distinction between life and death does not seem as absolute as he expected:

> Had I known hunger would follow me into the undiscovered country I would have taken more time for lunch before shuffling off this mortal coil. . .And what an ignominious death it was! Death by dunderheaded official?[46]

Since Pocket is generally a comedic figure, his misapprehension here facilitates humor at the same time that it raises questions about what constitutes death and what happens to human consciousness

and appetite once mortal life has ended. Shakespeare, of course, explores such questions in many of his plays.

This narrative tactic emerges at length later in the novel when Puck faces death and is determined to have permanently passed away, even though many of those involved in these adventures are unsure how Puck can actually be subject to mortality. Thus, when Oberon announces "I have no fear. I am immortal," Pocket reminds him "So was the Puck, your grace."[47] Since Pocket and Cordelia remain alive even after leaving Lear's kingdom, in contradiction to what happens in Shakespeare's play, Puck's demise could be seen as simply another antithetical gesture that similarly undermines the trajectory of Shakespeare's plotlines. In Moore's telling, however, this extended incident allows the author to invoke a link to World of Warfare while raising questions about which human constraints apply to creatures from other categories. Pocket, notes, for instance, that none of the fairies are likely to have murdered Puck, since he died while they were squirrels:

> it was broad daylight when Puck stopped the arrow. And I think we can say that a squirrel is very unlikely to have shot a crossbow no matter how small the weapon.[48]

Titania points out the usual distinction between the fairy and human realms when she tells the story of the death of the Indian boy's mother in childbirth: "She, being mortal, of that boy did die" (2.1.505), but the barriers between humans and fairies seemingly remain fungible, as the Fairy Queen's sexualized encounter with Bottom as an ass indicates. In *Shakespeare for Squirrels,* the issues become even more complicated, since Moore introduces the master obfuscator Rumour, from *Henry IV, part two,* into the story. Eventually, however, Puck returns to the narrative, after a symbolic three days of death, only to discover that he may be the father of the little Indian boy.[49] Shakespeare, of course, raises related questions frequently. Is Caliban, human, for example, being the son of a witch by the devil who is sometimes mistaken for a fish or a monster? (*Tempest*, 5.1.2343-7; 2.2.1109, 1115).[50] What powers do the weird sisters in *Macbeth* possess? They can generate winds but cannot kill the seaman whose wife refused to share her chestnuts: "Though his bark cannot be lost, / Yet it shall be tempest-tossed" (1.3.122-3). How do we interpret the powers

and limitations of Hermione when she is immobilized in *The Winter's Tale* or, in fact, when Hermione Granger encounters a similar fate in *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets*? Do all of these figures inhabit different regions of the same "world" or do they live in intersecting or parallel universes? Many of the texts inspiring fan fiction raise similar topics for consideration. The laws governing time, space, physics, and mortality repeatedly become subjected to new rules and challenges, as writers, including Moore, imagine what different environments could become if the strictures informing their existence were redesigned.

By directing his novels at an audience literate in a range of intellectually rich artifacts and theories, such as those alluded to above, Moore hints at why so many gifted Shakespearean actors also work in projects such as *Star Trek, Sherlock, Dr. Who, Harry Potter, Lord of the Rings,* and *Game of Thrones.* Like Shakespearean drama, these texts challenge standards familiar from what might be called "the real world." They are filled, for instance, with realistic characters who interact with figures from other geographies or dimensions. Such spaces frequently operate under rules varying from those applicable in human, earthly domains. These texts encourage intellectual and emotional engagement, rewarding viewers and audiences who bring deep knowledge bases into these encounters. Enthusiastic external participants then frequently take the narratives in new directions through additional writing or creative activity. They challenge characters and audiences to test their intellectual, physical, and/or moral mettle against dark forces that may or may not be human. Christopher Moore's *Fool* trilogy is often light-hearted and raucous, but it simultaneously supplies its readers with a complicated refashioning of a number of challenging texts, including those by Shakespeare. As my title suggests, their "shape and making" may remain ambiguous and in flux, but these realms invite readers and audiences to join fervent, imaginative explorations of innumerable questions involving humanity, the spirit world, and "the great globe itself" (*Tempest*, 4.1.1884).

Notes

All quotes take from *The Riverside Shakespeare,* edited by G. Blakemore Evans (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1996).

1. Pope includes a lengthy footnote defining these diffuse terms, which range from sexually explicit genres to "feel good" narratives, characters from multiple

fictional universes, and other creations. Johnathan H. Pope, *Shakespeare's Fans: Adapting the Bard in the Age of Media Fandom* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020), 15.

2. Brian Mansfield, "10 actors who played one character on multiple TV shows," *USA Today*, 8 February, 2015, accessed 11 October, 2020. https://www.usatoday.com/story/life/entertainthis/2015/02/08/multiple-shows-better-call-saul/77600410/.

3. Sara K. Howe and Susan E. Cook, eds. *Representing Kink: Fringe Sexuality and Textuality in Literature, Digital Narrative and Popular Culture* (Lanham, MD. Lexington Books, 2019); "Lil Succubuss," "Types of Animal Roleplay," March 12, 2020. Accessed 16 February, 2021. https://animal-role-play.com/2020/03/12/types-of-animal-roleplay/.

4. Howe and Cook, *Representing Kink,* 1.

5. Christopher Moore, *Fool* (New York: HarperCollins, 2009); Moore *Lamb: The Gospel of Biff, Christ's Childhood Pal* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004); Moore, *Serpent of Venice* (New York: HarperCollins, 2014); Moore, *Shakespeare for Squirrels* (New York: HarperCollins, 2020).

6. Christopher Moore was very generous in his willingness to answer my questions and I am very grateful for his cooperation. Moore, Personal email correspondence. 2021. Accessed January 28, 2021.

7. McClellan, among others, discusses the kinds of "worlds" operative in fan fiction. Ann K. McClellan, *Sherlock's World: Fan Fiction and the Reimagining of BBC's Sherlock* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2018), 6.

8. Karen Helleckson and Kristina Busse, eds. *The Fan Fiction Studies Reader* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2014), 3-4.

9. Urban Dictionary, "Nerd." 2020. Accessed 11 October, 2020. https://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=Nerd.

10. Viviene E. Cree and Cathlin Macaulay, eds. *Transfer of Learning in Professional and Vocational Education* (London: Routledge, 2000), 6.

11. Francesca Coppa, ed. *The Fanfiction Reader: Folk Tales for the Digital Age* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2017), ix.

12. McClellan, *Sherlock's World,* 19.

13. Sheenagh Pugh, *The Democratic Genre: Fan Fiction in a Literary Context* (Bridgend, UK: Seren Press, 2005), 14.

14. McClellan, *Sherlock's World,* 19.

15. Moore, (January 28). Personal email correspondence. 2021. Accessed January 28, 2021.

16. Moore, (January 28). Personal email correspondence. 2021. Accessed January 28, 2021.

17. McClellan, Sherlock's World, 6.

18. Valeri M. Fazel and Louise Geddes, eds. *The Shakespearean User: Critical and Creative Appropriations in a Networked Culture* (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), 8.

19. Coppa, *The Fanfiction Reader,* viii.

20. Moore, *Shakespeare for Squirrels,* 271.

21. According to the Urban Dictionary, Easter eggs are "A hidden item placed in a movie, television show, or otherwise visual media for close watchers.

Originates from the 1975 movie "The Rocky Horror Picture Show," when the cast had an Easter Egg hunt but most of the eggs went unfound. They can be seen throughout the film in various locations (such as under Frank N. Furter's throne). Urban Dictionary, "Easter Eggs." 2020. Accessed 11 October, 2020. https://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=easter%20egg.

22. Nahum Tate, *History of King Lear* (London, 1681).
23. Moore, *Fool,* 175.
24. Moore, *Serpent of Venice,* 151.
25. Moore, *Serpent of Venice,* 214; Edgar Allan Poe, *Cask of Amontillado.* (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 1847).
26. Ligia Tomoiagă, *Elements of the Picaresque in Contemporary British Fiction* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2012), 19.
27. Moore, *Fool,* 74. It seems likely that this avid, but circumscribed, sexual relationship alludes to the lovers Pyramis and Thisbe, who were famously separated by a wall in *A Midsummer Night's Dream.*
28. Moore, *Fool,* 74.
29. Moore, *Fool,* 75.
30. Moore, *Fool,* 75.
31. Moore, *Fool,* 8.
32. Moore, *Fool,* 5.
33. Moore, *Serpent of Venice,* 44.
34. Moore, *Serpent of Venice,* 220.
35. Moore, *Serpent of Venice,* 220.
36. As is probably clear, there are inevitably popular culture, literary, and historical references included in these novels that will not be discussed here. I am grateful to my son for his guidance on gaming culture.
37. Lois Parkinson Zamoraand Wendy B. Faris, eds. *Magical Realism: Theory, History, Community (*Durham: Duke UP, 1995), 3.
38. Moore, *Shakespeare for Squirrels,* 263.
39. Paul Waldau, *Animal Studies: An Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), xii.
40. Moore, *Shakespeare and the Squirrels,* 145.
41. Moore, *Shakespeare and the Squirrels,* 132.
42. Waldau, *Animal Studies,* xiii.
43. Moore, Shakespeare and the Squirrels, 141.
44. "Feign Death," *Wikidot,* 2020. Accessed 11 October, 2020. http://dnd5e.wikidot.com/spell:feign-death; "Feign Death," *Wowpedia.* Accessed 11 October, 2020. https://wow.gamepedia.com/Feign_Death.
45. Moore, *Shakespeare and the Squirrels,* 29.
46. Moore, *Shakespeare and the Squirrels,* 29.
47. Moore, *Shakespeare and the Squirrels,* 173.
48. Moore, *Shakespeare and the Squirrels,* 136.
49. Moore, *Shakespeare and the Squirrels,* 258.
50. Not surprisingly, Caliban appears in many fan fiction creations. See, for example, "Caliban (The Tempest)," *Non-alien Creatures Wiki,* Accessed 3 March, 2021. https://non-aliencreatures.fandom.com/wiki/Caliban_(The_Tempest).

An Argument for Cleopatra—the "Herculean Hero"—of Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*

Jordan Charlton
University of Nebraska — Lincoln

William Shakespeare's play *Antony and Cleopatra* focuses on the fatal love affair of the titular characters, the queen of Egypt, Cleopatra, and the militant leader of the Roman triumvirate, Mark Antony. This play is a dramatization of an already familiar narrative from the centuries prior. Writers like Plutarch and Virgil as well as Chaucer and Horace had their own iterations of the drama. Shakespeare's play offers a re-centered vantage point of the political and romantic dynamics of this relationship between lovers and legends. This rendition complicates and humanizes the mythos of Antony and Cleopatra in ways that include new considerations for this audience. Additionally, Shakespeare veers away from some of his traditional approaches to writing in this text. I believe that Shakespeare goes further in his portrayal of the Egyptian queen than with most of the other women he writes and would like to offer a new reading of her lasting influence. This essay is primarily interested in the structures of power Antony and Cleopatra defend and display between them and seeks to further the discussion of a particular character archetype highlighted in the work of Bruce R. Smith's *Shakespeare and Masculinity.* By relying on close readings of the play, feminist theory, and Smith's argument, sufficient evidence can be provided for another contextualization of one of Shakespeare's most endearing characters.

Journal of the Wooden O. Vol 20, 20-31
© Southern Utah University Press
ISSN: 1539-5758

Smith's *Shakespeare and Masculinity* focuses on the ideals, character types, and themes of masculinity in the stage plays of William Shakespeare. When listing the character archetypes present in Shakespeare's dramas, Smith identifies the following variations: the chivalrous knight, the Herculean hero, the humanist man of moderation, the merchant prince, and the saucy jack. Smith concludes that the characters in *Antony and Cleopatra* display characteristics aligned with the archetype of the Herculean hero, who he defines as "a warrior of great stature who is guilty of striking departures from the morality of the society in which he lives."[1] Ultimately, Smith chooses Mark Antony as the character who exemplifies this position the most fully. He argues that the Roman military leader's departure from his responsibilities as a husband and an army leader show the ways in which his character has abandoned his duty in favor of love. However, I believe that the Herculean hero of the play is Cleopatra and not Antony.

While Smith's Herculean hero archetype assumes a masculine figure, the notions of masculinity applied do not seem to bar Cleopatra from this position. First, we'll need to take into consideration the role of masculinity in the work of our author. Smith writes, "Shakespeare's comedies often invite the conclusion that masculinity is more like a suit of clothes that can be put on and taken off at will than a matter of biologic destiny."[2] Plays like *Twelfth Night* and *The Merchant of Venice* utilize cross-dressing as a humorous look at the construction of gender. Although our play is a tragedy and not a comedy, the play retains a fluid approach to understanding gender identity. In Act 2, Scene 5, this dynamic comes alive again as Cleopatra relives the story of getting Antony drunk, and convincing him to wear her clothes in exchange for his own, even going so far to convince him to give her his sword (2.5.18-23). Certainly, it is Cleopatra's charm that influences this decision, but it is also her cunning.

Cleopatra has to contest her own sense of power and the increased suspicions surrounding her love to a married man. Later in Act 2, Scene 5, when the Messenger brings news of Antony's marriage to Octavia, Cleopatra bursts into a rage and threatens the life of the Messenger, ultimately finding less shame in the act of adultery than murder. Cleopatra's role in the play is complicated further by the dynamics of gendered expectations. As political and

militant leaders in their respective lands, the ideals of masculinity are shifted for Antony and Cleopatra, and I would argue that this scene offers the first observable force that shifts the dynamic of their relationship. Romantic love and political power are often at odds with one another in *Antony and Cleopatra.* What's at stake for both characters is the public and private intimacy of their relationship in the face of military and political expectations. Mark Antony is expected to be the fearless leader of the Roman army, the leader that Caesar applauds eloquently and celebrates (1.4.56-72). As Antony's love and affection become apparent to Caesar, Antony becomes a burden that Caesar describes as the type of boy who would choose to "Pawn their experience to their present pleasure / And so rebel to judgement" (1.4.32-3). Caesar wishes a shame on Antony that would drive him back to Rome.

In his book, *Descriptions of England,* William Harrison describes the "orders" of citizens, including, "Nobility and other gentlemen whose wealth is in land, inhabitants of cities and towns who earn their living by practicing a profession or plying a trade, yeomen farmers who own or lease the land they work, and laborers who own nothing themselves and sell their services to others."[3] From this description, we can understand that Shakespeare's audience would have understood citizens to be divided by gender as well as class. To understand how Cleopatra could fit the character archetype of the Herculean hero, therefore, we must be aware of the author's approach to masculinity. Smith writes, "any discussion of [the] ideals of masculinity in early modern England must take into account, then, differences in social rank."[4] By getting Antony to agree to this gender-challenging swap, Cleopatra's actions challenge the ideas of class-based differences associated with masculinity and society. Cleopatra's character is intriguing in the ways she performs as a lover, a militant leader, and the destroyer of the Roman triumvirate. The queen is presented to the audience as the epitome of desire, intelligence, and jealousy, amongst other things. These capabilities allow her to possess a type of agency that many women in seventeenth-century England did not have. In this way, the choice to focus on the character of Cleopatra means having to open up an inquiry into a much wider conversation about women, power, and representation on the stage in seventeenth-century England.

M. Ayub Jaija asks what position women hold in Shakespeare's plays, and the first place to look for an answer comes at the beginning of the play.[5] *Antony and Cleopatra* begins with these lines by Philo, one of Mark Antony's followers:

> Nay, but this dotage of our general's
> O'erflows the measure. Those his goodly eyes,
> That o'er the files and muster of the war
> Have glowed like plated Mars, now bend, now turn
> The office and devotion of their view
> Upon a tawny front (1.1.1-5).

Editor John Wilders glosses "dotage" as "infatuation," in the 1995 edition of the text.[6] As Wilders reads it, Shakespeare differentiates this relationship as a lesser version of the love Antony has for "the files and muster of the war." This interpretation can be thought of as a way to show Cleopatra as inferior to Mark Antony because she cannot wholly occupy a space in his heart. In this introduction to the queen, we can see why Courtni Wright might claim that to show a fully liberated woman might be dangerous for Shakespeare, so instead he complicates the way the audience first comes to understand this heroine.[7]

The text brings in another aspect of difference by making reference to the queen's appearance—her "tawny front." This description of something akin to the dirt of the earth would mean Cleopatra had a very dark complexion compared to the Roman citizens. Philo's decree shows that Antony's affair with Cleopatra has belittled him and left him a mere mortal, despite his political position. While his eyes were once fixated on things above, like Mars, they are now cast down below, insinuating that the Roman general has sunk to a new low through this entanglement.

Philo continues the introduction by saying, "Take but good note, and you shall see in him / The triple pillar of the world transformed / Into a strumpet's fool" (1.1.11-13). If love be indeed a measure of power, in this way, Cleopatra retains power, though she is referred to as a whore or strumpet. The "triple pillar of the world" represents the Roman triumvirate, whose members include Mark Antony, Octavius Caesar, and Lepidus. Philo's warning serves as a precaution to not fall in love with a woman of another nation as well as not to fall for a powerful woman because she very well might be the folly and downfall of a powerful man or empire.

Later in act 1, Cleopatra asks, "Why did [Antony] marry Fulvia and not love her? / I'll seem the fool I am not. Antony / Will be himself" (1.1.42-4). Wilders's version, unlike earlier editions, glosses those as being spoken directly to Antony and not performed as an aside. Wilders states that Cleopatra's apprehension with regard to Antony's marriage is because his devotion to his Roman wife makes her look weak in the eyes of others and because she knows he will continue to "be the fool, or deceiver he is."[8] If Wilders is correct in suggesting that Cleopatra speaks those lines directly to Antony instead of in an aside to the audience, then readers should also conclude that Cleopatra is even bolder than might have initially been thought. If that is the case, then the position of power, at least on the stage, belongs to Cleopatra as she postulates that it is her name and esteem that will be the subject of judgement due to Antony's infidelity. Furthermore, she suggests that he will be a fool—indeed, that he already is.

Early on in Act 1, when Antony first hears that his wife Fulvia is upset with him and that Octavius Caesar has called him home, Antony mulls over the decision and rejects the idea of returning to Rome and leaving Cleopatra's side, saying, "Let Rome in Tiber meet and the wide arch / Of the ranged empire fall / Here is my space" (1.1.34-5). Antony is assuming the role of a provider or protector of his beloved, albeit in a tongue-in-cheek manner because his rightful duty should be to Fulvia, to whom he is married. Antony's choice to stay with his beloved might be seen as sincere, but his choice is also a representation of the power Cleopatra has over him.

When considering the staging of the play, the ways that one character introduces another or gazes into the eyes of a third brings into question who might literally be doing these things on stage, which is a question Sarah Beckwith asks in the article "Are There Any Women in Shakespeare's Plays?: Fiction, Representation, and Reality in Feminist Criticism." Beckwith's work is in conversation with Dympna Callaghan's book *Shakespeare Without Women* and begins to look closer to the historical representation of the stage for answers. Beckwith's scholarship seeks to "focus on wider problems in feminism about what it means to secure cultural capital and political representation in patriarchy for women and other oppressed groups."[9] Ultimately, because the stage was still a space

only gendered for men during this period, Cleopatra would have been played by a man. This leads to one of the first observations that Smith points out: that gender identity is closely connected to performance. Because of this, Cleopatra can be the hero of her own story.

The performance of masculinity was also imperative for the stage as Smith lays out the fear of men performing in feminine ways by writing that "Galen's one-sex theory of the human body located masculinity not in the possession of distinctive sexual organs (men's equipment was imagined to be an extruded version of women's) but of behavior," and that "to become effeminate was an ever-present possibility."[10] Therefore, in act four, scene two, when Enobarbus cries out, "Look, they weep / And I, an ass, am onion-eyed: for shame, / Transform us not to women!", he is voicing a living anxiety of actually being turned into a woman. The stage was a place where power and masculinity were displayed through performance and where transformations could happen.

The audience's apprehension about the potentially transformative nature of the body and of the performance of gendered acts was also supplemented with the idea that men's bodies were in some ways "perfected" while women's bodies were incomplete. The idea was that men's bodies, made distinct through their "extruding" genitals, were the completed versions of what female bodies were trying to become. Additionally, gendered identity was hard to locate because, "'gender' in early modern English was connected to the declension of masculine, feminine, and neuter nouns in Latin."[11] Enobarbus gives voice to this fear when he wishes, "Transform us not to women!" (4.2.35).

In love, Cleopatra overwhelms her beloved in the power dynamic early in the play. In act one, Antony declares of Cleopatra "She is cunning past man's thought" (1.2.152). Antony's declaration serves to remove the confinement typically placed around women's intellectual ability. While this does serve to show women as the intellectual equals of men, Shakespeare does not push the envelope to the extent of demonstrating a modern notion of gender equality. In the same conversation, when Enobarbus learns that Antony's wife Fulvia is dead, Enobarbus responds by saying:

> Why, sir, give the gods a thankful sacrifice.
> When it pleaseth their deities to take the wife of a

> man from him, it shows to man the tailors of the earth; comforting therein, that when old robes are worn out, there are members to make new. If there were no more women but Fulvia, then had you indeed a cut, and the case to be lamented. This grief is crowned with consolation: your old smock brings forth a new petticoat, and indeed the tears live in an onion that should water this sorrow. (1.2.160-8)

Wilders glosses the lines 170-171 as being full of sexual innuendo, much like the majority of this interaction with Antony. Additionally, Enobarbus makes a comparison that declares women to be like men's clothing, suggesting that they can simply be replaced like an old robe or piece of cloth. He further claims that women should only be seen as complementary to men's bodies and not as important in their own right. Shortly after Antony's consideration for his love's intelligence comes a series of jokes that work to undo this effect and to create a negative audience perception of women. If we follow Jajja's ideas about how women are represented, this section of the text does nothing to contribute to the way that women are viewed in the plot. In a space like this, it is especially hard to see how Shakespeare acts as an agent of change and promotion on behalf of women.

Smith explains the expectations of masculine performance in these plays by writing, "Shakespeare and his fellow actors replicated within the small space of the Globe's wooden O the very process whereby masculine identity was performed in the world of early modern England at large."[12] Additionally, "Shakespeare's male characters attest that masculinity is also a function of person as *agents,*" and that "Stage performances of masculinity entail all four senses of 'person.'"[13] Indeed, the stage was one of the two places that held the most cultural capital in the community and was also a place of education.

Not only does Cleopatra's relationship with Antony challenge ideals of marriage by the church, but it also challenges contemporary ideas of love. Love functions as a dynamic of power in the play, and Cleopatra's first lines are concerned with the dynamic of love. In her first line, she asks, "If it be love indeed, tell me how much" (1.1.14). David Hillman approaches love as a system of power and a dynamic that plays a large part in the understanding of *Antony*

and Cleopatra, writing "Cleopatra's opening salvo in *Antony and Cleopatra* is a provocation, a dare—not just to her Roman lover but to audiences and critics both within and without Shakespeare's late tragedy of love."[14] Love, in this play, becomes its own barrier against the progress of the characters as Antony is inhibited in his responsibilities by the call of love. Cleopatra has a much better grasp of this power and therefore wields this power over her beloved. Hillman writes that love, transference love, and infatuation are all gendered forms of power, with transference being one of the most moving parts of the drama. Because Cleopatra wields a better understanding of love, Antony is subjected to what would have been considered an effeminate role. Hillman cites Freud's "Observations on Love in Transference" from *Wild Analysis,* following up on the characteristics of transference love by stating:

> It is true that this infatuation [transference love] consists of reissuing old components and repeating infantile reactions. But this is always the essence of falling in love. Everybody repeats childhood patterns. . . . Perhaps love in transference has slightly less freedom than the love that occurs ordinarily in life and is called normal; it shows more clearly its dependence on its infantile predecessor, and it proves to be less adaptable and flexible, but that is all—the differences are not essential. . . . You have no right to deny the title of "genuine" love to an infatuation that makes its appearance during analytical treatment. If it appears far from normal, this is easily explained by the circumstance that falling in love even outside analytical therapy is more reminiscent of abnormal than normal mental phenomena.

Antony, the focus of Cleopatra's love, is subjected to these childlike features of his love. Because he is so infatuated, he leaves his post as part of the triumvirate to follow his love. These actions show how the queen performs a form of power over Antony, as he has to know that she is in better control of her will. However, Cleopatra is still subject to the difficulty of love, as is made very clear in her exchange with the messenger in act three, scene three, when the queen asks a series of questions about Octavia in a fit of jealousy and curiosity. Love proves to be a factor that does not care whom it subjects to its will.

At the end of the play, Cleopatra herself brings into question the focus of performance and gender in a moment that is rich in its dramatic irony. Just before her death, the queen declares:

> Nay, 'tis most certain, Iras. Saucy lictors
> Will catch at us like strumpets, and scald rhymers
> Ballad us out o'tune. The quick comedians
> Extemporally will stage us and present
> Our Alexandrian revels; Antony
> Shall be brought drunken forth; and I shall see
> Some squeaking Cleopatra boy my greatness
> I'th' posture of a whore. (5.2.214-9)

In this way, the queen becomes her own orator and a playwright, rewriting the narrative on how she will be depicted. This moment in a drama is typically reserved as a place for the male hero to have his last attempt at a dramatic monologue, but instead, Cleopatra gets the focus on stage. She calls out those who will tell her story by declaring that those saucy (glossed as "insolent" or "lascivious") writers will cast her majesty as nothing more than a strumpet or loose woman. Cleopatra cries out against that perspective on both her behalf and the behalf of women in power in general. She seems to assert her authority and the value of understanding her role as a powerful individual, the Herculean hero of the text, that I would like to believe she is.

Because the stage was a place for only male performers, it is essential to remember that Cleopatra would have been played by a man even when delivering this speech. Relying once again on Rackin's research, it's important to think about how we might interpret the portrayal of women characters by young, male actors. In the chapter, "Boys Will Be Girls," Rackin mentions several of the potential reasons that influenced Shakespeare to rely on an all-male cast.[16] A large portion of the inspiration was seeped in patriarchic values as the performances were limited to male participation and were written for male audiences despite women's participation in and patronage of the arts. Another reason Shakespeare used an all-male cast was his intention to avoid any potential confusion about the sexuality of his productions. He did not want to put women on display for men's entertainment. In some ways, this could be seen as a potential honor, but that is only if one assumes that the virtue of a woman is steeped in her chastity and that having a multitude

of men seeing her would somehow lessen her value. Because it would be fine to have a man on stage, and this was not seen as lessening men's value, this view must be seen as another deterrent to equality.

By understanding the context of Shakespeare's characters, we can adapt our understanding of what they represented then and now. Though Smith's archetypes are good at identifying the characteristics that Shakespeare uses in his plays, there exists a need to critically inquire what those types represent not just in terms of historicity but also in terms of culture. In some ways, by refusing to see women as the heroines or provocateurs of the texts, the risk of continuing patriarchal values is still very high. Viewing Cleopatra as the Herculean hero of this text opens new understandings of women's ability to perform gendered roles and inspires the question of how other women might be leading the way in Shakespeare's other works.

Notes

1. Bruce R. Smith, *Shakespeare and Masculinity* (Oxford University Press, 2012), 48.

2. Smith, *Shakespeare and Masculinity,* 3; For a larger view of women's position and engagement in the theater in Shakespeare's works, see also Jill Dolan, "Rehearsing Democracy: Advocacy, Public Intellectuals, and Civic Engagement in Theatre and Performance Studies," Theatre Topics 11.1 (2001): 1–17, doi:10.1353/tt.2001.0005; Robert I. Lublin, "Feminist History, Theory, and Practice in the Shakespeare Classroom," *Theatre Topics* 14.2 (2004): 397–410, doi:10.1353/tt.2004.0021; and Joshua Mabie, "The Problem of the Prodigal in *The Fair Maid of the West, A Christian Turned Turk,* and *The Renegado," Renascence* 64.4 (2012): 299–319, doi:10.5840/renascence201264431.

3. Smith, *Shakespeare and Masculinity,* 94.

4. Smith, *Shakespeare and Masculinity,* 43.

5. M. Ayub Jajja, "A Feminist Reading of Shakespearean Tragedies: Frailty, Thy Name Is Woman," *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences,* 8.1 (2014): 228–237.

6. John Wilders, ed., *Antony and Cleopatra* (Bloomsbury, 1995).

7. Courtni C. Wright, *The Women of Shakespeare's Plays: Analysis of the Role of the Women in Selected Plays with Plot Synopses and Selected One Act Plays* (University Press of America, 1993).

8. Wilders, *Antony and Cleopatra,* 93.

9. Sarah Beckwith, "Are There Any Women in Shakespeare's Plays?: Fiction, Representation, and Reality in Feminist Criticism," *New Literary History* 46.2 (2015): 246.

10. Smith, *Shakespeare and Masculinity,* 106.

11. Smith, *Shakespeare and Masculinity,* 11.
12. Smith, *Shakespeare and Masculinity,* 37.
13. Smith, *Shakespeare and Masculinity,* 37.
14. David Hillman, "'If It Be Love Indeed': Transference, Love, and Anthony and Cleopatra," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 64.3 (2013): 301.
15. Hillman, "Transference, Love, and Anthony and Cleopatra," 301-333.
16. Phyllis Rackin, "The Place(s) of Women in Shakespeare's World: Historical Fact and Feminist Interpretation," in *Shakespeare and Women* (Oxford University Press, 2012): 26–48.

"From the text of Shakspeare": William Charles Macready, *King Lear,* and the Theatrical Antiquarianism of Locrine

Alexandra LaGrand
Mary Baldwin University

I. Introduction

In response to William Charles Macready's 1838 production of *King Lear,* an article from London's Theatrical Examiner wrote that he had "restored to the stage Shakspeare's true *Lear,* banished from it, by impudent ignorance, for upwards of a hundred and fifty years."[1] The "impudent ignorance" was in reference to Irish poet Nahum Tate's 1681 adaptation of the play. This adaptation, typical of Restoration revision, cut the character of the Fool, created a romance between Edgar and Cordelia, and featured a happy ending in which Lear and Cordelia both live. Tate's version of the play was fashionable throughout the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and many celebrity actors would persist in the tradition of using Tate's text over Shakespeare's. Macready's restoration, however, would oust Tate's Restoration adaptation of Shakespeare's *King Lear.*

Macready's decision to restore the "authentic" Shakespearean text of the play derives from a mindset of theatrical antiquarianism. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines antiquarianism as "The profession or pursuits of the antiquarian; taste for, or devotion to, antiquities."[2] While the phenomenon of antiquarianism was rife throughout many facets of nineteenth century British culture, it

Journal of the Wooden O. Vol 20, 32-48
© Southern Utah University Press
ISSN: 1539-5758

was particularly present within the theatre industry. For theatre practitioners, this mindset was customarily displayed through scenery, costumes, and stage properties in the pursuit of stage pictures that were reminiscent of a play's historical setting. Like his contemporaries, Macready also implemented antiquarian visual components to his plays; however, his work with the play text offered the most significant long-term impact on the stage. He focused on the text as a relic—or "antiquity"—through which he manifested his devotion to Shakespeare.

Macready and his contemporary news outlets claimed his 1838 production as a restoration. However, status as a restoration of Shakespeare's *King Lear* is more complicated than it initially appears. The prevailing claim about this production was that it was "From the text of Shakspeare," according to its playbills, and was thus resurrecting Shakespeare's original play text for performance.[3] And yet, Macready performed his own revisions of Shakespeare's "original." He textually altered the play, incorporating his own additions, deletions, substitutions, rearrangements, and reassignments. For that matter, Macready's base texts were contemporary, nineteenth-century print editions that conflated the quarto and folio versions of the play. Using these editions, he revised, rewrote, and rearranged the textual components of the play into something entirely new. In reality, the culmination of this was a performance script only adjacent to any "original" text; rather, he had created something that more closely resembled an adaptation of the play.

It is worth noting that Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier in their anthology, *Adaptations of Shakespeare,* acknowledge the difficulty in naming the textual products that are adaptations. They discuss several possible terms, including "alterations," "imitations," "spinoffs," "tradapations," "offshoots," and even "appropriations." Towards the conclusion of their discussion on labelling adaptations, they write that:

> Adaptation implies a process rather than a beginning or an end, and as ongoing objects of adaptation all Shakespeare's plays remain in process. Finally, to fall back on adaptation as the working label is to take advantage of its general currency. It is the word in most common usage and therefore capable of minimizing confusion.[4]

Central to this particular definition of "adaptation" is the idea that adaptations are in process. Shakespeare's plays are constantly undergoing some degree of adaptive work as fluid textual processes, as they are repeatedly edited and produced for the stage. Macready's work with *King Lear* exists within this conversation of adaptation not only because his productions exist in the larger historical process of *King Lear,* but also because they exist within their own decades-long process with the play. Similar to how Fischlin and Fortier return to the term "adaptation" for lack of a better term, then, I will refer to Macready's work with *King Lear* as that of an adaptation in the effort to reinforce the dichotomy between his perceived restorative reputation and his actual adaptive work.

Macready performed numerous edits to his production scripts of *King Lear,* but one of his most noteworthy augmentations to the play is his addition of a character named Locrine. Beginning with his 1834 production, he introduced Locrine while he prepared his prompt book. This character derives from the 1595 play, *The Lamentable Tragedie of Locrine,* a play once attributed to Shakespeare. It was this play that likely served as the primary source and inspiration for Macready's addition, since literary critics were still debating its authorship well into the nineteenth century. Using archival evidence, this essay will argue that Macready participated in *Locrine*'s ongoing debate of canonicity, which prompted his theatrically-antiquarian addition of the Locrine character in his productions of *King Lear.* I will begin with an examination of Macready's prompt books and the specific moments of Locrine's presence in the text. Following this will be a discussion of Macready's engagement with *Locrine*. Finally, the dramaturgy of Macready's inclusion of Locrine will be contextualized through an analysis of Locrine as Macready's artistic signature and manifestation of his theatrical antiquarianism.

II. Locrine in Macready's Text

Macready's theatrical antiquarianism was so enduring that his productions of *King Lear* would not be complete without Locrine. Because of this, Macready would include Locrine in every one of his performances of *King Lear* for the rest of his theatrical career. This included productions from 1834, 1838, and 1851, along with

revived performances in other years. Macready is ordinarily credited with textual restoration, and there is some truth to this claim, but Locrine serves as one piece of evidence that he was also engaged in textual adaptation by means of his theatrical antiquarianism. This began with his prompt books.

Macready's prompt books are evidence of how he envisioned *King Lear* for performance. The scope of this study encompasses seven prompt books associated with Macready's performances of the play. Four of these prompt books are held by the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, D.C. The remaining three are housed at the Victoria and Albert Museum's National Art Library in London. These prompt books vary in date, ranging from 1834 to 1851, comprising the majority of Macready's theatrical career. Some of these prompt books share similar edits, and others do not. Some are easily legible, and others are not. Each prompt book was its own unique iteration of a theatrical performance, but taken together these seven prompt books suggest an evolution of Macready's reading of the play, and the way he wished it to be executed on stage.

For Macready, Locrine was a necessary textual component for his productions of *King Lear.* Accordingly, Locrine exists in all but one of his prompt books. He is omitted from what is presumed to be a prompt book from Macready's 1834 production. Charles H. Shattuck dated this copy to Macready's 1834 production, while describing it as "a studybook or preparation copy."[5] A study book or preparation copy was the house copy or a stage manager's copy of the edited prompt book. These copies were meant to be master scripts, inclusive of all roles in the production. Locrine is absent from this copy, but that does not mean he was absent from the production. Gabriella Reuss discovered a comparable 1834 prompt book in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. She notes that Locrine appears in it, which could "lead us to consider the Victoria and Albert copy as the draft of the Bodleian one."[6] Furthermore, Locrine appears in playbills for the 1834 production. This confirms that Locrine was present in Macready's 1834 production of *King Lear,* making him a significant feature in all of Macready's productions of the play.

As his prompt books were prepared, Macready needed to revise his base texts in order to incorporate Locrine as part

of the play. Macready's next two prompt books are evidence of this, as Macready adapted the former Gentleman character to accommodate Locrine. These two prompt books come from Macready's 1838 production. Even though these two copies are dated to the same 1838 production, they differ dramatically in condition. While one is neat in presentation, with measured-out lines denoting line cuts and intact pages, the other has layers of handwriting crossed out and pages torn or missing throughout the book. Locrine, however, appears in both. In the first copy, housed by the Folger, he first appears in the handwritten dramatis personae list at the beginning of the prompt book, listed just after Oswald. In the base text's printed *dramatis personae,* contrarily, Locrine is absent, but the characters coming after Oswald are a Gentleman and a Captain. If these lists were placed side-by-side, Locrine's position in the handwritten list would correlate to the Gentleman character in the printed list. Because Locrine's lines come primarily from the former Gentleman character, we can infer that Macready intentionally transformed the Gentleman into Locrine for his performances.

Macready's modification of the Gentleman into Locrine was one of the consistent revisions across his prompt books. To complicate this, however, in the V&A Museum's corresponding 1838 prompt book copy, there is a possible likeness not between the Gentleman and Locrine, but rather between the Captain and Locrine. On this copy's corresponding handwritten *dramatis personae* page, there appears to be two layers of handwriting. The first layer seems to have "Captain" listed after Oswald—as is in the previous Folger copy—along with "Gentleman [to Cordelia]" listed after the Captain character. This Gentleman character was to be played by an actor referred to as Mr. Roberts, according to the handwritten actor list opposite the character list. The top layer of handwriting, however, changes this. The Gentleman character is crossed out entirely, and the Captain character is written over and replaced with "Locrine."[7] Connected to the handwritten "Locrine" is a line that crosses the page and points to Mr. Roberts. What this suggests is that Mr. Roberts was contracted initially to play the Gentleman character; somewhere in the casting process, however, this changed. The Captain character was dispensed with, and Locrine took the place of the Gentleman. Mr. Roberts then

became the actor to play Locrine. A playbill from the 1839 revived performance of the 1838 production confirms that Mr. Roberts was in the Covent Garden company and playing Locrine. This establishes the probability that Mr. Roberts also played Locrine in Macready's landmark 1838 production the previous year. Alluding to the larger relationship between the Gentleman and Locrine, these characters continued to be in conversation with one another as Macready prepared his prompt books for each of his productions of the play.

As previously noted and as will continue to be the case in this discussion, Macready's prompt books remain evidence for his commitment to Locrine's presence in his productions of *King Lear.* This commitment was so persistent that even transcriptions of his prompt books featured Locrine. In 1839, actor and stage manager John Moore transcribed Macready's 1838 prompt book into his own personal copy. A handwritten addition on the bottom of the printed *dramatis personae* notes Locrine.[8] Because this copy is not only missing pages but also has passages cut and pasted onto existing printed passages, it is difficult to trace if Locrine maintains the same dialogue and blocking from earlier or later Macready productions. Additionally, Moore transcribed another copy of Macready's 1838 prompt book. While this copy may have been transcribed earlier, it corresponds to a performance at least a decade succeeding the original production, as it includes a playbill from an 1850 production of the play at New York's Bowery Theatre.[9] This prompt book's base text included a printed *dramatis personae* of the cast of Macready's 1838 production. Interestingly, Locrine appears in this printed list of characters and is played by Mr. Roberts, confirming the casting assigned by the previous prompt books. As Moore's two copies show, Locrine's presence in Macready's productions of *King Lear* was understood to be an important addition, so much so that subsequent transcriptions of his prompt books also retained Locrine.

Even when Macready went on tour, he took Locrine with him. His touring prompt book copy was assembled sometime between 1843 and 1844. Akin to the previous two prompt books, this copy was also a transcription of Macready's 1838 prompt book. According to Shattuck, this copy was "Probably Macready's touring book after 1843."[10] Following Macready's resignation from

management at Drury Lane in 1843, he was not engaged at either patent theatre in London. Instead, he embarked on an American tour, followed by a Parisian engagement in 1844, and an English provincial tour in 1845.[11] This prompt book, in all likelihood, was his touring copy of the play. Locrine features in this copy, entering alongside Curan at the start of the play. Even throughout his theatrical travels, Macready kept Locrine.

Perhaps the most significant of Macready's prompt books is his copy from his final performance of *King Lear* at the Theatre Royal Haymarket during his farewell tour in 1851. As expected, Locrine does not appear in the printed list of characters that begins the prompt book.[12] Nevertheless, Locrine appears handwritten in just a couple pages later when the script cues the processional order for actors to enter in the first scene of the play. Locrine enters alongside Curan, which replicates the previous prompt book's stage directions. Because this was Macready's final performance of the play, this prompt book can be interpreted as the final edited version of his *King Lear.* This copy chronicles the culmination of an editorial process that took almost two decades, with Locrine being featured in every phase of its development.

Taken together, this group of seven prompt books help to illuminate Macready's theatrical antiquarianism. Even though Locrine was not present in one of Macready's 1834 prompt books, Locrine was present in that production. Locrine would remain in each of Macready's productions and prompt books from that point forward. As seen in the prompt book transcriptions completed by Moore, Locrine also found his place in any reproduction of Macready's prompt books. The implication of this is that no production of *King Lear* by Macready would be complete without Locrine's presence. Locrine was Macready's textual necessity, fueled by his theatrical antiquarianism.

It remains to ask how Locrine functions within Macready's *King Lear.* Admittedly, Locrine is a minor role in *King Lear.* His primary function is as a messenger, appearing briefly only to disappear once more. Studying Locrine's movement and dialogue from Macready's 1851 prompt book can illustrate the effect of his presence on stage. This prompt book was from his final performance of *King Lear,* and the penultimate performance of his career. Arguably, this means that this is a final copy of Macready's

King Lear—the culmination of decades of working on this play. Originally printed in 1811 from the George Steevens edition of the play, this edition was utilized in marking the edited script for performance. It should also be noted that any time Locrine has speech or blocking, his name is handwritten into the prompt book, visually replacing the Gentleman character's speech prefix in the printed text and adopting his lines. This means that Locrine was a deliberate choice throughout each of Macready's prompt books because he had to be actively written in every time he was to appear onstage.

From the start, this prompt book establishes Locrine as a courtier or messenger figure. In this prompt book, the first time we see Locrine within the play proper is in the opening procession of act one, scene one when Lear enters for the first time. Macready has called for Locrine to enter alongside Curan in a crowd of people, including at least six other lords, six ladies, and four officers, not to mention a herald carrying a crown, another officer with the map, and a physician with a sword.[13] What is significant here is that among at least nineteen onstage ensemble members, Locrine is named. To be given a name is to be given an identity versus being just another member in the crowd. Because Locrine was named and because he took the stage next to Curan, a previously-existing character, we can infer that he was not meant to be seen alongside the other minor, unnamed characters. Instead, we can equate him to Curan, who—in this particular prompt copy—is listed as a courtier. More than likely, this means that Locrine was also considered some kind of courtier.

Locrine's status as a courtier or messenger figure continues, and the blocking establishes his obedience to Lear. Following Lear's outburst in response to Cordelia's refusal of the love test, Lear says, "Call France;—Who stirs?" At this point, the prompt book's handwritten blocking calls for Locrine to "[go] off quickly."[14] From this, readers can infer that Locrine was the character going off to retrieve the King of France and the Duke of Burgundy. This is supported by the fact that Gloucester—the character typically charged with retrieving France in other scripts—does not exit from this scene. Locrine does, and while the printed text—not the annotated script edits—calls for Gloucester to re-enter with France and Burgundy later on, it is reasonable to believe that

Locrine is the one to escort them onstage. This bit of stage business would establish Locrine not only as a messenger, but a royal one, because of his display of obedience to Lear. This is furthered by his consistent presence onstage with Lear in the first half of the play. Following the stage business outlined by this prompt book, audiences don't see Lear enter any scene without Locrine until the storm scene. Because audiences consistently see Locrine with Lear, these scenes help authenticate Locrine as a royal servant whose loyalties lie with Lear.

Even when Lear is absent, Locrine remains a loyal servant to him. This is evident through his speech to other characters. While Locrine is a minor character and does not have many lines, those he does are reassigned to him from the former Gentleman character. The bulk of his dialogue comes in act three, scene one. This scene features just him and Kent—still disguised as Caius—onstage discussing the plight of Lear just before the storm scene. When Kent asks where the king is, Locrine replies, "Contending with the fretful element: / Bids the wind blow the earth into the sea, / Or swell the curled waters 'bove the main, / That things might change, or cease."[15] Locrine's speech here continues on for another eight lines describing Lear's turmoil. Once more, audiences see Locrine associated with Lear through his lengthy speech describing what Lear has experienced. Not only is the connection reinforced through Locrine's recollection of Lear's circumstances, but also through the fact that this means Locrine was there and witnessed Lear's actions. Once more, this ties Locrine to Lear. At the conclusion of this scene, Kent tasks Locrine with delivering his ring to Cordelia, and says that "she will tell you who your fellow is."[16] This confirms Locrine's status as a royal messenger associated with Lear, because Kent entrusted him to deliver a personal artifact to Lear's beloved daughter, which would, in turn, reveal Kent's identity to him.

Because of his loyalty to Lear, Locrine often demonstrates loyalty to Cordelia as well. The next scene in which Locrine appears is following Lear and Gloucester's reunion. This scene is often remembered as the scene in which Lear scatters flowers across the stage in his madness. Locrine enters towards the end, alongside the Physician, and attempts to approach Lear. This is unsuccessful, because Lear promptly leaves the stage with other attendants running after him. Nevertheless, Locrine speaks again

in this same scene. The disguised Edgar, who had been present to accompany his father, approaches him and inquires about the imminent battle:

> *Edgar:* Do you hear aught, sir, of a battle toward?
> *Locrine:* Most sure, and vulgar: every one hears that
> Which can distinguish sound.
> Though that the queen on special cause is here,
> Her army is mov'd on.[17]

Once more, this prompt book has Locrine taking the former Gentleman's lines from the printed base text. This is Locrine's final moment of speech in Macready's production. Audiences can infer that, along with the Physician, Locrine was tasked to find Lear in this scene. Because, pages later, audiences see Lear accompanied by the Physician and Cordelia, it can be inferred that Cordelia was the one to task the Physician and Locrine to find Lear. This is reinforced by Locrine's recounting of Cordelia's purpose in Britain and the location of her army. It was already known that Locrine had seen Cordelia, following Kent's previous order to him. When Locrine returns in this scene to find Lear, he has returned as a messenger not for Lear, the British king, but for Cordelia, the French queen. Locrine's loyalty to Cordelia, then, is demonstrative of his loyalty to Lear.

This allegiance continues until the end of the play. The next time Locrine appears, audiences can infer that he had been used as a messenger between Cordelia and the Duke of Albany. In a scene that was completely cut from Macready's production, an unnamed messenger informs Cordelia that "The British powers are marching hitherward," to which she responds, "'Tis known before," because she already knew about the status of the British armies.[18] Although this passage was cut from the performance, it helps to inform Albany's lines later on when he shares with Edmund that "The king is come to his daughter," alluding to the recent reunion between Lear and Cordelia.[19] It would make sense that Locrine served as the intermediary for Cordelia and Albany to share this information, which explains why they knew about the other's actions. It also could explain why, at Locrine's next appearance, he stands with Albany. At the start of the final scene of the play, Albany enters with Locrine by his side. In Macready's prompt book, there is a

hand-drawn diagram on the page opposite of the text to coordinate the placement of each character. Goneril, Albany, and Regan stand in a line at the edge of the stage closest to the audience, but Locrine stands just diagonally behind Albany. Locrine's presence alongside Albany reinforces Albany's status as representative of and aligning with Lear and Cordelia. In this moment, Edmund had just delivered the news of Lear and Cordelia's capture. Albany is the highest-ranked character on the stage at that point, and he would have the power to release them. Because of this, Locrine likely would have remained with Albany until their release, at which point he could return to Lear.

Unfortunately, this is not the case, as Edmund had previously ordered the execution of Lear and Cordelia. Locrine is afforded one last display of loyalty to Lear. The final textual moment that the stage affords Locrine is in the closing scene of the play. Following the duel between Edmund and Edgar, Edmund reveals his plan to execute the king and his daughter. In a last attempt to save them, Macready calls for three knights, Locrine, Kent, and Edgar, to exit, in that order. The significance of this comes in Locrine's exit before Kent or Edgar, two characters with larger roles. Of the named characters in this stage direction, Locrine is the first to go and try to save Lear and Cordelia.[20] This action echoes an entire play of alignment to Lear. Because Locrine spent the duration of the play, and thus the duration of Macready's production, serving and representing Lear, audiences associate Locrine with the king. His final action, as the first named character to attempt to save them, can and should be read as a final gesture of loyalty—a servant doing anything to protect his master. This gesture fails and the group reenters just five lines later, preceding Lear with Cordelia's dead body. Locrine's reentrance is also of note, because instead of being the first of the named to reenter before Lear, he is the last. This completes Locrine's character arc: from the beginning of the play, Locrine is associated with Lear, and he ends it in the same way. Just before audiences see Lear enter carrying the dead Cordelia, they would see Locrine, presumably distraught at the loss. His final moment of stage business, then, is in reference to Lear's own grief. Locrine remains loyal to Lear until the end, so when Lear's heart breaks, Locrine's does too.

III. Locrine in Macready's Context

Macready's mindset of theatrical antiquarianism includes the use of sources from the English Renaissance to supplement his text and to create a Shakespearean relic or antiquity. As noted earlier, while there are many potential sources Macready could have employed in this pursuit, the most plausible is *The Lamentable Tragedie of Locrine,* a play first printed in 1595. Similar to *King Lear,* the *Locrine* play narrates the story of an ancient British king and illustrates how his choices lead to his downfall. Printed by Thomas Creede, the title page of the quarto credited the authorship of the play to "W.S."[21] Because of the possibility of Shakespearean authorship, *Locrine* was included in the printings of the Third and Fourth Folios. *Locrine* had therefore been connected to Shakespeare from its very inception and continued to be closely connected to Shakespeare for many years. The possibility of *Locrine*'s Shakespearean canonicity presumably influenced Macready's decision to name his character Locrine.

An avid reader with numerous books to his name, Macready likely accessed *Locrine* through his ownership of a copy of the play. In 1839, Charles Knight first published his *Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspere,* which included eight volumes of plays. The final volume of this edition was referred to as the Doubtful Plays; however, in its table of contents, it refers to the majority of the plays within the edition as "ascribed to Shakspere."[22] This maintains the possibility of Shakespearean authorship. After Macready's death in 1873, his personal library was auctioned. In the catalogue inventory of Macready's library were the eight volumes of Knight's *Pictorial Edition,* including the volume of *Doubtful Plays.*[23] This confirms that, at the time of his death, Macready had in his possession at least one copy of the *Locrine* play and was potentially engaged in its ongoing authorial debate. This is further reinforced by Macready's personal acquaintance with Knight. As Macready's diaries show, Knight had personally given Macready a copy of *King Lear,* and they had had at least one conversation in which they mutually disapproved of Tate's adaptation of the play:

> Copy of Lear from C. Knight, who gives a long disquisition upon the bad taste of N. Tate and those who acted his version of King Lear, but cannot spare one word for the successful

> attempt to place Shakspeare in his own form again upon the stage.[24]

This serves as proof that, in addition to exchanging titles between them, Macready and Knight had literary discussions pertaining to Shakespeare and the textual histories of his plays. This helps to establish as plausible that they would have discussed *Locrine*'s canonicity as well. Consequently, Macready's inclusion of the Locrine character in his productions of Shakespeare's *King Lear* signals his apocryphal reading and likely engagement with *Locrine*'s possible canonicity.

Locrine's possible status as canonical would not only serve as a manifestation of Macready's theatrical antiquarianism, but would also benefit the actor-manager by utilizing Locrine as an artistic signature. The nineteenth century theatrical arena of London saw steep competition between actors, which often developed into fierce rivalries. While American actor Edwin Forrest is often referred to as Macready's utmost rival because of the disastrous Astor Place Riot, it is English actor Charles Kean that potentially influenced Macready's introduction of Locrine. Kean's rise as an actor was in opposition to Macready, and the two would battle against each other's successes throughout their careers. Kean's envy towards Macready turned into an attempt to copy Macready's work. Macready knew that Kean was trying to copy his prompt books, so through the inclusion of Locrine, Macready left an artistic signature in his prompt books of *King Lear.* Moreover, the introduction of Locrine onstage could have served efforts to fight against Kean's plagiarism.

Aside from competition and envy over Macready's success with *King Lear,* it is unclear why Kean was so insistent on obtaining a copy. It is worth noting, however, that Kean's father, renowned actor Edmund Kean, had been among the first to attempt to stage a restoration of *King Lear* in the early 1820's.[25] Despite his efforts, his production had failed, leaving Macready to earn the reputation of being the restorer to Shakespeare's *King Lear* a decade later. Whatever reasons Kean had, he attempted on several occasions to copy Macready's prompt books.

Their rivalry eventually made it clear to Macready that he needed to protect his artistic integrity. In 1841, he wrote in his diary: "[Wilmott] told me that Mr. C. Kean wanted him to try to make out my adaptation of *King Lear* for him—that Wilmott

told him he could not, and if he could he did not think he should be justified in doing it."[26] Just as Locrine was loyal to Lear, John Wilmott was loyal to Macready, protecting his artistic creation. Wilmott was Macready's chief prompter, a role that gave him the responsibility of marking the production prompt book and ensuring that actors knew their lines onstage. After Wilmott refused to share Macready's work, Kean's efforts to get a copy of Macready's *King Lear* continued. In 1845, while abroad on an American tour, Kean urged his friend Robert Clarke to write to John Pritt Harley, an actor at Drury Lane[27] at the same time as another prompter, George Cressal Ellis.[28] Clarke had written to Harley that Kean "requested me if I could to obtain a Prompt Book of Lear as acted by Macready."[29] It is unclear whether or not this attempt to copy Macready's prompt book was successful, but considering that Kean's efforts persisted after this, it seems he had yet to see his efforts come to fruition. This would not remain the case. Ellis, who was once assistant prompter to Wilmott, Macready's loyal prompter, had made copies of Macready's prompt books for his own personal collection. Before long, he "transcribed these for other actors," including copies made for "Samuel Phelps, Edwin Forrest, Charles Kean, and Hermann Vezin."[30] Kean would soon reach success. In an article discussing Macready's prompt books, Shattuck wrote:

> Among the 86 or more items of the Charles Kean prompt-book collection [at the Folger Shakespeare Library], at least seventeen prove to be transcriptions or transplantations of Macready materials—including prompt-books of ten plays, four books of scene designs, and three books of costume designs. They were prepared for Kean between 1845 and 1850 by George Cressall Ellis.[31]

Ellis was therefore responsible for a prolific scheme of plagiarized prompt books. Wilmott's loyalty to Macready in this instance had been fruitless; it was clear that Ellis's loyalty lay with Kean. This is only confirmed by Ellis's acceptance of a position in Kean's company at the Princess's Theatre in 1850. In turn, he was rewarded routinely with gifts, increases in salary, and numerous other favors from Kean.[32] Because of Kean's ceaseless pursuit, Macready's prompt books must be viewed as holding tremendous theatrical value.

Macready's antiquarian inclusion of Locrine offered protection, as it reinforced his artistic claim over his work. Because Locrine is not seen in other productions of *King Lear* at the time, he is entirely Macready's creation. Macready's use of Locrine in his prompt books acts as a maker's mark to identify clearly whose intellectual property the prompt books were. As early as 1834, Macready was considering publishing his prompt book of *King Lear.*[33] Adding a never-before-seen character into his productions served as insurance to protect his work in perpetuity. Should Macready have recognized his Locrine character in a production that was not his own, he would be able to discern that they had plagiarized his text, because Locrine functioned as the symbolic representative of his own intellectual property. It is also worth noting that one of Macready's closest friends, Thomas Noon Talfourd, was a member of Parliament at this time. In 1837, just a year before Macready's most prominent production of *King Lear,* Talfourd introduced the Copyright Act to Parliament. This act would build upon previously existing statutes in order to clarify and expand copyright protections for literary works.[34] Macready had created his own adaptation of *King Lear,* with Locrine as one of his editorial pieces of evidence, and at one point considered publishing it. This prompt book would have served as intellectual property, potentially protected under Talfourd's act. Macready was aware of Kean's attempts to copy his prompt books; he wrote about it in his diary. Hence, Macready needed something that could personalize his work. Macready, ever the theatrical antiquarian, incorporated Locrine, who served doubly as a manifestation of his theatrical antiquarianism and a strategy to protect his artistic integrity.

IV. Conclusion

To conclude, Locrine is a manifestation of Macready's theatrical antiquarianism, his impulse to reconnect his Victorian present with the Shakespearean past. Because of his mindset of theatrical antiquarianism, Macready used the text as a relic to exhibit his devotion to Shakespeare. Because it is possible that Macready understood *Locrine* to be the work of Shakespeare, he had a fitting source for creating a character. Locrine, in turn, became his artistic

signature that he used in order to protect his artistic integrity. Macready had utilized his own apocryphal reading, looking at what could have been a Shakespearean text, and incorporated it into his own work. His inclusion of the Locrine character serves as a manifestation of his theatrical antiquarianism because of his attempts to engage the *Locrine* play and pay homage to Shakespeare. The greater significance of Locrine is a revised understanding of Macready's status as having restored Shakespeare's *King Lear.* Locrine is one piece of textual evidence that Macready was not a restorer, but rather, an adapter who took theatrical liberty while editing his prompt books. In this sense, the playbills for his productions were right: Macready's *King Lear* was, indeed, from the text of Shakespeare—just adapted for the nineteenth century stage as a result of his own theatrical antiquarianism.

Notes

1. *Lives of Shakespearian Actors III*, vol. 3, ed. Richard Foulkes (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2010), 135-36.
2. "antiquarianism, n.," OED Online, Oxford University Press, September 2020, www.oed.com/view/Entry/8810.
3. Covent Garden Playbills, 1819-1839, Bill Vol. G2 C85, Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C.
4. *Adaptations of Shakespeare: A Critical Anthology of Plays from the Seventeenth Century to the Present,* ed. Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier (London and New York: Routledge, 2000), 2-3.
5. Charles H. Shattuck, *The Shakespeare Promptbooks* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1965).
6. Gabriella Reuss, "Veritas Filia Temporis, or Shakespeare Unveiled?" *The AnaChronist* (2000).
7. Prompt book of *King Lear,* 1838, F.48.C.18, Forster Collection, National Art Library, Victoria and Albert Museum, London.
8. Prompt book of *King Lear,* 1839, PROMPT Lear 16, Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C.
9. Prompt book of *King Lear,* 1850s-1870s, PROMPT Lear 17, Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C.
10. Shattuck, *Promptbooks,* 213.
11. Foulkes, Richard. "Macready, William Charles (1793–1873), actor and theatre manager." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*
12. Prompt book of *King Lear,* 1851, PROMPT Lear 4, Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C.
13. PROMPT Lear 4, 339.
14. PROMPT Lear 4, 344.
15. PROMPT Lear 4, 400.
16. PROMPT Lear 4, 402.

17. PROMPT Lear 4, 445.
18. PROMPT Lear 4, 435.
19. PROMPT Lear 4, 454.
20. PROMPT Lear 4, 467.
21. W.S., *The Lamentable Tragedie of Locrine* (London: Thomas Creede, 1595).
22. William Shakespeare, *The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspere,* 1st ed. (London: Charles Knight & Co., 1839).
23. *Catalogue of the Library of William Charles Macready,* Esq., (London: Christie, Manson & Woods, 1873), 15.
24. William Charles Macready, *The Diaries of William Charles Macready: 1833-1851,* vol. 2, (London: Chapman and Hall Ltd., 1912), 55.
25. Emily Mullin, "Macready's Triumph: The Restoration of *King Lear* to the British Stage," *Penn History Review* 18.1 (2011): 23.
26. Macready, *Diaries*, vol. 2, 139.
27. G.C. Boase and Katharine Cockin, "Harley, John Pritt (1786–1858), actor," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*
28. William Charles Macready, *William Charles Macready's King John: A Facsimile Prompt-Book,* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1962), 5.
29. Robert Clarke, letter John Pritt Harley, 1841-1845, Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C.
30. Macready, *King John,* 4-5.
31. Charles H. Shattuck, "Macready Prompt-Books," *Theatre Notebook* vol. 16 (1961): 7-10.
32. Macready, *King John,* 5.
33. Macready, *Diaries,* vol. 1, 164.
34. Edith Hall, "Talfourd, Sir Thomas Noon (1795–1854), writer, judge, and politician," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

The Dream of *Cymbeline:* Ovid and the Idea of Late Shakespeare

Gabriel Lonsberry
Purdue University

We can, in part, thank the Victorians and their interest in assigning a narrative to Shakespeare's body of work for the very idea of Shakespeare's "late plays." Russ McDonald recounts this development:

> Since *Pericles, Cymbeline, The Winter's Tale,* and *The Tempest* undeniably resembled one another and differed from the rest of the canon, the decision to group them into one category and interpret them as the culmination of an artistic career—of the artistic career—struck a cultural chord, harmonizing with Victorian ideas of struggle and triumph, sin and redemption.[1]

And the sentiment has proved enduring: in *Shakespeare: The Four Romances* (1989), for instance, Robert M. Adams engages with the now-ubiquitous notion that "Shakespeare in his final period was completing on a life-large scale a kind of tragic pattern, defined as prosperity-destruction-re-creation which he had previously adumbrated in other plays but here brought to triumphant completion," and in *Shakespeare's Late Plays* (2009), Nicholas Potter compares these works to "Beethoven's 'late' string quartets and piano sonatas, . . . in which an accomplished and celebrated artist turns in upon himself and reflects upon his art and his success in a mood of introverted self-absorption.[2] Such descriptions do lend an attractive element of finality to Shakespeare's career, and it

Journal of the Wooden O. Vol 20, 49-58
© Southern Utah University Press
ISSN: 1539-5758

is unquestionably tempting to see the playwright himself in "the figure of Prospero," to quote Potter once again, "turning his back on his art having completed a work from which he will personally benefit directly very little, . . . becom[ing] a figure of . . . artistic self-abnegation."[3] In a similar manner, *The Winter's Tale* can be understood as picking up where *Othello* left off, resurrecting Desdemona as Hermione and self-consciously bringing the high tragic period to a celebratory close. But what about *Cymbeline,* the remaining of Shakespeare's final solo-authored works?

Lacking obvious potential for biographical interpretation and neglecting to conclude any of the playwright's greatest stories, *Cymbeline* has always fit uneasily alongside the other late plays. And, in contrast to the more revered *Tempest* and *The Winter's Tale,* the plot of *Cymbeline* is "almost incoherent," as Emrys Jones complains—"a chaos," in Harold Bloom's estimation, or, to borrow Posthumus's own description of his experiences in the play, "a dream, or else such stuff as madmen / Tongue and brain not; . . . a speaking such / As sense cannot untie" (5.4.115–8).[4] In fact, we do find allusions to Shakespeare's earlier works in *Cymbeline,* but there are dozens, each adding to the mess, and they are gross distortions—"parodies," according to Bloom. "What was [Shakespeare] trying to do for himself as a maker of plays," Bloom asks, speaking for anyone invested in the idea of late Shakespeare, "by the heap of self-parodies that constitute *Cymbeline?*"[5]

The answer to that question and the best means of approaching this perplexing drama may lie in one of its most memorable scenes, Giacomo's intrusion into Imogen's bedroom. "The crickets sing, and man's o'er-labored sense / Repairs itself by rest," Giacomo narrates,

> Our Tarquin thus
> Did softly press the rushes ere he wakened
> The chastity he wounded. Cytherea,
> How bravely thou becom'st thy bed. Fresh lily,
> And whiter than the sheets! That I might touch,
> But kiss, one kiss. Rubies unparagoned,
> How dearly they do't. 'Tis her breathing that
> Perfumes the chamber thus. The flame o'th' taper
> Bows toward her, and would underpeep her lids
> To see th'enclosèd lights, now canopied

> Under these windows, white and azure laced
> With blue of heaven's own tinct.
> . . . On her left breast
> A mole cinque-spotted, like the crimson drops
> I'th' bottom of a cowslip . . .
> She hath been reading late
> The tale of Tereus; here the leaf's turned down
> Where Philomel gave up. I have enough. (2.2.11–46)

I have quoted this passage at some length because I will be referring to it several times, but also in order to provide a sense of the "Ovidian opulence" of the chamber, to borrow Charles and Michelle Martindale's description—as they go on to note, the room is furnished with "a silk tapestry, showing the story of 'proud Cleopatra, when she met her Roman,' and a chimney piece with 'chaste Dian, bathing' . . . as well as 'two winking Cupids / Of silver.' . . . There is too an Ovidian stress on the lifelike artistry of the work."[6] At the center of all this opulence, mythological images swirling about her, lies Imogen, asleep, with Ovid's *Metamorphoses* open on her lap. And here is the key to comprehending the drama, a play that Bloom claims "will not abide a steady contemplation."[7] As Imogen sleeps we can recognize *Cymbeline* as a rich, Ovidian dream, swirling with images less from classical mythology than and from Shakespeare's own mythology as it changes shape again and again. It is in a sense, Shakespeare's *Metamorphoses*, and reading the play from this perspective goes a long way toward unlocking both *Cymbeline* and Shakespeare's late art as a whole.

Like Ovid's epic, which details such mythological tales as those of Apollo and Daphne, Tereus and Philomel, and Diana and Actaeon, the action of Cymbeline revolves almost entirely around literal and metaphorical hunts. We have already seen how Giacomo stalks his prey in the bedroom, evoking several scenes of Ovidian conquest while, in his mind, violating the sleeping Imogen, and we are reminded of Ovid again as Cloten tracks Imogen and Posthumus through the woods, seeking to "ravish her—first kill him" before ironically becoming game to Belarius, Arviragus, and Guiderius—"We'll hunt no more today," Belarius says in reaction to the slaying (3.5.134, 4.2.161). Long before this violent turn, in fact, Cloten conceives of his pursuit of Imogen as an Ovidian hunt, imagining that Actaeon bribed Diana's ladies in order to reach the

goddess: "I know [Imogen's] women are about her: what / If I do line one of their hands?" he wonders, "'Tis gold / Which buys admittance . . . and makes / Diana's rangers false themselves, yield up / Their deer to th' stand o'th' stealer" (2.3.62–6).

Moreover, *Cymbeline* shares with the Metamorphoses the sentiment that hunting a person—treating them like one's prey—has a dehumanizing effect, as when the Queen, who will pursue Posthumus and Imogen for much of the play, attempts to deceive Cornelius, the physician: "I will try the forces / Of these thy compounds on such creatures as / We count not worth the hanging," she says of her poisons, betraying her true designs, "but none human" (1.5.18–20). In hunting the two lovers, then, the Queen transforms them into animals, but the effect almost always works both ways in Shakespeare's story: Cloten, for instance, "observes the same forms of courtly wooing" as the honorable Posthumus, as Joan Carr observes, "yet they cover a bestiality that shows through," most blatantly when he is in nature, on the hunt.[8]

Returning to Giacomo's bedroom intrusion, we find even more of what Jonathan Bate characterizes as an "Ovidian […] use of a language which fuses the characters with the natural world." Bate notes that Giacomo's narration morphs Imogen into a "fresh lily" (2.2.15), and the "flame o'th' taper / Bows toward her" just as "wind or water, warm with desire, would playfully touch a nymph in Ovid; the mole on her breast," he continues, "takes its identity from the marking on a cowslip" (2.2.19–20).[9] Similarly Ovidian transformations are to be found throughout the play, as when Belarius likens his adopted sons to "zephyrs blowing below the violet" (4.2.171), and in Imogen's metamorphic description of the parting Posthumus: "I would have broke mine eyestrings, cracked them, but / To look upon him," she insists,

> till the diminution
> Of space had pointed him sharp as my needle;
> Nay, followed him till he had melted from
> The smallness of a gnat to air, and then
> Have turned mine eye and wept. (1.3.17–22)

In her grief, Imogen reconstitutes her lover first as a needle, then as a gnat, and, finally, as air. And later, when Arviragus mourns the apparently dead Imogen, his eulogy transforms her into flowers in the same, gradational way:

> With fairest flowers
> Whilst summer lasts and I live here, Fidele,
> I'll sweeten thy sad grave. Thou shalt not lack
> The flower that's like thy face, pale primrose, nor
> The azured harebell, like thy veins; no, nor
> The leaf of eglantine, whom not to slander,
> Out-sweetened not thy breath. (4.2.217–23)

Bate too highlights this passage, noting, "Here Shakespeare is writing in the same key as the Ovid who turns golden lads and girls into flowers."[10] But the picture is not always so pretty: in the throes of misogynistic jealousy, for instance, Posthumus supposes that Giacomo "found no opposition" when seducing Imogen, that he "spoke not, but / Like a full-acorned boar, a German one, / Cried 'Oh!' and mounted" (2.5.15–17). Giacomo thus becomes a brutish beast in Posthumus's mind as he imagines the sexual conquest he believes took place. This leads us to another important and equally Ovidian way that transformation functions in *Cymbeline:* as a means of deception.

In Ovid we find numerous scenes of transformative trickery, whether in the story of Callisto, where Jupiter takes the form of Diana as a means of embracing the unsuspecting nymph, or in the case of Europa, who is abducted by Jupiter in the guise of a bull. Transformation and manipulation go hand in hand in *Cymbeline,* too, most often in the form of distorted stories and signs which, as Cynthia Lewis explains, "lure the characters into perceptual traps."[11] Posthumus's jealousy is inspired by Giacomo's manipulation of reality—a misrepresentation of events that causes Posthumus to misread the bracelet, once "a manacle of love," as "the cognizance of [Imogen's] incontinency" (1.1.122, 2.4.127)—and, Lewis continues, the "malleable" Posthumus falls right into "the hands of [this] polished and daring illusionist."[12] As a result, Imogen loses faith in her own interpretive abilities, deciding that "all good seeming [is] put on for villainy" (3.4.53–5), yet she too mistakes "the garments of Posthumus" for proof that Cloten's headless body is that of her husband (4.2.307). Belarius, albeit to less malicious ends, has likewise skewed the story of Guiderius and Arviragus in order to keep them under his control. As John Pitcher observes, by employing transformative, natural imagery (the boys are "beetles rather than eagles," Pitcher summarizes), Belarius "has

been holding them back, in his version of an idyll, to prevent them leaving him."[13] Addressing further distortions and manipulations, Pitcher notes that "the Britons have been conned into paying for a conquest the Romans never made . . . and similarly Posthumus will pay [Giacomo], a Roman lord, for a phoney conquest over Imogen, the British princess."[14]

The parallel is significant, for it leads us back to the bedroom scene. We have already noted how most if not all of the inciting actions in *Cymbeline* involve Ovidian transformation of some kind, whether in hunting, deception, or both, and the protean nature of the plot may explain why Bloom and so many others find the play an incomprehensible chaos. But what are we to make of the flood of Shakespearean allusions? Looking again at Giacomo's midnight soliloquy, we see him imagining himself as "Tarquin . . . softly press[ing] the rushes" (2.2.12–3), but for us—and for the playwright too, it can be assumed—the image recalls Shakespeare's Tarquin as much as Ovid's. The tapestry on the wall, depicting "the story [of] / Proud Cleopatra when she met her Roman," more obviously invokes the celebrated barge scene from Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra,* when, in Giacomo's words, "Cydnus swelled above the banks, or for / The press of boats or pride" (2.4.69–72), and in this light, Giacomo's references to Tereus and Philomel may remind us more of *Titus Andronicus* than the *Metamorphoses*, as it does for Ann Thompson, who argues, "In *Titus Andronicus* [Shakespeare] is depending largely on an elaboration of Ovid. . . . In Cymbeline he seems to be relying fairly directly on his own earlier work in *Titus.*"[15]

Indeed, when one is looking for them, allusions to Shakespeare's earlier works emerge in truly staggering numbers, and while the plot of *Cymbeline* is certainly Ovidian in all of the senses I have been describing, the play may represent Shakespeare's *Metamorphoses* even more in that it is a rapidly transforming myriad of Shakespearean mythology. It is immediately apparent that we have returned to the ancient British world of *King Lear,* for instance, and we next recognize *Romeo and Juliet* in Cornelius and his sleeping potion, this play's Friar Lawrence. But something is not quite right: Pitcher remarks that "Arviragus should enter *'with Imogen, dead'* (not 'as if dead'), which looks like a purposeful recollection of Lear carrying Cordelia," but the reader knows that

Imogen is not dead, and this comical scene is a far cry from the one it reenacts—among the most harrowing in all of Shakespeare.[16] It is, in fact, almost offensive to compare the two, and the same could be said of *Romeo and Juliet:* like Juliet, Imogen wakes to find her slain lover and delivers an impassioned speech over his corpse—but this is no Romeo; it is the idiot Cloten who was only just trying to rape her.

Bloom refers to these many moments not as allusions but as parodies, and he is right to do so. In robbing Imogen of just a bracelet, Giacomo is not Tarquin but a shadow of that imposing predator. Nor is he the savage Chiron with Demetrius, despite invoking Tereus and Philomel as he does. Giacomo is sometimes likened to Iago, as Bloom observes, but he is "a mere trifler compared with the more-than-Satanic greatness of Othello's destroyer," and by the end of the play "we badly miss the true Iago, who defies the coming torture and will not speak. The wordy [Giacomo] all but recapitulates the entire play, and declines from being Iago's parody to being the travesty of a chorus."[17] Bloom contends that Posthumus's childish, misogynistic outbursts make him a "parody-Othello" in turn, and he continues identifying burlesques in every corner of the play: "Through patriotic rant," Bloom writes, "Shakespeare shockingly parodies his John of Gaunt, Faulconbridge the Bastard, and Henry V, by assigning the British defiance of Rome . . . to the wicked Queen and the rotten Cloten"; "Posthumus, in peasant disguise, vanquishes and disarms [Giacomo], and then abandons him, in a debasement of the Edgar-Edmund duel"; "we are suddenly back in *Measure for Measure* with the jovial Pompey, bawd turned executioner's assistant, exuberantly informing Barnadine that the ax is upon the block"; "The last scene opens cheerfully with the announcement that the Queen, herself a parody of Lady Macbeth, ended 'with horror, madly dying,' like Queen Macbeth"; and his list goes on.[18] What is important to note in all this is that the play *keeps changing,* and once it has changed it refuses to stop: as Thompson notes, "Imogen has begun as Rosalind, fleeing from court to find her lover in the wilderness, turned into Desdemona, the innocent victim of a jealous husband, and has just woken up as Juliet beside her husband's corpse."[19] This metamorphosis occurs in all of the characters in this strange drama, and, furthermore, we find the

very story metamorphosing back and forth between genres at will, much oftener and more dramatically than was common to the increasingly popular tragicomedies of the day. One moment we are in one of Shakespeare's festive comedies, with an empowered, cross-dressing heroine lost in the green world; the next, someone's severed head is being thrown into a river before a deus ex machina sets everything right again. The play itself is as protean as its plot.

So how are we to understand this? The sole constant in our discussion of *Cymbeline* has been the *Metamorphoses*, so it only makes sense to return to Ovid. "Many of the earlier plays are lavishly decked out with Ovidian mythological references," A. B. Taylor observes, but "in the great tragedies Ovid goes underground."[20] Charles and Michelle Martindale attempt to account for this change, writing, "A more plausible explanation lies in changes of taste and fashion among audiences, for which Shakespeare always had keen antennae. Thus in the 1590s there was a general vogue for Ovidian narrative, which waned thereafter [and] came to be felt as old-fashioned."[21] In one sense then, Shakespeare's bringing Ovid back to the fore of *Cymbeline* can be understood as the ultimate expression of self-conscious finality, confirming what so many believe about the playwright and the narrative arc of his career. "Ovid was Shakespeare's favorite poet," the Martindales assert, the foundation of much of Shakespeare's early work, and, in a way, looking back to Ovid is like looking back to the start of himself as an artist, bringing his work full circle.[22] The Martindales go on to note that in his earliest uses of Ovid, Shakespeare, like the Elizabethans in general, often "emphasized a vein of pathos, glamour and romance," but "Shakespeare's conception of Ovid matured as he grew older," and in the later, tragicomic *Cymbeline,* "the results were . . . more genuinely Ovidian in the curious mixture of tones."[23] This too suggests that, through Ovid, Shakespeare was reflecting on and perhaps amending his previous work, and at this point it may be useful to consider the final lines of the *Metamorphoses:* "Now I have brought a work to end which neither Jove's fierce wrath / Nor sword, nor fire, nor fretting age with all the force it hath / Are able to abolish quite." Ovid writes:

> Let come that fatal hour
> Which, saving of this brittle flesh, hath over me no power
> And at his pleasure make an end of mine uncertain time.

> Yet shall the better part of me assurèd be to climb
> Aloft above the starry sky; and all the world shall never
> Be able for to quench my name. For look how far so ever
> The Roman empire by the right of conquest shall extend,
> So far shall all folk read this work. And time without all end
> (If poets as by prophecy about the truth may aim)
> My life shall everlastingly be lengthened still by fame.[24]

In permeating the play with self-references—in cataloguing his canon and mythology in his own version of the *Metamorphoses*—Shakespeare may be channeling Ovid's triumphant epilogue and completing his life-long project on a note that reaffirms his immortality as an artist, reiterating his many claims throughout the sonnets that "Not marble, nor the gilded monuments / Of Princes shall outlive this powerful rhyme" ("Sonnet 55" 1–2). And if this is the case, *Cymbeline* deserves to stand alongside *The Tempest* and *The Winter's Tale* as one of Shakespeare's great late plays.

But of course if we remember to look closely at *Cymbeline*—to recognize it as a text of constant transformation and deception, an Ovidian dream that not even the soothsayer can correctly interpret—and if we manage not to forget that the play contains no Shakespearean self-allusions, only self-parodies, we may understand this romantic sentiment of artistic permanence as a parody itself. We may realize that this rapidly transforming *Metamorphoses* has lured us, the readers, into its trap, and that the endlessly clever Shakespeare, aware of the approaching close of his career, has laid that trap for us to fall into. Perhaps Ovid would be proud.

Notes

1. Russ McDonald, *Shakespeare's Late Style* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 22.

2. Robert M. Adams, *Shakespeare: The Four Romances* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1989), 18; Nicholas Potter, *Shakespeare's Late Plays: Pericles, Cymbeline, The Winter's Tale, The Tempest,* ed. Nicolas Tredell (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 3.

3. Potter, *Shakespeare's Late Plays,* 3.

4. Emrys Jones, "Stuart *Cymbeline,*" *Essays in Criticism* 11.1 (1961): 98; Harold Bloom, *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human* (New York: Riverhead, 1999), 616; Quotations from Shakespeare are from are from *The Norton Shakespeare,* ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al., third edition (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2016).

5. Bloom, *Invention,* 621.

6. Charles Martindale and Michelle Martindale, *Shakespeare and the Uses of Antiquity: An Introductory Essay* (London: Routledge, 1990), 55.

7. Bloom, I*nvention,* 616.

8. Joan Carr, "*Cymbeline* and the Validity of Myth," *Studies in Philology* 75.3 (1978): 320.

9. Jonathan Bate, *Shakespeare and Ovid* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001), 218.

10. Bate, *Shakespeare and Ovid,* 218.

11. Cynthia Lewis, "'With Simular Proof Enough': Modes of Misperception in *Cymbeline*," *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 31.2 (1991): 348.

12. Lewis, "'With Simular Proof,'" 351.

13. William Shakespeare, *Cymbeline*, ed. John Pitcher (London: Penguin, 2005), xxxi, 232.

14. Shakespeare, *Cymbeline*, 211–2.

15. Ann Thompson, "Philomel in Titus Andronicus and *Cymbeline,*" *Shakespeare Survey* 31 (1979): 25.

16. Shakespeare, *Cymbeline,* lv.

17. Bloom, *Invention,* 616, 636.

18. Bloom, *Invention,* 619, 622, 632, 634–5, 636.

19. Thompson, "Philomel," 32.

20. A. B. Taylor, *Shakespeare's Ovid: The Metamorphoses in the Plays and Poems* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 212.

21. Martindale and Martindale, *Uses of Antiquity,* 83.

22. Martindale and Martindale, *Uses of Antiquity,* 45.

23. Martindale and Martindale, *Uses of Antiquity,* 45, 54.

24. Ovid, *Ovid's Metamorphoses,* ed. Madeleine Forey, trans. Arthur Golding (London: Penguin, 2002), 15.984–95.

Divided Fathers, Divided Kings: Echoes of *Arcadia* in Shakespeare's *King Lear*

Angeline Morris
University of Alabama

Introduction

The parallels between Philip Sidney's *New Arcadia* and William Shakespeare's *King Lear* have long been recognized by scholars. In his introduction to the Arden edition of *King Lear,* R.A. Foakes notes that "for the action involving Gloucester and his two sons Shakespeare remembered an episode in Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia,*" and describes the scene in which Mucidorus and Pyrocles encounter an old man being led by a younger one, who turns out to be his son.[1] While it is clear that Sidney's text influenced *King Lear*'s Gloucester plot, it seems negligent to ignore the possibility that *Arcadia* had an impact on other parts of the play. The Gloucester plot is not the only example of a divided family in *Lear;* Lear and his daughters also (somewhat more obviously) represent the problems that arise when division occurs.

The actions and behavior of Lear in Shakespeare's play heavily mirror those of Basilius in *Arcadia*. Both men have traits that connect them to the ideas of divided family and divided nation within their stories. In highlighting this connection between Lear and Basilius, I aim to show the importance of examining these two texts' relationship in greater detail. I analyze the ways in which Lear's behavior as father and king echoes that of Basilius in order to show that *Arcadia* had a more extensive influence on *King*

Journal of the Wooden O. Vol 20, 59-68
© Southern Utah University Press
ISSN: 1539-5758

Lear than has previously been shown. Both texts present rulers who divide themselves from their family; in doing so, they also present a divided nation, one which can only be healed through reconciliation.

The *Arcadia*/*Lear* Relationship

Lear and *Arcadia* are most often tied to each other through the influence the latter had on the former's subplot. The key connection is highlighted in George Bullough's *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare.* Shakespeare, he writes, was focused more on "the emotional and ethical implications of the story" than on details of setting.[2] This interest led him to highlight the interplay of family relationships within the text and "he recalled the story of the blind Paphlagonian king in Sidney's *Arcadia* (1590), who believed his wicked son and rejected his good one and was physically blinded by the former and cherished by the latter."[3] Although Sidney's story appears to be present only in the Gloucester subplot—Edmund as the son who Gloucester trusts and Edgar as the one he rejects—it appears within Lear's story as well, in his acceptance of Regan and Goneril and his rejection of Cordelia.

Bullough notes that both Gloucester and Lear, like Sidney's nameless king, are sent to wander the world. Similarly, Lear takes on the role of a father "who could barely subsist as a beggar at men's doors," which he also shares, in part, with Edgar.[4] Most significantly, Bullough notes that both Lear and Gloucester die "between joy and grief," as the Paphlagonian king does at the end of Sidney's story.[5] In Bullough's reading, Shakespeare wanted to show how the main plot and subplot are related, and "their emotional relationships and final interweaving are so close that it is misleading to speak of 'main-plot' and 'under-plot.'"[6] Bullough is only one of many scholars to comment on the influence of *Arcadia* on *Lear;* in fact, it seems almost impossible for critics writing on the play to *not* mention it. Both R.A. Foakes and Stephen Greenblatt mention the play's debt to *Arcadia* in their respective critical introductions to *King Lear,* and critics William A. Oram and Anthony D. Weiner also reference its influence on Shakespeare's plot.[7]

Although the Gloucester plot is a popular topic for scholars, criticism on *Arcadia* and *Lear* does extend beyond it. Although it highlights the intertwined *Arcadia/Lear* relationship, Thomas

McFarland's essay "The Image of the Family in *King Lear*" is most interested in the importance of family dynamics in Shakespeare's play. According to McFarland, *Lear* is unique in its portrayal of family because it "involves a different model of experience, an image of family life that is neither flamboyant nor unique. On the contrary, it is in significant respects almost commonplace."[8] Compared to the story's source material, Shakespeare's play presents readers with "an image of the family in dynamic interaction, an image intensified and underscored by being doubled into parallel plots."[9] At the heart of the play's problems are, McFarland argues, Lear's conflation of his role as king with his role as father; in acting as a father rather than a king and dividing his kingdom, Lear sets the tragedy in motion.[10] Greenblatt similarly comments on the familial drama present in the play; "In *King Lear,*" he writes, "Shakespeare explores the dark consequences of this dream [of commanding obedience and love] not only in the state but also in the family, where the Renaissance father increasingly styled himself 'a little God.'"[11] He also makes note of the Gloucester subplot, arguing that its "unusually full and intense treatment […] has the effect of suggesting that what is at stake extends beyond the royal family alone, that the roots of the tragedy lie deep in the nature of things."[12] Both of these critics highlight the significance of the familial role in *Lear,* not just in the main plot but in the subplot as well. Because these two plots are so closely intertwined, it seems foolish to not pay attention to the familial aspects of Lear's story.

Conflated Bodies: Misunderstanding the Body Politic and the Body Natural

Both *Arcadia* and *King Lear* demonstrate the struggles of being placed into dual roles of power. Basilius and Lear struggle with being both kings and fathers and understanding the boundaries between their two roles. In fact, their weaknesses lie in their lack of division between roles. Basilius does not recognize the issues which arise when he attempts to act for the benefit of his body natural, rather than his body politic; Lear struggles similarly, but conflates his role as father with his role as king, rather than consciously trying to separate the two. Both men fail to comprehend the ways in which their body natural and their body politic are interconnected. Although neither man realizes it, their decisions as men and fathers

have negative effects on their nation, equally dividing their families and their kingdoms.

Basilius's struggle with his dual roles comes to a head in his extreme response to the oracle's prophecy. Receiving what he perceives to be a horrible prophecy, Basilius acts to prevent it, and uproots his entire family to live in the woods of Arcadia. Although this act of paternal protection seems innocent enough, its effects on Basilius's body politic are devastating, as his counselor Philanax predicts. Basilius has not had any problems with his people until this point, Philanax notes. "Why," he asks, "should you deprive yourself of government for fear of losing your government, like one that should kill himself for fear of death? Nay, rather, if this oracle be to be accounted of, arm up your courage the more against it, for who will stick to him that abandons it?"[13] This prophecy, Philanax argues, is merely that—a prophecy. In acting to prevent it, Basilius risks damaging the relationship he has with his people—the relationship of head to body. Running in fear to the woods shows Basilius's weakness and damages his relationship with the body politic. In doing so, he separates the body natural from the body politic, cutting the head off the political body and leaving it leaderless. Abandoning his people makes Basilius a weak king, even if it seemingly makes him a better father.[14]

Philanax also reacts negatively to Basilius's decision about how to treat his daughters. Having learned from his friend that Basilius intends to keep Pamela and Philoclea from marrying, Philanax writes, "what shall I say, if the affection of a father to his own children cannot plead sufficiently against such fancies?" (81). In choosing to prevent his daughters' marriage, Philanax argues, Basilius is making an unnatural choice. As the girls' father, he should want them to find fulfilling marriages and provide him with grandchildren to make his old age better. Because he only knows Basilius's responses to the prophecy and not its contents, Philanax is completely baffled by this choice. What horrifies him more, however, is Basilius's decision to separate his daughters and place them into two houses. Dividing the girls is bad enough, but placing Pamela under the protection of her father's foolish friend Dametus "comes of a very evil ground that ignorance should be the mother of faithfulness" (82). Basilius's choice will not encourage goodness and faithfulness in his elder daughter, but rather place

her under the control of a man whose ignorance will serve only to harm her. Basilius's decision to ignore his friend's advice helps to set many of the events Philanax fears in motion, and leads to a rending in two of the family unit.

While Basilius literally divides his daughters by placing them in separate houses, Lear takes division one step further by dividing his kingdom between them. Even prior to beginning his love game, Lear has already decided on his division of Britain; it only remains to be seen which child will receive the largest piece. Because Lear believes his role as father to be the same as his role as king, he does not understand the inherent problem presented by his division of the kingdom.[15] Fathers are able to divide their lands among their children, because there is no overarching power attached to the act. Kings, however, cannot divide their land without dividing their body politic. The land is not merely an economic boon, something that will help to support Lear's daughters and secure their futures, but also the very essence of Britain. In breaking Britain into pieces, Lear is breaking apart the body politic, something which should never be disunited.[16]

Lear also fails in his role as father, however, by not identifying Cordelia's lack of performance with the true nature of her love for him. In challenging his daughters to swear their love "[t]hat we our largest bounty may extend / Where nature doth with merit challenge," Lear asks for a performance of love from his daughters instead of the real thing.[17] This is evident in the responses given by Goneril and Regan; both women utilize strongly poetic language in order to convey just how deeply they care for him. Regan's words, especially, highlight the performative and competitive nature of this contest. When asked by Lear to give her answer, she responds that, although she and Goneril are both of similar mettle, "In my true heart / I find she names my very deed of love: / Only she comes too short" (1.1.69-72). Goneril and Regan's joint declarations of love echo the fawning comments of courtiers towards their monarch; although possibly sincere, they do not truly embody the love that the speakers claim to feel. Cordelia, however, by saying only "Nothing" (1.1.87), refuses to play this manipulative love game. "Unhappy that I am," she tells her father, "I cannot heave / My heart into my mouth. I love your majesty / According to my bond, no more nor less" (1.1.91-3). Lear's inability to recognize the truth

of Cordelia's love in comparison to that of Goneril and Regan is a failure of his role as father, which he takes to be an attack on his role as king. Lear's conflation of his roles means that he does not truly recognize the love Cordelia has for him; instead, he willfully banishes the one daughter who cares for him, preferring the empty promises of Goneril and Regan to Cordelia's truth.

Both Basilius and Lear fail to understand the two roles that they play within their narratives. Basilius, in forsaking his body politic for the sake of his body natural out of love for his daughters, ignores the way his act will appear to his people. He forgets that, as king, he is not just a father to the children of his body, but also to the people of Arcadia. In moving to protect his blood children alone, rather than considering the fate of the country as a whole, Basilius negatively affects his relationship with his people. Similarly, Lear's conflation of his two paternal roles leads him to damage not only his relationships with his daughters, but also his relationship with his country.

Both men split apart their daughters and, in turn, the lands that they rule, without fully comprehending the consequences of their actions. Arcadia begins to fall apart because of Basilius's decision, as a small revolution, led by Cecropia's man, Clinias, is able to attack the royal family's retreat in the woods. This group of "clowns and other rebels" have nothing tethering them to their compatriots; instead, "so many as they were, so many almost were their minds, all knit together only in madness" (Sidney 379). Without their head, Basilius, to lead them and direct their movements, the people of Arcadia are not unified. The lack of a head splinters the body of Arcadia, connecting its parts together "only in madness," and not through the leadership of their king.

Similarly, by dividing the kingdom between his daughters and removing himself from the throne, Lear has deprived his people of a true head. He himself does not seem to recognize this result; the madness of the body politic in *Arcadia* is instead inscribed upon Lear's physical body. Denied the trappings of power by Goneril and Regan, Lear chooses to "abjure all roofs" and "[t]o wage against the enmity o'th'air" rather than admit his loss (2.2.397-8). Although he warns Regan to "not make [him] mad" (2.2.407), not long after his abjuration he is revealed to be wandering the landscape in a crazed state. Speaking to the weather around him,

Lear almost acknowledges his own responsibility for the division he has created, but still fails to comprehend his actions fully. "Nor rain, wind, thunder, fire are my daughters," he cries;

> I tax you not, you elements, with unkindness.
> I never gave you kingdom, called you children;
> You owe me no subscription. Why then, let fall
> Your horrible pleasure. […]
> But yet I call you servile ministers
> That will with two pernicious daughters join
> Your high-engendered battles 'gainst a head
> So old and white as this. (3.2.15-18, 20-4)

At first, Lear appears to recognize his fault—his gift to his children of the kingdom has led to the situation he finds himself in now, and he willingly submits. However, he just as quickly decides that Nature has allied itself with Regan and Goneril, and therefore attacks him wrongfully. His gift of power has led to his abuse at the hands of those who should be respectful of his venerable old age. Lear's brief (apparent) clarity is immediately darkened once more by his metaphorical blindness and literal madness; in failing to recognize his fault, he cannot fully acknowledge the damage he has done to his bodies.[18] Lear's madness is therefore the direct result of his decision to divide his power and his body politic. The body politic cannot be divested so easily, a fact which both Basilius and Lear seem not to understand. This straining against division after the fact causes a lack of comprehension, which prevents any recognition of a singular purpose.

As the madness of the Arcadians is triggered by Basilius's division of himself and his family from the body politic, so the division of the kingdom without comprehending the damage to the body politic triggers Lear's breakdown. Both of these forms of madness also highlight the unnatural state which leads to them. Just as it is "unnatural" for the body to have no head (political or physical), it is also "unnatural" for the Arcadian people to have no king—or at least, to have a king who does not fulfill his duties. Similarly, as it is unnatural for the king to attempt to break up the body politic into pieces, so Lear's madness highlights the unnatural separation between body natural and body politic.

Lear and Basilius, however, have not only divided themselves from the body politic; they have also separated themselves from

their family. In dividing his daughters and placing them in separate households, Basilius quite literally divides the family unit. Similarly, Lear's division of the country among Goneril, Regan, and Cordelia leads to a literal separation, as Lear is shuttled between Goneril and Regan and Cordelia is banished to France. This lack of unity within the family mirrors the division of the nation from its king; as the family crumbles, so too does the country. In failing to understand their roles as fathers to their families as well as to their people, Lear and Basilius cause the destabilization of both.

Reconciliation and the End of Division?

The only opportunity both Lear and Basilius have to repair the divisions they have created is through reconciliation. Although we do not see a full reconciliation between either Basilius and the Arcadians or between Basilius and his family within the *New Arcadia,* there is plenty of evidence to suggest that it is forthcoming. Zelmane's speech to the Arcadians, which leads them to put aside their weapons and to turn once more to their king, heralds a future reconciliation between Basilius and his body politic. Similarly, Basilius's willingness to fight for the deliverance of Pamela and Philoclea opens up the possibility of their reunification and reconciliation with each other.[19]

Lear, on the other hand, does have a moment of reconciliation with the daughter he has wronged. In his reunion with Cordelia, Lear cannot quite believe that she is there before him, and thinks that she is a spirit come back to haunt him (4.7.46-9). Lear's willingness to admit his wrongdoing allows Cordelia to fully forgive him—although her father says that she has cause to hate him, she refutes this, replying, "No cause, no cause" (4.7.72-5). Reuniting with his daughter also helps to alleviate some of the symptoms of Lear's madness, caused by his splitting of the body politic. Cordelia's return opens the possibility of Lear regaining power and reunifying the king's two bodies.[20] Reconciling with Cordelia allows Lear to begin the work of repairing the damage he has done; however, the play's tragic ending—with Cordelia dead in Lear's arms and the bodies of Regan and Goneril onstage—prevents a true reunion of the family in life. In this sense, then, Lear's reconciliation is a failed one. He has reconciled himself with

part of his family, but not all, and therefore cannot reconcile his two bodies, split asunder as he split his family apart.

Obviously, there is much more to be done in examining *Arcadia* and *King Lear* side by side. The comparisons that I have drawn here are by no means the only ones that can be seen between Basilius and Lear, nor are they the only ones that exist. Much more scholarship remains to be done on the relationship between these two plays, especially outside the direct connection between the Gloucester plot and the Paphlagonian king episode. If scholars can agree that Shakespeare was familiar with this moment in Sidney's text, there are certainly opportunities to consider the possibility that he was familiar with more of the story. In examining the relationships between family and nation, therefore, I hope to open the gates to scholars to critically dissect the parallels between these two texts.

Notes

1. R.A. Foakes, introduction to *King Lear,* ed. R.A. Foakes (London: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 1997), 100.
2. Geoffrey Bullough, *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare,* vol. 7 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1973), 283.
3. Bullough, *Narrative,* 284.
4. Bullough, *Narrative,* 284.
5. Bullough, *Narrative,* 284. This is not the only connection that Bullough mentions between *Arcadia* and *Lear;* he also notes the possible connection between the story of Plangus and the dialogue between Cecropia and Pamela, in which Pamela "proves the dependence of nature on a benevolent order," to *Lear*'s plot (Bullough 286-7).
6. Bullough, *Narrative,* 286. For a more detailed analysis of the source materials of *King Lear,* including its connection to Book 10 of Spenser's *Faerie Queene,* I highly recommend consulting Bullough's text.
7. Oram and Weiner are mostly interested in the intertextual nature of the Gloucester plot, with Oram focusing on the changes which Shakespeare made in his play and Weiner on the ways in which Shakespeare's story draws from both *Arcadia* and Spenser's *Faerie Queene.* Greenblatt refers to the Gloucester plot as "a tale [Shakespeare] adapted from an episode in Philip Sidney's prose romance *Arcadia*." See the introduction to this paper for Foakes's critical understanding of *Arcadia* and *Lear*'s relationship. Stephen Greenblatt, introduction to *King Lear,* ed. Stephen Greenblatt (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2016), 2320.
8. Thomas McFarland, "The Image of the Family in *King Lear,*" *Shakespearean Criticism,* ed. Michael L. LeBlanc, 73 (2003): 104.
9. McFarland, "Image of the Family," 105.
10. McFarland, "Image of the Family," 105-6.
11. Greenblatt, introduction, 2317.

12. Greenblatt, introduction, 2320.

13. Sir Philip Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia,* ed. Maurice Evans (New York: Penguin, 1987), 80-1. All future citations will be in-text.

14. It does not, but Basilius seems to think that it does.

15. In fact, McFarland argues that Lear's conflation of his roles is also what leads him to believe he can still hold the power he has as king after his divestment of rule (McFarland 105).

16. Shakespeare's second history tetralogy highlights this issue quite clearly, especially in Gaunt's speech in *Richard II* 2.1, which shows the downfall of the land because of the failures of the king.

17. William Shakespeare, *King Lear,* ed. R.A. Foakes (London: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 1997), 1.1.52-3. All further citations will be in text.

18. He quite literally believes, as he later tells a disguised Kent, that he is "a man / More sinned against than sinning" (3.2.59-60).

19. The possibility of reconciliation with Gynecia in the *New Arcadia* is left somewhat hazy, as there is no definite ending to either Basilius's or Gynecia's obsession with Zelmane. Readers can only hope that they find happiness with each other, in the end.

20. In fact, this is the traditional ending to the Lear story—several sources, including *Faerie Queene* and *The True Chronicle History of King Leir,* say that Cordelia comes back to restore her father to the throne.

Feminine Veneration Over Patriarchal Domination: Reading Ecology in *The Winter's Tale*

Kaitlyn Reid
Queen's University

Early in act two of William Shakespeare's *The Winter's Tale,* Mamillius, the young son of Leontes, states, "A sad tale's best for winter."[1] Although it is often grouped with Shakespeare's comedies, many scholars categorize *The Winter's Tale* as one of the playwright's late romances. A critical reading of the play quickly proves the young prince's point and connects the brutal realities of winter to Leontes's court in Sicilia. The play is a "generically confused"[2] hodgepodge, beginning in a form resembling high Greek tragedy, and concluding with an ending almost too miraculous and happy to be attributed to the mind that poeticized Tarquin's rape of Lucrece, and dramatized the baking of young Goths into pies in *Titus Andronicus.* Stephen Orgel notes that as early as 1672, ". . . Dryden, looking back at the drama of the last age, singled out *The Winter's Tale,* along with *Measure for Measure* and *Love's Labour's Lost,* for particular criticism," while also drawing attention to criticism from virtually every era that called the play, "ridiculous," and even, "beyond all dramatic credibility."[3] While these criticisms are valid in many ways, an analysis of *The Winter's Tale* through an ecofeminist lens proves to be incredibly fruitful. Distinct parallels can be drawn between the structure of the text and the cyclical realities of Nature. The play can be read as offering explicit criticism of man's domination of his

Journal of the Wooden O. Vol 20, 69-80
© Southern Utah University Press
ISSN: 1539-5758

environment and an encouragement to substitute the domination, demonstrated primarily by Leontes, with veneration, primarily illustrated by Hermione and Perdita.

Jennifer Munroe writes that "Although both the husbandman and the housewife practice an 'art' . . . their arts are not equal. The husbandman's art makes him 'maister of the earth.'"[4] As Munroe is referencing the husbandry manuals of the period, it is safe to conclude that this notion of being a master of the earth referred to the early modern man controlling literal earth, that is to say, his land. However, Leontes proves to be committed to asserting his masculine dominance over his realm and the people in it at all times. This moves us away from the idea of man's control over a piece of land that he owns and personally maintains, toward the concept of a king dominating his nation. Leontes's dominating force would not have been new, nor would it have been shocking to the play's original audience as, "For the first time in two centuries the Divine Right of Kings became a serious political philosophy..." under the leadership of King James I who, "...resisted, as a matter of principle, any questioning of the royal judgement, and was especially concerned with maintaining and strengthening the royal prerogatives."[5] To argue that *The Winter's Tale* was designed to criticize the reign of James I is not something that this paper is prepared to assert; however, a consideration of the similarities between James I and Leontes in terms of their styles of kingship and perceived desires to control their environments effectively broadens the concepts of Nature and facilitates an ecologically focused reading of the play beyond Perdita's references to flowers in act four.

Kakkonen and Penjak note that "First and foremost, ecofeminism tries to make visible the connections—historical, conceptual, and experiential—between gender domination and environmental deterioration and profiteering by male prepotency,"[6] and these connections are first demonstrated by Leontes's treatment of Hermione and the resulting barren stasis of Sicilia. Leontes's "bad husbandry" results in an incredible amount of waste, and a thorough analysis of his domination of Sicilia, Nature's active presence in Bohemia, and the characters who inhabit these two opposite worlds illustrates the futility of man's attempts to master Nature and his environment. This reading ultimately stresses that

such domination will undoubtedly interrupt Nature's cycle, a cycle that is restored to Sicilia at the end of the play when Perdita returns, bringing with her the desire to nurture as opposed to control.

Sean Kane argues that *The Faerie Queene* is about, " . . . the relations of living organisms to the external world where the organisms are human beings, and the external world comprises of the environments provided by history and society as well as nature."[7] While Shakespeare's play and Spenser's poem were written at very different times in England's history, Kane's assertion, that the presence of the natural world is not the only way in which a text can be examined from an ecological standpoint, can be applied to Shakespeare's play as well. It becomes clear that an examination of space in the play, and the human interactions that occur in that space, supports a reading of *The Winter's Tale* as an ecological text. This idea is echoed by Simon Estok who writes, "Certainly space (and how it is conceptualized) in a play such as *The Winter's Tale* is very important . . . it determines the structure of the lived experiences of the people in those imagined spaces."[8]

The play opens and spends the majority of its time in Sicilia, and it is the pollution of the Sicilian environment by Leontes that sets the events of the text in motion. Greta Gaard writes that "The relational inter-identity that is the starting point of ecofeminism conceives environment and identity as co-constituted, and 'home' as a socially constructed location, an act of place-and-identity co-creation that takes time, energy, and commitment,"[9] but the depths of Leontes's desire to dominate his environment make this co-creation tantamount to impossible. Most readings of the text focus on Leontes's jealousy over the affair he suspects between Hermione and Polixenes. Jealousy is definitely present; however, to read Leontes's jealousy as one of a sexual nature, without considering other possibilities does not give the text the consideration it deserves and does not hold up in a careful reading that is actively paying attention to the ecological undertones of the play. This is best explored through an examination of the scenes leading up to Hermione's imprisonment. Leontes, as always in his quest to control his environment, wants Polixenes to stay in Sicilia: "Clear from the beginning of the play . . . is the proposition that Leontes is hardly a master of human art over the potentially wild landscape, an incompetence that compromises his authority."[10]

This "wild landscape" can be defined as anything Leontes does not have complete control over. This includes Nature, his wife, and Polixenes, as evidenced by his admission that he could not convince Polixenes to stay in Sicilia. When Hermione's request is successful, Leontes laments, "At my request he would not. / Hermione, my dearest, thou never spok'st / To better purpose" (1.2.87-9). In this instance, Hermione proves to be more of an active husbandman than passive housewife through her ability to sway Polixenes, and it is this first display of her feminine power and ability to influence that begins Leontes's fall as "His estimate of his own influence goes from one extreme to the other."[11]

These first scenes, and the play as a whole, are riddled with references to or images of gardening, farming, and the cultivation of land in general, and "ecofeminism underlines the relation of men to culture and that of women to nature."[12] When Leontes first praises Hermione for getting Polixenes to stay in Sicilia, she responds by saying, "I prithee tell me; cram's with praise, and make's / As fat as tame things"(I.2.90). In her use of the term "tame things," Hermione connects herself to that which is domesticated. This could be a reference to her talents at housewifery and hosting; however the connection of the word tame to animals kept for the purposes of land cultivation and farming means that we are instantly reminded that Hermione is meant to be the domesticated body in this scenario, not the one with the control and ability to determine who does what. This idea is furthered as Hermione's speech continues, and she makes references to field work and ploughing saying, "You may ride's / With one soft kiss a thousand furlongs ere / With spur we heat an acre" (1.2.93-5). The terms acre and furlong are clearly a means of measuring land, and in his notes on the scene, Orgel emphasizes that these measurements would have been based on the amount of land that domesticated animals could plough in a given workday.[13] In connecting herself to the laborious work of tilling land, Hermione further casts Leontes as the farmer or husbandman in the situation; however, her ability to succeed in his venture, to keep Polixenes in Sicilia, makes Leontes second guess his competency and ability to control his realm and the relationships in it.

This idea that Leontes's jealousy is not simply sexual, but is significantly more complex, originating in his mistrust of his own

abilities as ruler, husband, and master of his realm, is furthered by his reaction to the affair he believes has been the result of his failings as a husbandman. In his mind, he has tried and failed to control his environment, but the one thing he has managed to cultivate is a relationship between his wife and his boyhood friend turned rival. Even the lines that most suggest that Leontes's jealousy is solely sexual can indicate a distinct ecological undertone. For example, the line, "And his pond fished by his next neighbour" (1.2.193), is clearly quite sexual, but it also once again connects Hermione to the natural world as a piece of property that Leontes presumes to own and believes he can benefit from by controlling who fishes from it. In the patriarchal world of Sicilia, the adultery or the loyalty of a wife is only part of the greater concern to control and dominate one's environment. This is evidenced by the fact that, "we find Leontes much more preoccupied with the idea of revenge against his male rival than with his wife: he regrets that the "harlot king" has escaped and is therefore "beyond [his] arm."[14] In other words, it is his perceived inability to control Polixenes at this point that most vexes Leontes. This opposes the popular notion that his downward spiral is brought on by lustful jealousy.

After Polixenes flees Sicilia with Camillo, Hermione is the only person left who remains a threat to Leontes's dominance over his environment, and therefore she must be punished. Leontes "is a man whose power resides in language, a man who controls women, a man who treats women and the environment as passive objects that, ideally, lack their own volition and voice."[15] Hermione is barred from Mamillius and is imprisoned, stripped of her comforts even during the birth of her daughter. She laments, "My second joy, / And first fruits of my body, from his presence / I am barred like one infectious" (3.2.94-6). Hermione's imprisonment, seclusion, and trial, then, act as Leontes's method of returning Hermione to her passive role as a domesticated entity: Nature contained by a man-made enclosure. As discussed above, Hermione herself has made connections between her own body and facets of the natural world that Leontes, as ruler, might tame—the land, livestock, etc.—but "ecofeminist values oppose all forms of hierarchy and domination,"[16] and Hermione's willingness to be compared to "tame things" (1.2.91), and other parts of the natural world which are often dominated, speaks to the fact that

she exists in a patriarchal society insistent that women are "raised to be obedient."[17] Despite these comparisons, the better reading of Hermione's connection to nature is that she herself is Nature, as evidenced by her ability to outperform Leontes's attempted husbandry. Roberts writes, "Women's fertility, her cyclical anatomical processes, and her subordinate position...confirmed her closeness to Nature and reinforced the view that she was to be controlled by male Culture."[18] Leontes cannot have ultimate control over his environment while his wife, and by proxy Nature, are free to thrive; he will never attain true dominance while Nature is left unrestrained. As Hermione is stripped of her agency and comforts, Nature is stripped of its wild chaos and is contained to suit the needs of men.

Leontes's final act of dominance over the Sicilian environment occurs at Hermione's trial. He has every opportunity to set things right, as Hermione insists upon her innocence and begs Leontes to understand her behavior. She stresses, "I loved him, as in honour he required; / With such a kind of love as might become / A lady like me" (3.2.62-4). Even facing death, Hermione emphasizes that her actions were in service to her lord and master, and that her only crime was in succeeding where he was unable to. Nothing works to sway Leontes, although Shakespeare does provide the reader with one brief instance of hope. This moment occurs as the Officer reads the sealed message from the Oracle at Delphos. The message tells nothing but truth, even foreshadowing the ultimately happy ending of the play saying, "the king shall live without an heir if that / which is lost be not found" (3.2.132-3). However, Leontes dismisses the words of the Oracle, words that he believed would give credence to his charges against Hermione. As the oracle goes against Leontes's authority, he quashes the evidence its message provided: "There is no truth at all i'th' Oracle. / The sessions shall proceed; this is mere falsehood" (3.2.137-8). His decision to dismiss the message of the Oracle and to only listen to his own desire to punish those who questioned his control pollutes Sicilia with familial waste, and "His daughter, his son, his wife and his friends are each withdrawn from the space he seeks to control."[19] Mamillius dies, Hermione appears to die, Perdita is sent away with Antigonus where she is left for dead, and Nature's cycle halts in Sicilia, stopping growth and condemning the people left behind to life in a perpetual winter.

The last scene of act three and the entirety of act four signal a significant shift in the text in more ways than one. The transition to Bohemia leaves the death and winter of Leontes's court behind and introduces the reader to the regrowth, rebirth and regeneration of spring and summer in a land where respect for Nature is valued over domination. We also see a shift in genre as Shakespeare moves away from the high Greek tragedy he developed in the court of Leontes, and towards a lighter comedic tone in a green space where, "animals—both savage and domestic—abound, a woman reigns as queen, and a pickpocket triumphantly practices his illicit trade."[20] However, as Charlotte Scott notes, "The introduction to Bohemia is notoriously dramatic: conditioned by shipwreck, exile, stormy skies, a ravenous bear, hallucinations and death. . . Bohemia begins as a threatening and destabilizing experience."[21] The Bohemian wilderness can be read as a rendering of the chaotic and wild nature of Nature itself, and while there are tragic undertones present during the reader's introduction to Bohemia, they are necessary for the eventual restoration of Sicilia. The opening of act four is Shakespeare's way of emphasizing the fact that wild chaos, as opposed to human control, is crucial to Nature.

The most tragic events before the regeneration of act four begins are the deaths of Antigonus and the Mariners; however, their deaths, "eradicate the potential contamination of Bohemia by the things of Sicilia, with the exception of the baby, who will now be raised by the shepherds, whose approach to nature, we learn, is much different than Leontes's."[22] The scene opens on the shores of Bohemia and we are instantly made aware that there is a general sense of foreboding among the Sicilians. The Mariner worries, "In my conscience, / The heavens with that we have in hand are angry, / And frown upon's" (3.3.4-6). There is a general sense that the men from Sicilia are outsiders and that Nature is responding to their threatening presence. Shortly after, Shakespeare writes the most famous stage direction of all time, [*Exit, Pursued by a Bear*] (3.3.56), and Antigonus dies accepting that, in the wilderness of Bohemia, men who seek to control or interfere with Nature eventually become the hunted. Michael Bristol writes, "The bear as symbol of the excessive cruelty of royal tyranny has ironic resonance . . . in that it is Antigonus, the compliant servant who does the king's bidding, rather than any of the other persons who

spoke against Leontes who suffers this extravagant punishment."[23] This is significant as it suggests that Nature, through the natural necessities and urges of its inhabitants, is somehow stepping in here to right a wrong, or in this case, the many wrongs that transpired in Leontes's Sicilia: "The male bear puts an end to the last vestige of Leontes's anger against his wife and daughter,"[24] and it is, "as if Nature operates here not out of malice but an alternative sense of justice, and we are reminded that Antigonus's demise came not from the bear's violent desires but rather his basic need to eat."[25]

Antigonus's death, while unfortunate, can be understood and accepted by the reader due to his loyalty to Leontes and the fact that he did as was commanded of him despite knowing how incredibly wrong it was. However, Perdita almost ends up dying as well due to the destruction of Antigonus. Tom Macfaul notes that, "Shakespeare's most famous moment of a character being absorbed into nature is the death of Ophelia in *Hamlet*"[26], and in the same way that Ophelia was integrated into the pond that formed her watery grave, so too could Perdita have been swallowed by the Bohemian wilderness, were it not for the Old Shepherd.

The introduction of the Old Shepherd primes the reader for the events and ramifications of act four when he says, "thou metst with things dying, I / with things new-born" (3.3.104-5) in the sense that in many ways, his finding Perdita results in a kind of rebirth for her away from the "rot and pollution"[27] of Leontes's court. The Old Shepherd and the Clown nurture Perdita and introduce her to their lifestyle, where Nature is venerated as opposed to dominated. Perdita is raised to eventually become, "the sheep-shearing 'Queen' of her adopted land and the hope of the future for her father and Sicilia."[28] Although her title does not hold the power and prestige that Leontes's crown holds, Perdita proves herself to be the one and only hope for her father through her knowledge and respect for her environment and through championing the cause of a Nature that remains free from human control and intervention.

Munroe writes that Perdita "operates as an ambassador of the natural world, not its superior . . . Perdita's superior social position is demonstrated not by her assertion of authority over it but rather in the way that her horticultural art represents rather than alters nature."[29] This sentiment is echoed by Polixenes who, in disguise, meets Perdita at the sheep-shearing and states, "Nothing she does

or seems / But smacks of something greater than herself, / Too noble for this place" (4.4.157-9). Perdita's royal birth combined with the reverence for the natural world taught to her by her found family in Bohemia, cement her as the antithesis to her controlling father, and this stands out almost instantly to Polixenes, who knew Leontes and had first-hand experience of his attempts to control everything in his path.

Perdita's knowledge of Nature implies a kind of respect that leads into one of the most obviously ecological exchanges in the text, as she discusses the gillyvors. Scott writes that, "Perdita rejects the streaked gillyvors because their synthesis of colour suggests human intervention to the point of manipulation,"[30] saying, "our carnations and streaked gillyvors, which some call nature's bastards" (4.4.82-3), to which Polixenes replies by stating, "This is an art / Which does mend nature—change it rather—but / The art itself is nature" (4.4.95-7). The text blurs the line between art and nature here, but in the end, Perdita comes out on the side of reverent distance, and Polixenes, on the side of human interference. While Polixenes is not suggesting the domination that Leontes craved, his determination to prove the necessity of interference connects him to the patriarchal "male Culture" stressed by Roberts, that asserts the need for man to subdue Nature and by extension, the feminine. This exchange between Perdita and Polixenes makes it clear that through *The Winter's Tale* Shakespeare aligns the feminine with Nature and nurturing, and the male with dominance and control. The degree of this alignment depends on the character and which environment they inhabit, and Perdita's cements her position as the only character able to bring the spring and regeneration of Bohemia to the brutal winter of Sicilia. The scene also harkens back to Hermione's references to the cultivation of land when Perdita stresses, "I'll not put / The dybble in earth to set one slip of them" (4.4.99-100); however, instead of casting a man as the farmer, as Hermione cast Leontes, Perdita asserts that she will be the one taking care of the land, and as such, will not abide human intervention that seeks to alter and manipulate Nature. Scott notes, "The 'cunning' use of the 'dybble' that Perdita refuses exposes her reluctance to intervene in an industry dependent on management… Perdita's representation of intervention as supporting 'nature's bastards' attempts to impeach human interference in specifically

moral terms."[31] Like her mother, Perdita proves over and over again that she is a better "husbandman" than Leontes, illustrating the power of respect and nurturing over dominance, and she brings her knowledge and reverence for Nature back with her when she returns to Sicilia.

The play begins in a Sicilia defined by domination and by Leontes's need to categorize and control all things. Bohemia introduces the reader to the rebirth and regeneration possible in the spring and summer months and illustrates that "it is precisely the high summer of life that Leontes has lost for himself and Hermione"[32], when he attempts to prevail over Nature and his environment. Acts one to three spawn death, waste, and a stunted growth and development in Sicilia, while act four introduces the healing and regenerative powers of the summer months into the world of the play followed by act five, where the restorative powers of nurturing are exemplified by the "statue" of Hermione coming to life. Paulina, as the "stage manager of the event"[33], gives the audience yet another woman in the play who Leontes tries to control and categorize, but who ends up playing a role in the healing of the Sicilian environment. The statue scene demonstrates that, like Perdita, Paulina is an apt caretaker.

The notion that "art can improve on nature through human intervention is radically undermined by the revelations" of the final statue scene.[34] Prior to the revelation of Hermione's life, Leontes is reunited with both Polixenes and Perdita, so in many ways the Sicilian environment is restored before the big reveal; however, Shakespeare does not show us these restorative exchanges. There is no concrete answer as to why that is, but this paper posits that the reason is to allow the audience their happy ending while still highlighting the true power and restorative abilities of the final cycle of Nature represented in *The Winter's Tale* through the highly regenerative and restorative act five. Seeing the statue, Leontes laments, "I am ashamed. Does not the stone rebuke me / For being more stone than it?" (5.3.37-8), giving the audience the first real hint that Perdita's return has affected him, and inspired him to acknowledge his failings. Leontes's reaction to the statue and especially the beauty in Hermione's aging over the last sixteen years highlights his healing, and then Hermione's quasi-resurrection asserts not only the status of Nature as superior to art and the

manmade world, but also that Nature's cycle has come full circle, and healed all of the damage and waste in Sicilia caused by Leontes's controlling tendencies.

"The play closes belonging to three women who all believe in nature—Perdita's purism, Paulina's mock statue, and Hermione's aging face testify to a belief in the nobility of the real thing, when the 'art itself is nature.'"[35] The fact that women, in every instance, prove to be the closest to Nature is no coincidence, and reading *The Winter's Tale* through an ecofeminist lens emphasizes the need for the protection of Nature and, by extension, a respect for the role of women in society. Munroe notes that according to Markham and the husbandry manuals of the period, "the wife's practical knowledge of the natural world makes her closer to Nature itself, which in turn underscores the need for the wife to be mastered by the husband just as he, as the books for men insist, must master Nature."[36] I contend that *The Winter's Tale* is absolutely criticizing man's attempts to dominate Nature and his environment. In the world of the play, attempting to dominate a woman is as futile as attempting to dominate Mother Nature herself, a lesson that cost Leontes the life of his son, and sixteen years of stasis away from his wife and daughter. Although it is both a romance and a comedy at points, *The Winter's Tale* is really a cautionary tale, designed to be read as a warning to those who dare to dominate rather than nurture and respect.

Notes

1. William Shakespeare, *The Winter's Tale* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 2.1.25.
2. Simon C. Estok, *Ecocriticism and Shakespeare: Reading Ecophobia* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 97; Rene Girard, "The Crime and Conversion of Leontes in *The Winter's Tale,*" *Religion and Literature* 22.2/3 (1990): 193-219.
3. Stephen Orgel, Introduction to *The Winter's Tale* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 1.
4. Jennifer Munroe, "It's All About the Gillyvors: Engendering Art and Nature in *The Winter's Tale,*" in *Ecocritical Shakespeare* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011): 144.
5. Orgel, "Introduction," 12-13.
6. Gordana Galić Kakkonen and Ana Penjak, "The Nature of Gender: Are Juliet, Desdemona and Cordelia to their Fathers as Nature is to Culture?" *Critical Survey* 27.1 (2015): 19.
7. Sean Kane, "Spenserian Ecology," *ELH* 50.3 (1983): 461.
8. Estok, *Ecocriticism and Shakespeare,* 92.

9. Greta Gaard, "New Directions for Ecofeminism: Toward a More Feminist Ecocriticism," *Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment* 17.4 (2010): 658.
10. Munroe, "It's All About the Gillyvors," 146.
11. Rene Girard, "The Crime and Conversion of Leontes in *The Winter's Tale,*" in *Religion and Literature* 22.2/3 (1990): 196.
12. Kakkonen and Penjak, "The Nature of Gender," 19.
13. Orgel, "Introduction," 99.
14. Jeanne Addison Roberts, T*he Shakespearean Wild: Geography, Genus and Gender* (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1991), 159-160.
15. Estok, *Ecocriticism and Shakespeare,* 95.
16. Gaard, "New Directions for Ecofeminism," 648.
17. Kakkonen and Penjak, "The Nature of Gender," 25.
18. Roberts, *The Shakespearean Wild,* 26.
19. Estok, *Ecocriticism and Shakespeare,* 92.
20. Roberts, *The Shakespearean Wild,* 161.
21. Charlotte Scott, *Shakespeare's Nature: From Cultivation to Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 155.
22. Munroe, "It's All About the Gillyvors," 147.
23. Michael D. Bristol, "In Search of the Bear: Spatiotemporal Form and the Heterogeneity of Economies in *The Winter's Tale,*" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 42.2 (1991): 160.
24. Roberts, *The Shakespearean Wild,* 83.
25. Munroe, "It's All About the Gillyvors," 147.
26. Tom Macfaul, *Shakespeare and the Natural World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 60.
27. Estok, *Ecocriticism and Shakespeare,* 98.
28. Roberts, *The Shakespearean Wild,* 84.
29. Munroe, "It's All About the Gillyvors," 151.
30. Scott, *Shakespeare's Nature,* 176.
31. Scott, *Shakespeare's Nature,* 180.
32. Macfaul, *Shakespeare and the Natural World,* 79.
33. Roberts, *The Shakespearean Wild,* 163.
34. Scott, *Shakespeare's Nature,* 184.
35. Scott, *Shakespeare's Nature,* 186.
36. Munroe, "It's All About the Gillyvors," 148.

"I have drunk, and seen the spider": Conjuring Empathy or, How to Style Words in *The Winter's Tale*

Jessica Tooker
Indiana University, Bloomington

Upon hearing the Delphic oracle's report exonerating Queen Hermione of infidelity, Leontes briskly remarks, "There is no truth at all i'th' oracle. / The sessions shall proceed—this is mere falsehood" (3.2.137-138).[1] Rendering the prophecy a bogus non-sequitur, and establishing speech as a powerful force affecting how people deal with each other, Shakespeare's last solo-authored king uses words with remarkable style. Leontes's shocking but stylish denial of the queen's innocence demonstrates not only his virtuoso deployment of language shaping critical actions, but also how badly he needs his words to have an impact on others and the world at large. As Lynn Enterline observes, the king "desire[s] to master the world by controlling all language."[2] Tragically, Leontes's magisterial, if icy demonstration of rhetorical agency is also an example of verbal abuse. To be sure, we have all experienced this type of language—directed at ourselves, someone else, or a group while we were present, and in films, television programs, or social media. Additionally, this violent discourse can be a devastating issue in relationships, romantic and otherwise.

Deeply attuned to the problem of harsh words directed at another person or a collective, in his penultimate romance, *The Winter's Tale,* Shakespeare analyzes the complex dynamic between

Journal of the Wooden O. Vol 20, 81-99
© Southern Utah University Press
ISSN: 1539-5758

violent language and its stunning performance. Showcasing the traumatic upshot of what might be called "wounding words," hurtful language which impacts interlocutors as it is penetratingly felt in body and mind, my piece argues that the play stimulates the offstage audience's empathy as a cure for verbal abuse and analyzes how language influences its members' "fellow feeling" response to performance. Cognizant of the power of words to wound and heal, Leontes's striking investment in rhetorical domination, featuring his stylish utilization of effortlessly confident language, illuminates his belief that, as Stanley Cavell puts it, "To speak is to say what counts."[3] Of course, saying what counts is germane to expressing empathy—the affective response of feeling with, and not simply for another person. Consequently, I want to suggest that in *The Winter's Tale*—a stunning meta-theatrical investigation of empathy's compelling impact upon the Early Modern theater and the audience—words and empathy often conjure up each other, and emerge as an antidote for verbal abuse, or other forms of unkind language.

Ellen MacKay argues, "To deal in performance is always and inescapably to deal in conjuration."[4] Her claim foregrounds the Early Modern playhouse as a space of illusion where actors serve as its Protean agents. Frequently, in Shakespeare's corpus, performative conjuring is executed by using powerful words to instantiate change. In *How to Do Things With Words,* J.L. Austin argues that words can simultaneously perform an action: "To say something is to do something . . . by saying or in saying something we are doing something."[5] Austin calls this type of speech *a performative sentence* or a "performative," which "indicates that the issuing of the utterance is the performing of an action—it is not normally thought of as just saying something."[6] Therefore, as Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick observes, "Austinian performativity is about how language constructs or affects reality rather than merely describing it."[7] In order for a speech act to be successful, precise ritualistic and felicitous conditions must also be fulfilled. For example, "The *circumstances* in which the words are uttered should be . . . appropriate, and [often] the speaker himself or other persons should *also* perform certain *other* actions, whether 'physical' or 'mental' actions or . . . uttering further words."[8] By turns deploying what Austin calls *illocutionary acts,* or "utterances

which have a certain (conventional) force" and *perlocutionary acts* establishing "what we bring about or achieve by saying something, such as convincing, persuading, [etc.]," the main characters in *The Winter's Tale* deftly fill its scenes with performatives, demonstrating that this is a play where words transformatively impact actions and the other way around.[9] As it has been said, "Words have the power of the sword." To this end, I want to suggest that during a performance of this marvelously intense romance, members of the offstage audience sustain transient affective wounds from the verbal abuse which they hear and feel inexorably—on body and in mind—and that the rhetorical damage which the play inflicts is cathartically healed by the processes of what I call "empathetic witnessing." Similarly to Hermione, the audience learns from the trauma of verbal abuse as it is borne upon the body.

I argue that Shakespeare helps the audience to manage the shocking events and sometimes excruciatingly harsh words of the play by deploying the affective trauma which psychologists call "Stockholm Syndrome" as a landmark performative mechanism. First observed in the 1970's, this is a phenomenon where hostages adjust to their terrifying condition by empathizing with their hostage takers, even bizarrely defending them after escaping from their clutches. Fritz Breithaupt observes that because "the experience of being taken hostage is so existentially traumatic that it can in fact shake the contours of the self," the profound violence of the hostage situation simultaneously engenders the hostage's experience of "self-loss" and triggers "fellow feeling" with the hostage taker.[10] Thus, in the case of hostage-taking, "Empathy does not originate here as an end in itself, but rather as a concrete medium that keeps channels of communication open."[11] And as we might expect, the hostage taker increasingly assumes monologic control over the connection which, rather than remaining "a dialogical I-you-relationship…becomes a 'you with me' relationship."[12]

Mainly responsible for generating Shakespearean Stockholm syndrome, Leontes engages the offstage audience in the affective undercurrents of what I would call "l'extimité pain," or the pain of external intimacy. In *The Sublime Object of Ideology,* Slavoj Žižek explains of Jacques Lacan's concept of *l'extimité,* "The symbolic order is striving for a homeostatic balance, but there is

in its kernel, at its very centre, some strange, traumatic element which cannot be symbolized, integrated into the symbolic order—the Thing. Lacan coined a neologism for it: l'extimité—external intimacy."[13] Perhaps l'extimité pain occurs in two phases. The first is characterized by genuine affective distress which is ironically provoked by the normal entries of others into the intimate world of individuals. The second is delineated by the shocking verbal abuse (explicitly contrary to the longing for kind words) that often follows hard upon the entrance of these people into the same private world. Frequently, the verbal abuse that is deployed during times of l'extimité pain is triggered by the strong emotion of jealousy which Émile Littré defines as, "A sentiment which is born in love and which is produced by the fear that the loved person prefers someone else."[14] Although their jealousy is hardly obvious at all times, Hermione and Leontes's experience of l'extimité pain is shown in Roland Barthes's description of Werther's response to Charlotte, who heartlessly presents his gift of orange slices to another man:

> "The oranges I had set aside, the only ones as yet to be found, produced an excellent effect, though at each slice which she offered, for politeness's sake, to an indiscreet neighbor, I felt my heart to be somehow pierced through." The world is full of indiscreet neighbors with whom I must share the other . . . "You belong to me as well," the world says.[15]

Barthes speculates that Werther concludes his anecdote by bitterly reflecting, "It was scarcely worth my while to set aside these oranges for her, since she gives them to others."[16] Ultimately, Werther confesses of his jealousy: "I am *vexed* with the others, with the other, with myself (from which a 'scene' can be generated)."[17] In the case of Shakespeare's "good queen" (2.3.56) there's negligible admission of these human feelings of vexation, or honestly put, jealousy. And in the case of the king the reaction swiftly becomes horrifying. But if we look closely, the couple's interactions with others are often permeated by the sharp sting of jealousy—instigated by the couple's yearning to possess each other—and the fantasy that one might completely control another person with the force of his or her desire. Of course, the phenomenal jealousy of Hermione and Leontes (one implicit, the other explicit) is somewhat to be expected because, if subtly, the couple are obsessed with each other—and

with talking every day of their lives. Hermione, especially, craves Leontes's praise. Erotically, she murmurs to the king, "Nay, let me have't—I long. . ." (1.2.101).

To be sure, a central theme of *The Winter's Tale* is the mutual passion of king and queen—and its haunting undertones of l'extimité pain. Because they are so deeply connected, the "traumatic kernel" provoking their experience of this stripe of pain is the (ironically normal) presence of others within their world, excepting perhaps Prince Mamillius. Over the course of *The Winter's Tale,* I suggest that audience members are affectively ministered to by witnessing the destruction and miraculous reconstruction of the love between an equally powerful king and queen whose words separate and bring them back together. And by foregrounding the crucial question of the offstage audience's desire—how what it wants is cathartically performed onstage—the play satisfies its members' collective, if perhaps unexpressed longing to hear transformative words and to be healed by them. Since light and darkness are forces that exist in almost all human beings (and generally speaking, those whom Shakespeare found most interesting), Hermione and Leontes courageously reveal their desires, shadows, and pain to the light—and to our empathetic witnessing of their remarkable love story.

Famously, the play platforms "the winter's tale" that the audience never hears fully told. The only person to receive most of the narrative is pregnant Hermione, and the teller is her ill-fated son, Mamillius. Evocatively, Hermione asks the prince to tell her a ghost story. However, because Mamillius may sense the impending threat to his mother's life—tragically, the queen will be imprisoned and exiled for sixteen years—he opts not to tell everything onstage. Because ghosts are dead people, Mamillius's superstition is that speaking of ghosts will lead to the creation of one. He isn't wrong. But, macabrely, the death that his tale presages is his own.

Strikingly, Hermione makes the request for the winter's tale herself. Re-joining Mamillius and the court ladies, she asks him to "Pray you sit by us, / And tell's a tale" (2.1.22). Perceiving the grief that his father's wounding words have recently caused to his mother, Mamillius empathetically observes to Hermione, "A sad tale's best for winter" (2.1.25). Intuitively, the prince tells the "winter's tale" as a performative cure for Leontes's snowballing

verbal abuse, thus demonstrating the fact that, as Russ McDonald observes, "Language . . . has become an instrument for constructing a harmonious, protected realm within a bare and hostile world."[18] Extending solace to Hermione as they are spoken, Mamillius's performative utterances illustrate how, as Austin explains, "To utter the sentence . . . is to do it." or, in other words, "To say something is to do something."[19] In fact, the prince's tale may, wondrously, become the play itself. As Cavell remarks, "I have heard it said . . . that the remainder of the play, after we no longer hear what Mamillius says, or would have said, is the play as it unfolds."[20]

Before Mamillius begins to speak, Hermione offers a few specifics on what she wants to hear. When the prince conjuringly reveals of his narrative selection, "I have one / Of sprites and goblins" (2.1.25-6) the queen agrees: "Let's have that, good sir. / Come on, sit down, come on, and do your best / To fright me with your sprites." (2.1.27-8). Significantly, Hermione doesn't want to hear a story about goblins; she asks the prince to discourse on "sprites" instead. Of course, the queen's preference for a tale about "sprites" is an affectionate reference to the young prince who is (at this moment) full of life. Moreover, she prudently cautions her son not to discourse on foul goblins in front of the court ladies. But if we take Mamillius's reference to these unnerving creatures as tacitly alluding to his father (who has recently been behaving like a "goblin" to his mother), the queen's request for a story about "sprites" (and not goblins) also signals Hermione's growing unease with Leontes's recently distressing behavior. During her trial, the queen will bravely clarify to her husband, "The bug which you would fright me with I seek" (3.2.90). At this moment, as she recalls Mamillius's "winter's tale," Hermione seeks out the "bug" or "goblin" in the king's words, or perhaps within the king himself, who transiently plays the goblin (or "bugbear") whom she protectively sought to keep from her son's mind.

Initially, Leontes's violent jealousy (what Mamillius's telling stimulates) is occluded by the tale's more innocent claim to be domestic entertainment.[21] As Mamillius creepily explains to Hermione (and for a moment to the rest of the audience), "There was a man— / Dwelt by a churchyard—I will tell it softly, / Yon crickets shall not hear it" (2.1.28, 30-1). From what we are told,

sometime in the past a nameless man (who probably symbolizes father Leontes) lived near a churchyard. According to the prince's haunting narrative, this was a ghostlike individual who hadn't yet acknowledged his symbolic death, the fact that he had already begun to die emotionally, if not physically. Because without Hermione's love Leontes feels that he is dying—and he enforces tragic consequences for his emotional pain. Listening, and perhaps unconsciously calling attention to her erotic desire to be filled up by words, Hermione coaxes the prince: "Come on then, / And give't me in mine ear" (2.1.32).

Immediately after Mamillius begins the winter's tale, Hermione's husband enters and explodes into fury. Intense Leontes explains his hurt feelings thus:

> There may be in the cup
> A spider steeped, and one may drink, depart,
> And yet partake no venom, for his knowledge
> Is not infected: but if one present
> Th' abhorred ingredient to his eye, make known
> How he hath drunk, he cracks his gorge, his sides,
> With violent hefts. I have drunk, and seen the spider.
> (2.1.39-45)

The extraordinary metaphor of the spider in the cup is the king's unsubtle explanation to the queen that he's seriously aware of the fact that Hermione has committed adultery with Polixenes of Bohemia. Irately, Leontes points out that, really, the problem is he knows, cannot help but know, is tormented by the knowledge of what the Queen has already done—and therefore his entire psyche is consumed by the hideous cognizance that as he magnificently puts it, "I have drunk, and seen the spider." The king's speech demonstrates how as Linda Charnes observes, "Real life is what is most hypnotically represented."[22] Leontes clarifies that if he hadn't found out about his wife's bald sinning against him and their marriage he wouldn't currently have a problem with her. The issue is his tortured awareness of what she has already, stonily—and probably repeatedly—done. (To the king's mind, the adulterers are flying in the face of his royal prerogative to soundly bed his own wife, as often as he desires). So, Leontes lashes out with a stunning and humiliatingly public diatribe against the wretched queen—a vituperative, highly stylized expression of pain, shame, and rage at

what he imagines (albeit incorrectly) to be marital infidelity. He is unbelievably angry with her.

The dazzling image of the spider lying in wait at the bottom of the cup (and Leontes's gorge rising when he spies the lurking arachnid) foreshadows the king's vengeful plan to weave a plot-proof web where he will—at least in his own mind and with devastating consequences—convict the innocent queen of adultery with, as he indignantly monikers Polixenes, "the harlot king" (2.3.4). Startled by Leontes's entrance (and despite perhaps being tacitly pleased by the spectacle of the king's jealous rage), Hermione pointedly asks her husband, "What is this? Sport?" (2.1.58). But the question proves futile, as at this moment the queen has underestimated the king's exacting and jealously Stockholmsian mindset. Incensed with Hermione, Leontes coldly orders the gathered lords: "Bear the boy hence: he shall not come about her. / Away with him" (2.1.59-60). Tragically, the stage directions indicate that, "Mamillius is taken away." Forever. And in the same scene, Leontes inexorably commands of his wife, "Away with her, to prison" (2.1.103). He jails her so that no one else can have her.

By the first scene of the second act, the audience is confronted with multiple tragedies of separation. Yet, Shakespeare begins *The Winter's Tale* by showing us a couple who are in love with each other—and, I think, never quite fall out of love. Movingly, Hermione and Leontes embody the Biblical sentiment in Genesis 2:24: "That is why a man leaves his father and mother and clings to his wife, and the two of them become one body." In other words, cognizance of their bodily separation—the condition of being Other to one another—leads the king and queen to experience a tenet of Lacanian *l'extimité,* the inexorable fact of the Other's being as "something strange to me, although it is at the heart of me."[23] Perhaps one reason why the couple remains in love is because Hermione matches flashy Leontes verbally—and there was probably a lot of charismatic bantering during the king's torturously long summer courtship of her as well. But when Leontes begs Polixenes to stay with them a while longer, Hermione doesn't immediately intervene. In fact, the king must prompt her: "Tongue-tied, our queen? Speak you" (1.2.27). This may be the highest praise that Leontes feels he can offer to anyone. He wants to hear how his wife's mind works. In her first words in the play, Hermione succinctly argues her case:

> I had thought, sir, to have held my peace until
> You had drawn oaths from him not to stay. You, sir,
> Charge him too coldly. Tell him you are sure
> All in Bohemia's well; this satisfaction
> The bygone day proclaimed. Say this to him,
> He's beat from his best ward. (1.2.28-33)

Since her words are primarily intended to please her husband, the queen may briefly hesitate before speaking. Craving Leontes's approval of her speech, Hermione explains to the king that she has given the matter some thought and is surprised by what he believes to be the necessity of her intervention. However, since it gratifies Leontes to show off her verbal skill, she will continue to speak, if necessary. Hermione sees and loves Leontes as a complete person—and of course she will argue for Polixenes's staying. Recognizing Leontes's performative introduction of (as Sedgwick puts it), "the topic of marriage itself as theater," Hermione skillfully enacts the proverb: *"le mariage, c'est les autres:* like a play, marriage exists in and for the eyes of others."[24] In her speech, Hermione calls Polixenes's earlier promises "oaths," which she observes are serious vows. Comically, she also explains that were he to swear that he longs to see his son Florizel, the hard-hearted couple would relent and she and the court ladies would emasculatingly "thwack him hence with distaffs" (1.2.37). But when all is said and done, Hermione solicits Polixenes on behalf of Leontes: "Yet of your royal presence I'll adventure / The borrow of a week" (1.2.38-9). Using the word "adventure" as a verb, the queen presents the extra days in the kingdom as good fun, intimating to the foreign king: "Let's think of my bantering with you, my having my way with you, as a game which will only elicit more pleasures." And because she is aware of her husband's jealous penchant for always assuming the worst about her interactions with other men, Hermione empathetically reminds the king (in the only time that she uses his name in the play), "Yet, good deed, Leontes, / I love thee not a jar o'th' clock behind / What lady she her lord" (1.2.42-3). Because she longs for Leontes's praise, Hermione manipulatively refrains from using his name frequently so that she can retain the upper hand in conversation. Of course, the queen probably secretly enjoys saying her husband's name, allowing him to hear it—very occasionally—from her treasured lips. Because as Žižek observes, "it is the name .

. . which supports the identity of the object," Hermione transiently controls Leontes by utilizing "the radical contingency of naming, the fact that naming itself retroactively constitutes its reference."[25] By naming Leontes, Hermione confers his identity to him.

In response to Bohemia's repeated avowal that he really can't stay—"I may not, verily" (1.2.45)—Hermione swiftly remarks,

> Verily?
> You put me off with limber vows. But I,
> Though you would seek t'unsphere the stars with oaths,
> Should yet say "Sir, no going." Verily
> You shall not go. A lady's "verily" is
> As potent as a lord's. Will you go yet?
> Force me to keep you as a prisoner,
> Not like a guest: so you shall pay your fees
> When you depart, and save your thanks. How say you?
> My prisoner? Or my guest? By your dread "verily"
> One of them you shall be. (1.2.46-56)

As the queen uses the word, "verily" means "truly" or "sincerely." In the final scene of the play, Leontes (recalling Hermione's speech) asks of Paulina's mysterious stone statue, "Would you not deem it breathed, and that those veins / Did verily bear blood?" (5.3.64). In his later usage, Leontes's "verily" evokes his wife's humanness, her pregnant body and its moving aliveness. Of course, at this moment the queen's language demonstrates that she is both human and humane—a thoughtful human being who uses words (in this case, perlocutionary utterances manifesting change) to great effect. As Leontes's queen observes to Bohemia, "A lady's 'verily' is / As potent as a lord's" (1.2.50-1.) After Polixenes agrees to stay on at least until mid-week, Hermione changes the topic of conversation to ask him about the kings' childhoods together. According to Polixenes, original sin was unknown to the boy princes whom he nostalgically depicts, "as twinned lambs that did frisk i'th' sun / . . . what we changed / Was innocence for innocence" (1.2.67-9). But this male-only Eden didn't last. As Hermione (indicating her person and pregnancy) wryly points out, "By this we gather / You have tripped since" (1.2.75-6). The queen uses the pronoun "this" to refer to several things: her pregnant body, the fact of her marriage to Leontes, and their conversation. She jokes to Polixenes that since she's carrying the king's second child, he and Leontes

have obviously "tripped," or "fallen" since those halcyon days of childhood innocence. Of course, man's universal "fall" into sexual pleasure—and the deep, contingent joys of the marriage bed—are represented by Hermione's dramatic onstage pregnancy and the upcoming birth of Princess Perdita. Observing that his wife is herself quite a trip, Leontes bemusedly asks Hermione, "Is he won yet?" (1.2.86). And she confidently assures the king, "He'll stay, my lord" (1.2.87). Inarguably, Hermione has satisfied the Austinian dictate that by *saying* something (arguing her case), she has simultaneously *done* something (achieved Polixenes's staying). And of course, as a result of her stylish rhetorical performance she has been instantiated as what Bradin Cormack dubs "the third sovereign in the room" whose language highlights "the sovereign source, in *her,* of a measurable effect in the world."[26] Seriously impressed by his wife's speech, Leontes confesses, "At my request he would not. / Hermione, my dearest, thou never spok'st / To better purpose" (1.2.87). He is very proud of her.

But the queen's intervention is undertaken at her husband's behest and in pursuit of his approval. Subtly, Hermione's preference for Leontes to speak first indicates her desire for him to approve of her speech. Unsubtly, the queen ends up begging the king for praise. Hearing Leontes's satisfied observation that she has never turned her words towards a better purpose, Hermione immediately asks, "Never?" (1.2.88). And in response to the king's minimalist reply ("Never, but once.") (1.2.89), the queen prompts him to go on, explain what you mean: "What? Have I twice said well? When was't before?" (1.2.90). For as she observes,

> One good deed, dying tongueless,
> Slaughters a thousand waiting upon that.
> Our praises are our wages. You may ride's
> With one soft kiss a thousand furlongs ere
> With spur we heat an acre. But to th' goal:
> My last good deed was to entreat his stay.
> What was my first? It has an elder sister,
> Or I mistake you. O, would her name were Grace!
> But once before I spoke to th'purpose? When?
> Nay, let me have't—I long. (1.2.92-101)

Facetiously, Hermione quips to the company present that if her husband doesn't praise her for doing a good deed, she will instantly

cease to do thousands more. Characterizing herself as a healthy mare glowing with vitality, galloping through the kingdom's fields, and motivated onwards by a "soft kiss" of the spur, the queen metaphorically connects the image of the thin, biting metal spurs of the horse's rider to Leontes's incisive encomiums (which inspire all of her good deeds). Hermione admits that she feels paid, even overpaid by Leontes's praise. The comic haste with which the queen swears that she will act after hearing the king's commendations emphasizes the Austinian dictate that performative words do something as they are being uttered. To be sure, a brief pause between words uttered and actions taken may exist, but—as Hermione assures Leontes—not much of one. The queen speaks honestly of her responsiveness to her husband's words. Poignantly, Hermione wants to hear from Leontes that she has done well. His words fill her with utmost pleasure.

Wanting his sweet wife to be gratified by his speech, Leontes recalls the first time that the queen spoke to the purpose, "Why, that was when / Three crabbed months had soured themselves to death / Ere I could make thee open thy white hand / And clap thyself my love. Then didst thou utter, 'I am yours for ever'" (1.2.102-4). Smoothly reminding Hermione of her somber vow to him, the king calls attention to the fact that he was actually listening when she mocked Polixenes for making his grave oaths—and that she has obviously made some of her own. In this brief reminiscence, Leontes speaks—really, performs speech—with remarkable style. Recollecting the lovely memory of his tenacious pursuit of the queen (for months, crab-like, he approached her indirectly), Leontes empathetically suggests that he understands his wife as likely suffering from the slight pangs of "l'extimité pain." After all, since she is close to giving birth—and will soon be experiencing a whole other level of pain—Hermione may privately long to be alone with Leontes, even if she doesn't say so directly. Tragically, Hermione's dangerously *excessive* longing to hear Leontes's praise becomes a condemning force against her when he begins to suspect her of committing adultery. Of course, the king's rhetorical technique for injuring the queen is especially upsetting because Hermione feels surfeit with joy upon hearing Leontes's praise. Openly expressing her pleasure, she acknowledges his words and her own good deed by drolly exclaiming, "Why, lo you now, I have spoke to th' purpose twice" (1.2.106).

Believing that things have resolved themselves as they should, Hermione freely "gives her hand to Polixenes," and they walk to another part of the stage. Instantly, Leontes furiously exclaims, "Too hot, too hot! / To mingle friendship far is mingling bloods" (1.2.108-9). Tormented by Othello-esque jealousy, Leontes launches into a series of obsessive diatribes against Hermione's infidelity where his tortured speech communicates its own incommunicability. Stephen Orgel argues that Leontes's "linguistic opacity," which I suggest is frequently triggered by l'extimité pain, underscores the fact that the Early Modern period "often found in incomprehensibility a positive virtue," and thus the audience is challenged to "interpret this obscurity."[27] Understanding the king's complexly byzantine syntax as a stylized expression of l'extimité pain, audience members find themselves empathizing with Leontes, whose blustery language showcases his jealous rage and moving expression of "Shakespearean pathos, a sense that one may feel mere sadness enough to fill an empty world."[28] After watching Hermione and Polixenes exiting [for what the former perhaps inadvertently refers to as a (per)version of Eden: "If you would seek us, / We are yours i'th' garden" (1.2.176-7)], Leontes spits out, "Inch-thick, knee-deep, o'er head and ears a forked one!" (1.2.185)—and ominously advises Mamillius, "Go play, boy, play. Thy mother plays, and I / Play too" (1.2.186-7). I would argue that the extremely high level of verbal abuse in *The Winter's Tale* is intended to briefly affectively traumatize members of the offstage audience that we are supposed to feel the violent shock of Leontes's unkind language as it resonates within our bodies and minds. For example, after Mamillius is forcibly taken from the queen's arms, Leontes will furiously hiss to the gathered lords (and Hermione): "Look on her, mark her well. / . . . 'Tis pity she's not honest, honourable. / She's an adulteress! / . . . I have said / She's an adulteress, I have said with whom. / More, she's a traitor . . . / she's / A bed-swerver, even as bad as those / That vulgars give bold'st titles" (2.1.65, 68, 78, 87-9, 92-4). Derek Traversi argues that as Leontes becomes convinced of Hermione's infidelity, his language displays an "insistence upon the harsh directness of common speech."[29] An example of forceful illocutionary speech—and devastating wounding words—Leontes's verbal abuse of Hermione, which is filled with

"a series of disruptions, disturbances and distortions . . . in the smooth progress of the play['s] language," displays what Gordon McMullan observes as the "tension and violence of expression" in Shakespeare's "late style."[30]

In the final scene of Act 2, Leontes commands the lords of Sicilia to organize "a just and open trial" (2.3.203) for the queen. But as it turns out nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, Leontes seizes on the public courtroom as a transformative space where all speech act conditions will be met and his words alone will have maximum impact—what Cavell resonantly dubs a "theater of jealousy."[31] Arguably, during the trial Hermione is put in the position of a hostage who must defy her hostage-taker (and empathetically attempt to see things from Leontes's perspective) in order to save her life. However, she evades the trauma of "self-loss" by making several honest arguments of her own (including directly stating her innocence), all of which persuade audiences onstage and off. For obviously all of the accusations made against the good queen are inaccurate and unfair. At the center of this scene, Cleomenes and Dion enter with a letter from the Delphic Oracle. The life-saving report is as follows:

> *Hermione is chaste, Polixenes blameless, Camillo a true subject, Leontes a jealous tyrant, his innocent babe truly begotten, and the king shall live without an heir if that which is lost be not found.* (3.2.130-131)

Leontes incredulously asks, "Hast thou read truth?" (3.2.134) and when it's confirmed that the report is accurate, the king simply states: "There is no truth at all i'th' oracle. / The sessions shall proceed—this is mere falsehood" (3.2.137-8). Of course, Leontes's blasé denial of the truth is shockingly tragic. Flatly denying the validity of the missive, Leontes "abuses" its message by employing an Austinian "Rho" (r) or "hollow" rhetorical case where "we speak of our infelicitous act as 'professed' or 'hollow'. . . and as not implemented . . . rather than as void or without effect."[32]

To be clear, the oracle's words are hardly lacking in effect. On the contrary, their veracity will be demonstrated throughout the rest of the play. However, by dismissing those truthful words with a speech act of his own, the king ensures that the oracular report cannot prove the queen's innocence. Leontes communicates to

Hermione that now he is the only god to whom she must attend. Verily, Shakespeare never wrote a more heartbreaking queen.

After Leontes's shocking abuse of the oracular truth, a messenger reports that the boy-king Mamillius has died from grief at being taken from his mother (who faints and is carried offstage until Act 5). The sorrowful king vows repentance: "So long as nature / Will bear up with this exercise" (3.2.237-8). And after witnessing Leontes's atonement for the wrongs that he has committed against his loved ones, the audience is encouraged to forgive his unbelievable verbal abuse of his wife.

The king's resolution to "bear up" presages a legendary stage direction in the Shakespearean corpus. After Antigonus lays the infant Perdita down on the (fictional) Bohemian seacoast, and flees the hunting tumult, he cries, "I am gone forever!" (3.3.57). Famously, the direction indicates Antigonus's, "Exit, pursued by a bear" (3.3.57). There are remarkable rumors that the rough beast in *The Winter's Tale* was real.[33] However, despite critical speculation, it's highly unlikely that a real bear appeared onstage. The nobleman's pursuer was probably a man in a bear suit, roaring loudly.[34] In addition to conjuring up the experience of performative wonder, the indomitable bear's unexpected arrival stimulates audience members to feel as stunned as Hermione was when lambasted by Leontes, whose verbal violence towards her renders him a metaphoric substitute for one of Mamillius's spectral "bugbears."[35] Yet, the bear's entrance also heralds Leontes's human/e transition from violence to solitude, to nurture and nurturing. For ultimately the king emerges as a restorative agent, especially at the end of the play when—at long last—he embraces his long-lost (and supposed dead) wife.

The statue scene showcases a performative miracle. Stone is made flesh onstage. The fifth act opens with Leontes's appreciation of Paulina's presence in his life and agreement with her request that he allow her to choose a new queen for him. It has been sixteen long years since Leontes cursed her out of the royal chamber and prepared himself for Hermione's horrific trial. In response to Leontes's commendations, Paulina says that she has only ever attempted to do good and humbly observes of his and Polixenes's visit to her abode: "It is a surplus of your grace which never / My life may last to answer" (5.3.7-8). Paulina's use of the word "grace"

echoes Hermione's persistent questioning of Leontes regarding her first good deed: "What was my first? It has an elder sister, / Or I mistake you. O, would her name were Grace!" (1.2.98-9). As the fifth act movingly reveals, Hermione's metaphoric sister turns out to be Paulina, whose empathetic visitations to both members of the royal couple reflect spiritual and everyday grace. Arriving at her house, Leontes asks to see the statue of his queen, and revealing the sublime object, Paulina announces, "Behold, and say 'tis well" (5.3.20). At this point, the audience hears another echo of Hermione's words—and her longing for Leontes's praise: "What? Have I twice said well?" (1.2.90). In her request, Paulina subtly asks the king to publically praise Hermione (who isn't actually a statue and is attentively listening to the conversation). The duly-acknowledged queen has a moment to prepare herself before Paulina, "Draws a curtain and reveals the figure of Hermione standing like a statue."

Of course, the statue is remarkably life-like because, although unbeknownst to audiences onstage and off, it's living Hermione. Paulina's conjuring ruse is also Shakespeare's. Among the most striking examples of knowledge being occluded from the audience in the corpus, the remarkable secret of Hermione's sixteen year preservation as a living queen becomes, as Anne Barton observes, "a resurrection which is as much a miracle for the theatre audience as for the characters involved."[36] The queen's stunning choice to playact a statue *in front of Leontes* recalls her imprisonment and lengthy exile—and emphasizes her freedom and vindication. Furthermore, the scene presents a healing reversal of performative Stockholm Syndrome (where the hostage's voice is silenced by the hostage taker's own)—because now Leontes badly wants to hear from (silent) Hermione. Called upon to valorize the onstage miracle of stone transformed into flesh, the offstage audience's belief in what it witnesses is stimulated.[37] In a 2010 Royal Shakespeare Company production of the play, the scene was staged with the purpose of gravely frightening Leontes. The queen held herself motionless until she chose to move—and to badly scare her spouse. I believe that Shakespeare would appreciate this interpretation, which emphasizes the king's gentle come-uppance. Returning to the world and to her place as his wife, Hermione empathetically reverses her earlier questioning of Leontes when he demanded that

Mamillius be taken from her arms. At this moment, the queen not only forgives the king, but gamely prompts Leontes to wonder: "What is this? Sport?" When Hermione steps from her pedestal, Leontes joyfully exclaims, "O, she's warm! / If this be magic, let it be an art / Lawful as eating" (5.3.110) and, finally, embraces his wife.

Crucially, in this last scene Hermione also establishes herself as Perdita's mother. Assuring the princess, "[I] have preserved / Myself to see the issue" (5.3.127-8), she psychically reverses Leontes's earlier dismissal of his daughter: "No, I'll not rear / Another's issue" (2.3.190). Because Hermione has returned, she clarifies her investment in raising Perdita—the fact that it's hardly an issue for her. Literally, Hermione's *last word* in the play is "issue." Intuiting that Leontes used the word pejoratively to refer to infant Perdita, the queen negates the king's prior usage by emphasizing that she has waited for years to be in her daughter's life. There are no issues now. Speedily appropriating Hermione's questioning of Perdita as a modus operandi for engaging with others, the king tells everyone that each person in the drama which he has co-opted can "demand and answer to his part" (5.3.153) and asks Paulina to lead them away for further conversation. And Leontes commands that all this be done with haste, *as he can't wait to be with her again*—and this time, hopefully forever. Hermione and Leontes's empathy for each other makes their reunion possible. And they demonstrate the truth of what we might call the *human/e oracle:* knowing what is true in our hearts and communicating this reality accordingly. Indubitably, Hermione and Leontes's great love abides at the core of *The Winter's Tale.*

Notes

For the same person for sixteen years and his mother, Rob and Deborah.

1. All Shakespeare quotations are from William Shakespeare, *The Winter's Tale,* ed. John Pitcher (London and New York: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2010).

2. Lynn Enterline, "'You speak a language that I understand not': The Rhetoric of Animation in *The Winter's Tale,*" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 48.1 (Spring 1997): 41.

3. Stanley Cavell, *Disowning Knowledge in Seven Plays of Shakespeare* (1987; repr., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 205.

4. Ellen MacKay, "Against Plausibility," in *Theater Historiography: Critical Interventions,* eds. Henry Bial and Scott Magelssen (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2010), 26.

5. J.L. Austin, *How to Do Things With Words,* eds. J.O. Urmson and Marina Sbisà, 2nd ed. (1962; repr., Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975), 12.

6. Austin, *How to Do Things With Words,* 6-7.

7. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2003), 5.

8. Sedgwick, *Touching Feeling*, 8.

9. Sedgwick, *Touching Feeling*, 109.

10. Fritz Breithaupt, *Cultures of Empathy,* working paper, The Poynter Center for the Study of Ethics and American Institutions, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN. (2009), 34.

11. Breithaupt, *Cultures of Empathy,* 35.

12. Breithaupt, *Cultures of Empathy,* 38.

13. Slavoj Žižek, *The Sublime Object of Ideology* (1989; repr., London and New York: Verso, 2008), 147.

14. Roland Barthes, *A Lover's Discourse: Fragments,* trans. Richard Howard (New York: Hill and Wang, 1977), 144.

15. Barthes, *A Lover's Discourse: Fragments,* 110.

16. Barthes, *A Lover's Discourse: Fragments,* 110-11.

17. Barthes, *A Lover's Discourse: Fragments,* 111.

18. Russ McDonald, *Shakespeare and the Arts of Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 191.

19. Austin, *How to Do Things With Words,* 6, 12.

20. Cavell, *Disowning Knowledge,* 198.

21. As Marjorie Garber observes of its genre, "The 'winter's tale' of this play's title is both literal and proverbial. The phrase meant something like 'fairy tale,' or a diverting entertainment, largely for the amusement of women, children, and the old." Marjorie Garber, *Shakespeare After All* (2004; repr., New York: Anchor Books, 2005), 830.

22. Linda Charnes, "Extraordinary Renditions: Towards an Agency of Place," in *Shakespeare After 9/11: How a Social Trauma Reshapes Interpretation,* eds. Douglas A. Brooks, Matthew Biberman, Julia Reinhard Lupton (Lewiston, NY.: Edwin Mellen Press, 2011), 75.

23. Dylan Evans, *An Introductory Dictionary of Lacanian Psychoanalysis* (1996; repr. London and New York: Routledge, 2006), 83.

24. Sedgwick, *Touching Feeling,* 72.

25. Žižek, *The Sublime Object of Ideology,* 104-105.

26. Bradin Cormack, "Shakespeare's Other Sovereignty: On Particularity and Violence in *The Winter's Tale* and the Sonnets," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 62.4 (Winter 2011): 493, 509.

27. Stephen Orgel, "The Poetics of Incomprehensibility" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 42.4 (Winter 1991): 434, 436.

28. Cavell, *Disowning Knowledge,* 203.

29. Derek Traversi, *Shakespeare: The Last Phase* (1955; repr., Stanford: Stanford UP: 1965), 116.

30. Gordon McMullan, *Shakespeare and the Idea of Late Writing: Authorship in the Proximity of Death* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 111, 115.

31. Cavell, *Disowning Knowledge,* 196.

32. Austin, *How to Do Things With Words,* 16.

33. For example, Elizabeth Davis argues, "It's not impossible that a real bear was used at the premiere. The Globe Theatre was, after all, not far from the city's bear-baiting pits." Elizabeth Davis, "'Exit, pursued by a bear': How do you approach Shakespeare's famous stage direction?" *Royal Opera House News* (April 2014), https://www.roh.org/news/exit-pursued-by-a-bear-how-do-you-approach-shakespeares-famous-stage-direction.

34. As John Pitcher observes, "The role of pursuing Antigonus offstage would have been played in early performances by an actor in a bear costume, possibly a white one." John Pitcher, Introduction to *The Winter's Tale* by William Shakespeare, ed. John Pitcher (London and New York: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2010), 143.

35. Consequently, Michael Bristol is surely correct to argue that, "It is appropriate to consider this bear as a Candlemas bear since Candlemas is the *time* of boundaries and transformations." Michael Bristol, "In Search of the Bear: Spatiotemporal Form and the Heterogeneity of Economies in *The Winter's Tale,*" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 42.2 (Summer 1991): 161.

36. Anne Barton, *Leontes and the Spider: Language and Speaker in Shakespeare's Last Plays,* ed. and intro. Kiernan Ryan, (1999; repr., London and New York: Routledge, 2013), 40.

37. As Janet Adelman observes, "Shakespeare's is a participatory theater, in which the awakening of our faith is required." Janet Adelman, *Suffocating Mothers: Fantasies of Maternal Origin in Shakespeare's Plays, Hamlet to The Tempest* (New York and London: Routledge, 1992), 235.

Actors' Roundtable
Acting during COVID-19: What Shakespeare Actors Did During the Pandemic to Survive

Michael Don Bahr
USF Education Director

Featuring: Quinn Mattfeld, Betsy Mugavero, and René Thornton, Jr.

Bahr: Welcome. What a fabulous morning and fabulous yesterday we've had thus far. I really enjoyed our last panel and many of the comments made by the last panel. The last paper, Kasen's paper, I think will tie in well with what we are talking about here. The Wooden O Symposium has always had a panel where we celebrate and archive the productions that the festival is doing here. Many times, when we are doing an obscure piece such as *Troilus and Cressida*—although it's not so obscure for you René. I think you've done four of those, right? Anytime we are featuring obscure plays, I like that to essentially be the show we talk about. We got a chance last year to talk about *Hamlet*. We had a *Hamlet* panel, and that was pretty historic and important. We also in the last panel talked about Russia and Russian influences. I would have enjoyed seeing that set during the time of Nicholas II. We also felt that *The Book of Will* was a very important show last year and so we did that as well.

Journal of the Wooden O. Vol 20, 100-128
© Southern Utah University Press
ISSN: 1539-5758

Those of you that have been at the festival before may recognize these actors, but there are many of you who are not within the region that the Utah Shakespeare Festival resides in and you may not know where these actors come from. The first thing we are going to do are introductions, and then we're going to focus on three things.

Hang onto your hats; we are going to be here for an hour and a half, but it will be very exciting. We are going to spend probably the first twenty minutes talking a little bit about what the pandemic has done to them and the type of work that they've done during the pandemic and the type of work that they've put together, and also what it has done to them, but I'd also like to talk to them about adaptation. We are very fortunate to have three equity actors who have a lot of experience with Shakespeare and his work. We just did a virtual seminar a couple weeks ago with René, who has performed in every single play in the Shakespeare canon. And I know that both Betsy and Quinn have also performed a lot of Shakespeare's plays.

They know him well, so the second twenty minutes we're going to focus a little bit on what it's like to adapt Shakespeare in the many ways that you can adapt Shakespeare as well. Then we will open it up to questions from our participants here as well, but for now so that the audience can get to know you, I would love for you to introduce yourself. Tell us a about your career, where you worked etc., and then we'll launch in with a pandemic question. Let's start with Quinn, then René, and then Betsy. Go ahead Quinn.

Mattfield: Hi, I'm Quinn Mattfeld. I would have been out at the Utah Shakespeare Festival for, I believe it would have been my tenth season had we done it this summer. I grew up in the Northwest. I went to school at the University of Oregon, then I went to Penn State. After that, I moved to New York, bounced around, did some theater in New York, and then did my first season at the Utah Shakespeare Festival in 2009, where I met my wife, and from there I went to LA. I became a resident company member of the Pacific Conservatory for the Performing Arts in Santa Maria. After that, I went on a national tour with *Matilda the Musical* playing the evil, TV-obsessed father, Mr. Wormwood. After that I went back to New York and did another and have been

at the festival off and on since then. When I went back to New York most recently, I had been both a director and a playwright and I went out to the Southwest Shakespeare company to be one of the co-artistic directors there. I got to direct a number of shows and decide on seasons and actually had a play produced out there and was going to have another one. Michael do you want to talk about what has happened as a response to the pandemic?

Bahr: Let's just do introductions so we know where we are all speaking from and then I'm going to talk about what happened and you can talk about Southwest Shakes.

Mattfield: Great! So now I've moved to Pennsylvania so you can imagine where the story about the job goes, but I was an artistic director for about three years in Arizona, the southwest Shakespeare company, and I'll hand it off to René.

Thornton: Hi everyone, my name is René Thornton, Jr. I am originally from New York City. I, too, would have been back at the Utah Shakespeare Festival for my fifth season, I believe. I was there last summer and it had been about seventeen years before that since my previous three seasons. I am currently a company member with the resident ensemble players at the University of Delaware. We are actually on summer break, but in three weeks we will be back to work. The bulk of my career I spent at the American Shakespeare Center. I was there for almost fourteen years and that is where I have done a lot of Shakespeare.

Mugavero: Hi, I'm Betsy Mugavero. I am originally from Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. I went to Temple University for undergrad and then went to the University of California Irvine for my MFA. This summer would have been my eleventh season in Cedar City. I started in 2008, and have had a really fun time on the stage there. I am super sad not to be there right now with all of you. I have worked at Idaho Shakespeare, the Folger Theater in DC, and the Great Lakes Theater in Cleveland. Most recently I was the co-artistic director at Southwest Shakespeare Company in Mesa, Arizona with Quinn Mattfeld, and now I am in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, returning to my roots.

Bahr: Fantastic. It is an honor to have you here. Let's jump straight in to talking about the pandemic. I want to make sure that for history and for the archives that we can talk about not only the good that comes out of a pandemic, but also what the pandemic

did to us. So, I'm going to start with—where were you? What did the pandemic do to the contracts that you had and to the projects that you were starting on? Let's start with Betsy, then René, and then Quinn.

Mugavero: Well, I was in rehearsal for *Hudson The Musical,* which was a musical written by Quinn Mattfeld and Danny Tieger about Henry Hudson, the explorer. We actually had the stage reading performed at Utah Shakes for *Words Cubed* last year, if anyone was able to see it. It was really great and such a fun learning experience for us and we were ready to launch it in April in Mesa. We were a week into rehearsals with a fabulous cast and a great group of collaborators and they cancelled the MBA and we thought, "ugh, um, I don't think we're going to be able to do our play." I think it came as a shock to everyone that we weren't going to continue, but we also had members of our team say privately "Thank you. I feel like I'm putting myself at risk everyday by leaving my home and coming here. I have family members who are immunocompromised." That really made our decision to cancel the production feel very validated—we were protecting our community.

From there, the company had to move completely to an online platform, which I'm sure we will get into, and without revenue streams coming in, without donations coming in, it is really hard to sustain the staff. And, as I'm sure many of you have seen, all over the country theaters are making huge, huge cuts to their staff, and unfortunately at Southwest Shakes, Quinn and I were both furloughed indefinitely. Because we don't have a crystal ball to see what will happen next, we decided to pick up and move to be closer to family, which was extremely important for me because this is obviously an extremely emotional time losing not only that important part of my life but then the news of Utah's Shakespeare Festival not being able to proceed. We just decided, okay, let's just be near family and take a break.

Thornton: So, the company I worked with, the REP, had just done the opening weekend and two student matinees of a production of *The Crucible,* in which I was playing John Proctor. After our last student matinee, we learned that there had been a COVID case on campus the day before, so campus got shut down. That was the last time I stepped inside a theater. That was in early

March. Part of my job at the REP also includes teaching class at the University of Delaware, so fortunately we still had class to get us through the rest of the semester. Our company was financially in a position to honor everyone's contracts through the end of the season, which would have been May. Now is the summer when we would have been off anyway.

Bahr: Quinn, anything to add about what happened with Southwest and your other roles?

Mattfield: My story is pretty much similar to Betsy's story. This was going to be the premier of a show that I had been working on since I had been on tour with a friend of mine, Danny Tieger. We had a reading of it at Words Cubed, the program at the Utah Shakespeare Festival, and Betsy was directing it. It was going to open there and then go up to the Lyric Repertory Company in Logan, so it was going to be this really cool spring/summer, doing two different versions of the show. We were in the middle of rehearsal and somebody looked at their phone and said, "the MBA just canceled their season." I remember that very distinctly and I remember thinking "this is all over, isn't it?" And because we are actors and directors, and that work can't be done right now, we are sort of doing odd jobs. I am actually trying to see if I can tailor my skill set to something else, so right now I'm looking for copyrighting work and writing work, going from the very available career of the theater to the very available career of a writer.

Bahr: Let's talk about that, because you all kind of pivoted very quickly. There were a couple of Zoom online performances spoken about a little bit, and I know all of you have been involved in Zoom performances and also part of ensembles. René, I know you've been involved in that type of stuff, too. And Betsy has been in trainings and workshops, too. Talk about the pivot. What type of work were you able to do and put together, and how did those processes work?

Mugavero: I was going to say that we had quite a few productions at Southwest Shakes go online live, recorded readings of Shakespeare plays that were really successful, and I think it was just really fun for people to listen from home and see their favorite actors. That is still going on with Southwest and other companies and I encourage you all to tune in when you can because it is a way to see some theater.

Because of all of the experience that we are getting on Zoom and communicating in this way, watching the school systems making decisions about what their platforms will be for the upcoming school year, Quinn and I decided to help by making our own little unit of a theater company in Pennsylvania. It could be national if somebody was inclined to ask us. We put together a little package for educators that we are familiar with in the area and said, "Look, we can teach Shakespeare; we can make Marie Curie's Nobel Prize speech come alive for you. We can do anything with a sliding scale. We just really want to help and give the students access to other voices and other perspectives, so we are willing to help with Shakespeare, English, math, science, whatever you need in order to assist educators and students alike, especially since we can just Zoom in."

Mattfield: Because the conventions of the theater shifted over to a virtual world and because we moved over to Zoom, Betsy and I then collaborated on making a couple of videos. People had asked us for instructional videos for public speaking, one was fitness instructors, one was literally how to do Zoom, tips for Zoom. We had made a couple of those.

I created my own little desk late night piece, which is called *This Dumb Week.* You can find it on YouTube and I do it every week. It is just me talking about whatever I'm reading in the newspaper.

We are also devising a two-person *Christmas Carol* right now, so the creative juices haven't stopped flowing. It's just like when you run water through the maze and you close one door; the water is going to run somewhere else. It is just a matter of that.

What is really interesting is that it reminds you of what it is that is unique and so valuable about the theater—about everybody being in the same room together. There are ways for us to approximate it and to be on Zoom and to connect with one another, but that is still an individual experience, similar to television and film, where you watch and have your own intimate experience. Whereas, in the theater we all have that collective experience together—we are all moving with the story together, and I think that is something that we very much miss and we probably will go back, but until that time, we just have to find ways to create and to see if we can adapt to the circumstances.

Bahr: René, tell me about what I'm going to call your pivot point. What happened in your pivot and what happened in the communities that you were working with?

Thornton: Well, the silver lining, such as it is, was that I was then available for projects that I would not have otherwise been available for, and so I've been super fortunate. I've done seven virtual readings so far and I have an eighth one next week. I've done three panels and recorded a children's book. So I've been able to work with one company that is based out of London, another one has folks from Athens, and another was with Southwest Shakes. So, access to participation in creating things with people that I would otherwise not have been able to spend time with has been great, but to be clear, though that sounds like a lot to do, there has also been plenty of me curled up in the corner crying and missing my life, missing the world, and missing my job. I have been fortunate that there has been some work to do, but it is still, as Quinn would say, not the same.

Bahr: Before we leave the pandemic world, I want you to think about this question. Is there anything that this medium taught you about the medium and the work that you wouldn't have learned otherwise in front of an audience?

Mattfield: I think there is something actually. When you're doing Zoom readings, you are in an audience, you are hearing. It is an auditory medium, especially Shakespeare. You used to go and hear a play, that's the way they would say it, let's go hear a play, and that is the way they used to write about it and talk about it. Going to take in a play was actually an auditory experience. There is something about this when you are doing Shakespeare and it is just you and the words.

Certainly, I don't think this medium does it better because it still has to be translated into, I don't know, I don't understand computers, I assume it is binary code, and then back out to actual sound. It's not the vibration of sound going from my mouth to your ear, but there is still something about going in your own kind of world, speaking and listening to this writer and this particular format, this artist. Again, I don't know that it's better, but there is something very interesting about that individual experience of being able to just sit and listen to a play that has been valuable in a way, to reduce it in a weird way to what is essential. It is essential

that I heard these words. That is a unique experience and it is something that both theater and this virtual experience have.

Bahr: Other comments, René or Betsy.

Thornton: I can't think of anything off the top of my head that I have learned necessarily about the text during this time. I have been experimenting with how we can use this medium innovatively. The first Zoom reading that I did was very still and quiet and direct—more like TV/film. And so, what I'm interested in is how do we make this space more theatrical? What are the ways in which we play with the camera, in and out of the frame? Is there some element of that which can still maintain something that is more than what TV and film can do because otherwise, what is this medium? What are we offering? Are we doing anything that Netflix doesn't already offer?

Mattfield: That is a really great point, asking 'what is the theatricality of this medium' rather than 'this medium is like film or TV' or whatever. Betsy and I did a reading of this play called *Coleridge Interrupted.* There were all types of backdrops and people came in at weird angles. There were things that were sort of preplanned that we had to react to in the moment. The conventions were very unique to this medium, which I thought was kind of interesting.

Mugavero: I was going to say that it's still live, which is really interesting because of instead of it being live and you feeling the audience's energy coming back to you, you have to be a step braver, or brave in a different way, because you just have to trust that the joke will land or the emotion will fly through that tiny camera hole. You don't know. When we are on stage, as we've said before, in these kinds of panels and in actor talk backs, our brains are all over the place. We see the guy get up to go to the bathroom as we are saying a huge emotional soliloquy. Everything is observed by us when we are on stage. Everything our audience is doing is observed.

In this case, we cannot make any observations, but we have to trust that what we are delivering is meeting someone on the other side. I think what it has made me do is to use an acting technique I use when something distracting is happening in the audience when I'm live on stage. Instead of looking at the audience, I focus on my partner and I have to visualize my partner somehow in that

little camera hole. I can't make eye contact with Romeo. If I look here where Quinn is, I'm not looking at him, or it doesn't look like I'm looking at him, so I'm making my eye contact with the camera and I'm piercing through ZIP codes, time zones to wherever he is and I'm hoping that the energy is coming across. It requires a lot of effort and bravery to just go for it.

Mattfield: I was just thinking it is sort of like being a pitcher and you throw the ball, but then there is this huge sheet in front of where the batter and the catcher are and so you just have to go, "I think that was a pretty good throw." And you have no idea if they called a ball or a strike. But I know I threw it with good intention. It really is just a bizarre experience.

Bahr: René, did you have anything to add to that? I wasn't going to ask this question, but you can thank Betsy for this. I wasn't going to make it about acting lessons on Zoom—how to apply Meisner—but it does go back to your fundamentals, right? Your scene partners, which we know in Shakespeare is everyone, right? We know we're completely communicating with that audience. When you can't get them back, then you just bear down and try to get back to them, right?

Mattfield: When you are on stage, the stage is a very horizontal kind of experience. You are watching two halves of a conflict and there is usually internal conflict in that. Whereas, on film it is kind of a vertical thing, you know what I mean? Like you are the only one. So, in a way you kind of have to reflect both sides of the conflict and you'll see actors that are very, very good at it. You don't have to worry about how it looks or how you are necessarily representing that on stage because you have someone else who is doing that other part of the storytelling.

Bahr: Acting is storytelling.

Mattfield: Yeah, yeah, when it is just you, you do have to think a little bit about being not just the actor in the moment, but a little bit of the chorus reflecting the storyline that is happening as well, to get Greek about it.

Bahr: I am going to shift gears a little. We've got a great audience out there, and I see their names, which is fabulous. If there is anyone out there who has a question, feel free to jump in. You can either raise your hand or wave at me, or you can even put it in the chat because I will see it there. I trust the minds that are out there. There might be some great stuff you want to ask.

I am going to shift to the next question as we talk about adaptation because if this was another year, you three would be the greatest, most fantastic resources for Shakespeare adaptation. What do we do when we take Shakespeare and we make those productions here and how important is what Quinn brings to a role or René brings to a role or how Betsy shapes her performance? How important is the lens of the director?

It is so easy to think about and ask those questions when we've got an actual play that we are discussing. I just want you to think about every play that you've ever done as I ask this next question. It's the first day of rehearsal; you're coming into this space and you're ready to hear about the director's vision, or what the director wants to do. You've previously read the play and you're coming to the table here. What is the most valuable thing that you feel you bring to the table as an actor preparing to do that play?

Mugavero: I was just going to say that beyond the word Zoom, adaptation and adapting may be the word of this year. I feel like everyone on earth is "adapting" right now to a new situation, which is funny because that is what this panel is about. When I come into a first read and I learn the concept, I just want to say yes. I want to say to the director, yes, I'm here and I want to do that.

I may have had ideas for the character and what I think the story should be, but I love collaborating with a director and going "ooh, that changes the way that I think of my character and the way that I think of the relationships with the other characters in the play." So I like to adapt to someone else's idea because it opens things up for me.

Bahr: Adaptation, well done, that's great.

Thornton: I haven't thought this through, so I'm not entirely sure how it is going to sound, but, I think the most valuable thing that each of us brings to the table is ourselves. I think that for x, y, or z reasons I was given this role as opposed to the other people who could have been given this role, so you now have me, my physicality, my voice and experience, occupying this space. My job is to bring those things to the table for you to mold and shape and use as you see fit, and I find that is as true now as in the before times.

Bahr: Quinn?

Mattfield: I agree. If you watch Renée's *Hamlet* and Betsy's *Hamlet* and Quinn's *Hamlet* they are going to be different *Hamlet*s. They are just going to be by virtue of the fact that it's different humans that are the prism through which the character is being projected. I think one of the things that I'm always trying to do when I come to a role or come to a show is to ask how do I take what is being given to me and try to make it even better. That's what you are trying to do as an artist, too. The director is trying to look at the actor and discover what they're doing and make the best version of that thing that they're doing. I want to facilitate that.

For me, my goal is to be able to say, this is the director's vision. This is the way they tell the story. This is what is interesting to them about this particular iteration of it or the story they want to tell. And then I can I think, "Okay great, how can I facilitate that through character, through whatever my particular smaller part of the larger story is?" Whether you are playing Hamlet or you're playing spear carrier #2, you can facilitate that story. You may not be able to see this change through, but you can say, the cool thing about when I'm spear carrier #2 is I just get to reflect something. If I can kind of reflect something that is still me participating in the story and trying to augment it, make it better, to make it fuller. I think that is the thing that I find really valuable in actors as a director and also what I try to do as an actor.

Thornton: When we talk about adaptation of these plays, either now or in the before times, it is important to talk about the impact that costume designers have. Now in these Zoom play days, I have yet to work with a costume designer on a Zoom play. As Quinn was talking, I was thinking about the *Twelfth Night* we did at the festival last summer. I had, as we do, ideas about how Orsino might be before we showed up. Then when the costume had a long curly wig and a giant gold robe, I thought, "Okay, time to adapt, time to pivot, time to take that in." In the real world there are so many different kinds of artisans who help create what we do, but now, in this Zoom space, a lot of that weight has been put back onto the actor's shoulders.

Bahr: Anybody else have anything to say about that? I love what René said about collaboration. Theater is a collaborative art—director, actor, designer—with all those ideas coming

together to create the experience. So, if we are going to produce at this time, and we've actually heard some great panels about people who are playing in this arena, we must think, "How am I going to adapt? How am I going to give this pen over to Quinn?" There is a forced collaboration that you have to artificially create. Forced collaboration is there naturally when someone comes in and shows you the costume design, which you haven't seen in a normal process, and you go, "Oh, that's what I'm wearing." There are really rich elements to that kind of collaboration and there are collaborators through the whole process that you are engaging with, right? Any ideas on the importance of collaborators in the role of adaptation?

Mattfield: Yeah. You know, if you are going to try and direct, I keep using *Hamlet* because we are talking about it, but if you are going to try and direct Betsy as Hamlet, and you want her to do a René Hamlet, you are just going to end up being disappointed and you are going to end up frustrated with the actor because Betsy's never going to do the Hamlet of René, no offense Betsy, I'm sure you've got a great René Hamlet in there.

Mugavero: Challenge accepted.

Mattfield: Depending on who you cast, you're really asking for their collaboration and what they are going to bring to it. If I cast Denzel Washington because I really want him to do a Christopher Walken kind of performance, that just doesn't make any sense.

Bahr: I'm going to bring up *Richard II* because I know I can. René, what role did you play in *Richard II?*

Thornton: I played Thomas Mowbray and whatever Hotspur's name is before he is Hotspur.

Mattfield: Henry Percy.

Thornton: There we go, Henry Percy.

Bahr: Because sometimes talking about these concepts in the nebulous is not nearly as exciting as actually about talking about an actual play. I'd like to ask Betsy if you can talk a little bit about the journey you went on "adapting" *Richard II* and the all-female *Richard II* journey? I would like to have René bring some perspectives in on that as well.

Mugavero: So that was the last performance I was in, an all-female production of *Richard II* at Southwest Shakes directed by Quinn. It was extremely exciting to be a part of it. I didn't think

of it as this is how women play Richard, or any of these roles. We just came at them. We didn't change pronouns. We just were the characters and we told the story just as Shakespeare would have in his time, except it would've been all men.

I absolutely loved playing the role. I didn't hide my femininity. I also didn't play it up to make any kind of point. I just played the character as honestly and sincerely as I could, given the circumstances that he was in. I had no political agenda with this piece. We were thrilled that the audiences loved it and were accepting of this idea.

It was actually a very stripped-down production as well and we called it our Blackfriar series. We had candlelight and performed it on the front of the stage with a curtain behind us. It was a very small playing space and it was super intimate. After one of the performances, a woman came up to me and said "you did something to me tonight because I saw a woman as a king," and I hadn't considered that kind of impact. What my audience is seeing—because of my gender playing this role and not playing it with any kind of stamp of gender on it—just, as Quinn was saying earlier, by being myself, it was sending some kind of message to people and an impression that is very positive for them. It was a super rewarding experience for me.

Bahr: I know Quinn stepped out for a minute to take care of the baby. I would like you to talk a little bit about the director's position on this. Initially it was going to be an "all-female" production, and you had concerns, as a producer, about having a male director. Do you want to talk about that journey?

Mugavero: I did. I thought if it's going to be all-female it has to be all-female across the board. I actually spoke with one of René's former colleagues at American Shakespeare Center, Vanessa Morosco, who is a great theater artist, about this because she is a director and ideally a director I would love to have work on something like that with me.

She said, "You know when you have Quinn, or a male identifying person, directing an all-female production, it appears that he has chosen to do this and he has chosen these people to work with and these women to collaborate with and that is a really positive message. It means that now Betsy can direct an all-male production and no one will think anything of it. Just because you are a different gender doesn't mean you can't tell the story."

I think that is really positive, especially as we continue exploring gender equity, diversity, and inclusion, which is a huge topic right now and as a lot of companies are changing their mission statements and policies. We all get to collaborate, no matter what our backgrounds are or how we identify.

Bahr: René, I'm going to make a bridge here to a different production. Tell us about your *Richard II* production, not that the theme of this conference is *Richard II,* but we could think about it as adaptation and a king who can adapt, if you want to do that. We hadn't planned to talk about this play, but I think there are great lessons that can come from this, so please tell us about your production of *Richard II.*

Thornton: The production of *Richard II* that I did was at the American Shakespeare Center. As we did for all of the plays that we did at the American Shakespeare Center, there was gender cross casting, some women definitely played some male roles. Later they actually did a production with a female in the role of Richard, but I wasn't there for that. It was a fairly standard Blackfriar's production of a history play. There was nothing particularly groundbreaking about it, but we checked all of the appropriate *Richard II* boxes.

Bahr: We have a comment in the chat from Peggy Saunders.

Peggy[Audience Member]: People who come to the festival love having different people in the same role. This is what brings me back to USF year after year. I want to see those different interpretations and those adaptations. When we see a *Hamlet,* and those big ten Shakespeare plays that are very, very popular come popping up about every five years, we are able to see many of those same plays, but with different designers, different actors, and people in different roles. Can I just say I want to acknowledge what just happened there. That is one of the things I love about teaching in this time. Some people hate it; they'll say the camera is off and that type of stuff. I love that we are all intimate in everybody's houses. I love that we see dogs and cats and plants and bookshelves, and that we're all human beings here through this time.

Bahr: It's like cell phones in a classroom—I'll use them. WNYC hosted a Shakespeare in the Park production of *Richard II* with a primarily black cast, with Andre Holland as Richard, and, as a nice twist, Mariam Hyman as Bolingbroke. A radio play like that production asks even more of the audience as there are no

visual cues. It's a really nice production, and it is still available at NYCstudios.com. I was actually really very busy preparing for this, so I have not heard it yet, but I love the fact that I'm listening to regular NPR and they're advertising *Richard II,* so Georgia you got to make sure you listen to that.

Thornton: That's interesting because the REP, the company that I work with, has a radio play performance lined up in the fall. We will be doing an adaptation of Bram Stoker's *Dracula*.

Mattfield: I didn't get to hear Betsy's answer about *Richard II* and adaptation. I was just going to say that I did a significant amount of adapting during that process. It wasn't because it was all female; we really didn't make anything of that. I kept referring to it sort of as a modern day parable or as the Cohen brothers. The play shows people who are not ready for the change that is coming. There is a big change in the world that is about to happen, and there are some people who are good at seeing it coming and adjusting, like Bolingbroke, like Northumberland, those people are willing to do what it takes to survive, and there are people like Richard and Gaunt who are not, so that was sort of the core of the production for me.

We started in Elizabethan traditional male clothing and updated to very modern, a bit more androgynous costumes as we went through it. The first person to come out was Gaunt, who had died in Elizabethan and then immediately switched to Northumberland in this very sleek modern kind of pant suit thing. Everybody was like, "Whoa, what is that thing that just walked on stage?" It was really, really effective. The change was so visible when the audience could see who was changing clothes and when were they changing clothes, when were they making that movement over to the new world?

The cool thing with plays like that is there are so many characters and you can adapt them. I like to take smaller characters and give them arcs because Shakespeare was like, "I have to write a character for my thirty-fourth actor in the company," so he comes in and announces something. We don't have that since we usually have about ten to twelve actors, so you can take characters and sort of remake their arc to be a little bit more interesting. You can take this bit of language and move it over here and now that gives Percy a really interesting arc in a way that he didn't have before, because he just kind of shows up, says a couple of lines, and then gets out.

Bahr: Did Shakespeare have thirty-four actors in his company?

Mattfield: He had a lot of actors. I don't remember how many, but it's a lot. He had a lot of actors that he had to write for. We don't have nearly as many unless we're at the National or on Broadway or something like that. We tend to double cast a lot, and so did he, but then you get into those histories and you've got to double cast sixty roles or something like that with thirty-some actors. Because we truncated it. When that happens, I think it's really cool to give this character, who starts in the beginning and then disappears completely in the second half of the play, this other person's language. And you can see them become this part of the way that the world is transitioning. I actually think of those limitations as new forms. When I only have twelve people, I can make these two characters the same person and see what kind of arc that gives them to make that a more satisfying sort of story. It is more interesting to play as an actor, and it can help facilitate the story telling. It can help tell the story that we are trying to tell from another angle.

Bahr: I have a question, and this is for all three of you. We've had fabulous papers about all sorts of amazingly adaptive pieces and how pieces have been adapted for various reasons. What are the foundational things that you think about? I know that you had that amazing adaptation of Frankenstein that you've done recently. Do you change something just to make it cool and sexy, just for the sake of controversy? What are the fundamentals that you have to keep in mind as you're "adapting"? What are the fundamentals that you hold on to as you amplify the voice of a piece?

Mattfield: Two things and then I'm done. What story do you want to tell? What questions do you want to ask? That's the thing you base the adaptation on. I could elaborate, but I've been talking.

Thornton: I think I've done a fair amount of cutting Shakespeare's plays for the American Shakespeare Center's Actors Renaissance and I always just fundamentally try to maintain the integrity of the story that the playwright was telling. I'm not a huge fan of adaptations that are about changing the story to fit your thinking because if you do, I feel you should just write your own play. I'm interested in how do you adapt the text while still remaining true to the heart and intent of it.

Bahr: We have a comment here from Howard Schmidt, and then another question here. As a costume designer, I wanted to follow through on René's comment on bringing up costumes. If I remember right, prior to early 1919 contracts, which, just in terms of historical trivia, I believe happens to coincide with the Spanish Flu epidemic, actors still had to provide their own costumes. There were some notable exceptions, which I think were Russian or German companies.

What I am seeing on Zoom theater are actors not being trained to be on the same page with their fellow actors in terms of costumes. More significantly, I can see which actors have thought out the lighting and the scenic background. I just have to let you know that before this thing started, René actually turned on a light to make sure that his light was better, and it is, and then I turned on my light. So, where I'm headed is, I'd like to ask how to quickly help out actors in terms of the light in which they are revealed, the clothing they are seen in, and having a background which doesn't compete with the actors for the focus. Any comments on that?

Mugavero: Yes. I have a whole video on how to present well on Zoom based on what I have observed as an actor working in these circumstances. I'm about to present to a group of women at a local financial institution here because their boss was saying that the employees turn their cameras off during a meeting with a client because they don't want to be seen. We're training people in a different way to connect on a human level using Zoom or Skype or whatever, and a lot of it is about setting up your environment to succeed, like lighting, making sure you can be heard with whatever device you're using.

As far as actors collaborating with costume design, you know we don't really have directors for these online meetings—sometimes we do, sometimes we don't—so there's no hand involved to say, "Hey Betsy you need better light on your face." Everyone is just trying to survive on their own and our access is limited to materials in our own home for costumes. So, if you are doing a period piece and one person has a cool bonnet, but nobody else does, should that person really wear that bonnet? It they do wear the bonnet, you as the viewer are confused, like why is she wearing a costume and she's not. It is all affecting the way that you're hearing the story.

Mattfield: So, I shouldn't have worn the bonnet is what you're telling me.

Mugavero: Get rid of the bonnet! I had two productions that were influenced by costume, one in particular. The costume designer knew our limitations and said, "Hey, if you're playing Mistress Ford, you're blue. All the Fords are blue, all the Pages are red, and that's how we're going to remember who everybody is, and so-and-so is going to wear this kind of hat when he's this character." It wasn't based in any kind of style or period, but it was helpful to the audience to follow the characters.

Mattfield: That's really cool too, the idea of everybody being blue, which is just what you were talking about Michael—reduction—because we are reduced to this. Or, maybe as René was demonstrating, you can do more, you can play with the conventions, but it is kind of cool to reduce what a costume designer does to "you're all blues to help tell that story." That is sort of a stripped-down version.

Bahr: I found that it goes both ways. We have so many conventions, so many beautiful ways that we are using technology to help and assist us, and then there are other people who completely strip everything away so it is just spoken word. In other words, black screen, in just their lighting. I'm thinking of the Patrick Page's *Macbeth* where they just used black screens and candles, kind of experimenting with the medium. You can apply that to any theater play that we're watching, right? There are some performances where we completely strip it away so it's just the essence of the words or we bring in things to emphasize all of that.

Mugavero: Not to speak again, but what we found at Southwest Shakes is the more we could see of someone's home, the more their personality was visible, the more successful the reading was. People are given a chance to see you in your habitat and that's really cool for an audience. It's really cool for me to see where all of you are right now. "Iris I wish I was with you wherever you are right now. Take me home please Iris." We found that the blank screen didn't resonate as well with people.

Bahr: Which I think, Howard Schmidt, might mean there is a lesson there. There is something about character when we add all those things. Your question applied to this and I think it will launch into other places here in a minute. When it was determined we were going virtual for the Wooden O Symposium, we only had two or three weeks to pivot into this. We started exploring and I

talked to three different salesmen who sold me Whova (an event management app). I don't know what any of these salesmen look like as none of them let me see their faces. I know that they were probably told by corporate that they were afraid I was going to make a judgment about this young guy however he looks, but I thought it interesting that they saw me. They got to see what I look like and that we are engaging this way as opposed to this human interaction that we want here. Hey, I'm really loving the product, but it would've been nice if I could've talked to an individual. Oh, didn't they talk to you? No, it was a nameless screen with a packaged promotion. That's kind of the world we have.

Mattfield: I think we've all been in those comedies where you're like, man I really could've gone with a faceless screen out there; that would've really improved my performance.

Bahr: And as a teacher, that's where I say, hey at some time in the class, I've got to see your face; I've got to see what's happening here.

Thornton: I'm the same way with my students. I know there was a lot of talk about letting your students have their cameras off for x, y, and z reasons, but in my classroom, I'm sorry, you have to have that camera on, A) because, frankly, I just need to know that you're actually there, which I cannot do if your camera is off, and B) staring at my computer screen with a bunch of blank black squares on it is not a good time for me. Even here, I can see three to four of the attendees and so that interaction that I miss so much from live faces I can at least get by seeing your faces that I cannot get via blank screen. I'm not a big fan of everybody having their cameras off I have to say.

Bahr: Again, opening it up for any questions you may have. I have a question here from Chris, who asks, "Are any of you surprised by any ah-ha moments, or have you had an epiphany about a character or line that you don't know you would have had with that line or character within a regular season? I'm assuming that those ah-ha moments happen to you on a regular basis, but I'm asking you to look at the whole canon of plays that you have. Have you experienced that moment of adaptation or discovery when all of a sudden you saw something that you didn't see before in another play?"

Mattfield: All the time. I think that's why we keep coming back to Shakespeare because I've played Hamlet three times and I've seen it a billion and read it a bunch and the last performance I probably found new things or heard something in a different way. Every time, there's something that you've heard over and over and over and then you finally hear it a new way and you go, I've never thought of it that way. I never thought of this being the operative word. As the man in the play says, "it hath no bottom." In most of the plays, maybe not in *Merry Wives,* but most of the plays, you never go, well, we've done all the Macbeths we can do; that was it; we found it. We've accomplished *King Lear.*

Mugavero: My process has changed a lot as an actor since I became a parent because I don't have time to cry myself to sleep at night over my choices on stage, which I did before, admittedly. I was so self-loathing about what I was doing and choosing. Now I have to come into every rehearsal and use every single moment that I'm rehearsing as wisely as I can and make choices as an actor and think, "Well, that didn't work," with much less ego involved. So I say okay that that didn't work. I'll try something else next time. That's just because I've had to adapt to my personal life. I think it's made me a better performer because I've started to—it's not that I've lost the doubt that I have about myself from time to time, but I've started to accept that things are going to change and that I can try new things, and that I have to use my time as wisely as I can when I'm in the room with everyone.

Bahr: I think we just heard an actor testify to what all the scholars have been saying, that every production is an adaptation.

Mattfield: Absolutely it is. It has to be, and probably some of them were intended to be. I don't know that Shakespeare necessarily intended his *Hamlet* to be four and a half hours long. It's probably part of the plan to figure out what you want to keep, what you want to cut. He had been writing it for years and years and years and years, probably changing it and making little additions here and there and then eventually you can trim it. It's like a director's cut; you trim it back to whatever theatrical cut you want.

Bahr: René? I'm sorry, Georgia [audience member] go ahead.

Georgia [Audience Member]: I'd like to go back. Betsy talked about how you play off one another if you're on the stage, but right now you can't look in people's eyes—you don't see; you're all

in your own little box—so what are people really doing to create connections? You're kind of all in your own world, so how do you bring your globe with all the other globes and still feel that you've done a kind of interactive performance? I'd like a little more comment on that. What do you bring, René, when it's almost like doing a single play by yourself, but when it gets integrated, it has to work together, so how do you rethink that? Do you just hope it works? What happens to you?

Thornton: I think a little bit of this was touched on earlier, but listening becomes a different thing and active listening becomes super important, especially because now there's a camera on both of you and on a stage you could turn your back and do something. And, similarly, there's the thing that Betsy was talking about. I've tried to get better at just talking to the camera instead of trying to really feel like I'm connecting to the actor because now I'm not connecting to anybody. I'm neither connecting to the actor or the audience, and so for me, it's just the audio of hearing my scene partner and then responding to the sounds of how they said what they said. That is sort of what I would do on stage, but I don't have the physical thing to also be reacting to.

Mugavero: We are also finding that when you're acting in this medium it's kind of like being compressed in a box. Our bodies have to be small and compact and you have to keep everything tight. So, if you have to have an outburst, you have to have an outburst that's smaller, because most of the time you're not going to be able to do extreme movement and how that translates is sort of dicey. You learn as you go because if you move too fast it's confusing and it's visually annoying and so you have to have all of your reactions be like film acting, have it all be in your eyes and your face and in your vocal quality. You can't shout over Zoom. People are wearing headphones and it just doesn't filter correctly with the audio technology that we're all using. For example, whispering works on Zoom; it does not work on stage.

Mattfield: It's interesting too to see how quickly we all learned tricks—sometimes just out of necessity. When you're on stage, a director might say to you a couple times as a young actor, can you do this with your upstage hand so that you're not blocking yourself off from the audience. Go like this instead so that they can see you. You figure that out, and after you do that a couple times you know to do that with your upstage hand so you don't block yourself off.

When we started sitting doing Zoom, it took me maybe two readings before I realized I can't jump in because if I jump in everything gets muddled and you can't hear both things at once. You can't hear the other person talking. In the theater you can, but on Zoom you can't; you hear one person or the other. I figured out this trick with *Hamlet* where somebody would say something. I would wait and go [audible exhalation] and then start. The sound, the audible exhalation would bring the camera back to me because it's speaker focused. Never doubt an actor's narcissism; it is our greatest tool. I was like how do I bring the focus immediately back to me after that person is done talking, but I don't want to use the words to do it. I want to actually say the words while people are watching me, so you go [audible exhalation] in order to bring the focus of the speaker thing back to you. It took me, like I said, two times to learn that trick, but we do, we adapt.

Bahr: Go ahead Iris [audience member].

Iris [Audience Member]: First of all, I want to say hi to Betsy. I was lucky enough to see her in *Romeo & Juliet* and *Othello* and I loved it. I am not a professional Shakespearean actor or scholar, but I am a professional audience member. My question is, when we're talking about adaptation and we're talking about the Zoom medium, has anybody adapted a Shakespearean play using a chorus? I've seen choruses used, and I think, when using Zoom, if they want to break down that fourth wall and have the audience members become that chorus, it could really be very effective. I think breaking down that fourth wall would be something you can do on Zoom that you may not be able to do in a theater.

Bahr: Anybody want to talk about the use of chorus or breaking the wall like that?

Mattfield: Well, when we did *Henry V,* we did a Zoom reading at Southwest Shakespeare Company; Brian was playing Henry V.

Iris: I wish I'd seen that!

Mattfield: Yeah, he's pretty good. Beau Heckman, one of our actors in Arizona, was playing the chorus and was specifically talking straight to the audience, but you had mentioned the audience being the chorus, is that what you were saying Iris?

Iris: Yes, doing it on a smaller screen can be a little bit difficult, but also, I love breaking down that wall. I love the catharsis that I get and how I get even more than that, and I think that a Zoom

audience would love it. I think the actors might also like that, and then you would see all different faces and show the universality of something.

Bahr: There actually has been a lot of work. I'm not sure if you saw the session right with Kacen before this. He pointed out that there have been some nice experimental groups. The challenge with Zoom, and Quinn just talked about it, is it can't listen to more than one person at the same time. Somehow, we as humans do, but because of it, if we all start speaking at once, it would not pick up.

Iris: Oh, yes, you're right. Technically that could be a problem.

Bahr: So anytime you see these really amazing choruses with fifty people on a screen all singing harmonically, some sound designer had a great time. It is deceptive. If you play with Zoom's technology, you go wow, I can't do that. We have our high school Shakespeare competition going on right now, which hosts 3,500 kids from all across the nation. We are going to have a virtual competition. Monologues are easy, piece of cake; duo/trios are tougher, and then there are ensemble scenes. We started initially with requiring a fixed camera for a level playing field, but we realized we were limiting artists on their ability to adapt so that we can do some of that stuff that René was talking about. We're going to get some pretty unique performances. We don't care where the camera is placed, but giving the artists permission to use the medium will open up some pretty creative things.

Mattfield: Especially with high schoolers—kids who grew up with screens always being around and always being a part of their life, you are going to get some really cool stuff.

Thornton: For one of my classes this past spring, I had them do their final on TikTok. They had to create TikTok videos for their final, and the things they can create are so much more interesting than our generation is capable of creating with these screens.

Bahr: Let's get out of their way, right? This from Leah, who says, "I just finished a thorough experimentation in adapting Shakespeare to the Zoom medium with a virtual version of the ASC theater camp. There was a lot of TikTok. I agree René; I think they are poised and ready. Just get out of their way and give them permission." Other comments, other questions?

Thornton: I had a visual aid; where did it go? It just closed itself. As we were talking about costumes, I wanted you to see what happens when actors are left to their own devices. I was playing Heracles in a reading of *Alcestis* because I've been doing a lot of Greek drama on Zoom lately and comedies. The director wanted an action movie hero, but I own nary a fatigue in my closet, so this is what you get instead. This is what happens when actors are left to their own devices. [shows costume on Zoom]

Bahr: I have another comment here, and I'm going to formalize this a little bit. The writer asks that you tell us a little bit about your journey of discovery. I know all three of you went on a different journey here, but I'm asking about your journey of discovery with the Bard, with Shakespeare. What was your first introduction to Shakespeare, when did you realize that, oh, he's da man, and then, I'm assuming here, but having talked to a lot of actors, there is a second epiphany that comes a little later on in your life where you go, oh, he's da man! What was your first "he's da man" moment and then your second "he's da man" moment and what caused those moments? You want to talk about that?

Mattfield: Yes, I do, absolutely. The first moment was, I think, in high school when I read *Hamlet* and *Othello*. Those two plays just seemed so modern and so close to what was going on in the world and it seemed so odd to me that it almost seemed topical. There was just something very exciting about it. I don't think I was able to articulate what it was specifically that was so interesting about it.

Like I said, you play Hamlet three times and each is different. The first time I had done it, my father had passed away a little bit before and I really got the Hamlet whose father had passed away. He was in mourning. But I didn't understand the Hamlet that came back from England. Having done it two more times, I understood not just the Hamlet who lost his father, but also the Hamlet who comes back from England and has found a kind of balance and a peace and a focus that he didn't have before.

As you age you start to realize, oh, I just hadn't had that experience yet. I think, though, for me, the really amazing things about Shakespeare are those things where you go, well this is a really cool coincidence, but there's no way he could have intended that, right? I mean, it's really cool that this thing happened, but

that's just way too smart; that's on a whole other level of genius. Then you rehearse that show and you rehearse a bunch of other shows and those moments keep happening and you keep going, come on there's no way that he could have possibly intended that. One example, in *Macbeth,* the one that always stuns me, and that I'm still not sure I believe entirely, is the knocking, the sound of knocking. That play is filled with the word or sound dun: Dunsinane, Duncan, "if it were done when tis done, then it were well it were done quickly." Dun, dun, dun.

There is a game that the English play called Dun in the Mire which is a horse pulling a log out of the muck, and dun also means darkness, right? The dunnest smoke of hell. There's so much dun, and I started realizing he's creating this verbal pattern, this dun, dun, dun, dun, which sounds like [knocking on table]. It was the first time I went, oh, he's making knocking; he's making everyone make knocking sounds, so there's this constant knocking sound that is happening throughout the entire play and it was like my head was exploding. There's no way he could have possibly intended that, right? But then you have one, if not multiple moments, in every single play of his that you work on, where you go, for example, how is it that he's working threes into *Hamlet* this way, and it's so consistent. He must have been a very boring person to talk to because whatever was happening in his head must have been the most exciting, fascinating, engaging experience a human could possibly have. It really is beyond anything else I've ever experienced as an artist.

Bahr: René or Betsy? When did you first say wow this is cool and then later, oh wow?

Thornton: I did my first when I was fifteen. I played Oberon in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and what was being asked of me was so much more than any school play for kids that I had done up to that point. I immediately noticed that it felt different. I didn't have the words for it then, but I just felt different.

I don't know that I can point to a single ah-ha after that. It was a series of ah-has throughout undergrad and grad school as I was working on these plays and continually rediscovering what a genius he was in so many extraordinary ways. And still, as I think Quinn said earlier, to this day this is still why I like doing these plays because I can still hear things that I haven't heard before. I

was thinking about Betsy's Olivia in *Twelfth Night* last summer, the 8000th production of *Twelfth Night* that I have been in or seen, and yet, I heard lines in new ways from her that I had never heard from Olivia ever before. That's both attributed to Betsy as an actress and also to the genius of Shakespeare—the depth of his writing—that it can resonate so profoundly in different ways. Usually something profoundly resonates in just one way, but he was able to make it so it could be brilliant in a bunch of different ways.

Mugavero: Yes, it's just peeling back an onion. You're finding new layers of every character, every line, and everything in the text in every exploration you have of a play. I started in high school and fell in love with the text because at the time everyone was saying that my voice was annoying and I didn't want to talk on the phone. I didn't know what was going on, like I just didn't sound fun for anyone to listen to. So I was really insecure about speaking out and speaking up. I mean I had friends; everything was fine, but in my own sad hormonal brain, I thought everyone hated my voice. So, I found a Shakespeare book in my parents' house and started reading *Rome & Juliet,* just instantly fell in love with it, and said, "wow, there's so many words you can use as a human, and this guy really put them together well." Then I started studying and ended up feeling that I had an aptitude for it and a love for it. As I developed as a person and as an artist, I just kept coming back to it and loving it, and it's still going to be my life's work whether or not there is theater that we can get paid to do. I continue to pursue this because I find more of myself every time I get to speak the language and every time I get to hear someone else speak it.

I think there are two ah-ha moments that came to mind. Of course, every minute I'm out there or listening in a dressing room or in an audience, there are ah-ha moments going off in my head constantly, but when Quinn and I did *Hamlet* in this garage warehouse thing in LA, which was my only experience doing the play, and his second time playing Hamlet, it was really cool, really weird and very LA. We were in the round and people were sitting on couches and drinking, and it was a really cool production. I had just come out of grad school and I was in LA and I was very unhappy. So listening to Quinn say the Hamlet lines about being the quintessence of dust, about what it is to be alive and how frustrating and huge and small it is at the same time was exactly

how I was feeling at the moment. I was trying to find purpose and trying to figure out what the heck I was doing and very, very unhappy. I was like, "Yeah, that's exactly how I feel. I am Hamlet, right now." That was the first time that I connected completely with one of Shakespeare's characters, and of course it's the one we all do. It was a really beautiful therapeutic moment for me.

I had another ah-ha moment two summers ago when we were doing *Othello*. I was in *Othello* playing Desdemona and I was Nerissa in *Merchant of Venice.* Every day I would go from one rehearsal to the other and wonder how did this guy write both of these plays, not to mention all of the others. These are two totally different tones and people, and yet I have chills all day, everyday with both of these pieces and I'm just so humbled by someone's ability to do that.

Bahr: Cool, cool. I have one last killer question, but before I go to that, I want to open it up for any other questions that you as a company of participants might have. Are there any other comments or questions before I ask this closing question of them? Anybody? All right, here we go. I didn't warn you about this one, and so I apologize, but can we be honest, really, about what this has done to us, as opposed to saying, hey, we're trooping through? Please tell us what you feel the future of the theater and Shakespeare is given what you presently know about the theater and Shakespeare through the times you've lived in, and the times that we're going through now. What is the future of theater and Shakespeare?

Mattfield: I think a lot of people and scholars and thinkers and theoreticians will call it different things, but I've always called it, or maybe just lately started calling it, original principles. Some people say original practices, but I think what we mean is original principles, the idea of a theater that is really about simple magic and imagination and the very basics of what this art form is. It doesn't require a ton of money; it doesn't require a ton of explosions and special effects and whatever. What comes out of the original principles that Shakespeare used in the Blackfriar's and in the Globe is not a huge expansive complicated kind of storytelling; it's a simple, deep storytelling and that is what I think has always interested us as humans about theater. We go to theaters to have a clear, simple, and very deep experience. Sometimes you

get additional complexity on top of that, but the present and also the past of successful theater is that you're going there to have a very singular experience, an experience we can't get anywhere else. As Peter Brook says, "the invisible shows up," and all of a sudden there's a spiritual transformation that's happening. I think we get there through very simple storytelling and that's what Shakespeare used. I think he knew that and I think it's why he wrote the way he wrote.

Thornton: I think for me as a culture and society, we are on the precipice of great change. My hope for theater and for Shakespeare in the future is that we have had four hundred years of Shakespeare primarily being told from the perspective of a singular voice and now we have an opportunity, as theaters reconstitute themselves as places of inclusion, to hear what Shakespeare sounds like and what it looks like when we let different voices tell his stories. I'm excited to see what that looks like, and what it sounds like, and how I can continue to have more ah-ha moments with Shakespeare when I get to hear different voices speak his language.

Mugavero: I think we'll see, I mean, he's already the most produced playwright in America, he and Lauren Gunderson, but I think we're going to see even more Shakespeare happening because it's public domain and people can do it outside in their backyard. People like me and Quinn are going to be doing it on a sidewalk this winter. And we'll be doing Dickens, writing our own adaptation, but we're going to have to keep doing this work and it is the work that is available to everyone. It is work that everyone wants to come to because it's familiar in some way. Even if you are afraid of Shakespeare, you can think well, it's free, let me go watch that. I think we'll have a lot more people, a lot more amateur companies popping up to produce their own Shakespeare, which will make it more accessible to everyone in their own backyard.

Bahr: Well, thank you very, very much. I want to thank you for your lifetime of great performances, which I've been able to see and have benefited from. I know there are many patrons missing the theater right now. We miss you on the stages; we miss you and creative things happening. We will keep the torch lit; we'll keep the lights on and we will all return to those spaces again. I want to thank you for your experience, for sharing what happened to you personally, and also for sharing about your thoughts on adaptation as well. Thank you very, very much and God bless.

UNDERGRADUATE PAPER

The Effect of Gaps on Memory in Shakespeare's *Winter's Tale* and Related Works

Grace Clawson
Grinnel College

Introduction

During a 1995 study on memory, Henry Roediger and Kathleen McDermott tested the brain's tendency to create memories that it did not experience. To accurately recall a series of closely associated words on a list, each research subject had to bridge the gap between perception and memory in order to complete the study. Though this study focused on the association of context and words in series of lists, Roediger and McDermott discovered "a powerful illusion of memory: People remember events that never happened."[1] The memory of each participant became a condition of perception over time. In a similar sense, in his "Sonnet 5" and *The Winter's Tale,* Shakespeare introduces chronological gaps that permit the distillation of time's destructive and constructive effects on memory.

Defining Gaps

Gaps, by definition, challenge the continuous progression of time with their presence. Stemming from Old Norse, the word "gap" itself describes a break in continuity, which creates a chasm or hiatus.[2] Paradoxically, the stagnancy of a hiatus suggests no shift in character or disposition, while chasms imply differences between

Journal of the Wooden O. Vol 20, 128-141
© Southern Utah University Press
ISSN: 1539-5758

viewpoints. We find this vibrant combination in literature, where theatre especially thrives on gaps as plots parse into scenes and acts. Actors exiting the stage signal a pause in the action or hiatus but move the plot forward. *The Winter's Tale* 4.1 exemplifies this effect as time itself enters, breaking the progression of the action. The embodiment of Time proclaims:

> To me or my swift passage, that I slide
> O'er sixteen years and leave the growth untried
> Of that wide gap, since it is in my power
> To o'erthrow law and in one self-born hour
> To plant and o'erwhelm custom. (4.1.5-10)[3]

His presence both acts as a progression of the plot, literally shifting the scene by sixteen years, and introduces a pause, removing the audience from the continuous line of events. He does so swiftly, mentioning that he will leave the growth "untried," which ultimately requires the audience to trust the character to manipulate time in such a fashion. More, it indicates that the growth of the characters will remain static. Time emphasizes this gapping effect even more by his use of elision; instead of using the entirety of the "overthrows" and "overwhelms," he replaces certain syllables with apostrophes, as if to create a gapping effect in the words themselves. The movement from "o'er" to "throw" mimics the action of throwing—flipping quickly over words. However, "o'erwhelm" brings forth the idea of capsizing the very notion of law and custom at once, which halts any overall progression. The use of this gap of time serves to promote the passing of time, yet does not support the development of characters.

The uncertainty about the time between the present and what lies ahead produces a gap that may only be resolved by arrival in the future. Consider, for example, the effect of a fragmented timeline in the dystopic novel *Station Eleven* by Emily St. John Mandel. The plot, centering on the occurrence of a pandemic, focuses on the individual's approach to life before and after such a catastrophic event. St. John Mandel builds on the theatrical nature of gaps and bullies time into non-linear configurations, which parallels the figure of Time in *The Winter's Tale.* The sudden shift introduces a rift in time, a gap, as the forward movement of time occurs while humanity digresses, which in and of itself "o'erwhelm[s] custom." She writes scenes as vignettes, slowly uncovering information about

other characters and locations in a fragmented manner. St. John Mandel juxtaposes the likelihood of a future envisioned in science fiction and the reality of the affected world through a consistently shifting point of view. This constant adjustment creates gaps that highlight the relationship between the world before and the world after the spread of illness.

The modulation of time demonstrated in *The Winter's Tale* and *Station Eleven* reveals the intricacies of temporality within a set period of time. Each successive gap in scene pauses the current dialogue, but also creates tension as the audience struggles to parse the ensuing events and to create context in absentia; the gaps diversify and complicate plots solely by existing between two events.

Distillation of Memory in Shakespeare's Sonnets and Barthes's Winter Garden Photograph

The use of time as a stagnating and motivating agent additionally pervades the tone of Shakespeare's fifth sonnet, in which the speaker expresses his desire for the addressee to remain in his current state of beauty, "For never-resting Time leads summer on / To hideous winter and, confounds him there" ("Sonnet 5," 5-6). These lines introduce a linearity of time—a movement from past to present which not only images Time as an unforgiving vandal of beauty but also as an entity that retains the worst qualities of people. The narrator, in contrast to time, then proposes his desire: a distillation of the young man's essence. The usage of the word "distillation" suggests some sort of purification of the young man's being, which indicates the speaker will refuse his poorer qualities. This distilled memory provides an inaccurate perspective of his character, as only his amiable qualities will remain. This refusal also adds to the character of the Young Man, glossing over his poor qualities, which creates a more positive remembered image in the eyes of the speaker.

Furthermore, the sonnet uses glass as a means to capture the "liquid prisoner" (10), thus creating a situation that rejects the standard conception of forward-moving time. According to John Garrison, this sonnet reflects on the nature of glass as a vessel of time because sand—the marker of time in an hourglass—has roots in time.[4] Both representative of the sand that passes through an

hourglass and the vial that holds it, glass functions as another chasm and behaves similarly to gaps; it holds the dynamism of progressing time, but also the stillness of solid glass.

Roland Barthes also uses glass as a vessel of both progression and stagnancy to reveal a new relationship between himself and his late mother in the "Winter Garden Photograph."[5] While in his mother's apartment, Barthes encounters a photograph of his mother and her brother; "standing together at the end of a little wooden bridge in a glassed-in conservatory, what was called a Winter Garden in those days."[6] The glass, constructing both the winter garden and the picture's frame, adds a nuanced stillness to the image. Winter gardens offer a sense of the spring or summer regardless of the temperature, acting as a gap from reality. The image, frozen in time provides insight to the nature of gaps. The speaker discovers the young girl in the image after she dies, which means he both experiences the gap of seeing his mother once more, and the gap between his mother's childhood and parenthood. He explains that he travels over three-quarters of a century to arrive at the image of his mother;[7] once he sees this picture after so long a gap, he learns a new identity belonging to his mother, one that he never knew when she lived.

Photography itself acts as a preparation for death, as the actual process of capturing an image creates an emblem for remembrance. A dissection of the word "photography" separates the word into two parts: photo, or light, and graphing. In a sense, the imaging of a person acts as a means for recordkeeping, capturing them in the current state in which they reside. Peggy Phelan advances this idea, arguing that photography forces the viewer to reconcile and come to terms with the past, especially during the gap between the taking of the photo and the viewer's interaction with it. The placement of this particular gap lies between the subject and the person viewing the photo. When considering this relationship, photography, as a means to capture an image, takes on a new light, one that creates a rehearsal for death; the staging of a photo beckons a future viewer to look upon a moment in the past.[8] An interaction of this magnitude forces a reconciliation with the gap, and in Barthes's circumstance, forces him to develop the image using his own mind and imagination. He assumes the identity of his mother's keeper, referring to her as "his little girl."[9] This relationship continues an

identity Barthes took on before her death as Barthes cared for her up until her last moments. In the moment when he sees her as a child, he reassumes this relationship, reforming it into a paternal relationship. Even though this kindles the bond between him and his mother once more, the effect of time modulates his perception of the relationship, even potentially creating a parody of his last moments with his mother. By referring to her as his little girl, Barthes reduces his mother to merely one small portion of her life instead of viewing her in her entirety.

Barthes's reduction of his mother to a person needing care lies in contrast with his assertion that he finally understands her. In fact, the gaps of time between his mother's death and his viewing of this photo and his mother's past and his knowledge of her morph his image of his mother into something new. The use of glass and time in both "Sonnet 5" and "The Winter Garden Photograph" suggest a hermetic identity in which the medium of glass protects and exculpates the memory of its subject.

Tracing Gaps in *The Winter's Tale*

Shakespeare's use of time and distance as a means to define relationships transcends "Sonnet 5" and appears within the relationships in *The Winter's Tale.* The effects of distance and time serve to both purify and place strain upon the relationship that Polixenes and Leontes share. Similar to the overall structure of play, which heavily depends on the manipulation of emotion by time, the relationship between the two kings features the effects of sustained absence on friendship. Camillo, in the very beginning of 1.1, defines the relationship as one that sprouted in childhood, yet developed in spite of their distance. He tells Archidamus, "They were trained together in their childhoods, and / there rooted betwixt them then such an affection that cannot / choose but branch now" (1.1.22-5). The use of "branch" indicates a connection that thrives with distance and Camillo describes how even in absence, the kings appeared close by means of sending letters and gifts (1.1.26-9). Once Leontes and Polixenes are reunited in Sicilia, other characters, including Hermione, have access to the seemingly well-rooted relationship between Leontes and Polixenes. Similar to Barthes, upon experiencing his relationship under a new light, Leontes receives clarity, even if misguided clarity, about the

relationships he maintains with his wife and companion. Unlike a contained distanced relationship, the new intimacy caused by removing the gap allows Hermione the potential to insert herself into the relationship.

When Leontes suspects that Hermione and Polixenes are committing adultery, a Barthes-like relationship between Leontes and Polixenes builds. Leontes adopts a new image of his spouse, purely based on Hermione asking Polixenes to remain in Sicilia, which leads Leontes to quickly assume the two are engaged in an affair. Similar to the dynamic between Barthes and his mother, this change in attitude erupts from the interpretation of a single moment in time. Leontes frames the suspicion of his wife's infidelity within the context of his friendship with Polixenes, in which he mentions that "To mingle friendship far is mingling bloods" (1.2.140). This mingling of bloods overwhelms and agitates him. With this statement, Leontes rejects Hermione's place in his relationship with Polixenes, thus villainizing his wife and companion and negatively affecting the audience's perception of the relationships.

Leontes's own introspection about his relationships mirrors that in "Sonnet 5" as he uses glass to reflect upon the relationship between Hermione and Polixenes. He sees them as"paddling palms and pinching fingers, / As now they are, and making practiced smiles / as in a looking glass" (1.2.145-50). His use of glass works similarly to the way it functions in "Sonnet 5;" it brings forth a method of both reflection and ensnarement. Leontes paints an image of self-reflection, yet mirrors do not offer a complete image of what they show, which in turn is only a surface level understanding of what stands before it. By placing Hermione and Polixenes in front of a mirror, he only reflects the image of them that he wants to see.

Through his storytelling, Mamillius also reflects his own agency, as he operates as the mechanism by which the plot progresses. Hermione drives the plot away from her impending trial and towards an alternate future when she asks Mamillius to tell her a story. Hester Lees-Jeffries suggests that "storytelling is frequently either staged or alluded to, but ideas about storytelling within it are also strongly associated with children."[10] By inserting a scene that depicts storytelling, Shakespeare highlights a crucial

moment for the audience. Aside from being the only scene in *The Winter's Tale* that contains storytelling, Mamillius's story and his agency over the story may reflect his character. In addition to his importance to the narrative as a child storyteller, his approach parallels that of Barthes in that Mamillius considers how the circumstances of a single person in a moment influence a facet of understanding.

Mamillius operates from a position of authority when delivering his story. He takes control of his narrative, first asking Hermione what kind of story she wishes to hear. He inquires, "Merry or sad shall it be?" (2.1.31). After she responds that she wishes to hear a happy story, Mamillius retorts, "A sad tale's best for winter. I have one / of spirits and goblins" (2.1.33-4). His refusal of optimism sets the tone for the first half of the play—one that adopts a somber tone. Joseph Roach explains how certain stories of the past influence the future, elaborating on how his storytelling acts as an "onstage demonstration of how telling a story from the past summons the future by reading forward to the worry lines that it will produce on the face of memory."[11] Mamillius's story will haunt the play because the audience never has the opportunity to hear what he says to Hermione in his tale before his death. Because his death occurs offstage, his open-ended story puts a strain on the viewer's memory of his character.

Mamillius's story also offers hope in the face of destitution, as it begins in a churchyard, a place that contains both life and death; his tale, though supposedly laced with sadness, does not indicate that the somberness will persevere throughout the entirety, only the beginning. The phrasing of his words also suggests that the future may shift, as he mentions how sad stories seem apt for the winter. Winter itself exists as a temporary state, especially in the context of the sixteen-year gap that breaks the play and leads to summer.

Though storytelling accommodates the possibility of revelation, the scene contains a series of gaps that prevent this from occurring. Mamillius introduces the need for privacy in his storytelling by separating himself and Hermione from the rest of the onstage characters, speaking softly so Hermione's "crickets shall not hear it" (2.1.41). In doing this, Mamillius creates a physical space between him and other characters that extends

to the audience. In moving away and telling the story privately, Mamillius creates a gap between the audience and the story. Because the possibility of Mamillius repeating his words dies with him, the future appearances of the story's elements depend on the progression of the rest of the plot.

In a sense, Mamillius creates the tone in which he will be remembered, as the introduction to his story, "There was a man— . . . / Dwelt by a churchyard" (2.1.38-40), begins a sad tale. The churchyard offers little hope for the boy, as it directs the narrative to death. The combination of the churchyard, a space associated with burial, and the young boy's storytelling to his mother accommodates both life and death. His story, though, introduces the possibility of Foucauldian heterotopias, as churchyards represent a realm in which the living and the dead exist in a state of togetherness. The story parallels this, as Mamillius, a character remembered in death, interacts with Hermione, who experiences a resurrection in the final scene. The general premise of Mamillius's story lasts through the sixteen-year gap as the entirety of the first act behaves as a tragedy, but once winter passes, so does the tragedy of the beginning acts.

The transition to a more comical play does not excuse the tragedy of the past, and Mamillius's tragic death acts as a residual marker of the despair in the first half of play. Despite Leontes's reunion with Hermione and Perdita, the family can never return to its former state. Unlike the rest of his family, Mamillius remains lost. Leontes acknowledges his grief; Hermione undergoes a resurrection, and Perdita returns to Sicilia. Mamillius remains dead, and his absence lingers even towards the end of the play. Sixteen years after his death, Paulina says to Leontes, "King Leontes shall not have an heir / Till his lost child be found?" (5.1.47-8). In referencing Leontes's child, she uses both the words "child" and "infant" (1.5.52) to describe his missing heir. Paulina references Perdita in this claim, but her inclusion of both terms may allude to Mamillius. The possibility of returning from the dead, whether as a ghost, a dream, or a statue, suggests a possibility of his return. Yet, the memory and finality of his death prove that comedic endings cannot remedy all tragic events, despite the gap.

Hermione's Resurrection as a Complication

Hermione's memory becomes complicated in the latter half of the play as her image takes on the physical form of a statue. Paralleling her death, the statue exists beyond the eye of the audience, which once again confuses whether or not she actually dies. This confusion originates immediately after the queen's death, as Paulina exclaims, "I'll say she's dead. I'll swear it" (3.2.224). A certain ambiguity lies in the way Paulina expresses this, as her wording compromises the objectivity of death. She mentions how she will "say" that Hermione died, rather than blatantly coming forth and saying, "she's dead." By saying this, Paulina assumes a power over Leontes, advertently shielding him from the truth of his wife's demise. Ambiguity follows when Antigonus, tasked with deserting Perdita in the woods, tells the child:

> I have heard, but not believed, the spirits o' th' dead
> May walk again. If such thing be, thy mother
> Appeared to me last night, for ne'er was dream
> So like a waking. (3.3.20-3)

The inverted syntax used by Antigonus introduces the prospect of seeing Hermione even before clarifying that she appears in a dream. Antigonus considers the possibility that his dreams may reflect reality.[12] He sees Hermione as a shadowy figure in white; his memory of her remains unstained, like the white robes he sees her in, which highlights the pureness he envisions when he remembers her. Even only a short time after her death, Antigonus only remembers the pure characteristics of the queen, especially as he envisions her as a beacon of sanctity (3.3.26-7).

Considering Antigonus's purified perception of Hermione through the lens of religion—namely early modern Protestantism and Catholicism—may indicate that his memory paints an inaccurate depiction.[13] Antigonus's inability to suspend his disbelief in the presence of Hermione may indicate that his beliefs align with Protestantism rather than Catholicism because Catholics were considered to be more likely to believe in spirits than Protestants. Additionally, for a Catholic, the ghost of Hermione would be in purgatory, meaning her spirit may not be as pristine as Antigonus believes. The gaps between religion, ontology, and time twist the accuracy of Antigonus's memory of Hermione.

The inaccurate remembrance of Hermione's character as someone completely morally unstained may be a mechanism to complicate her character in death and suggest that she may return.

Hermione's return calls into question time's ability to interfere with memory. Jefferies notes that "art cannot simply memorialize the dead: it can almost bring them back to life."[14] She goes on to explain how Shakespeare, in his earlier sonnets, "assert[s] that art can eternize beauty."[15] While the statue of Hermione acts as an emblem of remembrance, it too falls subject to the violent and relentless nature of time. Instead of embodying her figure as it appears at the time of her death, the details of the craftmanship indicate an older image of the late queen. Leontes, taking note of the appearance of the statue remarks, "Hermione was not so much wrinkled, nothing / so aged as this seems" (5.3.32-3). When Leontes attempts to touch the statue, Paulina interferes, telling him that the paint has not dried, which indicates an air of newness. By introducing wrinkles to Hermione's face, as well as mentioning the freshness of the paint, Shakespeare brings Hermione to the present instead of preserving her in the past.

Hermione's statue acts as a monument to her character before her death and reintroduces her to both her husband and the audience. The statue modulates the means by which we remember Hermione, as it replaces the previous image of her with something both new and aged, rejecting the purified subject that Shakespeare envisions in his sonnets. An older Hermione indicates a development in her character despite her sixteen-year absence.

Though not inherently obvious, Hermione's character development becomes clear once the audience witnesses her interactions, or lack thereof, with Leontes. Van Dijkhuizen suggests that Leontes's development as a remorseful character does not necessitate forgiveness from his wife.[16] Upon descending from the pedestal, Hermione does not engage in a conversation with Leontes, which may indicate her inability to forgive him in entirety. Her only interaction with Leontes occurs when she embraces him; otherwise, her final lines pertain to Perdita's return (5.2.153-61). Shakespeare's general lack of stage directions adds ambiguity to her reaction. In order to convey this reunion to the audience, Polixenes remarks that their interaction happens. He specifically mentions that "She" (5.3.32-3) embraces him, sparing any mention of

Hermione's name. Polixenes delivers this line while the queen embraces her husband, but only indicates that a woman does so. The omission of her name may also reveal an acknowledgement that at this moment of the play, Hermione differs from her former self. Though Polixenes details an act as simple and noticeable as an embrace between two people, a gap exists between the expected outcome and the reality because Hermione does not verbally communicate her forgiveness. Leontes, overcome with grief, hopes for his ideal woman—Hermione. Leontes focuses on the future of his marriage instead of remedying his actions against Hermione and his child. Given her lack of communication with Leontes, the appearance of reparation may appear one-sided. By distinguishing the supposed resolution between the couple, Polixenes actually impresses the feelings he expects of Hermione onto her relationship with Leontes, which tries to create the comedic happy ending, one that results in union rather than separation.

Not only does her potential disinterest in her husband suggest that Hermione undergoes a character change, but it also modulates the very idea of the happy ending. The final scene reflects a purified version of the exposition but maintains the complication and destruction which existed before the gap. Leontes attempts to employ an optimistic ending; he graciously rejoices in his own marriage and also attempts to create a marriage for Paulina. Her general attitude towards marriage complicates this optimistic ending, as before Leontes gives her hand to Camillo, she mentions, "I, an old turtle, / Will wing me to some withered bough and there / My mate, that's never to be found again, / Lament till I am lost" (5.3.166-69). Leontes acts as though the sixteen years clears all tragedy, yet Paulina's lamentation for Antigonus remains after all this time. She functions as the tether to the unfortunate events. The proposal of marriage to Camillo merely points out the discrepancy between how Leontes experiences memory in relation to the present, and how memory actually functions between characters. Unlike Paulina and Hermione, Leontes experiences the gap of time as a period of purification. The purification of Hermione and Leontes's relationship outshines the deaths of Antigonus and Mamillius. Paulina and Hermione accept the past, retaining the memory of their loved ones; they keep the rawness of tragedy on the forefront of their minds. This separation creates a gap between

Leontes and Hermione and Paulina, as they experience time in opposing ways.

Statues and Photographs: Hermione's Statue as a Winter Garden Photograph

Hermione's reemergence as statue evokes a new definition of her being to Leontes—one that revitalizes his faith in his marriage—similar to Roland Barthes and his mother. Just as the photograph highlights hidden aspects of Roland Barthes's mother, the statue acts as a Winter Garden Photograph to the audience. Leontes, after the gap of time, regains the positive opinion of his wife that he held prior to her trial. To the audience, however, the statue provides a turning point in Hermione's character, symbolized by her aged face and disinterest towards Leontes. The difference lies in the age of the subject; Roland Barthes discovers a new facet of his mother as a young girl while the audience becomes accustomed to an older image of Hermione. The gap of time still serves as buffer between the reintroduction of subjects. Most similarly, Barthes writes, "Nor could I omit this from my reflection: that I had discovered this photograph by moving back through Time."[17] Barthes, by capitalizing "Time," requests the audience to suspend thoughts of the commonly accepted notion of linear time, which parallels the suspension of reality the audience of *The Winter's Tale* must undergo as Time announces the leap forward by sixteen years. Both literary pieces require their audiences to maintain an open mind in regard to Time. Unlike *The Winter's Tale,* both the audience and the speaker of "The Winter Garden Photograph" undergo a reintroduction. Barthes discovers his mother's identity only after he has accepted the fact that she has died. Because Hermione returns to life, Leontes does not experience the statue in the same way that Barthes experiences his mother, as he merely maintains the living image of her from before the gap. His rejection of the deaths keeps him from assuming this new identity.

Although Hermione acts as a Winter Garden Photograph, the modification of her character does not occur universally; Leontes falls victim to the gap of time, because in exchange for Hermione's return to life, he becomes stagnant, unable to progress further. He seems to know he lacks crucial understanding of Hermione's return. He ends the play saying:

> Lead us from hence, where we may leisurely
> Each one demand and answer to his part
> Performed in this wide gap of time since first
> We were dissevered. Hastily lead away. (5.3.189-92)

He directs this at Paulina, which suggests that he desires to discover what he misses, given her importance in the resurrection.[18] In particular, he requests information about "his part" during the gap of time. However, whether he actually receives these answers is never resolved, as the play ends abruptly, as he instructs Paulina to "hastily lead away," almost as if instructing her to leave the prior events in the past. The play's final gap appears within these last lines, as the audience never learns whether or not Leontes uncovers the new identity of Hermione that he lacks in the last scene of the play. The gap of time continues to affect the audience as the ambiguity of Leontes's ending—whether or not he comes to term with the memory—is unresolved.

The gap of time thus serves both as a constructive and destructive interference in the final moments of *The Winter's Tale,* as Leontes desperately asks for answers but immediately instructs Paulina to "lead away" before they can be given. He ultimately fails to find the answers that he seeks. Unlike the speakers of the sonnets and Roland Barthes, who experience a sense of clarity from the preservation of their loved ones, Leontes's ambiguous reconciliation with Hermione reveals his inability to cope with the gap of time.

Notes

1. Henry L. Roediger, and Kathleen B. Mcdermott, "Creation of False Memories: Remembering Words Not Presented in Lists," *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 21.4 (1994): 803–14, https://doi.org/10.1037/e537272012-273.

2. "gap, n.1." *OED Online,* Oxford University Press. (Accessed 2 December 2018).

3. William Shakespeare, *The Winter's Tale,* ed. Barbara A. Mowat, and Paul Werstine (New York: Washington Square Press, 2005).

4. John S. Garrison, *Glass* (New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015), 42-46.

5. Roland Barthes, "The Winter Garden Photograph," in *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography,* trans. Richard Howard (New York: Hill & Wang, 1980), 67-70.

6. Barthes, "Winter Garden Photograph," 68.

7. Roland Barthes, "The Little Girl." in *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography, trans.* Richard Howard (New York: Hill & Wang, 1980), 71-73.

8. Peggy Phelan, "Francesca Woodman's Photography: Death and the Image One More Time," *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 27.4 (2002): 979-1004.

9. Barthes, "The Little Girl," 72.

10. Hester Lees-Jeffries, *Shakespeare and Memory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 182.

11. Joseph Roach, "'Unpath'd Waters, Undream'd Shores': Herbert Blau, Performing Doubles, and the Makeup of Memory in *The Winter's Tale,*" *Modern Language Quarterly* 70.1 (March 01, 2009): 117-31.

12. Walter S. H. Lim, "Knowledge and Belief in *The Winter's Tale,*" *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 41.2 (2001): 317-34.

13. For a more thorough discussion pertaining to the intersectionalities between Protestant and Catholic ideology in *The Winter's Tale,* see Walter S. H. Lim "Knowledge and Belief in *The Winter's Tale.*"

14. Lees-Jeffries, *Shakespeare and Memory,* 134.

15. Lees-Jeffries, *Shakespeare and Memory,* 134.

16. Jan Franz Van Dijkhuizen, *A Literary History of Reconciliation: Power, Remorse and the Limits of Forgiveness* (New Delhi: Bloomsbury, 2018), 62–70.

17. Barthes, "The Little Girl," 71.

18. Chloe Porter, *Making and Unmaking in Early Modern English Drama: Spectators, Aesthetics and Incompletion* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), 64-97.

UNDERGRADUATE PAPER

Adherence and Deviation: *Pericles*'s Slow Progress Toward Social Change

Megan Velez
Brigham Young University

"Opinion's but a fool that makes us scan / The outward habit for the inward man," Simonides says upon seeing Pericles's habit as he rides into the tourney at Pentapolis.[1] Yet *Pericles, Prince of Tyre* has often been judged by its strange outward style, almost un-Shakespearean in manner. Shakespeare's more famous masterpieces, including *Hamlet* and *King Lear,* enjoy liberal use of source material but evince no special care in adhering too closely to it. *Pericles,* however—though written in Shakespeare's maturity, after such great specimens of adaptation—makes a spectacle of borrowing, constantly directing audience attention to the external sources that predate and inspire it. The stylistic differences between acts of the play have led many scholars to regard this surprising faithfulness as a flaw influenced by the questionable collaboration of George Wilkins; however, the performative nature of adaptation becomes one of the text's greatest strengths, making evaluation of tradition and innovation one of its central themes. Thus, even as the text calls attention to the mythical world from which it is derived, *Pericles, Prince of Tyre* challenges audiences to reevaluate assumptions about their own world, especially regarding the distribution of prestige and power.

Pericles's close adherence to its sources demonstrates the problems inherent in blind application of any system. The

Journal of the Wooden O. Vol 20, 142-150
© Southern Utah University Press
ISSN: 1539-5758

recasting of a narrative—taken from Gower's *Confessio Amantis* and the later *Pattern of Painful Adventures*—as a work of drama without substantial transformation violates the expected form of the new genre. The inherited episodic nature of the narrative constantly disrupts the Aristotelian unities of time, place, and action. The first act alone transports audiences from Antioch to Tyre to Tharsus, and the entire play consists of snapshots spanning years, only loosely tied together by a narrator conjured from beyond the grave, whose style contrasts sharply with that of the other elements of the play. Thus, apparent unwillingness to change the inherited tradition leads to a jarring instantiation of the new medium in which it is presented. Such eccentricities in the play's form and style emphasize an anti-authoritarian strain running through it by demonstrating that one set of rules does not fit all circumstances, and a flawed code should be resisted rather than universally applied.

The play's unusually faithful adherence to source material also makes its rare departures from its parent texts more noticeable, particularly in the case of the titular character's name change from Appolinus to Pericles. Isaac Asimov attributes the new name to the influence of Sir Phillip Sidney's Pyrocles, insisting that "the Pericles of Shakespeare's play has nothing whatever to do with Pericles of Golden Age Athens."[2] However, such a contestation is difficult to prove, especially since the Athenian Pericles's inclusion in Plutarch's *Lives of the Noble Greeks,* which influences a large proportion of Shakespeare's plays, indicates that the Bard couldn't have been ignorant of the new name's possible implications. The connotation would have been as obvious to the classically aware among Jacobean audiences as to modern scholars. The primary consequence of invoking an Attic connection initially seems to be the evocation of a democratic atmosphere, but familiarity with Plutarch's account reveals that the historical Pericles's concessions to the lower classes were often motivated more by political exigence than by democratic conviction.[3] This complex background foregrounds issues of class and the tension between appearance and reality, themes which color almost every conflict in Shakespeare's *Pericles.*

The tension between tradition and adaptation emphasizes the bewildering pursuit of sifting fact from falsehood that drives

the forward momentum of the plot. *Pericles* is filled with facades and disguises, from Antiochus's riddle to Dionyza's "mourning" of Marina. Simonides asserts the folly of taking anything at face value, and this caution applies to the crafting of the play itself. The surface is a whimsical plot lifted from antiquity, but the substance can be read as a critique of Jacobean England, subtly suggested by seemingly insignificant details. Ambiguities throughout the play implicitly challenge the validity of generally accepted social conventions and institutions, echoing Plutarch's complaint that "So difficult a matter is it to trace and find out the truth of anything by history when, on the one hand, those who afterwards write it find long periods of time interrupting their view, and, on the other hand, the contemporary records of any actions and lives, partly through envy and ill-will, partly through favor and flattery, pervert and distort truth."[4] While written as part of his attempt to defend the historical Pericles's character from what he considered vicious slanders, this observation clearly casts doubt on Plutarch's own interpretation of events, interrupted and shaded by intervening years and his own biases. *Pericles, Prince of Tyre* invites audiences to embrace this sense of indeterminacy by treating official narratives with the skepticism due to any tale.

Much of the tension between tradition and adaptation is centered in Shakespeare's use of Gower as a chorus. *Pericles* has been categorized as "a collective instance of Recovered-Memory Therapy, but with a skeptical edge," due to Gower's clear remoteness even as he peddles the memory of medieval English identity as a panacea to contemporary problems.[5] Gower's strict iambic tetrameter casts him as alien and stilted in a world of flowing pentameter and a genre emphasizing action over narration. Scholars have noted the medieval obsession with *auctoritas,* which has been characterized as almost precluding the ability to do anything without regurgitating an extensive tradition of anecdotal or literary precedent in justification.[6] The poet that Shakespeare chose to resurrect is an extreme example of this tendency. Gower, here utilizing distinctly archaic meter and diction, "was himself famous for revitalizing old tales," reminding audiences that the play's borrowed narrative is older than even the version found in *Confessio Amantis*.[7] It is therefore all the more surprising when this ancient specter changes his tune, beginning to take on more modern color throughout the

play until he delivers his final epilogue in the loose pentameter common to Shakespeare's other characters and without any jarring, obsolete diction (5.4). "*Et bonum quo antiquius eo melius,*" the older the better, he says in Act One (1.0.10). But, by his epilogue, even he has conformed to contemporary form, signaling to audiences that the restorative properties he initially promised are found not in the past but in an innovative future.

Even without Gower's direct intervention, the play's archaisms are clear, but beneath them lies a throbbing heart of innovation. Its overused plot led to Ben Jonson's critical description of *Pericles* as "a mouldy tale."[8] However, the loosely connected nature of that plot, spanning leaps of years and leagues, allows for extreme experimentation in form, stretching the accepted limits of theatrical representation. Harold Bloom contests that Shakespeare may have chosen this source specifically for its revolutionary potential because he "had exhausted" the modes of "history, tragedy, and comedy."[9] In this sense, the play's use of tradition in its subject enables its violation of tradition in its form, emphasizing the theme of improvement and achievement though subverting past standards. It is in a similar vein that Pericles invokes the image of the Trojan Horse upon his first arrival at Tharsus only to juxtapose its violent cargo "with corn to make your needy bread," emphasizing the salvation he offers the famished city by contrasting it with the historical destruction of Troy (1.4.94). Here the protagonist, like his play, invokes precedent only to glorify its subversion.

Much of the innovation Pericles seems to advocate is entwined with a shift in power dynamics, one example being Marina's struggle for power after being snatched away and sold in Mytilene. The threat of prostitution is not only a personal test for Marina, playing on her spiritual and emotional fears, but a significant part of a wider critique. The brothel represents commercial exchange in general and, particularly, the commodification of human flesh.[10] Thus, when Marina is threatened with loss of maidenhead and the more senior prostitutes are treated as "baggage," their objectification is more economic than sexual (4.2.20). It is ironic, then, that Marina generates more income as a governess than she would have as a prostitute, partially because she does not need frequent replacements due to illness (5.0.10-1). This unprecedented success radically challenges the oldest business in the world, suggesting

again that the oldest practices may not be the best. In this way, Marina not only keeps herself unstained and worthy of a comic ending, according to conventional sensibilities of the time, but strikes a blow for the entire base of production attempting to resist systemic objectification.

The lower classes continue to speak out against official narratives through the fishermen, who expose the working-class reality beneath the egalitarian ideology espoused in Pentapolis. Instead of a king providing for his people, we see the commonest of men preserving Pericles's life and providing him with the armor he needs to improve it by employing a skill that would probably have been considered vulgar and unnecessary for a royal. Meanwhile, they complain about the rich in tones that "may echo the language of the 1607 Midlands Uprising against landlord enclosures of the common lands."[11] When Pericles engages in the tourney, Simonides suggests a progressive view of class judgment, indicating that, despite his poor attire, it is not unreasonable for Pericles to hope that "by [Thaisa] his fortunes yet may flourish" (2.2.45); however, he fails to acknowledge that neither this nor any avenue to greater social standing or economic stability appears open to men who, like the fishermen, have neither the training to fight in a formal tournament (though that lack of expertise almost certainly wouldn't have exempted them from conscription) nor the means to purchase armor. The king's nominal ideology promotes merit-based judgment, while social conditions prevent the majority of laborers from developing the established forms of merit. The fishermen provide the means for Pericles's rise without any hope for similar improvement in their own lives, demonstrating this usually shrouded injustice. Despite Pericles's promise to reward them, they are prominently absent from the rest of the play and apparently far from the prospering hero's thoughts.[12] Thus, the fishermen represent a wide segment of society that exists only as a means of production whereby members of a higher class can excel. Pentapolis's unreachable ideals and Pericles's broken promise echo the position of many audience members, then and now, calling for a critical reexamination of hegemonic ideologies and recognition of the exploitation they perpetuate.

While Pericles prospers by the help of commoners in Pentapolis, his own citizens seem to do quite well during his

absence from Tyre. While the lords there seem to uphold the authoritarian narrative that "kingdoms without a head . . . Soon fall to ruin," the idea of a divinely appointed ruler is subverted by the ultimate equanimity with which Tyre endures the loss of its prince (2.4.36-7). Even the concerned nobles immediately invoke the protocol of "free election," implying that the state is dependent not on Pericles for its prosperity but on the accepted mechanisms by which the people order their own governance (2.4.34). When Pericles does finally return, he is "Welcomed and settled to his own desire," and that is all the play has to say about it before Gower rushes on to spend nearly fifty lines recounting Marina's upbringing in Tharsus (4.0.1-2). There is no chaos for the returning ruler to resolve, and his welcome is no matter of great moment or fanfare. At least, it includes nothing significant enough to stage or even note in passing. Tyre's considerable independence from its ruler, like Pericles's notable dependence on the fishermen in Pentapolis, challenges narratives of divine right by demonstrating that, rather than a king facilitating prosperity for his people, royalty and nobility are supported only by the effort of the lower levels of society. Combined with the Athenian allusions—especially the noted reference to "free election"—this suggests that society should reshape itself in recognition of the fact that true power lies in the base of production.

The most violent shift of power in the play is perhaps also its most notable deviation from earlier source material. In *Confessio Amantis,* Gower is careful to include the council of war that Appolinus holds after his daughter's marriage. After this preparation, the Prince of Tyre sails personally to Tarsus, "And strong pouer with him he [takes]."[13] There, he oversees the "execucion" of his revenge on Dionise and those involved in her plots.[14] Shakespeare's version of the scene, however, includes no mention of Pericles. After his reconciliation with his wife, Pericles never again mentions Cleon or Dionyza and, instead of amassing an army and sailing to Tharsus, he lives out the remainder of his days quietly in Pentapolis. Meanwhile, "For wicked Cleon and his wife, when fame / Had spread his curséd deed to the honored name / Of Pericles, to rage the city turn, / That him and his they in his palace burn" (5.4.11-4). The last speech in the play leaves audiences with an image of justice being exacted not by royal prerogative but by

a mob of commoners, who the play clearly supports in destroying their leaders. The incident is indemnified against censorship or accusations of sedition not only by its descent from an old, respected narrative but by the assertion that the people's actions are both in a ruler's "honored name" and sanctioned by the even higher authority of the gods (5.4.15-6). However, the scene still stands as a clear vindication of the violent uprising of lower classes against corrupt leadership.

Of course, Pericles's personal representation of stagnation and progress demonstrates that violence is not the only–or even, necessarily, the most effective–way to advance. The catatonia into which Pericles has sunk by the opening of Act Five serves as a vivid analog for tradition. Just as Pericles refuses to answer anyone for three months, traditional aristocrats ignore the murmurings of "vulgar" crowds demanding redress for unfair labor, taxation, and conscription policies, among other grievances. Just as Pericles has not "taken sustenance / But to prorogue his grief," such societies accept no ideological sustenance except that which reinforces the old stratifications (5.1.21-2). And, just as Pericles violently pushes Marina away when he first perceives her trying to speak to him, privileged classes strike out with force when common voices rise enough to threaten the ideologies which perpetuate power imbalances (5.1.74). Significantly, the role of rousing Pericles from his stagnant slumber falls not to a lord but to Marina. Casting a woman as the catalyst for recovery and progression suggests empowerment for the traditionally voiceless. Additionally, Pericles's response to Marina's words makes discourse the instrument of awakening. This not only encourages the voiceless in society to seize the right to speak but also subtly recalls the art of playwriting as a form of political speech. The play can offer revolutionary ideas because the theatre is a place where those silenced by convention are heard.

Despite his membership in the privileged classes that audiences are encouraged to question, Pericles himself participates in the sort of interrogation his play advocates. When he begins to recognize Marina as his daughter, he checks his credulity multiple times, often interrupting the girl's narrative to ask for further proof. Early in their conversation, he promises, "I will believe you by the syllable / Of what you shall deliver," yet immediately tests her

by asking more questions (5.1.158-9). Once she has answered these questions, resolving all doubts, Pericles loudly announces his joy, sharing with Helicanus his certainty that he has found his daughter, before suddenly pausing to present one final test. "What was thy mother's name?" he asks Marina, "For truth can never be confirmed enough, / Though doubts did ever sleep" (5.1.190-2). No matter how well the girl's previous responses have satisfied him of her identity, Pericles sees nothing but advantage in continually seeking greater confirmation of reality. In this scene, his pattern of accepting new information demonstrates a healthy skepticism. He does not blindly cling to his belief that Marina is dead, discounting the evidence before his eyes. Nor does he quickly accept a stranger's claims without substantial proof. Similarly, societies fester in corruption when ideologies are blindly accepted and never challenged. However, if proposed advancements are accepted for the sake of change without careful consideration, they may (in grand Orwellian fashion) prove just as detrimental as the systems they replace. Thus, the only way to improve a society is to constantly reevaluate the narratives that codify it.

Pericles, Prince of Tyre, despite some superficial flaws, shows an astonishing awareness of craft. A carefully woven adaptation of earlier narratives, it emphasizes the similar care taken in crafting official reports and ideologies. Additionally, it provides an unambiguous critique of societies' selective silencing of voices. The English class system was based almost entirely on ancient traditions, and outdated ideologies of honor and chivalry perpetuated the aristocratic primogeniture that kept power in the hands of a few familiar names. Moreover, James I, King of England when Shakespeare wrote *Pericles, Prince of Tyre,* was an intense advocate of divine right, arguing that some narratives–those originating from and supporting him–were unquestionable. The play explicitly presents Pericles as a paragon of monarchical virtue, but subtleties of choice and circumstance implicitly demonstrate that no one is above doubt. Even the "Moral Gower," perhaps the most traditional figure Shakespeare could have invoked, serves to highlight the necessity to reexamine assumptions, let go of the past, and adopt new conventions to meet the future.

Notes

1. William Shakespeare, *Pericles, Prince of Tyre,* ed. Stephen Greenblatt (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2016), 2.2.254-55.
2. Isaac Asimov, *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*, in *Asimov's Guide to Shakespeare,* vol. 1 (Garden City: Doubleday & Co., 1970), 186.
3. Plutarch, "Pericles," in *Lives of the Noble Greeks,* ed. Edmund Fuller (Garden City: International Collectors Library, 1959), 127.
4. Plutarch, *Lives,* 138.
5. Jonathan Baldo, "Recovering Medieval Memory in Shakespeare's *Pericles*," *South Atlantic Review* 82.2 (2016): 171.
6. Baldo, "Recovering," 177.
7. Baldo, "Recovering," 171.
8. Harold Bloom, *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human* (New York: Riverhead, 1998), 603.
9. Bloom, *Shakespeare,* 604.
10. Rui Carvalho Homem, "Offshore Desires: Mobility, Liquidity and History in Shakespeare's Mediterranean," *Critical Survey* 30.3 (2018): 48-50.
11. Walter Cohen, "Pericles," in *The Norton Shakespeare,* 3rd edition (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2016), 2869.
12. Cohen, "Pericles," 2870.
13. John Gower, *Confessio Amantis or Tales of the Seven Deadly Sins* (2008), 1920-1927, Project Gutenberg eBook. References are to line.
14. Gower, *Confessio,* 1952.