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

Subscription rates are $15.00 per year for individuals and libraries. Subscribers outside the United States should add $7.00 for postage and handling. Subscriptions and correspondence should be sent to: Southern Utah University Press, 351 West Center Street, Cedar City, UT 84720, or by e-mail to press@suu.edu.

JOURNAL OF SHAKESPEARE SYMPOSIUM

Volume 4

Published by the
Southern Utah University Press

in cooperation with the
Gerald R. Sherratt Library and the
Utah Shakespearean 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. Scholars from many disciplines present papers that offer insights into the era of William Shakespeare.

The symposium is conducted the first week of August in Cedar City, Utah, and coincides with the Utah Shakespearean Festival's summer season. Three plays from Shakespeare's canon are performed each summer in the Adams Memorial Shakespearean Theatre, a unique performance space modeled after the Globe Theatre, Shakespeare's own "Wooden O."

Table of Contents

The Taming of the Shrew and the New Historicism

William Babula
Sonoma State University

Most commentators on William Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew* begin with Kate's concluding speech of submission to Petruchio in Act 5. The modern response to her apparently self-extinguishing speech has been the establishment of the ameliorative tradition of *Shrew* production and critical interpretation, sometimes referred to as the "revisionist" position. Along these lines, many directors feel that they can make the final speech more palatable by a variety of ironical devices such as an obvious wink by Kate to the audience, or Kate's overhearing her husband's wager as in the 2000 Ashland production so her submissive speech is just good business sense to collect the bet, or Kate's running off from Petruchio to continue the chase after her speech as played by Taylor and Burton in the 1966 Zeffirelli film. But numerous critics argue that this ameliorative approach is not a modern distortion of early modern sexual politics but that Shakespeare himself has ameliorated not only Kate's concluding speech, but the entire play by a variety of distancing devices based on a conscious theatricality. The most obvious example of which is the two part Christopher Sly Induction.

The Induction, which creates a play-within-a-play structure, which reminds us "that we are watching a play and not reality,"[1] functions in several ways to undercut an unambiguous interpretation of Kate's final speech. Harold Goddard, an early "revisionist," saw the play and Kate's speech as ironical and inconsistent with Shakespeare's treatment of other heroines—which may explain why it is the only play that Shakespeare created as a play-within-a-play. According to Goddard, "The play ends with the prospect that Kate is going to be more nearly the tamer than the tamed, Petruchio more nearly the tamed than the tamer, though his wife naturally will keep the true situation under cover."[2] Goddard also stressed the point that the play is an interlude put on by strolling players, which brings "its main plot to the edge of

farce." This movement to farce, which functions as another distancing device, also allows *The Taming of the Shrew* to be turned on its head as Bianca is revealed as the true shrew at the end of the play when she chides her husband as a fool for betting on her duty.[3] Howard Bloom makes a similar point but he dismisses the Induction, with the unwarranted claim that it could have fit any number of Shakespeare's plays.[4]

Tori Haring-Smith in her book on the stage history of *The Taming of the Shrew* writes of the troupe putting on the play for Sly: "It can distance the play by allowing the audience to see the actor behind each character; the characters become imaginary constructs. This technique is as artificial as *commedia*. . . "[5] Dorothea Kehler finds in her essay "Echoes of the Induction in *The Taming of the Shrew*," a subversive, feminist subtext.[6] In all of these cases, from Goddard to the present, the ambiguity, the dialectic, is generated for the most part by Shakespeare's use of the play-within-a-play structure that creates a conscious theatricality, which distances the action from the audience.

But a new historical approach presents a compelling contrasting view that returns to an older misogynistic interpretation before the so-called "revisionists" like Goddard emphasized the ameliorative approach. Lynda Boose points out the historical context of the submission scene where Kate offers to put her hand beneath her husband's foot in her article, "Scolding Brides and Bridling Scolds: Taming the Woman's Unruly Member."[7] According to Boose, "What transpires onstage turns out to be a virtual representation of the ceremony that women were required to perform in most pre-Reformation marriage services throughout Europe. In England this performance was in force as early as the mid-fifteenth century and perhaps earlier."[8]

She goes on to describe the Sarum (Salisbury) Manual in which the bride "prostrates herself at the feet of the bridegroom." In another manuscript of the Sarum Rite the bride is directed 'to kiss the right foot' of her spouse. Given this historization, Boose argues that the ameliorative tradition "serves the very ideologies about gender that it makes less visible by making less offensive. To tamper with the literalness of Kate's physical submission onstage deflects attention away from an equally literal history. . ."[9] For her, Kate's submission reenacts the Sarum rite of literal female prostration.

Can there be a reconciliation of historical fact and dramatic effect? The answer may lie in the old joke of the Induction and the new shrew joke at the conclusion of the play under the larger concept of conscious theatricality.

The action at the conclusion, which Boose sees as the dramatic equivalent of the historical demeaning ring ceremony, is, as she points out, a recreation of a ceremony no longer allowed in Reformation England. She writes, "For the wedding ceremony that Shakespeare's text alludes to, while almost certainly recognizable to an audience of the 1590s, was itself an anachronistic form outlawed by the Act of Uniformity over forty years earlier."[10] Her interpretation of this embedded ceremony is that Shakespeare recreates the ceremony of male dominance into a vision of a golden-age lament for a world gone by.

On the other hand if the ceremony is put in the context of the Induction which presents an unreal world from which we are distanced through the device of an elaborate play-within-a play joke, and one which disappears, the outdated and outlawed ceremony recreated in the play may also reflect that unreality and distance. For this ceremony of submission had in fact disappeared as well from ritual forms in post-Reformation England. Just as the phrase "to obey" has disappeared from the wife's vows in contemporary wedding ceremonies and for much the same reason. The old joke turns into a newer and much more complicated one, tied to the Induction. For all of the strength of her historical argument, Boose never deals with the effect of the Induction and its creation of a play-within-a-play structure, which separates it from the vicious and cruel history of the treatment of women she goes on to explore in great and effective detail, tracing the history of such devices as cucking stools and scold's bridles, both gender specific punishments for "unruly" women who chose to exercise their sexuality or their tongues without a male in control. [11]

Returning to the play-within-a-play structure, we are made very aware that the performance that the players will put on is not real. It is a play put on for a foolish tinker who himself has been at war with women. Thus Shakespeare may not simply be evoking a Golden Age of female obedience and submission to male domination but questioning the reality of that Golden Age of gender roles.

A review of the connection between the Induction and the play put on by the strolling actors is instructive. The Induction jest goes back to "The Sleeper Awakened" in *The Arabian Nights* and to old ballads like "The Frolicksome Duke, or The Tinker's Good Fortune."[12] The main plot derives from numerous folk tales, ballads, and literature, which tell of men taming their shrewish wives, including Chaucers' Marriage Group in *Canterbury Tales* and the Tale of Tom Tyler in "A Merry Jest of a Shrewd and Curst Wife Lapped in Morel's Skin."

The main point of connection is the jest concept. In both the Induction and the Kate/Petruchio plot similar jokes are played on deceived characters. An examination of the Induction will show how in fact Shakespeare has very carefully connected the plots and the two jests.

First Sly in Induction 1 is introduced as a braggart, a role that is not unlike Petruchio's. In fact a good case can be made for doubling of the roles, another reason for the disappearance of Sly. The Lord and Huntsmen then enter and argue over the virtues of three hounds—a comic and not very flattering parallel to the closing act of the play with its argument over the virtues of the three new brides. Then the Lord spies Sly and decides to pull the "Sleeper Awakened" jest to convince Sly he is a lord who has been asleep and dreaming he was a tinker these past fifteen years. In the next movement the traveling players appear and the lord gets them to promise to put on a play for Sly. As part of the jest a page is to dress as Sly's lady and the Induction 1 ends with the lord's orders on how the disguised page is to act and speak.

In Induction 2 the main thrust is upon the metamorphosis of Sly. The images described in the paintings all fit this theme of metamorphosis from Adonis to Io to Daphne. These mythological transformations are all sexually related and when applied to Sly they take on an aura of absurdity. And if Sly's metamorphosis is ironic, a similar argument can be made of Kate's. And Petruchio's transformation cannot be ignored in this context. He too is changed.

While there are numerous parallels in the Induction to the Kate/Petruchio plot, the main point of comparison is the comic submission of the page to the tinker which parallels the submission of Kate to Petruchio. The Lord orders his servant to dress the male page as Sly's wife and to give the page these instructions on how to behave and what to say:

> He bear himself with honorable action
> Such as he hath observed in noble ladies
> Unto their lords, by them accomplished.
> Such duty to the drunken let him do
> With soft low tongue and lowly courtesy.
> And say, "What is't your honor will command,
> Wherein your lady and your humble wife
> May show her duty and make known her love?
> (Induction 1, 109-116)[13]

By the same token we have Kate in Act 5 who has learned how to behave and what to say after her experience in Act 4 with the confusion between the sun and moon and the old man and the

budding virgin. Like the Page, she plays the subservient lady, agreeing to accept her husband's version of reality, to a somewhat intoxicated lord Petruchio. Note how the phrase "Such duty" from the Induction reappears in Kate's concluding speech:

> Such duty as the subject owes the prince,
> Even such a woman oweth to her husband . . . (5.2, 159-160)

It is not hard to imagine the body of Kate's speech to be exactly what the lord in the Induction advised:

> What is't your honor will command,
> Wherein your lady and your humble wife
> May show her duty and make known her love?
> (Induction 1, 114-116)

Kate's way of showing her duty is:

> And place my hand under my husband's foot. (5.2, 181)

As she concludes her speech, the parallel situations are a caution to the audience not to take Kate's speech any more seriously than the disguised page's or Kate's transformation anymore seriously than Sly's. As Margie Burns has argued, Kate has become sly as an adjective rather than Sly as a capitalized character. And it is appropriate that Sly and the old Induction jest disappear as the new jest and the new "Sly" replace it.[14]

When placed in the context of the Induction, the ameliorative tradition of *The Taming of the Shrew* is not a later modern imposition but an outgrowth from Shakespeare's own early modern ambiguous material and intentions. If it reflects a historical reality, it challenges at the same time that reality.

As Boose writes, women who were forced to participate in this ceremony found ways to resist this feminine shame. She quotes an Anglican church historian's transcription of how women in France came to restage this ceremony: they would "accidentally" drop the ring during the demeaning ritual so their stooping had a justification unrelated to the symbolic submission and the appearance of worship paid to the husband would be got rid of.[15]

But Boose gets this example from eighteenth century France and an earlier example of a bride knocking her head against her husband's shoe from a Russian wedding. She admits she has no surviving commentaries from English sixteenth-century women and is trying to recover a woman's likely reaction from these foreign and later examples. And as she noted the English ceremony was itself an anachronistic form outlawed by the Act of Uniformity over forty years earlier. [16]

Ultimately the historical and the dramatic can be reconciled by the very fact of the anachronistic nature of the ceremony which is played before an audience informed through the Induction and its numerous ironic parallels to the main action that this is not reality but a play-within-a–play device Shakespeare has employed to distance himself and the audience from the very sort of historic degrading ring ceremony that Boose deplores.

Even a quick review of Shakespeare's most likely source, "A Merry Jest of a Shrewd and Curst Wife Lapped in Morel's Skin, for her Good Behaviour" (printed c. 1550) points out the difference of Shakespeare's intent. In the ballad the husband beats his shrewish wife bloody then wraps her in the salted skin of a dead old horse named Morel. This wife has a gentle sister like Bianca who is her father's favorite. The father also warns the suitor of his daughter's shrewishness but the suitor goes ahead and tames her with the Morel skin and salt treatment. The ballad concludes with a celebration of the taming and these closing lines:

> He that can charm a shrewd wife
> Better than thus,
> Let him come to me, and fetch ten pound
> And a golden purse. (115-118)[17]

Petruchio's lines, spoken much earlier in the play at the end of Act 4 scene 1, echo the concluding lines of the ballad:

> He that knows better how to tame a shrew,
> Now let him speak; 'tis charity to show. (4.1, 198-199)

The lines come early because the focus has shifted. Kate will make her transition in Act 4 when she acquiesces to her husband's demands and accepts the sun as the moon and the old man as a young budding virgin. She learns how to play the game. At the same time these lines remind us of the conscious theatricality that started with Sly and the Induction. Petruchio is speaking directly to the audience in his appeal for assistance.

Petruchio's last lines to Kate after her ironical speech of submission suggest a very different ending from the "Morel" ballad. Unlike "Morel" where the ending coincides with the taming, Kate has had time to regroup. And she chooses an outlawed form of submission that an astute Petruchio may recognize and wonder if she is putting him on, but if he does, he doesn't care. He says:

> Why, there's a wench! Come on, and kiss me Kate. (5.2, 184)

And finally:

> Come, Kate, we'll to bed. (5.2, 188)

We have both an affirmation of affection and the triumph of the now sly Kate.[18] We are not presented with the brutal male triumph as we are in the "Morel" ballad. In fact, the last lines about shrews are spoken by Hortensio and Lucentio who will be dealing with their own newly shrewish wives. Hortensio says after Kate and Petruchio exit.

> Now, go thy ways, thou hast tamed a curst shrew. (5.2, 192)

And Lucentio concludes:

> 'Tis a wonder, by your leave, she will be tamed so. (5.2, 193)

The shift is significant. Petruchio is not left on stage to brag about the taming as the last lines of the "Morel" ballad do. Like the outlawed ceremony, Shakespeare is suggesting that Petruchio is past his time as well. If anyone is in ascendancy it is perhaps the "sly" Kate who has learned how to tame a male. The anachronistic ceremony is not a longing for a golden age but a recognition at least for Shakespeare that male/female relations are changing. As added proof consider the heroines to come in his plays including the wonderfully articulate Beatrice and the determined Rosaline. In the end, the new jest of a Kate transformed from shrew to sly replaces both the old jest of the Induction and the anachronistic ceremony of submission.[19]

Through his use of distancing, the play-within-a-play, farce, and the anachronistic ceremony Shakespeare has created a character who runs counter to the images of the shrew created in the culture of the time. As Margie Burns comments, "At the beginning of the play, Sly disappears, to be replaced by Katherina the shrew; at the end of the play, Katherina the shrew disappears, to be replaced by someone evidently rather . . . sly."[20] While reminding us of Goddard's interpretation, this transformation also provides an explanation for the disappearance of Sly and the Induction cast. Burns argues, however, while Kate is now sly enough to fool her husband and the result is an ambiguous ending, it is not one in which Kate is a sneak and her husband a dupe. Rather irony and earnestness are related to each other, not merely antitheses.[21] Thus while Kate's final speech may be sly and ironical, or as Holly Crocker asks, "Real or ruse, that's the frightening question,"[22] it also is a speech of reconciliation. And while Petruchio may be half-fooled and half-aware of the irony, like the metamorphoses depicted in the Induction, Kate has changed to loving and clever wife. And ultimately so has Petruchio, from fortune hunter to husband and lover. Ultimately both the devices of the play and the anachronistic

historical context validate the ameliorative approach as Shakespearean.

Notes

1. Norman Rabkin, Shakespeare and the Common Understanding (New York: Macmillan,1967) p.200. For a full discussion of conscious theatricality see Chapter 5, "The Great Globe Itself", pp.192-238.

2. Harold Goddard, The Meaning if Shakespeare, Vol.1 (Chicago and London: Chicago University Press, 1951) p. 68.

3. Goddard, pp.68-69.

4. Harold Bloom, Shakespeare and the Invention of the Human (New York: Riverhead Books, 1998) p. 28.

5. Tori Haring-Smith, From Farce to Metadrama, A Stage History of *The Taming of the Shrew*, 1594-1983 (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1985) p.166.

6. Dorothea Kehler, "Echoes of the Induction in The Taming of the Shrew," Renaissance Papers, (1986), 31-42.

7. Lynda Boose, "Scolding Brides and Bridling Scolds: Taming the Woman's Unruly Member," SQ, 42 (1991), 182.

8. Boose, 182.

9. Boose, 182.

10. Boose, 184.

11. Boose, 186.

12. Haring-Smith, From Farce to Metadrama, endnote 4, p.212.

13. All citations are to The Taming of the Shrew, ed. David Bevington, (New York: Bantam, 1988).

14. Margie Burns, "The Ending of the Shrew," Shakespeare Studies, 18, (1986), 41. Burns presents a comprehensive analysis of the connections between the Induction and the main plot and argues that the play is complete as is and the concept of a missing Sly ending is beside the point.

15. Boose, 183.

16. Boose, 184.

17. "A Merry Jest," in "Shakespeare's Sources" in The Taming of the Shrew, ed. David Bevington, (New York: Bantam, 1988) p. 127.

18. Burns, 60.

19. Burns, 60.

20. Burns, 54.

21. Burns, endnote 10, 62.

22. Holly A. Crocker, "Affective Resistance: Performing Passivity and Playing A-Part in the Taming of the Shrew," SQ, 54 (2003), 158. Crocker employs the Lacanian principle as it relates to gender identity. The full quotation reads: "Real or ruse, that's the frightening question; and Katherine's bearing suggests that the active/passive binary meant to represent gender difference is really only a ruse."

Male Pattern Boldness: Zeffirelli's Feminist Adaptation of *The Taming of the Shrew*

William Brugger
Brigham Young University–Idaho

In the history of the world, feminism got off to a relatively late start. Notions of female inferiority were held from ancient Israel to ancient Greece, from the early Christian era right up to today, which some refer to as the post-Christian era. Most scholars agree that 20th-century feminism, although preceded by two hundred years of women's rights struggles, did not emerge until after World War II,[1] and date literary feminism's dawning at the late 1960s.[2]

The late 1960s also saw the release of Franco Zeffirelli's adaptation of *The Taming of the Shrew*, a production which, despite some shortcomings, represented a landmark achievement in the filming of a Shakespeare play. Prominent film critic Leonard Maltin, for example, proclaimed, "Zeffirelli has succeeded in making a film instead of a photographed stage play."[3] Other reviewers complimented the film's elaborate costuming and authentic settings. Gareth and Barbara Evans, for example, took delight in the film's "opulent sense of Renaissance Italy."[4]

In addition to these achievements, which eventually became Zeffirellian trademarks, *Shrew* broke ground in another way: its uniquely feminist take on Shakespeare's tale. In 1967, the film's advertising tagline read: "In the war between the sexes, there always comes a time for unconditional surrender." But surrender for whom? Cleverly, by intentionally fostering such ambiguity, the film's promoters peaked audience curiosity before *Shrew's* release. More importantly, the tagline hinted at a new interpretation by encouraging viewers to suspend any preconceptions or predeterminations concerning the identities of victor and victim.

Audiences already familiar with Shakespeare's play, those adhering to—or expecting—a traditional interpretation, would have anticipated Kate's eventual, humble surrender to a proud Petruchio. But, as viewers quickly realized, Zeffirelli's version effectively

promotes the contrary: Kate's conquering a duped Petruchio. Many scenes Zeffirelli added in order to make the successful transition from play to film progressively endow Kate with sufficient marital power so that, by film's end, the roles of "tamer" and "tamed" are, if not completely and permanently reversed, at least interchangeable.

Audiences not quite ready to admit Petruchio's defeat, or those unsure about feminism's foray into the Shakespeare scene, could console themselves with a mutual taming. Such hesitancy to embrace Zeffirelli's new approach was a natural response: feminist reinterpretations, according to Renaissance researcher Philip Kolin, allow Shakespeare's women to be "rightfully seen as more complex, more central, and sometimes even subversive"[5]—thereby souring some tastes. In addition, while feminism was off to a strong socio-political start by 1967, it had not made much headway into literature, let alone Shakespeare studies. Kolin notes that feminism did not stake a claim in Shakespeare territory until nearly a decade later: "[I]t is only since the mid-1970s that feminism as both theory and praxis has focused on Shakespeare."[6] Even so, it would take nearly another decade for feminism to establish a permanent residence. In the fifteen or so years since, feminists have successfully "challenged and problematized many male-centered critical approaches to Shakespeare's plays . . . his women characters, and . . . male/female identities in the plays."[7]

From the film's first frames, Zeffirelli reveals a concern for the portrayal of women: *Shrew* opens by depicting one woman in a demeaning role, another in a stereotypical one. The former, a plump strumpet, hangs out her window. Her blond hair contrasts sharply with the Italian citizenry's darker coloring, and she sports what seem to be eight- or nine-inch heels. As a complete package, she stands apart—in all dimensions and aspects—and is the personification of artificiality. Literally, she possesses too much of what some carnal men apparently desire. Moreover, she is a hideously grotesque monster-figure (explaining Tranio's trauma and hasty retreat).

By placing her so early in the film, Zeffirelli's first female may be viewed as a kind of paradoxically repellant hostess, "welcoming" repulsed audiences (as she welcomes Tranio) into a perverse patriarchal society that apparently supports her livelihood—the same society in which Kate lives. Shakespearean scholar and film critic Russell Jackson observes that these initial scenes create a "convincingly detailed social picture of a world of sexual and social success."[8] She may even serve as a forerunner to Kate, as both

women live in isolation and are acknowledged only when they make some sort of concerted effort. Both are left to watch "real" life operate below their living quarters. In various ways and at various times, men label, purchase, use, and reject them —and force them to project an external persona inconsistent with their inner selves.

In contrast, Bianca ("white") is openly pursued by men in the daytime. She, too, stands apart, but does so by virtue of her beauty, virginity, marriageability, status, manners, wealth, and finery; in short, every quality the "slattern" lacks. What she reveals, Bianca conceals. Even so, it could be argued that Bianca does prostitute herself somewhat, as she giggles and spins through Padua's streets. It may not be coincidental that Zeffirelli places her at the center of town, at the marketplace, where goods are displayed and transactions made. Bianca has no business to conduct there, except to display herself as an eligible bachelorette. Strange men like what they see, and begin to serenade her—a form of solicitation—as another pursuer, behind Bianca, playfully lifts her veil without her consent—a clear affront to her modesty, as evidenced by her gasp. It is at this precise moment of "exposure" that Lucentio sees her and is love-struck.

Sadly, Kate is not so fortunate. In contrast to Bianca's romp, audiences first find Kate shut in an upper-level room, by her own will, observing her younger sister's return with suitors in tow. This scene is extremely telling: Kate is inside looking out, a damsel in a different kind of distress. Closed shutters allow no one to see in, allowing Kate to control perception. These shutters, arguably, have psychologically symbolic value, effectively representing Kate's emotional defenses. Within minutes of Bianca's return, Kate violently reminds Bianca—along with her entourage and Baptista's entire household—of everyone's constant discrimination and favoritism.

On the morning of Kate's "bad heir day," Petruchio arrives to claim her. Tellingly, Kate is the commanding presence as the two meet. As Petruchio witnesses the siblings' catfight, Zeffirelli portrays Petruchio as startled by Kate's viciousness. Wisely, Petruchio chooses to initially remain concealed, sizing up his opponent while assessing his own readiness and determination, before withdrawing for additional preparation. Tellingly, as Petruchio attempts to catch Kate off-guard, she does not even flinch; instead, she treats him in the same manner he treated Hortensio's servants earlier: with utter contempt for having intruded, sans snarl. Within seconds, she deceptively outwits him by pointing beyond him, pretending to address her father. When

Petruchio's back is turned, she makes a quick exit, giggling delightedly once safely out of reach—exhibiting the same kind of giddiness Bianca did as she was "escaping" men earlier. Kate finds as much pleasure in evading men as Bianca does attracting them.

In effect, Kate bests Petruchio first psychologically, then physically. By sheer luck, he happens to see her scurrying to another section of the estate. Once spotted, she attempts numerous evasive maneuvers as he approaches (placing heavy grain sacks over a trap door, pulling up a rope ladder, throwing barrels down a staircase, breaking a handrail, even physically throwing him off of her). Such duping and ducking will continue, right up to the film's end, with a puzzled Petruchio often lagging behind. Zeffirelli's Kate is a quick thinker—and a real action figure. The only way Petruchio has of controlling Kate, therefore, is to somehow physically overpower her: by wearing her out, twisting her arm, locking her up, or carrying her over his shoulder. In fairness, and true to Shakespeare's play, Kate is never in any serious physical danger while in Petruchio's company, a man whose bark is worse than his bite. As one reviewer observed, "Zeffirelli's *Shrew* avoided the direct violence usually included in 2.1 by turning the scene into a series of chases. There is in [Jack] Jorgens' words, 'harmless violence and festive destruction.' "[9] Petruchio's tendency to problem-solve physically becomes discernable to Kate quickly. Her learning to anticipate and evaluate his "hostility" is half her battle; the other half is learning how to subtly diffuse it and get on with the business of satisfying her own needs and wants.

Until she learns this, she still physically defends herself as best she can: running and climbing until exhausted, pounding on locked doors and tugging on their handles, struggling to release herself from his grip—and even striking him. During many of these battles, Zeffirelli's Petruchio is winded, sweaty, and sore, yet masks such effects when in Kate's presence. Were he not physically larger and stronger, Zeffirelli seems to suggest, Kate would have sent Petruchio packing shortly after his arrival. Certainly she has already rendered other men impotent, an observation Gremio makes early in the play ("she's too rough for me" [I.i.55]). Such men include her own father, whose authority Kate mocks every chance she gets.

At Petruchio's departure, Zeffirelli has him lock Kate in an upper room. Viewers may wonder why Zeffirelli has her sequestered; after all, Petruchio has already subdued her, he does not need her consent to marry, and he is actually leaving. On one level, Petruchio effectively puts Kate in storage, like a toy he has

finished playing with and will pull out when he returns. (Significantly, it is the very room from which Kate emerges on her wedding day less than a week later). On another level, Kate's "incarceration" symbolizes other forms of her imprisonment: societal, legal, patriarchal, even emotional. Even though Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar would not publish literary images of the "madwoman in the attic" until 1979, Zeffirelli's scene constitutes another contribution to the now-famous motif. At the very least, viewers are given a better view of Kate's terrible situation, sensing her helplessness, alienation, and frustration as they recall, perhaps, what it was like, as children, to be locked in a room as punishment.

A credit to trapped women everywhere, Zeffirelli's Kate refuses to do nothing. Sliding a table toward the door, she climbs on top of it and peers out a small window, watching Petruchio descend the staircase, hearing him confirm arrangements for the couple's wedding. Outraged yet still confined, Kate then does the only thing she can: she thinks. More accurately, she schemes. Zeffirelli's sensitive camera then captures Kate doing something she will do several times throughout the film: smiling, somewhat wickedly, somewhat hopefully, yet clearly indicating that she has discovered a way to get revenge on her aggressor. Though she actually says nothing, her smile hints at a method to her madness.

This scene, though brief, is a critical juncture in Zeffirelli's (modified) plot structure: Kate must determine how to confront a very serious challenge. Her decision seems an inversion, not surprisingly, of a Renaissance proverb: "Men act and women talk."[10] Intentionally or not, Shakespeare plays with this notion in *Shrew* as, generally speaking, Petruchio talks and Kate acts. Specifically, while he merrily explains his intentions in audience asides at regular intervals, she schemes silently. This dramatic detail Zeffirelli apparently discerned from the play and effectively employs in the film, so that Kate's every physical setback—from being locked in the room to being literally carted off on her "honeymoon"—is immediately followed by a psychological comeback, evidenced by only a devious smile prior to its realization. This pattern is one of Zeffirelli's ingenious contributions to the play, as he chronicles Kate's progression from overt physical assaults to covert psychological subterfuge. Zeffirelli's message: this woman cannot—will not—be beaten. While no man in the play is a match for Petruchio, a woman, paradoxically, is.

In Shakespeare's *Shrew,* Petruchio has the power; in Zeffirelli's *Shrew,* much of that power is transferred to Kate. The film, then, may be viewed as feminist not only because the female is

empowered, but also because the male has been stripped of much of his. To be sure, Zeffirelli's Petruchio, Richard Burton, is manly, perhaps even a man's man: strong features, broad shoulders, hairy chest, full beard, commanding presence, hearty laugh, coarse manner. While he may be, in the words of one viewer, "a self-confident, swaggering lout,"[11] there is absolutely nothing effeminate about him. Other males are subservient to him to varying degrees. Early in the film, for example, as Petruchio awakens with a hangover, two of Hortensio's servants enter his chamber. As one pours fresh water into a washbasin, another sprinkles in rose petals. Annoyed either by their intrusion or their eagerness to please, Petruchio snarls, sending the servants scrambling for the door. Of course, servants are ordinarily submissive, but Petruchio's displeasure is clearly exaggerated. Incidentally, animals respond similarly: moments later, as Petruchio makes his way toward Baptista's residence, a stray dog takes one look at him, yelps, and scurries away—a testament to Petruchio's supreme beastliness. Later in the play, Baptista does not verify Petruchio's dowry as he does with Gremio and Hortensio; instead he takes him at his word, whose claims are vague. The extent of Petruchio's estate is summed up only as "all my lands" (II.i.125)—repeated twice in the film.

If Zeffirelli had an agenda in his characterization of Petruchio, it may have been to exaggerate his stereotypical manliness to the point of ridicule, as he did with the tart from the start. Without question, Zeffirelli's Petruchio is a well-drawn likeness of Shakespeare's comic figure: audiences laugh *with* him as he merrily goes about taming Kate. But a generous portion of the film's collective humor is also aimed at Petruchio's expense; audiences laugh *at* him—at his grossness, his impropriety, his insobriety, even his naiveté—either in mockery or out of vicarious embarrassment. One reviewer observed that Burton's character "appears so alcohol-soaked his timing is all off."[12]

But perhaps it is Burton's unique characterization which allowed Zeffirelli to go where Shakespeare himself feared to tread: Kate and Petruchio's wedding. Filming the couple's ceremony was risky: every reader of the play envisions the event differently and such a substantial insertion would, therefore, be ripe for scrutiny and subsequent criticism. Viewed optimistically, however, what better opportunity to portray this particular Petruchio in all his "glory," while simultaneously pushing certain buttons Kate never knew she had?

Prior to the wedding scene, audiences saw Kate forced upstairs, locked up, and abandoned. A few days later—her wedding day—

she remains inside the same room, but is unresponsive as another man—her father—now begs her to come out. In her own time, and by her own will, she soon emerges, takes her father's arm and begins a grand descent down a staircase. This same staircase, which she voluntarily descends by her father's supporting arm, Kate involuntarily ascended by Petruchio's forceful arm. Weary, haggard, and humiliated then, she appears radiant and dignified now, eager to claim the day as her own. Interestingly, no other women attend her, suggesting that an independent, self-sufficient Kate readied herself alone. Harking back to the film's beginning, Kate is still apparently wary about letting anyone get too close, especially at this time of great vulnerability.

Approaching onlookers—a crowd she has always associated with hostility—Kate is unable to anticipate how they will receive her. She is momentarily apprehensive, glancing repeatedly at her father for emotional support (he never looks at her, but focuses on those waiting below). To Kate's surprise, she is applauded; more importantly, she is accepted—and seemingly forgiven for being such a shrew. Zeffirelli captures beautifully this pivotal moment when Kate's heart softens, as evidenced by the genuine smile she cannot wipe from her face. For the first time, she likes people, and even gives Bianca a tender, sisterly kiss (representing both an apology and a request for forgiveness), before turning her attention to a bounteous banquet prepared in her honor. Her wedding, so far, is picture-perfect; the day promises to be a bright start to a new life. For the moment, Kate is Everywoman.

This moment lasts nearly three hours, near the end of which men in attendance, noticing a stray dog approaching the church, cruelly equate it with Petruchio's arrival, adding insult to Kate's injury. Instantly, Kate's mood changes from relative patience to resentment then rage. Question: if the crowd insinuates that the groom is a dog, by analogy, what does that make the bride?

A single stray comment reminds everyone of Kate's former persona—the persona she wants to shed which has now been reapplied. Zeffirelli is again commenting on the damage done by labels, underscoring the truism that people become what others perceive them to be. The circularity of Kate's situation is dizzying: 1) originally branded a "shrew," 2) she makes a genuine attempt to lose the label, 3) and makes significant and rapid progress, 4) only to be publicly reminded of the label without warrant, 5) provoking her to respond accordingly, 6) and behaving in a manner consistent with the label, 7) causing the label to be reapplied. Also significant is the fact that the joke and the subsequent laughter means the

crowd has officially given up hope, and therefore the support which Kate so desperately wants and needs.

Shortly thereafter, Petruchio arrives. Not only is he extremely late, he is extremely dressed, the antithesis of the knight in shining armor. Mocking knightly attributes of chivalry and fidelity, he flirts with rooftop women by blowing them kisses as he approaches the church—further fueling his fiancée's fire. The bride's elegance and glamour is matched only by the groom's impropriety and indecorum, evidenced most notably by his parading skewered pheasant. Assuming the best of intentions, the dead birds are Petruchio's contribution to the wedding feast. Hopefully, they are freshly killed, "justifying" his lateness. Zeffirelli has Petruchio participating in the quintessentially manly sport of hunting while Kate waits patiently, if not worriedly, under a hot Italian sun in a multi-layered wedding gown. Moreover, once Petruchio reaches the church steps, he first addresses not Kate, but her dowry-providing father. In a matter of minutes, Kate has gone from bride to butt to barter.

Despite being deeply offended, Kate shows uncharacteristic restraint. Her defensive weapon of choice is a warm, inviting smile—identical to one she gave while locked in the room. Convinced of her sincerity, Petruchio eagerly climbs the church's steps, arms outstretched to embrace her, only to be shoved back down into the crowd. Fortunately for a stunned Petruchio, the crowd—as Zeffirelli films it—is in his corner, breaking his fall and cheering him on to battle. This 1-2-3 sequence—alluring smile, eager approach, and instant rebuff—occurs again on the couple's wedding night, as well as at virtually every potentially intimate moment they (almost) share. Some interesting symbolism may be found in each character's elevation: here, at the church, on top of the stairs, Kate is physically higher than Petruchio. She makes him come to her; in order to rise to her level, he needs her invitation or permission. This same scenario is true at Baptista's house (where Kate looks from a third-story bedroom window down on an advancing Petruchio), at Baptista's mill (where she climbs multiple stairs to hide in an attic or loft, and prevents him from entering), and even in Petruchio's house (where Kate occupies his second-level master bedroom while he sleeps downstairs).

Anxious to embarrass him as much as he did her, Kate runs to the altar. Kate's intention is to refuse Petruchio once he vows to marry her, effectively doing what many men have done to women: leave them at the altar—every woman's nightmare. (If successful, Kate may fulfill many a female fantasy.) The camera catches Kate

impatiently tapping her fingers on the altar, an indication of her disregard for marriage and the supposedly holy spot at which its ceremony is performed. After enduring more pre-marital mischief, Kate's supposed moment of triumph arrives: instead of declaring the usual "I do," she spitefully protests, "I WI LL N—," physically prevented from finishing the desired adverb by a kiss from her new husband. Again, the crowd gleefully intervenes, their "congratulations" effectively drowning out a dazed Kate's objections.

Zeffirelli's film then cuts to the reception. Kate has recovered nicely, mingling with well-wishers and exhibiting a resiliency she will increasingly rely on. But this grit hits the fan when she witnesses Petruchio's avaricious reception of an immense money chest: Kate's dowry—20,000 crowns—and another turning point for the newly bought newlywed. Zeffirelli intentionally places Kate exactly where she does not belong: in the exclusively male sphere of commerce. Her stunned expression says it all: the previous public humiliation she suffered is nothing compared to this private degradation. Symbolically, she watches herself being handed over—even manhandled—in a literal transfer of ownership, helpless to forestall the transaction. Zeffirelli shows men anxiously surrounding the chest, and then rapaciously reviewing its contents, before escorting it out of the house and onto Petruchio's cart. These painful images may explain why, at Petruchio's heartless announcement to leave the reception early, Kate wholeheartedly asserts herself like never before, publicly denouncing her husband's decision. Unfortunately, for at least a third time in a single day, no one takes her side—not even her father. For a third time, she is silenced. And, for a third time, a male's physical force is used to restrain her, as Petruchio carries her outside like some commodity and dumps her on a donkey. She *has been* swept of her feet—just not the way she had imagined. As a bride on her wedding day, she *is* a spectacle, just not the way she had hoped. Kate's own wedding guests, warm and dry inside the reception hall, smile happily not because they blissfully imagine *her* future, but because they blissfully imagine *their* future—without her. The donkey carries Kate, while Petruchio carries her dowry.

Zeffirelli films Shakespeare's references to the couple's miserable and muddy journey from the reception hall to Petruchio's home, retaining Kate's tumble into a puddle as well as Petruchio's callous refusal to pull her out. (Instead, he laughs uproariously, then rides away without looking back.) Shakespeare's company, of course, would have faced serious challenges in presenting this

scene on stage, which is probably why the playwright had Grumio relate the account. But there may have been another reason Shakespeare did not attempt the scene's enactment: to audiences hearing the story in third person, Kate's mishaps are comic. Zeffirelli's filming of them, however, may border on the tragic as audiences witness her suffering "firsthand." While the film's scene can be initially funny, if one suspends its common classification as farce, its humor quickly fades upon imagining the implications such an ordeal could have in actuality. Kate, unprotected from the elements and already wet from rain, is wearing a multi-layer dress, now soaked completely through and undoubtedly heavy. She still has quite a few hours to travel before arriving at her new home, by which time it is *snowing*. Petruchio, notes one critic, "looks disappointed and disgruntled when the bedraggled Kate walks through the door, as though he had hoped she was dead and the dowry his with no further trouble."[13] For a moment at least, it seems as though Zeffirelli intentionally spoils the fun, concerned with the possibility that Kate's wedding date could easily have been her death date as a result of exposure. As when a practical joke backfires, ending in unintentional injury, Petruchio's taming almost went too far. Even though few would conclude that Petruchio is homicidal, he may be sadistic; at the very least, he is cruel, fit to be classed with the passersby in the parable of the Good Samaritan. This scene, like so many before and after it, poignantly illustrates the humorlessness of Kate's state, eliciting considerable sympathy while validating the view of Kate as victim.

Such sympathy also extends to Kate's wedding night: historically, the socially acceptable and expected moment of a woman's submission to a man's demands. Zeffirelli could have shown Petruchio as deferring the possibility of intimacy, but chose not to. Instead, audiences glimpse a character capable of deserting his new bride in the afternoon and desiring her in the evening. Once Kate is sure Petruchio not going to force himself upon her, she assumes control via her sexuality by partially undressing in front of him and letting him kiss her shoulder before coyly turning away and getting into bed. As she did at the church, she smiles invitingly. As he did at the church, he approaches eagerly, at which point Kate hits him over the head with a bed warmer. Experiencing agony instead of ecstasy, Petruchio responds by destroying what would have been their wedding bed, saving face by blaming the bed's inadequacy on his servants. Zeffirelli's film allows for the interpretation that Petruchio's tantrum, unlike his other tirades, is not premeditated, and that he may have been willing to end the

taming (at least temporarily) in exchange for intimacy.

Not to be outdone, Kate resorts to crying—loud enough to be heard within earshot, leading Petruchio to believe he has won this battle ("this is a way to kill a wife with kindness" [IV.i.208]). Zeffirelli, however, makes it clear that Kate is the victor: once she is certain that Petruchio has heard her sobbing, she smiles to herself—just as she did shortly after he locked her in the room—for a number of reasons: she has avoided intimacy with a man she neither loves nor respects, she is left alone, and she has a comfortable bed all to herself. She solely occupies the master bedroom; in effect, and in his absence, she is more than the mere mistress of the house—she is its master.

If there is any doubt as to her new role, it is alleviated early the next morning, as Zeffirelli's Kate not just cleans house, but directs Petruchio's servants to clean it. By extension, Kate is also declaring her intolerance for her husband's habits, lifestyle, and behavior. Within a few hours, Petruchio's domain is dominated and domesticated by Kate, who, for example, has the chandelier lowered and deep-cleaned before her husband arises from his hardwood table (a delightful contrast, clearly proving who slept better). Kate's fervor means that the estate's impending transformation will be radical. By the next scene, it is immaculate: the armory is polished; the table is symmetrically set with fine tableware; fresh flowers abound (in spite of the recent snowfall); all the servants are bathed, well dressed, and freshly pressed; the dog is, well, *groomed*. And, last but not least, even Petruchio is scrubbed. Of course, directly or indirectly, he is footing the bill. If Petruchio is actually spending money on home improvement, then he has been domesticated; if Kate is, then she has gained her husband's trust. Either way, she wins.

This same scene also depicts Kate fussing over the servants, not in any dissatisfied way, but with fondness and pride—and in direct contrast to Petruchio's harsh treatment. More importantly, she has befriended them and they reciprocate by treating her with respect. For all intents and purposes, they are *her* servants. In fact, she treats them better than she does her husband, and their allegiance forces Petruchio to feign acceptance while he sits apart from the action, just as Kate did earlier in the film. She has had to adapt, and does an admirable job of it.

Even though domestic life has improved for the couple, their endeavors at mutual taming continue. When Kate's new cap and dress arrive (specially ordered by Petruchio), she is overjoyed. Her expression, aimed at her husband, is complete adoration for both

the gift and its thoughtful giver. Zeffirelli's filming of this scene again suggests that Petruchio, with a little restraint, could have ended the battle right then and there, with both parties emerging victorious. True to the play, Petruchio immediately announces his dissatisfaction, prompting Kate to verbally abuse him in front of their servants and guests. Added to the film is Petruchio's cleaving the cap and shredding the dress unnecessarily, delivering the message that it is one thing to deny a person something, quite another to destroy it. His subsequent justification speech (in which he argues against fine clothing), though eloquent, becomes hypocrisy in this film, as he is stunningly arrayed in gold thread. He is, however, at least consistent, leaving the room once a devastated Kate begins to cry.

While traveling to Padua for Bianca's reception, Kate now rides a horse, having apparently graduated from her donkey days. Having passed Petruchio's short course in astronomy, Kate, upon arriving in Padua, is stunningly outfitted in a crimson velvet dress with gold accents and trim (she got the dress after all). Moreover, she is perfectly coordinated with Petruchio's attire. Sporting matching formalwear, the Bianca/Lucentio reception will, in many ways, also be *their* reception. Their apparel also signifies cooperation, conformity, harmony, equality and perhaps even mutual love, if color means anything to Zeffirelli. In contrast, no other couples' clothing matches in the film's final banquet scene.

With Kate's "surrender," the war is over—for Petruchio at least. Now, looking good and apparently feeling even better, Petruchio bids Kate to kiss him—in public. She feigns embarrassment, but Petruchio persists. Audiences expecting a cinematic smack equal to the lip-numbing numbers of previous decades are quickly disappointed, as is Petruchio, who gets only an anticlimactic peck on the nose, followed by an innocent grin. Kate's kiss may be viewed as a kind of compromise, simultaneously satisfying his need for either affection or affirmation, as well as her concern for discretion. But it also represents the absolute minimum she can do and still comply. And, for the first time, surrounding crowds work to Kate's advantage rather than to her husband's: with witnesses, Petruchio is hard-pressed to protest.

Dazed and confused, Petruchio is quiet and pensive during dinner, paying more attention to his wine than his wife. Periodically, both he and Kate watch Lucentio and Bianca caressing and kissing across the table. Still silent, the troubled twosome then observes small children playing near their table. When one child begins to cry, Biondello quickly comes to his aid, comforts him, then gently

places him on a dog's back. The camera then fixes on the couple's studied expressions, both of which suggest that their maternal and paternal instincts have been aroused. In a thirty-second shot, Zeffirelli asks an insightful question: are Kate and Petruchio ready for children? Up to this point, each has been so completely, so chronically self-absorbed. In response, Petruchio glances at Kate, giving her a shy half-smile, evidence that he is not opposed to the prospect of having children. But his expression also suggests a realization that he will need Kate's compliance to make that happen—something she also seems to sense. If Kate has a change of heart, it may explain the earnestness with which she gives her final speech. During the filming of this scene, Elizabeth Taylor surprised the production's cast and crew, including its director, who later wrote in his autobiography:

> I had assumed, as I imagine had Richard, that when we did the notoriously controversial final scene in which Katherine makes her act of submission not merely to Petruchio but on behalf of all women to all men, she would do it in the now accepted ironical way. The usual trick is for the actress to wink at the audience as much as to say, "We all know who really has the upper hand, don't we?" Amazingly, Liz did nothing of the kind; she played it straight.[14]

Kate's sincere speech moves not only Petruchio (Richard Burton, according to Zeffirelli, became misty-eyed at Taylor's performance), but everyone in attendance. Kate—the butt of jokes and the source of embarrassment—is now the center of attention and the object of adulation. Just as she was a spectacle when she left these people a short time earlier, she is a spectacle now, a true sight to behold—this time, for all the right reasons.

For his part, Petruchio couldn't be more proud—or aroused. Smiling broadly, he approaches her, embraces her, compliments her, and kisses her. Delighted by their first mutual kiss, Petruchio turns and faces a cheering crowd, but in the moment it took him to turn back to Kate, she disappears. His laughter quickly dies, while the crowd's revives. Distressed, he begins to part and move through the crowd in an attempt to catch up to his wife, who apparently got away unhindered with the help of some friendly conspirators. With great effort, Petruchio reaches the door through with Kate escaped, and, once through, Grumio closes it shut, barricading it with his body to prevent others from following.

As Grumio closes the door behind Petruchio and the film ends, two scenarios are imaginable. One is that Kate waits for Petruchio to follow her, he does, the couple unites, and finally

consummates their marriage, in which case Grumio guards a nuptial "bedroom door," ensuring their privacy. But if Zeffirelli wanted to promote this ending, the scene's sequence—her speech, their kiss, her departure, his confusion, his exit, their reunion—seems odd, nor does it feel romantic. It is hard to imagine that Kate, having just given the speech of her life, suddenly desires intimacy. Maybe it was the kiss but, for believability, Kate would have to have been aroused enough by a two-second kiss to leave the reception *without her partner.* There needs to be more evidence to make this connection: for example, Kate clinging to her husband after the kiss, whispering in his ear, or taking him by the hand and leading him out of the reception room.

A second, more consistent scenario is that another chase ensues and intimacy will be further forestalled into the indefinite future. Given the film's earlier chase scenes, and Kate's talent for evasion, it seems more plausible that the chasing which began their relationship continues, with Kate still in the lead. Having kissed Petruchio and aroused him, ditching him is a perfect way to publicly humiliate him. Petruchio's facial expression as he is trying to exit is one of embarrassed concession: Kate trumped him and, given the formality of the occasion, he graciously acknowledges it. In this way, Kate gives Petruchio a taste of his own medicine, depriving him of something he desperately wants just as he denied Kate a longer wedding reception, food, and a new dress. It is comic, ironic, and fitting that Kate wins this final round.

After the film's release, and after the dust of controversy settled, Zeffirelli's interpretation went on to significantly alter the way modern readers and viewers approached Shakespeare's text. By 1977, Jack Jorgens would label the play a "piece of male chauvinist wishful thinking" promoting the dangerous idea that a "woman's will can be broken and in the end both she and the man will be the happier for it."[15] The play was also produced differently: "following the emergence of 'women's liberation,' " observes critic Diana Henderson, "between 1976 and 1986, five Shrews . . . appeared on North American television—setting a frequency record for productions during the era for sound recording."[16] Attesting to Zeffirelli's impact, at least some these productions, such as the American Conservatory Theater's, gave the overall impression that Kate reigned. By the time Zeffirelli's *Taming of the Shrew* became available on videocassette in the mid-1980s, the reverse side of the video jacket cover touted it, in feminist jargon, as "a look at male chauvinism and women's liberation in the 16th-century." Following a brief plot summary, the blurb concluded with this open-ended

lure: "Kate has found a more effective way to dominate her mate." Feminist critics such as Marianne Novy can confidently present *Shrew* in 1999 as *the* "paradigmatic comedy for feminist rewriting."[17]

Thus, the view that Kate "won" this battle of the sexes seems to have prevailed, putting Zeffirelli ahead of his time by at least ten years, and as much as twenty, guiding Shakespeare's future as much as preserving his past—a conclusion consistent with Zeffirelli's own self-perception as "an enlightened conservative continuing the discourse . . . [and] renovating texts."[18]

Notes

1. C. Hugh Holman and William Harmon, *A Handbook to Literature*, (New York: Macmillan, 1986), 201.

2. M. H. Abrams, *A Glossary of Literary Terms*, (Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace, 1993), 233.

3. "Taming of the Shrew." Internet Movie Database.

4. Gareth Evans and Barbara Lloyd Evans, *The Shakespeare Companion*, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1978), 208.

5. Philip C. Kolin, *Shakespeare and Feminist Criticism: An Annotated Bibliography and Commentary*, (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1991), 5.

6. Kolin, 3.

7. Kolin, 5.

8. Russell Jackson, "Shakespeare's Comedies on Film, " *Shakespeare and the Moving Image: The Plays on Film and Television*, eds. Anthony Davies and Stanley Wells, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 110.

9. Ace G. Pilkington, "Zeffirelli's Shakespeare," *Shakespeare and the Moving Image: The Plays on Film and Television*, eds. Anthony Davies and Stanley Wells, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 170.

10. Kolin, 6.

11. "Taming of the Shrew." Internet Movie Database, .

12. "Taming of the Shrew." Internet Movie Database, .

13. Pilkington, 171.

14. Franco Zeffirelli, *Zeffirelli: The Autobiography of Franco Zeffirelli*, (New York: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1986), 215-216.

15. Jack J. Jorgens, *Shakespeare on Film*, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1977), 67.

16. Diana E. Henderson, "A Shrew for the Times," *Shakespeare, the Movie: Popularizing the Plays on Film, TV, and Video*, eds. Lynda E. Boose and Richard Burt (London: Routledge, 1997), 150.

17. Marianne Novy, *Transforming Shakespeare: Contemporary Women's Re-Visions in Literature and Performance*, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999), 4.

18. Nicholas Thomas, *International Dictionary of Films and Filmmakers: Directors*, vol. 2, 2nd ed., (Chicago: St. James Press, 1991), 944.

Examination and Mockery in *Henry IV, Part One*

David Crosby

The "play extempore" that Prince Hal and Falstaff enact in Act II Scene 4 of *Henry IV, Part One,* is widely admired by critics as one of the most enjoyable, creative, and defining moments in the relationship between these two characters. News has just come to the tavern from King Henry's messenger that the prince "must to the court in the morning" (268).[1] The rebels in the North and West are taking to the field, and Henry is calling up the reserves, as it were, to meet the challenge. Falstaff remarks that Hal will be "horribly chid tomorrow" and urges him to "practice an answer." The prince seizes the opportunity to suggest a bit of play-acting: "Do thou stand for my father, and examine me upon the particulars of my life" (297-300). Falstaff, who is clearly something of a theater buff, immediately begins organizing the scene, collecting props, suggesting a way to simulate the effects of crying, and dictating the style of presentation. He will have a joint-stool for his throne, his hacked up dagger for a scepter, and a cushion for his crown; he will drink sack to make his eyes red; and he will deliver his lines in the bombastic manner of King Cambises, the title character of Thomas Preston's early Elizabethan tragedy (1570).

Falstaff's actual style is closer to that of John Lyly in *Euphues*, embellishing his text so much with balance, antithesis, alliteration, and references to proverbial natural history so that his meaning is nearly lost. He also displays a bit of the preacher in his biblical references to pitch that defiles and knowing the tree by its fruit. But the burden of his message, delivered in his assumed character as Henry IV, is one that we have come to expect: Prince Hal has a reputation as a waster of time, a frequenter of bad companions, and a thief; things not to be endured in a prince of the realm (318ff.). The actor Falstaff begins to peek through the mask of the character Henry IV when he qualifies his complaints about the company Hal keeps: "And yet there is a virtuous man whom I have often noted in thy company…a good portly man…his age

inclining to threescore...and now I remember me, his name is Falstaff....Him keep with, the rest banish" (332-41).

At this point Prince Hal objects: "Dost thou speak like a King? Do thou stand for me, and I'll play my father" (343-44). Falstaff responds with one of the sharpest puns in Shakespeare: "Depose me?" he asks, referring to his loss of his role as king in this little play but also glancing backward at Henry IV's deposing of Richard II and forward to that same Henry's fear, expressed in the next scene, that Hal will join forces with Hotspur and seek to depose his own father. It should be noted here that if there was anything that could not take place in a play (at least in print) during Elizabeth's reign, it was the deposing of a king, as Shakespeare knew well from the censoring of the deposition scene in his Richard II.[2] Apparently deposing a make-believe king was all right.

But "depose" has other meanings as well, both intransitive and transitive: to testify or bear witness, to swear to the truth of something; and to question or examine a witness, especially in a legal proceeding. Shakespeare has used "depose" in both these legal senses before in his history plays. In *Henry VI, Part Three*, the Duke of York has sworn an oath to let Henry VI reign in peace until his death. But his youngest son, Richard (later to become Richard III) argues that the oath was invalid because Henry had no authority over York, and therefore, "seeing 'twas he that made you to depose,/ Your oath, my lord, is vain and frivolous" (I.2.25-26). In *Richard II*, as Henry Bolingbroke approaches the lists to prove in arms the justice of his accusations against Thomas Mowbray, Richard instructs the Lord Marshal to question him about his name and reason for appearing, "And formally, according to our law,/ Depose him in the justice of his cause" (I.3.29-30).[3]

Surely Falstaff's use of "depose" reflects one of these legal senses as well, since he goes on to claim that he is, in fact, the better questioner than Hal: "If thou dost it [depose me] half so gravely, so majestically, both in word and matter, hang me up by the heels for a rabbit sucker or a poulter's hare" (345-47). I would suggest further that it is a particular kind of legal wrangling that Shakespeare is glancing at in this scene, and that its significance is signaled when Prince Hal tells Falstaff to "examine" him on the particulars of his life.

In an earlier article,[4] I proposed that Shakespeare developed a dramaturgical technique that I called the "examination scene," and that he based it on conventions and tropes found in the published examinations of Protestant and proto-Protestant martyrs, disseminated primarily through John Foxe's martyrology, *Acts and*

Monuments of the English Church. In its most developed form, the examination scene involves an accused person being brought before a powerful judge to be examined about actions and beliefs that, if continued, merit the death penalty. There may be an accuser who seeks justice or revenge against the accused, but frequently the accusation is arbitrary or unjust. The accused, often a woman, claims to be powerless and have no standing or ability to mount a defense, but then finds within herself a previously unsuspected power to speak and match wits with the judge. Frequently the judge is sympathetic, but claims to have no authority to change or mitigate the effects of either the law or his own sworn decision. Often the judge grants the accused time to meditate and repent or at least find the resources to extricate herself from her predicament. Frequently the examination scene sets up the terms for the final resolution of the play's conflict. As examples of examination scenes I cited the openings of *Comedy of Errors* and *Midsummer Night's Dream,* the questioning of Othello and Desdemona before the Senate, Lear's early confrontation with Cordelia, and Angelo's second interview with Isabella in *Measure for Measure.*

What I am proposing here is that the scene we have been looking at is also an examination scene, but that it does not take the conventions of the examination seriously; rather it makes a mockery of them. Because they are play acting, Prince Hal and Falstaff can switch around the roles of accused and judge, using them to score points off each other, and not take the outcome of the examination seriously.

It may seem something of a stretch to look for the source of this particular scene in Protestant polemical literature; certainly examination is a common enough concept that we don't need to look for any specific connection to the examinations of heretics. But before we dismiss the connection out of hand, it would be well if we remembered that the character who has come down to us as Falstaff in all the printed versions of Shakespeare's plays, was originally named Sir John Oldcastle, a knight who was commemorated in Protestant reformation polemical literature as a martyr.

Oldcastle appears to have served Henry IV capably in campaigns in Scotland, Wales, and France, and came to be good friends with Prince Hal during their joint service in Wales. In 1404, after the battle of Shrewsbury, he served in Parliament as a knight of the shire for Herefordshire and in 1408 he became sheriff. In 1409 he married Joan Cobham and acquired the right to be styled Lord Cobham and to attend the upper house, which he did

beginning in 1410. It was at about this same time that he began to run afoul of Church authorities on suspicion of heresy for harboring an unlicensed chaplain who was preaching the condemned doctrines of the Lollards, followers of the fourteenth century reformer John Wycliff.[5]

Bishops and secular authorities had become increasingly concerned with Lollardy after the Peasants' Revolt of 1381. Heresy not only imperiled souls. "Its frequent links to sedition made its suppression even more urgent..... To rulers preoccupied with stability and acutely aware of its fragility, heterodoxy signified political unrest and war".[6] This urgency led Archbishop Arundel in 1396 to petition Richard II and Parliament for the power to burn heretics at the stake. It was not until 1401 under Henry IV that Parliament passed the statute *De Haeretico Comburendo,* and William Sawtrey, a Lollard priest, became the first heretic to be executed in England.

Lollard sympathizers in Parliament fought back in 1410, introducing measures that would modify the heresy statute and confiscate large portions of Church property. The measures failed, and during the Easter recess John Badby, a layman who denied the doctrine of transubstantiation, was burned at the stake. By March 1413, the last week of Henry IV's life, the reformers had become so troublesome that he called a convocation of bishops to deal with them. After his death, the convocation resumed in June and Oldcastle's troubles began in earnest. Charges of heresy were brought against him, and he was referred to the new King Henry V, who tried unsuccessfully to get him to submit to the bishops. His trial was held in September, and he refused to subscribe to the Church's doctrines of transubstantiation, auricular confession, adoration of the cross, and primacy of the pope. He was condemned but was granted a stay of forty days in which Arundel and Henry apparently hoped he could be made to recant. A formal retraction of his beliefs was printed, but it appears he refused to sign it.[7] In any event, he escaped from Tower prison in September and was implicated in the Lollard uprising on Twelfth Night, 1413. According to later indictments, the purpose of this massive gathering in St. Giles Field was to capture the royal family, "wholly...annul the royal estate as well as the estate of prelates and religious orders in England, and to kill the King, his brothers,...the prelates and other magnates of the kingdom, and to turn men of religion to secular occupations: totally to despoil cathedrals...and religious houses of their relics and other ecclesiastical goods, and to level them completely to the ground."

The man to be appointed regent was none other than Sir John Oldcastle.[8] King Henry managed to foil the plot, and put to death many of the conspirators, but Oldcastle was not apprehended until 1417, when he was carried to London, hung in chains in St. Giles Field, and burnt as a heretic.

Fifteenth century chroniclers generally depicted Oldcastle as a heretic and traitor whose elimination was necessary to stabilize both church and state. His adherence to heretical doctrines endangered people's souls and their hope of salvation; his attacks on king and clergy threatened the late medieval hierarchy on which the social order was seen to depend. With the spread of Reformation ideas in England during the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI, historians John Hall, and even more decisively, Rafael Holinshead, began to back off from such harsh judgments of Oldcastle. Protestant polemicists such as William Tyndale, John Bale, and John Foxe decisively reinterpreted late medieval religious dissent as an unfinished proto-Reformation, and Oldcastle as one of its most important martyrs.

Shakespeare almost certainly borrowed the name Sir John Oldcastle from an old anonymous play called *The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth,* first performed in 1588, registered with the Stationer's Company in 1594, but not printed until 1598, perhaps to cash in on the popularity of Shakespeare's then new Henry plays.[9] The Oldcastle of the *Famous Victories* plays a fairly minor role, participating in a robbery near Gad's Hill with Ned and the Prince, but displaying no signs of Falstaff's corpulence, cowardice, or comic wit. After that early scene he seems to be around only to express his desire that Henry IV die soon; but when he does, the much changed new King Henry V forbids Oldcastle, along with other knights, to come within ten miles of his person.

In fact the character that Shakespeare bestows on Falstaff borrows far more from the clown Derick in *Famous Victories* than from Oldcastle. Derick is a Carrier who has been robbed by Cuthbert Cutter, also known as Gadshill. Derick gives evidence against Cutter before the Lord Chief Justice, in the presence of Prince Hal, and he witnesses the scene in which Prince Hal boxes the Justice on the ear—a scene that is alluded to in Shakespeare's Henry IV, Part Two, but never dramatized.[10] Immediately afterward, Derick acts out the scene with John Cobbler, a London watchman who was also there, in a way that strongly resembles the "play extempore" enacted by Falstaff and Prince Hal. Derick says, "'Faith, John, I'll tell the what; thou shalt be my Lord Chief Justice, and thou shalt sit in the chair; and I'll be the young prince, and hit thee

a box on the ear.... John responds, "Come on; I'll be your judge! But thou shalt not hit me hard?"[11] As they reenact the scene, the humor derives largely from their falling out of character, and from the knockabout business of the box on the ear. But there is no mistaking that it inspired Shakespeare to the far funnier, subtler, and also more serious scene that he assigns to Prince Hal and Falstaff.

Although Shakespeare probably took the name Oldcastle directly from the *Famous Victories*, he was certainly aware of the historical figure, who appears also in the narrative sources of his history plays—the chronicle histories of John Hall and Raphael Holinshead, and the ecclesiastical history of John Foxe. And he must have been aware that the story of Oldcastle was a hotly contested one. Sir John was either a dangerous heretic who threatened true doctrine and the king's person; or he was a steadfast and valiant reformer who died at the hands of vengeful clerics who misled and deceived the king. This is what politicians today call a wedge issue. You could not have it both ways. As Brad Gregory puts it: "More dramatically than sermons, catechisms, or common worship, martyrdom trumpeted what was at stake in disputes over the content and practice of true Christianity;"[12] or as Thomas Freeman maintains more succinctly, "Martyrdom was perhaps the most extreme form of mimesis": any man willing to imitate the sacrificial act of Jesus, even to the death, for his specific beliefs, focuses the minds of his witnesses in a remarkably powerful way.[13]

The majority of critics maintain that Shakespeare and/or the Lord Chamberlain's men removed Oldcastle's name from the printed versions of the plays because of objections from Oldcastle's wife's descendants Sir William Brooke and his son Henry, the sixteenth century's Lords Cobham. Presumably they did not want to see their ancestor's husband parodied as a drunken coward, and since they had oversight of the licensing of plays, they were able to force the issue. So Oldcastle became Falstaff in every printed edition of the play until Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor restored Oldcastle's name in the 1986 Oxford edition of the complete plays, forcing scholars to face once again the historicity of the Falstaff character.[14]

It seems to me that the Brooke family were probably not the only segment of Elizabethan society who might object to Shakespeare's portrayal of Oldcastle. During the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward, and Elizabeth, the English Church had rejected the doctrines of transubstantiation, auricular confession, adoration of images, and papal supremacy; in fact, through the 1580s and into

the 90s, missionary Catholic priests were being executed by Elizabeth's government as traitors for preaching exactly those doctrines. Would Shakespeare, then, deliberately manipulate the character of the historical Oldcastle, knowing the kind of political firestorm it might create?

The answer must remain conjectural, but I think there is good reason to believe that he did. For one thing, there is external evidence collected by Taylor and Wells, and summarized by Susan Hodgdon in her edition of the play, that even though Oldcastle's name never appeared in the printed record, "it was apparently retained in court and private performances—another form of publication—and audiences certainly continued to identify Oldcastle with Falstaff... well into the seventeenth century."[15] But more important to literary critics is the internal evidence that Shakespeare frequently depicts Falstaff in ways that suggest features of Oldcastle's life and death. In the examination scene that I began this article with, when Hal has taken Falstaff's place acting Henry IV, he unleashes a stream of comic invective that includes a metaphorical epithet depicting Falstaff as "that roasted Manningtree ox with the pudding in his belly" (II.iv.360-61). This verbal image bears an uncanny and unsettling resemblance to the woodcut in Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* which depicts the 1417 martyrdom of Oldcastle.[16] He hangs from a large wooden frame by chains around his lower thighs, his belly, and his neck, facing upward and raising his hands toward heaven with burning faggots of sticks or reeds piled below him and the flames licking upward and beginning to engulf his body. Soldiers, prelates, and townspeople surround him as two men tend the fire. It could easily be a scene from the popular Manningtree fair in Essex, with revelers gathering around waiting for an ox to finish roasting. This possible allusion to the image of Oldcastle's martyrdom is strengthened by references to Falstaff as roast meat. As J. Dover Wilson pointed out 60 years ago, Hal summons Falstaff into the Boar's Head with the words, "Call in ribs, call in tallow," summoning up the image of "roast Sir Loin-of-Beef, gravy and all." He goes on to suggest that human sweat was "likewise thought of as fat, melted by the heat of the body," as Falstaff on Gad's Hill "sweats to death, and lards the lean earth, as he walks along."[17]

But where does Shakespeare stand with respect to the contested history of Oldcastle: does he portray him as heretic and traitor, or reformer and martyr. The answer, I believe, is neither. Shakespeare was seldom interested in historical accuracy in his presentation of characters: ask members of the Richard III society. What

Shakespeare does, I think, is attack the image of Oldcastle the martyr in order to make some important points about martyrdom and its place in the religious and political realm of Elizabethan England.

Shakespeare's Oldcastle/Falstaff is no martyr. His vanity, gluttony, and drunkenness mark him as a sinner, and his cowardice in the face of death or injury confirms the case. He runs away from Hal and Poins on Gad's Hill, then makes up a ridiculous story to justify himself. When appointed to command troops in the battle against the rebels, he undermines his sovereign's cause to line his own pockets, has no regard for his men, and shows up on the battlefield at Shrewsbury with a bottle of sack in his case instead of a pistol. Brad Gregory points out that one conceptual requirement for martyrdom is that there must be people willing to die for their beliefs.[18] Falstaff's attitude toward dying for a cause is perfectly summed up in his Act V soliloquy after he has risen from his apparent death at the hands of Douglas: "I am no counterfeit. To die is to be a counterfeit, for he is but the counterfeit of a man who hath not the life of a man; but to counterfeit dying, when a man thereby liveth, is to be no counterfeit but the true and perfect image of life indeed. The better part of valor is discretion, in the which better part I have saved my life" (V.4.115-18).

The true martyr in *Henry IV, Part One*, is Hotspur, who has all the temperament to die for a cause and is offered up to his father and uncle's ambition. When we first encounter Hotspur, he jousts verbally with King Henry about the status of his prisoners, refusing to turn them over unless the King will ransom his brother-in-law Mortimer, whom he believes has fought valiantly for Henry against the Welsh. When Henry dismisses him and orders him to speak no more of Mortimer, Hotspur burst out to Northumberland and Worcester:

> Speak of Mortimer?
> . . . . . .
> Yea, on his part I'll empty all these veins,
> And shed my dear blood drop by drop in the dust,
> But I will lift the downtrod Mortimer
> As high in the air as this unthankful king...(I.iii.130-36)

This willingness to die for a just cause is one of the earmarks of martyrs. Also like a martyr, he takes his uncle and father to task for having abandoned the true king Richard for "this canker Bolingbroke" and urges them to repent and make amends:

> Yet time serves wherein you may redeem
> Your banished honors and restore yourselves
> Into the good thoughts of the world again... (180-82)

He sees it as his role to

> dive into the bottom of the deep,
> . . . . . .
> And pluck up drowned honor by the locks,
> So he that doth redeem her thence might wear
> Without corrival all her dignities. (203-07)

Later, when an unidentified correspondent questions the practicality of the plot that his family has undertaken against the King, his response turns to religious based bigotry, calling the man "a pagan rascal,... an infidel." And when Owen Glendower tries to impress him with the portents that attended his birth and his miraculous powers, even extending to calling up spirits and commanding the devil, Hotspur rebukes him as a good Wycliffite might have:

> If you have power to raise him, bring him hither,
> And I'll be sworn I have power to shame him hence.
> O, while you live, tell truth and shame the devil! (III.i.57-59)

Later still, when it appears that his father and Glendower will not be able to join him in the field, and the prospect looks bleak, he welcomes the prospect of dying, "Doomsday is near; die all, die merrily" (IV,i.134). This willingness to die, this confidence in the righteousness of one's cause, this willingness to call those who question your beliefs infidels and pagans—these are some of the characteristics of martyrs, and though chivalry, like martyrdom, has a romantic appeal to the purer side of our nature, it is not ultimately a good basis for the creation of stable governments.

At a time when the Elizabethan religious and political compromise was in danger from both Catholics and Reformers, there was no room for martyrs who threatened the stability of the realm. The valiant and headstrong Hotspur is more like the historical Oldcastle, and the future Henry V sacrifices him as surely as his historical predecessor sacrificed Oldcastle. Shakespeare uses Oldcastle to get his audience thinking of martyrdom in its historical context, then makes Falstaff such a winning rogue as an anti-martyr of mockery that the audience will reject the simple either/or of the religious and political zealots and begin to see life in its complexity, as Prince Hal does while he moves through the various stages of his preparation for kingship. As for Falstaff, as the epilogue from *Henry IV, Part Two*, expresses it, "Oldcastle died martyr, and this is not the man."

Notes

1. All line references to *Henry IV, Part One*, are to Barbara Hodgdon, *The First Part of King Henry the Fourth: Texts and Contexts*, text edited by David Bevington (Boston and New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1997).
2. The first three quartos of Richard II were printed without the deposition scene in Act IV, which did not appear until the fourth quarto in 1608. Showing the deposition scene on stage could be controversial, too. In 1601 friends of the Earl of Essex commissioned a special performance of Richard II on the night before Essex arrived in London in an unsuccessful attempt to usurp the throne from Elizabeth. One of the company's shareholders was called before the Privy Council to testify about the circumstances of this performance. See the introduction to Richard II in Stanley Well, Gary Taylor, et al. (eds.) *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), p. 413, and Russ McDonald, *The Bedford Companion to Shakespeare: An Introduction with Documents*, 2nd ed. (Boston and New York, Bedford/St. Martins, 2001), pp. 124-25, 140.
3. Shakespeare also uses "depose" in both these senses later in his career. In *Measure for Measure*, when Angelo tries to trick Isabella into agreeing sleep with him to by questioning her about the nature of sin and the law, he says:

   > Then I shall 'pose you quickly.
   > Which had you rather: that the most just law
   > Now took your brother's life, or, to redeem him,
   > Give up your body to such sweet uncleanness
   > As she that he hath stained? (II.4.51-55)

   Later in the same play, Marianna testifies to Duke Vincentio that Isabella's accusations against Angelo are false, because she is prepared to swear that he was with her at the time:

   > [She]charges him, my lord, with such a time
   > When I'll depose I had him in mine arms
   > With all th' effect of love. (V.1.194-96)

   Citations from *Henry VI, Part Three*, are from John D. Cox and Eric Rasmussen, *King Henry VI, Part 3* (London, Arden Shakespeare, 2001). Citations from *Richard II* and *Measure for Measure* are from the Oxford Complete Works.
4. David Crosby, "Shakespeare's Use of Examinations in *Measure for Measure*," *Journal of the Wooden O Symposium*, Vol. III (2003), pp. 23-35.
5. This summary of Oldcastle's career is indebted to Alice-Lyle Scoufos, *Shakespeare's Typological Satire: A Study of the Falstaff-Oldcastle Problem* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1979), pp. 45-56.
6. Brad S. Gregory, *Salvation at Stake: Christian Martyrdom in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999), p. 88.
7. Scoufos, pp. 49-50.
8. Hodgdon, p. 351.
9. Hodgdon, p. 291. Both Hodgdon and David Scott Kastan accept that the anonymous *Famous Victories of Henry V* served as a dramatic source for Shakespeare as he was writing the Henry IV plays. See Kastan, ed., *King Henry IV, Part 1* (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2002), pp. 342-43.

10. *Henry IV*, I.2.194-95. Oxford Collected Works.
11. *The Oldcastle Controversy: Sir John Oldcastle, Part I and The Famous Victories of Henry V*, ed. Peter Corbin and Douglas Sedge (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991), V.95-97,99.
12. Gregory, p. 176.
13. Thomas Freeman , "The Importance of Dying Earnestly: The Metamorphosis of the Account of James Bainham in *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*," in *The Church Retrospective*. Ed. R.N. Swanson. (Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 1997). 267-288. Freeman goes on to quote the somewhat irreverent statement by Donald Kelley that martyrdom is "*imitatio Christi* with a vengeance." Donald R. Kelley, "Martyrs, Myths and the Massacre: the Background to St. Bartholomew, AHR 77 (1972), 1328.
14. For a statement of the evidence and reasoning behind the decision of the Oxford editors see Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor, *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987).
15. Hodgdon, p. 350.
16. The woodcut is reproduced in Hodgdon, p. 361.
17. J. Dover Wilson, "Falstaff and the Plan of *Henry IV, Part I*," reprinted from *The Fortunes of Falstaff* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1944), pp. 15-35, in James L. Sanderson, ed., *Henry the Fourth, Part I* (New York: Norton Critical Edition, 1969), p. 269.
18. See Gregory for a summary of four conceptual requirements for martyrdom, pp. 26-29.

"Away With That Audacious Lady": Paulina's Rhetoric In *The Winter's Tale*

Diane M. Dixon
Grove City College

I first read *The Winter's Tale* in an undergraduate Shakespeare course at Northwestern University over thirty years ago. At that time, Hermione the young, well-spoken vulnerable wife was the character to whom I was drawn. Fast forward thirty-three years. Upon rereading *The Winter's Tale*, I find Paulina, the outspoken older woman, now draws my attention. I admire the way Paulina takes on Leontes, boldly telling him precisely what she thinks—which is precisely what he does not want to hear. The verbal struggle between Leontes and Paulina illustrates an important energizing principle of language, particularly the tension Mikhail Bakhtin identifies between "authoritative discourse" and "internally persuasive discourse." While not addressing gender, Bakhtin explains the dialogic movement away from "authoritative discourse" toward "internally persuasive discourse" in ways that help illuminate the central conflict in this play. King Leontes speaks the language of authority, and Paulina calls into question his authoritarian control. In his later years Shakespeare created a number of capable women, especially in the problem comedies, including Isabella in *Measure for Measure* and Portia in *Merchant of Venice*; these women revise the systems they engage with. Among older women like Paulina, however, Margaret Mead has identified a trait peculiar to the post-menopausal period: zest. In this stage, unencumbered by childbearing and child rearing, women often move beyond restrictive cultural scripts and speak out against prevailing norms. Paulina illustrates well this postmenopausal zest or PMZ, and I and some of my peers can particularly relate to this audacious lady whom Harley Granville-Barker calls "Plucky Paulina."[1] She reminds me of several women I have admired, including a colleague affectionately known as "Hurricane Hilda," who often unsettled the male leadership of the college where I teach, boldly exercising her voice for worthy causes. Like Hilda and other PMZers, Paulina employs bold discourse that includes transgressive, artful, and medicinal words. Her audacious words are the major force that

moves events in *The Winter's Tale* from tragic disaster to healing recovery.

Paulina's transgressive words are spoken in response to the courtly rhetoric that Leontes has used to silence Hermione. Leontes' official language, what Bakhtin would term "authoritative discourse," imposes its dogmatic version of truth and the law. In *The Dialogic Imagination*, Bakhtin writes:

The authoritative word demands that we acknowledge it, that we make it our own; it binds us, quite independent of any power it might have to persuade us internally; we encounter it with its authority already fused to it. . . . It is, so to speak, the word of the fathers. Its authority was already *acknowledged* in the past. It is therefore not a question of choosing it from among other possible discourses that are its equal.[2]

Bakhtin describes this as a "magisterial" language that "demands our unconditional allegiance."[3] Lynn Enterline comments that Leontes "speaks as if his voice alone should be heard."[4] Of course he *is* the king, surrounded by his company of courtiers, who dare not counter his pronouncements. When his advisors try to make some defense of Hermione, Leontes orders them to hold their peace since "We need no more of your advice" (2.1.168).[5] Bakhtin explains how such authoritarian discourse "retards and freezes thought";[6]

Leontes sees himself alone as competent to judge. Unjustly accused, Hermione tries to defend tactfully her faithfulness in language that has a powerful emotional effect:

> For Polixenes
> (With whom I am accus'd), I do confess
> I lov'd him as in honor he requir'd;
> With such a kind of love that might become
> A lady like me; with a love even such,
> So, and no other, as yourself commanded;
> Which not to have done I think had been in me
> Both disobedience and ingratitude
> To you and toward your friend, (3.2.61-69)

but she is silenced during her trial. Enterline argues that Leontes' jealousy is caused by Hermione's power of rhetoric: "Outdone in rhetorical power by his wife, Leontes . . . moves to reassert control over her language."[7] Hermione has successfully persuaded Polixenes to stay when Leontes could not. Leontes asserts his authority through the official language of the indictment:

> Hermione, queen to the worthy Leontes, King of Sicilia,
> thou art here accused and arraigned of high treason, in

> committing adultery with Polixenes, King of Bohemia, and conspiring with Camillo to take away the life of our sovereign lord the King, thy royal husband: the pretense whereof being by circumstances partly laid open, thou, Hermione, contrary to the faith and allegiance of a true subject, didst counsel and aid them, for their better safety, to fly away by night (3.2.11-21).

In her trial Hermione says to Leontes: "You speak a language that I understand not" (3.2.80). This couple clearly is speaking different languages. Leontes' authoritative discourse silences Hermione's more persuasive discourse, which comes from her heart and powerfully appeals to everyone who is roused by Leontes' harsh accusation.

After the tragic events of the first act, Paulina makes her entrance and promptly plagues Leontes with her "audacious" voice. Hermione's tragedy awakens Paulina's anger and her rhetoric so that she breaks free from Leontes' courtly authority, openly expressing her contrarian response. Bakhtin explains this dialogic movement/pattern:

> Consciousness awakens to independent ideological life precisely in a world of alien discourses surrounding it, and from which it cannot initially separate itself; the process of distinguishing between one's own and another's discourse, between one's own and another's thought, is activated rather late in development.When thought begins to work in an independent, experimenting and discriminating way, what first occurs is a separation between internally persuasive discourse and authoritarian enforced discourse. . . . In the everyday rounds of our consciousness, the internally persuasive word is half-ours and half-someone else's. Its creativity and productiveness consist precisely in the fact that such a word awakens new and independent words, that it organizes masses of our words from within.[8]

Her independence awakened, Paulina proclaims, "If I prove honey-mouth'd let my tongue blister," establishing herself as the voice contrary to the "honey-mouth'd" courtiers (2.2.31). She explains to Leontes and the court:

Paulina: Do come with words as medicinal as true,
Honest as either, to purge him of that humor.
That presses him from sleep.
Leontes: {What} noise there, ho?
Paulina: No noise, my lord, but needful conference
About some gossips for your Highness.
Leontes: How?
Away with that audacious lady! (2.3.37-42)

These two have begun their verbal sparring—his word provokes her counter word. Paulina uses her "boundless tongue" (2.3.92) to be Hermione's advocate since Hermione is unjustly silenced. Not mincing words, Paulina accuses Leontes of slandering his wife and children: "Whose sting is sharper than the sword's, and will not/... once remove/ The root of his opinion, which is rotten/ As ever oak or stone was sound" (2.3.87-91).

Stuart Kurland comments that Paulina "makes a habit of telling Leontes exactly what he doesn't want to hear."[9] Her manner of speech reflects a lively, emotionally vivid language, not part of lofty official discourse. Feeling baited, Leontes tries to put her down with the old jab about women "of boundless tongue" who beat their husbands. When Leontes taunts Antigonus about his out-of-control "lewd-tongued wife" and even threatens hanging because he won't stop Paulina's speech, Antigonus retorts,

> Hang all husbands
> That cannot do that feat, you'll leave yourself
> Hardly one subject. (2.3.110-112)

The wit demonstrated by this well-matched couple, Paulina and Antigonus, suggests their resistance to Leontes' authoritarian dogmatism and their ability to see the absurdity of his hysterical accusation. Such clever retorts indirectly call into question established authority.

When threatened with burning, Paulina goes on to tell Leontes:

> I'll not call you a tyrant;
> But this most cruel usage of your queen
> (Not able to produce more accusation
> Than your own weak hing'd fancy) something savors
> Of tyranny and will ignoble make you. (2.3.116-120)

Plaguing Leontes like an irritating gadfly, Paulina is the only one bold enough to confront the king about his idiotic belief in Hermione's adultery and witchery.

Building on Bakhtin's dialogic pattern, Julia Kristeva explains the tendency of women, who are often outside the language system, to transgress that system. This transgression is a significant part of the dialogic interaction between authority, which she terms the "symbolic," and the challenge to authority, which she terms the "semiotic." Her emphasis is on transgression—not stopping with definitive claims to truth, but teasing out the unconscious, "semiotic" outside-of-language meaning and thereby unsettling the "symbolic" law of the father. Kristeva writes that, "[t]he moment of transgression is the key moment in practice; we can speak of practice wherever there is transgression of systematicity."[10]

Since official language systems often do not reflect women's perspectives (recall Hermione's plea: "You speak a language that I understand not"), women like Paulina are sometimes forced to transgress the accepted speech in order to avoid complicity with the status quo, which can lead to moral atrophy. Paulina helps guard against the excesses of Leontes' dogmatism. We see ethical paralysis in the courtiers who Paulina claims "are thus so tender o'er his follies,/ Will never do him good, not one of you" (2.3.128-129). Visiting Hermione in prison, Paulina tells the attendants that she will tell Leontes about his daughter's birth since "The office/ Becomes a woman best. I'll take't upon me" (2.2.29-30). It is a woman's job not to be "honey tongued."

Paulina is not just baiting or irritating Leontes; she clearly is empowered by moral authority; she proclaims to Hermione's attendants in prison:

> I'll use the tongue I have. If wit flow from't
> As boldness from my bosom, let't not be doubted
> I shall do good. (2.2.50-52)

Ruth Vanita comments that Paulina is one of those "completely fearless women, so empowered by her moral authority that the ruler submits to her judgment."[11] She sees Paulina as participating in a "kind of female lineage, transmitting a moral power that contrasts with and is ultimately perceived as greater than the male lineage of economic and political power."[12] Vanita includes in this lineage Mary, the mother of Jesus, and Elizabeth, the mother of John the Baptist. Not merely a mouthy woman, Paulina uses her transgressive words to do good.

Such powerful outspoken women have been vulnerable through the centuries to the accusation of witchcraft—and Paulina is no exception. She wonders "What studied torments" Leontes has in mind; "What wheels? Racks? Fires? What flaying? Boiling/ In leads or oils? What old or newer torture?" (3.2.175-177). Such means have been used through the ages to silence those who stray outside the official system. Contrary to Hermione and the courtiers, Paulina refuses to be silenced. When Leontes threatens to burn Paulina for heresy, she turns the tables on him and his accusation: "It is an heretic that makes the fire,/ Not she which burns in in't" (2.3.115-116). Her transgressive words undercut Leontes' authoritarian manner. Being responsible means that Paulina exercises her ability to respond. She speaks boldly, countering the official rhetoric, by creating a productive dialogue with Leontes, a dialogue that carries moral authority.

In speaking transgressive words, Paulina uses artful words; her skillful tongue employs various artistic deceptions to reveal the truth and bring about a satisfying resolution. Appropriately, she creates an old wives' tale, a fiction, using the art of the tale to do her work. The sixteen year lapse when Leontes is wifeless and heirless seems unreasonable to the courtiers (particularly Cleomines and Dion, who argue in logical fashion for remarriage) though it fits well in a tale. Paulina is aware that the plot she is creating would be "hoot'd at/ Like an old tale," which does not carry much credibility (5.3.116-117). She nonetheless continues to spin her tale, as Kurland explains, defying "ordinary expectations to make a winter's tale believable by calling attention to the artificiality of its own contrivances and its presentation of the implausible as plausible."[13] Paulina's inventive use of the language of story helps break the bonds of the absolute authority of Leontes' language as it explores new imaginative possibilities.

Paulina's tale spinning begins when Hermione is accused of high treason and adultery. Hermione appeals to the authority of Apollo's oracle. Responding to the Delphic oracle's clear announcement of her innocence, immediately followed by the sudden death of her son, Hermione swoons and is carried off. Paulina immediately starts to weave her plot, accusing Leontes of all that has gone wrong, before she drops her bomb:

> The sweet'st dear'st creature's dead, and vengeance for't
> Not dropp'd down yet. Lord—the higher pow'rs forbid!
> She's dead. I'll swear it. (3.2.201-203)

Paulina persists in this untruth for years until Leontes is ready for the truth. Enterline comments that Paulina's lies point to the truth beyond falsehood:

> Between Hermione's vain though truthful swearing of innocence and Paulina's successful yet false swearing of death, *The Winter's Tale* uses the female voice to point beyond truth or falsehood, beyond a conception of language as transparent description. Instead it asks us to consider the *effects* of language.[14]

Such effects of language include the moral purpose of Paulina's words discussed earlier which make her deception a kind of *moral* lie—that is, a fiction with a moral purpose.

More than tale spinning, Paulina's artful, calculated words are able to change Leontes, from his Act I view that women will say anything, to his reversal in Act III, when he says to Paulina, "thou canst not speak too much" (3.2.215). As Paulina works her verbal

magic on Leontes, she asks his forgiveness in a way that playfully suggests the opposite:

> I am sorry for't.
> All faults I make, when I shall come to know them,
> I do repent. Alas I have show'd too much
> The rashness of a woman; he is touch'd
> To th' noble heart. What's gone and what's past help
> Should be past grief. Do not receive affliction
> At my petition; I beseech you, rather
> Let me be punish'd, that have minded you
> Of what you should forget. Now my good liege,
> Sir, royal sir, forgive a foolish woman.

The tone of this "confession" and "apology" invites us to think with irony "Methinks the lady doth protest too much." Paulina continues to rub it in:

> The love I bore your queen—lo, fool again!—
> I'll speak of her no more, nor of your children;
> I'll not remember you of my own lord,
> Who is lost too. Take your patience with you,
> And I'll say nothing. (3.2.218-232)

When Paulina "repents," Leontes is softened and ready for her reminder of his foolish errors. Her use of humor and irony are rhetorically designed to work on Leontes who responds, "Thou didst speak but well/ When most the truth," (3.2.332-33) expressing his belief in her words. Although Paulina apparently testifies to a lie that Hermione is dead, she justifies her lie. When she presents Hermione's daughter to Leontes, she insists she is "no less honest/ Than you are mad" (2.3.71-72). Leontes' blind madness requires something more than the simple truth.

Paulina's transgressive and artful words are the hard medicine that brings about the healing needed in Leontes' kingdom. Soon after her audacious interruption of the complacency of the court, Paulina speaks of her words as "medicinal:"

> I do come with words as medicinal as true,
> Honest as either, to purge him of that humor
> That presses him from sleep. (2.3.37-39)

Her words become the remedy that heals Leontes of his sudden disease of insane jealousy. Paulina goes on to describe herself to Leontes:

> And I beseech you hear me, who professes
> Myself your most loyal servant, your physician,
> Your most obedient counselor; yet that dares
> Less appear so, in comforting your evils
> Than such as most seem yours. (2.3.54-55)

As a physician, Paulina serves as a kind of midwife officiating at the rebirth of Leontes. After sixteen years of penance, as befits an old wives' tale, Paulina cures Leontes, healing him from the "infection" (1.2.145) of his irrational judgment as she preserves the memory of Hermione. In Act V Paulina gently persuades Leontes to let her choose a queen:

> Yet if my Lord will marry–if you will, Sir,
> No remedy but you will–give me the office
> To choose you a queen. She shall not be so young. (5.1.76-78)

Her rhetorical style becomes more gracious and kind. Commenting on her approach late in the play, Granville-Barker writes that Paulina "relaxes from her high-toned scolding to an almost motherly fussiness."[15] The hard edge of the surgeon's knife has given way to the soft touch of the mother's healing hand.

Paulina sees herself as the agent that brings divine healing and recovery; she claims nothing less than the authority and larger justice of Apollo's oracle: "the gods/ Will have fulfill'd their secret purposes" (5.1.35-36). She clings to the enigmatic part of the oracle's message: "King Leontes shall not have an heir/ Till his lost child be found," (5.1.39-40) and holds on to her intuitive hope that "the crown will find an heir" (5.1.47); she also holds on to the old religion that Vanita claims "empowered the powerless, especially women."[16] As she coaxes Leontes to let her choose a queen for him, Camillo, though unaware of what he is doing, is arranging in Bohemia for Leontes' long lost daughter, Perdita, to return to Sicilia. Winter is turning to spring. Divinity is controlling matters here; the gods are fulfilling their purposes. Sicilia is no longer a rigid, authoritarian environment, but one where renewal is possible; Paulina's rhetoric has done its healing work. Her acknowledgment of the divine elevates her strategies beyond clever words and plots to healing agency.

Not only does Paulina employ several rhetorical strategies to achieve the happy ending, she also creates a final, powerful rhetorical event in the living statue of Hermione; this part of her artistry requires a response from Leontes. As Paulina stage manages the climactic unveiling of the statue of Hermione, she instructs Leontes: "It is requir'd/ You do awake your faith" (5.3.94-95). The "magic" of this miracle requires more than words. Walter Lim discusses the Reformation emphasis on the "indispensability of faith to salvation" newly influential in Shakespeare's time.[17] He explains that faith in "miraculous possibility" must be present, although doubt and uncertainty are also present.[18] As Paulina guides

Leontes with her careful, healing words, his faith does awake—as does that of the audience as well; and wonder of all wonders, Hermione returns to life.

Paulina's final words to the restored couple give her blessing:

> Go together
> You precious winners all; your exaltation
> Partake to every one. I, an old turtle,
> Will wing me to some wither'd bough, and there
> My mate (that's never to be found again)
> Lament till I am lost. (5.3.130-134)

Paulina's words have brought tragic events to the satisfying resolution of comedy. Her job is done; Hermione and Perdita can carry on the necessary productive dialogue with Leontes. But Paulina is also a winner here because she and Camillo, a worthy match, will join in the wedded bliss. Shakespeare, still caught in the pairing off convention at the end of his romantic comedies, cannot be content to leave Paulina alone in her PMZ power. The relative chaos she releases with her "unbridled tongue" may be contained to some extent as she is married to Camillo.

Nonetheless, Paulina's audacious words bring about a promising new era for the kingdom of Sicilia. Although this late play of Shakespeare still demonstrates the conventions of romance, *The Winter's Tale* also grapples with the larger issues of gender and power relations we have seen reflected in the struggle between authoritative and internally persuasive discourse. This dialogic struggle has brought about a stronger kingdom. The male social order of Sicilia has faced a series of challenges—provoked by the persuasive speech of Hermione and carried on by the audacious speech of Paulina. This kingdom will now presumably function on a healthier basis as more voices are heard in a more balanced dialogic interaction in both the familial and the political arenas. Bakhtin would applaud. Behind this transformation lies Paulina, an inspiring woman whose PMZ has emboldened her tongue for a worthy cause. Paulina's persuasive challenge to Leontes' authoritative discourse has been a productive struggle which has helped bring healing to this kingdom. Hermione and Perdita, who we see in Act IV has inherited her mother's verbal skills, will now speak their minds to a listening Leontes. We can presume that the well-spoken Hermione will carry on Paulina's important work now that she too has entered her PMZ period. Paulina's audacious words help establish this new era.

Notes

1. Harley Granville-Baker, *More Prefaces to Shakespeare* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1974), 23.
2. M.M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, ed. Michael Holquist (Austin: U of TX Press, 1981), 342.
3. Ibid., 343.
4. Lynn Enterline, " 'You Speak a Language that I Understand Not': The Rhetoric of Animation in *The Winter's Tale*," *Shakespeare Quarterly 48.1* (1997): 27.
5. All act, scene, and line references to *The Winter's Tale* are to *The Riverside Shakespeare* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997).
6. M.M. Bakhtin, *The Bakhtin Reader,* ed. Pam Morris (London: Arnold, 1994), 17.
7. Enterline, 18.
8. Bakhtin, 345.
9. Stuart M. Kurland, "'We need no more of your advice': Political Realism in *The Winter's Tale*," *Studies in English Literature* 31.2 (1991), 377.
10. Julia Kristeva, *The Kristeva Reader,* ed. Toril Moi (New York: Columbia UP, 1986), 29.
11. Ruth Vanita, "Mariological Memory in *The Winter's Tale and Henry VIII*," *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 40.2 (2000), 315.
12. Ibid., 312.
13. Kurland, 379.
14. Enterline, 33.
15. Granville-Baker, 20.
16. Vanita, 311.
17. Walter S.H. Lim, "Knowledge and Belief in *The Winter's Tale*," *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 41.2 (2001), 319. *Literature 1500-1900.* 41.2 (2001): 317-334.
18. Ibid., 321.

Charlotte Lennox's *Shakespear Illustrated* (1753-1754): Reading Eighteenth-Century Adaptation Practice in *Measure for Measure*

Katherine Kickel
Case Western Reserve University

The Enlightenment is not traditionally regarded as an age that was particularly conducive to Shakespeare. Usually, this is because of the effect that Neoclassical dramatic theory is thought to have had on the editing, adapting, and producing of his plays. The English Romantic Samuel Taylor Coleridge and his German contemporary August Wilhelm Schlegel are best known among Shakespeare scholars for their assignment of a Romantic "genius" to the Bard, yet their persistent and often explicit disparagement of their eighteenth-century predecessors is certainly no small component of their own ethos as literary critics. In one of the most famous pronouncements on the necessity of disavowing the Neoclassical legacy, Schlegel writes:

> ...I must separate myself from *them* entirely. What they say is hardly ever true, and certainly never profound...The recent editors go farther still, both in their prefaces, which are just meant as rhetorical exercises on the theme of praising the poet, and in their notes on particular passages. Not only do they concede that his plays offend against the rules, which is to examine them by wholly inappropriate criteria, but they also accuse him of bombast, of a confused, ungrammatical, conceited way of writing and of the most improper buffoonery (my italics).[1]

Here Schlegel's contempt for Neoclassicism is evident (especially given its strict adherence to the three dramatic unities). But what Schlegel and many of the other Romantics fail to see is that the Neoclassical location of a "general nature" in Shakespeare is, as G.F. Parker puts it, "...just as tenable and as unquestionably responsive to a real potentiality in the plays as those preferred by [their] greatest Romantic antagonist...."[2] As Parker's *Johnson's*

Shakespeare goes on to argue, in relation to the Neoclassicists generally and Johnson specifically, "...the [inherited] Romantic view is most usefully seen as neither a development nor a refutation [of the eighteenth century's critical stance] but a powerful alternative."[3] Thus, for all of the pedantry that the Romantics traditionally associate with both Pope and Johnson's prefaces to the plays, it is important to remember that the long eighteenth century actually did support the construction of Shakespeare as its national poet and playwright, and it did so with an unrivaled fervor in comparison to previous eras.

At the beginning of the Restoration, Shakespeare's plays had not been reprinted as a collected edition since the appearance of the second folio in 1632.[4] As the publication of his plays had dwindled, so also did their productions. By the middle of the seventeenth century, very few living actors had any experience performing the most famous Shakespearean roles since the number of regularly rotated plays *before* the Civil War had decreased to a mere five: *Hamlet, Othello, Julius Caesar, The Merry Wives of Windsor,* and *Henry IV part I*.[5] Yet between the years 1660 and 1769, a virtual latter-day Shakespearean renaissance occurred in England when twenty-four plays were reintroduced to the public and a number of festivals celebrating the Bard first transpired.[6]

In *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare, Adaptation, and Authorship* 1660-1769, Michael Dobson investigates how Shakespeare came to occupy the "centre of English literary culture."[7] In doing so, Dobson reminds us that while the Romantics certainly fostered new ideas about "authorship" and " genius," the eighteenth century actually initiated the most important traditions that we associate with Shakespeare study today.[8] Of the many to choose from, Dobson stresses the introduction of female actresses to the stage, the incorporation of Shakespeare in secondary and post-secondary curriculums, the reproduction of his work in scholarly editions, and the memorialization of the Bard in public monuments as particularly significant.[9] Ironically, though, the same age that sought to enshrine Shakespeare in the Western canon, is also the era replete with challenges to his laureateship. Perhaps, the most significant example of Shakespeare's perceived tenuity in the eighteenth century is evidenced in the persistent rewriting of his plays. Some examples of famous eighteenth-century Shakespearean adaptations include:

> ...the first conflation of two Shakespeare plays into one (*The Law Against Lovers,* created by Sir William Davenport from *Measure for Measure* and *Much Ado About Nothing* in

1662); the first *Troilus and Cressida* in which Cressida commits suicide to prove her innocence (John Dryden's *Troilus and Cressida, or Truth Found Too Late,* first acted in 1679); the first *Henry V* in which the protagonist is pursued to France by his scorned ex-mistress Harriet, disguised as a page (Aaron Hill's *King Henry the Fifth, or, The Conquest of France by the English,* 1732); the first *As You Like It* to betroth Celia to Jaques and include *Pyramus and Thisbe* (Charles Johnson's *Love in a Forest,* performed in the same year); and the first *Cymbeline* to observe the unities of time and place (prepared by William Hawkins in 1759).[10]

Given the prevalence of such productions during the Enlightenment, it is important to consider what factors may have contributed to all of these rewritings. In this essay, I argue that one part of the answer to that query lies in the appearance of Charlotte Lennox's *Shakespear Illustrated*, a little-known three volume compilation of Shakespeare's source tales. In what follows, I examine Charlotte Lennox's *Shakespear Illustrated: Or the Novels and Histories on which the Plays of Shakespear are Founded, Collected and Translated from the Original Authors: With Critical Remarks: In two volumes* (1753-1754) in order not only to understand how one eighteenth-century female reader, writer, and critic read Shakespeare, but also to see how Lennox's scholarly project (the only study of its kind in the eighteenth century) encouraged eighteenth-century adaptations of the plays through its own model of revisionist scholarship. By reading Lennox's interpretation of *Measure for Measure* as a case in point, I chart the development of a new critical tradition in the eighteenth century: one that was for the first time centered solely on Shakespeare and explicitly concerned with the nature of literary adaptation—whether on the stage or the page.

During the eighteenth century, the English writer Charlotte Lennox became famous for her novel *The Female Quixote* (1752). And although *The Female Quixote* still remains popular among both students and scholars of the eighteenth century (due in no small part to the fact that Dr. Johnson is believed to have wrote the chapter entitled "Being in the Author's Opinion, the best Chapter in this History"), it is noteworthy that her literary criticism never fared as well. Indeed, *Shakespear Illustrated* was largely ignored by the literary establishment in the eighteenth century—first, by *The Gentleman's Magazine* (which only mentioned it in passing) and, later, by *The Monthly Review* which curtly dismissed it by saying: "Her remarks, which are very judicious, and truly critical are chiefly intended to prove that Shakespear has generally spoiled every story on which the above plays are founded, by torturing them into low

contrivances, absurd intrigue, and improbably incidents."[11] In either case, whether the result of virtual neglect or blatant condescension, Charlotte Lennox's nonfiction never garnered the same acclaim that her fiction did, which is strange because in many ways the two are intimately connected. After all, *The Female Quixote* is an adaptation while *Shakespear Illustrated* reflects on adaptation practice.

Shakespear Illustrated is a text all about the idiosyncrasies of adaptation. However, Lennox is less concerned with the growing trend of rewriting the Bard than she is with depicting the Bard's adaptations of others; thus, *Shakespear Illustrated* is the first study of its kind in the eighteenth century to detail the source tales of Shakespeare's plays and then to read these wellsprings alongside the plays that they inspired. In essence, Lennox is the first literary critic to note that the eighteenth century's adaptation practices stem, in part, from the very plays that it was so often criticized for altering. So while Lennox certainly cannot be credited with beginning the adaptation movement in the eighteenth century, her scholarship can be read in light of its support for this practice since it provided any director, scholar, or playwright with the standard derivations that Shakespeare's plays took.

The first two volumes of *Shakespear Illustrated*, published in 1753, contain discussions of *Measure for Measure, Romeo and Juliet, Othello, Cymbeline, All's Well that End's Well, Twelfth Night, Macbeth, A Winter's Tale, The Comedy of Errors,* and *Hamlet*; the third volume, published in 1754, addresses *Troilus and Cressida, Richard the Second, 1 Henry IV, (I,II, and III) Henry VI, Richard III, Henry VIII, Much Ado about Nothing,* and *King Lear.* While it is unclear how many of the original texts were actually used (rather than "cribbed") in her research, it is clear that Lennox exhausted the linguistic resources that she found in the friends and colleagues that Johnson introduced her to for help. (Under Antonio Barretti's guidance, Lennox is able to translate from Cinthio, Bandello, Boccacio, and Ariosto to name a few.)[12] As is immediately evident, Lennox does not cover all of Shakespeare's plays in her study and what appears to be a gap in her project, actually turns out to be a function of its investigative parameters: Lennox is primarily interested in the French and Italian sources so she limits herself to these tales.

From the beginning of her project, Lennox acknowledges that as a female reader, scholar, and writer herself, she is presumptuous to employ a critical voice at all in her work. It is important to remember that as a professional novelist, Lennox is allowed, even encouraged, to engage in her "female scribbling."[13] However, the commendations that she received for accounting the quixotic

misadventures of Arabella (a young devotee of French romances) do *not* extend to her participation in the male dominated academy of literary criticism—unless she is acting under the auspices of being a research assistant for her mentor Dr. Johnson (who many believe originally set Lennox on her course of scholarly investigation in preparation for his own edition).[14]

In the dedication, Lennox anticipates the criticism that she foresees her project meeting. Some of its inadequacy, she attributes (rather cheekily) to the fact of her being a woman: That no such Enemies may arise against me (though I am unwilling to believe it) I am far from being too confident, for who can fix Bounds to Bigotry and Folly? My *Sex*, my *Age*, have not given me many Opportunities of mingling in the World; there may be in it many a Species of Absurdity which I have never seen, and among them such Vanity as pleases itself, with false Praise bestowed on another, and such Superstition as worships Idols, without supporting them to be God.[15]

And although Lennox admits to her own inadequacies—"my sex, my age"—in tackling a task as enormous as she has, her voice nonetheless contains a tenor of authority as she points out the temptation of what Shaw would later term "bardolatry" in any Shakespeare study.

When it comes to her actual readings of the plays, Lennox, like her mentor Johnson, sees Shakespeare's greatest strength in his rendering of a "general nature." She writes of Shakespeare's players, "These Characters are so copiously diversified, and some of them so justly pursued, that his Works, may be considered as a Map of Life, a faithful Miniature of human Transactions, and he that has read *Shakespear* with Attention, will perhaps find little new in the crowded World."[16] Locating a universal depiction of humanity in the Bard, Lennox suggests that it is Shakespeare's use of the "mirror," rather than the "lamp," that demonstrates his talent.[17] Moreover, she points out that while Shakespeare is known for his "imagination," very few of his plots were actually "original" (because, as she explains, the notion of "originality" was defined differently during the Renaissance): "But the Truth is, that a very small Part of the Reputation of this mighty Genius depends upon the naked Plot, or Story of his Plays. He lived in an Age when the Books of Chivalry were yet popular, and when therefore the minds of his Auditors were not accustomed to balance Probabilities, or to examine nicely the Proportion between Causes and Effects."[18] For Lennox the fact that Shakespeare has incorporated source tales in his plays is important, in large part, because so much of

her own reputation as a novelist hinged on her oft-criticized invocation of Cervantes. However, Lennox also notes a troubling absence of the dramatic unities in Shakespeare when she says that he was not "accustomed to balance Probabilities, or to examine nicely the Proportion between Causes and Effects."[19] And this discrepancy is precisely what Lennox believes is at the heart of *Measure for Measure 's* problem.

Her presentation of the source tale in *Measure for Measure* is typical of how *Shakespear Illustrated* as a whole proceeds. Lennox begins her discussion of the play by recounting "The fifth Novel of the eighth Decad of the Hecatomythi of *Giraldi Cinthio.*"[20] Next, she provides a synopsis of the plot which is then followed by her own "critical remarks." In praising Shakespeare's version of the tale, she writes: "There are a greater Diversity of Characters, and more Intrigues in the Fable of the Play, than the Novel of Cinthio;…."[21] But in criticizing its overall composition, she notes, "…yet, I think that wherever *Shakespear* has invented, he is greatly below the Novelist; since the Incidents he has added are neither necessary nor probable."[22] It is difficult to tell here whether Lennox is being ironic or not. Usually, her proponents believe that Lennox's criticism is dipped in irony when she alleges that Shakespeare has inappropriately altered the tales to suit his own needs. In this case, it stands to reason that if Shakespeare's "genius" derives from his ability to elaborate on established storylines then why should she be prohibited from invoking Cervantes in her novel? On the other hand, if Lennox's adversaries are correct, then it seems that she is actually suggesting that the eighteenth-century notion of "original" authorship must be privileged above all else. In the end, though, neither of these simple premises fully supports her reasoning when she writes: "*Shakespear,* though he has altered and added a good deal, yet has not mended the Moral, for he also shews Vice not only pardoned but left in Tranquility."[23] In order to understand Lennox's criticism here, it is important to remember that whereas in the original tale the Lady (Epitia) actually does sleep with the Angelo character (Jursite) in order to save her brother (only to be betrayed by him later when he proceeds to execute her brother despite her sacrifice), in Shakespeare's version the opposite is true as a result of Marianna's bedtrick. According to Lennox, this adaptation is a mistake: "As the Character of the Duke is absurd and ridiculous, that of *Angelo* is inconsistent to the last Degree; his Baseness to *Mariana,* his wicked Attempts on the Chastity of *Isabella,* his villainous Breach of Promise, and Cruelty to *Claudio,* prove him to be a very bad Man, long practiced in Wickedness

[and deserving of revenge]...."[24] Thus Lennox's discontent over Shakespeare's use of the source tale does not stem from the fact that he has changed it; rather, it derives from her belief that he has not changed it enough.

Of course, Lennox's unhappiness about Shakespeare's rendering of Angelo is far from constituting her only criticism of the play. Lennox also has a problem with Shakespeare's interpretation of Epitia. Of Isabella, she writes:

> The Character... in the Play seems to be an improvement upon that of *Epitia* in the Novel; for *Isabella* absolutely refuses, and persists in her Refusal to give up her Honour to save her Brother's Life; whereas *Epitia*, overcome by her own Tenderness of Nature, and the affecting Prayers of the unhappy Youth, yields to what her Soul abhors, to redeem him from a shameful Death.[25]

And though Lennox is pleased by the fact that Shakespeare makes Isabella "more virtuous" than her source, she is dismayed that her language does not always reflect the true strength of her inner character—not because it is too soft, but rather because it is too harsh. In a gesture that is typical of how Lennox involves her readers, she asks them: "Is this the Language of a modest tender Maid; one who had devoted herself to a religious Life, and was remarkable for an exalted Understanding, and unaffected Piety in the earliest Bloom of Life?"[26] Desiring a character who is both rhetorically virtuous as well as actively vengeful, Lennox sees an inconsistency between Isabella's depiction and the play's conclusion. Ultimately, she believes that the title is misleading because

> ...it should have been, according to the Duke's own Judgment to have made it *Measure for Measure;* but when Angelo was pardoned, and restored to Favour, how then was it *Measure for Measure?* The case is not altered, because *Claudio* was not put to death, and *Isabella* not violated; it was not through Angelo 's Repentence, that both these Things did not happen; a Woman he was engaged to, supplied the Place of *Isabella,* and the Head of Claudio's. *Angelo* therefore was intentionally guilty of perverting Justice, debauching a Virgin, and breaking his Promise, in putting her Brother to death, whose Life she had brought by that Sacrifice....This Play therefore being absolutely defective in a due Distribution of Rewards and Punishments.[27]

Here Lennox is disturbed by what she sees as the play's "lack of morality"—a common complaint among the Neoclassicists.

However, her use of the phrase in relation to Shakespeare's characters is not solely an ethical one. For Lennox "a lack of morality" also denotes an inconsistency in Shakespeare's rendering of female characters that she finds troubling. She believes that Shakespeare's departure from the source tale's portrayal of Epitia introduces a host of technical problems to the plot when it fails to observe the dramatic unities: "The Fable thus manag'd, takes in as great a Variety of Incidents, as with Propriety can be introduced in a Play, and those Incidents naturally rising out of one another, and all dependent on the principal Subject of the Drama, forms that Unity of Action, which the Laws of Criticism require."[28] Thus Lennox, like many of her Augustan contemporaries, seems to be concerned with a dramatic ideal that Shakespeare never had in mind in the first place—a point emphatically made by Schlegel at the beginning of this essay, but one that nevertheless needs to be examined in order for her to be fully understood.

What do we make of Lennox's observation of all of these inconsistencies between the source tale, Shakespeare's play, and the dramatic unities? And, even more importantly, what do they tell us about the conception of authorship and the notion of "originality" in the eighteenth century when we read Shakespeare through Lennox's intellectual lens? These are the main questions that *Shakespear Illustrated* raises. Overall, at least in my own reading of the text, Lennox's insistence on the importance of justice in her reading of *Measure for Measure* seems in most ways to miss the point that Shakespeare is making about mercy and the problems inherent in the meting out of revenge. Even the source tale does not go far enough in distributing justice for Lennox's taste. In this sense, Lennox actually performs what she criticizes Shakespeare for doing. In an ironic gesture in a text all about the inconsistencies of source tales and their dramatic adaptations, Lennox actually offers her audience *another* rewriting of the tale of Juriste and Epitia in order to demonstrate how Shakespeare should have done it. So beyond merely criticizing Shakespeare' s adaptation, *Shakespear Illustrated* also offers an alternative adaptation—not only of Shakespeare's play, but also of its source. Rather than simply have Epitia marry the condemned Juriste and then save his life, Lennox wants her to enter a Cloister and then have her husband "stab himself in Despair" upon realizing her loss.[29] Regardless of how Lennox thinks that the *Measure for Measure* should end, the important point here is that she believes that it should end *differently* than how it has, and she feels that she has the right to alter its conclusion to conform to her aesthetic expectations. Furthermore, she is

convinced that when the dramatic unities are fulfilled all of the characters will become ethically codified in a manner that she does not see in the play's present form.

In a study all about the implications of adaptations, Lennox provides her audience with not only Shakespeare's version, but also her own. In doing so, she invites them to consider the validity of any play's conclusion. And she opens the door to supporting the practice of theatrical and literary adaptations, not by merely justifying her own version (and the versions of her contemporaries) but by illustrating how Shakespeare himself employed it in his own formulations. It is by example that Lennox uses Shakespeare to consider the validity of these practices while she also engages in them herself. Ultimately, whether the reader agrees or disagrees with Lennox's opinion does not really matter. The significance of her text rests in the fact that she has begun a scholarly conversation about the plays that is informed by a practice that very few have actually critically considered.

With the introduction of her "critical remarks," Lennox has initiated a much larger debate on the intention of adaptation and the meaning of "originality" in writing. By inserting her personal voice into the text, she argues for what she wants to see, while she also scrupulously shows what is already there through her compilation of the source tales. Simultaneously, she exemplifies what is fast becoming a common gesture by the end of the eighteenth century: an approach to Shakespeare's plays through a reflection on their themes rather than merely their conventions. So while Lennox does occasionally become distracted by a Neoclassical requirement in her discussion, this is hardly her only concern. She also writes rather eloquently on language, poetic technique, and meaning. By comparing the source tales to the originals, Lennox illustrates the evolutionary capability of any storyline while she implies the ever-changing cultural significance of these particular tales. Most important of all, though, Lennox is able to address (although somewhat inadvertently by the extended attention that she pays in critiquing them) the study of Shakespeare's characters, rather than simply his plots.

Lennox's work is interested in character, and this is where she diverges from many of her contemporaries. Is Lennox a feminist, per say, in her approach to Shakespeare? Might her insolence to speak on the Bard and then to criticize his dramatic conclusions be construed as the rumblings of an eighteenth-century proto-feminist discourse? Well, to argue one way or the other actually misses the point. Lennox is a reader of Shakespeare and she is an

obvious admirer of his work. Yet this does not prohibit her from engaging with the plays on her own terms, and it does not prevent her from becoming an active participant in a scholarly conversation that she feels compelled to enter—even if she is precluded from doing so as a woman. She looks up the plays' sources, she learns French and Italian, and she reads them according to how she thinks they should be read. The fact that Lennox engages in a type of textual revision herself does not prohibit her from assessing Shakespeare's. Moreover, her critical exercise reminds us of the eighteenth century's impetus for a new form of "originality" in writing (even on the part of its literary critics) while it also demonstrates an approach to the text that was largely taken for granted in the composition of both fiction and drama in the eighteenth century.

It is important to remember that the very gesture that initially included Lennox in the conversation about Shakespeare in the eighteenth century (the potential that she sees in his plays for adaptation), is also the same gesture that has ever since excluded her from the academy (when adaptation came to be seen as a sign of disrespect to the author). But when *Shakespear Illustrated* is read in light of the popularity of eighteenth-century theatrical and literary adaptations as well as the earnestness of eighteenth-century readers to revive Shakespeare's plays in the national repertory, it becomes clear that Lennox's intention is not to mar Shakespeare by her "critical remarks" (as many have suggested) or to embarrass herself. Instead, she wishes to attest to the multiplicity of interpretation that early modern readers experienced upon reading or seeing the plays and to investigate the nature and use of adaptation practice in her own writing and research. Thus, Lennox's view of Shakespeare, like many of the Neoclassicists, has been unfairly distorted by the acerbity of the Romantics' dismissal. Yet, this only partially clarifies her long-standing exclusion from Shakespeare Studies.

According to Ann Thompson and Sasha Roberts, the academy's preference for certain rhetorical genres [i.e. the scholarly edition, monograph, essay, and article in a learned journal] helps to explain the absence of some early modern women writers from traditional historiographies of eighteenth-century literary scholarship, yet it does not account, as I have demonstrated here, for Lennox's case because she did produce a scholarly monograph.[30] Instead, much of Lennox's omission from Shakespeare Studies might be attributed to the nature of her research. Unlike her Bluestocking contemporaries, who were all famous for promoting

the bard in the national literary consciousness, Lennox's reputation as a Shakespeare critic rested on the so called "audacious" remarks that she made about the plays. Unfortunately, these comments have largely excluded her from any serious historical consideration as either a member of the Ladies Shakespeare Club or a participant in the male dominated academy of the eighteenth century, and she deserves credit for her role in both.[31] Ultimately, Lennox's lone dissenting voice as a female critic amidst the emergent genre of eighteenth-century male criticism on Shakespeare, is innovative in the sense that, as Margaret Anne Doody puts it, "her tart remarks can be refreshing after so much elaborate praise...."[32] In the end, it is precisely the unconventionality of Lennox's tone, the "tartness" in her writing, that beckons us back to her and her Age of Reason (still in search of Shakespeare and his plays)—even after so many years.

Notes

1. Quoted in G.F. Parker, *Johnson's Shakespeare* (New York: Clarendon Press, 1989), 12.

2. Parker, 13.

3. Parker, 13.

4. Michael Dobson, *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare, Adaptation, and Authorship* (New York: Clarendon Press, 1992), 2.

5. Dobson, 2.

6. Dobson, 2. To put it simply, according to Dobson a great deal had happened very quickly: "By 1769, when almost every national newspaper and magazine reprinted Rowe's biography as part of their coverage of David Garrick's Stratford Jubilee, readers of Shakespeare might have consulted collected editions not only of Rowe but an illustrious succession of prestigious writers including Alexander Pope, Sir Thomas Hanmer, and Samuel Johnson, and any actor in the employ of the Theatres Royal would have needed a working familiarity with at least twenty-four of Shakespeare's plays, revivals of which accounted for more than one in six of all dramatic performances given in London." (2).

7. Dobson, 3.

8. Dobson, 3.

9. Dobson, 3.

10. Dobson, 4. Ultimately, then, the same period that saw the revival of every single Shakespeare play (excluding *Love's Labour's Lost*), also saw an adaptation of every single Shakespeare play (excluding *Othello* and Henry IV, part one) (Dobson 4).

11. Quoted in Miriam Rossiter Small, *Charlotte Ramsay Lennox: An Eighteenth Century Lady of Letters* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935), 198.

12. Colin Franklin, *Shakespeare Domesticated: The Eighteenth-Century Editions* (London: Scolar Press, 1991), 225.

13. Jane Spencer, *The Rise of the Woman Novelist: From Aphra Behn to Jane Austen* (New York: Basil Blackwell, 1986), xi. Spencer writes: "In the eighteenth

century we can detect the presence of a view of writing that links it to the feminine role rather than opposing the two. This, as I will show, encouraged the expansion of women's professional writing. But at the same time as encouraging women to write, this feminization of literature defined literature as a special category supposedly outside the political arena, with an influence on the world as indirect as women's was supposed to be" (xi).

14. In Boswell's *Life of Johnson,* Johnson, after dining with Fanny Burney, Elizabeth Carter, and Hannah Moore, is said to have described his young protégé thus (on March 14, 1784): "Three such women are not to be found: I know not where I could find a fourth, except Mrs. Lennox, who is superior to them all" (qtd. in Ann Thompson and Sasha Roberts, eds., *Women Reading Shakespeare 1660-1900: An Anthology of Criticism* (New York: Manchester University Press, 1997), 15). Johnson was Lennox's friend and mentor for over thirty years, so it should come as no surprise that he encouraged her to embark on the scholarly study of Shakespeare almost ten years before his own edition came out. Many scholars believe that what was originally a research task undertaken by Mrs. Lennox in preparation for aiding Johnson, ultimately became its own publication.

15. Charlotte Lennox, *Shakespear Illustrated: Or The Novels and Histories On which the Plays of Shakespear Are Founded, Collected, Translated from the Original Authors with Critical Remarks* Printed for A. Millar (New York: AMS Press, 1973), viii.

16. Lennox, x.

17. M. H. Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1953).

18. Lennox, viii-ix.

19. Lennox, viii-ix.

20. Lennox, 1.

21. Lennox, 24.

22. Lennox, 24.

23. Lennox, 25.

24. Lennox, 31.

25. Lennox, 32.

26. Lennox, 34.

27. Lennox, 35-37.

28. Lennox, 27.

29. Lennox, 26.

30. Thompson and Roberts, 7. Such reasoning obviously applies to the Shakespeare Ladies Club (formed in 1736 and aimed at reinstating the Bard's plays in the London theatrical repertory) as well as the formidable minds of Elizabeth Montagu (author of *Essay on the Writings and Genius of Shakespear, Compared with the Greek and French Dramatic Poets: With Some Remarks upon the Misrepresentations of Mons. De Voltaire* (1769) and Elizabeth Griffith (author of *The Morality of Shakespeare's Drama Illustrated* (1775) (both spoke with equal eloquence on the necessity of recognizing Shakespeare as a figure of national import). For additional information on eighteenth-century women's efforts to revive the Bard see Elizabeth Eger, "'Out rushed a female to protect the Bard': The Bluestocking Defense of Shakespeare," *Reconsidering the Bluestockings,* eds. Nichole Pohl and Betty A. Schellenberg (San Marino: Huntington Library, 2003), 127-153. Eger reminds us of the "striking reversal of roles" between female literary scholars and Shakespeare in the eighteenth century: "While many

contemporary critics have been concerned to add women's writing to an existing canon of literature by men, few have considered women's role in forming that canon at its first inception or acknowledged their active critical presence as a historical fact that must be relearned" (129). And, as a case in point, the Bluestocking defense of Shakespeare illustrates one of the best examples of a female recovery movement in history. Yet the same accolades that Eger pays to Elizabeth Montagu and Elizabeth Griffith in her essay are not extended to Lennox—making her largely forgotten, in many ways, by both female historians as well as more traditional ones.

31. The Shakespeare Ladies Club was formally established in the late 1730s and comprised "an informal association of 'Ladies of Quality' who in addition to supporting the Abbey project petitioned theatre management to revive more Shakespeare in place of both the libertine excesses of Restoration comedy and the irrational insipidity of Italian opera" (Dobson, *Making of the National Poet*, 147). The Ladies Club met such tremendous success that in 1755 Eliza Haywood had this too say of them: "Some ladies, indeed have shewn a truly public Spirit in rescuing the admirable, yet almost forgotten *Shakespear*, from being totally sunk in oblivion:—they have generously contributed to raise a monument to his memory, and frequently honored his works with their presence on the stage:—an action, which deserves the highest encomiums, and will be attended with an adequate reward; since, in preserving the fame of the dead bard, they add a brightness to their own, which will shine to late posterity" (qtd. in Eger, 127). However, as Eger points out, the women who participated in this revival were eventually eclipsed by their own constructions of Shakespeare and have ever since fallen into obscurity. In any case, Lennox's efforts are rarely associated with these women either literally or figuratively—in large part, I believe, because of the nature of her comments.

32. Margaret Anne Doody, "Shakespeare's Novels: Charlotte Lennox Illustrated," *Studies in the Novel* 19.3 (Fall 1987): 296-310.

John Fletcher's Taming of Shakespeare: The Tamer Tam'd

Todd Lidh
Flagler College

In *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London,* Andrew Gurr argues for four types of evidence that contribute to the portrait of contemporary playgoers: circumstances of performance, demographics, contemporary accounts of playgoing and "evidence for the mental composition . . . of the kind of playgoer the hopeful poet might expect to find in the crowd at the venue intended for his play" (5-6). He places significantly more emphasis and authority on the first three types of evidence—those he characterizes as physical—and takes only the most tentative steps towards the final kind of evidence. His overriding concern is that this last kind of evidence can be misinterpreted without firm, historical analysis as a foundation. Despite his caution and despite examples to substantiate his concern, Gurr essentially calls for an analysis of mental composition: "perhaps, though, the solidity established with the other three [types of evidence] may provide an anchorage for further exploration of this fourth kind" (6).

One way, perhaps, to avoid subjective analysis is to consider plays which underwent some kind of revision. In its most basic sense, *revise* means "to go over again, to re-examine, in order to improve or amend."[1] Almost exclusively, *revision* is used to describe the process and product of a writer returning to his or her work and the alterations, modifications, additions and deletions he or she makes to it.

In *The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time,* Gerald Bentley suggests: "[One] type of revision of dramatists' manuscripts in the theaters occurred when the actors prepared the play for a revival. There are a great many records of one sort or another of this common practice; even the general public seems to have taken it for granted . . . And even the players took it for granted that their audiences were familiar with the custom of revision, whether it was admitted or not" (237-238). Ben Jonson, in his *Timber, or*

Discoveries, was among the many who argued that poets should "repeat often what we have formerly written; which beside that it helps the consequence, and makes the juncture better, it quickens the heat of imagination, that often cools in the time of setting down, and gives it new strength, as if it grew lustier by the going back" (*De stylo* 411).

It is apparent that early modern playwrights saw opportunities to capitalize on notoriety, and this may have been a driving force behind the composition *The First Part of Hieronimo*, the later-written prequel to Thomas Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy*. In a different vein, and one perhaps more closely linked to the fundamental definition of "revision," is John Fletcher's *The Woman's Prize: or, the Tamer Tam'd*, a sequel to Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew* where the plot is continued, but characters are altered significantly.

I believe that John Fletcher's *The Woman's Prize* is more than merely a second-class follow-up to Shakespeare's *Taming of the Shrew*, a fairly standard critical opinion. In looking at the gender/marriage debate that runs from approximately 1600-1620 (culminating with Swetnam and *hic mulier*), I believe that Fletcher anticipated an audience far more receptive to a "new London woman," such as those who appear in his play, and he emphasizes the difference between his audience and earlier ones by using Shakespeare's well-known play and characters. By revising some of those characters (but not all), Fletcher maximizes the effect and importance of the ongoing gender debate.

The relationship between Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew* and Fletcher's *The Woman's Prize, or, The Tamer Tam'd* is both simple and complex—simple in that every editor of Fletcher's drama or critic of his work acknowledges the Shakespeare work as the source play. *The Woman's Prize* has been called a "sequel," a "continuation," a "counterblast," an "adaptation," a "spin-off," a "burlesque," and even a "calculated intertextual glance."[2] The simple fades into complex with respect to how and why Fletcher's revision takes place.

Fletcher anticipated an audience much more receptive to strong female characters versus those found in Shakespeare's play: while Katherine from *The Taming of the Shrew* may be strong-**willed**, she eventually accedes to the wishes of her father and her husband and at least speaks the language of a proper wife. Fletcher has strong women in his play, ones represented as independent and willing to speak their minds no matter the cost. Whereas Shakespeare's play is a "pleasant comedy" set in Italy to entertain a group of English (including the audience), Fletcher's play is a

"battaile without blood," according to the Prologue, and the stakes are higher because Fletcher is essentially setting up a rematch between the two main combatants from the first play.

It is too limiting to dismiss the notion of Fletcher as merely Shakespeare's reviser, as George Ferguson does in his 1966 critical edition of *The Woman's Prize*: "Fletcher goes no further than [keeping three Italian names—Petruchio, Tranio and Bianca]; he repeats none of the speeches, action, or subplotting; instead he turns the plot materials over and transports the action to London—leaving the Italian names and the changed character of Petruchio to hint rather broadly at the older play" (12). This sentence contains the whole of Ferguson's effort linking *The Woman's Prize* with *The Taming of the Shrew*.

The actual connection between Fletcher and Shakespeare appears obvious: as Shakespeare neared retirement as the head playwright for the King's Men, Fletcher was brought in to fill in the gaps and, eventually, to take over as lead playwright. Fletcher's collaborations with Beaumont, Massinger, Field and even Shakespeare as well as his individual contributions kept him employed until his death in 1625. The overlap with Shakespeare goes deeper than time of service, however; Gurr states that the popularity of the King's Men between 1609 and the early 1620s[3] was unrivaled, and his argument rests largely on the familiarity later audiences had with earlier works, particularly those by Shakespeare. *The Woman's Prize* as a sequel to *The Taming of the Shrew* easily fits this pattern. Fletcher himself, less than a decade later, treats the notion of revising an old play in the prologue to his *The False One*:

> New titles warrant not a play for new,
> The subject being old; and 'tis as true,
> Fresh and neat matter may with ease be fram'd
> Out of their stories that have oft been nam'd
> With glory on the stage. (1-5)

Minor Revisions

Fletcher, like most revisers, makes changes that are slight and do not have the same significance as other revisions. Among these is Hortensio who becomes Moroso in Fletcher's play and Baptista who becomes Petronius. In what can only be described as a literal lessening of character, Shakespeare's Lucentio is revised into Rowland, the young suitor to the younger daughter. Finally, Bianca is revised as Livia, the younger daughter fighting her father's wishes for whom she is to marry.[4] Unlike Shakespeare's Bianca, who is

mostly acted upon but performs some part in the final decision regarding her marriage, Livia plays a major role in the plotting and duping of her father. In a small way, this revision of Bianca into Livia establishes the basis for what I believe truly marks Fletcher's play as a significant revision of *The Taming of the Shrew*: his attention to and strengthening of female characters as well as in his limited revision of Petruchio.

Kate/Maria

Despite Kate not actually being an on-stage character—her name goes noticeably unmentioned the play—she appears in Fletcher's revision in two substantial ways: first, with regard to the final scene in *The Taming of the Shrew*; and second, in the guise of Petruchio's second wife, Maria.

Kate's final speech and its closing action (placing her hand under Petruchio's foot) are at once a vindication of Petruchio's taming process and an affront to feminists no matter how nascent. Much of what has been said critically about Shakespeare's play emphasizes the central relationship between the tamer and the shrew. This relationship has been used to tout Shakespeare as feminist, anti-feminist, radical, or reactionary.[5]

Fletcher, writing for an audience familiar with Shakespeare's play, must have seen this same prominence and thus chose to use irony as the basis for his presentation of Kate in his play. She does not make an appearance in Fletcher's play, but her presence is impossible to ignore; she is referred to as early as the sixteenth line in the first scene:

> What though his other wife,
> Out of her most abundant stubbornesse,
> Out of her daily hue and cries upon him,
> (For sure she was a Rebell) turn'd his temper,
> And forc'd him blow as high as she? (I.i.16-20)
>
> * * * *
>
> For yet the bare remembrance of his first wife
> (I tell ye on my knowledge, and a truth too)
> Will make him start in's sleep, and very often
> Cry out for Cudgels, Colstaves, any thing;
> Hiding his Breeches, out of feare her Ghost
> Should walk, and weare 'em yet. Since his first marriage,
> He is no more the still *Petruchio*, (I.i.31-37)

These opening descriptions, as well as ongoing references to Kate throughout the play, revise the ending of *The Taming of the Shrew* in a fundamental way: Kate has not been tamed, much as Petruchio

would like everyone around him to believe. Fletcher provides no alternate motivation for Kate's actions at the closing of Shakespeare's play; instead, he returns to the earliest descriptions of her by Gremio and Hortensio and restores them in describing Katherine after marriage—"a devil" (I.i.121), "a shrewd ill-favor'd wife" (I.ii.60) and "Her only fault, and that is fault enough, / Is that she is intolerable curst / And shrewd and froward, so beyond all measure" (I.ii.88-90). Petruchio did not tame "Katherine the curst"; rather, as he states in the middle of *The Woman's Prize*, "did Heaven forgive me, / And take this Serpent from me" (III.iii.165-166). Here, Fletcher makes his first substantive revision—and this to a character never seen on stage! Fletcher could have merely said that Petruchio's first wife had died, but any references to their married life would have reflected the literal ending of *The Taming of the Shrew*: Kate tamed, Petruchio the victorious husband. Many of Maria's complaints, real or imagined, about her future life with Petruchio are dependent on his first wife being shrewish and Petruchio continuing his attempts at taming her.

During Fletcher's playwrighting years, the tradition handed down was that "women were told over and over and over that they were inferior, that they had lesser minds, that they were unable to handle their own affairs" (Hull 140). Barbara Baines, in her introduction to three anonymous pamphlets from 1620 (*Hic Mulier*, *Haec-Vir* and *Muld Sacke*), comments:

> Discourses on the precise nature of woman's frailty and the most effective cure for it were popular throughout the Renaissance. By the close of the sixteenth century, many writers had come to the defense of women, but after the death of Queen Elizabeth, the detractors seem to have found the larger audience. The antifeminist arguments and responses to them intensify during the reign of James I . . . (v)

In updating Shakespeare's play but still removed from the flashpoint of *Hic Mulier*, Fletcher anticipates an audience similar to that for both *Epicoene* and *The Roaring Girl*: one not enslaved to popular taste but likewise not unfamiliar with gender issues of importance – in marriage, in social circles, in political debates. This intertextual connection emphasizes not only how Kate is revised by Fletcher as a non-reformed shrew, but also how she is truly revised as Petruchio's second wife, Maria.

Maria exhibits the same willfulness and strong personality as her predecessor with one substantial difference: Maria's goals are not Kate's. Kate's motivations are based on her personality,

described and demonstrated: "that wench is stark mad" (I.i.69) and "If I be waspish, best beware my sting" (II.i.206). Maria reserves her marital favors to create "a miracle" (I.ii.69), to make Petruchio "easie as a child, / And tame as feare" (I.ii.113-114). Maria's ultimate goal is to be married to Petruchio, just not married to the Petruchio who has the reputation for aggressively taming his first wife and for being an overbearing, dominating husband. Maria herself says of Kate, "She was a foole, / And took a scurvy course; let her be nam'd / 'Mongst those that wish for things, but dare not do 'em" (I.ii.141-143).

The contrast between these two is perhaps starkest when looking at each's final speech. Kate's is, at the least, a verbal recitation of a traditional role for a wife with heavy emphasis on the dominant position of husband—"thy lord, thy king, thy governor . . . / thy lord, thy life, thy keeper, / Thy head, thy sovereign" (V.ii.138, 146-7). Her speech, 44 lines total, is all-but impossible for many modern audiences to accept at face value;[6] while no direct evidence exists as to how Shakespeare's audience might have reacted, some insight does exist in the change between Shakespeare's and Fletcher's anticipated audiences: the latter could accept overt characterizations of strong women, even domineering women; in Shakespeare's play, that characterization is squelched.

Maria's final speech, a mere 18 lines, could hardly be more different from Kate's. It is a eulogy for Petruchio (who has faked his death in a last-ditch effort to shake the resolve of his wife), but she has nothing good to say about him nor about her loss: "There are wants I weep for, not his person" (V.iv.28). Fletcher does not merely revise Kate's speech here—he obliterates it. Maria's words are so far to the opposite end of the spectrum compared to Kate's that the two speeches are more contrast than comparison. Maria's action, not only not to mourn her husband's death but to insult him over his coffin, completely negates the message contained in Kate's speech: honoring and obediently serving one's husband. Fletcher tempers Maria's words by the end by having Maria's language in the closing lines echo Kate's own—"make me what you please" (V.iv.42), "your servant" (43), and "all my life / . . . I dedicate in service to your pleasure" (65,67)—but the resolution of the conflict is decidedly changed from the earlier play.

Bianca

I believe that Bianca is the most important character in Fletcher's *The Woman's Prize*. In one sense, this Bianca is not the one from *The Taming of the Shrew*—that is Livia; in another sense,

however, a truer sense, this Bianca is the one from Shakespeare's play, just older. As such, Fletcher makes his most impressive revision by taking Bianca from *The Shrew* and showing her as grown up—she is at once a supporter of shrewish behavior and an advocate for the more traditional role of wife. Just as Shakespeare's Bianca progresses from wooed young lady to an "understudy" shrew (Burns 43), Fletcher's Bianca contains these two disparate philosophies and, as such, manages to tie the two plots of the play together. Moreover, she demonstrates what Maria eventually achieves: a union of strong-willed behavior and womanly decorum. She even utilizes some of Kate's own language because Kate herself functions as the original example of these two disparate approaches to her gender role.

Bianca's overriding purpose in *The Taming of the Shrew* is to gain the freedom to marry but not necessarily to anyone she has been presented with before the play begins. As she tells her sister, "of all the men alive / I never yet held that special face / Which I could fancy more than any other" (II.i.10-12). Still, she wishes Kate to marry someone, anyone, so that she may marry whomever she wishes. Her final choice, however, appears to be almost instantaneous. Her quick response to Lucentio may be either a young girl's fancy or, as she says, a case where she "learns her lessons [to] please herself" (III.i.20).

From Act 3 until the last scenes of Act 5, Bianca becomes essentially a non-entity, only speaking briefly with Lucentio to confirm her affection. When her father confronts both lovers V.i., all she says is "Cambio is chang'd into Lucentio" (123). It is Lucentio who reveals their marriage to Baptista. While Vincentio rails against the way he has been treated by Tranio and the Pedant, the duping of Baptista is largely ignored. Bianca has had to do little to usurp the authority of her father, and Lucentio's idyllic description of their marital bliss mirrors their brief on-stage courtship.

In the play's final scene, however, everything changes. Lucentio discovers, much to his surprise and at no small cost to his bank account, that Bianca has no intention of being at his beck and call:

> *Bianca*: Fie, what a foolish duty call you this?
> *Lucentio*: I would your duty were as foolish too.
> The wisdom of your duty, fair Bianca,
> Hath cost me [a] hundred crowns since supper-time.
> *Bianca*: The more fool you for laying on my duty. (V.ii.125-129)

With this, Bianca says no more—at least in Shakespeare's play. The pattern for Fletcher, however, has been set: a relatively quiet,

demure Bianca who has learned from her older sister how to be "headstrong" (V.ii.130).

Ferguson's critical edition devotes no space to discussing the Bianca in Fletcher's play. His longest treatment of her character? "Bianca, the trouble maker" (15). Similar to critics of *The Taming of the Shrew*, critics of *The Woman's Prize* focus most of their energy on the main-plot couple, Petruchio and Maria. Unlike her counterpart in Shakespeare's play, Fletcher's Bianca is not involved in an engagement plot, so her character is pushed by critics even further to the background than even Bianca of *Shrew*. But Bianca is crucial—she is the only character to play a pivotal role in both plots (Maria/Petruchio and Livia/Rowland). This importance is a direct result of Fletcher anticipating an audience more receptive to 'strong woman' plays, and by including her in his revision, Fletcher creates a bridge between the two works beyond that of borrowing of a few names.

Bianca is the first to raise the notion of Maria's rebelling against Petruchio and their marriage bed. Interestingly, Bianca uses the phrase "Believe me" to reinforce her advice to the newlywed, Maria. As Kate's sister, Bianca would have first-hand knowledge of Petruchio's continued efforts to be the domineering husband described throughout Fletcher's play. Perhaps more telling on this point is Bianca's "All the severall wrongs / Done by Emperious husbands to their wives / These thousand yeeres and upwards, strengthen thee: / Thou hast a brave cause" (I.ii.122-125). Her line may serve, however subtly, as motivation to spur on and "command" Maria and her rebellion (I.iii.111ff). If Bianca has witnessed the violent treatment of Petruchio to Kate, she may be driven by some revenge motive against her sister's abusive husband—Fletcher uses the phrase "abusing his first good wife" later in his play (III.iii.118). This Bianca, in no small fashion, picks up where Shakespeare's Bianca left off: a willful woman unwilling to subscribe to the social 'norms' for a new wife. In this case, the new wife is Maria, but Bianca's actions and advice ring familiar, particularly as the play progresses. Bianca and Lucentio begin their marriage with a debate over duty (as quoted before); after Maria is counseled by Bianca in *The Woman's Prize*, Petruchio and Maria debate the same topic.

Through most of the first two acts, Fletcher's Bianca serves as a coach for Maria, educating her in the ways of a strong-willed woman. She also serves as the catechizer for Livia, who comes to join their rebellion. With Maria properly educated, Bianca proceeds

to educate the now-ensconced Livia and eventually the City and Country women who join their crusade.

Bianca's work is done so well, having trained all the women in the play, that she disappears from the main plot. When Petronius and the other men come to Maria's house to call them down from their isolation, all the other women **but** Bianca participate in name-calling, declarations of independence and negotiation of terms. Her job is done, at least with regard to training Maria. Bianca learned from Shakespeare's shrew, Kate; she in turn has passed along this education to Fletcher's female characters. Mission accomplished, Bianca turns to the plot nearest to her own original one: the duping of Petronius to arrange the marriage of Livia and Rowland. In this case, her plotting with Livia and conning of Petronius are what allow the match between Rowland and Livia to take place at all.

My goal here is not merely to raise awareness of Bianca's character but to tie together the Biancas from each play by showing Shakespeare's Bianca in her context—a shrew in training, but contained by the traditionalist context of the play—alongside the revised Bianca in Fletcher's play, a Bianca who has grown into her shrewishness, learned where to apply it (and when not to) and turned it into a positive, strong-woman characteristic instead of a negative. The marriage matches between Maria/Petruchio and Livia/Rowland are both made to the satisfaction of the men. Petruchio must be won over, but the Bianca-trained Maria is up to the task; Rowland must be duped into his match, and Bianca plays an integral role in making that happen. The older generation, represented by Moroso and Petronius, are the unhappiest characters in the play at the end, perhaps a commentary on how the social climate had changed in the time since Shakespeare's play was first performed.

Petruchio

Petruchio is arguably the one character not rewritten by Fletcher, at least not to the degree he rewrites Kate and Bianca. Petruchio spends nearly the entire play doing what his character does in Shakespeare's play—"taming" his willful wife. As before, he hopes to starve her into submission—"She must do nothing of her selfe; not eate, / Drink " (I.i.45-46)—but while his actions remain consistent from the original play to the revision, the outcome of this rematch battle of the sexes is not. Kate is supposedly subdued by Petruchio's machinations, becoming the perfect, dutiful wife. The end of *The Taming of the Shrew* is not one of domination/submission, but it is one of "virtue and obedience"

(V.ii.118); in *The Woman's Prize*, Maria may claim to be her husband's "servant" (I.iv.46), but her husband considers her his "unhappiness, [his] misery" (V.iv.41). Indeed, Maria claims to have tamed Petruchio and, by doing so, earned equal footing, according to the play's Epilogue:

> The Tamer's tam'd, but so, as nor the men
> Can finde one just cause to complaine of, when
> They fitly do consider in their lives,
> They should not raign as Tyrants o'r their wives.
> Nor can the women from this president
> Insult, or triumph: it being aptly meant,
> To teach both Sexes due equality;
> And as they stand bound, to love mutually. (Epilogue 1-8)

Petruchio in *The Taming of the Shrew* is the ruling husband, brooking no disobedience from his new wife. He comes into the play swaggering and proceeds apace to tame his bride-to-be. The initial wooing scene (II.i), described by one critic as "breathing fire" (Asimov 455), pits Petruchio against Kate in a pitched battle of words. While she insults him mercilessly and even slaps him during the scene, he remains resilient and calm, referring to their confrontation as a "chat" (268). At the conclusion of their duel, he announces to Baptista that he will agree to marry Kate; in doing so, he dismisses Kate's railing against him and her insults. This declaration comes on the heels of Katharine calling Petruchio a "half lunatic," "madcap ruffian" and "swearing Jack" (II.i.287, 288). Not surprisingly, Maria executes a similar strategy to confute Petruchio in his efforts to control his 'willful' wife. I should perhaps acknowledge that Fletcher does revise the tamer, Petruchio, in a sense: as the tamer, Maria. Fletcher's Petruchio is not the same man as that in Shakespeare's play in that he is wholly unsuccessful in subduing his bride; instead, it is **his** fierceness and volatility that are tamed. Anticipating an audience familiar with Shakespeare's Petruchio and his methods for shrew-taming, Fletcher creates similar situations for his characters but that are inverted versions of those moments in the older play.

In no small fashion, Petruchio and Kate's encounter just after their marriage is not unlike Petruchio and Maria's just after **their** marriage. Her challenge of "I will be angry; what hast thou to do?" (III.ii.216-7) is answered with his infamous "I will be master of what is mine own. / She is my goods, my chattels, she is my house, / My household stuff, my field, my barn, / My horse, my ox, my ass, my anything" (230-2). Fletcher replays this scene when Petruchio first confronts Maria over her boycott of their marriage bed, even using similar phrasing to enhance the echo:

Petruchio: If you talk more,
I am angry, very angry.
Maria: I am glad on't, and I wil talke. (I.iii.168-170)

* * * *

Ile make you know, and feare a wife *Petruchio*,
There my cause lies.
You have been famous for a woman tamer,
And beare the fear'd-name of a brave wife-breaker:
A woman now shall take those honours off,
And tame you; (I.iii.261-266)

Maria, in direct response to a use of Kate's own language, sets the same agenda Petruchio did in the earlier play, to tame a strong-willed, 'angry' spouse; obviously, however, the genders have been reversed—a reflection, I argue, of Fletcher's anticipated audience that accepted these types of roles and actions from women.

The 'taming' of Petruchio is perhaps Fletcher's largest revision to this character and is manifest in Petruchio's final words:

I am born again:
Well little *England*, when I see a husband
Of any other Nation stern or jealous,
Ile wish him but a woman of thy breeding, (V.ii.60-63)

Shakespeare's Petruchio revels in the dynamic between him and his wife, that of master and obedient wife. In fact, he uses the word *obedience* or variants no fewer than three times; however, the word does not appear in the entire final scene of *The Woman's Prize*—in any character's dialogue. Indeed, the word does not appear in the entire fifth act. Certainly, it would be inadequate to position an entire argument on the presence or lack of a single word, but considering its use in light of Fletcher's other changes to *The Shrew* reinforces his revisions.

Until the end of the Fletcher's play, Petruchio is the same swaggering man he was in Shakespeare's play; Maria is as willful as her counterpart, but she is neither defiant nor obstinate without reason—she admits to loving Petruchio early in the play. Her reasons for "taming" him are so that she is not lorded over and beaten down like Kate. This relationship, and Maria's accomplishment, would have held no comic force if the previous play had not existed; likewise, to have a taming battle between two unrecognizable characters would not have contained the same levels of knowing as a battle between a well-known Petruchio and the new iteration of his wife. Just as the characters in Fletcher's play are aware of Kate and her history (revised as it may be here), Fletcher's anticipated audience would be familiar with Shakespeare's

characters and the changes introduced. It has been said that ideas reach saturation in their life-cycle when parodies and spoofs appear; these latters' existence is wholly dependent on the audience 'getting the joke' by being familiar with the original, and I think Fletcher's audience was expected to understand the history of the characters portrayed to best see the revision and inversion of taming.

As I have indicated previously, an ongoing desire on the part of Elizabethan and Jacobean audiences to see familiar characters in slightly new surroundings (dare I even mention Elizabeth, Falstaff and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*?) may have been as much an economic force as an artistic one. While there is no shortage of playwrights denigrating audiences for their tastes,[7] there is also no shortage of playwrights ultimately catering to that same audience.

Revision and Anticipated Audience

H.J. Oliver contends that "the Elizabethan audience came to see [the] play 'pre-conditioned' . . . to enjoy the spectacle of the taming of one on whom they would not expect to waste a moment's sympathy" (50). He says this of Shakespeare's play, but these words ring true of Fletcher's play as well. The 'pre-conditioning' Oliver speaks of must have played no small role in Fletcher's choice of subject matter and characterization. Fletcher chose to use Shakespeare's characters for a reason: he anticipated that his audience would be familiar with the confrontation between Petruchio and Kate and, most importantly, with its outcome. A significant social shift had occurred, however, and Fletcher anticipated an audience different from that of the original play. As Linda Woodbridge indicates,

> the majority of plays acted between 1610 and 1620 . . . were the property of companies that played either exclusively to the public theater or to both theaters; to be acceptable, a play had to pass muster at the public theater, bastion of the citizenry.
>
> * * * *
>
> [After 1610], no shrew tamings were staged; to the contrary, *The Woman's Prize* . . . showed the shrew tamer tamed by this wife; Maria tames her tamer without ever becoming shrewish herself. (250)

By leaving Petruchio essentially unrevised, Fletcher anticipated an audience that would expect the confrontation between Petruchio and Maria to end similarly to the first play. Thus, by having the story end on a decidedly different note and portraying a character whose similar machinations are ultimately thwarted, Fletcher is

able to tap into the familiarity of character while creating a new play, one whose comic turns are dependent on the previous play.

More importantly, his revisions reflect a major issue of the time period (critics consider the *hic mulier* period to be from 1610-1620), that of the proper role of women and men in Jacobean society. Critics have noted this relationship, but none have drawn connections between what Shakespeare wrote and what Fletcher revised. As seen in Maria, Bianca and even Petruchio, Fletcher anticipated an audience vastly different from Shakespeare's. His play, according to Linda Woodbridge, was well-versed and keenly aware of the new London woman controversy: "conditions in contemporary life influenced the choice of these conventions rather than others and that the strong-mindedness of contemporary women was one of those conditions" (267-8).[8]

In his book, *The John Fletcher Plays*, Clifford Leech contends that Fletcher "was no serious defender of women's rights, but rather a man who took some interest and pleasure in watching a fight between well-matched opponents. In *The Woman's Prize* it would seem good to him that Petruchio should be subdued, as Shakespeare had given him an apparently final victory in an encounter where no advantage, in Fletcher's view of the nature of things, could be more than temporary" (53). Inherent in Leech's description here is anticipated audience: Fletcher's "view of things" as playwright was contingent on public taste and disposition; certainly playwrights were less successful in correctly anticipating an audience (for example, Ben Jonson's *The New Inn* and Beaumont's *Knight of the Burning Pestle*), but the economic realities of theatrical life in London necessitated a reasonable anticipation of what an audience would care to see. That Fletcher chose to take an already-existing play and change the relationships within it to such a degree is an ideal example of anticipated audience having an impact on revision strategies. Fletcher could have written an entirely new play on this subject, but his taking a play already in his company's repertoire and reworking it speaks to the notion of audience playing a role in that decision and its execution.

Notes

1. This definition, from the OED2 CD-ROM (v. 1.13), is contemporary with the earliest plays discussed here: "1596 Bacon *Max & Use Com. Law* (1630) 'Ep. Ded. 2' To revise the Romane lawes from infinite volumes..into one competent and uniforme corps of law."

2. Terms are taken, respectively, from Munro, 283; Gayley, 83; Baldwin, 377; McKeithan, 58; Squier, 120; Cone, 65; and Smith, 39.

3. "The only evidence for change turns up under Charles, when the company seems to have begun to acknowledge a difference in tastes between the Blackfriars gentry and the Globe's citizenry . . ." (Gurr *Playgoing* 169).

4. Of course, Fletcher's use of Bianca's name for what is an altogether different character opens many exciting possibilities for anticipated audience shown through revision; this issue is discussed later in the chapter.

5. For a sample of diverse readings, see critical editions by Oliver (1998); Holderness (1989); Bloom (1988), Bevington (1988); Thompson (1984). Also, Dusinberre's *Shakespeare and the Nature of Women*, Patterson's *Reading Between the Lines*, Chamber's *The Elizabethan Stage*, McKeithan's *The Debt to Shakespeare in the Beaumont-and-Fletcher Plays*, Haring-Smith's *From Farce to Metadrama: A Stage History of 'The Taming of the Shrew'*, and Dolan's *'The Taming of the Shrew': Texts and Context*.

6 . "The Shakespeare in the Park (New York, NY) production that featured Morgan Freeman and Tracey Ullman reflected the discomfort many people felt about the ending of the play, and offered a version of the 'solution' that now seems commonplace. When Kate was making her deferential speech at the end, she was down on her knees helping Petruchio off with his boots. He was seated on a stool, looking very pleased with her comments. As she finished, she upended him and he landed on his back, first shocked, then amused. Then the two of them walked off together arm in arm, having 'played a joke' on the rest of the people on stage" (van den Berg).

7. For a representative sampling, see Marlowe's *Tamberlaine* (1587), Lyly's *Midas* (1589), Heywood's *The Brazen Age* (1595), Jonson's *What You Will* (1601), Beaumont's *The Fox* (1607), Ford's *Broken Heart* (1629), even as late as Shirley's *The Doubtful Heir* (1640).

8. Woodbridge goes one step further: "King James' attempt . . . to enlist the support of literature in his campaign against aggressive women was, as far as can be judged from extant plays, a signal failure. We can account for the drama's new image of women, forged during the *hic mulier* years, by positing increased pressure by female playgoers. . . . For generations, literature had sought to modify women's behavior by praising Grissils and damning shrews; during the *hic mulier* years, women forced the drama, at least, to provide models more to their taste—Katherine of Aragon, the spurned wife who stands up for herself; Maria, the rebellious wife whose insubordination is celebrated; the Duchess of Malfi, the widow allowed a sex life with no authorial condemnation. Whether any insubordinate wife was ever celebrated by any living creature in the real world is finally a secondary question: a real world whose literature admits to her celebration as an imaginative possibility is capable of celebrating her in the flesh eventually" (267).

The Winter's Tale: Folktale, Romance, and the Disney Film Formula

Lan Lipscomb
Troy University, Montgomery Campus

In the fall of 2003, a Shakespeare Comedies course I taught concluded with *The Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest* as examples of the romances. Throughout the course the students had shown an interest in the folk elements of Shakespeare's plays appearing occasionally in some of the comedies and in great abundance in the romances. We therefore spent some time on the literary uses of folk elements and on romance traditions from the middle ages forward, and thus the students became familiar with folk motifs found often in romances, such as the fair unknown and the exile's return. By chance, I remarked that many Disney films, notably the animated fairy-tale based ones like *Cinderella* and *The Little Mermaid*, use many folk and romance elements, and I also suggested that our modern notion of folktale has been both sustained and skewed by popular Disney adaptations such as these. The resulting discussion of the connections between these films and Shakespearean romances was lively and instructive. And in the grand pedagogical tradition of no good deed going unpunished, I came up with a paper topic in which my students analyzed *The Tempest* for folk motifs it had in common with Disney's 1989 *Little Mermaid.*

This approach worked well in my academic setting: a non-traditional evening school with a small but vigorous English major, and I hope it will work for you—whether you are a student or a teacher. Since the papers went back to the students before I knew about the Wooden O Conference, however, my remarks in the first half of this essay connecting *The Tempest* and Disney film will derive from my memory of points made by the students. To illustrate its further application, I will then make the same sort of analysis with *The Winter's Tale* and Disney's *Sleeping Beauty* as my main bases of comparison.

When I assigned the paper, the students were given some labels and brief descriptions of folk motifs drawn largely from the Aarne-Thompson index, but I did not direct them to that daunting

resource. This more informal approach stemmed partly from their limited practice with folklorist methodology and from the little time then remaining in the course. Admittedly, replacing Aarne-Thompson with Disney as a resource is like using one of those popular instruction manuals for non-specialists: *The Dummy's Book of Folktale Motifs*, so to speak, but those books' utility derive from simplicity and transparency—and those were the advantages of using Disney film in this course.

In our discussion preceding the paper assignment, the students were particularly successful in finding features to compare and contrast between *The Tempest* and *The Little Mermaid* as their primary "text" from the Disney canon. They were first drawn to this film because of obvious points of comparison to the play. Both play and movie involve a struggle of wills between overbearing fathers (Prospero and King Triton) and nubile daughters (Miranda and Ariel). Both have settings in which contrasts of sea and land and storms at sea are important. And both, in fact, have characters named Ariel, although it so happened that none of the students remarked on that connection.

The students readily perceived, however, one important source of conflict in both works. Prospero and King Triton are widowers raising marriageable daughters over whom they maintain a jealous guard. While Prospero anticipates as inevitable the union of Miranda and Ferdinand, he makes the going rough for a while for the two lovers: "But this swift business / I must uneasy make, lest too light winning / Make the prize light" (I.ii.542-544). A more heavy-handed Triton forbids his daughter any contact with the human world. In defying her father, Ariel turns to Ursula the Sea-Witch who pretends to be sympathetic to the mermaid's wish, but like an evil step-mother of folktale tradition has her own interests in mind and intends to make Ariel her victim in achieving them.

The students also noted that the *Tempest* and *Little Mermaid* feature a frequently appearing folktale motif: the incomplete sets of parents. Like Miranda, Ariel is motherless, and Ariel's husband-to-be, Prince Eric, appears to have lost both parents. As a point of fact, the only Disney films our class could come up with in discussion that featured both parents were coincidentally dog-centered: *The Lady and the Tramp* and *A Hundred and One Dalmations*. The latter has both Pongo and Perdita (note the Shakespearean echo on that name) as mother and father to their own as well as an adoptive brood.[1] The human masters of Pongo and Perdita, though not parents themselves, constitute nonetheless a married couple—a true rarity in Disney film and folk narratives. A child

having both natural parents is, similarly, almost never found in Shakespeare's romances. Imogen has a father and step-mother; Perdita has a foster-father in the Shepherd and is separated for sixteen years from her true parents, one of whom is assumed by the play 's audience to have died; Miranda is motherless; Marina is brought up by foster-parents: first Cleon and the evil Dionyza and second the Pandar and Bawd. As in all of these Shakespearean instances, the fractured or incomplete parental set in folktale typically results in the hero or heroine as a child being raised by surrogates who are often odd choices for the role. The child is thereby often charmingly naïve about marriage and relationships and will find in marriage, presumably, completeness in a family after being raised in a single-parent home or as an orphan, step-child, or foster-child. The absence of all or some of the customary parental protections and nurturing, furthermore, makes the child susceptible or vulnerable to the influences of the larger world.

Miranda and the mermaid Ariel are types from folk tradition known as "the fair unknown." This means that their true identities are mistaken or unknown by themselves and/or by people important to them until revealed near the story's end. The motif appears in the Disney film after Ariel surrenders her voice to the Sea Witch in order that she may be changed from a mermaid into a human. The princess arrives in Prince Eric's court but cannot identify herself in any way or succeed in winning his love without her voice. Eric would know her by the voice he heard when she rescued him, but without it, he finally disregards her in favor of the Sea Witch who has assumed Ariel's voice and a more pleasing shape in which she intends to marry Eric.

One of the students noted that *The Tempest* uses the fair unknown motif differently. When in Act One Miranda is first seen by Prince Ferdinand, he elevates her in his imagination instead of denigrating her, wondering if she is a goddess or a woman. This is interesting because often the fair unknown's worthy qualities are hidden from view to some extent, and usually under an appearance of poverty. The student also noted, however, that the princely lovers in Shakespearean romances (including Ferdinand and *The Winter's Tale*'s Florizel) love blindly and overlook the supposedly humble position in life of lowly maids, and in this play Miranda's nobility is obscured by her exiled condition. While Miranda quickly assures Ferdinand that she is a maiden and no goddess, he does not know her for what she truly is, the daughter and heir of the Duke of Milan, until Act Five.

The student was responding to an interesting characteristic of the fair unknown motif which in class discussion as a follow-up to the papers we gave the label: "noble humility / humble nobility." This was our means of describing how the fair unknown characters benefited, so to speak, from their disadvantages. The fair unknown is typically—if not universally—extraordinarily attractive and capable, as well as patient and mild in temperament. The beauty or ability of the fair unknown makes her stand out among the common people. (My pronoun references to the Fair Unknown in this essay will be female since the Disney and Shakespearean examples are, but the fair unknown can be male. The Old French label also has the masculine alternative *libeau disconnu* , examples of which include Percival, Moses, Oedipus, and even Jerry Lewis as Cinderfella). And oftentimes, the fair unknown is felt instinctively by them to be of noble origin. Moreover, it was assumed that the fair unknown's upbringing among the commonalty improved her; it made her better than a noble person who never benefited from substantial contact with the humbling influences of everyday life. Folk narratives, in fact, express a need in which the fair unknown figure, although invariably of noble birth, be better than her birth. And she is bettered by being less than exclusively noble, with all the self-interested, proud, and obnoxiously superior posturing that a privileged station in life normally suggested to the non-noble classes (Disney's *Cinderella* demonstrates this particularly well by contrasting the title character to her evil and loutish stepsisters). The nobly born Ariel and Miranda have the common touch. They accept as companions whoever is at hand, or they actively seek friends outside of an exclusive social set. The examples in the Disney film are a fish named Flounder and hermit crab named Sebastian. Miranda, on Caliban's behalf, as she reminds him, "Took pains to make thee speak, taught thee each hour / One thing or other" (I.ii.425-426) until he attempted to violate her. Ariel and Miranda are never disdainful, and they accept with admirable patience their disadvantages. Ariel differs from Miranda in being more fully aware of what it means to be and to reject being a princess, but both are intuitively or deliberately improved by their sympathizing and humanizing contact with a larger, less exclusive world. This trait makes them powerfully appealing characters, and it is what the class termed "noble humility." When, furthermore, as is often the case, the fair unknown is loved by a prince who cares nothing for her apparently lowly condition, we have an instance of "humble nobility."

Folktale frequently features an evil charm, a curse, or dilemma which must be resolved—often through white magic and often with a *deus ex machina* effect. One student noted that Prospero and King Triton alone are possessed of such white magic. And while Triton's magic is opposed by the Sea Witch's evil magic, Prospero has no comparable foil, except that before the play's action commences, he undoes the charm made by an evil witch Sycorax which had enclosed the sprite Ariel in a tree. Both Triton and Prospero use their magic to achieve eventually a happy ending. Prospero first calls down the storm which causes the shipwreck and separates different parts of the ship's company. He then uses Ariel as his means of keeping them apart until he can orchestrate his resolution. (By the way, the Little Mermaid, unnamed in the Hans Christian Andersen original, was given a name by the Disney screenwriters which suggests they had the *Tempest* at least remotely in mind—perhaps because the stories' two Ariels are held in submission by both white magicians [Prospero and Triton] and black magicians [Sycorax and Ursula]). The opening of the curtain to reveal Miranda and Ferdinand at chess is not magic, but it has that effect on Alonso. And before Prospero relinquishes his magic forever by breaking his staff and burying it "certain fathoms in the earth" (V.i.64), he releases Alonso and the court party from their charmed state. Triton in the Disney film gives up his fatherly possessiveness and transforms his daughter from mermaid to human in one wave of his magical trident, which, like Prospero's staff, is the instrument of his magical powers. Several students noted that point of comparison, and one of them saw in the Sea Witch's desire to get Triton's trident a parallel to Caliban's conspiracy with Stephano to deprive Prospero of his magic by possessing his books. When the Sea Witch does, in fact, get the trident, she uses it to brew a terrific storm which ends only when Prince Eric kills her.

* * *

My Disney analogue to *The Winter's Tale* is the 1959 *Sleeping Beauty*, based on Charles Perrault's telling of the fairy tale. It features two kings, Hubert and Stefan: the fathers, respectively, of Prince Phillip and Princess Aurora. The evil fairy Maleficent (literally, 'the evil-doer'), offended by not being invited to a celebration of the birth of the princess, curses the infant, declaring that she will prick her finger on a spindle before her sixteenth birthday and die. However, Meriwether, one of three good fairies, has not yet given the princess her blessing which, while it cannot perfectly

countermand the curse, can modify it so that Aurora will not die but sleep until awakened by true love's kiss.

To hide Aurora from Maleficent, the good fairies change her name to Briar-Rose and raise her up humbly in an abandoned woodcutter's home deep in the forest. Fearful of drawing Maleficent's attention, the fairies even give up use of their wands, which means they have no magic to ease this straitened existence. When we see her next, after sixteen years have passed, the princess is now the fair unknown: barefooted and in neat but patched clothes. Wearing her poverty unselfconsciously and gladly accepting her share of the chores, she walks out on her birthday to gather apples. In the woods, she meets Prince Phillip who instantly loves her without knowing her true identity. Thus we have both the noble humility of Briar-Rose and the humble nobility of Phillip so typical of the fair unknown motif as well as its frequently attendant love-is-blind characteristic. Similarly, Perdita, *The Winter's Tale*'s fair unknown, reappears in the play after sixteen years of a modest but comfortable pastoral upbringing in the home of the Shepherd who, when he found her as an infant, recognized her superior birth, speculating that her mother was "a waiting gentlewoman in the scape" (III.iii). Prince Florizel sees her as desirable, no matter what her parentage is. His father Polixenes, although he acknowledges Perdita's charms, is infuriated that Florizel intends to marry a shepherd girl. All of these are typical reactions to the fair unknown figure.

Like *Sleeping Beauty*, *The Winter's Tale* features the triumph of white magic (or at least a seeming triumph) in the way Paulina brings Hermione to life in the play's last scene. Figures comparable to Paulina in *Sleeping Beauty* are the three good fairies who take upon themselves responsibility for preserving the princess in safety for sixteen years and use their magic to restore her to her former life at the story's end. For the same span of sixteen years, Paulina safeguards Hermione who, like the awakened Aurora, then returns from apparent death to life and is restored to her proper noble station.

Yet another folktale motif is the riddling prophecy. In *The Winter's Tale*, this is supplied by the oracle: "The King shall live without an heir, if that which is lost be not found" (III.ii). In *Sleeping Beauty*, the riddling prophecy is replaced by a prophetic curse and an ordeal which function like the riddle in throwing up seemingly insurmountable obstacles to a happy resolution. To prevent Maleficent's curse, King Stefan orders all spinning wheels in the kingdom destroyed, but Maleficent hides one in a secret chamber of the castle where Aurora, of course, pricks her finger.

The good fairies intervene, as already remarked, by softening the curse with the counter-charm to replace death with sleep until Aurora is awakened by true love's kiss. The fairies also cause all in the castle to sleep, because they mistakenly believe that Prince Phillip intends to marry someone else, and they need time to solve that problem. To complicate things further, Phillip is ambushed on a visit to Briar-Rose's cottage by Maleficent, who imprisons him and taunts him with the spectacle of his release long after he has grown old and feeble while Briar-Rose in her enchanted sleep remains young. The good fairies help Phillip to escape, but Maleficent places a forest of thorns around the castle where Aurora sleeps. When he is about to hack his way through, Maleficent assumes the shape of a fire-breathing dragon and attacks him. She is, of course, killed; the kiss delivered; Briar-Rose revealed as Aurora; and—to everyone's joy—the Princess and Prince will marry.

Shakespeare also uses the ordeal. Ferdinand in *The Tempest* is made to carry logs while Alonso and Antonio are made to suffer for their roles in depriving Prospero of his dukedom and sending him into exile. In *The Winter's Tale*, Perdita is denigrated and threatened by Polixenes, but the most important ordeal is Leontes'. He suffers for the actual death of Mamillius and the supposed deaths of Hermione and Perdita. When Perdita (literally, 'the lost one') is recovered, the play's riddling prophecy appears answered. But one more 'lost one,' Hermione, will also be miraculously recovered—in a surprise ending for the audience and a release from his ordeal for Leontes.

When Briar-Rose and Perdita leave the court, sojourn in a wilderness, and journey back to court to discover their true origins, they enact the folk motif of the exile's return, an element as old as the story of Moses or Oedipus. *The Winter's Tale* has, in fact, two exiles in Perdita and Camillo. Restored to Leontes' favor, Camillo comes back to Sicily where he will wed Paulina. After her return and once she is revealed as the lost princess, Perdita will marry Florizel and unite the houses of Sicily and Bohemia.[2] In the Disney films, Briar-Rose, Snow White, and even Cinderella are restored from exile, if you consider that Cinderella has been banished from her proper place in her own household to a dilapidated tower. Briar-Rose will shed that name and with it a mistaken identity as a poor foundling. When Prince Phillip's father, King Hubert, saw her as such, he violently opposed his son's intention to marry a peasant girl. Restored to her proper name and birthright, Aurora can marry Prince Phillip as had been arranged at her birth with his father's blessing. However, like Perdita's and Florizel's, their union

is prompted by true love, and not some dynastic or political advantage, because they met and fell in love when Aurora was the fair unknown, the seemingly humbly born Briar-Rose.

Using Disney alongside Shakespearean romances led my class to one last insight. After the students got their papers back, we looked at the story of the Little Mermaid as Hans Christian Andersen first told it. In Andersen's story, the Little Mermaid never marries her beloved prince. Her bargain with the Sea Witch was that should she fail to win him in marriage, she would in fact die. The Little Mermaid's sisters intervene, however. They cut off their hair and give it to the Sea Witch to induce her to change the bargain so that the Little Mermaid can save herself by killing the Prince before his wedding night is over. Her sisters bring her the knife to do the murder, but she throws it away. At that, the daughters of the air appear and grant her other great wish by giving her an immortal soul. The Disney formula, by contrast, requires that its heroine, after suffering for love, be fetched up in a marriage to her Prince Charming. And the Disney version, in my students' opinions, was preferable for the way it corrected what they saw as a failure in Andersen's conclusion. Andersen's deeply moral tale, with its surprising extension of the "happily-ever-after" ending to an eternal afterlife, jarred with their sense of literary propriety.

The students' reaction to the ending in Anderson's original *Little Mermaid* provided a useful revelation and a way of replying to what critics sometimes regard as the clumsy plotting or unconvincing character motivation of Shakespeare's romances. In *The Winter's Tale*, for example, Leontes's sudden onset of suspicion over Hermione's marital chastity, Paulina's notion that the sight of his newborn daughter will soften Leontes's heart, and the death of Antigonus by a bear have all been criticized as inadequate to the genius of Shakespeare. Those criticisms do not take into account that folktales in crude form were a sort of literary *lingua franca* whose conventions Shakespeare could depend on his audience to recognize and accept—despite their irregularities. The equivalent *lingua franca* of folktale for us today may well be the Disney film formula in animated fairy tales such as those sketched here. But to meet modern tastes, Disney 's fairy tales fix many of the problems in plotting and characterization so typical of folktale. When the Disney writers adapted Perrault's version of the Sleeping Beauty folktale, they also simplified it and reduced it to a formulaic plot used over and over since the 1937 release of *Snow White and the Seven Dwarves*.

The Disney *Sleeping Beauty* actually derives from a highly literary re-telling, Charles Perrault's *La Belle au Bois Dormant* (1683). Although Perrault, a member of the Académie Française, was a neo-classicist who took rough and illogical folktales of the past and gave them smoother polish, his version nonetheless possesses a more complex plot, unmotivated action, and superfluous characters—all of which the Disney version has refined away and which may remind us of the sometimes problematic Shakespearean romances. The Disney screenwriters of *Sleeping Beauty* collapse Perrault's seven good fairies into three and replace an old fairy whom the king and queen forgot to invite to the celebration of their daughter's birthday with Maleficent. The old fairy in Perrault then disappears entirely from the narrative. His Sleeping Beauty pricks her finger on her sixteenth birthday because she happens to find an old woman in a remote garret of the castle who has not heard the edict which banned all spinning wheels. Drawn by curiosity to the spindle, Perrault's Sleeping Beauty touches the needle and falls into her one-hundred year's sleep. As it happens, everyone in the kingdom, except the king and queen who leave the castle and continue to grow old until their deaths, falls asleep, and all growth and motion cease except that a wall of thorns grows up which proves impenetrable until a hundred years elapses and a worthy prince undertakes the rescue. For this unnamed hero, the thorns part and dissolve away.

Disney collapses Perrault's old fairy and this old spinning woman into the film's more substantial and frequently appearing villainess Maleficent. Disney's Prince Phillip appears in the very beginning as the destined husband to Princess Aurora, and that prompts a great portion of the film's action. However, for the Disney story to proceed thus, the original story's hundred-years sleep—one of the folktale source's most distinctive features—is replaced by a slumber of a few days. Furthermore, in Perrault, the story is only a little more than halfway completed with the marriage of the Prince and Briar-Rose. Here, briefly, is the rest. The Prince and Sleeping Beauty have two children, a son named Day and a daughter named Dawn (Fr. *l'aurore*, hence the name for Disney's Aurora). The Prince's mother, a descendant of ogres, intends to eat them and Sleeping Beauty while her son is away. She orders her steward to kill and cook for her dinner first the girl, then the boy, then the mother. The good steward (a figure from folktale tradition who may be likened to Shakespeare's Camillo and Antigonus or Laius's shepherd in *Oedipus Rex*) replaces them in turn with a lamb, a kid, and a hind. The evil mother-in-law learns

of the deception and orders a vat of "vipers and toads, with snakes and serpents of every kind" in which to throw Sleeping Beauty, the children, and the steward, but the Prince arrives at just that moment. His mother, enraged, throws herself into the vat and dies.

The Disney model of adaptation from folktale differs significantly from what Shakespeare did when he drew on the ancient practices of folk literature for his romances. Folktales with their older and less literarily perfect qualities were familiar in Shakespeare's day—as they still were in Perrault's—in their unimproved states, and these authors respected their essential folktale qualities. It appears that the more polished and simplified versions of folktale such as Disney's have chased from our collective memory the way folktale worked when they were the products of illiterate or semi-literate persons telling a story at the hearth and not those of screen-writers in Burbank, and this may go a long way in explaining why students and critics react disapprovingly to the occasional rough spots in Shakespeare's romances. When, however, we contrast Disney's adaptations to their earlier antecedents, we can be reminded that Shakespeare's original audience knew folktale in its less sophisticated form. In both Disney fairy tale and Shakespearean romance, we will find a common fund of folktale elements, but we must not expect that Shakespeare's romances, like Disney's fairy tales, will employ the more logical plotting and characterization that we moderns have come to expect.

Notes

1. Even the more recent Disney collaborations with Pixar, *Toy Story* and *Finding Nemo*, with their highly original story-lines continue the tradition of the single-parent home.

2. In *The Tempest*, Prospero will return as Duke to Milan, his villainous brother Antonio will be displaced, and the houses of Naples and Milan will be united by the marriage of Miranda and Ferdinand.

The Place, Space, and Voice of Rebellion: Limits of Transgression in *Henry IV, Part I.*

Lindsay Adamson Livingston
University of California Los Angeles

Henry IV, Part I is replete with images of transgression. From Henry IV's seizure of the crown that precedes the play, to prince Hal's uproarious living that does not befit an heir apparent, to the classically grotesque figure of Falstaff and Hotspur's uncontrollable wrath, to the hybridity of the land itself, little, if anything in the play is free from transgressive tropes. Cutting through boundaries is more the rule than the exception; and the royal family's example has made misbehaving the norm. But does all this amount to transgression? Can one subvert limits that were not stable to begin with? Ultimately, in this world of shifting boundaries and ever-changing ethics, rebellion in the form of true transgression becomes impossible; there must first be stability in order to disrupt the norm. Henry's originary transgression of uncrowning the clown king Richard creates a world where subversion is status quo, and nothing is a violation.

In the first scene of the play, the newly crowned Henry IV is preparing to lead a crusade into Jerusalem, "[t]o chase these pagans in those holy fields / Over whose acres walked those blessed feet / Which fourteen hundred years ago were nailed / For our advantage on the bitter cross" (I.1.24-27).[1] Henry's reference to the crusade contains layers of transgressive imagery; on the surface he is talking about a war, an invasion of the boundaries of a nation. The notion of a crusade also recalls medieval beliefs of the Crucifixion of Christ as the "original transgression," a violation which, in Henry's world, would have been considered the most subversive uncrowning of a king to ever take place. The metadramatic process of uncrowning a king is a staple of carnivalesque and subversive play-acting[2]; it also, of course, is reflective of Henry's own transgression: he usurped the throne from the rightful monarch, Richard II. Henry is paying for his violation by existing in a kind of purgatory, a liminal space where he can no longer claim superiority over an

impotent authority (as he did to his cousin Richard); neither is he fully the king, since he lacks divine right. As Claire McEachern notes, Henry seems "ill-suited to the political order (and disorder) his accession to the throne has unleashed."[3] Henry's was a violent seizure of the throne, and it legitimized the notion that the kingship belonged to he who was strong enough to take it.

This notion problematizes the concept of divine right, the rule of law that had interpreted genetic succession as the will of God. Henry's blatant mocking of this concept creates an inversion in the world of the play; here, the will of man is as powerful as that of God—maybe even more so. This causes slippage between the man/God binary, and blurs the boundary between human and divine will. This makes Henry's position a hybrid one: he is neither rightful, nor entirely inappropriate heir to the throne. This concept of hybridity is vital to understanding the kind of chaotic transgression that Henry unleashes upon his kingdom. Jervis' definition of transgression is useful in explaining this relationship:

> The transgressive is reflexive, questioning both its own role and that of the culture that has defined it in its otherness. It is not simply a reversal, a mechanical inversion of an existing order it opposes. Transgression, unlike opposition or reversal, involves hybridization, the mixing of categories and the questioning of the boundaries that separate categories. It is not, in itself, subversion; it is not an overt and deliberate challenge to the status quo.[4]

Henry's usurpation of the crown spotlights many issues about the king's body as divine vessel. Henry, it would seem, was not divinely selected, and therefore does not possess the necessary connection with a religious or mythological past that would serve to legitimize his reign.[5] He is forced to create that link, mimetically depicting himself as the rightful king through spectacle. As Henry lectures Hal on his misbehaviors, he also lets the wayward prince know how he has managed to solidify his legitimacy in the hearts of the people—through pageantry and spectacle:

> By being seldom seen, I could not stir
> But, like a comet, I was wondered at;
> That men would tell their children, "This is he!"
> Others would say, "Where? Which is Bolingbroke?"
> And then I stole all my courtesy from heaven,
> And dressed myself in such humility
> That I did pluck allegiance from men's hearts,
> Loud shouts and salutations from their mouths
> Even in the presence of the crowned king. (III.2.46-54)

Henry creates a royal spectacle even before he becomes king; this is the beginning of a metadramatic process intended to confirm his shaky legitimacy in the hearts of the people. In such a procession, Michael Bristol explains, "the city streets become a stage, [and] the royal personality occupies the center of a theatrical performance."[6] Henry's transgression extends well past his mere usurpation, as he hybridizes both social space and his image as a member of the royal party before he became king. Rather than an inversion or a reversal, Henry's seizure of the crown is a hybridization that manipulates the boundary between divine and human will.

Henry's personal opinion of his transgression is somewhat unclear; one is left to wonder whether he was mounting a crusade to do penance, to follow his beliefs, or, as he later advises his son in 2 *Henry IV,* to "busy giddy minds / With foreign quarrels" (IV.5.213-14). Whatever Henry's feelings toward his transgression, there is no doubt that his kingdom is paying a dear price for it: Bristol suggests that "The violent uncrowning of the royal martyr or royal villain is invariably accompanied by a more generalized, pervasive social violence or civil war."[7] Henry's actions have struck a mortal blow to monarchical power and authority; that authority rests on the agreement of all to abide by it and Henry's violations have opened up a space for the people to disagree with both him and his method of assuming the throne. This disagreement finds its loudest voice among the Percy family, whose displeasure at Henry's behavior leads them to instigate a civil war. In a lovely bit of ironic augury, Hotspur encourages his father and uncle to participate in treason against Henry, to atone for their roles in Richard's overthrow and to protect their potentially besmirched reputations. He asks them:

> Shall it for shame be spoken in these days,
> Or fill up chronicles in time to come,
> That men of your nobility and power
> Did gage them both in an unjust behalf
> (As both of you, God pardon it! have done)
> To put down Richard, that sweet lovely rose,
> And plant this thorn, this canker, Bolingbroke? (I.3.170-176)

The rebellion begins, and Hotspur's transgression is evident in his speech as well as his actions. It is easy to see how a full-out treasonous rebellion is transgressive; Hotspur is in the middle of the storm, and his seriocomical wrath plays into his image as a carnivalesque parody. Worcester says of his nephew that "he hath the excuse of youth and heat of blood, / An adopted name of

privilege— / A hare-brained Hotspur, governed by a spleen" (V.2.17-19).

The transgressiveness of the insurgents is compounded by the hybrid nature of their group. Hotspur is to keep his Scottish prisoners, and Worcester contracts with the king of Scotland to have those troops fight in the uprising. Edmund Mortimer's Welsh marriage and position as Richard's successor made him a formidable enemy to Henry; his alliance with Glendower brought Welsh forces to the fray. This conjoining of powers that were often very much at odds leads to a somewhat monstrous (and very threatening) hybrid army, and suggests that the Percies were not the only ones who saw Henry's transgression as an open invitation to cross boundaries. Like the rebels themselves, the land is also hybridized, as the insurgents prematurely divide up their spoils, and Henry's kingdom is "gelded," "divided" and "transformed"; Hotspur even contemplates repositioning a river to ensure that his portion of the land is properly delineated (III.1.69-131). In the spirit of true transgression, this partitioning of the land cuts through established boundaries of ownership, yet, paradoxically, also completes those boundaries by reaffirming their current existence.[8] The civil war is similarly transgressive: it creates and subverts boundaries; in the process it reaffirms the strength of the boundaries that already existed. Nevertheless, this is all based on truant authority and the absence of a metanarrative; belief in an unchanging authority and a metanarrative are each required for actual transgression. This absence suggests that, in the world of the play, binaries are disrupted and boundaries are arbitrary. With no edge to challenge, there can be no transgression.

The scene structure of the play (echoing the land) is heterotopic. The play leaps from scenic location to location, mixing people, spaces, and perspectives—it is, itself, hybridized, and Hal is the link between the many worlds. In the tavern, Hal leads a life of carnivalesque abundance with Falstaff. Falstaff is widely recognized as Shakespeare's consummate incantation of the grotesque carnival body. Grossly fat, lazy, gluttonous and lustful, Falstaff happily inhabits at least five of the seven deadly sins.[9] Falstaff is a personification of Bakhtin's carnival laughter, which is

> A festive laughter…it is not an individual reaction to some isolated "comic" event. Carnival laughter is the laughter of all the people…It is universal in scope; it is directed at all and everyone, including the carnival's participants…This laughter is ambivalent: it is gay, triumphant, and at the same time mocking, deriding.[10]

The audience laughs both *with* Falstaff and *at* him, much like Hal does. Hal's relationship with Falstaff is representative of "an inverted world, where the desired object must always be of lower status, where dirt triumphs over the family hierarchy, where 'the bottom' is the source of all delight."[11] Hal chooses Falstaff over his own aristocratic background, particularly his father. Juxtaposed against the cruel machinations of both the court and the rebel camp, the tavern scenes are a welcome diversion—a carnivalesque atmosphere of acceptance. Combined with acceptance, however, is mockery, creating yet another heterotopic and hybridized space within the play. Employing festive imagery, Hal is constantly describing Falstaff is as a piece of meat or food; he never misses an opportunity to describe the fat knight in grotesque and culinary terms, referring to him as "that trunk of humors, that bolting hutch of beastliness, that swoll'n parcel of dropsies, that huge bombard of sack, that stuffed cloakbag of guts, that roasted Manningtree ox with the pudding in his belly;" even when Hal presumes Falstaff is dead, he calls him a fat deer (II.4. 434-437, V.4.106). The prince's good-natured ribbing of his companion disguises an ambivalence in these scenes; the jokes are both amusing and disconcerting, the characters both warm and threatening—and none more so than the prince himself.

Hal's transgressive characteristics are in some ways the most vivid of the play, and in others the least; while the other characters are somewhat confined to their worlds and roles, Hal is the only fluid element that has a place among all the worlds. Bakhtin's theory of open-endedness—the idea that the body is not fixed, but rather is in a constant process of becoming—can be applied to the prince's body, which, since he is heir apparent, is becoming the king's.[12] Hal will be king someday; and he views his time with Falstaff and the other denizens of Eastcheap as a preparation, just another step in his development and progression toward the time he will rule. He is develops a heteroglossic language,[13] one that is represented by hybrid construction, and employs a tension between official and unofficial discourses within the national language. Hal sees the use in a king who can "drink with any tinker in his own language" (II.4.18). In *Henry IV, Part 2*, Warwick reminds the king that his son is acquiring this language, telling him that:

> The Prince but studies his companions
> Like a strange tongue, wherein, to gain the language,
> 'Tis needful that the most immodest word
> Be looked upon and learnt. (IV.4.68-71)

This learning is vital to Hal's becoming the king. The medieval

conception of the king's body as a "doubling," which encompasses both the physical body of the monarch as well as the symbolic body that represents structural stability, is at play in Hal. Aware of what his future holds, Hal is readying himself for kingship by imitating "the sun, / Who doth permit the base contagious clouds / To smother up his beauty from the world," so that he may emerge triumphantly when the time is right (I.2.190-192). Seemingly, Hal does this in order to legitimatize his (and, retrospectively, his father's) reign; becoming a

> Figure of authority that is at once distanced from the here and now by self-identification with mythological and legendary past, and at the same time fulfills and completes the here and now by revealing the underlying harmony of a continuous and durable social structure.[14]

Hal, through his prodigal performance and revolutionary transformation (which, he informs the audience in the second scene, he is already planning), links himself to the mythological past of the bible. Hal creates the durable social structure of which Bristol speaks, but his cunningly planned reformation generates the appearance that he is in fact *revealing*, rather than *creating* the structure. Hal's change masks his true transgression by making it seem like he was just going through a 'phase,' something akin to the rites of passage that Jenks describes as being "frightening, dangerous, and damaging but also predictable, expected, and routine." The phase is not transgressive because transgression is always "a step into the unknown and a step that is without precedent."[15] Through his plan Hal manipulates public opinion, presenting himself as an ideal king to follow Henry—one that will restore order to the world by reinstating the boundaries his father collapsed.

Once it is clear that Hal is not frequenting Eastcheap because he likes it, but rather because it is a necessary part of the metanarrative he's created for himself, he is no longer a participant in the carnivalesque laughter, but a usurper of it. Carnival laughter is for everyone, to be sure; but not, one would think, for those who only *pretend* to be part of 'everyone.' Hal is a consummate actor, and knows the best way to gain the love of his companions. When Falstaff kids that Hal has had dalliances with Mistress Quickly, Hal retorts:

> *Prince:* Why, what a pox have I to do with my hostess of the tavern?
> *Falstaff:* Well, thou hast called her to a reckoning many a time and oft.

Hal then reminds Falstaff what kind of a reckoning this was:

> *Prince:* Did I ever call for thee to pay thy part?
> *Falstaff:* No; I'll give thee thy due, thou hast paid there.
> *Prince:* Yea, and elsewhere, so far as my coin would stretch; and where it would not, I have used my credit. (I.2.47-55)

In a clever inversion, Claude Peltrault points out the true nature of the prince's kindness. The prince "has not just paid everybody's part, he has played a part to everybody."[16] His manipulation extends to everyone in the play; his father thinks he's a waste and Hotspur refers to Hal as "The nimble-footed madcap Prince of Wales / ...that daffed the world aside / And bid it pass" (IV.1.95-97). Eventually, however, Hal fulfills his plan, defeating Hotspur and showing himself to be the rightful heir to the throne. Before he kills him, the prince warns Hotspur "think not, Percy, / To share with me in glory any more. / Two stars keep not heir motion in one sphere, / Nor can one England brook a double reign / Of Harry Percy and the Prince of Wales" (V.4.62-66). On the battlefield, the prince fulfilled the measure of his scenario, using his pretended transgression to prepare him for the kingship. Hal's full reformation is not finished until the end of *Henry IV, Part 2* when, upon becoming king, he casts Falstaff out of his life for good; however, Hal's performative utterance in Act 2 of Part 1 suggests that he had already exorcised his friend from his heart. During a bit of play-acting Falstaff implores Hal:

> *Falstaff:* Old Jack Falstaff, banish not him thy Harry's company, banish not him thy Harry's company. Banish plump Jack and banish all the world!
> *Prince:* I do, I will.

Hal's answer has a sense of finality to it, and reminds the audience of his manipulative intent. But even Hal's transgressions—his prodigality, his abandonment of the inhabitants of Eastcheap, his manipulations of language and image to suit his needs, his hybrid existence—are enabled by Henry's chaotic world. Hal has no intent of breaking any real boundaries; and his pseudo-transgressive manipulations have restored order to the world: Henry has solidified his power, the land has no new divisions, and the rebellion has been quelled.

Hotspur's death signifies Hal's entry into the royal arena. Hal's actions thus far have set him up as a dark horse, so he can emerge triumphant at last. His plan was an attempt to secure his legitimacy; a variation on the theme of Tudor kings and queens, whom Bristol

suggests "used the royal entry partly as a political technique to confirm their questionable legitimacy."[17] His was quite a royal entry; he had learned from his father that appearances are everything. Hal's outward appearance as one perfectly in control of his destiny may, however, be a chimera; his newly ordered and balanced kingdom

> May on closer inspection seem like radical instability tricked out as moral or aesthetic order; what appeared as clarity may seem now like a conjurer's trick concealing confusion in order to buy time and stave off the collapse of an illusion...what we took to be the "center" may be part of the remotest periphery."[18]

Hal's redefinition of boundaries may, in fact, be merely illusion that covers up a kingdom just as 'un-transgressable' as his father's. Particularly in the Lancastrian tetralogy, Shakespeare refuses to create seamless metanarratives that define the center and periphery, forcing a reevaluation of the sense of transgressiveness. True transgression requires something to subvert, differences to hybridize, and fixed boundaries to cross, and since the world Henry created is already in a state of chaotic flux, authentic transgression is made impossible—perhaps for generations.

Notes

1. William Shakespeare, *Henry IV, Part One*, ed. David Bevington (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987). Text references are to act, scene, and line of this edition.

2. Michael Bristol, *Carnival and Theatre: Plebian Culture and the Structure of Authority in Renaissance England* (New York: Methuen, 1985), 70-71. Bristol further notes that the uncrowning of a clown king in carnival festivities was a "transgressive metaphor of [the] popular festive form" that was used to "interpret actual events. From where the common people stand, many of the episodes of high political life can be seen to decline inadvertently into self-travesty. The tragedy and violence of contingent historical events like the fall of a king are witnessed in the public square as grotesque and bloody self-parody." *Henry IV, Part I* conflates the uncrowning of an actual king (Richard) with the uncrowning of a clown king (through its use of carnivalesque metaphor), blurring the boundary between carnivalesque play-acting and reality.

3. Claire McEachern, ed, Introduction, *Henry IV, Part One*, by William Shakespeare (Penguin Books, 2000), xxxi.

4. J. Jervis, *Transgressing the Modern: Explorations in the Western Experience of Otherness* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), 4.

5. Bristol, *Carnival and Theatre,* 59-60. Authority must ground itself in an unchanging legitimacy sanctioned by mythological or religious (biblical) genealogy. Bristol suggests that this legitimacy allows the figure of authority to be "at once distanced from the here and now by self-identification with a mythological and

legendary past, and at the same time fulfills and completes the here and now by revealing the underlying harmony of a continuous and durable social structure."

6. Ibid.

7. Ibid., 198.

8. Chris Jenks, *Transgression*, (London: Routledge, 2003), 2. Jenks repeatedly emphasizes this paradox, insisting that "to transgress is to go beyond the bounds or limits set by a commandment or law or convention, it is to violate or infringe. But to transgress is also more than this, it is to announce and even laudate the commandment, the law or the convention. Transgression is a deeply reflexive act of denial and affirmation."

9. Lawrence E. Levin, "Hotspur, Falstaff, and the Emblem of Wrath in *1 Henry IV*." *Shakespeare Studies,* 10: 43-65: 44.

10. Mikhail Bakhtin, *Rabelais and His World*, Trans. Helen Iswolsky (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984), 11-12.

11. Peter Stallybrass and Allon White, *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1986), 168.

12. Bakhtin, *Rabelais*, 26. The body "is not a closed, completed unit: it is unfinished, outgrows itself, transgresses its own limits."

13. Mikhail Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination* (), 264. Hal "makes use of the internal stratification of language, of its social heteroglossia and the variety of individual voices in it."

14. Bristol, *Carnival and Theatre*, 62.

15. Jenks, *Transgression*, 42.

16. Claude Peltrault, "(Para-) Dramatic Inclusions in *1 Henry IV*: the Transgression of the Play, the Play of Transgression, Royalty and Theatricality," *The Show Within: Dramatic and Other Insets, English Renaissance Drama (1550-1642)* (Montpellier: Publications de Universite Paul-Valery, 1990), 168.

17. Bristol, *Carnival and Theatre*, 61.

18. Stephen Greenblatt, *Shakespearean Negotiations*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 47, 173.

Juliet on the Balcony — The Upper Stage at Elizabethan Theatres

Fumiyuki Narushima
Kitami Institute of Technology, Kitami, Hokkiado, Japan

Although the upper stage had existed since the time of innyard acting, the really ingenious use of it did not come out until the 1590s, which coincided with the advent of Shakespeare. Jonathan Bate points out in the introduction to his edition of *Titus Andronicus:* '. . . the opening scene of the play evinces a mastery of multiple entrances and exits, including use of the "above" stage, that surpasses anything in any previous Elizabethan play.'[1] Actually, the demands for the upper stage at the public playhouses became intense enough at this period to make one of the profit-chasing impresarios, Philip Henslowe, take action.

Henslowe was so attracted by the upper stage. Most of the famous plays performed at his Rose Theatre have scenes using an upper stage: Thomas Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy: 'Balthazar* aboue' (line 773); '*Bel imperia* at a window' (line 1680);[2] Robert Greene's *Orlando Furioso*: 'Sound a Parle, and one comes vpon the walls' (line 394);[3] George Peele's *Battle of Alcazar*: 'En<te>r aboue Nemesis' (lines 25), 'Enter Nemesis aboue' (line 56);[4] Christopher Marlowe's *2 Tamburlaine*: 'Enter the Governour of Babylon *upon the walles with* [Maximus *and*] *others'* (5.1.0);[5] *The Jew of Malta*: *'Enter* Abigall *above'* (2.1.19), *'Fight: Enter* Barabas *above'* (3.2.4), *'Enter* [Barabas] *with a Hammar above, very* busie' (5.5.0);[6] and *Doctor Faustus: 'Enter* Benvolio *above at a window, in his nightcap: buttoning'* (line 1178).[7] Each of these plays earned Henslowe 3 pounds a day, the largest sum in the daily record of takings.[8]

Henslowe rebuilt his Rose in 1592. Included in the plan might have been the refurbishment of the stage, to furnish pillars to support its upper stage and the heavens.[9] It was done only five years after the Rose was first built, and no other reason can be presumable except to outwit or follow up the rival playing company, Shakespeare's Chamberlain's Men, which was so popular among

the citizens with the spectacular scenes utilizing the upper stages. Henslowe must have seen some of Shakespeare's plays at his Rose, and he should have realized the effects of the upper stage. Edward Alleyn, Henslowe's son-in-law and the leader and star player of the Admiral's Men, is said to have played Titus's part.

After the Chamberlain's Men was established in 1594, Shakespeare stopped using the upper stage very often. Approximately after the emergence of the company, the *aloft* stage directions vanish from the Shakespearean canon. This could be surmised as a result of the company's moving out to other theatres. In that year, they began playing at the Theatre, and then they used the Curtain from 1597, because the lease for the Theatre expired, until 1599, when the Globe opened to receive them.[10] Under these circumstances, they must have found it difficult to keep the former way of acting, because of a certain kind of inconvenience, that is, a lack of facilities.

By 'facilities' I mean some of the machines and structures to build and utilize the upper stage at a London theatre. They needed, first of all, the large two pillars on the main stage to support the otherwise dangling superstructure, at the height of a third story, whose floor is called 'heavens'. Inside this structure was set a machine to descend actors or thrones to the main stage.

The existence of both the pillars and the descending machines at earlier stages is uncertain, although it can be safely said that at the Globe (even at the first Globe) and the later Rose (that is, after the refurbishment) some evidence shows that they had them.

In the following discussions, I will try to dig up some problems concerning the upper stage at Elizabethan theatres, using data of stage directions of the Elizabethan and Jacobean period, which I assembled with other members in a project, whose result is now open to the public on a web site.[11] I will deal with *aloft* stage directions first, which are very few in number, but I think many important ones are included among them, focusing on the other writers' use of them, and later I will relate the found evidence to Shakespeare's cases.

Aloft Directions

Compared with *above, aloft* is not very common as a stage direction in Elizabethan plays. Shakespeare first used it, and there is no instance by other playwrights during the sixteenth century. *Aloft* appears mostly in his early plays: *1 Henry VI* (4.2.2), *2 Henry VI* (1.4.12), *Richard III* (3.7.94), *The Taming of the Shrew* (Induction.2.0), *Titus Andronicus* (1.1.0, 17, 294), *Romeo and Juliet*

(3.5.0), and then in *Antony and Cleopatra* (4.16.0, 38).[12]

Other major writers preferred above. Shakespeare also used it in *2 Henry VI* (1.4.54), *The Taming of the Shrew* (1.1.246), *The Merchant of Venice* (2.6.25), *Henry VIII* (5.2.34), and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (2.1.47). This incongruity occurs perhaps because some of these plays were collaborations (with John Fletcher mainly, who used above in all his plays). *The Merchant of Venice* was performed at court and, for that reason or not, has many orderly stage directions probably by someone else.

Only minor writers followed Shakespeare in using *aloft*: instances can be found in John Mason's *The Turk* (lines 83, 210-11, and 1785),[13] Gervase Markham and Lewis Machin's *The Dumb Knight* (pp. 128, 186, and 189),[14] Joshua Cooke's *Greene's Tu Quoque* (pp. 203, 227, and 282),[15] and others. There would have been proper reasons for these authors to select this uncommon word, and my first impression is that the venues these plays were performed at provide an answer.

Apart from Shakespeare, *aloft* was mainly used at indoor playhouses. *The Turk* and *The Dumb Knight* were played at the Whitefriars, Nathaniel Richards's *Messalina* at the Salisbury Court. More precisely, if it was played at court with a masque and dance, there is a strong inclination toward this trend. Although Cooke's *Greene's Tu Quoque* was first performed at the Red Bull in 1611, surely it would have been transferred to the Cockpit in 1625.[16] It was mounted at court on three occasions: (27 Dec. 1611, 2 Feb. 1612, and 6 Jan. 1625).[17] This frequency is a rare case.

For Thomas Goffe, who wrote five plays in total for Oxford students (one of them is lost), there was a certain distinction between *aloft* and *above*. The examples of both are present in *The Courageous Turk*. However, his three instances of *aloft* always come with from before it: *'Enter from aloft . . .'* (line 166), *'. . . whilst* Fame *speakes from aloft . . .'* (line 270), *'He goeth from aloft'* (line 1770). Apparently his *aloft* is accompanied with a concept of movement or distance. The first case concerns the heavens and flying devices:

> *Enter from aloft two Torchbearers, then* Iupiter *and* Iuno, *and two Torchbearers more, then* Mars *and* Uenus, *and two Torchbearers more, then* Apollo *and* Pallas, *and two more Torchbearers, then* Neptune *and* Diana. *Whilst they are discending,* Cupid *hanging in the Ayre, sings to soft Musicke this Song following.* (lines 166-170) [18]

Not all the gods and goddesses can be suspended by the devices, but at least Cupid is in the air, and 'discending' sounds more like from the upper stage, not through the descending

machine. However, there is one problem. Could the confined upper stage hold so many people at once? There are four sets of divine couples led by two torchbearers each.

Of course we can present them four by four: four people can be tolerable on the above stage, albeit it will become pretty hard to detect the properties of each deity from far and also it would be very awkward up there.[19]

This play was performed at Christ Church Hall, Oxford, one of the oldest venues that were furnished with flying machinery, according to John Astington.[20] This theatre was not in a strict sense academic, but the designs and construction of the stage were in charge of the King's Office of Works, that is, it was made into a kind of court theatre. The designer who created the royal stage in 1605 was Inigo Jones.[21]

At a court theatre, thrones for monarchs were set facing the stage. Kings were there to be seen, not to see. Keith Sturgess says:

> When the sovereign was present at a court performance or masque, there was inevitably generated a kind of double theatre . . . When a play was performed for James at Oxford in 1605, the state had to be moved from its first position because, so anxious functionaries were aware, the King would not be properly seen by the audience. That, as a result of the move, he himself could but poorly hear and see the play was of less account.[22]

The state was indeed 28ft away from the stage.[23] The elevated throne was flanked on either side by the lords' boxes. The resultant space between the state and the stage was called 'piazza' and left open, but the ladies sat along the walls of this area, because they were not allowed to sit before the king with their backs to him. Maybe it was on this 'piazza' that the masque dance was performed.

At this theatre, Jones introduced one innovative device of scenery: a system of *periaktoi*,[24] which consists of pillars with three boards assembled triangularly. When the pillar rotates, by a winch set under the floor, the three faces of the panels are replaced, making a scenic change possible. At the most, five pillars were able to stand at the end of the auditorium, that is, between the stage and the state of the monarch. [25] The rather peculiar size of the room (it has 115ft in length, about three times longer than the Cockpit-in Court) made it easier to put this cumbersome equipment in place.

The most important thing to be observed is that actors could climb up these pillars. Or, they could hide behind the standing

boards and come forward when the pillar rotated. Some actors dressed as gods were able to speak from the top of the pillars.[26] When Jones presented *Tethys' Festival* at Whitehall, the middle board of the five was made twice the width. Five is an apt number for pillars, because in the play that we are considering now, we have four pairs of gods appearing. I'm not sure which god and goddess took the center stage, but as the four pairs must come down at once, Cupid may be right to descend to the center. I'm not saying that *periaktoi* were actually used for *The Courageous Turk*, but there is a possibility that a similar device was in use, as we have a previous example at least.

But what does the 'discending' indicate? The stage direction says that after the gods and goddesses enter, *'they are discending'*. From where do they descend? I think this means that they simply come forward down the stage. It is known that the Christ Church stage was raked toward the front.[27] As it was an unusually long theatre, it may have taken time for the actors to come forward. Moreover, if they used the piazza, they must come down from the stage to dance on the floor between the stage and the state. So, the *discending* was not from the upper stage or by flying devices, but from the main stage to the dancing floor in front. In this sense, this is a unique usage of *descending*.

The second example from *The Courageous Turk* also concerns flying, because Fame is directed to ascend after his speech (line 366). Moreover, Alexander refers to Fame's wings (line 290) and says, '. . . Which soare i'th middle region of high glory' (line 291). It may be appropriate to have Fame suspended in the air while he delivers his speech. But the special function of these two uses of *aloft* clashes with the third. Unfortunately, the last case of *aloft* from the play is not about flying but just a usual exit from the balcony. Here we can say that the author was not constant in his use of *aloft* in the play, but later corrections by someone else might have affected the stage directions.

The scene in *Messalina* that has *aloft* in it is also a masque, or to be precise, an antimasque. *Aloft* here applies to a flying device, too: '. . . Messallina and Silius *gloriously crown'd in an Arch-glitering Cloud aloft, Court each other'* (lines 2207-9). While they are descending, another instance occurs: '. . . Narcissus *enters aloft with a Torch and speakes'* (lines 2230-31).[28] But in other parts of the play, *above* is used twice.

The first example is comprehensible, that is, *aloft* is employed for flying machines. The torch in the second case is not decorative but practical, because the next stage direction shows that it is left

burning after Narcissus's exit, to give light to the following dance. As with Goffe, it would have been used to illuminate the actors in the obscure theatre. The glittering cloud was a comparable invention; it reflected light, although it didn't have a lighting source. Narcissus needed the torch to snatch the audience's attention from the brightly adorned vehicle. The torch confirms that he stood somewhere dim, that is, not necessarily on the upper stage, where no extra lighting might have been needed. He also needed to stand close to the dancers if he really wanted to illuminate them.

John Kirke's *The Seven Champions of Christendom*, which also has both *above* and *aloft* in it, was performed at the Red Bull and put to the Cockpit later.[29] In this play of thunder and lightning, rocks cleave and witches hover.

Rocks really were a property at this Red Bull and Hercules throws them.[30] Moreover, the rock in this play, probably represented by the walls of the tiring-house, could be accessed by climbing, for the witch Calib says, 'Whilst on the outside of this Rocke I climbe / Vp by the crags unto the top' (C2r).[31]

Should we suppose that she was really meant to climb up the wall? Alternatively, she may have had time to exit once and climb the stairway in the tiring-house, because St.George comes chasing her and speaks about nine lines to fill up the stage. The next stage direction reads '. . . *the Rocke cleaves, she sinkes* . . .' (C2v). If Calib stood at the level of the upper stage, this direction means that she disappeared from above to come down to the inner stage. However, Reynolds suggests more elaborate stage settings for a similar scene in Heywood's Brazen Age.[32] In Wentworth Smith's *The Hector of Germany*, another Red Bull play, young Fitzwaters enters aloft on a rock (F4-G1v).[33]

One of the *above* stage directions in *Seven Champions* is slightly odd:

> *Enter Brandron* and *Clowne above.*
> *Bran:* Where art thou love?
> *Clowne:* Here, here, as close as beggery to a Prodigall,
> Ile ne're forsake yee Ile warrant.
> *Bran:* 'Tis well; now we have attaind the highest
> top: ha! (K2r)

Why doesn't Brandron recognize Suckabus the clown? Or, what kind of action could we expect on the narrow upper stage? Should we suppose a similar setting of a craggy mountain just like the witch's residence, where the two climbers are having a hard time to trail their way? Although the scene is changed to the giant's 'castle', the setting may remain as it was when the play began.

Of course, at the Red Bull, a bulky public playhouse like the Globe, there must have been plenty of room for the actors on the upper stage, but at the Cockpit or at court, how could they deal with the scene? Furthermore, this play demands more than usual numbers of actors on the upper stage, '*Enter above* Ormandine, *his friends*, Tarpax, *& spirits*'(G3r); '*Enter* Brandron *aloft, with all the Champions and Clowne*' (K4r). In the latter case, we have nine people above, for there are seven champions as the title of the play suggests. As we can see here, the wordings differ between *aloft* and *above* in this play: most likely a sign of correction or insertion by someone. We are not sure how the players presented the scenes, but the fact that the play was mounted at several kinds of venue may have resulted in the confusing disparities in stage directions. The same can be true with Shakespeare.

A bewildering direction occurs in *Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany: He opens the door and finds* Lorenzo *asleep aloft'* (1.1.53).[34] Alphonsus unlocks the door of Lorenzo's study and enters to pick up a note. Before long Lorenzo wakes up from his bed, but where does he lie? The stage direction is not clear enough about which door Alphonsus is opening, but most probably it would be the door or curtain to the discovery room, because he is already present on the main stage to speak some lines before this action. I suppose here Lorenzo lies upon a bed set inside the discovery room, that is, *aloft* does not denote the upper stage as usual. In this way, *aloft* sometimes may allow a range of meanings according to the situation. Lorenzo shouldn't be on the upper stage, because Alphonsus couldn't see him if he gets into the discovery room.

So far I have referred to the questionable cases concerning *aloft* stage directions. I'm not picking up unstable instances to argue that *aloft* is unreliable, but I'm just showing the variety of usage *aloft* applies to, thus allowing it to reveal what it does show about theatre circumstances of the age. We can only infer from the existing data when we consider the now extinct theatres.

What can we say about Shakespeare's plays from these investigations of other writers? First of all, Sly's whereabouts in *The Shrew* don't have to be on the upper stage itself. The galleries or gentlemen's rooms, if they could afford him access to them, would be more comfortable for him and smoother for the stage progress. Many plays we have seen allowed *aloft* being elsewhere from the upper stage, making an important distinction between *aloft* and *above*. Especially in *Alphonsus*, although the secretary's bed cannot be located assuredly, we find a resembling relaxed atmosphere to Sly's. As we guess from his lines, he is not standing

but in bed, for he is not supposed to be fully recovered from sickness yet. Also, he invites his 'wife' to bed. As the attendants should remain with him watching the play, a gentlemen's room seems to be good enough for serving wine or settling a bed for him.[35] However, *'The Presenters aboue'* (1.1.246) would better stand at the upper stage unless he should interfere with Sly's repose. Thus we can differentiate the use of *aloft* and *above* in this play.

Some plays can contain many actors on the upper stage, thus supporting *Titus's 'Tribunes and Senatours aloft'* (1.1.0). The Red Bull had the best capacity to hold more than seven actors upstairs: *'Flourish. Enter aboue vpon the wals, Priam, Hecuba, Hellena, Polixena, Astianax, Margareton. with attendants.'* This is from Heywood's *1 The Iron Age* (p. 298).[36] The second Globe and the Blackfriars were able to hold six persons upstairs at the maximum: *'Above* BEAUFORT JUNIOR, MONTREVILE, BELGARDE, *the three* SEA CAPTAINS' (Philip Massinger, *The Unnatural Combat*, 2.1.192; played at the Globe in 1624);[37] *'Enter (above)* Caesar, Ptolomy, Achoreus, Appollodorus, Anthony, Dollabella' (John Fletcher, *The False One*, 5.2.34; performed at the Blackfriars in 1620).[38] *Titus's* five actors (*'Enter aloft the Emperour with Tamora and her two sonnes, and Aaron the Moore'* (1.1.294) was a fairly moderate number, but the play was old and originally mounted probably at the Theatre or the Rose.

Above Directions

Next, let me refer to some cases of above directions. As the above directions are abundant, we will not be able to treat everything at once that was found in the data. We should select and distinguish among them. My priority here goes to clear and evident cases. I admit that my investigation is not thorough but selective concerning above directions here in this chapter. We will begin by taking up the data which support some points made so far in the discussion.

George Peele's *The Love of King David and Fair Bethsabe* opens with the Prologue's action: *'He drawes a curtaine, and discouers Bethsabe with her maid bathing ouer a spring, she sings, and Dauid sits aboue vewing her'* (lines 25-27).[39] Where is David if he can observe Bethsabe? If she is inside the discovery space, no one can see her from the upper stage. David commands Cusay to bring her to him. They trip their way to David, but when they enter to him, there is no *above* in the stage direction (line 134). Nor is there any above direction when Cusay first appears to David (line 76). That is, there is no direction of above except the very first one which sets him there.

How can we deal with this discrepancy? David is said to be in his tower, but the confusion deepens when David's subjects assault and win Hanon's tower in the next scene. The stage direction says that Hanon and King Machaas stand on the walls (line 195). Of course it is very natural for an Elizabethan theatre to shift its scene without mentioning it. The same upper stage may first denote David's castle, and next, Hanon's. In that case, Bethsabe must be revealed on the main stage, and we need a kind of canopied structure for her. If we place David elsewhere, Bethsabe would be in the central discovery space.

The concept of *above* is opposite to *below*, and these two words are customarily paired together when used in a stage direction, usually the former appearing first. However, in rare cases *below* is used independently and it makes us wonder. In William Rowley's *A New Wonder, a Woman Never Vexed*, we have '[*A noise below in the bowling-alley of betting and wrangling*]' (p. 121).[40] Alan Dessen and Leslie Thomson classified this usage as *under the stage*,[41] but we cannot think that a bowling alley is placed underground at an inn or tavern, and it could be just backstage that the sound is heard. As if to prove this, after a few lines we have *'(A noise above at cards)'* (p. 123), that is, Rowley was thinking of above and below as a pair from the first, just like other playwrights were.

Old Foster the miser goes bankrupt and he is put to prison for debt. We see him begging: '[OLD FOSTER *appears above at the grate, a box hanging downe*' (p. 174). This can be on the upper stage, but if so the next direction is a little strange: '[ROBERT *puts in money*' (p. 175), because Robert stays on the main stage while his father gets inside the grate. I understand that Old Foster dangles a box connected to a very long rope from the balusters down to the main stage. When Robert puts money in, Foster tediously or quickly winds up the rope as his whim takes. From the text we can see that this action is repeated twice or thrice. It would make a good comical scene for the audience.

In the gate scene of *The Death of Robert, Earl of Huntingdon*, a stage direction goes *'Enter, or aboue*, HUBERT, CHESTER' (p. 275).[42] This Robin Hood play by Henry Chettle and Anthony Munday was performed at the Rose in 1598. The hesitating mood in the utterance shows the playwright's worries about the unreliable circumstances concerning the theatre facilities. This can be a good evidence of certain facts among theatre situations of the Elizabethan age.

The upper stage is sometimes reckoned to be big enough to commit murder in. A passage in Robert Yarington's *Two Lamentable*

Tragedies implies that the audience can see the access to the upper stage. Merry the criminal says, 'Goe vp those staires, your friends do stay aboue'. A mystery is that the victim Beech's shop is also described as on stage.

A direction 'Unseen above' (Q5) appears in Richard Brome's *The Court Beggar*.[43] This can be taken as *within* upstairs. The voice belongs to Lady Strangelove who is attending Sir Ferdinand the mad man in his bedroom. There are some four or five men under on the main stage, and her chambermaid Philomel and Dainty come out to the main stage probably to make sure to the audience that the sound was really upstairs. Later, Ferdinand himself is heard *above unseen.*

One of the most exquisite writers who relied on the upper stage was Heywood. His stage directions are so elaborate that many critics and scholars think that they aren't playable, but here they need some consideration. Especially his Age plays abound in *above* directions: we have four cases in *The Brazen Age*, two in *Silver*, one each in *1 Iron* and *2 Iron*. Four among them refer to a flying machine.

One direction reads *'All the Gods appeare aboue, and laugh, Iupiter, Iuno, Phoebus, Mercury, Neptune'* (*The Brazen Age*, p. 237).[44] These gods are laughing at Mars and Venus, who are caught by Vulcan in the cave.[45] The situation is the same with King David, and we had better place the cave on the main stage with a certain kind of structure, because otherwise the gods could not see the couple inside the discovery space if it was directly under the "above" area.

Window Directions

Many stage directions include *windows*, which denotes amorous atmospheres characteristic of comedies, while *walls* is mainly used for histories or tragedies. I'll discuss some of the problems concerning *windows* at theatres, focusing on *Romeo and Juliet*, but some others will come to begin with.

First, let me take up the cases of water throwing from the windows. In Anthony Munday's *Fedele and Fortunio*, Victoria's maid, Attilia, throws water out of the chamber pot over Captain Crackstone's head (4.6.79).[46] As the two ladies stand above on the upper stage, it would have made a very spectacular and comical scene for the original audiences.

Although it is not stated in the stage direction, a similar device would be present in John Fletcher's *The Woman's Prize or The Tamer Tamed*, at Maria the taming wife's window. Sophocles, Petruchio's friend, says, "... when suddenly / a water-worke flew from the

window with such violence, that had / I not duck'd quickly like a Fryer, *coetera quis nescit?* The chamber's / nothing but a meere *Ostend*, in every window Pewter cannons / mounted, you'll quickly finde with what they are charg'd, sir" (1.3.86-90).[47] Andrew Gurr points out that this play (1612) was mainly presented at the Blackfriars, after the Globe was burned down in 1613. The indoor theatre attracted many women to go to enjoy the plays, one of the reasons why Fletcher flattered the ladies attending with the story of the tamed husband.[48]

Water on stage, which is a taboo in modern indoor theatres, (as the cleaning would become so hard,) doesn't seem to have been so in the Elizabethan age. Probably because some of the theatres were constructed outside, they felt free to wet the stages. There are many blooding scenes or bloodletting scenes where pigs' gore was utilized.

But it seems to be very audacious to throw water from above, because usually the upper stage was installed inside the building with a cover whose purpose was mainly to shelter actors from rain. It is possible that these chamber pots were fakes, not containing water inside. With the situation of the actors and their reactions, they could easily have presented the reality of water. As I pointed out, if it was performed at the Blackfriars, an indoor private theatre, the fake seems to have been inevitable.

I suppose here that most of the murders or suicides could have been done very near to the front, downstage, thus making the cleansing easier. I do not know why Desdemona, who is killed on her bed in front of the discovery space, is smothered, not stabbed, but probably some instinct worked on Shakespeare and the stagehands. In fact, in the original story by Cinthio, Desdemona is beaten to death by the Ensign, and camouflaged to have died from the accident of falling of ceilings. Detailed study can answer this for sure.

In Robert Tailor's *The Hog Hath Lost His Pearl*, Albert disguises himself as his friend Carracus in order to steal into Maria's room through her window. He climbs the rope ladder that has been prepared beforehand, and when he comes to the top, he blows out the candle (p. 440).[49] Most probably, this candle is carried by Maria, and we may have here evidence that the upper stage was lit by some means. Katherine's window is also lit in Marston's Jack *Drum's Entertainment* (p.195).[50] Claramante in Davenant's *Distresses* also carries a light when she appears above (p.40).[51] Especially at dark indoor thetres, it would have been good to bring some source of light.

Maria gets down by means of the ladder, although it is very rare for women to do so. She must have changed clothes now and is lightly dressed, perhaps in her riding habit, because she is going to elope with the true Carracus.

Other climbing lovers sometimes fail to reach the balcony. In Marston's *Insatiate Countess*, Mendosa climbs the ladder to Lentulus' window, but at the top he falls and he is seriously wounded. He is carried away by foolish Captain and Watch (3.1.42).[52]

In Robert Daborne's *A Christian Turned Turk*, Gallop climbs up the ladder to Agar, Benwash's wife (10.36).[53] He successfully gets into her room, but soon he is discovered and the mad husband sets fire to the house. Gallop escapes from the window by the help of Agar's sheets, but he gets some serious injury. Thus we can observe that windows are frequently associated with elopement and illicit love, which may be obvious from Shakespeare's cases in Jessica and Juliet.

Although it was never acted at any playhouses and no record remains about its performance, John Jones's *Adrasta* has an elaborate scene of descending by ropes in it (D2-D3v).[54] A low-born girl Althea, who is loved by the Duke's son Lucilio, is trapped and confined in a house on a charge of treason against the Duke. Lucilio comes to rescue her, sends her away, and gets in the house to play her part at the next day's court trial.

First, Lucilio makes Althea, who comes to the window, let down a line to fasten the clothes which she needs to escape in. She changes her clothes just at the window, while he talks about eight or nine lines. Again, the line is let down to draw up a ladder of cord, and then she comes down by it.

Now, let us go to Romeo and Juliet. First, let me take up an unusual case of descending in the form of *go down*. In *Romeo and Juliet*, 3.5, the Q1 stage direction for Romeo reads *'He goeth down'* (3.5.42), allowing him to exit before the Nurse appears. He is visible to the audience while coming down, because he uses the ladder. Juliet also comes down later: *'She goeth downe from the window'*(3.5.67). However, as we can see, her descending is a little different from Romeo's. She must use the stairs in the tiring-house, so she disappears from the stage once, and enters again down on the main stage. Strictly speaking, the stage direction for her should be *'Exit above'*.

Q1 describes Romeo and Juliet as *'at the window'*. Q1 and Q2 contrast definitely at this point. Q2 and F are theatrical and say that they are *aloft*. *'At the window'* is a very ambiguous wording as a

theatrical diction. We are not sure of where they stand at Juliet's residence. Are they inside the house? Or, is the audience looking up from the garden orchard?

The Nurse's 'Your lady mother is coming to your chamber' (17) gives us one hint to solve the problem. Where does she stand to speak this sentence? Near Juliet on the balcony? Yelling at her from the orchard? Either way, she speaks this line because she is not in the chamber. If she herself is in the chamber, she would not use the word 'chamber'. So, until this line, Juliet stays at the balcony. We can imagine Juliet's chamber is meant to be adjacent to the balcony. Theatrically she climbs down, but descriptively she just moves to the next room. The only solution that Q1 could give was 'She goeth downe from the window': the amalgam of horizontal and vertical actions.

If a new scene started after Juliet's descending, it may be easier to understand, because we have a scenic change. Q1 ends the page G3v with Juliet's *'She goeth downe from the window'* and the new page G4r opens with *'Enter Iuliets Mother, Nurse.'* Maybe this is a vestige of the original acting.

Let me here deviate for a while to discuss the difference between movies and theatrical performance. If a director determines to shoot Juliet for a film, he can easily rely on cutting technique. Just after the close-up of Juliet who is lamenting for Romeo's going away (on the balcony, that is, outside in the orchard), the director can insert or paste the scene of Juliet inside the house pretending to be at ease, in order to cheat Mother's detection. The director can easily access to the technique, and we audiences also think it proper and give no doubt about the procedure.

Theatres cannot give access to that technique, yet very few people are aware of the fact. At a theatre, Juliet cannot come down so quickly to answer her Mother's call. She must climb down the backstage stairs which are unseen by the audience, and enter again from the main door. Usually this action takes the time required for 3 or 4 lines of speech at least (in the case of male characters). Girls (albeit boy actors) take more time, because of their clumsy dresses (6 lines or more).

So, what can be performed within the blank? The main stage will be blank unless another actor enters on the main stage beforehand.

After Romeo leaves, the film-director's camera, which chases Juliet, quits shooting at her from outside the orchard, and goes inside the house and shows her in the closet. This happens at the moment when she starts climbing down. What we can call "double-

locality" resides here at the flight of stairs.[55]

Q2 and F make a mistake of double entrance for Juliet's Mother: 'Enter Madam and Nurse'(36) and 'Enter Mother'(64) without her exit in between. Only Q1 has 'Enter Nurse hastely'(36) alone first, and then 'Enter Iuliets Mother, Nurse'(64) later. The Nurse and Lady Capulet must enter on the main stage. Otherwise, they must utter 200 or so lines on the upper stage with no one else below. This play is unusual in that Lady Capulet does not talk much to fill the time while Juliet is descending.[56] Let us compare a similar instance found in another play.

Our next example is from John Ford. In his *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*, 1.2, Annabella, above at her chamber window, finds her brother below and must come down to him. While she descends to him with her tutoress Putana, he has been given a soliloquy of some length, in order perhaps to earn the time for their action (1.2.144-63).[57] This is a usual way of performance, but the next one is a little different.

In 3.2, Giovanni eavesdrops on Soranzo's wooing of Annabella. When she gets sick, he hurriedly comes to help her. The stage direction sets him above, so that he can't be allowed enough time to come to help her before she falls down. On the main stage, Soranzo alone is left to speak but he talks only one line between Annabella's collapse and Giovanni's rescue. Of course, a certain action would be able to cover the silent stage, e.g. taking care of Annabella , but we cannot deny the uneasiness of the stage action.

Giovanni enters with her father Florio and Putana. It is not only unnatural that they all enter together at once but, to begin with, is it physically possible that he could climb down in such a short time?[58] Furthermore, in order to enter with the Father and the tutoress, Giovanni must hurry more, because of the handicap he suffers from being upstairs.

Instead, can't we imagine that he is hiding himself just behind a tree or a rock (i.e., one of the pillars that support the 'heavens',) and should be ready at hand when needed? It seems natural that Florio and Putana are both within hearing, because these two seem to be agreeing about this wedding match.

This problem of the time required for descending remains to be solved for me and needs more evidence to be dealt with, which will be the main subject of my next paper.

Study of the upper stage especially about its effect on the stage business is old/new. Old in that the data we rely on are very old, but it's also new because very few people have been aware of the values and effects. It is a new study, and as usual with a new thing,

we have fewer proofs and many problems. I hope this paper will open the door to a new study from a new angle.

Notes

1. *Titus Andornicus*, ed. Jonathan Bate (London: Routledge, 1995), 79-80.

2. Thomas Kyd, *The Spanish Tragedy*, ed. W. W. Greg and D. Nichol Smith (Malone Society Reprints, 1949).

3. Robert Greene, *Orlando Furioso*, ed. W. W. Greg (Malone Society Reprints, 1907).

4. *Two Elizabethan Abridgements: The Battle of Alcazar & Orlando Furioso*, ed. W. W. Greg (Malone Society Reprints, 1922).

5. *The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe*, ed. Fredson Bowers, 2 vols. (Cambridge: CUP, 1973), i.

6. Ibid. i.

7. Ibid. ii.

8. *Henslowe's Diary*, ed. R. A. Foakes and R. T. Rickert (Cambridge: CUP, 1961), 16ff.

9. Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespearean Stage* 1574-1642, 3rd edn (Cambridge: CUP, 1992), 38 and 130.

10. Ibid, 41 and 248.

11. http://130.158.228.38/. But I also refer to Alan Dessen and Leslie Thomson, *A Dictionary of Stage Directions in English Drama* 1580-1642 (Cambridge: CUP, 1999), especially under the items of *above* and *aloft*.

12. Shakespearean references are to *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, ed. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor (Oxford: OUP, 1986).

13. John Mason, The Turk, ed. Joseph Q. Adams, Jr. (Materialien zur Kunde des alteren Englischen Dramas, xxxvii, 1913).

14. *Dodsley's Select Collection of Old English Plays*, ed. W. Carew Hazlitt, 15 vols. (London: Reeves and Turner, 1875), x.

15. Ibid. xi.

16. Andrew Gurr, 'Playing in Amphitheatres and Playing in Hall Theatres', *The Elizabethan Theatre XIII*, ed. A. L. Magnusson and C. E. McGee (Toronto, 1994), 47-62, esp. 57.

17. According to the list attached to John H. Astington, *English Court Theatre 1558-1642* (Cambridge: CUP, 1999).

18. Thomas Goffe, *The Couragious Turk and the Raging Turk*, ed. David Carnegie (Malone Society Reprints, 1974).

19. Usually audiences could only see an actor to the waist on the upper stage at indoor theatres. See the Roxana picture for example.

20. John H. Astington, 'Descent Machinery in the Playhouses', J. Reeds Barroll, III ed., *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England II* (New York, 1985), 118-33, esp. 121.

21. John Orrell, *The Theatres of Inigo Jones and John Webb* (Cambridge: CUP, 1985), 24.

22. Keith Sturgess, *Jacobean Private Theatre* (London: Routledge, 1987), 159.

23. Orrell, 30.

24. Ibid. 31-33. Orrell cites an anonymous Cambridge reporter who saw a false wall at this venue that changed its aspects three times.

25. Ibid. 34.
26. Ibid. 33.
27. Ibid. 31.
28. Nathaniel Richards, *The Tragedy of Messalina*, ed. A. R. Skemp (Materialien zur Kunde des alteren Englischen Dramas, xxx, 1910).
29. Gurr, 'Playing', 57.
30. George Fullmer Reynolds, *The Staging of Elizabethan Plays at the Red Bull Theater 1605-1625* (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1940), 75.
31. John Kirke, *The Seven Champions of Christendom*, STC 15014 (1638). STC stands for the numbering in *Short-Title Catalogue*, ed. A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave (London, 1946) with the date of publication.
32. Reynolds, 76.
33. To my regret, I was not able to get access to the quarto text itself. This information derives from Reynolds.
34. *The Plays and Poems of George Chapman: The Tragedies*, ed. Thomas Marc Parrott (London: George Routledge & Sons, 1910).
35. This supposition was refuted by Professor Gurr in his personal letter, his reason being that it would be a long way for the actors to travel. In that case, I offer the partitioned galleries over the stage, as he suggested, which were sometimes called 'tarras', or 'music-room'. See Gurr, 'Playing', 147, for example.
36. Thomas Heywood, *The Dramatic Works*, 6 vols. (London: John Pearson York Street Covent Garden, 1874; repr., New York: Russell & Russell, 1964), iii.
37. Philip Massinger, *The Plays and Poems*, ed. Philip Edwards and Colin Gibson, 5 vols. (Oxford: OUP, 1976), ii.
38. Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, *The Dramatic Works*, gen. ed. Fredson Bowers, 10 vols. (Cambridge: CUP, 1966-96), viii.
39. George Peele, *The Love of King David and Fair Bethsabe*, ed. W. W. Greg (Malone Society Reprints, 1912).
40. *Dodsley's*, xii.
41. Alan Dessen and Leslie Thomson, 28.
42. *Dodsley's*, viii.
43. *The Dramatic Works of Richard Brome*, 3 vols. (London: John Pearson, 1873), i.
44. Thomas Heywood, *The Dramatic Works*, iii.
45. Reynolds, 99.
46. *A Critical Edition of Anthony Munday's Fedele and Fortunio*, ed. Richard Hosley (New York: Garland, 1981).
47. *The Dramatic Works*, iv.
48. *The Shakespeare Company*, 1594-1642 (Cambridge: CUP, 2004), 11.
49. *Dodsley's*, xi.
50. *The Plays of John Marston*, ed. Harvey Wood, 3 vols. (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1939), iii.
51. *The Works of Sir William Davenant* (London, 1673. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1968).
52. *The Insatiate Countess*, ed. Giorgio Melchiori (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1984).
53. *Three Turk Plays from Early Modern England*, ed. Daniel J. Vitkus (New York: Columbia UP, 2000).

54. This text was not accessible to me, either. For the information I referred to the database I mentioned.

55. See C. Walter Hodges, *Enter the Whole Army* (Cambridge: CUP, 1999), 37, where he describes the bedchamber has been 'transposed'. My own conclusion does not differ so much from his.

56. See Mariko Ichikawa, *Shakespearean Entrances* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 42-43. She quotes Richard Hosley and thinks that stage business such as calling names might have filled the gap (Hosley, 'Shakespeare's Use of a Gallery over the Stage', Shakespeare Survey, 10 (1957), 77-89).

57. *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*, ed. Derek Roper (London: Methuen, 1975).

58. See Ichikawa, 42.

Shakespeare's Comets

David Nuranen

Most authorities agree that contemporary events frequently inspired passages in Shakespeare's plays. Scholars call such passages "topical allusions." These allusions cover a wide variety of subjects: from the success of rival acting companies in *Hamlet*, "These are now the fashion...." (2.2.341-342) to Essex's 1599 military venture to Ireland in *Henry V*, "bringing rebellion broached on his sword" (5.Chor.32).[1] Do the plays allude to astronomical events of Shakespeare's day? Some believe so. For example in *King Lear* (1605) Gloucester says, "These late eclipses in the sun and moon portend no good to us" (1.2.103-104). G.B. Harrison writes: "Gloucester's observations on 'these late eclipses in the sun and moon' probably refer to notable eclipses that occurred on September 27 and October 2, 1605."[2] Similarly, Shakespeare may have alluded to the four comets that appeared during his career. They arrived in 1590, 1593, 1596, and what today we call Halley's Comet in 1607. (Edmond Halley saw it on its next return in 1682.) Each time one of these comets was visible, Shakespeare alluded to comets in a play he was writing: *I Henry VI*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, *I Henry IV*, and *Pericles*. The proposed dates for these plays in *The Riverside Shakespeare*, for example, and the dating of these apparitions in Vsehsvyatskii's *Physical Characteristics of Comets* exactly match. This suggests a connection between these comets and allusions. The connection is that Shakespeare saw these comets, and they aroused his interest. Then, with comets on his mind, he spontaneously alluded to one in the play he was writing. These comets inspired these allusions.

Why does this interest us? Why do we care if these comets inspired these allusions? There are three reasons. First, we are dealing here with some of the most popular and most performed of Shakespeare's plays. As Paracelsus said, "The more knowledge is inherent in a thing the greater the love...." When we hear Petruchio say in *The Taming of the Shrew*, "Gentiles methinks you frown, and wherefore gaze this goodly company, as if they saw some wondrous monument, some comet or unusual prodigy?"

(3.2.93-96), it adds to our delight in the play knowing, when Shakespeare wrote that, a comet was being gazed on. Again in *I Henry IV* the king says, "By being seldom seen I could not stir but like a comet I was wondered at..." (3.2.46-47). When Shakespeare was writing these words, a comet was wondered at. This adds interest to the play.

Also consider that the last of the four comets was Halley's. Halley's Comet is a touchstone of our experience on Earth. It comes around every seventy-six years or so, roughly the life span of modern people. So there is a good possibility most of us will experience Halley's. And this is an experience we share with past and future generations. For example the famed Bayeux Tapestry portrays Halley's Comet foreboding misfortune to Harold the Second in the Battle of Hastings in 1066. Also Giotto of the Renaissance painted a scene of the Nativity called *The Adoration of the Magi* with a comet as the Star of Bethlehem. Since Halley's appeared in 1301, near the time he was painting that, it has been suggested that this comet was his inspiration. In fact Halley's did appear near the birth of Christ—11 B.C. Some, therefore, have looked into the idea that it actually was the Star of Bethlehem. Reliable observations of Halley's have been found at least as far back as 240 B.C. Halley's Comet is indeed an experience mankind has shared throughout its history. If we accept that Shakespeare himself alluded to Halley's Comet, that will add a new wonder to it for future generations. It will next appear in 2061.

Finally there is a third, important, practical reason for studying these comets. Shakespeare did not leave us a chronology of his plays. We do not know the exact dates he wrote them. We do know the exact dates the comets arrived. If we accept that these comets inspired these allusions, then these plays could not have been written before the dates the comets appeared. This study provides important data for dating these plays.

Shakespeare's works, however, also mention comets at least two times when records do not report any. *Julius Caesar* has, "When beggars die there are no comets seen; / The heavens themselves blaze forth the death of princes" (2.2.30-31). But here, in writing about the death of Caesar, Shakespeare is referring to a specific historical comet associated with Caesar's death. In June of 44 B.C., three months after his assassination, a comet appeared. To the Romans it was a sign of Caesar's ascension into heaven. Also *The Two Noble Kinsmen* contains the phrase, "Comets prewarn" (5.1.51). John Fletcher, a writer in Shakespeare's theatrical company, wrote parts of this play. Although some believe Shakespeare wrote

Act 5 and possibly this phrase, the word "prewarn" argues against that interpretation, for it is not a common Shakespearian word. Indeed, it is found nowhere else in all his writings. However that may be, with these few exceptions, every time Shakespeare's works allude to comets one graced the skies around the world.

Let us now look at the specifics of this idea. To see if these comets inspired these allusions we will ask three questions, the same three questions, of all four comets. The first is was Shakespeare working on these plays when the comets appeared? What evidence do we have for that? The second question is did Shakespeare see these comets? The third question concerns the allusions themselves. Do they have any qualities that suggest these comets inspired them?

The Comet of 1590

"During the 18th year of Wan-Li reign-period," a Chinese record for 1590 says, "a comet was seen in the SE. After more than 10 days it disappeared."[3] This comet may have inspired allusions in *I Henry VI.* Our first question asks what evidence do we have that Shakespeare was working on *I Henry VI* in 1590? Dating a play such as this is a two step process. One begins by attempting to find the earliest possible date the play could have been written. Internal evidence of the play is now studied for clues to, among other things, the sources Shakespeare may have used. One of the sources for *I Henry VI* was the second edition of Holinshed's Chronicles. The second edition was published in 1587. So this play was written after 1587. Next let us try to determine the latest possible date. Now external evidence is studied such as contemporary documents that refer to the completed work. Philip Henslow was the manager of the Rose Theater. He kept a diary. He recorded on March 3, 1592 that the Lord Strange's Men, Shakespeare's company in the early 1590's, presented a new play called "*Harey the Sixth.*" So *I Henry VI* was probably written sometime between 1587 and 1592—a span of five years. You see now how imprecise dating these plays can be. If this comet did inspire these allusions, we can narrow the dates between March 5, 1590 and March 3, 1592—a span of two years. Modern opinion narrows it even more. G.B. Evans, the editor of the *Riverside Shakespeare*, writes, "it is tempting to believe, with A. S. Cairncross, that *I Henry VI*...preceded Parts 2 and 3 in point of composition, that all three plays were written about 1590...."[4]

Now let us ask our second question. How likely is it that the authors of *I Henry VI* (it is almost certainly a collaborative work)

saw this comet? Consider how different viewing the night sky must have been before the Industrial Age with little air pollution or city lights to drown out the stars. The skies must have been close to pristine. Tycho Brahe, the great Danish astronomer, was observing the comet form his observatory on the island of Haveen between Denmark and Sweden. On March 5, he recorded that it was as bright as a first magnitude star. The next night Tycho watched as the tail grew 10 degrees long. Like the Chinese, he continued to observe it for eleven nights, up to March 16.[5] Is it unreasonable to believe that the authors of *I Henry VI* could also see this comet?

Finally our third question asks do these allusions have any qualities that suggest this comet inspired them? Consider this. In the first act, in the first scene, in the very first lines of the play the authors wrote: "Comets, importing change of times and states, / Brandish your crystal tresses in the sky, / And with them scourge the bad revolting stars / That have consented onto Henry's death…" (1.1.2-5). Something at this time was arousing their interest in comets, for in the third act they alluded to one again: "Now shine it like a comet of revenge, / A prophet to the fall of all our foes!" (3.2.31-32).

The Comet of 1593

A Korean record for 1593 states, "On a *jen-hsu* day in the seventh month of the 26th year of Sonjo [6th August] a (*hui*) comet appeared outside the *Tzu-Wei* (Enclosure). When it reached *Chhuan-Sho* it began to appear smaller. It went out of sight on a *ping-wu* day in the eighth month [19th September]."[6] The least bright of the four apparitions, third magnitude, it nevertheless was observed in Europe the longest, over a month—July 30 to September 3. This comet may have inspired the allusion in *The Taming of the Shrew.*

Now let us ask our three questions of this comet. First, was Shakespeare working on *The Taming of the Shrew* in 1593? Why do authorities propose this date? Although *The Taming of the Shrew* is a difficult play to date, a reasonable estimate is possible. On May 2, 1594 a play called *The Taming of* (*a*) *Shrew* was recorded in the Stationers' Register. (The Stationers' Company was a printers and booksellers guild.) *A Shrew* is either a play Shakespeare used as a source to write *The Shrew*, or *A Shrew* is a poorly printed version of Shakespeare's play (*The Shrew*). G.B. Evans believes: "If the second view is accepted, a view that has steadily gained support in recent years, Shakespeare's play (*The Shrew*) would have to be dated not

later than 1593."[7] Elsewhere Evans states: "*The Taming of the Shrew* must have been written between 1590 and 1594."[8] This is a span of four years. If we accept that this comet inspired this allusion, we narrow the date between July 30, 1593 and May 2, 1594—a span of less than a year. Of all the plays we are looking at, this comet data helps us most with dating *The Taming of the Shrew*.

Our second question asks did Shakespeare see this comet? Because of the curvature of the Earth, comet apparitions are more clearly seen in different parts of the world. Much depends on the latitude of one's location. Ripensis, an assistant of Tycho Brahe, first saw this comet on August 1. On August 4 it had a tail 4.5 degrees long. On August 23 he recorded that it matched a Cephei, a pulsating star, in "light, size and color." He continued to observe it up to September 3.[9] Repensis made his observations from Zerbest in Germany. The latitude of Zerbest is 51.59 degrees north, only 33 miles north of the latitude of London, 51.30 degrees north. In London Shakespeare was writing at this time in *The Taming of the Shrew*: "Gentles, methinks you frown, / And wherefore gaze this goodly company, / As if they saw some wondrous monument, / Some comet or unusual prodigy?" (3.2.93-96).

The Comet of 1596

Japanese documents for 1596 record, "Between the fifth and the seventh month of the first year of the Keicho reign-period [May-August, 1596] a (hui) comet appeared at 10.00 to 21.00 hr at the NW. Some said that this happened during the last ten days of the sixth month. On the seventh day of the seventh month (the comet) was still visible."[10] This comet may have inspired an allusion in *I Henry IV*. Astronomers made detailed observations throughout the Far East: Japan, Korea, China. Also European astronomers, Moestlin, Rothmann, Snellius, carefully recorded the comet. Tycho Brahe first saw it on July 24 while in Copenhagen. That night he wrote that its head matched a star of second magnitude, and it had a tail seven degrees long. He quickly returned to Haveen and observed the comet there until August 6.[11]

Again the first of our three questions asks what evidence do we have that Shakespeare was working on *I Henry IV* when this comet was visible? One of the play's probable sources is *Civil Wars* by Daniel. *Civil Wars* was published in 1595. Consequently, *I Henry IV* probably was not written before 1595. The completed work was entered in the Stationers' Register on February 25, 1598. So what does this tell us? This play probably was written between

1595 and February of 1598—a span of three years. If this comet inspired this allusion then *I Henry IV* was written between July 24, 1596 and February 25, 1598—a span of nineteen months.

Question two asks did Shakespeare see this comet? Remember this was before the invention of the telescope. Galileo made his first telescope in the summer of 1609 two years after the last of these comets appeared. So unlike much of today's astronomy, these comets were not remote astronomical events seen only with the aid of telescopes and spacecraft. All the astronomers we have been quoting made their observations with the naked eye. If they could see these comets with the naked eye, is it not reasonable to believe that Shakespeare could?

Now let us ask our third question. Does this allusion have any qualities that suggest this comet inspired it? Consider when this allusion was written. Again Shakespeare writes about comets when one appeared. If this comet did not inspire this allusion, the only other explanation for their occurring at the same time is that it was a coincidence. When the infrequency of comet apparitions is considered, can one accept this as being a coincidence? At the time this comet was moving across the skies of Europe Shakespeare was writing in *I Henry IV*, "By being seldom seen, I could not stir/ But like a comet I was wond' red at..." (3.2.46-47).

Halley's Comet of 1607

A Chinese record for 1607 states, "On a *Hsin-yu* day in the eighth month of the 35th year, a (*hui*) comet appeared at the *Tung-Ching* (22nd lunar mansion) with its tail pointing SW. It was of a pale colour, measuring about 2 feet and moving slowly towards the SW. On a *ting-ch'ou* day (7th October), it passed the *Fang* (fourth lunar mansion)."[12] This was Halley's Comet, the most spectacular of Shakespeare's career. It may have inspired an allusion in *Pericles*.

First, however, *Pericles* also presents the problem of dual authorship. If, as is widely believed, others worked on this play, did Shakespeare write the act containing the comet allusion? Some have studied the different styles of the play to find Shakespeare's contribution. Harrison writes, "There is little trace of his hand in any passage before Act III. With the third act the style changes and much of the remainder of the play may well be Shakespeare's writing...."[13] The comet allusion is in Act 5.

Again let us ask our three questions. Was Shakespeare working on *Pericles* when this comet appeared? Fortunately, *Pericles* is one of the easier plays to date. Shakespeare got part of the plot from Lawrence Twine's *The Pattern of Painful Adventures*.... First published

in 1576, Twine's work was reprinted in 1607. If Shakespeare used this reprint, then *Pericles* was not written before 1607. Also it was entered in the Stationers' Register on May 20, 1608. This play, therefore, was probably written in 1607-1608.

On October 4, 1607 Johannes Kepler wrote to a friend, "Your letter is prophetic. You write how one has to measure the parallax of a comet. And behold, there appears a comet. I saw it for the first time on the 26th of September (others on the 25th of September)."[14] Our second question asks did not only astronomers such as Kepler see this comet, but more important, did Shakespeare see it? He probably did for several reasons.

To begin, unlike 1986, this apparition of Halley's was spectacular, as in 1910. Indeed people, not just astronomers, saw it as far off as North America. In 1607 a small group of settlers was building Fort St. George at the mouth of the Kennebec River in Maine. On the morning of September 25 they sighted "a blasing starre in the noreast of them."[15] Astronomers, of course, also recorded the impressive qualities of this comet. Longomontanus first saw it on September 28. He wrote that it "equaled Jupiter in size and Saturn in brightness." Kepler recorded on October 5 that its tail was 10 degrees long. He continued to observe it for a full month. On October 26 he reported that it matched a star in Ophiuchus' spear.[16]

Another reason Shakespeare may have seen this comet is that recorded sightings of it were made in Great Britain, some quite near him. At least two British astronomers left records. William Lower saw the comet when he was on a ship in Carmarthen Bay west of Britain. In 1607 Great Britain still used the Julian Calendar. It listed dates ten days earlier than continental Europe's Gregorian Calendar. Lower, therefore, recorded for September 17, "Passing over the sea into Wales about midnighte going abord I saw a Comete."[17] (Although Kepler reported seeing it on September 26, and Lower on September 17, in reality they saw it one night apart.) When he landed, Lower recorded the comet until October 6. He sent his observations to the second British astronomer, "his especiall good friend Mr. Thomas Harriotte att Sion neere London." Harriot lived at Sion House, the mansion of the Earl of Northumberland. Sion is just outside London on the banks of the Thames, between Isleworth and Brentford. Harriot recorded observations there for over a month. As late as October 22, only ten miles west of the Globe Theater, he wrote, "It a was reasonable clear enough to have sene the comet, but for the light of the mone, and for the hauzines of the horizontal ayre."[18] Only a few miles

away, Shakespeare was writing at this time in *Pericles*: "I am a maid,/ My lord, that ne'er before invited eyes, / But have been gaz'd on like a comet" (5.1.84-86).

Finally our last question asks does this allusion have any qualities that suggest Halley's Comet inspired it? Close examination shows that it does. For example here Shakespeare repeats for the third time, when a comet appeared, the same thought or analogy about comets. The thought is that someone is wondered at the way a comet is wondered at. In 1593 Shakespeare wrote, "you...gaze this goodly company, as if they saw...some comet...." Three years passed, and in 1596 this thought occurred to him again, "like a comet I was wondered at...." Eleven years passed, and here again he repeats this unusual analogy, "I...have been gaz'd on like a comet."

Another quality the allusion in *Pericles* has suggesting a connection with Halley's Comet is that this is now the fourth time Shakespeare alluded to comets when one appeared. It is difficult to accept that could happen even one time by coincidence. How much more difficult is it to accept that that could have happened four times in a row by coincidence?

These comets, in fact, did inspire these allusions. Consider how in 1590 when Tycho Brahe was recording a comet as bright as a first magnitude star, the authors of *I Henry VI* were writing, "shine...like a comet...." And when examined closely, one sees that the last three allusions even describe the act of viewing a comet. In 1593, Shakespeare wrote, "they saw...some comet...." And a comet was seen for all of August and longer that summer. In 1596 Shakespeare wrote, "a comet...wondered at." And again, a comet with a tail seven degrees long was wondered at that year by astronomers throughout Europe. Then, in 1607 Shakespeare wrote, "gazed on...a comet." And from America, to China, to Sion House ten miles from the Globe Theater, the renowned Halley's Comet was being gazed on. These comet passages, like the passages to eclipses King Lear, are topical allusions. Little in Shakespeare's world seemed to escape his curiosity.

SHAKESPEARE'S COMETS

During William Shakespeare's career four comets appeared. Each time one was visible, Shakespeare alluded to comets in a play it is believed he was then working on. The dates the comets were visible and the proposed date for each play match.

PLAYS*			COMETS*		
TITLE	COMET ALLUSIONS	PROPOSED DATE	DATES VISIBLE	MAXIMUM LENGTH	MAXIMUM BRIGHTNESS
I HENRY VI	"Comets, importing change of times and states, Brandish your crystal tresses in the sky, And with them scourge the bad revolting stars That have consented unto Henry's death..." (I.i.2-5) "Now shine it like a comet of revenge, A prophet to the fall of all our foes!" (III.ii.131-32).	(Revised 1594-95) 1589-90	March 5 to March 16 1590	10 degrees	1 magnitude
THE TAMING OF THE SHREW	"Gentles, methinks you frown, And wherefore gaze this goodly company, As if they saw some wondrous monument, Some comet or unusual prodigy?" (III.ii.93-96).	1593-94	July 30 to September 3 1593	4.5 degrees	3 magnitude
I HENRY IV	"By being seldom seen, I could not stir But like a comet I was wond'red at..." (III.ii.46-47).	1596-97	July 24 to August 6 1596	7 degrees	2 magnitude
PERICLES	"I am a maid, My lord, that ne'er before invited eyes, But have been gaz'd on like a comet" (V.i.84-86).	1607-8	(Halley' s) September 26 to October 27 1607	10 degrees	(It was brighter than a first magnitude star.) 0 magnitude

* All data on the plays is from The Riverside Shakespeare, pages 48-55. G. Blakemore Evans editor

* All data on the comets is from Physical Characteristics of Comets, pages 112-113. S.K. Vsehsvyatskii editor

Notes

1. *The Riverside Shakespeare*, ed. G. Blakemore Evans (Boston: Houghton, 1974). All quotations from the plays will be from this edition, 930.

2. *Shakespeare the Complete Works*, ed. G. B. Harrison (New York: Harcourt, 1968), 1136.

3. Ichiro Hasegawa, "Catalogue of Ancient and Naked-Eye Comets,6 *Vistas in Astronomy*, 24 (1980), 95.

4. Evans, 588.

5. S. K. Vsekhsvyatskii, *Physical Characteristics of Comets* (Jerusalem: Israel Program for Scientific Translations, 1964), 112.

6. Ho Peng Yoke, "Ancient and Mediaeval Observations of Comets and Novae in Chinese Sources," *Vistas in Astronomy*, 5 (1962), 213.

7. Evans, 49.

8. Evans, 106.

9. Vsekhsvyatskii, 112.

10. Ho, 214.

11. Vsekhsvyatskii, 112.

12. Ho Peng-Yoke and Ang Tian-se, "Chinese Astronomical Records on Comets and 'Guest Stars'" *Oriens Extremus* 17 (December 1970): 79.

13. Harrison, 1349.

14. Carola Baumgardt, *Johannes Kepler: Life and Letters* (New: Philosophical Library, 1951), 75.

15. Peter Broughton, "The View from Colonial America," *Sky & Telescope* August 1985: 126.

16. Vsekhsvyatskii, 112.

17. James Bradley, *Miscellaneous Works and Correspondence of James Bradley*, ed. Stephen Peter Rigaud, The Sources of Science No. 97 (New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1972), 513.

18. Bradley, 518.

International Shakespeare and *The Winter's Tale*

Ace G. Pilkington
Dixie State College
and Olga A. Pilkington

The purpose of this article is to put Shakespeare in context, not just as an English writer but as an international one. His international impact begins during his lifetime, partly as a result of English actors on the continent and partly as a result of Shakespeare's own choice of subject matter. He drew on stories and histories from many countries beyond his own, and he was influenced by what was happening outside of England. One indication of Shakespeare's importance as an international writer is the ongoing struggle for the "ownership" of the Bard. As a cultural icon, he has been attacked, defended, almost worshipped, and very nearly confiscated.

Shakespeare is practically everywhere, and surprisingly, has always been practically everywhere. For instance, there is a replica of Shakespeare's original Globe Theatre in London. That's to be expected. But there are also replicas (among other places) in Cedar City, Utah, in Rome, in Prague, and in Gdansk. There are approximately 120 Shakespeare festivals in America, but the website shakespeare.about.com under the category Shakespeare: Festivals and Theatre Companies: Europe offers a chance to "search a database for over 1300 festivals from Andorra to the [sic] Ukraine."[1]

One indication of Shakespeare's importance to people outside of England is the argument about whether Shakespeare himself was English or not. Many people agree that he's not, and then they disagree as to what country he really came from and which country understands him best. *Star Trek* parodies the issue in *Star Trek VI* when the Klingon leader says, "You have not experienced Shakespeare until you've read him in the original Klingon."[2] Sicilian Professor Martino Iuvara (basing his conclusion on the work of two professors at the University of Palermo between 1925-1950) claims that Shakespeare was an Italian named Michelangelo Florio

Crollalanza. Crollalanza (which means Shakespeare in Italian) changed his name and his country of residence.[3] Ivan Turgenev, speaking on the 300th anniversary of Shakespeare's birth, said, "Для нас Шекспир не одно только громкое, яркое имя...он вошел в нашу плоть и кровь...каждому знакомы и дороги созданные им образы...образ Гамлета не ближе, не понятнее нам, чем французам, скажем более - англичанам?" ("Shakespeare for us is not just a big, bright name...he is part of our flesh and blood... Everybody knows and loves his characters... And don't we Russians better understand Hamlet than let's say, the French—or the English.")[4]

Hungarian theatre director Arthur Bardos directed *Hamlet* in England in 1949. When he was asked by the BBC what it was like to do so, he replied, "Of course, it's a great honor and challenge, but to tell you the truth, it's strange to hear the text in English because I am used to the original version translated by Janos Arany."[5] The Germans call Shakespeare "*unser* Shakespeare" our Shakespeare. It's sometimes hard to remember that *der Schwan vom* Avon is not really Wilhelm Shakespeare. After all, many Germans believe that the classical German translation of Shakespeare by Tieck and Schlegel is better than the English original. At the same time that Turgenev was claiming Shakespeare for the Russians, the Germans for the 300th *Geburtstag vom Barden* were founding the first Shakespeare society, *die Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*. Their annual journal is *Das Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*. As an indication of its openmindedness it is published in both German and English.[6]

The English, of course, keep trying to claim Shakespeare for themselves, as a national and not an international poet. The essential position that underlies many English responses to the Bard is something like this: Shakespeare is universal and immortal, but to have those qualities in full measure, he must be English. One of the clearest and earliest assertions of this position came in 1769, when the successful London actor David Garrick staged a Shakespearean Jubilee in Stratford and then put on a play about it in London. Shakespeare was proclaimed to be better than writers from any other country, and the play showed that certain categories of spectators such as Frenchified aristocrats, Stratford peasants, and Irishmen (Captain O'Shoulder) were simply unable to comprehend Shakespeare's English brilliance. This is, as some English newspapers at the time pointed out, more about commerce and power than about Shakespeare.[7] Nevertheless, by 1814 in *Mansfield Park*, Jane Austen wrote, "Shakespeare one gets acquainted with without knowing how. It is part of an Englishman's

constitution."[8] Writing in his diary on October 29th 1815, Napoleon Bonaparte would have agreed, though his evaluation of the English and their poet was considerably more negative. He said, "People take England on trust, and repeat that Shakespeare is the greatest of all authors. I have read him: there is nothing that compares with Racine or Corneille: his plays are unreadable, pitiful."[9]

However, for good or ill, it was by then and had been for over a hundred years too late to confine Shakespeare to that one sceptered isle. Shakespeare was always international in his plots, in his characters, and in the places where his plays were played. In his *Guide to Shakespeare*, Isaac Asimov divides the plays according to the countries where they take place. By his account there are 15 English plays (and one of those is British/Roman, one is Scottish, and one is Danish), 12 Italian plays (though *Measure* is in Vienna, *Twelfth Night* is in Illyria, and *Tempest* is partly in Bermuda), 7 Greek plays (counting *Midsummer* and *Winter's Tale* as Greek), and 4 Roman plays.[10]

In 1585, English actors went with the Earl of Leicester's army when it landed in the Protestant Netherlands. One of those actors was Will Kemp, for years the main comic actor in Shakespeare's company. "The first unquestionable records of British instrumentalists and actors performing outside Britain"[11] are in Elsinore (now Helsingor) also in 1585. They returned in the following year, and three of the principal actors listed in the First Folio were part of the company.[12] Shakespeare had good information about Europe from literary and many other sources, and he used it brilliantly.

One of the best examples is *The Winter's Tale*, even though the Russian connections to and background for the play are seldom mentioned by scholars.[13] Perhaps one reason is that literary critics use literary sources more often than historical ones. Perhaps another reason is the partial quarantine of Russian materials that began with the Soviet takeover following World War I and intensified after World War II with the Cold War. Whatever the reason or reasons may be, the connections are too clear to be ignored.

Shakespeare's romance *The Winter's Tale* tells the story of two countries—Sicilia—the country of spring, rightfully possessing a sea coast—and Bohemia—a country of winter, granted one by Shakespeare for the purposes of his plot. Leontes, the jealous and tyrannous king of Sicilia, causes the deaths of his son, Mamillius, and his wife, Hermione, and orders that his baby daughter, Peridita, be abandoned in the wilderness. Leontes has brought winter into

his wonderful spring kingdom. Happiness will not return to Sicilia until "that which is lost" is "found." So proclaims the "oracle."

Though *The Winter's Tale* might seem pure fancy, it mirrors the events of its time. Moreover, "as Shakespeare composed his romance for staging in 1611, winter and Muscovy were in fashion."[14] The use of winter in the title and the fact that Leontes' Queen Hermione can lawfully claim "The Emperor of Russia was my father"[15] allows us to see parallels with the history of this so-called Country of Winter and to argue that Hermione's heritage is not merely an exotic detail, but an integral element of the play. As Daryl Palmer says, "Shakespeare…goes out of his way to inflect his drama with a Russian accent."[16] When Hermione says of her father, "Oh that he were alive, and here beholding / His daughter's triall"[17], she can mean no one but Ivan IV, Ivan the Terrible (*Groznii*). He was the first of Russia's rulers "to visualize himself as ... Tsar"[18] or emperor, and he was certainly well known to Shakespeare and his contemporaries.

In 1553, the English government backed an expedition by the Muscovy Company of Merchant Adventurers that went in search of a northeast passage. The survivors spent the winter in what was to become Archangel, "and in the spring pushed overland to the court of Ivan the Terrrible."[19] The resulting connection between England and Ivan's court, which was to last until his death, was of vital importance. As Norman Jones says, "Need for new markets and sources of foreign exchange drove English merchants into the world in a way undreamt of by their fathers."[20] The English not only established what were sometimes exclusive trading rights with Russia, they also traveled overland in Ivan's large and expanding country and set up trading stations, opening yet other markets. Anthony Jenkinson, searching for trade routes for the Muscovy Company and reporting also to Ivan himself, drew the "First coherent map of Russia"[21] in 1562. "For his part, Ivan was already imagining new labors for the Englishman. What mattered to the Russian ruler was Jenkinson's extraordinary gift for dealing face-to-face with strangers, his cultivation of familiarity."[22] Arthur Edwards reached the court of the Shah of Persia in 1569.[23]

In addition to the glory of the adventures and the value of the trade goods, there was also a more personal connection between Ivan the Terrible's Russia and Shakespeare's England. Ivan asked for Queen Elizabeth's hand in marriage and "he required that Elizabeth sign a secret agreement to claim sanctuary in his court, as well as he in hers."[24] Elizabeth offered Ivan sanctuary whenever he felt the need of it, but she refused the other two requests as

tactfully as possible. Though he was angered by the refusal, Ivan clung to the notion of escaping to England and to the idea of marrying Elizabeth, or failing that, one of her kinswomen, for the rest of his life. (A fascinating state of affairs that is almost never mentioned in biographies of Elizabeth I.) In a 1584 meeting with Jeremy Bowes, the English ambassador, Ivan declared "that he was so determined to marry one of Queen Elizabeth's kinswomen that he had come to the conclusion that he must himself go to England and claim his bride."[25] "England ... shone like a vision of paradise for him,"[26] but unfortunately, Ivan died a few weeks after that conversation. Boris Godunov, Ivan's eventual successor as Tsar, also had plans for English marriages but for his children, not himself.[27] Ivan the Terrible's affection for England had been such that upon his death, the Russian "chancellor appeared in the apartments of Jeremy Bowes ... to say with malice, 'The English Emperor is Dead'."[28]

Many English merchants and diplomats of the time saw the Empire of Ivan *Groznii* as "an imperfect analog to England."[29] And many of Ivan's character traits and experiences are echoed in *The Winter's Tale*. To an audience (such as the one at James's court in 1613) with proper background information, the play unveils additional meanings and shows Shakespeare's alternative scenario for the flow of history.

Jacobean England (and James himself) had a special interest in Russia, Ivan the Terrible, and rulers who might succeed him. Following the deaths of Ivan *Groznii* and Boris Godunov, Russia experienced a great crisis, later given the name of "Time of Troubles." After 1605, it became "a shaken nation which proved unable to unite behind a successor for fifteen years."[30] And for some time King James I was considering the possibility to become "the politique father" for Russia. In 1612, "John Merrick, chief agent for the Muscovy Company ... was proposing that the king [James I] make Russia a protectorate."[31] In fact, in 1613 "Merrick left . . . with two sets of instructions, one detailing the protectorate . . . the other recognizing whatever ruler happened to be in place when they arrived."[32] Only Mikhail Romanov's installation as Tsar prevented James from attempting the grandiose project.

So it is plausible to suppose that the audience of the time welcomed the references to the country of Ivan *Groznii*. To make these references more plentiful and meaningful, Shakespeare had to shift some of the characters' connections in his original source—Greene's *Pandosto*. "In Greene's story, that is, the Russian connection is to the Polixenes character and matters incidentally."[33] Following

the fashion of the time, Shakespeare increased the Russian elements in his play. It is not only Hermione's reference to her father that sends the minds of the audience to Russia to take a close look, it is the whole kingdom of Sicilia that resembles the Empire of snow. And King Leontes himself is no one but Ivan *Groznii*. Thus, in *The Winter's Tale* we see a clear parallel of Sicilian kingdom and Russian empire. One of Shakespeare's contemporaries George Turberville describes the Russia of the time as "savage soyle, where lawes doe beare no sway / But all is at the King his will, / to save or els to slay."[34] Doesn't this description apply to the kingdom of Leontes? What laws, what regulations does he follow in carrying out the tyrannous punishment of his wife? Does the oracle possess any authority for Leontes? Nothing has the power to control or stop this "jealous tyrant." Like Ivan *Groznii*, he easily accuses and discards a wife, distrusts his subjects, and causes the death of his own son. I. Garin suggests about Ivan *Groznii*, that "любимейшей забавой молодого царя было жениться" ("getting married was the Tsar's favorite amusement").[35] And in *The Winter's Tale* why would Paulina be so nervous about Leontes' second marriage if the possibility were not real? Doesn't Leontes wish Perdita for himself, not knowing she's his own daughter? "I'd beg your precious mistress" as a "trifle,"[36] he says to Florizel when the Bohemian prince asks Leontes to "step forth mine advocate; at your request / My father will grant precious things as trifles."[37]

It seems as though Shakespeare is deliberately trying to make Leontes as much like Ivan *Groznii* as possible. For example, "Ivan's temper ... always grew more violent in winter."[38] "Ivan lost two of his daughters by Anastasia in infancy."[39] And Anastasia herself, who was Ivan's first and most beloved wife, was described by the English ambassador Jerome Horsey in words that make her sound very much like Hermione, "This empress became wise and of such holiness, virtue, and government, as she was honored, beloved, and feared of all her subjects."[40] "Her death threw Ivan into paroxysms of grief."[41] Ivan's recreations, as reported by Giles Fletcher in *Of the Russe Commonwealth*, included watching men fight bears.[42] Often, the man's fate was the same as that of Antigonus. One of Ivan's courtiers did what Camillo would not. His name was Bomelius, he had a degree in medicine from Cambridge University, and he "was a superb poisoner"[43] who varied the time it would take the poison to act according to the Tsar's instructions.

It is interesting to look at Hermione's position in the play. On the one hand, she is the daughter of "the Emperor of Russia" and, on the other hand, she is married to him. Right before the

oracle is read, Hermione says, referring to the Russian Emperor, "Oh that he were alive, and here beholding / His daughter's trial! That he did but see / The flatness of my misery; yet with eyes / Of pity, not revenge![44]

In this speech the Sicilian queen suggests that even Ivan the Terrible would have pitied her. But does she realize that Leontes is the incarnation of the Russian Emperor? Probably not, and only the audience having the appropriate historical background information can predict the outcome of the trial. Shakespeare puts Hermione in a double position relating her twice to the same person. This allows him to show two perspectives on the then-popular Russian ruler. For some his terrible temperament and aggression brought horror and distraction; for others, the Tsar's favorites at the moment, the name meant protection. And Hermione mentions her father at the moment when her life is under a mortal threat.

It is worth noting that the queen's words are not commented on by Leontes. Just after Hermione's lines end, there is a shift in the action, and the oracle is brought by Cleomenes and Dion, who "have Been both at Delphos." Shakespeare sets it up so Leontes doesn't have to answer Hermione's warnings and accusations. Of course, it would have been pretty hard for him to do so, since he is himself Ivan *Groznii* to an extent.

Looking at *The Winter's Tale* from the perspective of historical events at that time, its Russian references become clearer and easier to recognize. Also, the play reveals many more parallels and linkages with Russia than it might at first seem. If Sicilia is the country of spring which now has to go through the "winter In storm perpetual" it is because its ruler is a tyrant. Such a set up in the play clearly parallels Russia at that time.

But Shakespeare's goal in writing *The Winter's Tale* was not to present the history of another country in iambic pentameter. He set out to create a world of romance, where there is always a place for a second chance, and forgiveness is granted on request, without any hesitation. Making Leontes resemble Ivan *Groznii* and providing the happy ending for the play, Shakespeare suggests that another historical scenario was possible for Russia.

Shakespeare shows the troubled kingdom of Leontes, and thus of Ivan *Groznii*, and that such troubles can be cured by the power of youth. Unfortunately for the real Ivan, who murdered his son, such a cure was no longer available. But Shakespeare shows his belief in the triumph of youth and forgiveness. In *The Winter's Tale* he pictures a battle between the Old and the Young, between

winter and spring. And this is why the bear, which "carries symbolic and cultural associations; ideas of winter and tyranny"[45] eats Antigonus (representative of the Old) and leaves Perdita (hope of the Young). The play suggests that spring always comes after winter. The change of seasons is inevitable; hope and happiness replace the misery of distrust and accusation. Spring comes back to Sicilia, and "A sad tale" which is "best for winter" is no longer told in the kingdom of Leontes. It is likely that there was at least some connection to the question which was soon to be put to James I and must already have been swirling in the gossip of London: Should the King of England become the protector of Russia?

Meanwhile, the interaction between the actors on the continent and Shakespeare was indeed an interaction, a two-way border with the actors scattering over Europe, and Shakespeare sometimes responding. For instance, the famous Pickle Herring character is a clear influence on Autolycus, and there is even a reference to him as early as *Twelfth Night* with Sir Toby Belch's double entendre when he first sees Feste, "A plague o' these pickleherring!"[46]

From Denmark and the Netherlands, the English actors spread out through Europe, visiting courts and market towns, including Frankfurt, Paris, Strasbourg, Gdansk, Warsaw, Prague, Konigsburg (now the Russian city of Kaliningrad), Dresden, and Ghent. The companies did their best to avoid the Thirty Years' War, the English Revolution, the collapse of Elizabeth (James I's daughter) and Frederick's (the Elector Palatine) attempt to establish themselves in the kingdom of Bohemia (1619-20 was the brief good time there), and other unpleasantnesses. Poland (which mostly remained neutral) was very attractive.[47] In Ghent in 1624, there is a record of John Green's company doing 42 plays, including *The Tragedy of Romeo and Juliet*, *The Tragedy of Julius Caesar*, *The Tragedy of Hamlet*, and *The Tragedy of Lear, King of England* .[48] Shakespearean adaptations had been performed earlier, but the publication of the First Folio made everything so much easier! Green was probably the originator of Pickleherring, the clever fool who became and remained so popular throughout Europe that he was even added to tragedies. Perhaps the best example of this is a German version of *Romeo and Juliet* first performed as early as 1604 and revived following the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. In it, Pickleherring suggests that Juliet could have 10 husbands (with him being one) and not just Romeo and Paris. He refers to the corpse of Tybalt as "a parcel of snot . . . bleeding like a pig," and he is not much kinder to the dead Juliet, whom he describes as "stretched out like a log, as stiff as a frozen stockfish."[49] With the German companies

(who sometimes described themselves as English Comedians), Pickleherring went on to Russia, where he became Prince Pickleherring, possibly because the Russians could not imagine so foolish a character without a title.

The Russian experience with Shakespeare is in some ways typical and in others unique. Ultimately, as the Easternmost European nation and the largest country on Earth, it is an extraordinary example of Shakespeare's international impact. Russia's first direct acquaintance with Shakespeare took place in the middle of the 18th century. The first play presented to the Russian audience was an adaptation of *Hamlet* by the Russian playwright Sumarokov in 1750. Though the play was a clear adaptation of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, the Bard's name did not appear on the title page. Later, this mistake was taken care of by Catherine the Great, who translated and adapted *The Merry Wives* in 1786 and for the first time in Russia put Shakespeare's name on the printed page. Catherine was working with a German "original" and claimed her adaptation to be "A free but weak translation from Shakespeare."[50] Staged in the same year it was published, *Merry Wives* became a Russian play known as *This Is What It Means to Have a Buck-Basket and Linen.* Catherine's version was an adaptation; indeed, she set the play in St. Petersburg and gave all the characters Russian names. Sir Hugh Evans becomes Vanov, the Fords are transformed into Fordov and Fordova, Master Page is known as Papin, and so on. Falstaff appears as Polkadov and represents a Frenchified Russian dandy who enjoys French wine and constantly shows off his a la mode outfits and French vocabulary.

Hamlet has had much influence on the literatures, philosophies, and even the moods of most European countries, but nowhere has his influence been greater than in Russia. The play was extraordinarily popular from the nineteenth century on. "The principal reason for the sustained interest of the aristocracy lay in the romantic fascination with the character of Hamlet himself. Russian aristocrats felt a strange kinship with this privileged court figure torn between the mission he was called on to perform and his own private world. . . By the early nineteenth century there seemed nothing surprising in a Russian aristocrat's leaving his boat to make a special pilgrimage to 'the Hamlet castle' at Elsinore."[51]

The "Hamlet question" led to aristocratic and artistic suicides, but it also became a "search for the meaning of life" and "inspired the turn to 'the people' by Belinsky (and the radical populists after him)."[52] Perhaps the most surprising re-imagining of the Prince (and one of the closest to Shakespeare's original character) was

Boris Pasternak's in the poems he appended to Doctor Zhivago. In Pasternak's words, "Hamlet is not the drama of a weak-willed character, but of duty and self abnegation. . . Hamlet is chosen as the judge of his own time and the servant of a more distant time."[53] In the hands of Pasternak, who was also a translator of Shakespeare's plays, Hamlet had been transformed and, of course, personalized yet again, the Prince once more became the perfect symbol, part of the interplay between audience and author.

Although Shakespeare was wildly popular under the Tsars, he did not become less so under the Commissars. "Of all playwrights, Shakespeare was the most attractive for theatres, schools, and research institutes because he represented the highest artistic value approved by Marx and Engels themselves. Even the dyed-in-the-wool apparatchiks didn't dare to attack him openly."[54] Samuel Marshak, a Soviet writer and translator of Shakespeare, pointed out that Shakespeare could attract Russians even in the most difficult times. In his presentation at the Shakespeare Conference in Stratford-on-Avon in 1957, Marshak said, "Недавно мне довелось увидеть старую афишу, извещавшую о шести пьесах Шекспира, представленных в один и тот же вечер 1920 года, - а поверьте мне, 1920 год не был для нас легким годом." ("Recently I came across an old theatre poster, which announced six Shakespeare plays being performed during the same night of 1920—and believe me, 1920 was not the most calm year for us.").[55]

Marshak also says that "На сценах наших театров, даже в самых отдаленных маленьких городках, Шекспир - не редкий гость, а постоянный жилец. И о талантливости наших актеров судят по тому, насколько успешно они справляются с шекспировскими ролями." ("On our stage, even in small and most remote towns, Shakespeare is not a visitor, but a permanent dweller. The talent of our actors is measured by the success of their Shakespearean roles."[56] Marshak goes on, proudly declaring that "За сорок лет существования Советского Союза общее количество изданных у нас на различных языках томов с произведениями Шекспира только на одну или две тысячи не дошло до трех миллионов." ("For the forty years of the existence of the Soviet Union the total number of copies of Shakespeare's works published falls only one or two thousand short of three million copies.")[57]

In wartime Leningrad, "Thousands of spectators wrapped in furs, blankets, and mufflers jammed the unheated halls and applauded. . . Othello."[58] On the radio were *Hamlet* and *Romeo and*

Juliet.[59] "Over the years 1945-1957 alone, the Soviet stage saw more than 300 productions of Shakespeare's plays."[60] Roman Samarin tells the story of trying to purchase a copy of Shakespeare's sonnets as translated by Samuil Marshak. It was in the 1960s in Moscow. He writes, "'What do you expect?' the young saleswoman in the bookshop turned on me indignantly when I ventured a grumble at the instantaneous disappearance of the *Sonnets*, which had materialized briefly on their shelves that very morning. 'After all, it's Shakespeare!' And you should have seen her face, alive with contempt for the dilatory purchaser, and with understanding of the importance of those *Sonnets*, which the Moscow public, always quick to snap up anything new in the way of books, had been tracking down all over the city from the moment the shops had opened. The great Englishman's reflected glory shone back at me from the eyes of this youthful creature, so serenely conscious of the true worth of William Shakespeare."[61]

On March 8, 2003, for International Women's Day, a holiday that is considerably more Russian than it is international, the employees of The Institute of Chemistry and Chemical Technology in Krasnoyarsk, Russia celebrated in a peculiarly Russian way. The men read Shakespeare's sonnets aloud to the women.[62] The sonnets were in Marshak's translation, and it would be hard to find a better example of Shakespeare's integration into Russian society. In times of trouble and times of celebration, his voice is as natural, as expected, as that of Pushkin or Turgenev. In the words of Nina Diakonova, "Any really great writer who was the bearer of a message of true humanity, who knew all there was to know about the sufferings of men and women, meant more to Russian readers than to their European counterparts. He became a light in the darkness, a guide, a support, a teacher, acquiring the status of a religious Master."[63] Perhaps in the last analysis the secret to Shakespeare's universal appeal, the reason so many peoples wish to claim him as their own may be found in the words that the great Soviet Shakespearean scholar Alexander Anikst spoke at an international conference in London, "Don't ask for simple answers from Shakespeare! Just believe in Shakespeare, in his greatness, in his wide outlook, in his ability to put into one play a whole world with all its contradictions, contrasts and problems."[64]

Notes

1. www.shakespeare.about.com
2. *Star Trek VI: The Undiscovered Country.* Dir. Nicholas Meyer. Paramount, 1991.

3. "Was Shakespeare Italian?" http:// www.shakespeare.about.com/library/weekly/aa051800a.htm?once=true

4. **И. С. Тургенев, *Речь о Шекспире*,** http://www.az.lib.ru/t/turgenew_i_s/text_0250-1.shtml ., Olga Pilkington's translation.

5. John Elsom, ed., *Is Shakespeare Still Our Contemporary?* (London: Routledge, 1989), 94.

6. "Shakespeare in German 'Der Schwan vom Avon' auf Deutsch," http://www.german.about.com/library/weekly/aa.011501a.htm

7. Michael Dobson, *The Making of the National Poet. Shakespeare, Adaptation, and Authorship, 1660-1769* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 218-19.

8. Jane Austen, *Mansfield Park* (London: Richard Bentley,1882), 54.

9. *Napoleon Bonaparte, The Corsican: A Diary of Napoleon's Life in his Own Words* (Norwalk: The Easton Press, 1993), 469.

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

11. Zdenek Stribrny, *Shakespeare and Eastern Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 7.

12. Stribrny, 8.

13. Daryl Palmer's excellent work on Shakespeare and Russia is helping to correct this situation. See his "Jacobean Muscovites: Winter, Tyranny, and Knowledge in *The Winter's Tale,*" *Shakespeare Quarterly,* Vol.46, No.3 [Autumn, 1995], 323-339; and his *Writing Russia In The Age Of Shakespeare* (Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2004).

14. Daryl Palmer, "Jacobean Muscovites: Winter, Tyranny, and Knowledge in *The Winter's Tale,*" *Shakespeare Quarterly,* Vol.46, No.3 [Autumn, 1995], 323-339; p. 328.

15. William Shakespeare, *The Winter's Tale*, ed. Frank Kermode (New York: New American Library, Inc., 1963), 3:2.177.

16. Daryl Palmer, *Writing Russia in the Age of Shakespeare* (Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2004), 181.

17. Shakespeare, *The Winter's Tale*, 3.2.118-19.

18. Harold Lamb, *The March of Muscovy: Ivan the Terrible and the Growth of the Russian Empire* (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1948), 130.

19. Winston Churchill, *The New World* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1959), 94.

20. Norman Jones, *The Birth of the Elizabethan Age: England in the 1560s* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1993), 227.

21. Lamb, 182.

22. Palmer, *Writing Russia in the Age of Shakespeare*, 55.

23. Jones, 227.

24. Lamb, 187.

25. Robert Payne and Nikita Romanoff, *Ivan the Terrible* (New York: Cooper Square Press, 2002), 415.

26. Payne and Romanoff, 415.

27. Palmer, *Writing Russia in the Age of Shakespeare*, 183.

28. Lamb, 197-98.

29. Palmer, "Jacobean Muscovites: Winter, Tyranny, and Knowledge in *The Winter's Tale,*" 326.

30. James Billington, *The Icon And The Axe, An Interpretive History of Russian Culture* (New York: Vintage Books, 1970), 102.
31. Palmer, "Jacobean Muscovites: Winter, Tyranny, and Knowledge in *The Winter's Tale*," 327.
32. Palmer, *Writing Russia in the Age of Shakespeare*, 209.
33. Palmer, "Jacobean Muscovites: Winter, Tyranny, and Knowledge in *The Winter's Tale*," 324.
34. Cited in Palmer, "Jacobean Muscovites: Winter, Tyranny, and Knowledge in *The Winter's Tale*," 329.
35. И. Гарин *Пророки и Поэты*, (Москва: Терра, 1994), 2; also available at www. lib.novgorod.net/Shakespeare/p_p.txt Olga Pilkington's translation.
36. Shakespeare, *The Winter's Tale*, 5:2.223.
37. Shakespeare, *The Winter's Tale*, 5: 2. 221-222.
38. Payne and Romanoff, 204.
39. Payne and Romanoff, 205.
40. Payne and Romanoff, 174.
41. Payne and Romanoff, 173.
42. Giles Fletcher, *On the Russe Commonwealth. 1591 Facsimile Edition with Variants* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1966), 110.
43. Payne and Romanoff, 316.
44. Shakespeare, *The Winter's Tale*, 2.117-121.
45. Palmer, "Jacobean Muscovites: Winter, Tyranny, and Knowledge in *The Winter's Tale*," 332.
46. William Shakespeare, *Twelfth Night*, ed. Bruce R. Smith (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001), 1:5. 94-95.
47. Stribrny, 12-13.
48. Stribrny, 12-13.
49. Stribrny, 22.
50. Stribrny, 29.
51. Billington, 354.
52. Billington, 355.
53. Cited in Billington, 562.
54. Stribrny, 97.
55. http://www. lib.ru/POE ZIQ/MARSHAK/a_shakespiare.txt, Olga Pilkington's translation.
56. http://www. lib.ru/POE ZIQ/MARSHAK/a_shakespiare.txt
57. http://www. lib.ru/POE ZIQ/MARSHAK/a_shakespiare.txt
58. Mark Slonim, *Russian Theatre from the Empire to the Soviets* (Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1961), 131.
59. Slonim, 331.
60. Roman Samarin, comp., *Shakespeare in the Soviet Union, A Collection of Articles* (Moskow: Progress Publishers, 1966), 7.
61. Samarin, 7.
62. Natalia Ivanchenko. Personal Interview. 3/10/2004.
63. Nina Diakonova, "Three Shakespearean Stories in Nineteenth Century Russia" *Russian Essays on Shakespeare and His Contemporaries* (London: Associated University Presses, 1998), 100.
64. Elsom, 180.

A Hero, Not a Zero: Taking a Look at Hero in Shakespeare's *Much Ado About Nothing*

Raychel Haugrud Reiff
Wisconsin

Shakespeare's *Much Ado About Nothing* is the story of lively, merry Beatrice, who has found a way to break out of the confining, passive feminine roles expected by society. She strives for happiness by wittily and laughingly taunting and teasing the men as she asserts her independence and wins the hearts of all. Although her active tongue and clever mind make for a great character on stage, she is not a typical woman. Most women, then and now, are not as daring or as clever as she is. However, Shakespeare also shows us a more conventional female, Beatrice's quiet cousin Hero. Talking little, seeming passive and obedient, she almost seems to be a nothing, a "zero." So silent is she that critics for decades have dismissed her as a woman who is of no interest. In 1960, critic Bertrand Evans devoted no time to her because she is "nearly speechless,"[1] a sentiment echoed by Paul and Miriam Mueschke in 1967, who described her as "shadowy and silent."[2] Since the 1960s, with the advent of feminism, critics have seen her in an even more negative light, a woman of absolutely no importance because she is totally dominated by men. In 1974, James Smith rejected her as a woman who has "bowed to conventions";[3] in 1979, Kenneth Muir proclaimed her a "nonentity";[4] in 1982, Harry Berger asserted that she is the "most male-dominated of heroines";[5] and in 1994, Marta Straznicky denounced her as a "docile, submissive female."[6] Quiet and demure, she is hardly noticed by the other characters on stage either. Indeed, when love-struck Claudio asks his friend, "Benedick, didst thou note the daughter of Signoir Leonato?" (1.1.155-156),[7] Benedick replies, "I noted her not; but I looked on her" (1.1.157).[8] Scarcely anyone notes Hero, for she appears to be merely background material, a girl looking beautiful and smiling sweetly. But a closer look at Hero shows that she, like Beatrice, struggles against the pressures of conformity and the adherence to societal

rules of being a sweet, passive female. However, she does not do this in the same manner as flamboyant Beatrice who openly asserts herself with much talking and with great humor. Yet, in her quiet ways Hero, like her cousin, actively pursues happiness for herself and for those she loves.

Although their methods and mannerisms are different, Beatrice and Hero are much alike internally. Both possess the same inner strengths necessary for happiness then and now: first, independence; second, love for and understanding of others; third, a realistic perception of the world; fourth, wit, which combines humor and intelligence; and fifth, purity of mind and body. One or more of these qualities are seen every time Hero speaks in the play.

Quiet Hero's love for and understanding of Beatrice is apparent in the opening scene, in which she speaks one seven-word speech addressed to Leonato and the messenger. After Beatrice has inquired about the whereabouts of "Signoir Mountanto" (1.1.30), a name the two men do not recognize, Leonato asks Beatrice, "What is he that you ask for, niece?" (1.1.34). Hero, not Beatrice, replies, "My cousin means Signoir Benedick of Padua" (1.1.36). Her short speech reveals two things about her: first, she knows Beatrice's heart because she understands who it is that Beatrice is concerned about; second, she understands Beatrice's reluctance to let her feelings for Benedick be known. By answering for her cousin, quiet Hero helps Beatrice glean information about her loved one without letting Beatrice embarrass herself in front of the men by revealing the extent of her interest in Benedick. These are the only words Hero says in this long, opening scene where everyone else, except the morbid Don John, talk at length. When she is on the stage, modest, shy Hero stands silently, letting the men and Beatrice do the talking. But her seven-word speech shows her understanding and concern for Beatrice.

The next time Hero speaks, Act 2 Scene 1, she shows a second quality: a realistic perception of others, as she shows herself to be as knowledgeable about people as Beatrice is. When the men ask if Don John was at supper, the ladies respond with comments about his character. Beatrice begins with a humorous but accurate observation: "How tartly that gentlemen looks! I never can see him but I am heartburned an hour after" (2.1.3-4). Hero, in less vivid terms, agrees that Don John is an undesirable person: "He is of a very melancholy disposition" (2.1.5). Both women accurately assess his character while the men say nothing about him. Later in the play we see that the men's failure to perceive the true nature of

Don John leads to great unhappiness and discord as Don Pedro and Claudio, both honorable but naïve men, believe the scoundrel Don John when he reports that Hero is unfaithful to Claudio. Shakespeare is clear that insight into a person's character is essential to attaining happiness in the world.

Later in this scene, we see that Hero, like Beatrice, is an independent woman who willingly asserts herself to assure her own happiness by choosing her marriage partner herself, although this does not, at first, appear to be the case. Thinking that Hero is going to be courted by the prince, Don Pedro, a worthy man but one Hero does not love, Hero's father and uncle tell her that she must accept his marriage proposal. Her uncle begins, "Well, niece, I trust you will be ruled by your father" (2.1.47-48) and therefore marry Don Pedro. Hero does not answer, thus implying compliance. But independent Beatrice cannot be quiet, because she fears that her gentle cousin will not seek her own happiness and marry Claudio, the man she loves, but will instead follow convention and obey the order of her father to marry the prince. With earnest humor, Beatrice explains, "Yes, faith, it is my cousin's duty to make curtsy and say, 'Father, as it please you'" (2.1.49-50), but she continues by appealing to Hero, "But yet for all that, cousin, let him be a handsome fellow, or else make another curtsy and say, 'Father, as it please me'" (2.1.49-51). Dismissing Beatrice's remarks as pure jest and waiting for no response from Hero, Leonato commands Hero, "Daughter, remember what I told you. If the Prince do solicit you in that kind, you know your answer" (2.1. 61-63). Even now, Hero says nothing. To her family and to the audience, this silent girl appears to be a sweet, compliant young woman who will passively obey her father without question, even to the point of sacrificing her happiness and marrying the man of her father's choice, not hers.

But appearances are deceiving in this play, and silent Hero proves that she is not a doormat when she speaks to Don Pedro at the masked ball. Instead of being shy or compliant, she shows a "surge of spirit," as Berger put it,[9] becoming the independent, free-thinking woman Beatrice urged her to be, a woman who says, I will marry "as it please me" (2.1.52) and thus assure herself of happiness. Her entire encounter with Don Pedro clearly shows that she is not the simpleton her elders consider her.[10] She asserts her independence as soon as Don Pedro approaches her and asks her to walk with him. Before agreeing to his simple request, she sets down three requirements he must meet: he must "walk softly and look sweetly and say nothing" (2.1.82). Then, she cleverly

plays on the word *walk* by playfully stating, "I am yours for the walk; and especially when I walk away" (2.1. 83-84). When Don Pedro asks if he can be in her company, she shows a definite mark of independence as she says, "I may say so, when I please" (2.1.86). Her independence continues when she responds to the Prince's question, "And when please you to say so?" (2.1. 87). Hero replies, "When I like your favor, for God defend the lute should be like the case!" (2.1.88-89). Although critic David Bevington explains that "favor" means "face," meaning that she will say yes when she likes his face,[11] "favor" here could instead stand for "personality"; thus her meaning would be that she will walk with him and listen to his supplications when she better knows his inner self. Either way, she does not appear to be ready to agree to marry this powerful prince. After one more witty comment about his visor, "Why, then, your visor should be thatched," (2.1.92-93), she leaves with him. Clearly, this Hero—unlike the silent, obedient, conventional daughter pictured in the first part of the scene—shows a spirited nature when she speaks to Don Pedro.

When next we see quiet Hero, her independent nature is obvious even though she is silent. We learn that Hero is going to marry Claudio, not the Prince, as her father had ordered. Although Leonato had said nothing about how she should respond to an offer from Claudio, Hero, according to the Prince, accepted Claudio's marriage proposal before her father even knew the young man was interested in his daughter. The Prince tells Claudio, "Here, Claudio, I have wooed in thy name, and fair Hero is won" (2.1.284-285). It is only after Hero has agreed to marry Claudio that her father is informed of the match. Don Pedro goes on, "I have broke with her father and his good will obtained" (2.1.285-286). Thus, Hero breaks with tradition and actively chooses her own husband before her father can give his permission.

Although she has arranged her own marriage, she is still a shy young woman in the company of men. As her engagement to Claudio is announced and celebrated, Hero stands silent, not even uttering a word when Beatrice tells her to "Speak, cousin" (2.1. 296). But talking in front of socially powerful men is not modest Hero's style; she is not like the boisterous Beatrice. As Hunt explains, "All that shy, dutiful Hero can do is whisper."[12] But her happiness is obvious as Beatrice states, and Claudio confirms, that she "tells him in his ear that he is in her heart" (2.1.300-301).

Even as Hero is basking in her own joy, she does not allow herself to forget about her cousin's happiness. Hero's final speech in this scene reveals once more her loving, generous nature toward

her cousin, as well as her insight into Beatrice's heart. When Benedick's friends decide to play matchmaker for their friend and Beatrice, they ask Hero to help. She is very willing: "I will do any modest office, my lord, to help my cousin to a good husband" (2.1.357-8). Lovingly, she wants to help her cousin marry the man she knows Beatrice loves. Unlike the men, who do not recognize that Beatrice and Benedick truly love each other, she knows that Beatrice's choice is Benedick.

In the eavesdropping scene in Act 3, many of Hero's inner strengths are revealed. As Hero is setting the stage for Beatrice to overhear her, she once again demonstrates her realistic knowledge of people. This young, sheltered girl understands that ambitious social climbers have a tendency to destroy others, even those they once needed for their advancement, much like tall honeysuckles overshadow the sun which had originally helped them grow. She states:

> . . . honeysuckles, ripened by the sun,
> Forbid the sun to enter, like favorites,
> Made proud by princes, that advance their pride
> Against that power that bred it. (3.1. 7-11)

When Beatrice arrives, other important aspects of Hero are revealed: her love for her cousin, her insight into Beatrice's heart, and her intelligence and wit in knowing how to accomplish her mission of bringing Beatrice and Benedick together. As critic Neely remarks, she uses "aggressiveness, realism and wit,"[13] much like Beatrice, to achieve her purpose. Hero's role as a matchmaker is a difficult one because she has to help Beatrice do two things: first, recognize that she loves Benedick, and second, learn how to let down her guard and dare show her love to Benedick. Just as Beatrice had been afraid that Hero would not seek her own happiness because she would be too timid to assert herself to marry the man she loved, so Hero worries that Beatrice will not let herself find true happiness because she is too defensive to let Benedick see her true feelings for him. Therefore, Hero needs to make sure that Beatrice sees herself as cold and distant so she can change her ways. To accomplish this, Hero exaggerates Beatrice's imperfect qualities, speaking of her in most unflattering terms. Beatrice, she says, is "too disdainful" (3.1.34); she is "coy and wild" (3.1.35). Her heart is formed "Of prouder stuff" (3.1.50) than any other woman's. "Disdain and scorn ride sparkling in her eyes" (3.1. 51), and "her wit / Values itself so highly that to her / All matter else seems weak" (3.1.52-54). Because "she is so self-endeared" (3.1.56),

"she cannot love" anyone (3.1.54). She goes on to explain how Beatrice "turns every man the wrong side out" (3.1.68). Hero flatly states that Beatrice's behavior is so opposite to societal standards that it "cannot be commendable" (3.1.73). With these condemning words, Hero forces Beatrice to see herself as too scornful.

Next, Hero shows Beatrice how she uses her clever wit to push loved ones away. Hero explains that even she is afraid to tell Beatrice about her witty disdain because, she says, "If I should speak, / She would mock me into air; O, she would laugh me / Out of myself, press me to death with wit" (3.1.74-76).

Once she has made Beatrice think about her self-destructive behavior, Hero turns to the merits of Benedick so that Beatrice, knowing that others admire the man she loves, will feel free to acknowledge her love for him. Hero praises Benedick to the hilt, calling him "so rare a gentleman" (3.1.91) that he is "the only man of Italy" (3.1.92). She reiterates this a few lines later when she exclaims, "For shape, for bearing, argument, and valor, / [Benedict] Goes foremost in report through Italy" (3.1.96-97). She concludes her praise of him by stating that he "hath an excellent good name" (3.1.98). Thus Hero, through her exaggerated remarks on both Beatrice and Benedick, has paved the way for Beatrice's happiness. She has painted an inflated picture of Beatrice's shortcomings as a person who does not dare reveal her true feelings, covering them up with wit and ridicule, and she has drawn a flattering picture of Benedick, making him the greatest catch of all Italy. Her ploy works; Beatrice immediately bids farewell to "contempt" and "maiden pride" (3.1.109), exclaiming, "Benedick, love on; I will requite thee / Taming my wild heart to thy loving hand" (3.1.111-112).

Typically critics have not looked at this scene as showing Hero in a positive light. Instead they interpret it as a revelation of Hero's jealousy toward her flamboyant cousin because of her tirade against Beatrice. And, in fact, her original stated intent is to solely talk about Benedick. Before Beatrice arrives, she tells her partner, Ursula,

> Our talk must only be of Benedick.
> When I do name him, let it be thy part
> To praise him more than ever man did merit. (3.1.17-19)

But instead of praising Benedick, most of Hero's lines condemn Beatrice, perhaps revealing, Neely says, "some resentment of Beatrice's domination."[14] Critic Berger agrees that Hero is

envious of Beatrice as he thus states: "The vigor with which she berates her cousin suggests that she is doing more than pretending for Beatrice's benefit. She only pretends to pretend; the game of make-believe is a . . . form behind which she can stalk Beatrice with 'honest slanders' (III.i.84), letting her know what she really thinks of her, what she really feels, without (for once) being interrupted or put down."[15] Hero's speech on honeysuckles and favorites may reinforce this idea: Beatrice could be seen to be the favorite, like the gorgeous honeysuckles which overshadow the sun, symbolic of Hero, that helped them grow and flower. However, critic Smith dismisses the idea that Hero "is knowingly giving a false report, seizing the opportunity, once she feels safe from her cousin's tongue, to return mock for mock."[16] Such techniques, he explains, "would not be in accordance with Hero's submissive or (to repeat the adjective) sallow nature," and furthermore, he says, "Beatrice herself takes occasion to confirm it [Hero's account of Beatrice's disdainful self]."[17] Even if Hero is a little jealous, and it is not clear that she is, we can forgive her, for quiet Hero loves her cousin and helps make her life better.

In Hero's last scene before the tragic wedding, Act 3 Scene 4, many of Hero's underlying attributes are revealed as she is speaking to the women while selecting garments for her approaching marriage: we see her independence, perception, wit, realistic approach to life, and purity. First, her assertiveness and independence come through. Margaret, not liking a garment Hero has chosen, suggests that Hero rely on Beatrice's taste. Hero's reply, "My cousin's a fool, and thou art another. I'll wear none but this" (3.4.10-11), shows her impatience with those who suggest that she should always listen to Beatrice. On her wedding day, she is clear that she will not hear of following anyone's wishes but her own. "I'll wear none but this" (3.4.10-11), she declares. Also, her witty nature and perception are seen when she and Margaret tease Beatrice for acting sick to cover up the fact that she is really in love. Margaret plays on Benedick's sexually suggestive name[18] by telling Beatrice to get some "*carduus benedictus*, and lay it to your heart" (3.4. 68-69), and Hero picks up on the nature of this medicine by adding a slightly bawdy pun: "There thou prick'st her with a thistle" (3.4.71).[19] This short scene also shows Hero's realistic approach to the world and her sexual modesty as she expresses her apprehension over her ensuing marriage.[20] Never earlier has she expressed any doubts about marriage or about Claudio, but here, in the presence of her close female friends, Hero reveals that her wedding garments may not give her pleasure because, she says,

"my heart is exceeding heavy" (3.4. 23-24). Then she is appalled by Margaret's sexual innuendo as Margaret replies, "'Twill be heavier soon by the weight of a man" (3.4.25-26). Shocked, shy Hero exclaims, "Fie upon thee! Art not ashamed?" (3.4.27). Negative female sentiments over marriage are rarely mentioned in comedies, where marriage is seen as the final, happy ending. In this comedy, Shakespeare shows Hero as a realistic young girl who is apprehensive about marriage—giving up her life and body to a man she barely knows.

Thus, in the first three acts, Hero's stellar inner qualities are portrayed as she quietly strives for happiness for herself and those she loves.

But in Act 4, her strength of character is severely tested when Claudio publicly accuses her of infidelity in the mock wedding scene. This "repudiation and shaming of Hero is a social disaster" for her, as Jacobs says,[21] because this public denunciation of her can ruin her reputation for the rest of her life. Unwilling to stand passively and watch herself be destroyed, Hero shows her assertiveness and independence as she actively defends herself against the influential men who accuse her, even though they are her social superiors. Earlier she has barely spoken to them, so great is her shyness and modesty. But now, she cries out: "O, God, defend me! How am I beset! / What kind of catechizing call you this?" (4.1.77-78). She pleads with Claudio, "Who can blot that name [Hero] / With any just reproach?" (4.1.81-82) And she denies that she met with a man in her room, "I talk'd with no man at that hour, my Lord" (4.1.86). But she is silenced, passively swooning in a faint after almost all of the powerful men in attendance—the prince Don Pedro, his brother Don John, her fiancé Claudio, and her father Leonato—condemn her. Only Benedick withholds judgment. When the young men leave, she rallies herself once more, showing her strength of character. So sure is she in her innocence that she tells her father that he can "Refuse me, hate me, torture me to death!" (4.1.184) if he can "Prove . . . that any man with me conversed / At hours unmeet or that I yesternight / Maintained the change of words with any creature" (4.1.181-183).

Then she falls silent, letting others make plans to defend her honor. Without consulting her, the men decide that she should pretend to be dead and passively wait for her name be cleared in time. Acting much more aggressively, Beatrice, who is "commit[ed] to justice," as Straznicky states,[22] attempts to clear her cousin's name through actions, telling Benedick to "Kill Claudio" (4.1.288),

and thus defend Hero's honor, a challenge he undertakes but, luckily, does not have time to execute. Later, when Hero is found innocent, her father and uncle attempt to bring honor to Hero by berating and challenging Claudio. During all of these actions, Hero is silent, appearing to fall back into her prescribed role as a dependent woman in a society, letting the men (and Beatrice) make all the important decisions relating to her.

Although Hero does not speak, it is clear that she approves of the actions, for she is a realist who knows that she can have no happiness or honor in her society unless her name is cleared. Therefore, she willingly pretends to be dead while she is in disgrace and waits for time to bring the truth to light, which critic Neely describes as "both an involuntary, passive escape from degradation and a voluntary constructive means to alter it."[23] But realistic Hero also knows that the pretense of death is merely a temporary measure. She realizes that the only way to really regain her reputation and be accepted by the community is to marry the man who once renounced her. Thus, her happiness depends on marriage to Claudio.

In the recantation scene in Act 5, Hero's words to Claudio show her kindness, her love, her willingness to actively seek happiness with Claudio, and, of course, her purity. Masked and pretending to be a cousin, not risking another scene of denunciation, she waits for Claudio to announce his intentions. Only when he tells her, "I am your husband, if you like of me" (5.4.58), does she reveal herself. Unmasking she replies: "And when I lived, I was your other wife; / And when you loved, you were my other husband" (5.4.59-60), adding, "One Hero died defiled, but I do live, / And surely as I live, I am a maid" (5.4.62-63). These lines clearly reveal the generous side of pure Hero; never does she chastise Claudio or berate him. She is ready to love and forget. Her happiness decided, Hero falls silent while her two male guardians explain her "resurrection" to the others.

Even though her happiness is secured, Hero does not forget about her cousin. When Beatrice and Benedick's marriage seems doomed because neither is willing to admit love for the other, it is quiet Hero who takes action to ensure her cousin's happiness. She steals a love note from Beatrice's pocket and shows it to the assembly, telling them, "And here's another [note] / Writ in my cousin's hand, stol'n from her pocket, / Containing her affection unto Benedick" (5.4. 87-89). Thus, the way is paved for Beatrice to marry the man of her choice, her soul mate, Benedick. Hero ends as she begins—thinking of the happiness and well being of her cousin.

Silent Hero, outwardly looking like a "zero" as a conventional, quiet, passive woman, seemingly so different from her laughing, vocal cousin, is, in reality, much like Beatrice—independent, loving, realistic, witty, and pure. With strength of character, love and concern for others, a clear understanding of the world, humor mixed with intelligence, and purity of mind and body, Hero, like Beatrice, shows that stifling roles set by society can be counteracted and true happiness can be found. Through these two cousins, Shakespeare shows that women with very different personalities can find happiness, as Beatrice laughs and talks her way through the maze of life while Hero quietly but actively pursues her own path to happiness.

Notes

1. Bertrand Evans, *Shakespeare's Comedies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960), 73.

2. Paul Mueschke and Miriam Mueschke, "Illusion and Metamorphosis in *Much Ado About Nothing*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 18.1 (1967): 53.

3. James Smith, *Shakespearian and Other Essays* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 36.

4. Kenneth Muir, *Shakespeare's Comic Sequence* (New York: Harper-Row, 1979), 72.

5. Harry Berger, "Against the Sink-a-Pace: Sexual and Family Politics in *Much Ado About Nothing*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 33.3 (1982): 303.

6. Marta Straznicky, "Shakespeare and the Government of Comedy: *Much Ado About Nothing*," *Shakespeare Studies* 22 (1994): 157.

7. William Shakespeare, *Much Ado About Nothing*, in *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, ed. David Bevington, updated 4th ed. (New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 1997), 1.1.155-156. All further references to this play will be placed in parenthesis immediately following the quote.

8. "Noting in this play refers to "habits of observation and interpretations." Nova Myhill, "Spectatorship in/of *Much Ado About Nothing*," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 39.2 (Spring 1999): 294.

9. Berger, "Against the Sink-a-Pace: Sexual and Family Politics in *Much Ado About Nothing*," 303.

10. As Berger says, "Hero peels off her mask of soft, sweet silence and becomes frisky. She tries to flirt, then to banter like Beatrice." Berger, "Against the Sink-a-Pace: Sexual and Family Politics in *Much Ado About Nothing*," 304.

11. David Bevington, Introduction to *Much Ado About Nothing*, in *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, ed. David Bevington, updated 4th ed. (New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 1997), 225; Note 2.1.88.

12. Maurice Hunt, "The Reclamation of Language in *Much Ado About Nothing*," *Studies in Philology* 97.2 (Spring 2000): 177.

13. Carol Thomas Neely, "Broken Nuptials: *Much Ado About Nothing*," *Shakespeare's Comedies*, ed. Gary Waller (New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 1996), 147.

14. Ibid.

15. Berger, "Against the Sink-a-Pace: Sexual and Family Politics in *Much Ado About Nothing*," 305.

16. Smith, *Shakespearian and Other Essays*, 30.

17. Ibid.

18. See Stephen B. Dobranski, "Children of the Mind: Miscarried Natives in *Much Ado About Nothing*," *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 38.2 (1998): 240.

19. Ibid.

20. See Neely, "Broken Nuptials: *Much Ado About Nothing*," 143.

21. Katherine Jacobs, "Shakespeare's *Much Ado About Nothing*, 5.4.109-18," *The Explicator* 59.3 (Spring 2001): 116.

22. Straznicky, "Shakespeare and the Government of Comedy: *Much Ado About Nothing*," 160

23. Neely, "Broken Nuptials: *Much Ado About Nothing*," 148.

The Meeking of the Shrew: Converging Perversions and Conversions in Katherine and Petruchio

Carol Schuyler
Dixie State College

At the end of Act 4, Scene 1, Petruchio describes his method of training Kate, his kite, and asks us: "He that knows better how to tame a shrew, / Now let him speak (4.1.197-98).[1] Petruchio is unlikely to be challenged because the precepts by which Katherine the curst (1.2.127) is beatified are similar to the guidance given for the creation of a new self by the Master in the Sermon on the Mount.

Katherine is indeed in a perverse state when we first see her entering with Baptista, Bianca, and Bianca's two suitors, Gremio and Hortensio. She demands of her father: "I pray you, sir, is it your will / To make a stale [i.e., prostitute] of me amongst these mates?" (1.2.57-58).[2] Gremio declares she is more fit for carting than courting, i.e., for "[a] whipping at the cart's tail [which] was a punishment for bawds and whores."[3] Shakespeare provides three additional images of Katherine's corrupt self.

First, there is the drunk and disorderly Christopher Sly who roars onstage with "I'll feeze you, in faith" to his hostess, i.e., he'll "beat" or "flog" her because she requests payment for glasses he broke (Ind. 1.1).[4]

Second, there is the mad elder sister dragging the younger whom she has bound and who pleads, "Good sister, wrong me not, nor wrong yourself, / To make a bondmaid and a slave of me" (2.1.1-2). Coming to rescue his obvious favorite, the father rails at Katherine: "For shame, thou hilding of a devilish spirit, / Why dost thou wrong her that did ne'er wrong thee?" (2.1.26-27). Brian Morris, the Arden editor, explains that a hilding is a horse but that Shakespeare also uses it for "a contemptible or worthless person of either sex [. . .] specially applied to a woman here."[5] Baptista mourns: "Was ever gentleman thus griev'd as I?" (2.1.37).

In a heartbeat, he is answered. Petruchio enters with the suitors and servants in various disguises and immediately agrees with him

on Katherine's dowry. And Petruchio is also the answer to Katherine's predicament as they immediately disagree. How different their banter is from Bianca's silence which provoked Katherine's tying and dragging her (2.1.29) and from Baptista's disparagement! Petruchio lavishes words—both sweet and salty—on her. He listens to what she says and bandies a suitable comeback. Previously, Katherine told Hortensio she'd "comb [a husband's] noddle with a three-legg'd stool" (1.1.64); his reply dismissed her: "From all such devils, good Lord deliver us!" (1.1.66) Gremio echoed him: "And me too, good Lord!" (1.1.67). Petruchio, though, plays her game. When he says he's "mov'd" to woo her, she puns on his being a "movable" such as "a joint-stool." Then he joins in (punning is contagious) with "Thou hast hit it. Come, sit on me" (2.1.198). (This is the second consecutive line they share.) All the while, the banter is teamed with, well, horseplay, that repeatedly brings them into eye contact and eventually mutual estimation. Isn't this better than the paternal physical affection Baptista bestows on Bianca? "Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted."[6]

Not only are Baptista and Katherine gaining relief from the new arrival in town, but so is Petruchio who came to "wive it wealthily" (1.2.74) and found the "Kate of [his] consolation" (2.1.190).

The third image of Katherine the curst, which continues the whores and horses pun and metaphor, is like Dorian Gray and his portrait. We see Katherine finely tricked out in her wedding costume. Inside, though, she is the equivalent of the grave-worthy jade that Petruchio rides in his motley garb to the ceremony. The horse is swaybacked and knock-kneed with a dislocated hipbone, tumors in her legs and under her ears, and swellings in her joints, jaw, and mouth. Mucous and blood discharge from her nostrils. Also, she suffers from jaundice, sweating and a dizzy madness, perhaps caused by a surfeit of meat (but aren't equine beings vegetarians?), so that she beats her head against the walls.[7] The horse's bit, bridle, girth, and crupper are in woeful condition (3.2.54-61): Baptista has not governed his daughter well.

Katherine is the analogous walking-talking wounded because she fears she's been stood up and, yet again, held up to public ridicule—though marriage to "a mad-brain rudesby, full of spleen" (3.2.10) may be a fate worse than death or "[dancing] barefoot on [Bianca's] wedding-day" (2.1.33). Petruchio recognizes the mote in his own eye; his deranged exterior matches both their choleric interiors. When Baptista objects to the groom's attire, Petruchio

defends his choice: "To me she's married, not unto my clothes. / Could I repair what she will wear in me / As I can change these poor accoutrements, / 'Twere well for Kate and better for myself" (3.2.115-18).

Again, the beatitude "Blessed are they that mourn" applies to Katherine and Petruchio, but "comfort" now means being strengthened or heartened—and well they will need it. After the vows are exchanged, Katherine must be dizzy with conflicting emotions: piqued by Petruchio's attraction to her, dazzled by his verbal pyrotechnics ("Where did you study all this goodly speech?" [2.1.256]), terrified by his outshrewing of her during the ceremony (Gremio, who had called her a devil now applies the epithet to Petruchio and declares: "She is a lamb, a dove, a fool to him" [3.2.155]), dismayed by his rejection of her public plea to dine at their feast ("[I]f you love me, stay" [3.2.202]), self-assertive ("I see a woman may be made a fool / If she had not a spirit to resist" [3.2.218-19]), and humiliated when Petruchio addresses her (while seeming to address the guests) as a horse ("Nay, look not big nor stamp, nor stare, nor fret" [3.2.226]). How she responds during his long "chattels" or "10th Commandment" speech ("She is my goods [. . .] my horse [. . .] my anything [. . .] Touch her whoever dare! [. . .] Fear not, sweet wench, they shall not touch thee, Kate. / I'll buckler thee against a million" [3.2.228-37]) must depend on the production. Is he reducing her to thinghood? Or elevating her to the sum of his treasure that he will defend against anyone and everyone as Baptista rushed to rescue his "treasure," Bianca, from her (2.1.32). In the 2004 Utah Shakespearean Festival production, Petruchio began the speech roaring and wildly gesticulating, quite alarming Katherine and all in attendance. Then slowly, in a decrescendo, he approaches her on his knees, speaks in a melting voice, and extends his hand to her—which she accepts.[8] He is Moses leading her out of Egypt, but the journey to the Promised Land is as troubled as that of the Israelites.

As they begin their life together, we can take comfort in Petruchio's vision of her during their wild wooing:

> Why does the world report that Kate doth limp?
> O slanderous world! [. . .]
> O, let me see thee walk. Thou dost not halt. [. . .]
> Did ever Dian so become a grove
> As Kate this chamber with her princely gait? (2.1.246-53)

Still a mare but at least not a jade. And we can comprehend why Petruchio declines her plea to stay. When he calls for his horse,

Grumio's assurance—"Ay, sir, they be ready; the oats have eaten the horses" (3.2.203)—is noted as a "comic reversal."[9] It would be an unfortunate reversal, though, if Petruchio allowed Katherine and himself to indulge in the physical feast of marriage before they prepared themselves spiritually. The horse-whisperer will succeed: Kate's inner self will come to match her fair appearance.

Another analogy applies to this wilderness experience on which the couple embark: the conversion of Saul of Tarsus. On the road to arrest Christians, Saul is thrown from his horse and blinded by light when he hears Jesus ask why he persecutes him. After he has fasted in a Damascus house for three days, Ananias comes to tutor him and restore his sight. Katherine's horse stumbles and she lands under her. Rather than cursing her "bemoiled" state, Grumio reports to Curtis that "she prayed that never prayed before" (4.1.70-1). Petruchio acts as an Ananias figure by teaching her mercy and justice. His method, the servants report is to "[kill] her [i.e., suppress her fire or choler][10] in her own humour" (4.1.167)—as he predicted to Baptista he'd do (2.1.130-37).

And it works. When Petruchio beats Grumio for supposedly causing the fall, Katherine "wade[s] through the dirt" to pluck her husband off the groom (4.1.69-70). Later, she attempts to allay Petruchio's anger—again, not cursing or criticizing him—when he strikes a servant who is removing his boots (4.1.134-36). "Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy": freeing others from condemnation also frees oneself from self-condemnation and prepares one to receive merciful help in one's own time of need.

But where is the help for her in what may be her "dark night of the soul"? The suffering Katherine yearns ever more deeply for just treatment. To Grumio, she complains: "The more my wrong, the more his spite appears / What, did he marry me to famish me?" (4.3.2-3). Longing for the old life under Pharoah, she continues: "I, who never knew how to entreat, / Am starv'd for meat, giddy for lack of sleep, / With oaths kept waking, and with brawling fed" (4.3.7-10). In at least one instance, Petruchio accompanies her in this discipline: "[B]etter 'twere that both of us did fast, / Since, of ourselves, ourselves are choleric / Than feed it with such over-roasted flesh" (4.1.160-62). Earlier, when Grumio describes to Curtis the eventful ride home, there is a jest about whether the wedded couple is riding one horse or two; could this relate to their suffering from the same flaw? (4.1.59-63). "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled." The couple's triumphant fulfillment will be sweet as they preside at Bianca and Lucentio's wedding feast.

Katherine's sanctification and Petruchio's transmogrification (in the eyes of his servants) continue as she is forced to rise to the precept: "Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." But it's hard to empty oneself of the desire to exert one's personal will and to break long-held habits. When Grumio taunts Katherine with offers of mustard and meat, she beats him. Her spirits lift when Petruchio offers her a meal—for which she thanks him as he commands (4.3.45-47)—and fall when Hortensio, at Petruchio's request, devours it. They soar when a milliner and a tailor show her a cap and a gown—her graduation costume, as it were, from Petruchio's school for wives. And plunge when he elaborately rejects them. The "moveable" is unmoved even by her moving protest:

> My tongue will tell the anger of my heart,
> Or else my heart concealing it will break,
>
> And rather than it shall, I will be free
> Even to the uttermost, as I please, in words. (4.3.77-80)

Anticipating her resistance to his disciplines, he has ordered her a "loose-bodied gown" (4.3.132). She is delighted with it: "I never saw a better-fashion'd gown, / More quaint, more pleasing, nor more commendable" (4.3.101-02). Petruchio, however, knows that this is the costume of "loose women."[11]—as does Grumio with his ribald jest (4.3.155-60). Katherine is still a harlot in the sense of not capitulating to Petruchio as "[her] lord, [her] king, [her] governor" (5.2.139). He advises her to disregard their mean garments because ""tis the mind that makes the body rich" (4.3.169). What a contrast to the scene just before this one where Tranio enlists the pedant in his scheme: "Go with me to clothe you as becomes you" (4.2.121)! As the Christopher Sly deception prefigures Katherine's transformation, the true/false Vincentio parallels it.

Nevertheless, Katherine does appear onstage in a new costume for the visit back to Baptista's. Their starting is delayed, though, because Petruchio disorients her with his maniacal insistence on its being 7 o'clock when it's almost 2 o'clock (am or pm?). Exasperated, he exclaims: "Look what I speak, or do, or think to do, / You are still crossing it" (4.3.189-90). Finally, Katherine has a man who gives her the time of day—but it's the wrong time. A sense of absolute futility that her preferences and efforts can make a difference must be enveloping her. That's as it should be: she must cease "kicking against the pricks"[12] if she's to become poor enough in spirit to enter the kingdom of heaven, i.e., loving union with her mate.

Katherine the Curst's Last Stand occurs when she "crosses" her husband over the brightness of the sun vs. that of the moon (4.5.2-23). (Is Petruchio cueing her that Brother Sun and Sister Moon have equal importance?) Then her eyes open to a new vision. On the one hand, she chimes in with him: "What you will have it nam'd, even that it is, / And so it shall be for Katherine" (4.5.21-22)—except possibly for her name: she doesn't call herself Kate. And, on the other hand, she is free to invent too, as she did in the wooing scene: even if he "please[s] to call it a rush-candle," (4.5.14), she'll agree.

Hortensio observes that "the field is won" (4.5.23). Is the indefatigable Petruchio raising the bar or celebrating his regard for his Kate's beauty when he describes the aged Vincentio whom they encounter on the road? There's not a whit of the "stale" here:

> Tell me, sweet Kate, and tell me truly too,
> Hast thou beheld a fresher gentlewoman?
> Such a war of white and red within her cheeks!
> What stars do spangle heaven with such beauty
> As those two eyes become that heavenly face? (4.5.28-32)

Clear-sighted, liberated Kate takes this opportunity to get back at her father and flirt with her husband:

> Young budding virgin, fair, and fresh, and sweet
> . . . . . .
> Happy the parents of so fair a child,
> Happier the man whom favorable stars
> Allots thee for his lovely bedfellow. (4.5.36-40)

When Petruchio abruptly reverses direction, pointing out that this is a "wither'd" man, Kate smoothly falls in about her "mistaking eyes, / That have been so bedazzled with the sun / That everything I look on seemeth green" (4.5.44-46). The stay in Petruchio's house has been a retreat to the green world where her life was regenerated. Vincentio, who encounters her for the first time, calls her a "merry mistress" (4.5.52). Her ears must ring with this praise after the barbs from her family and anti-suitors. "Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God"; Katherine now understands the sun of her domestic universe. "Katherine" and "Kate" (and all their variations) are associated "with the Greek *katharos,* meaning 'pure'." When Katherine addresses Petruchio as "husband" (5.1.130) and sails through her Public Display of Affection test, she is indeed "the prettiest Kate in Christendom" (2.1.187) that Petruchio foresaw in their wooing scene.

Lucentio's welcome speech at the wedding feast is unconsciously ironic. It accurately describes Katherine and Petruchio's marriage at this time but he and Bianca (as well as Hortensio and the widow) have a long way to go to match these words about himself and his bride:

> At last, though long, our jarring notes agree,
> And time it is, when raging war is done,
> To smile at scapes and perils overblown. (5.2.1-3)

Petruchio's remark is consciously ironic. "Nothing but sit and sit, and eat and eat!" How boring after the life he's recently led! Is he lusting for a new contest? Kate senses he is and joins in by pressuring the Widow for clarity about her remark: "He that is giddy thinks the world turns round" (5.2.20). The Widow ignores her first question ("Mistress, how mean you that?" [5.2.22]) and responds to Petruchio instead. But on Kate's pursuant: "I pray you [how polite!] tell me what you meant by that" (5.2.27), the widow persecutes her about her past: "Your husband, being troubled with a shrew, / Measures my husband's sorrow by his woe. / And now you know my meaning" (5.2.28-30). Katherine puts her down verbally; Petruchio sees more of a victory to savor. He is sure enough of his wife to propose a wager and to raise it when it's too low—after all, she's not chattel (5.2.71-73):

> Let's each one send unto his wife,
> And he whose wife is most obedient,
> To come at first when he doth send for her
> Shall win the wager which we will propose. (5.2.66-69)

Hortensio smirks: "I am afraid, sir, / Do what you can, yours will not be entreated" (5.2.89-90).

After his widow/wife will not come and Petruchio commands that Kate come to him, he avers: "I know her answer . . . She will not" (5.2.98). How quickly he forgets! He witnessed the sun/moon and virgin/old man tests. He declared to the tamer: "Well, Petruchio, this has put me in heart. / Have to my widow! And if she be froward, / Then hast thou taught Hortensio to be untoward" (4.5.76-78). How like Jesus's untrusting disciples he is! They saw how the miracle of the loaves and the fishes fed five thousand.[13] A little while later, when a crowd of four thousand pressed them, they despaired, not remembering the first such miracle or not believing there could be a second one.[14]

Kate, of course, wins the obedience test: "What is your will, sir, that you send for me?" (5.2.101). Petruchio explains the meaning of this "wonder" (as Lucentio and Hortensio call it):

"Marry, peace it bodes, and love, and quiet life, / An awful rule, and right supremacy, / And, to be short, what not that's sweet and happy" (5.2.109-111.) He has accomplished the "meeking" of the shrew, a now-obsolete verb used in James 3:7 in the 1526 Tyndale Bible.[15] The fortune of the meek is to "inherit the earth," so how appropriate that Baptista rewards them extravagantly: "The wager thou has won, and I will add / Unto their losses twenty thousand crowns, Another dowry to another daughter, / For she is chang'd, as she had never been" (5.2.113-16). Petruchio has indeed been "Kated" (3.2.243) in all the best ways.

He pushes his advantage using her preferred name: "Katherine, I charge thee, tell these headstrong women / What duty they do owe their lords and husbands" (5.2.131-32). I'd like to call Katherine's final speech the one where she demonstrates that she is a marital peacemaker—"Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called children of God"—with her quote from the Book of Common Prayer:[16]

> I am asham'd that women are so simple
> To offer war where they should kneel for peace,
> Or seek for rule, supremacy, and sway,
> When they are bound to serve, love, and obey.

However, her words unleash domestic strife in the other marriages. It works, though, for Katherine and Petruchio as they leave to consummate their marriage ("Come, Kate, we'll to bed" [5.2.185]) after inheriting both the earth and the kingdom of heaven.

* * *

Dale G. Priest, in "Katherina's Conversion in *The Taming of the Shrew*,"[17] uses Biblical passages to support a parallel interpretation to the husband's taming of his wife: it is the Lord's conversion of a wayward soul. Priest acknowledges that "To argue for a thoroughgoing parallel between Petruchio and Christ would be a bit reckless" because of the former's initial mercantile motive and general lack of humility.[18] However, Priest points to parallels such as these: a theological analogy whereby a lord makes Sly a new creature in his own image, sophistical verbal manipulation whereby Petruchio transforms Katherine's "railing" to "sweet singing," the transvaluation of a "last" figure into a "first" figure (Katherine in Baptista's household, then in Petruchio's) as Jesus did for the uncouth and despised who became his apostles, the metaphorical use of clothing as a teaching device about the exterior vs. interior person, echoing Matthew 6:25-27, and the example of trials that bless when they result in steadfastness and wisdom as described in James' Epistle.[19]

I base my parallel reading on Augustine's concepts (primarily) in the *Confessions*. In the 11th book, he writes:

> Our hope is that we may cease to be miserable in ourselves and may find our beatitude in you; for you have called us to be poor in spirit, to be meek, to mourn, to hunger and thirst for righteousness, to be merciful and pure-hearted, and to be peacemakers.[20]

Elsewhere he discusses perversion vs. conversion, habit, will vs. grace, the love of beauty, the interior vs. the exterior person, and obedience and charity. Scholars who have noted Augustine's influence on Shakespeare include Ann Livermore and Roy Battenhouse. In "Shakespeare and St. Augustine," Livermore finds evidence of *The Confessions* and *The City of God* in many of the plays: the major tragedies, especially *Hamlet*; the Roman plays; *Measure for Measure*; and *The Comedy of Errors*. In *Shrew*, she notes the setting in Northern Italy where Augustine experienced his conversion and a parallel between Christopher Sly and the "jolly, drunken beggar" on a Milanese street who provokes Augustine to consider how cheaply and easily the drunkard attains a temporary state of joy that costs Augustine and his friends so much intellectual effort in Book 6. Like Petruchio, Augustine desires a well-dowered wife in a well-ordered marriage. Like Lucentio, Augustine and his friends intend to take courses. Like Katherine, he haltingly learns obedience. He repeatedly needs "[plucking] out of the mire" and painful reminders that all earthly goods are secondary to God.[21]

I don't claim that Shakespeare intended *Shrew* as anything but a money-making farce. Christianity, though, permeated his society. In a *Shakespearean Newsletter* interview, John Velz told Michael P. Jensen that Shakespeare had experience in three denominations: Catholic, Anglican, and Huguenot.[22] David Danielle, in "Shakespeare and the Protestant Mind"[23] and "Reading the Bible,"[24] argues that England by the 1500s was a thoroughly Protestant, i.e., a Bible-reading culture. Shakespeare may have read or heard about Augustine's works or those of Luther, an Augustinian friar.

Instead, then, of Petruchio taming Kate, let's see how God uses the Holy Spirit to present Christ's beatitudes and infuse her soul with faith. The human soul must decide which to love and value most: its gaze is turned upward to God in conversion or downward towards earthy matters in perversion.[25] Alternatively, Augustine says, "my weight is my love, and wherever I am carried, it is this weight that carries me. Fire rises, stone falls.[26] For every occurrence of evil, the soul pays with "a wound in being, a lack or privation of some perfection that is expected to be present but is not."[27]

On the day of the wedding, Katherine is in the "hilding" phase exemplified by the horribly diseased horse Petruchio rides. Augustine's attachment was to lust, or as he admitted, he was "[i]n love with loving."[28] "[His] soul's health was consequently poor. It was covered in sores."[29] Augustine's description of the chain that binds him applies to Katherine who drags her sister onstage by a thick cord or chain to which she, too, holds fast:

> [I]t was no iron chain imposed by anyone else that fettered me, but the iron of my own will. The enemy had my power of willing in his clutches, and from it had forged a chain to bind me. The truth is that disordered lust springs from a perverted will; when lust is pandered to, a habit is formed; when habit is not checked, it hardens into compulsion. These were like interlinking rings forming what I have described as a chain, and my harsh servitude used it to keep me under duress.[30]

Bianca protests: "Good sister, wrong me not, nor wrong yourself, / To make a bondmaid and a slave of me. . . . Unbind my hands" (2.1.1-4). Katherine's anger may come from her desire to be a wife: she asks her sister which suitor she prefers; savvy Bianca assures her: "If you affect [Hortensio], sister, here I swear / I'll plead for you myself but you shall have him" (2.1.14-15). And then continues: "Is it for [Gremio] you do envy me so?" (2.1.18).

A wayward soul like Augustine, Katherine is helpless to free herself. She needs a deliverer who, in Augustinian terms, can give her justification or righteousness (synonyms for each other) and these can come only by grace or a gift of God—should God choose to give it. In the case of Paul, the Lord says: "[H]e is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel."[31]

Like Augustine, Kate can only wait for light to dissipate her darkness. Augustine's deliverance came in a garden in the prompting to "pick up and read" Paul's letters. What he saw in Romans 13 applies to both Katherine and Petruchio: "'Not in dissipation and drunkenness, nor in debauchery and lewdness, nor in arguing and jealousy; but put on the lord Jesus Christ and make no provision for the flesh or the gratification of your desires.'"[32]

As the Lord chose Paul and Augustine, he chooses (as Petruchio) Katherine: "Will you, nill you, I will marry you. Now Kate, I am a husband for your turn," i.e., her conversion "from a wild Kate to a Kate / Conformable as other household Kates" (2.1.264-71). To Baptista and the suitors, he declares: "I choose her for myself. / If she and I be pleas'd, what's that to you?" (2.1.295-96).

There's no falling in love without finding someone or something beautiful. Augustine writes of the "concupiscence of the eyes" which "pursues the beautiful, the melodious, the fragrant, the tasty, and the silky"[33] and then, after the garden experience, "Late have I loved you, Beauty so ancient and so new."[34] Of his Kate, Petruchio declares: "[B]y this light, whereby I see thy Beauty, / Thy beauty that doth make me like thee well" (2.1.266-67). The danger—the perversion—is falling in love with temporal things such as a hat and dress. Petruchio corrects Katherine with his deliberate misunderstanding: "I love thee well in that thou lik'st [the cap] not" (4.3.83). His instruction mirrors that in the Sermon on the Mount:

> Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? Or, What shall we drink? Or? Wherewithal shall we be clothed? . . . for your heavenly Father knoweth that you have need of all these things. But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.[35]

Even if Kate desires to please her savior, the course of true obedience doesn't run smoothly because her will is divided against itself. Augustine marvels: "The mind commands the body and is instantly obeyed; the mind commands itself, and meets with resistance . . ."[36] The most important definition of the relation of grace to free will in the Middle Ages was Augustine's: "Will is to grace as the horse is to the rider."[37] Kate's will is eventually surmounted: "For it is you, Lord, who will light up our darkness. From you derives our garment of light, and in you our darkness will be bright as noon."[38]

Katherine (in stage and film productions) does indeed wear a new dress for her homecoming. On their journey, the couple compliment each other: he praises the brightness of the moon, a feminine symbol: "I say it is the moon that shines so bright" (4.5.4) while she first declares of the masculine symbol: "I know it is the sun that shines so bright" (4.5.5). It doesn't matter which is illuminating the sky because the vaster difference is that "between Light as source and that which is lit up by another."[39] This Jack and Jill have fair interiors and exteriors—in contrast to the drinking vessels in Petruchio's home of which only one attribute could be expected when Grumio asks: "Be the Jacks fair within, the Jills fair without, the carpets laid, and everything in order?" (4.1.44-45).

At "our father's" house (as Priest highlights)[40], Katherine demonstrates in her paean to her lord's graciousness that hers is a

filial rather than a servile obedience (in the latter, one desires external rewards or fears punishments; in the former, one obeys from love because one delights in the loveliness of God). Obedience or charity is following Christ's twofold commandment of love: first, love God with one's whole heart, mind, and strength and, second, love one's neighbor as oneself in God (which consists of helping him or her to find the ultimate happiness that is loving God).[41] Katherine acknowledges her dependence: "Our strength as weak, our weakness past compare, / That seeming to be most which we indeed least are" (5.2.175-6).

Roy Battenhouse, in "Augustinian Roots in Shakespeare's Sense of Tragedy," uses *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Macbeth*, and other plays to illustrate that "[o]ne of the significant features of Shakespearean tragedy is imagery that frequent echoes Bible language or paradigm, even when the play's setting is pagan."[42] He suggests that the "double-level language" is reminiscent of Augustine's aphorism that "'souls in their very sins seek but a sort of likeness to God, in a proud and perverted, and, so to say, slavish freedom.'"[43] Shakespeare follows his medieval predecessors in using analogy as a principle of dramatic construction: horizontal or linear analogy (the porter scene in *Macbeth* is Macbeth's tragic situation in comic terms) and vertical analogy (Macbeth sees the handle of the dagger as an emblem of his mission, which is a perversion of devotion to the cross).[44] A comedy, too, can offer the "theological reflection"[45] encouraged by vertical analogy: Katherine as Petruchio's bride, their souls as brides of Christ.

Notes

1. All references are to the Arden edition. William Shakespeare, *The Taming of the Shrew*, ed. Brian Morris (Walton-on-Thames, Surrey: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1981).
2. Morris, 174-75.
3. Morris, 174.
4. Morris, 153.
5. Morris, 198.
6. *KJV* Matt. 5:4.
7. Morris, 226-28.
8. William Shakespeare, *The Taming of the Shrew*, Utah Shakespearean Festival, Cedar City, Summer 2004.
9. William Shakespeare, *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*, ed. David Bevington, 4th ed. (New York: Longman, 1997), 131.
10. Morris, 249.
11. Morris, 266.
12. *KJV* Acts 9:5.
13. *KJV* Matt. 14:13-21 and Mark 6:35-44.

14. *KJV* Matt. 15:32-38, Mark 8:1-9.

15. *The Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary*, vol. 1 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), 1761.

16. Morris, 296.

17. Kay K. Cook, "The Taming of the Shrew," *Midsummer Magazine: The Magazine of the Utah Shakespearean Festival*, Summer 2004, 10.

18. Dale G. Priest, "Katherina's Conversion in *The Taming of the Shrew*," *Renascence* 47.1 (Fall 1994): 32.

19. Priest, 32-37.

20. Augustine, *The Confessions*, intro, trans., and notes Maria Boulding, O.S.B., ed. John E. Rotelle, O.S.A. (Hyde Park, New York: New City Press), 284.

21. Ann Livermore, "Shakespeare and St. Augustine," *Quarterly Review* 303 (1965): 181-93.

22. Michael P. Jensen, "Talking Books with John W. Velz," *Shakespeare Newsletter* 52:3 (Fall 2002): 73-74.

23. David Daniell, "Shakespeare and the Protestant Mind," *Shakespeare Survey: An Annual Survey of Shakespeare Studies and Production*, vol. 54: *Shakespeare and Religions*, ed. Peter Holland (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001): 1-12.

24. David Daniell, "Reading the Bible," in *A Companion to Shakespeare*, ed. David Scott Kastan (Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, Inc., 1999), 158-71.

25. Augustine, *The Essential Augustine*, ed. Vernon J. Bourke, 2nd ed. (Indianapolis, Indiana: Hackett Publishing Company, 1985), 43.

26. Augustine in Boulding, 348.

27. Augustine in Bourke, 44.

28. Augustine in Boulding, 75.

29. Augustine in Boulding, 75.

30. Augustine in Boulding, 192.

31. *KJV* Acts 9:15.

32. Augustine in Boulding, 207.

33. Augustine in Boulding, 273.

34. Augustine in Boulding, 262.

35. *KJV* Matt 6:31-33.

36. Augustine in Boulding, 201.

37. Augustine, *De Liberio Arbitrio* 388-396, quoted in John Bartlett, *Familiar Quotations: A Collection of Passages, Phrases and Proverbs Traced to Their Sources in Ancient and Modern Literature*, ed. Emily Morison Beck, 15th and 125th anniversary ed. (Boston: Little, Brown, 1980), note #26, 128b.

38. Augustine in Boulding, 347.

39. Augustine in Boulding, 323.

40. Priest, 37.

41. Phillip Cary, "Faith Love, and Grace" in *Augustine: Philosopher and Saint* (Chantilly, Virginia: The Teaching Company, 1997), audiocassette 7.

42. Roy Battenhouse, "*Augustinian Roots in Shakespeare's Sense of Tragedy*," *The Upstart Crow* 20 (1986): 1.

43. Battenhouse, 1.

44. Battenhouse, 6-7.

45. Battenhouse, 7.

Parrot, Parody, and Paronomasia: Damnable Iteration in *Henry IV, Part I*

Michael Flachmann
California State University, Bakersfield

The skies of *Henry IV, Part I* are aflutter with talking birds. In act one, scene three, for example, after the abrupt termination of his interview with the king, Hotspur angrily vows to train a starling to speak "Nothing but Mortimer" in harassment of "this vile politician Bolingbroke" (221-223, 238).[1] Elsewhere in the same scene, Percy claims that the foppish lord who demanded his prisoners on the battlefield was little more than a "popinjay" (49) or a noisy parrot, while Kate later calls her choleric husband a "paraquito" (2.3.79) when he refuses to answer questions about his preparation for war. Likewise, Hal and Falstaff discuss cuckoos (which mimic cries of other birds) and sparrows in 2.4.341-350, estridges and eagles bate the wind in 4.1.97-99, and Worcester in 5.1.60-61 accuses the king of mistreating his family "As that ungentle gull the cuckoo's bird / Useth the sparrow." Most memorable, perhaps, is Hal's metaphoric indictment of the intellectually challenged Francis, who has "fewer words than a parrot, and yet the son of a woman" (2.4.96-97). Like Hotspur, Francis has descended a full link on the Great Chain of Being, reducing both men to bestial parodies of the divine potential encoded within their immortal souls. These omnipresent chattering birds, mocking their surroundings with satiric glee, are emblematic of a play in which echo, resonance, and mimicry reverberate throughout the dramatic landscape. Such repetition is not only evident in the language and action of the script, but also reveals important truths about Shakespeare's experimentation with the relatively new genre of historical drama so popular in England at the time and helps explain why *Henry IV, Part I* is arguably Shakespeare's most admired, accessible, and satisfying history play.

An important early example of this repetition can be found in the many parodic games played by Hal and Falstaff in the "churls

gone wild" sections of the script—the most delightful of which we might dub "Name that Proverb," in which one contestant offers a sustained prose version of a well-known saying or maxim, while the other attempts to guess its more economical equivalent. In 1.2, for instance, after Falstaff's lengthy depiction of the "old lord of the council" who railed at him unsuccessfully in the street, Hal correctly deduces that Falstaff is referring to the adage "wisdom cries out in the streets and no man regards it" (1.2.80-87). When Falstaff subsequently praises his young companion's "damnable iteration" (88), he refers, of course, to Hal's skill at repeating phrases with a satiric twist—that is, to "damn" or ridicule through comic repetition. Like the chattering birds elsewhere in the script, this "damnable iteration" is everywhere apparent, especially in the ubiquitous puns or paronomasia that bring humor to the dialogue while simultaneously supporting the action of a play deeply indebted to parody.

A mere fifty lines into the script, for instance, the king mimics Westmoreland's report of "uneven and unwelcome news" with the "smooth and welcome news" brought by Sir Walter Blunt concerning Hotspur's victory (1.1.50, 66). Similarly, Falstaff refashions the word "thieves" through such genteel euphemisms as "Diana's foresters," "gentlemen of the shade," and "minions of the moon" in 1.2.24-26. Verbal echoes such as "were it not here apparent that thou art heir apparent" (1.2.55-56), the quibble on "obtaining of suits" (69), the incessant repetition of " when thou art king," and Hal's sun/son puns all characterize a relationship between the two friends that thrives on what Falstaff casually refers to as "unsavory similes" (77). Even the play's occasional couplets provide a verbal context emphasizing repetition and parody—particularly in such slant rhymes as "deaths"/"this" (3.2.158-160) and "horse"/"corpse" (4.1.122-123), in which the second rhyming word of the couplet always mocks the first.

The remainder of the script, in fact, is laced with parody: Falstaff mimes a preacher in 1.2.147-153; Hotspur imitates the foppish courtier in his speech before the king in 1.3; the Second Carrier echoes Gadshill's request for a lantern (2.1.38-39); Falstaff copies the jargon of thieves in 2.2.84-87; Hotspur ridicules the letter of the unsympathetic lord in 2.3; Kate acts out Hotspur's nightmare references to "sallies" and "retires" in 2.3.50-56; Poins and Hal continually call for Francis the Drawer (2.4.35-80); Hal impersonates Hotspur and Kate in his "Fie upon this quiet life, I want work" speech (2.4.102-109); Falstaff repeats then exaggerates the number of men with whom he fought (2.4.200-227); Hal and

Falstaff mirror each other's invective-filled diatribes in 2.4.220-244; Bardolph's "Choler, my lord, if rightly taken" is echoed by Hal's "No, if rightly taken, halter" (2.4.320-321); Falstaff reiterates his own praise in "sweet Jack Falstaff, kind Jack Falstaff, valiant Jack Falstaff . . . and old Jack Falstaff" (469-472); Glendower and Hotspur parody each other with "He wisheth you in heaven . . . And you in hell" (3.1.9); Glendower brags that he can "command the devil" while Hotspur counsels him to "shame the devil / By telling truth" (3.1.53-55); Lady Mortimer's Welsh lament is repeated in perfect English by her father (3.1.188-215); when Kate admonishes Hotspur to listen to "the lady sing in Welsh," he counters that he would rather hear "Lady my brach howl in Irish" (3.1.229-230); Hotspur mimics Kate's "Not mine, in good sooth" with his own litany of tepid oaths (3.1.240-250); the king reminds Hal of the time Richard II was mocked by "gibing boys" (3.2.66); and Hal's pledge to his father that he "will die a hundred thousand deaths" reverberates two lines later with the king's "A hundred thousand rebels die in this" (3.2.158-160).

These verbal parallels are themselves echoed and underscored by situational repetition, which is likewise abundant throughout the play and which helps distinguish *Henry IV, Part I* as a self-consciously parodic play. Just as Hotspur's talking starling and Hal's reference to Francis as a dim-witted parrot introduce the motif early in the script, another important image confirms the technique near its conclusion—the specter of counterfeit kings. After Douglas kills Sir Walter Blunt in 5.3, for example, Hotspur explains that his victim was "Semblably furnished like the King himself" (21), but was not, in fact, the royal object of their search. "The King hath many marching in his coats" (25), confesses Hotspur, to which Douglas angrily replies, "I will kill all his coats! / I'll murder all his wardrobe, piece by piece, / Until I meet the King" (26-28). One scene later, when Douglas finally confronts Henry on the battlefield, he moans in exasperation, "Another king! They grow like Hydra's heads" (5.4.24), which is itself a classical image of uncontrollable repetition. "What are thou," he continues, "That counterfeitest the person of a king? (5.4.24-27). Told he is speaking to the king himself, not another of his "shadows" (5.4.29), Douglas admits, "I fear thou art another counterfeit, / And yet, in faith, thou bearest thee like a king— / But mine I am sure thou art, whoe'er thou be, / And thus I win thee" (34-37).

This metaphor of counterfeiting, which further develops the motif of parody and repetition in the play, is introduced earlier by Falstaff when he counsels Hal never to "call a true piece of gold a

counterfeit" (2.4.485-486) and repeated later in the script with Sir John's description of his threadbare soldiers as "slaves" and "scarecrows" (4.2.24, 38). Although disguising commoners as kings was a well-known protective device in medieval warfare, the symbol of a "counterfeit" ruler in this play invites comparisons to Henry's role as a usurper and to the royal aspirations of Hal and Hotspur, each of whom has designs on the throne. A "counterfeit" king—like a "slave," a "shadow," a "scarecrow," an old knight (like Falstaff) who "bates" and "dwindles" (3.3.2), and a worthless golden coin—is a pale and devalued echo of its former self, maintaining the image of its predecessor, but not the true value beneath its facade. It is a "damnable iteration," like the fuzzy, distorted, repetitive image of a third- or fourth-generation video copy, laughable in its pretensions and constantly mimicking the original on which it is based. On another, more metatheatrical level, the counterfeiting in the script takes on deeper significance when we realize that Blunt's impersonation of the king mirrors the manner in which Shakespeare's actors simulate the roles of all the historical characters in the play. In fact, through the process of theatrical doubling so familiar to a Renaissance audience, *1 Henry IV* in performance constantly reminds attentive viewers that the same relatively small group of actors is continually entering and exiting the stage—replete with a variety of costumes, beards, and vocal accents—in a repetitive creative process that brings to life well-known personages from the recesses of English history.

Framed, therefore, between these images of talkative parrots, counterfeit kings, and recurrent actors are a number of additional parodic elements in the action and imagery of the play that complement the verbal references already discussed. Chief among these, of course, is the manner in which the comic sub-plot echoes the more substantive main plot. While Hotspur and the Percy clan are planning their rebellion, for instance, Hal is doing battle with drawers at the Boarshead, where he upbraids Poins in military jargon for having "lost much honor that thou wert not with me in this action" (2.4.20-21). Similarly, the stately verse of the main plot is mimicked by the relaxed prose of the sub-plot until Hal, by accepting his responsibility as the future king of England, changes the rhythm of his destiny with the rhythm of his speech. His first-act soliloquy, in fact, where Hal pledges to "imitate the sun" (1.2.192), introduces a proleptic progress in which he foreshadows his future princely behavior through an anticipatory "pre-echo" (or, in modern cinematic jargon, a "prequel") of his reformation.

In short, the hero's ignoble behavior at the outset of the play sets up a dramatic mirror in which the reformed prince can look back at his earlier frivolous self in triumphant maturity. Hal's prescience in this early soliloquy turns the entire play into a dramatic fulfillment of his vowed reformation in much the same fashion that Poins' 1.2 prediction about the post-robbery behavior of Falstaff is made corpulent flesh during the fat knight's epic defense of his honor in the tavern scene in 2.4. When Hal finally does break through "the foul and ugly mists / Of vapors that did seem to strangle him" (1.2.196-197), he fulfills the pledge in his 1.2 soliloquy and in his interview with his father in 3.2, thereby confirming the audience's faith in the veracity of the young prince's word and commemorating the virtue of a play that always seems to deliver what it has guaranteed.

Additional parodic events in the script include Falstaff's ludicrous description of the robbery in 2.4, which simultaneously rewrites his cowardice at the conclusion of 2.2, echoes the rebel plot to steal the throne, and is itself burlesqued by Sir John's accusation in 3.3 that his seal ring "worth forty mark" (80) has been stolen in the tavern. In this sense, Falstaff steals from others and is then himself the victim of two subsequent comic robberies. Likewise, the linguistic clumsiness of Francis parodies the verbal expertise swirling around him; Hotspur's misguided and egocentric behavior is clearly a perversion of the well-known chivalric code of honor; and Falstaff, who is an exaggerated caricature of other men because of his immense size and comic exuberance, descends to self-parody later in the play when his subdued demeanor is a weak echo of his earlier robust self. In addition, Hal and Hotspur—the twin doppelganger "Harrys"—are mirror images of each other as they move inexorably toward their final confrontation on the field of Shrewsbury, just as Falstaff and the king both serve as father figures to the young prince. Early in the play, when Henry openly wishes that "some night-tripping fairy had exchanged / In cradle-clothes our children where they lay, / And called mine Percy, his Plantagenet" (1.1.85-88), he sets up a comparison in which Hal is the "counterfeit" prince, while Hotspur is the "true piece of gold." In typical ironic fashion, however, this parodic relationship is reversed by the end of the play when Hal, in triumph over his fallen foe, ends the "double reign" of adversaries (5.4.65) and contrasts his rise in power with Hotspur's " ill-weaved" and "shrunk" ambition (5.4.65, 87).

Most impressive, perhaps, is the anticipation of the real confrontation between Hal and his father in 3.2 via the mock

interview featuring Hal and Falstaff in 2.4. The script provides, in fact, a double prefiguration of the later scene by first having Hal play himself opposite Falstaff's king, then reversing the order whereby Hal impersonates his father and Falstaff enacts the prince's part. Both playacting episodes create a sense of *déjà vu* for audience members when they are finally treated to a solemn version of the two earlier humorous scenes, thereby forecasting the script's eventual movement from comic to serious mode via the final defeat of the rebels and the restoration of royal order at the conclusion of the play. Thus the script creates a Janus vantage point whereby viewers watching the playacting scene can look backwards in time to the real-life historical interview between Hal and his father that undoubtedly took place, as well as forward to the later theatrical encounter in 3.2. In addition, we learn a great deal about this dysfunctional father-son relationship through the earlier mirror scenes involving Hal and Falstaff. Not only do the two "actors" brilliantly anticipate the speech mannerisms of the prince and his father in 2.4, but the intensity of the king's anger at his son is expertly parodied in the earlier scene. Further, Hal's "I do, I will" provides a pseudo-comic anticipation of his eventual rejection of Falstaff at the conclusion of *Henry IV, Part II*. Similarly, Falstaff's agonized "Give me my horse, you rogues, give me my horse . . ." (2.2.28-29) might be seen as a prequil to King Richard's "A horse! A horse! My kingdom for a horse" (5.4.7) in *Richard III*—but that's a topic for another paper.

This vast network of verbal and situational parody encourages us to consider other important ways in which the rhetorical device of repetition serves the script. To do so, we need to step back from the play and evaluate its proper place in Shakespeare's *Henry IV* tetralogy and in the larger scope of the author's entire series of history plays. *Henry IV, Part I* is, of course, the second play in the four-part series dealing with the beginnings of the Wars of the Roses, which surveys historical events ranging from the early 1390's to Richmond's victory over Richard III in 1485. The second tetralogy, including the first three parts of *Henry VI* through *Richard III*, was written first, yet it deals with historical events following those of the *Richard II – Henry V* series. In this sense, the *Richard II* tetralogy is itself a prequil—composed later, yet dealing with earlier historical material. All theatrical versions of history are repetitive, of course, since the very nature of the genre relies heavily on an audience's prior knowledge of past events. In these two tetralogies, for example, Shakespeare was indebted to narratives derived from Holinshed, Daniel, Hall, Froissart, and other

chroniclers of the time whose sole purpose was to provide recorded historical information for a reading public eager to learn more about its national identity. As a result, Shakespeare's plays echo and reshape his sources, which are themselves a written compilation of actual historical moments that lie at least three removes from the scripts that rehearse and popularize these actual events from the past. When Shakespeare's characters speak of the "pattern" of history, then, as they do in *The Winter's Tale* (3.2.36) and elsewhere, the phrase suggests the commonplace adage that "history repeats itself," which enables the "past" represented by these plays to become our "present" via the miracle of theatre. Through the repetitive hearing and rehearing of these well-known stories—that is, through the "rehearsal" of history—we find ourselves situated within a chronological continuum that teaches us our proper place in the universe and our complex relationship to the millions of lives that surround us.

Among these eight popular chronicle plays, therefore, Shakespeare's *Henry IV, Part I* may be viewed as the only true "comedy" since it contains rich and plentiful humor, along with a plot structure that clearly moves from problem to solution and from bad fortune to good. Perhaps the ultimate parodic element in the play, then, is found not in its repetitive language or dramatic situations, but in Shakespeare's manipulation of the genre itself. In this crucial sense, the entire play is a parody of English history, putting a positive comic spin on well-known factual events. Somewhat akin to Polonius' "tragical-comical-historical-pastoral" sub genre in *Hamlet* (2.2.398), Shakespeare is refining the relatively new dramatic category of "historical comedy," which was still in its infancy at this time in the evolutionary development of theatre. If history is a story told by the winners, then *Henry IV, Part I* may legitimately be viewed within the comic context of Hal's rise to power and eventual ascent to the kingship. Although Hotspur is a worthy antagonist, he is defeated as much by the inexorable forces of history and the inevitable movement from feudalism to nationalism as he is by the deadly sword of Prince Hal.

As a result, Shakespeare has created what *New Yorker* movie critic Anthony Lane has, in another context, called "the comedy of apocalypse"[2] by turning the horrors of war and death into a comic masterpiece. History plays are usually parodic since playwrights are always under pressure to rearrange and massage past events to yield an ending that congratulates the victors. In a more meaningful way, however, *Henry IV, Part I* is "comic" because Prince Hal is an obvious paean to Elizabeth I. For an attentive

Renaissance audience, England's "ideal king" is a prelude to England's "ideal queen" within the majestic and enduring symphony of time. Like Prince Hal, "who never promiseth but he means to pay" (5.4.43), the script of *Henry IV, Part I*—through its abundant mimicry, echo, repetition, and parody—confirms audience expectations at every turn, thereby satisfying the dramatic appetite it has so cleverly created. Though Prince Hal dwells at the center of the play's "damnable iteration," this textual repetition is violated in a single, meaningful way when the son refuses to copy the actions of his father. In order to become a mirror for magistrates, Hal must of necessity articulate a different vision of kingship than that presented by Henry IV, whose stain of usurpation and manifest behavioral flaws he must eschew before he can rightfully govern the kingdom. In this sense, the play is an intensely personal parable about a young man who breaks out of the repetitive and parodic world around him to find his own unique and ultimately "comic" path to the throne of England.

Notes

1. All quotations are taken from *Henry IV, Part I*, The Arden Shakespeare, edited by David Scott Kastan (London: Methuen, 2002).

2. "This Is Not a Movie," *The New Yorker*, Anthony Lane, 9/24/01, p. 79.

UNDERGRADUATE PAPER

The Queen Triumphant: Gender and Power Struggles in *The Winter's Tale*

Sarah Carr
University of Puget Sound

Despite the strongly patriarchal atmosphere in which they were produced, many of Shakespeare's plays explore altered versions of standard gender and power relationships that call into question or even subvert the patriarchal paradigm. MacDonald touches on this in his essay "The Unheimlich Maneuver," in which he states that "power in Shakespeare's dramatic worlds often devolves from some rather unlikely sources, and... those who wield the most impressive shows of power are altogether likely to harbor fatal weaknesses".[1] In the case of *The Winter's Tale*, this unexpected source of power is a strong female character—the queen Hermione—and the weak and blustering authority figure is the acknowledged absolute ruler of Sicilia. King Leontes is an emotional, irrational man who is insecure about his position of power and is mistrustful of his wife because of the influence that she wields over him; Hermione for her part possesses a combination of dignity and self-control that appears to intimidate her husband. Shakespeare pits these two characters against each other in a highly charged and destructive power struggle. Many readers and critics interpret the end of this struggle as the [graceful] capitulation of the queen, which re-emphasizes the power of her husband and upholds the patriarchal values of Elizabethan England, or as an emphasis on feminine gentility that also stays within these same traditional bounds. I would argue that the play presents Hermione as a strong and powerful character, in high contrast with the weakness of her husband; that she maintains her power throughout—that the destructive insecurities of the king are ineffective in subduing her; and that her triumph is so emphatic at the end of the play that it can be read as a subversion of patriarchy.

Leontes first manifests his insecurity about his power by turning an irrationally jealous eye upon Polixenes in Act 1 Scene 2.

Although the two kings "were trained together in their childhoods, and there rooted betwixt them then such an affection" that only strengthened with age and maturation, Leontes is remarkably quick to suspect his boyhood friend of treasonous adultery (1.1.22-24).[2] His abrupt descent from professions of friendship into accusations of treachery is provoked by the display of friendly affection between Polixenes and Hermione; Leontes is extremely jealous of anyone who gains favor and (platonic) intimacy with his wife. This jealousy could be due to insecurity about his royal position—although the two kings are supposedly equals, he obviously resents the friendship between his queen and Polixenes which reinforces this state of equality—but his envy is more strongly centered in his discomfort with the queen herself. We are told that he tried for "three crabbed months" to gain Hermione's favor before she consented to marry him (1.2.104); even though she has since born him a son and is now pregnant with his second child, he still seems to be unsure of whether she is in his power, and sees the intimacy between Polixenes and Hermione as a threat to his own standing with his queen.

The irrational and paranoid "infection of [his] brains" soon expands to place Hermione herself in doubt and disgrace (1.2.147). By persuading Polixenes to stay, Hermione proves that she has more influence over the Bohemian king than Leontes does. In her supposed disloyalty, she poses an affront to his masculinity; Leontes is as fearful of being labeled as a cuckold and having his patriarchal authority flouted by a wayward female as he would be of violent insurrection. As noted previously, the king is still somewhat in awe of and uneasy about the woman he has married. By mentally debasing her to the level of a "hobby-horse" who "deserves a name/ As rank as any flax-wench that puts to/ Before her troth-plight," he raises himself above her to a position of injured innocence (1.2.278-280).

As his insecurities drive him further into a state of misguided and desperate vindictiveness, he becomes more and more the delusional tyrant. He invents "a plot against [his] life and [his] crown" supposedly contrived by the objects of his insane jealousy, and has Hermione imprisoned for her imagined betrayal (2.1.49). When his daughter is born and Paulina presents her to Leontes as evidence of the queen's innocence, he instead interprets the infant as yet another threat to his power. He is so tormented by his cancerous inferiority complex and so eager to obliterate any reminder of his incompetence and imagined 'cuckoldry' and to reaffirm his position of power that he is willing to take the life of a helpless infant.

During the scene with the newborn Perdita, Paulina warns the king that his irrational behavior "savours of tyranny" (2.3.119-120); by the time of Hermione's trial, Leontes has degenerated to true despotism. In an obvious attempt to reinforce his power and ensure that his queen is not proven innocent—an event which would bring more shame upon him than her supposed guilt ever could—he sets up an autocratic court of law, in which he is both accuser and judge. He pays no attention to the composed, graceful defense of the queen, clinging to the delusions that allow him to denigrate and dominate her by believing her false and condemning her to death.

In his attempts to quell his insecurities and reaffirm his position of absolute authority, he oversteps the bounds of friendship, loyalty, and even law. But when he challenges the power of the divine, he is at last undone. Apollo himself intercedes for the queen, disclosing through his oracle that "Hermione is chaste, Polixenes blameless," and "Leontes a jealous tyrant" (3.2.132-133). In desperation, Leontes cries out that "there is no truth at all i'th'oracle. The sessions shall proceed. This is mere falsehood" (3.2.139-140). He claims to possess greater authority than the god, thereby inciting the wrath of the divine and causing the death of his son, the loss of his queen, and the destruction of his power, honor, and credibility. The close of the first three acts of *The Winter's Tale* leaves Leontes a reviled and remorseful tyrant; his jealousy and vengeful attempts to conquer his wife and keep her "within [his] power" have only reinforced her blameless superiority and caused his own downfall into infamy (2.3.26).

Hermione's character provides a striking contrast to that of her husband. While he gropes for every possible opportunity to display his authority and allows his own emotions and insecurities to dictate his actions, she remains calm and rational. Anna Jameson, in her nineteenth-century examination of the character traits of Shakespeare's heroines, describes this "exterior calm" as an indication of "the most profound pathos, the most vivid impression of life and internal power".[3] She credits the queen with a "perfect command over her own feelings" and "complete self-possession" that allow her to maintain her dignity and power, despite her husband's jealous attempts to wrest them from her.[4]

It is apparent that Hermione has possessed this internal power and has exercised it over Leontes for as long as she has known him. As mentioned above, she kept him waiting for months before finally consenting to be his wife. Given his easily manipulated and inconstant emotions, he probably 'fell in love' with her without

thinking and immediately began pressuring her to marry him; Hermione, on the other hand, held him off and let "three crabbed months sour themselves to death" before making the decision to become his queen (1.2.104). We see therefore that even in the early stages of their courtship, Hermione was the more powerful partner—a fact that Leontes seems to be very aware of and uncomfortable with, given the fact that he still rebukes her for holding him off after years of marriage.

When Leontes comes to rail at his wife with his fanciful accusations and order her imprisonment in Act 2 Scene 1—the first actual confrontation between the two—Hermione maintains her composure remarkably well. Although confused and horrified by his slanderous allegations, she does not become irrationally angry or defensive, nor does she throw back insults at her husband, even when he calls her a "traitor," "bedswerver," and "adulteress" (2.1.91,95,90). Leontes is acting and speaking completely on misguided emotion, and is obviously trying to rouse an emotional response from her; if she bursts into tears and wails at his feet or pleads with him for mercy, he will gain what he wants—the upper hand in their relationship. Hermione, however, does not weep or plead. She tells her husband calmly, "You, my lord, / Do but mistake," and warns him that he will regret his irrational and slanderous behavior (2.1.82-83). She then turns to the lords witnessing this power struggle to explain that she is "not prone to weeping, as [her] sex/ Commonly are" but that instead she has "That honourable grief lodged [within her] which burns/ Worse than tears drown" (2.1.110-111,113-114). Her self-control and her announcement of her intent to be patient and rely upon the rationality of the court further arouses Leontes' jealousy and rage. He interrupts with "Shall I be heard?", trying once more to assert his control over the situation. Although the scene ends with Hermione's imprisonment, the queen leaves as composed and "honourable" as ever, having won yet another battle in the constant power struggle between Leontes and herself. She has maintained not only her dignity but the support of the lords, who plead with the king on her behalf and re-emphasize the irrationality and foolishness of his behavior.

The trial of Hermione can be seen as the culminating battle between the king and queen. He sets himself up as both the righteous accuser and the discerning judge (and comes off instead as the false accuser and the tyrannical judge) in a last-ditch effort to establish his superiority; she comes armed only with her own self-control. In her defense, she once again refuses to weep, plead,

or say anything that will weaken her position of blamelessness. "Innocence shall make false accusation blush, and tyranny tremble at patience," she says, predicting her own triumph, and she contrasts her dignity with the jealousies and lawless rigour of Leontes (3.2.29-31). "For honour, 'tis a derivative from me to mine, and only that I stand for" (3.2.42-44). She directly challenges the king's affectations of absolute power by appealing to "powers divine" to vindicate her and to Apollo to be her judge (3.2.27,115). The god obliges this petition in the message of the oracle, which declares her beyond doubt to be honourable and chaste and demotes Leontes to a jealous tyrant.

Predictably, Leontes does not take this emphatic defeat well; he challenges the authority of the god and condemns his wife to death. When Apollo punishes this affront by immediately killing Mamillius, Hermione exacts her own vengeance upon the king by faking her own death.[5] She refuses to allow him the luxury of repenting of his "injustice," of carrying out his intent to continue to husband her (3.2.146)—instead she escapes his court and leaves him to be racked by remorse and "shame perpetual" (3.2.237).

During her sixteen-year absence, it is evident that Hermione's power over her husband continues to affect Leontes. When pressured by his attendant lords to " forget [his] evil" and "forgive [him]self," he replies, "Whilst I remember/ Her and her virtues I cannot forget/ My blemishes in them" (5.1.5,6,6-8). He is still tormented by the memory of her blameless dignity, and seems to have accepted the superiority of the queen's virtues over his affectations and insecurities. Time and Paulina's persistent reminders of his guilt and her "unparalleled" nature have mellowed his raging drive for power and matured his insecure personality. He has made no attempts to replace her, even though he knows that remaining heirless will cost him the establishment of a dynasty in Sicilia; he chooses instead to mirror the long-suffering loyalty of his wife that he once made the mistake of doubting and profaning.

While Leontes grieves and pines ceaselessly for his queen, the fact that Hermione remains in seclusion for a full sixteen years indicates her complete psychological independence from him. Her memory maintains power over him, but he has no reciprocal power over her; she is content to remain in hiding until her daughter is restored and the king fully subdued. When she finally returns to the arms of her husband, she does so by descending goddess-like from a pedestal and embracing him wordlessly. Paula Berggren describes this ending as an embodiment of "the spirit of *The Winter's Tale*, which exorcises the violence of masculine jealousy and

redeems it through... patience."[6] Having conquered him, Hermione teaches Leontes the patience and self-control that are the sources of her power. "Leontes has to learn the woman's part, by unknowingly emulating Hermione as if he had tried on a woman's robes, before he can find her again."[7]

It is useful to note here a less hopeful and less subversive interpretation of the ending of the play. Marilyn Williamson, in her book *The Patriarchy of Shakespeare's Comedies*, argues that *The Winter's Tale* upholds patriarchy rather than subverting it. Although Leontes does have to learn from Hermione's patience and self-control before he can recover his wife and daughter, Williamson contends that this concession does not make him any less powerful: "the ruler has needed to absorb female values which preserve life, but those values do not alter his power."[8] Her interpretation of the play does not grant Hermione any triumph in the royal power struggle, but leaves Leontes in possession of "total authority, which absorbs and controls female creativity;" "the absolute power of the ruler to control the lives of others is unquestioned... although the ruler... may at first be tyrannical, he transcends that impulse. This change of attitude does not lessen his power."[9]

While this is reading certainly makes sense in the context of Elizabethan patriarchal attitudes, I would argue that Shakespeare is doing more here than simply reaffirming the conventional values of his day. The fall of Leontes, although it does not include his complete removal from political power, is nonetheless great enough that he cannot emerge from it unchanged; he does not transcend his irrational and tyrannical impulses on his own, but is punished by both the god Apollo and by Hermione and is forced to learn gentleness and patience over the period of sixteen years—under the 'patient' tutelage of Paulina. His continued remorseful and distracted state, even after such a long interlude, shows him to be far too dependent upon his queen to be an independent and absolute authority. She still wields such power over him that he would rather remain childless, thereby ensuring the end of the royal lineage, than dishonor her by taking another wife; a king who believes himself to be in possession of absolute power would not be likely to manifest such compunction when faced with the downfall of his dynasty. In addition, the manner in which Hermione is finally prepared to be reconciled with her husband—in a chapel, "awakened by faith", descending from a pedestal—is too suggestive of the divine power and mystery of forgiveness to be merely the return of a forgiving and subordinate wife (5.3.95). Lastly, Shakespeare clearly portrays the queen as such a strong

character and the king as such a weak and insecure one throughout the first three acts of the play that the sudden reversal of these roles in the last scene seems unlikely; the altered power/gender relationship that he creates is too well-developed to simply be cast off at the last minute and replaced with a typical patriarchal form.

Taking into account the political and ideological atmosphere of the court for which Shakespeare wrote at this point will give more weight to my fairly radical interpretation of *The Winter's Tale*. While we as members of twenty-first century society tend to consider the idea of female equality and empowerment as a more recent development, it did in fact have a place in the courts of Europe during the Renaissance. Evidence of this can be found in Baldesar Castiglione's *The Book of the Courtier*, a definitive text of Renaissance virtues which was widely read and followed and with which the court of England during Shakespeare's time was altogether familiar. Castiglione, thro ugh the voice of his character The Magnifico Giuliano de Medici, argues that equality exists between the sexes: "male cannot be more perfect than the female, since both the one and the other are included under the species man."[10] He goes on to state that, based on the philosophical belief of the day that "those who are weak in body are able in mind," "there can be no doubt that being weaker in body women are abler in mind and more capable of speculative thought than men."[11] He describes the virtues of a great woman by citing several historical examples of women who possessed power, self-control, fortitude and loyalty. It is not farfetched, therefore, given these widely although not universally accepted ideals, to assume that Shakespeare may have based Hermione upon these characteristics and the relationship between the king and queen of Sicilia on this principle of gender equality. Giuliano asserts that "women wish to... gain their freedom and shake off the tyranny that men have imposed on them by their one-sided authority;" this can certainly be applied to Hermione's struggle against her tyrannical husband.[12] He also asserts, rather bravely, that "woman does not receive her being from man but rather perfects him just as she is perfected by him."[13] The manner in which Hermione tames Leontes by the end of the play is a reflection of at least the first half of this theory.

Giuliano's best example of female excellence is Isabella of Spain, whose name would strike a chord with the Elizabethan nobles who both adhered to the *Book of the Courtier* as a model and were the primary audience for Shakespeare's *The Winter's Tale*. Isabella was one of the most powerful and renowned figures of the Renaissance—her fame would not have lessened much in the

generation between her lifetime and Shakespeare's day. Her daughter, Katherine of Aragon, the queen rejected by England's Henry the Eighth, was the heir to her mother's grace and ability. The wrong that she suffered at Henry's hands, and her posthumous vindication through her daughter Mary who eventually came to the English throne, would be quite fresh in the minds of the Elizabethan court (although the changed religious and political clime of protestant England may have cast a less favourable light on the memory of Katherine).

Shakespeare worked directly with this history in his play *Henry VIII*, written at much the same time as *The Winter's Tale*; I will not risk digressing from my original argument by bringing in the text of a second play here, but I do wish to point out the unmistakable correlations between Hermione's self-defense in *The Winter's Tale* and the self-defense of Katherine of Aragon. Hermione's calm and graceful defense closely mirrors Katherine's—both in the Shakespeare play and in the historical account—in its intelligent and self-possessed character; and just as Katherine's bastardized (and then reclaimed) daughter continued the Tudor line, so does Hermione's daughter Perdita reappear to assure the continuation of the Sicilian dynasty. These are connections which would have been even more obvious to Shakespeare's contemporaries than they are to us. These similarities, along with Castiglione's text, provide an historical context in which the presence of both gender equality and a powerful and triumphant female savior-figure in *The Winter's Tale* is undeniable.

Notes

1. Ronald MacDonald, "The Unheimlich Maneuver: Antithetical Ways of Power in Shakespeare," in *Shakespearean Power and Punishment: A Volume of Essays*, ed. Gillian Murray Kendall (Madison: Associated University Presses, 1998), 198.

2. All Shakespeare quotes are from *The Oxford Shakespeare*, ed. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988).

3. Anna Jameson, *Shakespeare's Heroines* (London: George Bell & Sons, 1898) 160.

4. Jameson, 167.

5. It must be noted here that Hermione's reappearance at the end of the play can be interpreted either as the result of magic or as her return after living in hiding until the completion of Apollo's prophecy. I assume the latter interpretation in this paper, as it helps to strengthen my thesis. I cite in my defense Hermione's speech to her daughter: "thou shalt hear that I,/ Knowing by Paulina that the oracle/ Gave hope thou wast in being, have preserved/ Myself to see the issue" (5.3.126-129); there are several other passages that can be used to support this reading. However, in the end, it must be admitted that Shakespeare simply does not specify whether Hermione hid or was magically restored.

6. Paula Berggren, "The Woman's Part: Female Sexuality as Power in Shakespeare's Plays," in *The Woman's Part: Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare,* ed. Carolyn Lenz, Gayle Greene, and Carol Thomas Neely (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1980), 30.

7. Berggren, 30.

8. Marilyn L. Williamson, *The Patriarchy of Shakespeare's Comedies* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1986), 153.

9. Williamson, 153.

10. Baldesar Castiglione, *The Book of the Courtier,* trans. George Bull (London: Penguin Books, 1967), 218.

11. Castiglione, 218.

12. Castiglione, 221.

13. Castiglione, 221.

UTAH SHAKESPEAREAN FESTIVAL
SOUTHERN UTAH UNIVERSITY PRESS