

Shawangunk Review

State University of New York at New Paltz
New Paltz, New York

Shawangunk Review

editors

H.R. Stoneback, Director of Graduate Studies

Daniel Kempton, Department Chair

managing editor

Jason Taylor

advisory editor

Thomas G. Olsen

Shawangunk Review, the journal of the English Graduate Program, is an annual review published by the Department of English at the State University of New York at New Paltz. *Shawangunk Review* publishes literary articles of interest to the graduate students and faculty, book reviews, poetry, and reports and news about the program. The views expressed in *Shawangunk Review* are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Department of English at SUNY New Paltz. Please address all correspondence to *Shawangunk Review*, Department of English, State University of New York, New Paltz, New York, 12561.

Copyright© 2001 Department of English, State University of New York at New Paltz.
All rights reserved.

Shawangunk Review

Volume Twelve

Spring 2001

6 From the Editors H.R. Stoneback

Shakespeare 1600-2000: Art, Adaptation, Appropriation

- 8 Introduction Thomas G. Olsen
- 11 From Playhouse to Printing House;
or, Making a Good Impression David Scott Kastan
- 33 “Unhonest Desire”: Culture, Schools,
and the Misallocation of Blame in
Romeo and Juliet Scott K. Jacobs-Royer
- 39 No Law, The Law, and The Law of Grace:
Redemption in *King Lear* Brenda M. O’Connor
- 45 The Conception of Narrative Self
in *King Richard II* Eileen Abrahams
- 51 *Henry V*’s “reformation in a flood”:
The Chosen, Anointed, or Self-Appointed? Elizabeth McGuffey
- 56 Pogues Me, Kate: Shakespeare, The Irish
Wars, and *The Taming of the Shrew* Lawrence Beemer
- 62 Set Phasers on Shakespeare: The Bard
as Cultural Weapon in *Star Trek* Adam J. Romano
- 67 “Are you a Good Witch or a Bad Witch?”:
Interpreting the Relationships of Prospero,
Ariel, and Caliban in *The Tempest* through
the Mythology of Northern Europe Kevin Cavanaugh
- 74 Shakespeare in Vogue:
The Bard at the Cinema Michelle Katzen
- 80 Shakespeare’s Native Tongue:
An Assessment of the Origins
of the English Language William Van Cleave
& Debbie DePiero
-

Shawangunk Review

Poetry and Translations

85	Catherine Aldington: <i>Imagiste</i>	Catherine Aldington
89	Four Poems in French (with facing page translation by H.R. Stoneback)	Roger Asselineau
94	Wordsworth's "England! the time is come..." (a French translation)	Roger Asselineau
96	Translations from Dante and Petrarch	A.M. Cinquemani
100	"Heat"	Dennis Doherty
101	"Easter Break"	Dennis Doherty
102	"90 Feet Away from You"	David Fish
103	"Boules at Night"	Adam J. Romano
104	"At the Grave of Tom Chamberlain"	Robert Singleton
106	"Ashokan, Looking Westward"	Robert Singleton
107	"Fannie's Stories"	Robert Singleton
108	"A Lovesong for Ellen Chesser"	H.R. Stoneback
112	"Pedagogical Dilemma #1"	Christopher Tanis
113	"View of the Sculpture Farm, Shawangunk Ridge"	Pauline Uchmanowicz
114	"Hans's Backyard"	Pauline Uchmanowicz
115	"'Crab on its Back' Arles, 1889"	Robert H. Waugh
116	"Lost Causes"	Robert H. Waugh
117	"Earthquake Ocean"	Robert H. Waugh

Shawangunk Review

Essays and Book Reviews

- 118 Sound and Sense in Elizabeth Madox
Roberts's "On the Mountainside" Steven J. Florczyk
- 124 A Letter to Elizabeth Madox Roberts Jenica Shapiro
- 128 From International Trade to Shopping
in London: Lynch Reconsiders the
Eighteenth-Century Novel Nancy E. Johnson
- 131 "I'm a-liven": The Enduring Value
of Elizabeth Madox Roberts's
The Time of Man Fiona Paton
& John Langan
-
- 134 News and Notes
- 136 Guidelines for Submission
- 137 Contributors
-

From the Editors

As this issue goes to press, we have recently completed the Thirteenth Annual Graduate Symposium, “The Eighteenth-Century Novel,” held on April 4, 2001. The Symposium Director was Professor Nancy E. Johnson, who arranged an engaging program featuring papers by our graduate students and a memorable keynote address—“Expressive Individualism and the Origins of Bourgeois Morality”—by Nancy Armstrong, Professor of English and Comparative Literature at Brown University. In April 2002, Professor Fiona Paton will direct the Fourteenth Annual Graduate Symposium: “The Beats.” Watch the Graduate Bulletin Board for further announcements and a call for papers.

This issue of *Shawangunk Review* begins with David Scott Kastan’s keynote address and graduate student essays from the Twelfth Annual Graduate Symposium—“Shakespeare 1600-2000: Art, Adaptation, Appropriation”—gathered, edited and introduced by Professor Thomas G. Olsen. The editors would like to express their gratitude to Professor Kastan for granting us the right to include his address, “From Playhouse to Printing House; or, Making a Good Impression.”

We are pleased to note that this issue bears ample evidence of the extraordinary vitality of the poetry scene on the New Paltz campus, with a number of graduate student and faculty poets represented in these pages, together with, for the first time, several translations. We plan to continue and expand this focus of the *Review*, and we encourage submissions of poetry, and translations of poetry, from English graduate students and faculty as well as other readers. We also welcome submissions concerning any area of literary studies: essays, explications, book reviews, scholarly notes and queries from any graduate student in English. We also welcome submissions of poetry, and translations of poetry, from English graduate students and faculty (see submission guidelines, page 136). The deadline for all materials (including 2001 Symposium papers) for the next issue is September 30, 2001. (Book reviews should follow the model and format of Professor Johnson’s review of *The Economy of Character* on page 128.)

In this issue, to observe the 75th anniversary of Elizabeth Madox Roberts’s *The Time of Man*, one of the greatest yet most neglected American novels of the twentieth century, we include two essays on Roberts, a Roberts-related poem, and a review of the recent reissue of *The Time of Man*. Regular readers of these pages will know that the National Elizabeth Madox Roberts Society was founded by a group of New Paltz faculty and graduate students in 1999. In the short time since its founding, the Society has grown to include members from

many states and several countries and has sponsored three national Roberts Conferences in Kentucky, most recently in April 2001 at St. Catharine College. In addition, as a special 2001 commemorations of *The Time of Man*, the Society held a special reading of Roberts's work at the Kentucky Writers Day Conference (April 22), will have a session at the American Literature Association Conference in Boston (May 24-27), will sponsor a Roberts Symposium at Westfield State College in Massachusetts (September 18), and will present a Graduate Forum at New Paltz (November 13). Readers interested in the Society's programs my contact H.R. Stoneback in the English Department or Society President John Langan (langanj@matrix.newpaltz.edu).

We will continue to publish our "news and notes" columns, as space permits, and we ask that readers continue to provide information regarding the many distinguished achievements of our former and current graduate students. For example, we would like to know the details of conference participation, publications, grants, and honors, as well as news regarding progress of our MAs in Ph.D. programs and reports about teaching and employment activities. Please submit items for this column to the editors. Also, we will include in future issues an "Abstracts of MA Theses" section. Degree candidates are encouraged to consult with their advisors and to submit a Thesis Abstract of approximately 150 words for publication in the *Review*.

H.R. Stoneback

Shakespeare 1600-2000: Art, Adaptation, Appropriation

The Twelfth Annual Graduate Symposium

Introduction

For readers fortunate enough to have attended the Twelfth Annual Graduate Symposium last year, I suspect that seeing this volume will summon up a pleasant remembrance of things past—things such as a convivial, stimulating evening of six outstanding graduate-student papers and a cutting-edge keynote lecture by our guest speaker, Professor David Scott Kastan of Columbia University. The students spoke on a range of topics, each of their papers valuable and provocative in its own ways, and Kastan was both intellectually provocative and amusing. Last year's audience will not soon forget his tale of roasted budge, served up with his keen reflections on the age-old but ever-amusing cultural differences between Britons and Americans.

For those who could not make the Symposium, there is, fortunately, a remedy. Among the contributions to this year's *Shawangunk Review* are all six student papers presented at last year's event, as well as a full version of Kastan's keynote talk, called here "From Playhouse to Printing House; or, Making a Good Impression." I encourage everyone to savor these thoughtful and important interventions into the long but always exciting intellectual and cultural endeavor we call Shakespeare Studies. One of the goals of the Twelfth Annual Symposium was to offer attendees a range of approaches to a range of questions concerning the ever-expanding field of Shakespeare criticism, and I think that readers of this collection will find that this goal has been ably met by the collective efforts of our six presenters and by Professor Kastan.

In terms of thematics and approaches, the papers by Eileen Abrahams and Elizabeth McGuffey might qualify as the most traditionally "literary" in approach. Abrahams examines Richard II, who becomes a king transformed into mere commoner, in one of Shakespeare's most daring examinations of the mystique of English royalty. She applies a combination of speech-act theory, specifically through the theories of Richard Rorty and J. L. Austin, and New Historicist ideas of power (citing at one point David Scott Kastan) to arrive at a reading of Richard's loss of the crown as a loss of his very identity, a process

which in turn points up the fundamentally contingent, unstable nature of selfhood. Elizabeth McGuffey takes up a later section of the same story, suggesting in her essay on *Henry V* that Hal, now King Henry V, is at best a problematic ideal Christian king.

Brenda O'Connor and Lawrence Beemer approach their respective topics historically, and both emerge as careful readers of crucial lines that cast long, long shadows over the interpretation of, in O'Connor's case, *King Lear* and, in Beemer's, *The Taming of the Shrew*. O'Connor argues that *Lear's* ending can offer us something quite at odds with a traditional tragic conclusion, suggesting that a vision of Christian grace offsets the lawless, self-interested actions of her sisters and the villain Edmund. Beemer is interested in political rather than theological meanings, and he argues persuasively that an Irish subtext can help to explain the awkward relationship between the play proper and its Induction, which has long given readers pause and has often simply been cut by directors. He makes a case that, at very least, suggests a new and very fresh cluster of meanings for taming, submission, and the "politic reign" that Petruchio declares over Kate.

Delivering on the Symposium's implicit promise to attend to matters of Shakespearean adaptation and appropriation as well as to literary art, Scott Jacobs-Royer gives us an insightful critique of the ways that that perennial favorite of tenth-grade teachers, *Romeo and Juliet*, has been shaped and over-determined by the institutions of quick-fix criticism, study guides, and teacher resources. He argues that the play grew out of a cautionary tale of youthful impetuosity, became something far more complex in Shakespeare's version, but now risks returning to a narrow, one-dimensional moral tale whose dangers to America's youth ought to concern us all. Adam Romano, as adept at discussing the subtle play of Shakespearean dramatic conventions as he is able to analyze the cultural forces behind *Star Trek*, offers a provocative reading of one of the most sustained forms of Shakespearean appropriation known to two generations of television fans and filmgoers. He surveys the ways that Shakespeare's artistic and cultural authority are appropriated to probe deep questions of political power, current controversies, and their relation to cultural authority.

David Scott Kastan's in-depth analysis of early Shakespeare printings is, quite literally, the kind of argument that experts in the field of Shakespeare studies are treated to at top professional conferences. Blending sensitivity to the development of Shakespeare's dramatic career with hard empirical data about the ways that Shakespeare's works first appeared in print, he describes publishing conditions that even reasonably experienced lovers of Shakespeare will find amazing. "Shakespeare," it turns out, did not always make for a good advertising campaign.

Finally, this issue of *The Shawangunk Review* also contains three essays not delivered at the Symposium, but which certainly deserve their places in this volume. Kevin Cavanaugh's essay concerns the late Romance *The Tempest*. With the recent popularity of New Historical and post-colonial approaches, this play has become a battlefield of radically differing and passionately held views about not only the text's meanings, but also our collective assumptions concerning the relationship between art and politics. Michelle Gatzen offers a very perceptive discussion of Baz Luhrmann's *Romeo+Juliet*, the film version that, for better or worse, is destined to shape at least a generation or two of initiates' first image of a Shakespeare play. Deborah DePiero and William Van Cleave approach the Shakespeare canon from a linguistic and philological perspective, describing the range of Shakespeare's vocabulary in the larger context of the diversity of the English language itself.

As a group, these ten essays say several things about the current state of Shakespeare studies. First, they remind us that the field is vast, porous, and complex enough to accommodate widely different but equally compelling approaches—and compelling answers, too. Second, as I have stressed to my graduate and undergraduate students during my four years here at New Paltz, a play text is but one kind of cultural artifact, and though it necessarily remains the basis, font, and foundation of all others, both pleasure and relevance can come from analyzing what *becomes* of a play text, whether it morphs into an episode of *Star Trek*, provides the basis of a hit teen film, or takes the form of a lesson plan that your tenth-grade teacher (following the orthodoxies of the day) drilled into you oh-so many years ago. Finally, these papers attest to the good news that Shakespeare, doing just fine in our culture generally, is also alive, well, and clearly thriving in the graduate program here at New Paltz.

Thomas G. Olsen

Symposium Keynote Speaker

From Playhouse to Printing House; or, Making a Good Impression

David Scott Kastan

“Who’s that?
No one. The author.”
—*Shakespeare in Love*

As is well known, Shakespeare, at least in his role as playwright, had no interest in the printed book or in its potential readers. Performance was the only form of publication he sought for his plays. He made no effort to have them published and none to stop the publication or distribution of the often poorly printed versions that did reach the bookstalls. His own commitment to print publication was reserved for his narrative poetry.¹ *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece* were both published in carefully printed editions by his fellow townsman, Richard Field, and to each Shakespeare contributed a signed dedication. The printed plays, however, show no sign of Shakespeare’s involvement in the publication process. He wrote them for the theater and not for a reading public; for him they were scripts to be acted, not plays to be read.

On such seemingly solid ground, many teachers and scholars have rested their confidence that the proper focus of academic attention is on the plays in performance. Thereby we are assured that Shakespeare’s work is returned to the medium in which it lived. There is much to be said for such a focus, and much—too much, I often think—has been said for it. Shakespeare does, of course, “live” in the theater; there he becomes our contemporary, responsive to our needs and interests. And that seems to me to be the problem. Shakespeare in performance yields too easily to our desires. In the theater Shakespeare escapes his historicity, becoming for every age a contemporary playwright, and arguably its most important one. Like the promiscuous Hero of Claudio’s tortured imagination, he is not merely our Shakespeare, he is everybody’s Shakespeare.

But if age has not withered Shakespeare in the theater, it should not be forgotten that his theatrical vitality is possible only because the plays did reach print. If he does not “live” there quite as animatedly as he does in the theater, at very least in print he is *preserved*. It is not an entirely happy metaphor, I admit. Living beings are preferable to mummies, and print, in any case, does not preserve language as firmly as formaldehyde preserves bodies. Nonetheless, without

print there is no Shakespeare for all time. It is in the printing house that his scattered “limbs,” as Heminge and Condell say, are collected and cured, re-membered as a body of work.

This re-membering is, of course, no more exact than any other act of memory. Psychologists know that memory is never a perfect witness to the event remembered; it represses, displaces, and falsifies; nonetheless it is informative, though less as an objective representation of the event than as the overdetermined register of the event’s reception and assimilation. Print remembers similarly; it too falsifies even as it recalls and records, incorporating elements separate from that which it would overtly remember. The Shakespeare remembered in the printing house is inevitably something other than Shakespeare—both more and less than his originary presence; his corpus is reconstructed by sets of motivations and practices that leave their marks upon the text, distorting it even as they preserve and set it forth.

This is not to return to the notion of an ideal text independent of the processes of its materialization; it is to recognize that the text, like the past, is never available in unmediated form. This mediation is precisely what marks it as text, exactly as that which marks the past as past is the impossibility of an unmediated engagement with it. Shakespeare is, of course, available to us only in mediated form. One could say that this means that Shakespeare is never therefore available to us; but to the degree that this is true, it is merely an uninteresting literalism. Shakespeare is available precisely because “Shakespeare,” in any meaningful sense other than the biographical, is—and has always been—a synecdoche for the involved mediations of the playhouse and printing house through which he is produced.

The printed plays that preserve Shakespeare for us are all in various ways deficient, yet, precisely in their distance from the ideal text of editorial desire (and, as that desire projects it, authorial intention), they witness to the complex conditions of authorship that shaped his theatrical career. Shakespeare has become virtually the iconic name for authorship itself, but he wrote in circumstances in which his individual achievement was inevitably dispersed into—if not compromised by—the collaborative economies of play and book production. Nonetheless, Shakespeare’s apparent indifference to the publication of his plays, his manifest lack of interest in reasserting his authority over them, suggests how little he had invested in the notions of individuated authorship that, ironically, his name has come so triumphantly to represent. Literally, his investment was elsewhere: in the lucrative partnership of the acting company. He worked comfortably within its necessary collaborations, and clearly felt no need to claim his play texts as his own as they began to circulate in print and be read.

In this regard, Shakespeare is perhaps somewhat more anomalous than many have supposed. While no doubt the great majority of playwrights “had no mind to be a man in Print,” as Robert Davenport says of himself in his preface “To the knowing Reader” to *King John and Matilda* (1655), many playwrights did not merely allow but actively sought publication to restore their intentions to the play they had written. Although all playwrights would have anticipated that their plays would be shaped by the demands of performance, the scripts legally the property of the acting company (and the genre itself, as we are often reminded, a sub-literary form perhaps incapable of sustaining the burden of literary ambition), many playwrights consciously turned to print to preserve their creation in its intended form.

Notoriously, Ben Jonson labored to rescue his plays from the theatrical conditions in which they were produced, seeking to make available for readers a play text of which he could be said in some exact sense to be its “author.” The 1600 quarto of *Every Man Out Of His Humor* insists on its title-page that it presents the play “As It Was First Composed by the Author B. I. Containing more than hath been Publickely Spoken or Acted.” Here Jonson asserts the authority of the authorial text over the theatrical script, reversing the tendency to offer the play to a reading audience, in the familiar formula, “as it hath bene sundry times playd,” as the 1600 quarto of *Henry V* has it. Even more remarkable is the 1605 quarto of *Sejanus*, to which Jonson contributes a preface in which he again announces that the printed text is “not the same with that which was acted on the publike stage.” But in the published quarto, rather than merely restoring theatrical cuts, he has in fact removed and rewritten the work of a collaborator. While admitting that “A second pen had a good share” in what was played, in the printed text Jonson replaces the work of his unnamed co-author with his own words never acted, disingenuously claiming that his motive in inserting his own “weaker (and no doubt lesse pleasing)” language was only a reluctance “to defraud so happy a *Genius* of his right, by my lothed vsurpation” (sig. ¶2^r).

But if Jonson’s aggressive determination to extract his plays from the customary collaborations of the theater is unique, his desire for a printed text that will preserve the dramatist’s intended form is not. Other playwrights similarly saw print as the medium in which their intentions could be made visible at least to their readers. Thomas Heywood, for example, insists in his epistle “To the Reader” in the 1608 quarto of his *Rape of Lucrece* that it has not been his “custome...to commit [his] plaies to the presse”; nonetheless, on account of the copies that have “accidently come into the Printers handes” in “corrupt and mangled” form, “This therefore I was the willinger to furnish out in his natiue habit” (sig. A2^r). In 1640, Richard Brome adds an epistle to *The Antipodes* in

which the “Curteous Reader” is told that this playbook too contains “more than was presented upon the *Stage*,” where “for superfluous length (as some of the *Players* pretended),” cuts were made. Brome says that for this printed edition he thought it “good al should be inserted according to the allowed *Original*; and as it was, at first, intended for the *Cock-pit Stage*” (sig. L4^v). For Brome, print restores and preserves the play he wrote, and, incidently, his remarks reveal that it was the uncut, authorial text that was “allowed” by the Master of the Revels.

Shakespeare, however, never asserted any such proprietary right over his scripts or expressed any anxiety about their printed form. His plays, of course, were subjected to theatrical necessities, revised by various hands to allow them to play successfully within the two hours traffic of his stage, but never did Shakespeare feel obliged to “furnish” the play he wrote in its “natiue habit.” Somewhat less than half of his dramatic output ever appeared in print while he lived, and of the plays that were published none is marked by any effort on his part to insure that the printed play accurately reflected what he had written. In their epistle “to the great Variety of Readers” in the 1623 folio, Heminge and Condell tell the would-be purchasers of the volume that the collection contains Shakespeare’s plays exactly “as he conceiued the[m],” but that extravagant claim is never one Shakespeare felt inspired to make himself.

Only eighteen of his thirty-seven plays were published in his lifetime, and none in an edition that Shakespeare claimed as his own. Still, with ten reprinted one or more times, at least forty-two separate editions reached print before he died. (If one counts *The Taming of A Shrew* as Shakespeare’s, there are forty-five surviving editions of nineteen plays.) Clearly Shakespeare was not only a successful theater poet, but his plays found a substantial reading audience. The first part of *Henry IV* appeared in six editions before his death, and a seventh before the folio was published in 1623. *Richard II* was published five times, as was *Richard III*. Several other plays were reprinted three times. At the time of his death, the total number of editions of his plays far exceeded that of any other playwright, and indeed no single play to that time had sold as well as *1 Henry IV*. (Even if one extends the time frame to 1640, only three plays—the anonymous *Mucedorus*, Kyd’s *Spanish Tragedy*, and Marlowe’s *Dr. Faustus*—appeared in more editions than *1 Henry IV*’s seven, *Mucedorus*, somewhat improbably to modern taste, topping the list with 14 printings between 1598 and 1639.)

While he lived, arguably Shakespeare had some competitors for theatrical pre-eminence, but what has often been overlooked is that as a published dramatist he had none. In our various measures of Shakespeare’s greatness, we have usually ignored the fact that in his own age more editions of his plays circulated than of

any other contemporary playwright. Eventually the prolific Beaumont and Fletcher would close the gap, but they never actually surpass Shakespeare. Ironically, although he never sought his success as in print, he is the period's leading published playwright.

The reason that this has not been observed perhaps may be that print has seemed to many an inauthentic calculus of Shakespeare's achievement, but more likely it is simply that this success literally "goes without saying"; it appears to us inevitable that Shakespeare's plays would reach print and thrive in that medium. In his own time, however, that success was hardly assured. We see the drama as the most compelling cultural achievement of the age and Shakespeare as its most extraordinary figure, but Shakespeare wrote in an environment in which plays were the piece work of an emerging entertainment industry. Publishers did not rush to publish new plays, largely because there was not a large and reliable market for them. Even though William Prynne, in 1633, disgustedly insisted that play books were "now more vendible than the choicest sermons," claiming that "above forty thousand Play-bookes have beene printed and vented within these two years,"² even by his tendentious accounting, plays still represented only a small percentage of the book trade. In the 1630s, something like twenty times as many religious books (sermons, catechisms, bibles, and theological works) were sold as plays.³

Peter Blayney has usefully reminded us of what is all too easy to forget, given history's judgments on the period's cultural achievement: plays, even Shakespeare's plays, represented an insignificant piece of the book trade. They were at best a risky publishing venture. "No more than one play in five would have returned the publisher's initial investment inside five years," Blayney tells us, and "not one in twenty would have paid for itself during its first year."⁴ While Shakespeare provided some publishers with considerable profit, eight of the eighteen plays that appeared in his lifetime did not merit a second edition before he died. And it is worth remembering that *Venus and Adonis* was published in sixteen editions by 1636, seven more than even the most successful of his plays.

In spite of the literary ambitions of some playwrights, plays were generally considered ephemera, among the "riffe-raffe" and "baggage books" that Thomas Bodley would not allow in his library lest some "scandal" attach to it by their presence.⁵ Publishers did regularly assume the risk of printing plays (though, between 1590 and 1615, on average only about ten were published a year), but they could not have done so imagining that either that they were preserving the nation's cultural heritage or about to make their own fortune.

Plays were published in essence because they could be. In a commercial envi-

ronment where publishing was largely opportunistic, plays were for a publisher a relatively inexpensive investment. If they did not, as Blayney says, offer a reliable “shortcut to wealth” (p. 389), they did allow a publisher the chance to make some money without great financial exposure. Manuscripts became available, probably at a cost to the publisher of no more than two pounds. No record of any payment for a play survives, but evidence like that from the *Second Part of the Return From Parnassus*, where the printer John Danter (of whom more later) is imagined offering an author “40 shillings and an odd pottle of wine” for a manuscript, suggests that this was something like the going rate for a small book.⁶ The play text would usually be printed in small pica type on nine sheets of the cheapest available paper. For an edition of 800, which was probably all a publisher would risk, the total costs of copy, registration, and printing would be about eight pounds. With playbooks retailing at around 6d. (viz., the “testerne” the publishers of the 1609 *Troilus and Cressida* hope its readers will think “well bestowd” with the play’s purchase) and wholesaling at 4d., a publisher, especially one who sold his own books, could break even with the sale of about 400 copies and might then begin to turn a modest profit, which would average about a pound a year—certainly not a spectacular windfall but a not insubstantial contribution to the financial health of the stationer’s business.⁷

The plays that were printed, almost certainly substantially less than a fifth of the number played, arrived at their publishers from a variety of sources, and in the absence of anything like our modern copyright law, the publishers had no obligation to inquire scrupulously into their provenance. All that was legally required was that they not violate another stationer’s claim to the text. If there was no prior claim, a publisher was free to print his copy with no regard for its author’s rights or interests. As George Wither wrote in 1624: “by the lawes and Orders of their Corporation, they can and do setle vpon the particular members thereof p[er]petuall interest in such Bookes as are Registered by them at their Hall . . . notwithstanding their first Coppies were purloyned from the true owner, or imprinted without his leaue.”

Until the first modern copyright law was passed in 1709, this remained the case. Copyright belonged to the publisher, not to the author, and the legal situation, as Wither bitterly noted, served the publisher’s interest at the expense of that of both the author and the reading public: “If he gett any written Coppy into his powre, likely to be vendible; whether the Author be willing or no, he will publish it; and it shallbe contriued and named alsoe, according to his owne pleasure: which is the reason, so many good Bookes come forth imperfect, and with foolish titles.”⁸

Wither's account of the stationer's statutory freedom "to belye his Authors intentions" is largely correct, though, in fairness, most stationers did make reasonable attempts to produce an accurate text. Authors did, of course, regularly protest the failures of the printing house, as in Thomas Heywood's well-known complaint against "the infinite faults escaped in my book of *Britaines Troy* by the negligence of the printer, as the misquotations, mistaking of sillables, misplacing halfe lines, coining of strange and neuer heard of words. These being without number, when I would haue taken a particular account of the *Errata*, the printer answered me, he would not publish his owne disworkemanship, but rather let his owne fault lye vpon the necke of the Author."⁹ But such charges also drew predictable replies from the stationers, who had to work quickly and often in circumstances that militated against precision, as John Windet insisted in a preliminary to a work of biblical commentary that he printed: "Some things haue escaped, others beene mistaken, partly by the absence of him who penned this Treatise, partly by the unlegeableness of his hand in the written copy."¹⁰

But Wither's main accusation, at least with regard to the drama, is true. Stationers for the most part showed little interest in either the quality or the origin of the dramatic texts they printed; they cared mainly that it be "vendible." Textual scholars, the heirs of Wither's dismay, have often used this fact to motivate their narratives of the transmission of Shakespeare's text. They similarly have stigmatized the stationers, or at least some, as dishonest and incompetent, all too willing to attempt a quick profit by publishing a pirated text of a play. But in truth the pirates, as Blayney and Laurie Maguire, among others, have recently reminded us, are largely bogeys of our imagination, functions of an anachronistic understanding of both the playhouse and the printing house. This is not to say that publishers did inevitably purchase their copy from the author or some other apparently legitimate owner; it is, however, to emphasize that stationers knew that the author's permission was not necessary to publish the work, and knew as well that in the case of drama the very notion of authorship is problematic. In any precise sense, the only pirates, and there were some, were those publishers who undertook to print a book that properly belonged to another stationer.

Unquestionably, plays were often published without their authors' consent or even knowledge, and in forms of which no doubt their playwrights would never have approved; but this should not be taken as anything more than evidence of the usual—and fully legal—procedures of the contemporary book trade. A potential publisher would purchase a manuscript of a play, which might in some cases be authorial, though it could as well be a scribal copy made for the acting

company or for a collector, or a transcript made by one or more actors. For the potential publisher it made no difference; no one of these granted the publisher any clearer authority over the text. All he would have been concerned with was that the manuscript not cost too much, that it be reasonably legible, and that no other stationer have a claim to the play.

There are some examples of writers objecting to the publication of defective versions of their work, although these inevitably reveal how limited was their ability to oppose unauthorized publication. Usually, the most they can do is provide authorized copy to replace the unsanctioned printing. Thus, Samuel Daniel explains the publication of the second edition of his *Vision of the Twelve Goddesses* in his dedication to the Countess of Bedford:

Madame: In respect of the vnmannedly presumption of an indiscreet Printer, who without warrant hath divulged the late shewe at Court, . . . I thought it not amisse seeing it would otherwise passe abroad to the prejudice both of the Maske and the inuention, to describe the whole forme thereof in all points as it was then performed. . . .¹²

Similarly, Stephen Egerton, in a preface to the second edition of one of his sermons that had been taken down by a listener in shorthand, says that had it been his own doing originally he would have “beene more carefull in the manner of handling And therefore that which I now do, is rather somewhat to qualify an error that cannot be recalled, then to publish a worke that may be in any way greatly commodious to other.”¹³ Both Daniel and Egerton are frustrated by the deficient texts that were published, but neither assumes that the publication of an unauthorized text is a legal issue. In the face of the publication of texts that neither author either delivered to or saw through the press, both realize that they have little recourse except to provide a better text for a new edition.

Regardless of the title-page claims, playbooks were often unauthorized, published, that is, in editions that differed not only from the author’s intended text but even from the text as it had been reshaped in performance; but these were not *illegal* printings; they do not provide evidence of criminal or dishonest business practices. Indeed, this is true even for the so-called “bad quartos” of Shakespeare’s plays. While these editions differ substantially from the familiar versions in which we know the play, and are arguably inferior if not corrupt, there is nothing to suggest their publishers knew them so. They operated in these cases very much as they did in all other publishing ventures, purchasing a play text on which they thought they might make a profit by having it printed and sold.

A published play text, we should remember, was not a priceless literary relic but a cheap pamphlet; it represented not the immortal words of a great writer but the work of professional actors whose skill involved improvisation as much as recall. The play itself had various lives in different theatrical venues, each of which would enforce changes upon the text. Why then would a publisher ever think in terms of the reliability or authority of the text?

Yet even if, however improbably, he did, how would a publisher recognize textual corruption? We hear a mangled phrase from a bad quarto, and our familiarity with the received text instantly reveals the deficiency. “To be, or not to be, I there’s the point.” There is no more familiar or compelling evidence of the manifest deficiency of Q1 *Hamlet* (sig. D4v). But if we did not know the more familiar version, would we think the line flawed? And indeed the putative corruption—“I there’s the point”—is, of course, a perfectly uncorrupt Shakespearean line. It appears in *Othello*, after Othello painfully comes to see that his worst fears about Desdemona’s betrayal must be true, revealingly in language that shows how fully he has internalized the pernicious racism that Iago exploits: “And yet how Nature erring from it selfe.” Iago instantly interrupts, determined that there should be no retreat from the damning knowledge: “I, there’s the point” (3.3.231-32, TLN 1854-5). In *Othello*, the line marks a moment of unmistakably Shakespearean power along the tragic trajectory of the play; in *Hamlet* it marks the corruption of the text.

The example may be too neat, and in fairness when one looks at the whole speech in Q1 *Hamlet*, one does find unmistakable signs of logical and syntactic jumble that seems more a function of the troubled transmission of the text than of the troubled mindset of its hero. Nonetheless, the initial question stands. Would a publisher who has come into possession of Q1 have any reason to be suspicious of the text he had purchased? At least at the level of text, the answer, I would insist, is “no,” though with *Hamlet* there is another factor that complicates the issue. (I suppose with *Hamlet* there is always another factor that complicates the issue.)

Q1 *Hamlet* was published by Nicholas Ling and John Trundle in 1603; the play, however, had been registered to James Roberts on 26 July 1602. If the quality of the text was not unduly strained, the quality of their right to it seems to be. Roberts’s entry establishes his title to the play, a title that is apparently violated by the edition that Ling and Trundle publish. Ling and Trundle are here perhaps truly pirates, not because they print a text in unauthorized form or one that had come to them via some actor but because they print a text registered to another stationer.

Nonetheless, I wonder if the ease with which we attribute piracy here is still not more a function of our textual expectation than of its publishing history. The usual account is that Ling and Trundle have indeed published what Fredson Bowers calls “a memorially reconstructed pirate text.”¹⁴ A second quarto is, of course, published late in 1604, “Printed by I. R. for N.L.,” as its title-page has it, that is, printed by James Roberts for Nicholas Ling. This quarto announces itself as “Newly imprinted and enlarged to almost as much againe as it was, according to the true and perfect Coppie.” It is consciously designed to supplant the first, offering itself as new and improved, or, actually, new and restored, some 1600 lines longer than Q1. The deficiencies of the earlier text are here replaced by authorized copy. Trundle’s absence from the publishing arrangements of the second quarto have been taken as evidence that he was the supplier of the corrupt copy for Q1, and the co-operation of Roberts and Ling is seen as a pragmatic compromise that acknowledges Roberts’s *de jure* title and Ling’s *de facto* right. In the familiar textual history, Q2 marks the victory of truth and justice. The “memorially reconstructed pirate text” is replaced by a properly authorial version, and the rights of the abused stationer are restored.¹⁵

It is a good story, but it isn’t necessarily or even very probably true. Roberts, who was a printer rather than a publisher, had on numerous occasions entered material that was eventually published by another stationer but was printed by Roberts. The entries seem to be for him usually a way of reserving work for himself without risking the capital that publication would involve. Roberts, for example, entered *The Merchant of Venice* in 1598, and two years later printed it for its eventual publisher, Thomas Hayes. Ling, on the other hand, was a publisher who, as Gerald Johnson has written, characteristically depended on “other stationers who located copy and brought it to him for help in publishing the editions,” often with the printing job reserved for them as their reward.¹⁶ Ling and Roberts also were well known to one another; twenty three editions published by Ling came from Roberts’s press. (Trundle, too, had employed Roberts, indeed in the very year that Q1 *Hamlet* was published.¹⁷) And title to *Hamlet* seems to have unproblematically settled on Ling, since he transfers it without question to John Smethwick in 1607. Given these relationships, what seems most likely is that the publication of Q1 *Hamlet* was less piratical than pragmatic, the result of a rather ordinary set of prudent arrangements between stationers. The only thing that fits uncomfortably with this thesis is that Roberts did not in fact get to print Q1 *Hamlet*, though the traffic in his print shop (it was the third busiest year of Roberts’s career in terms of the number of books printed and probably the heaviest measured by sheets printed) may well have made it impossible to accept

the job when it came due. For us it may seem incredible that a printer would pass up the opportunity to work on *Hamlet*, but job schedules would override any literary considerations; and, in any case, many things for a printer in 1603 might have seemed more compelling than a six-penny playbook, perhaps the edition of Drayton's *Baron's Wars* that he printed that year for Ling or Harsnett's *Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures* or even the two Bills of Mortality that he printed in the autumn of the year. Only an anachronistic sense of *Hamlet*'s value to a printer in 1603 has prevented the more likely version of events from being widely accepted. The putative corruptions of the text, the distortions of Shakespeare's great artistry, demand narratives of motivated villainy. Only a cad would publish a text as "bad" as Q1 *Hamlet*.

But to return to my major point here, it isn't obvious to me that Ling and Trundle had any particular reason to think the text they published "bad"—or indeed any to think it particularly good. What they thought was that they had acquired copy that was "vendible," a play text that might be published with some small profit to them. When a new text became available the following year, supplied perhaps by the acting company, who might well have been dismayed by what was in print, they were no doubt delighted to produce a second edition that might inspire new sales. This is a less interesting story, I admit, than tales of pirates, but it is almost certainly closer to the truth.

I am not saying that Q1 *Hamlet* is as good a play as the *Hamlet* that we usually read (though I would say that it is a better play than has generally been allowed, and certainly not "*Hamlet* by Dogberry," as Brian Vickers has termed it¹⁸); I am saying only that such questions of literary judgment should not be allowed to color our understanding of the textual history. When we see that history backwards, through the filter of a cultural authority not fully achieved until the mid-eighteenth century, inevitably we get it wrong. Shakespeare, one could say, was not exactly Shakespeare during his own lifetime.

An obvious example: when his plays were first published, his name was not what distinguished them in the bookstalls. As is well known, eight plays were published over four years before a play of Shakespeare's appeared in print with his name on the title-page. Cuthbert Burby first included Shakespeare's name on the quarto of *Love's Labor's Lost* in 1598 (and even then hardly as a ringing affirmation of authorship: the title-page asserting only that the play was "Newly corrected and augmented, by W. Shakespere," the name set in small italic type), but previously editions of *Titus Andronicus*, *2 and 3 Henry VI*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Richard II*, *Richard III*, *1 Henry IV* all had been published with no indication that Shakespeare was the playwright. The plays, with

the exception of *2 Henry VI*, all advertise the authority of the text as theatrical rather than authorial, by insisting that it is published “As it was Plaide” by whatever company had performed it.

One should, of course, conclude that what this means is that before 1598 the name “Shakespeare” on the title-page was not yet seen as sufficient inducement for a potential customer to purchase a play text at a bookstall. Indeed, most published plays advertised their theatrical auspices, emphasizing for us yet again that the drama was still subliterate, its audience, even for the published play, understood primarily as theater-goers. Play quartos do seem largely to have depended on playgoers for their sales, the six penny pamphlets a relatively cheap way of happily recalling a performance or catching up with one that had unhappily been missed. Richard Hawkins reminds the potential buyers of his edition of *Philaster* (1628) that the play “was affectionately taken, and approved by the Seeing Auditors, or Hearing Spectators (of which sort I take, or conceive you to be the greatest part),” though he anticipates also that his edition will be “eagerly sought for, not onely by those that haue heard & seene it, but by others that haue merely heard therof” (sig. A2^v). As excitement about a production waned with time, however, the published play would normally become less marketable: “When they grow stale they must be vented by Termers and Cuntries chapmen,” says Middleton in his preface to *The Family of Love* (1608), distressed that publication of his play had not taken place “when the newnesse of it made it much more desired” (sig. A1^v). Printed plays do seem for the most part to be tied to theatrical success, published with the hope, as Brome says in his epistle to *The Antipodes*, that “the publicke view of the world entertayn it with no lesse welcome, then that private one of the stage already has given it” (sig. A2^v); or, as Heywood writes in his preface to *Greene’s Tu quoque* (1614): “since it hath past the Test of the stage with so generall an applause, pittie it were but it should likewise haue the honour of the Presse” (sig. A2^r).

The “honour of the Presse” is usually reserved for plays that have succeeded on stage (*Troilus and Cressida* and *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* are the notable exceptions, for each the dramatic failure functioning as a sign of its sophistication¹⁹); and not surprisingly, then, title-pages usually advertise their plays as the records of performance rather than the registers of a literary intention. Whatever the actual status of the underlying manuscript, if the market for playbooks was largely playgoers, the strategy makes sense. Within a theatrical economy display of an author’s name on a play text offered no particular commercial advantage. It does seem, however, that, at least in Shakespeare’s case, this was in the process of changing. In 1598, reprints of both *Richard II* and

Richard III were published that did include Shakespeare's name on the title-page, and in 1599, a new edition of *1 Henry IV* was reissued with Shakespeare's name added. In the remaining years before Shakespeare died, twenty-nine editions of eighteen separate plays were published, only eight of which appeared without identifying Shakespeare as the playwright.

Most remarkable in this regard is the edition of *King Lear* published by Nathaniel Butter in 1608, with a title-page not merely identifying Shakespeare as the playwright but trumpeting his authorship at the head of the page and in a larger typeface than had ever before been used for his name: "M. William Shakespeare: / HIS / True Chronicle Historie of the life and / death of King LEAR and his three / Daughters." Here the play is displayed and celebrated as Shakespeare's, but the printed text is no more exclusively "HIS" than any of the other published plays that had previously escaped his control. It is a poorly printed play (indeed the first that its printer, Nicholas Oakes, had ever undertaken), and Shakespeare did not oversee its publication or concern himself with the imperfect results.

The play is obviously presented as Shakespeare's, but it literally belongs to Butter, the publisher who owns and controls the text, asserting Shakespeare's authorship as a marketing strategy, both to capitalize on Shakespeare's reputation and to differentiate this play from an anonymous play text of 1605, *The True Chronicle History of King Leir*. Shakespeare's name functions on the 1608 title-page perhaps as much to identify the playbook as the *playwright*. In either role, of course, it serves as a mark of distinction, but Shakespeare is here always the publisher's Shakespeare, not the author himself, a simulacrum invented to protect and promote the publisher's property.²⁰

The 1608 *Lear* quarto, then, does at least seem to point to Shakespeare's growing literary reputation. Butter, though he is unconcerned to provide a carefully printed text, is eager to offer what he does publish as Shakespeare's play and not merely as the record of performance by the King's men. Here is the earliest incontrovertible evidence of what in 1622 Thomas Walkley would claim in his edition of *Othello* (1622): that "The Authors name is sufficient to vent his work." Certainly Butter believed this true, publishing in 1605 an edition of *The London Prodigall* with a title-page claiming that it is "By William Shakespeare." We cannot know whether or not Butter thought the play was in fact by Shakespeare, but obviously he thought Shakespeare's name would help sell the playbook.

And other publishers apparently thought similarly. The two parts of *The Troublesome Raigne of King John* were published first in 1591 by Sampson Clarke with no authorial attribution but rather with the familiar title-page statement

that they were set forth “As they were (sundry times) publikely acted by the Queenes Maiesties Players”; but when they were reprinted in 1611 by John Helme, the title-page, while announcing that the texts were offered “As they were sundry times lately acted by the Queenes Maiesties Players” (“lately” replacing “publikely,” as the Queen’s men were now defunct), now included a new—and seemingly inaccurate—assertion that the plays were “Written by W. Sh.”²¹ And when they were again reprinted in 1622, this time by Thomas Dewe, the name of the acting company had disappeared from the assertion that they were “(sundry times) lately acted,” and the title-page now proudly claimed they were “Written by W. Shakespeare.” For Helme and Dewe it may merely be that they assumed these plays were indeed Shakespeare’s *King John*; in any case, it does seem likely that it was the rights to these that were leased by the consortium that published the Shakespeare folio, since the as yet unpublished Shakespearean *King John* was not among the 16 plays “not formerly entred to other men” duly registered by Jaggard and Blount on 8 November 1623. Yet, whatever the publishers’ understanding about the plays’ authorship, what is absolutely clear is that year by year on the bookstalls the commercial cachet of an old acting company weakened, while the commercial cachet of an old playwright grew.

But if some publishers were indeed convinced that “Shakespeare” on the title-page would help sell books, others seemed less certain about the marketability of the playwright’s name. *Titus Andronicus*, for example, was published in 1594 with no indication of its author, only that it had been “Plaide by the the Right Honourable the Earle of *Darbie*, Earle of *Pembrooke*, and Earle of *Sussex* their servaunts.” The reticence about authorship here was no doubt because in 1594 the theatrical provenance of the play was more impressive than its still little-known author; but the play was reissued two more times after its first printing (once in 1600 and again in 1611), with title-pages that carefully updated its theatrical history but without acknowledgement of Shakespeare’s authorship.

Similarly, in 1599, Cuthbert Burby published the second edition of *Romeo and Juliet*, but that title-page gives no indication that the play was by Shakespeare; and, lest this be taken only as evidence that even by 1599 the value of Shakespeare’s name was still being negotiated, ten years later *Romeo and Juliet*, like *Titus*, was published again still without identifying Shakespeare as the playwright. And indeed about eleven years after that, roughly the time when Thomas Walkley was insisting upon the commercial value of Shakespeare’s name, yet another edition of *Romeo and Juliet* (Q4) appeared, which again failed to identify its author—though interestingly a variant title-page was issued that does claim the play was “Written by W. Shakespeare.”²²

This edition (with its two separate title-pages) was published by John Smethwick, who, on the basis of the titles he controlled, apparently was invited in as a minor partner in the consortium of stationers who combined to publish the first folio. I take it that Smethwick, who had acquired the rights to the play from Nicholas Ling in 1607, had prepared a new edition of *Romeo and Juliet*, a reprint of the 1609 printing, and issued it with a reset version of the earlier title-page on which Shakespeare's name does not appear. The variant title-page (with Shakespeare's name) seems almost certainly to have been printed later, most likely issued sometime after negotiations for the folio rights revealed to Smethwick the nature of his property. (It is very improbable that the authorial title-page was issued first, as there is no obvious commercial reason to remove Shakespeare's name, but there is an obvious one to add it.) But until the issue of the variant title-page of *Romeo and Juliet*, Smethwick, just like Edward White, the publisher of the later *Titus* quartos, had published two editions of the play he controlled without identifying either as Shakespeare's; and, though it may seem incredible to us, it is at least possible that Smethwick, like White, did so without knowing that Shakespeare was the author.

How this could be the case is instructive. Both plays were first published by John Danter, *Titus Andronicus* in 1594, the first of Shakespeare's plays to appear in print or at least the earliest surviving publication, and *Romeo and Juliet* in 1597. Danter was an active stationer in London in the 1590s before his death at age 34 in October, 1599; in his eight-year career he printed or published 79 editions of 67 separate titles, mainly popular forms, like ballads, pamphlets, and plays. Danter's professional behavior, however, has been consistently denigrated as immoral and inept, Chambers, for example, identifying Danter as "a stationer of the worst reputation," and McKerrow saying of the 1597 *Romeo and Juliet* that "like all his work, it was very badly printed."²³ W. W. Greg agreed, combining the two judgments into general misgiving: "any dramatic quarto with which [Danter] was concerned is necessarily suspect in the first instance." "Danter's short career," Greg concludes, "is nothing but a record of piracy and secret printing."²⁴ For D. Allen Carroll, similarly, the whole career is tainted: "Everyone knows of the odor which attaches itself to the name of Danter."²⁵

But this may be another case where our anachronistic hopes and expectations for Shakespeare's text have infected our historical judgment; "the odor which attaches itself to the name of Danter" may not be the fetid scent of fraudulence or incompetence but only the homely smell of workmanlike activity. Danter does find himself entangled in various difficulties with the Stationers' Company, but they are for the most part the sorts of disputes that affect almost every member of the company at one time or other. In 1586, Danter was one of six

stationers accused of violating Francis Flower's patent to print *Accidence*, a popular Latin grammar, and with the others he was found guilty of illegal printing and "Dyshabled to prynte, otherwyse than as Iourneymen," as the Stationers' Court decreed; nonetheless, in 1589 he was sworn and admitted a freeman of the company.²⁶ In 1593 arbitration was ordered for some unnamed conflict that Danter had with Henry Chettle and Cuthbert Burby, a dispute inconsequential enough, however, that the three men on and off continued to work with one another to the end of the decade; and, what was more serious, in 1597, he had his presses and type "defaced and made vnservciable for pryntinge" for printing the *Jesus Psalter*, a work of Catholic devotion, "without authoritie."²⁷

His court record marks him as at worst a recusant but hardly a wicked or even particularly unruly member of the company. In almost all regards, including the difficulties he gets into with the Company, he behaves very much like other stationers. The animus that attaches to him results mainly from his publication of the 1597 "bad quarto" of *Romeo and Juliet*. It is that offence that is "rank" and "smells to heaven"—or at least to the acute olfactory sense of the new bibliographers. Danter is guilty of printing an imperfect text of one of Shakespeare's plays. There is no reason, of course, to think he knew it imperfect, and the printing itself is unremarkable, except that half way through the text the type font changes. Rather typically, the observation of this fact produces more derision: "never was a masterpiece ushered into the world in a worse manner," said Plomer,²⁸ but in truth the change in font reveals only that the printing was shared, probably with Edward Allde. Such shared printing was not uncommon (Dekker's *The Honest Whore* and the three 1604 quartos of *The Malcontent* are examples²⁹), and typographically little marks the composition and presswork as defective, and indeed it is not in any sense a poorer printing job than Q2, the so-called "good quarto."³⁰ The play, however, was not registered by Danter, and the absence of an entry, coupled with a text that seems to have been adapted for performance and perhaps reconstructed by its actors, has led to its vilification, most recently by a scholar as normally judicious as David Bevington, who calls it "a pirated edition issued by an unscrupulous publisher."³¹

Danter's *Romeo and Juliet*, however, was not a "pirated edition," and neither the quality nor the provenance of the text can be used to prove its publisher "unscrupulous." Printing a play that had been abridged for performance or even one recalled and reassembled by its actors did not violate any law or regulation. No stationer had a prior claim to the text of *Romeo and Juliet*, and Danter's avoidance of the expected registration procedures may have been motivated by nothing more nefarious than his desire to save the required fees. His usual habits,

it is worth noting, were more conventional. He was involved in the publication of nine plays, three of which he printed for other stationers; of the six he published himself, four were properly registered, including *Titus Andronicus*.

There is no particular reason to see his handling of *Romeo and Juliet* as symptomatic of some character flaw, or indeed as anything worse than somewhat cavalier treatment of what was essentially a pamphlet, at a moment when his own career seemed to be in free fall. In 1595 he was involved with 19 publications; in 1596, with 11; in 1597, the year *Romeo and Juliet* was published, only three, the following year just one. Late that year or early the next he died, and in 1600 the Stationers Company granted his widow and children “twentye Shillinge a year...out of the pooeres Account,” the mark of their poverty an addendum that an additional five shillings was “to be gyven vnto her presently in hand.”³² However *Romeo and Juliet* came into his possession, it must have seemed a small miracle. We might think better of Danter if we see his decision to save himself ten pence by denying the play both license and entrance less as an effort to put forth a degraded version of one of Shakespeare’s tragedies than as one to put food on the table for his family.

In any case, *Romeo and Juliet* fared better than its publisher. By 1599 Danter was dead, his family destitute; that same year, Cuthbert Burby reissued the play in a new edition, “Newly Corrected, Augmented, and Amended.” Printed by Thomas Creede, this second quarto (which is about 700 lines longer than Q1) seems to have been printed from Shakespeare’s papers, which must have been received directly from the acting company. This seems to be another occasion, like those involving Samuel Daniel or Stephen Egerton, where an effort was made to substitute an authorized text for one that was deemed deficient.

But, interestingly, however much the new edition of *Romeo and Juliet* was motivated by the desire to establish an *authorized text*, the effort does not involve the establishment of an *author*. Q2 may well be, as many bibliographers believe, a “good quarto” deriving from Shakespeare’s own papers, but what should not be forgotten is that neither the publisher nor the supplier of the good text thought it useful to say so. The play is once again published by Burby as a performance text, printed “as it hath bene sundry time publiquely acted,” though arguably that describes the theatrically abridged text of Q1 more accurately than it does Q2, which, deriving from the playwright’s papers, seemingly deserves precisely what it is denied: the acknowledgement that it is by William Shakespeare.³³ Such acknowledgement, however, was not forthcoming.

Burby’s receipt, in whatever manner, of Shakespeare’s papers does not mark his edition as any more regular than Danter’s. Indeed Burby’s rights to the play

most likely derive from some unrecorded negotiation with Danter. They had on occasion worked together. Danter had printed *The Cobbler's Prophecy* for Burby in 1594, and, more revealingly, the previous year Danter had entered the play *Orlando Furioso* and then transferred his title to Burby with the proviso, as the Stationers' Register records it, "(Danter to have the printing)." It is even possible that Burby's publication of *Love's Labor's Lost* similarly derives from a negotiation with Danter, who, it is plausible to think, may have printed the lost quarto that Burby's 1598 edition offers as "Newly corrected and augmented By W. Shakespere." In any case, though unregistered, Burby's rights to *Romeo and Juliet* were unquestioned, and in 1607 he transferred his title to Nicholas Ling. Nine months later, Ling transferred the rights to *Romeo and Juliet*, along with fifteen other titles, to John Smethwick, who (as we have seen) printed an edition of the play in 1609, again advertising it as "Newly corrected, augmented, and amended"—though in fact the title-page, like the text itself, is a simple reprint of Q2—and again omitting the name of the playwright, as he did once more in 1622, until he he decided to issue the variant title-page.

Since its first appearance in 1597, then, the play had belonged to four men, none of whom had felt obligated by either bibliographic scruple or commercial consideration to acknowledge Shakespeare's authorship. As the play became a less familiar element in the repertory of the King's men (and indeed no record survives of any production after 1598), the recurring title-page claim that the play was printed "as it hath beene sundrie times publiquely acted" inevitably became more gestural than descriptive, and as Shakespeare's name had become increasingly "vendible" in the marketplace of print, it is hard to imagine that if he was recognized as the play's author, his name would not have been used to help sell the editions (as indeed it is on the variant 1622 title-page).

But play texts, we must again remind ourselves, had not yet fully made the transition from the ephemera of an emerging entertainment industry to the artifacts of high culture. They did not yet demand an author, and in some sense they did not deserve one, the text being so fully a record of the collaborative activities of a theatrical company. As publishers transferred titles to such works there is no reason to think the author's name would automatically attach itself and follow along. Today we hear the title *Romeo and Juliet* and instantly supply Shakespeare's name. In 1597, in 1599, in 1609, and even in 1622, the Shakespearean canon did not yet firmly exist. The publishers who printed the play were arguably unaware, and certainly unimpressed, that they were printing a play by Shakespeare. In this regard it is worth noting that the Stationers' Register entry that records the transfer of titles from Ling to Smethwick has

items like “Master DRAYTONs *Poemes*,” “master GREENEs *Arcadia*,” and “SMYTHs *common Wealth of England*”; the plays, however, are anonymous: “ROMEO and JULETT,” “The Taming of A Shrewe,” “Loues Labour Lost,” and “a booke called Hamlett.”

Authorship is important to us, heirs of a romantic conception of writing as individual and originary, and if it was indeed important to some of Shakespeare’s contemporaries, it was not particularly important to Shakespeare himself or to the publishers who first brought his plays to the reading public. They did not see their task as the preservation of the work of the nation’s greatest writer as they set forth his plays; they were seeking only some small profit with limited financial vulnerability, as with their six-penny pamphlets they turned Shakespeare into “a man in Print” and made his plays available to desiring readers.³⁴

Notes

1. Katherine Duncan-Jones has argued that the 1609 edition of the sonnets was printed from Shakespeare’s own revised manuscript and was sold by Shakespeare to Thomas Thorpe; see her “Was the 1609 *Shake-speares Sonnets* Really Unauthorized?”, *RES* 34 (1983): 151-171. For reasons that are largely irrelevant here, I do not share the view that the volume represents another example of Shakespeare’s commitment to print, though, even if it is, it does not affect my argument about Shakespeare’s lack of interest in seeing his *plays* in print.
2. *Histrio-Mastix: the Players Scourge* (London, 1633): sig. **6^V.
3. See Kari Konkola, “‘People of the Book’: The Production of Literary Texts in Early Modern England,” *Publication of the Bibliographic Society of America* 94 (2000): 5-31, esp. fn. 26 on p. 18.
4. Peter W. M. Blayney, “The Publication of Playbooks” in *A New History of Early English Drama*, ed. John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), p. 389. See also Mark Bland, “The London Book-Trade in 1600,” in *A Companion to Shakespeare*, ed. David Scott Kastan (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), pp. 450-63.
5. *Letters of Thomas Bodley to Thomas James, First Keeper of the Bodleian Library*, ed. G. W. Wheeler (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1926), pp. 219, 222. Two playbooks, however, did in fact find their way into the early collection of the Bodleian; the 1620 Library catalogue lists Robert Daborne’s *A Christian Turn’d Turke* (1612) and Heywood’s *Fair Maid of the West* (1602).
6. *The Three Parnassus Plays*, ed. J. B. Leishman (London: Nicholson and

Watson, 1949), pp. 247-48. John Stephens, in his *Cynthia's Revenge* (London, 1613), speaks of authors who "gape after the drunken harvest of forty shillings, and shame the worthy benefactors of Hellicon" (sig. A2^V); and George Wither, in *The Schollers Purgatory* (London, 1624), sigs. B6^V-7^F, H5^F, similarly notes that stationers "can hyre for a matter of 40 shillings some needy IGNORAMUS" (sig. I1r).

7. This analysis is heavily indebted to Peter Blayney's extraordinary reconstruction of the economics of playbook publishing in his "The Publication of Playbooks," esp. pp. 405-413.

8. Wither, (see note 6 above).

9. Heywood, *An Apology for Actors* (London, 1612), sig. G4^F.

10. Alexander Roberts, *An Exposition Upon the Hundred and Thirtie Psalme* (London, 1610), sig. O4^F.

11. Blayney observes that "we have been too busy chasing imaginary pirates" to understand how play texts normally found their way into print ("The Publication of Playbooks," p. 394). Piracy, as Laurie E. Maguire notes, "relates technically to the circumstances of publication, where it means the infringement of one stationer's rights by another." See her *Shakespearean Suspect Texts: the "Bad" Quartos and their Contexts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 16. See also Cyril Bathurst Judge, *Elizabethan Book-Pirates* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1934), *passim*.

12. Daniel, *The Vision of The Twelve Goddesses* (London, 1604), sig. A3^F.

13. *A Lecture preached by Maister Egerton, at the Blacke-friers, 1589* (London, 1603), sig. A4^F.

14. Fredson Bowers, *On Editing Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Dramatists* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1955), p. 41.

15. For a full and richly suggestive account of the complex "textual situation" of *Hamlet*, see Leah Marcus, *Unediting the Renaissance: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Milton* (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 132-76.

16. See Gerald D. Johnson, "Nicholas Ling, Publisher 1580-1607," *Studies in Bibliography* 37 (1985): 203-15. On such reservation of printing rights, see, for example, Arber 111. 92, where Thomas Creede enters *The Cognizance of a True Christian* with a notation: "This copie to be alwaies printed for **Nicholas Linge** by the seid **Thomas Creede** as often as it shalbe printed."

17. STC 16743.2 and 16743.3, *A true bill of the whole number that hath died in the Cittie of London* (London, 1603). See Gerald D. Johnson, "John Trundle and the Book-Trade 1603-1626," *Studies in Bibliography* 39 (1986), esp. pp. 191-2.

18. *Times Literary Supplement*, 24 December 1997, p. 5.
19. On this aspect of *Knight of the Burning Pestle*, see Zachary Lesser, "Walter Burre's *Knight of the Burning Pestle*," *ELR* 29 (1999): 22-43; *Troilus*, of course, was published in 1609, with two separate title-pages, one announcing the play "As it was acted by the Kings Maiesties servants at the Globe," and one with only the indication that was "Written by William Shakespeare" and printed with the publisher's advertisement claiming that it was a "new play" that was "neuer clapper-clawd with the palms of the vulger."
20. Some of this material on the *King Lear* title-page appears in different form in my *Shakespeare after Theory* (New York: Routledge, 1999), pp. 37 and 81.
21. Few scholars believe *The Troublesome Reign* to be by Shakespeare, though W. J. Courthope insisted that "Shakespeare alone was the author." See his *History of English Poetry* (New York: Macmillan, 1903), v. 4, p. 55. More recently, Eric Sams has similarly argued that the anonymous play is the apprentice work of the young Shakespeare. See his *The Real Shakespeare: Retrieving the Early Years, 1564-1594* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), pp. 146-153. Although there are a number of verbal parallels, only two or three lines are identical in the two plays, which seems to rule out either play as an early version of the other. Scholars do believe, however, that one play is clearly indebted to the other, usually arguing that the anonymous Queen's men play was the source of Shakespeare's history.
22. George Walton Williams has dated this edition 1622; see his "The Printer and the Date of *Romeo and Juliet* Q4," *Studies in Bibliography* 18 (1965): 253-54.
23. E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1923), 3:187; and *A Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers...1557-1640*, gen. ed. R. B. McKerrow (London: Bibliographic Society, 1910), p. 84.
24. W. W. Greg, *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements: "The Battle of Alcazar" and "Orlando Furioso": An Essay in Critical Bibliography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1923), p. 130.
25. D. Allen Carroll, "Who Wrote *Greenes Groats-worth of Witte* (1592)?" *Renaissance Papers* 1992, ed. George Walton Williams and Barbara J. Baines (Durham: Southeast Renaissance Conference, 1993), p. 75.
26. *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company, 1576-1602*, ed. W. W. Greg and E. Boswell (London: The Bibliographic Society, 1930), p. 21 (3 Nov. 1586); and *A Transcript of the Stationers' Register*, ed. Edward Arber (London, 1875), 2:706 (30 Sept. 1589).
27. Greg and Boswell, *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company*, pp. 46 and 56 (5 March 1593; 10 April 1597).

28. Henry R. Plomer, "The Printers of Shakespeare's Plays and Poems," *The Library*, 2nd series 7 (1906), p. 153.

29. See W. Craig Ferguson, *Valentine Simmes* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1968), pp. 86-89.

30. Harry Hoppe calculated 0.9 printer's mistakes per page in Q1 and 1.4 in Q2. See his *The Bad Quarto of "Romeo and Juliet": A Bibliographic and Textual Study* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1948), pp. 8-9.

31. *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, ed. David Bevington (New York: HarperCollins, 1992), p. 1621.

32. Greg and Boswell, *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company*, p. 78 (7 July 1600).

33. Jill L. Levinson, editor of the new Oxford edition of *Romeo and Juliet*, argues that Q1 "shows clear signs of connection with performance"; Q2, however, with its "duplication of several passages," shows the marks of "authorial revision" and therefore must be based on "authorial working papers rather than a manuscript used in the theatre." See her "Editing *Romeo and Juliet*: 'A challenge [,] on my life,'" in *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts II*, ed. W. Speed Hill (Tempe: Medieval and Renaissance Text Society, 1998), esp. p. 69.

34. A version of this essay was delivered at University College London as the first of the Lord Northcliffe Lectures that I was privileged to give in March of 1999 and which will be published by Cambridge University Press. I am extraordinarily grateful to David Trotter and John Sutherland for organizing that occasion and for the comments and questions of colleagues in the audience that helped clarify my interests and argument. I also must thank Zach Lesser, Alan Farmer, and Elizabeth Sauer, who offered much needed advice, information, and encouragement at various critical stages of this essay's development.

**“Unhonest Desire”:
Culture, Schools, and the Misallocation of
Blame in *Romeo and Juliet***

Scott K. Jacobs-Royer

Although Shakespeare modeled *Romeo and Juliet* after Arthur Brooke's *Romeus and Juliet*, he did not endorse the harsh criticism of what Brooke calls “unfortunate lovers, thralling themselves to unhonest desire [and] neglecting the authority and advice of parents and friends” (Gibbons 239). Ironically, Brooke's moralistic warning to his readers has been institutionalized through criticism, study guides, and teacher resources, which differ from more sophisticated sources with greater scope and analysis. Not only has the play's received interpretation ignored a multitude of issues and themes that criticize political, social, and familial structures, it has twisted Shakespeare's criticism of a dysfunctional and hypocritical society that is hostile to true love into a criticism of the “unhonest desire” sought by impetuous youth. By addressing Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* with no agenda other than to explore and subvert tragedy—the true purpose of tragedy—we can make the work a medium through which the current issues that plague American youth can be addressed and perhaps rectified. The misallocation of blame serves only to repulse students from literature and amplify the disdain they feel from elders and authority figures, producing yet more adolescent withdrawal and self-doubt. Modern society, with its ever increasing gang violence, sexual violence, teenage suicide, murder, and family breakdown, parallels *Romeo and Juliet* too well; unfortunately, the current predicament is not confined to just Verona. The plague rages on.

While in-depth sources attempt to expose the intricate complexities of social interactions and influences through careful analysis of character values, motivations, and deficiencies, more popular and common sources, such as study guides and Internet resources, focus on the rash behavior of youth without delineating that it was the authority figures that set the youth in motion. Paul Brian of Washington State University explains that “Shakespeare emphasizes the over-hastiness and pre-mature nature of this love affair” and that “the love of Romeo and Juliet, although idealized, is rooted in passionate sexuality” (1-2). In terms of character development, “Classic Notes” maintain that “Juliet comes across as a young, innocent girl who obeys the commands of her parents. However, by the

last scene she is devious and highly focused...Romeo will undergo a similar transformation” (4). Such exclusive and narrow views, in effect, degrade the play with an obsessive disdain for youthful passion. The Norton and Arden editions, of course, give much greater attention to societal constraints that influence the young lovers. Stephen Greenblatt, in the *Norton Shakespeare*, explains that “Romeo and Juliet’s love and clandestine marriage can find no place in [the] familial order of things” (869), while Brian Gibbons, in the Arden edition, speaks of the “private world of intensity created by lovers...contrasted [against] the background of unstable forces indifferent to individual desires and always felt as threatening” (37).

If the premise that Shakespeare used highly developed poetic speech to elevate some of his characters above the mundane and vulgar is to be adhered to, then it follows that he is obviously elevating Romeo and Juliet. Gibbons explains that the “artistic triumph” of the shared sonnet of Romeo and Juliet serves as a means to “depict...each lover’s intimate and delicate states of consciousness, subtle and potent movements of feeling, [and] intuitions of [the] heart’s mysteries” (43). Romeo and Juliet share the play’s most eloquent dialogue; their intimate, heartfelt expression is unique. Through the metaphor of religious devotion provided by the sonnet, the lovers acquire a celestial aura that is echoed by Juliet’s musing that Romeo be “cut out in little stars” (3.2.23). According to *Classic Notes*, however, “this is a sacrilegious sonnet” (4), (incidentally, *sacreligious* is misspelled), and Paul Brian’s webpage study guide maintains that “this religious language is more blasphemous than pious” (4).

I doubt that Shakespeare intended to spend this “artistic triumph” on ironic disdain for his two protagonists. The idea of blasphemy could apply if Romeo and Juliet engaged in lewd and vulgar sex; however, they commit to holy matrimony. Furthermore, they are both virgins who idealize love and participate in a romantic game “played for a pair of stainless maidenhoods.” When the language of Romeo and Juliet is compared to that of characters such as Samson, who speaks of cutting off maidenheads and of “Thrust[ing] his maids against the wall” (1.1.16), and Mercutio, who advises Romeo to “be rough with love” (1.4.27), it is apparent that Shakespeare is making a distinction between the gentle and ideal reciprocal love shared by Romeo and Juliet and the vulgar and violent attitudes maintained by the society at large. By placing their love above the constraints of family and society, Shakespeare is promoting unbound love as an ideal and is thus criticizing those who impede or thwart its course.

Both Romeo and Juliet defy the traditional roles intended for them, and it is exactly this defiance and expression of purpose that give them credence and

honor. The establishment of masculinity was and still is largely based on physical dominance and sexual conquest. William Pollack, a contemporary adolescent psychologist and author of *Real Boys*, poignantly addresses Romeo's dilemma: "boys are constantly matching their own behavior, and that of others, to [masculine] stereotypes to see how it conforms" (147). Society tends to measure boys in the same manner. In the play the masculine model is Mercutio, whom Coleridge refers to as an "exquisite ebullience and overflow of youthful life...The man of rank and the gentleman with all its excellencies and all its weaknesses constitute the character of Mercutio" (Staunton, 1:222). In comparison to Mercutio, Romeo's devotion to love is a weakness. Ironically, the Friar and the Nurse both attack Romeo for his lack of masculinity; however, the moment Romeo questions his manhood and blames Juliet for making him "effeminate" (3.1.109), he violates his nature and initiates his downfall by avenging Mercutio's death and slaying the villainous Tybalt. Gary Taylor aligns Romeo with Othello and Antony: "The heroes retreat from their initial gestures towards heterosexual union to a world of masculine loyalties embodied in a companion who disdains or avoids the love of women and who bases his identity on his definition of himself as a fighter" (341). Romeo's compliance with the honor code seals his fate. This is where Shakespeare's ironic disdain is apparent, not in the sonnet.

Fortunately, a shift is occurring in the presentation of *Romeo and Juliet* if the evolution of *Cliff's Notes* between their 1960 and 1979 editions is anything to go by. The 1960 edition is little more than a plot synopsis emphasizing Romeo's "impulsive nature" (Hillegass 49), over and over; however, over the course of nineteen years, *Cliff's Notes* expanded enough to include an emphasis on the power structures at work in the play, namely the Prince's self-admitted "weakness [which is] responsible for the continuation of the feud" (Carey 57). When the focus is shifted to the Prince's inability to establish peace and Capulet's inability to control Tybalt, the play begins to open up; authority figures have little control over a system of conflict that they have initiated and that, in effect, destroy Romeo and Juliet. This interpretation clearly speaks to the 60s and 70s antiestablishment movement. The appropriation of blame seems to have a sort of political or social agenda. The Friar, who is guilty of hubris through the killing and resurrecting of Juliet (a heinous offense for a holy man) mysteriously escapes blame and "is still known for a holy man" in both editions. Perhaps because the Friar is a man of rank and power, he is pardoned by the Prince. It is difficult to understand why the Friar is pardoned, considering that he did not attempt "To blaze [Romeo's] marriage, reconcile [his] friends, / Beg pardon of the Prince, and

call [him] back / With twenty hundred thousand times more joy” (3.3.149.153), and concocted a plot based on deception and poison, which resulted in the “misadventured piteous overthrows” mentioned by the Chorus in the opening scene of the play. Relentless editing of Shakespeare and the various commentaries on his plays speak to the use of literature as social propaganda. Gary Taylor goes into great depth in an effort to explore the appropriation of Shakespeare, and it is apparent that time and time again Shakespeare has been tweaked, if not contorted, to fit the prevailing social attitudes of the time. Often social values are reinforced in the classroom by the presentation of literature. Therefore, if the popular disdain for “impetuous youth” is projected in the classroom, would it not take the form of a social value? Parents often ask, “Why is my son so withdrawn?” or “Why is my daughter so defiant?” My response is that they have been taught that their impulses are bad, that their sexual desire is evil and that they must allow themselves to be ruled by others in order to live a “good” life. Perhaps their natural inclination to think for themselves is in conflict with a system that tells them what to think. The complexity of *Romeo and Juliet* lends itself to interpretation that can be useful to today’s youngsters, if presented in a thoughtful manner.

The Folger Library has risen to such an occasion and has developed a series of teacher guides entitled *Shakespeare Set Free*. The title itself speaks of Shakespeare’s captivity. Jeanne Roberts explains the current situation: “It is tempting to isolate clear morals in these plays, but we need to resist the temptation to simplify them” (O’Brien 4). Students in high school rarely adore Shakespeare. No wonder. Adolescents reading *Romeo and Juliet* for the first time are being instructed that this play depicts the destructive nature of impetuous youth. It seems as though parents and teachers want to reinforce Brooke’s moral of obedience and chastity. Perhaps this why his view has been institutionalized. On one hand it is protective, but protective in the same way that Capulet was protective of his daughter—if it’s not his way, it’s the highway. We’ve seen the tragic effects of such thinking: a pile of dead bodies in the Capulet tomb. However, if students are allowed to form their own theories and support them with the text of the play, the students’ perspectives are brought to light and they begin to develop the critical thinking skills that are necessary to navigate our treacherous world (O’Brien 188).

By encouraging students to use the text of *Romeo and Juliet* to support their own theories, we can make the play a forum for discourse and debate, a forum often denied to adolescents. Psychologist Daniel Goldman takes a passionate stand on the situation of the adolescent: “the long-term prospects for today’s

children, marrying and having a fruitful, stable life together are growing more dismal with each generation” (232). This quotation comes after an assault of sobering statistics: “In 1990, compared to the previous two decades, the United States saw the highest juvenile arrest rate for violent crimes ever; teen arrests for forcible rape had doubled [Samson anyone?], teen murder rates quadrupled, [and]... the suicide rate for teens tripled” (231-32). Gang war is real and rampant in many urban areas and cannot be ignored. In terms of appropriation, this brings Baz Luhrmann’s *Romeo+Juliet* to the foreground. There are incidents of gun violence in America every day, mostly involving young people and alcohol and/or drugs. Why is our youth resorting to such drastic measures? What is pushing them to these extremes?

Ultimately, the goal should be to use *Romeo and Juliet* as a means to explore such issues and promote what Daniel Goleman calls “emotional intelligence,” which, simply put, is emotional balance gained by careful deliberation in moments of excessive tension. By allowing students to explore the parallels between their world and the world of *Romeo and Juliet*, we can help adolescents react to difficult situations with more poise and maturity. Allowing *Romeo and Juliet* to remain a living work of art by abstaining from commentary and criticism that defines or simplifies enables the process of understanding the play to remain just that: a process, ever-evolving, not an effort to come to thin explanations or simplistic morals. Hopefully, through greater intimacy with literature, students will begin to structure the future in a manner that does not rely upon the experience of narrowly defined morality, but in a manner that reflects the experience of tragic catharsis, namely insight.

Works Cited

- Brian, Paul. *Study Guide for Shakespeare: Romeo and Juliet* (1591?).
 <<http://www.wsu.edu:8080/~brians/love-in-the-arts/romeo.html>>.
- Carey, G. K. *Romeo and Juliet Notes*. Lincoln, Nebraska: Cliff’s Notes, 1979.
- Classic Notes. *Romeo and Juliet Full Summary and Analysis*. <http://www.grade-save...itles/romeoandjuliet/fullsumm.html>>.
- Gibbons, Brian, Introduction. *The Arden Edition of the Works of William Shakespeare, Romeo and Juliet*. London and New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Goldman, Daniel. *Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books, 1995.
- Hillegass, C.K. *Romeo and Juliet Notes*. Lincoln, Nebraska: Cliff’s Notes, 1960.

O'Brien, Peggy et al, eds. *The Folger Library, Shakespeare Set Free: Teaching Romeo and Juliet, Macbeth, and A Midsummer Night's Dream*. New York: Washington Square Press, 1993.

Pollack, William. *Real Boys*. New York: Random House, 1998.

The Norton Shakespeare. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1997.

Staunton, Howard, ed. *The Complete Illustrated Shakespeare*. New York: Park Lane, 1979.

Taylor, Gary. *Reinventing Shakespeare*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

No Law, The Law, and The Law of Grace: Redemption in *King Lear*

Brenda M. O'Connor

Shakespeare's *King Lear* has been misunderstood as a tragedy; indeed, the play appears to be a tragedy resulting in the death or downfall of the key characters. However, upon a closer, more critical reading, one will see that, in totality, *Lear* shows a progression from a pre-Biblical lawlessness, to a law based on reciprocity, and finally to a law based on grace, as understood in the Christian tradition. Through grace and forgiveness, *King Lear* becomes a Christian story of redemption, despite the deaths by the play's end.

The pre-Biblical lawlessness is exemplified by Edmund, who stands out as the only character who willfully and maliciously behaves in a lawless and futile manner. In fact, Edmund states quite clearly what this lawlessness is and that he operates within it:

This is the excellent foppery of the world, that, when we are sick in fortune, often the surfeit of our own behavior, we make guilty of our disasters the sun, the moon, and the stars; as if we were villains by necessity; fools by heavenly compulsion; knaves, thieves, and treachers, by spherical predominance; drunkards, liars, and adulterers, by an enforced obedience of planetary influence; and all that we are evil in, by a divine thrusting on. An admirable evasion of whore-master man, to lay his goatish disposition to the charge of a star! (1.2.109-117)

In contrast to Edmund's rejection of moral authority, we can understand the law of reciprocity, wherein a person determines her actions based on what reward she will receive. The law of reciprocity is exemplified by the Judaic laws, which were devised to keep the people in God's favor by giving them strict rules governing their actions. The most notable of these laws are the Ten Commandments, and particularly, for the purpose of this paper, the Fifth Commandment, "Honor thy father and mother." Lear takes this command to mean that his daughters will lavish, even to excess, upon him their love in words and deeds. Even in Act 1, scene 1, Cordelia tells Lear, "I love your majesty / According to my bond; nor more nor less" (91-92). While Cordelia speaks honestly regarding her duty to honor her father, Goneril and Regan speak falsely regarding the quality of their love and duty. Lear himself makes their inheritance

conditional on their spoken love:

Tell me, my daughters—
 Since now we will divest us, both of rule,
 Interest of territory, cares of state—
 Which of you shall we say doth love us most?
 That we our largest bounty may extend
 Where nature doth with merit challenge. (1.1.46-51)

After hearing both of her sisters' falsely lavish professions, Cordelia answers "Nothing." Lear responds, "Nothing will come of nothing, speak again" (1.1.89), establishing the mercantile quality of his love. Here, Lear is acting on a law of reciprocity whereby the daughters proclaim their love with words and he rewards them with land and power.

While it may seem out of the ordinary for a king to relinquish his crown and divide his lands while living, it was not entirely uncommon for an early modern parent to do so. Lear, from the very beginning of the play, expresses a desire "To shake all cares and business from our age, / Conferring them on younger strengths, while we / Unburthened crawl toward death" (1.1.37-39). In her book *King Lear and the Naked Truth*, Judy Kronenfeld explains this practice through exploring what she calls the "quid pro quo" nature of human relationships in Shakespeare's Europe, particularly those of parents and children. She argues that often a detailed contract was drawn wherein a father gave his land and money to his child in exchange for "raiment, bed, and food" (2.4.149). Oftentimes, the parent truly became a boarder in his own home. Furthermore, Kronenfeld states, "children could, in a sense, disinherit their parents, by refusing to maintain them" (113). In *King Lear*, we see Lear experience this displacement from role of father to role of child. Goneril speaks of Lear: "Old fools are babes again, and must be used / With checks as flatteries, when they are seen abused" (1.3.19-20); while Regan speaks to Lear: "You should be ruled and led / By some discretion, that discerns your state / Better than you yourself" (2.4.141).

By Act 4, we see the results of Lear's transactional love: namely, that he has lost all material possessions and power and is mad. Once reduced to this state, Lear can begin to understand his mistake. He says to Gloucester:

They flattered me like a dog; and told me I had white hairs in my beard ere the black ones were there. To say "aye" and "no" to everything that I said!—"Aye" and "no" too was no good divinity. When the rain came to wet me once, and the wind to make me chatter; when the thunder would not peace at my bidding; there I found 'em, there I smelt 'em out. (4.6.95-101)

Only because Lear has come to know the shallowness of Goneril and Regan's love for him can he then accept Cordelia's love. Cordelia represents the antithesis of Edmund's lawlessness and of Goneril and Regan's "quid pro quo" through the act of blessing Lear. She laments her father's condition in Act 4, scene 7: "O you kind gods, / Cure this great breach in his abused nature! / The untuned and jarring senses, O, wind up / Of this child-changed father!" (14-17). While the intellectual, spiritual, and practical roles change, Cordelia assumes the care-giving duties a parent would perform for his or her child, including the spiritual role of blessing.

Cordelia understands her role as child, speaking first in terms of her "bond" in accordance with the Judaic Law. In Elizabethan times, doctrines were disseminated through religious texts or sermons, such as *The Christian Man's Closet: Wherein Is Contained a Large Discourse of the Godly Training Up of Children*. This book, an English translation of *De Œconomia Christiana* (Antwerp, 1558), written by Bartholomaeus Battus, a Flemish Protestant (Krononfeld 103-104), contains the following:

This word honour, doth signify a true reverence and lowliness of heart, for this outward show in vailing of the bonnet, and bowing of the knee or body, is nothing worth, except there be joined therewithal the inward reverence of the mind, wherein godly children do testify, that they esteem nothing more precious and dear unto them than the love and honour of their parents.... Therefore to honour parents is not only to salute them humbly, to speak to them lovingly, and to use them courteously, to put off the cap before them, to give them the way and upper hand in every place: But also the holy Scriptures do teach children to obey their parents, to serve them, to fear, love, honour, and reverence them, not only in words and outward show, but in their hearts and minds also.

In light of this description, we then recognize Cordelia's inward devotion and sparse speech, "You have begot me, bred me, loved me; I / Return those duties back as are right fit, / Obey you, love you, and most honor you" (1.1.95-97), consistent with the moral teachings of the time.

In Old Testament times, across Egypt and the Middle East, the practice of giving a general blessing to one's children and a special blessing to the firstborn was common. Religious books in the seventeenth century also outlined the duties of children and parents. *Brantshpiegal*, written in 1602, explained the practice in these words:

Before the children can walk, they should be carried on the Sabbath and on the Holy days to their father and mother to receive their blessing. After they

are able to walk, they should go to them of their own accord, with body bent and head bowed, to receive the Blessing. (quoted in Smalley and Trent 33)

Similarly, “in Shakespeare’s England, kneeling to ask a blessing was a common gesture of respect from child to parent” (Novy 92). A blessing in Old Testament times served to “identify His [God’s] line of blessing through one family until the coming of Christ” (Smalley and Trent 25). However, in the Christian tradition, the blessing comes to mean not the generational lineage to Christ, but Christ’s acceptance, healing, and redemption (Smalley and Trent 26). In the New Testament book of Galatians, it is written, “If you belong to Christ, then you are Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise” (3:29, emphasis added). The basis for the transformation of the blessing to healing and redemption is found throughout the New Testament, in which Christ heals and redeems His people. It is written in the book of Ephesians, “In him we have *redemption through his blood*, the *forgiveness of sins*, in accordance with the riches of God’s *grace* that he lavished on us with all wisdom and understanding (1:7-8, emphasis added). This redemption through love and forgiveness is the Law of Grace. The English word “grace,” as used in the New Testament, comes from the Greek word *charis*, meaning “unmerited favor” (Arthur 18).

Lear does not deserve forgiveness for his treatment of Cordelia, yet receives it from her even though he has cursed her. Lear directly states his curse in the opening scene of the play, as he presents Cordelia “Dowered with [his] curse, and strangered with [his] oath” (1.1.205, emphasis added) to her suitor, Burgundy. The word “curse” comes from the “Hebrew word *qelalah*, which means ‘to esteem lightly, or dishonor’” (Smalley and Trent 166). Lear curses Cordelia, then soon dismisses her to France with, “Therefore be gone / *Without our grace, our love, our benison*” (1.1.266-267, emphasis added).

Cordelia acts in accordance with the Law of Grace when she “Forgive[s] as the Lord forgave [her]” (Colossians 3:13). In this way, she heals and redeems her father through the five elements of the traditional Judeo-Christian blessing. The five elements of the Judeo-Christian blessing are meaningful touch, a spoken message, attaching “high value” to the one being blessed, picturing a special future for the one being blessed, and an active commitment to fulfill the blessing (Smalley and Trent 27).

First, Cordelia offers meaningful touch when she gently kisses Lear upon her return from France in Act 4, scene 7. She offers the spoken message in addressing him:

O my dear father! Restoration hang
Thy medicine on my lips; and let this kiss

Repair those violent harms that my two sisters
Have in thy reverence made!" (4.7.26-28)

In this scene she also offers words of high value and pictures a special future for him as she calls him, "royal lord," and "majesty" (4.7.38). In speaking these words, Cordelia honors Lear, "the unkind father and the injured monarch at once; [i]t is both reconciliation and recoronation" (Novy 417).

Shakespeare could have ended the play with Cordelia, as the parental figure, forgiving the child-changed Lear. Yet Shakespeare has Cordelia remain before Lear, saying, "O, look upon me, sir, / And hold *your hands* in benediction o'er me: / No, sir, you must not kneel" (4.7.58-59, emphasis added). When he offers to justify her revenge, she states, "No cause, no cause," perhaps the most healing and redemptive words in all the play.

Consequently, the newly redeemed Lear can offer a blessing back to Cordelia:

Come, let's away to prison.
We two alone will sing like birds i' the cage
When thou dost ask me blessing, I'll kneel down
And ask of thee forgiveness. So we'll live,
And pray, and sing, and tell old tales, and laugh
At gilded butterflies, and hear poor rogues
Talk of court news; and we'll talk with them too,
Who loses and who wins; who 's in, and who 's out;
And take upon 's the mystery of things,
As if we were God's spies; and we'll wear out,
In a walled prison, packs and sects of great ones,
That ebb and flow by the moon. (5.3.8-18)

Lear is ready to make amends and to live, not according to the Law of Reciprocity, but by the Law of Grace, of unmerited favor. There is nothing left for Lear to exchange, except his love.

Even Edmund's lawlessness is eventually transformed into an act of repentance in trying to save Cordelia and Lear. This act is reflective of the Christian story of Christ's death on the cross, wherein one of the criminals hung with Him begs for Christ's forgiveness. The Law of Reciprocity that Goneril and Regan follow is concluded with their betrayal of Lear and with that betrayal, their resulting death. This, too, is suggestive of the Christian story of Christ's death on the cross, wherein the other criminal hung with Christ refuses redemption and dies without salvation.

While the deaths of Edmund, Goneril, and Regan may seem just punishment for their selfish and malicious behavior, we are also left with the seemingly sense-

less deaths of Lear and Cordelia. If we encounter this play from Edmund's lawless and nihilistic mindset, all life and death is meaningless; if we base our understanding on the Law of Reciprocity, as do Goneril and Regan, then we understand their deaths as just payment for their actions against Lear and one another. However, when we examine *King Lear* from the basis of grace, the deaths are not in a cause-and-effect relationship with the characters' actions. Regardless of the defeat in Lear and Cordelia's physical deaths, they have triumphed over spiritual sinfulness through truth, forgiveness, and grace. The grace, the unmerited favor, that Cordelia models restores order through redeeming Lear, and changes the play as a whole, from a tragic story to a Christian story of love, acceptance and healing.

Works Cited

- Arthur, Kay. *Lord, I Need Grace To Make It*. Sisters, Oregon: Multnomah Books, 1989.
- Kronenfeld, Judy. *King Lear and the Naked Truth: Rethinking the Language of Religion and Resistance*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1998.
- Novy, Marianne. "Patriarchy, Mutuality, and Forgiveness in King Lear." *Modern Critical Interpretations: William Shakespeare's King Lear*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1987.
- The Norton Shakespeare*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1997.
- Smalley, Gary and John Trent, Ph.D. *The Blessing*. New York: Pocket Books, 1986.

The Conception of Narrative Self in *King Richard II*

Eileen Abrahams

There can be little doubt that Shakespeare's treatment of the divine right of kings in *King Richard II* is a confirming instance of David Scott Kastan's claim that "Shakespeare's histories expose the idealizations of political power by presenting rule as role, by revealing that power passes to him who can best control and manipulate the visual and verbal symbols of authority" (469). Corresponding to the paradigmatic shift from the conception of political power as divinely ordained, and thus as permanent, to the conception of it as realpolitik, and thus as historically contingent, is Richard's individual, cataclysmic, but ultimately unsuccessful shift from a metaphysical to a performative conception of personal identity. In the course of his speech in Act 3, scene 2 Richard begins to grasp the notion that a monarch is not what one is, but rather something one does, a condition one enacts. At first, Richard responds to the discovery that rule is role by re-imagining his life as narrative, i.e., by re-conceiving himself as a subject in and of history. His re-imagining becomes a temporary source of strength for him, one which enables him to construct an identity against what the philosopher Richard Rorty calls "the contingency of selfhood" (23). However, Richard's acceptance of such contingency is, at best, episodic, and in the end, his willingness to re-invent himself gives way to nihilistic despair and a weary desire for release.

When he first hears of Bolingbroke's challenge to him, Richard does not act to prevent it, for he believes that it is impossible for his monarchy to be usurped:

Not all the water in the rough rude sea
Can wash the balm off from an anointed king;
The breath of worldly men cannot depose
The deputy elected by the Lord. (3.2.54-57)

The antimetabole of "Not," "Can," and "cannot" strengthens the rhetorical force of Richard's words and expresses his foundational belief in the divine right of kings.

Once Richard realizes belatedly that Bolingbroke's challenge will succeed, his whole world collapses. He does not conceive of "King" as merely a name and historical role he has been given; rather, that Richard is King Richard is a

logically necessary condition of his identity. If King equals Richard and if he is no longer King, then he is no longer Richard. At first, he reacts to this loss of identity by wavering between anger and self-pity. Toward the end of Act 3, scene 2, he becomes disconsolate:

Let's talk of graves, of worms, and epitaphs,
 Make dust our paper, and with rainy eyes
 Write sorrow on the bosom of the earth.
 Let's choose executors and talk of wills...

And a few line lines later:

For God's sake let us sit upon the ground
 And tell sad stories of the death of kings...(3.2.145-148, 155-156)

It is as Richard begins to write his own epitaph, in the power of his own rhetoric, that he begins to find strength. It is the strength of narrative.

With the anaphora “Let’s talk” (145), “Let’s choose” (148), and “Let’s sit upon the ground / And tell (155-156), Richard performs the kind of speech act which the philosopher J. L. Austin calls an “exercitive,” that is:

the giving of a decision in favour of or against a certain course of action, or advocacy of it. It is a decision that something is to be so, as opposed to an estimate that it is so. (154)¹

His speech gathers momentum with each repetition of “Let’s” until his rhetoric commits him to the telling of stories. It is in the moment that he speaks these words that Richard becomes aware of the possibility of making himself as *he will be told*.

Coincident with Richard’s impetus to *tell* in this speech is a diminution of his belief in the dual nature of the king. A dominant ideological construct both of Renaissance theology and jurisprudence is the idea that the king has in him two bodies. One is the natural body, which, as such, is subject to all the accidents of any natural body; the other is the body politic, which transcends the natural body and is not subject to human nature (Kantorowicz 18). That Richard’s belief in this idea fades is reflected in the linguistic content of the speech. The first ten lines contain ten occurrences of the pronouns “us,” “our,” and “we.” This usage reflects the conceptual framework of the king’s two bodies. These locutions are instances of what is commonly referred to as “the royal we.” The next four lines contain four occurrences of the word “some,” whose ordinary linguistic connotation is “more than one.” The following ten lines contain six occurrences of the personal pronoun “him,” or “his.” And in the last seven lines, the personal

pronouns “you,” “me,” and “I,” are used seven times. Clearly, Richard’s notion of the king’s two bodies is closing in on itself.

This closing in is reflected thematically as well. Midway through the speech, Richard imagines kings as having been fooled into believing that they are invulnerable:

...for within the hollow crown
That rounds the mortal temples of a king
Keeps Death his court, and there the antic sits,
Scoffing his state and grinning at his pomp,
Allowing him a breath, a little scene,
To monarchize, be fear’d, and kill with looks;
Infusing him with self and vain conceit,
as if this flesh which walls about our life
Were brass impregnable. (3.2.160-168)

The idea of performative identity, i.e., identity as a matter of a condition one enacts, is expressed by Shakespeare’s unique and sole usage of his neologism *monarchize*. Richard comes to realize that his identity as monarch was constituted by his ability [*to monarchize*—that is, rule is role—and there is no monarch behind the monarchizing. Indeed, the “crown” is “hollow” (3.2.160). This realization instantiates Kastan’s more general claim that in the history plays “the fictions of stability insistently assert themselves, but the plays may be read virtually as the discovery that they are fictions” (469). Richard has discovered that both substantive identity and divinely ordained monarchy are just such fictions of stability.

Richard has looked inward and found nothing. Now in order to construct a coherent self and stake a claim in history, he must position himself from the outside looking in. He must see himself narratively. How he is to act and how he is to be construed both depend upon in what stories he finds himself a part. He sees the part he is to play in Bolingbroke’s narrative when, in the next scene, he adopts an ironic attitude toward his usurper’s demands:

What must the king do now? Must he submit?
The king shall do it. Must he be dispos’d?
The king shall be contented. Must he lose
The name of king? a God’s name, let it go. (3.3.143-146)

Richard uses the word “must” both to express contempt for Bolingbroke’s demands and to proclaim his own narrative detachment. Although Richard recognizes the paradigmatic shift from the authority of divine right to the authority of Machievellian realpolitik, he does not grant its legitimacy. So, he mocks

Bolingbroke's authority by parodying the semantic logic of "the king must," a logic which is only coherent in Bolingbroke's new metaphoric. In addition, the anaphora of the definite article, "The," creates narrative detachment, and the word "must" strengthens this narrative stance by functioning exercitively in this scene. It functions as a kind of self-reflexive imperative, i.e., as a directive to act. And he does act: he creates his own role when, in the deposition, he attempts to write his own story, i.e., he attempts *to tell himself*. Having seen and rejected the role he is to play in the story Bolingbroke wants to tell, he now envisions himself as a subject of historical narrative, a narrative in which he plays the role of a deposed king.

It is Richard who best controls the visual and verbal symbols of authority when in the deposition he narrates the unfolding of the ritual events. Not only does his manipulation of events problematize the matter of who is king at this point, but it also exposes Bolingbroke's claim to the throne to ridicule. The following chiasmus makes explicit Richard's mockery: "Ay, no; no, ay; for I must nothing be./ Therefore no 'no', for I resign to thee" (4.1.100-201). Richard can no more un-king himself than Bolingbroke can make himself king.

Once un-kinged, Richard looks in the mirror for which he has asked, and lamenting that "my sorrow hath destroyed my face" (4.1.291), he dashes the mirror against the ground. Un-kinged, he is un-selved. However, Bolingbroke points out to Richard that what Richard laments is not real, and in doing so, he unwittingly leads Richard to *re-king* himself. Richard retells Bolingbroke's remarks to mean that Richard's sorrows are an external manifestation of a substantial grief. He analogizes Bolingbroke's remarks in terms of the Neo-Platonic idea that the more real something is, the more shadows it casts. The analogy corresponds to Plato's allegory of the cave, which itself depicts a hierarchy of levels of reality, each of which is the cause of the reflections that comprise the lower ones. Thus, Richard re-figures himself as king, and as such, he conceives himself as one of these higher level substances, one that casts many shadows. In other words, he re-imagines himself in the form of the king's body politic, and by doing so, he recasts himself in the form of an idealized king. Unable to sustain his role in an historically contingent narrative, he grasps onto a vestige of his metaphysical identity, and consequently, he lapses into the old metaphoric. By situating himself in this mythic, and thus a-historical, narrative Richard is able to transcend his suffering.

Although Richard's natural bodily identity is broken asunder, it is the identity embedded in the body politic which, for the time being, he heralds. When he confronts Isabel, his queen, after his deposition, he urges her to think of him as if he were already dead. He implores her, "Tell thou the lamentable tale of me"

(5.1.44), a tale in which Richard is identified as “a rightful king” (5.1.50). Thus, Richard recognizes that only in the idealized, or narrative, role of himself as deposed king does he truly acquire a stable identity. Only by positing this a-historical self can either he or Isabel transcend their suffering. However, he cannot sustain this conceptual point of view. Because he posits a self which is necessarily incomplete, i.e., one half of the king’s two bodies, he knows that this position offers only an illusory narrative freedom. Richard acknowledges this in his final, and only, soliloquy:

Thus play I in one person many people,
 And none contented. Sometimes am I king,
 Then treasons make me wish myself a beggar,
 And so I am. Then crushing penury
 Persuades me I was better when a king;
 Then am I king’d again, and by and by
 Think that I am unking’d by Bolingbroke,
 And straight am nothing. But what’re I be,
 Nor I, nor any man that but man is,
 With nothing shall be pleas’d, till he be eas’d
 With being nothing. (5.5.31-41)

Notes

1. I am indebted to Joseph A. Porter for the idea that Richard tends to speak in exercitives. It is an idea which Porter develops at the very end of the chapter on *Richard II* in *The Drama of Speech Acts: Shakespeare's Lancastrian Tetralogy*. Although he cites Austin, Porter's comment is a general one about the character of Richard. It is this general point which I attempt in the following paragraph to apply to this speech

Works Cited

- Austin, J.L. *How to Do Things with Words*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Kantorowicz, Ernst H. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.
- Kastan, David Scott. "Proud Majesty Made a Subject: Shakespeare and the Spectacle of Rule." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 37 (1986): 459-75.
- Porter, Joseph A. *The Drama of Speech Acts: Shakespeare's Lancastrian Tetralogy*. Berkeley: California University Press, 1979.
- Rorty, Richard. *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Shakespeare, William. *King Richard II*. Ed. Peter Ure. Walton-on-Thames, U.K.: Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd, 1998.

Henry V's "reformation in a flood": The Chosen, Anointed, or Self-appointed?

Elizabeth McGuffey

Shakespeare's major tetralogy demonstrates a tortuous internal struggle of Bolingbroke as a king who never quite reconciles himself to his crime against the divine right of kings. Prince Hal as Henry V must eventually redeem his father's crime and epitomize the ideal Christian King. The distinct internal debate, passed on in the symbol of the crown from Richard to Bolingbroke to Hal, finds its resolution on the eve of the battle at Agincourt when Henry V internalizes the cause of both his father's torment of conscience and craving for reconciliation. By embodying the characteristics of his immediate predecessors and actualizing a rhetoric inherited from them, he miraculously triumphs over France. It is via the Christianizing of ideas about mercy, war, and grace that the outcome was readily adaptable to the sixteenth-century social consciousness, and that our perception of Hal as the quintessential Christian King personified is realized.

Literary historians view the plays as political commentary. Some believe the plays point to the historical significance of a dynastic conflict existing between the houses of Lancaster and York in the fifteenth century. Others, especially Stephen Greenblatt, identify the prevalent influence of dynastic conflict in the plays in the ruling classes, who merely mimic guileful practices bequeathed to them by the fifteenth-century conflict. Providentialist philosophers marvel at the coincidence of the War of the Roses with the inception of the Tudor Dynasty. Tom McAlindon, however, claims that these theories, although relevant to England's history, are not plausible because they do not compensate for the fact that the composite mind of both Shakespeare and his audience mainly dwelt upon issues specific to their time. Thus, the Elizabethan audience understood the central historical analogy in *Henry IV* to be the second Northern Rebellion, which spanned the years 1569-70 (McAlindon 70).

In 1536 the precursor to this rebellion, the Pilgrimage of Grace, was led by forty thousand of Henry VIII's subjects who attacked Cromwell and Camden, ostensibly the military leadership of the king, as an attempt to revive the Roman Church. Cromwell and Camden had been inculcating the people with their Lutheran tenets and, in doing so, they suppressed the population by throwing

them out of the abbeys and the community, and by stifling Saints' days and pilgrimages. The six northern counties which staged the rebellion against this heretical behavior alerted Henry VIII to the fact. Although the southern counties could not enter the rebellion for various reasons, there were widespread sympathies there with the North. The pilgrims claimed that their cause would be essentially religious and peaceful as long as the King redressed their grievances. Toting banners and relics, and wearing badges from a recent Crusade against the Moors, they defended their divinely sanctioned cause. In 1569, a second Northern Rebellion marched against the throne, led by Thomas Percy, seventh Earl of Northumberland. Percy's ancestor, the Earl of Northumberland, Henry Percy, both an historical figure and a character in the *Henriad*, may have merged as one figure in the social understanding. Four more rebellions occurred in the sixteenth century, following the Pilgrimage of Grace, all in opposition to the Reformation, appearing with persistent images which assumed archetypal standing in connection with the rebellions. These, as well as the political implications conveyed by dramatization of cultural lore, would have inspired a patriotism in the Elizabethan audience.

Furthermore, the Books of Homilies, read to religious congregations of the period, not only provide evidence that the papacy backed the rebellions, but the four editions printed between 1575 and 1596 all open with a sermon devoted to the Pilgrimage of Grace. Thus, subversion transpired at the spiritual center of culture. McAlindon emphasizes the fact that the overthrow of Richard II, allegedly caused by the Bishop of Canterbury, and the successive rebellions of sixteenth-century England "are all linked in immediate sequence as part of the long history of papal incitement to rebellion against lawful rulers in Europe" (McAlindon 71-2). Inverted relationships in the plays would seem to have perplexed the sixteenth-century audience, particularly those asserted by church figures. According to the Abbot of Westminster in *Richard II*, the deposition of Richard is a "woeful pageant," and the Bishop of Carlisle predicts that "children yet unborn" will inherit the stigma of a national debate through civil wars lasting nearly twenty years with Bolingbroke as king (4.1.311-12). The church is a figurehead that blindly obeys the tradition of the Divine Right in order to maintain its own supremacy, ignoring whether the ruler benefits his nation. Subversive tactics of the papacy are implemented twice more in the *Henriad*, although the second and most important intervention occurs in *Henry V*. When the final play of the tetralogy, *Henry V*, appeared on stage, approximately thirty years after the bulk of these rebellions had occurred, its appeal to religious patriotism was "intrinsic to the state's self-justifying and self-protective version of history" (McAlindon 71).

Beginning *Henry V*, the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Ely must prevent the king from ratifying a bill which threatens to deprive the church of its wealth. To their advantage, the new king, Henry V, is concentrated upon authenticating his father's place on the throne and expiating his first disobedience. On his deathbed, Bolingbroke (*Henry IV*), is plagued by shame and remorse: "the memory of the former days . . . How / I came by the crown, O God forgive, / And grant it may with thee in true peace live" (2 *Henry IV* 4.3.342-47). He extends the emotional burden to Hal, the next ruler of state, and in the audience's mind, the church.

When Hal becomes king he promises the bishops he will reject the sinister bill in exchange for exonerating England's claim to France, which Canterbury willingly supports. With the Church's favor, the path is cleared for him to make the war on France an Holy War, which will preoccupy his people, redeem his lineage, and thus justify his rightful seat on the throne. Now that he works from a "god-sent pretext," Henry V begins to employ the rhetoric of a Christian King: "We are no tyrant, but a Christian king, / Unto whose grace our passion is as subject / As is our wretches fettered in our prisons" (*Henry IV* 1.2.241-43). Henry augments this new rhetoric with an intent to be merciful to conspirators plotting his death when he claims, "O let us yet be merciful" (2.2.47). Although he condemns the traitors according to their own verdict concerning a petty criminal, Henry's decision complies with Christ's Beatitude, "Blest are they who show mercy; mercy shall be theirs" (*Matt.* 5:7).

Henry's actions are in themselves, subversive, for the Chorus identifies him as the "mirror of all Christian Kings," an idea implicitly corresponding to the New Testament (*II:C.5*). Indeed, the repetition of the word "mercy" attests to the sixteenth-century belief in grace. To the Protestants grace could be achieved, perhaps, through meditation upon the Word of God; whether preached, read, sung, applied to life, or as a point of internal wrestling, such as Henry's "I and my bosom must debate a while" (4.1.31), to which Erpingham rejoins with religious blessings—the Word was a necessary but not sufficient condition. 'Grace alone' exemplified God's will and right to grant salvation to whomever he chose. The common spiritual notion was the central tenet of Calvinist doctrine and of proprietary concern to the predominantly Christian people (McAlindon 73).

Yet, Henry's rhetoric corresponds to Old Testament themes as well. After Henry realizes that England has triumphed at Agincourt, he calls for there to be sung the *Non Nobis* and the *Te Deum* in praise of the "God of Battles" (4.2.271). The *Te Deum* is a canticle of thanks and praise to God; but it is curious to note that the *Non Nobis*, Psalm 115, another hymn of praise and thanksgiving, immediately follows Psalm 114, "The Lord's Wonders at the Exodus." Chapter

15 of the book of Exodus is what scholars identify as the “Song of the Sea,” the earliest biblical text, which serves as Henry’s method and foundation upholding God’s participation in England’s war (Marx 85). Henry resembles the Old Testament King David, to whom are attributed songs of thanksgiving which glorify God’s having granted victory over his enemies (2 Sam. 22).

Henry’s enactment of Old Testament figures is sealed by a symbolic gesture of petition on the eve of the last battle, paralleling the book of Daniel, chapter 9, in which confession effects the mercy of a feared Creator:

O God of battles, steel my soldier’s hearts,
Possess them not with fear. Take from them now
The sense of reck’ning...

...think not upon the fault
My father made in compassing the crown.
I Richard’s body have interred new,
And on it have bestowed more contrite tears
Than from it issued forced drops of blood.

...More will I do,
Though all that I can do is nothing worth,
Since that my penitence comes after ill,
Imploring pardon. (4.2.271-87)

Such prayers are common admissions of God’s chosen in the Old Testament. Similarly, in 2 Chronicles, chapter 20, Jehoshaphat’s small army at Jerusalem is outnumbered, but victory is guaranteed since the battle is not theirs, but God’s.

Jack Miles notes in his book, *God: A Biography*, that imitation of God is central to Jewish piety, just as imitation of Christ is to Christians (3). Miles claims Western culture has been obsessed for centuries with the desire to imitate the Creator, a being whose chief feature is omnipotence. He suggests that religious faith substantiates God’s unlimited authority and providence by the appropriateness and goodness of all outcomes. Therefore, Shakespeare’s Henry V, at every turn, enacts the role of a servant to the greater God, the sovereign, and the nation; and Henry’s rhetoric conforms to religious and social transactions. If his character is not constant, his mutability reflects the religious and social diversity in Elizabethan England; indeed, his character is an unblemished mirror of the Christian times.

Works Cited

The New American Bible. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1971.

McAlindon, Tom. "Pilgrims of Grace." *Shakespeare Survey*, 48 (1995): 69-84.

Marx, Steven. "Holy War in Henry V." *Shakespeare Survey*, 48 (1995): 85-97.

Miles, Jack. *God: A Biography*. New York: Vintage, 1995.

The Norton Shakespeare. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1997.

Pogues Me, Kate: Shakespeare, The Irish Wars, and *The Taming of the Shrew*

Lawrence Beemer

The two Induction scenes which cause *The Taming of the Shrew* to be a play within a play have often been seen as problematic, and in many productions have been excised entirely for the sake of convenience. The transformation of a drunkard into a lord may not seem to complement the story of shrewish Katharina and Petruchio, but it does introduce the possibility of a second interpretation by leading the audience's eyes away from the primary domestic story and westward toward a political subtext.

The *dramatis personae* indicates that the primary character in the induction scenes, Christopher Sly, is both a tinker and a beggar. While we assume that "tinker" simply means a person who mends pots and other small metal items while operating from a cart, it is probably not meant to be employed as such in this particular instance. The *Oxford English Dictionary* is vague on the etymology of the word *tinker*; it suggests that there may be an onomatopoeic link to the sound of a small hammer on metal, but it also indicates a connection to a derogatory name for the itinerant peoples of Ireland. Although this sense of "tinker" has fallen into desuetude and has been replaced with the more polite word "traveler" and the inappropriately applied word "gypsy," it is highly feasible that Shakespeare is employing the word to denote Sly's national origin and to address an English political concern.

The Irish Tinkers share many of the characteristics of European Gypsies and are often associated or confused with them. Irish expansion to continental Europe has led many to suspect that Tinker familial caravans intermarried with Gypsy *kumpanias*, but it is extremely unlikely that the Tinkers originally descended from the true Gypsy or Romany bloodline. An actual point of origin is impossible to ascertain; because rampant illiteracy and storytelling traditions caused the Irish itinerants to rely on an oral tradition and because few anthropological studies exist prior to the 1970's, the genealogy of the caravans has never been precisely documented. Although many ambiguities exist, there is evidence to place the origins of the Tinkers well before Shakespeare's era and significant English legal documentation to show that they had become a

concern in the sixteenth century. Gmelch and Langan's photo-history of Irish itinerants, *Tinkers and Travelers*, suggests that "by 1175 'tinkler' and 'tynkere' begin appearing in written records as trade or surnames" and that "by the 1500's 'tinkers' were well established on Irish Roads" (10). Sixteenth-century England saw a great influx of wandering and dispossessed Irishmen; the English perceived this stream of immigrants as a cultural contamination and a counter-invasion to their own military engagements. In his book *Shakespeare, Spenser, and the Crisis in Ireland*, Christopher Highley states that:

Throughout the sixteenth-century, observers claimed that an "invasion" from Ireland was already underway—an invasion not of soldiers but of beggars and masterless men. A Welshman reported in 1528 that "20,000 Irishmen had entered Pembrokeshire in the past twelve months...and had practically over-run the country." (50)

In response to the growing number of Irish itinerants in England, Scotland, and Wales, legislation against vagrancy was handed down that targeted the lifestyle and trades of these people and made their very existence a punishable offence. *The Taming of the Shrew* begins with Sly arguing with the inn's hostess; in her first line, the hostess exclaims, "a pair of stocks, you rogue!" (Induction 1.2) While this is often viewed as a quick and simple way to establish Sly as a disreputable character, it seems that the hostess's threat may be founded on solid legal grounds. A Tinker could face imprisonment simply by leading the life that his own culture dictated. Many of the laws passed against vagrancy and begging were designed with language that specifically included the Irish itinerants. Under the administration of Edward VI, "an Acte for tynkers and pedlers" became instituted as policy and stated that

For as much as it is evident that tynkers, pedlers, and suche like vagrant persons are more harmful than necessarie to the Common Wealth of this realm, Be it therefore ordeyned...that... no person or persons commonly called tynker, pedler, or pety chapman shall wander or go from one towne to another or from place to place out of the towne, parishe, or village where suche person shall dwell, and sell punnes, poyntes, laces, gloves, knyves, glasses, topes or any suche like things or use or exercise the trade or occupation of a tynker. (qtd. in Gmelch 10)

By implication, when a reader begins to think of Sly as an Irish Tinker, fresh criticism of Shakespeare's Irish political content opens up in other areas. Tom Snout in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* is another comedic character and also a Tinker. In Eastcheap, Hal boasts that he "can drink with any tinker in his own language" (*I Henry IV* 2.5.16) This last passage recognizes "tinker" as more than a

simple designation of class or occupation; Tinkers do have their own secret language, Shelta. Like most of Tinker history, any “facts” that indicate an origin of the language are entirely unreliable, but it is clear that this language was used as means of keeping people outside of the culture at a disadvantage. If Hal can indeed converse in Shelta, then this line is a testimony to what degree Hal is initiated into England’s underworld population.

Sly is often discussed from the point of view of class conflict, but there are sufficient textual allusions to support a claim that he is Irish. Bizarrely, Sly mispronounces a Spanish expression, *paucas pallabris* (*pocas palabras*); it is not the mispronunciation that is so bizarre, but rather the beggar’s knowledge of any Spanish at all. Shakespeare puts these words into his character’s mouth quite deliberately; he may be playing off the paranoia of his audience, who suspected the Irish were conspiring against them with the Spanish. This paranoia was somewhat justified; both countries were loyally Catholic, and loathed the English. Apparently “Irish exiles urged [King Philip of Spain] to invade England from Ireland—a plan that was nearly adopted by the [Spanish] Armada commanders in 1588” (Highley 50). As Ireland has been one of history’s most invaded territories, a homogenous national identity is an unusually difficult concept to assert. Bloodlines contain the influence of every invading force; such diverse groups as the Romans, the Saxons, and the Vikings have all taken their turns influencing the Irish gene pool and, purportedly, so have the Spanish. The possibility of Spanish blood running through Irish veins further fueled England’s racial enmity for the western island. Just prior to Sly’s Spanish slip, he argues the legitimacy of his family by suggesting that the “chronicles” would show how they “came in with Richard Conqueror” (Induction 1.4). By “chronicles,” Sly is probably referring to Holinshed’s *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, the historical text that Shakespeare drew from as a primary source for his plays. The allusion to “Richard Conqueror” is often cited as Sly’s mistake for William the Conqueror, but what may be a simple comedic error for Sly must be considered a deliberate and calculated maneuver for his creator. Shakespeare specifically chooses the name Richard to replace William, and it is a Richard’s failed conquest of Ireland that will become a key element in a play written less than a year after *Taming*.

Shakespeare’s historical tragedy *Richard II* illustrates how costly military engagement in Ireland once overturned the monarchy and warns that the same could occur for Elizabeth. Instead of risking direct criticism of the queen and contemporary politics, Shakespeare used his histories as a safer avenue for commentary; by illuminating the past, he had hopes that his countrymen would not

be condemned to repeat it. Richard “hath not money for these Irish wars” (*Richard II* 2.1.259), and as it turns out, neither did Elizabeth: “At the end of the Nine Years War in Ireland, the Privy Council blamed England’s involvement there rather than in Europe for virtually bankrupting the nation” (Highley 2). Open warfare in Ireland created more problems than solutions; Richard’s invasion weakened and dispersed his army, emptied his coffers, alienated his overtaxed subjects, and resulted in the usurpation of the crown. Armed conflict in Ireland has historically proven ineffective, and as we know from even casually observing the last six hundred years, the Irish have never capitulated to force.

To the English, Ireland was not perceived as a foreign country that they hoped to acquire, but rather as a disobedient province that they already possessed. In 1541 Henry VIII declared himself king of Ireland; this re-titling both sanctified and legitimized his dominion over the western island in a fashion not unlike a sixteenth-century view of matrimony. The language of wedlock was pervasive when describing the tense relations between England and Ireland; for example, Fynes Moryson wrote in his essay “The Commonwealth of Ireland” that “The English have always governed Ireland not as a conquered people by the sword and the conqueror’s laws, but as a province united upon marriage,” and in his book *A Discovery of the True Causes Why Ireland Was Never Entirely Subdued*, Sir John Davies suggested that “the husbandman must first break the land, before it be made capable of good seed” (qtd. in Neill 1). Because it was perceived that the bond between the two islands was both holy and legal, England’s military conquest of Ireland would have been “a shameful conquest of itself” (*Richard II* 2.1.66). Ireland was not a separate and independent nation to be assaulted and invaded, but more of an unruly bride that would assume its proper role through a process of assimilation and taming.

While Shakespeare’s play *The Taming of the Shrew* retains all of the qualities of a domestic comedy that modern audiences continue to enjoy, there may have been a political subtext intended. Petruchio’s assertion of sovereignty and the means by which he achieves it over his bride Kate, the single most common female name in Ireland, may be operating as a parable for Anglo-Irish relations. As we have discussed, the play begins with the two slightly awkward induction scenes where the drunken Irish Tinker, Sly, is transformed overnight into an English lord. The true lord’s experiment on Sly is to see if the Tinker will forget his own identity if a new one is provided for him and, much to the lord’s enjoyment, the Irish rover assumes his newly acquired sedentary and aristocratic role. Anglicization was believed to be the viable alternative to war; if Irish culture could be eradicated and replaced with English culture, then the resulting

homogeneity would end the conflicts. The theory was that if the Catholics could be converted, if the Irish language were abandoned, and if the clan chiefs were renamed barons and lords, then one day the Irish would awaken to find that they, like Sly, had become Englishmen.

It's needless to say that simply renaming the Irish as English subjects was not as effective as Henry VIII would have hoped, and costly military engagement had proven futile. Shakespeare may be offering a solution to the crisis in Ireland in the form of *Taming*. As Highley points out, "when describing, let alone challenging, the controversial subject of English involvement in Ireland, Shakespeare and other writers both in and out of the theater worked out strategies of temporal displacement and spatial transcoding" (Highley 6). We accept that when Shakespeare is talking of distant times and places, he is addressing issues that were pertinent to *his* England: the play *Henry V* actually instructs the audience to imagine the battle of Agincourt as a representation of Essex's campaign in Ireland, but we have yet to envision the story of a man and his unruly wife as a parable even when the induction scene directs us to do so. The English believed that they were the categorical opposites of the Irish. While England was civil, the Irish were wild; they were Protestant, the Irish were Catholic; they had a monarchy, the Irish maintained feudalism; they had currency, the Irish had barter. Their problem was their polarity, and the English believed they could achieve harmony in their kingdom if the Irish would just see everything their way. Petruchio finally tames Kate in exactly this fashion; if Petruchio says that it is the moon that shines above them, then she must relent and agree, whether or not it is the blessed sun she sees.

Petruchio does not employ direct physical violence to achieve his ends; never raising a hand, he tames Kate by instituting the qualities in her he wishes her to possess. He controls her linguistically and dresses her according to his tastes. To begin the process, he assumes control of her provisions; the submission sequence (Act 4, scenes 1, 3, 5) begins with Petruchio denying his new bride access to food. In his tract *A View of the State of Ireland*, Edmund Spenser suggested that a solution to the Irish situation would be to starve them into compliance, and it is Lord Grey, under whom Spenser served in Ireland, who instituted an actual famine policy against the Munster rebels in the early 1580's.

When one begins to see *The Taming of the Shrew* as a parable for how to end the Irish wars, even Kate's final speech resonates with these concerns. Although a primarily domestic speech, her language here is highly political and pertinent to a discussion of the war against the rebellious Irish:

What is she but a foul contending rebel
 And Graceless traitor to her loving lord?
 I am ashamed that women are so simple
 To offer war where they should kneel in peace. (5.2.163-66)

The tensions between England and Ireland were as relevant a topic of discourse during the Tudor reign as they are under present administrations, perhaps even more so. Invasions and uprisings occurred with uncanny frequency in the sixteenth century. The wars were costly for both sides and were one of the paramount concerns of the day. Shakespeare's personal politics are very difficult to pigeonhole; there is ample textual evidence to categorize Shakespeare's beliefs as anything from sycophantic to subversive. Critics can only speculate, but it seems that the plays are against open warfare between the two islands, and although they argue that Ireland should assume a submissive role, that submission should be achieved through slyer means.

Works Cited

- Bagwell, Richard. *Ireland Under the Tudors*. 3 Vols. London: Holland Press, 1963.
- Fraser, Angus. *The Gypsies*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.
- Gmelch, Sharon. *Tinkers and Travelers*. Dublin: E.&T. O'Brien, 1975.
- Highley, Christopher. *Shakespeare, Spenser, and the Crisis in Ireland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Neill, Michael. "Broken English and Broken Irish: Nation, Language, and the Optic of Power in Shakespeare's Histories." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 45 (1994): 1-34.
- The Norton Shakespeare*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1997.
- Spenser, Edmund. *A View of the State of Ireland*. Ed. Andrew Hadfield and Willy Maley. Oxford: Blackwell, 1997.

Set Phasers on Shakespeare: The Bard as a Cultural Weapon in *Star Trek*

Adam J. Romano

Episode one of the science-fiction television series *Star Trek: The Next Generation*, stardate: 41153.7: the crew of the intergalactic starship U.S.S. Enterprise is being scrutinized and put on trial for all the atrocities committed by humankind throughout history by an omnipotent alien being known as Q. The crew's captain, Jean-Luc Picard, affirming that there will be no legal trickery in this court, makes the statement: "I recognize this court system as the one that agrees with that line from Shakespeare, 'Kill all the lawyers.'" Eventually, the captain's diplomatic capabilities exonerate him and his crew—but only temporarily.

Episode ten, stardate 41590.5: The trial of humanity continues as the crew encounters the god-like Q for the second time. In another plea for humanity's worth, Picard again calls upon the authority of Shakespeare and says:

What [Hamlet] might say with irony, I say with conviction. "What a piece of work is man. How noble in reason, how infinite in faculty. In form and moving, how express and admirable. In action how like an angel. In apprehension, how like a god."

By fragmenting Shakespeare's work and creating this ethos in his argument, Picard is guilty of having the very thing he wishes to avoid in the first episode—a lawyer. Shakespeare is immediately established as advocate for humanity, and this relationship will remain as a recurring motif throughout the show's seven-year course.

Undoubtedly, Shakespearean fragments have served this purpose before, creating a moral high ground by which our actions are gauged. A prime example of this occurs in the 1942 film *To Be or Not To Be*, in which a Jewish actor appropriates Shylock's "Prick us, do we not bleed?" speech from *The Merchant of Venice* in an attempt to persuade Nazi soldiers to let him go free. Thus, something once said by a decidedly wicked character, taken out of context, now serves as a speech on racial ethics. Outnumbered and restrained, the young Jewish actor relies on the only weapon available to him—Shakespeare's words. Likewise, when facing aliens such as Q, whose strength can not be thwarted physically, Picard resorts to using his own knowledge of the Bard as his means of defense.

Language is indeed a weapon and these days it is not unusual to hear post-modernists speak of it as such. They have taught us that words often serve as a means of maintaining power, and that those with that power protect language's ordained preponderance by not revealing its meaning to the masses. Likewise, academics and members of an assumed cultural elite have been known to protect the words of Shakespeare and use them as means to secure their self-worth. As a result, plays and sonnets that once had an inherent value of entertainment now easily serve as a mote around the academic's or tower.

For some, this is precisely what Captain Picard does with his Shakespeare. In her article, "Some suspect of ill: Shakespeare's sonnets and 'The Perfect Mate,'" Emily Hegarty accuses Picard of being overly protective of Shakespeare because of the manner in which he keeps his edition of *The Complete Works*. The heavy tome rests in a glass case and sits open inviting onlookers to see it only as a museum piece and not something to be read and enjoyed (Hegarty 54). Even in Picard's words we see his veneration for a sacrosanct Shakespeare, untouched by time. When Q decides to play the captain's quoting game, he says the line "All the galaxy's a stage." Picard corrects this quote by restoring it to "All the world's a stage" to which Q responds, "Well, if he was living he would have said 'galaxy.'" It's apparent that Picard will not be doing a twenty-fourth century adaptation of *As You Like It* any time soon.

Picard is probably not aware of how empowering Shakespeare is since "those with power are frequently least aware of... its existence" while those without it are most aware since it is that very power which is keeping them in servility (Delpit 568). It seems that Picard's concern with the playwright, for the most part, is chiefly ontological in nature, a means by which he can muse on the possibilities of existence. An android character, Data, strives to understand humans and emulates them to fit in. He often assumes the role of several Shakespearean characters in order to understand his crewmates better. After giving the captain a private performance of *Henry V*, he tells his lone spectator that he "plans on studying the performances of Olivier [and] Branagh." To this, Picard responds, "Data, you're here to learn about the human condition and there is no better way of doing that than embracing Shakespeare, but you must discover it through your own performance, not by imitating others." It is this mode of thinking, however, that makes the Bard a cultural weapon. Literary trends have moved away from seeing humanity as a collective because that philosophy implies that non-western cultures must rise to the occasion of meeting occidental standards. In outer space, it is no longer a matter of east versus west, but species versus species. Either way, a different form of appropriation is necessary to subvert this assumption of human unity.

Through misappropriation (if there is such a thing), the outsider can fight back in the cultural war. I applaud the *Star Trek* genre for addressing this issue in the feature length motion picture, *Star Trek VI: The Undiscovered Country*, the last film that utilizes the complete cast of the 1960s television series.

Stardate 9521.6: After years of bitter war, a belligerent race known as the Klingons show their willingness to accept peace with humanity by presenting their former enemies with their prize-possession—Shakespeare. At a diplomatic dinner with both species in attendance, the Klingon Chancellor makes a toast as a motion of good will; he proposes a toast to the “undiscovered country.” Another alien, Captain Kirk’s first officer, Spock, recognizes the phrase by saying, “*Hamlet*, Act three, scene one.” If we are to understand this toast in the context of Hamlet’s “To be or not be” speech, then the Chancellor is toasting to death, that thing from which “no traveler returns.” Realizing his mistake, the Chancellor quickly glosses his toast with the words “the future,” but by appropriating this famous speech for his own purposes, he betrays his best intentions because the quote yet retains some semblance of its original meaning, that of death. The death the Klingons are now vulnerable to is not so much a literal one but rather one of culture. Now the question “To be or not to be?” becomes a different inquiry: will the Klingons suffer a cultural death by joining hands with humans? It would seem that the answer is “yes” since they are already familiar with the spokesman of their former enemy. It is also likely that the forthcoming peace negotiation will not result in a cultural compromise; the crew of the *Enterprise* shows their incompetence in speaking Klingon, faltering over the language’s pronunciation and literal translation. Clearly, the cultural exchange between humans and Klingons will not be reciprocal.

As expected, some Klingons are not willing to lose their cultural identity to humanity. The Klingon military commander, General Chang, seems to have a fondness for Shakespeare, but his appreciation will eventually prove ironic. In an attempt to preserve hostility between the two races, Chang initiates the film’s final battle with the words “Once more unto the breach, dear friends,” those same words used by Henry V when initiating his own battle at Agincourt. Chang continues to unremittingly use his knowledge of Shakespeare to taunt the crew of the *Enterprise*. In one instance, he paraphrases the words of Shylock, “Tickle us do we not laugh? Prick us, do we not bleed? Wrong us, shall we not revenge?” By identifying himself with Shylock, a Jew in a land of Christians, Chang recognizes that he is that which is alien—that which is threatened by hegemonic forces. We now see that his words no longer pay tribute to humanity

but serve as counter-hegemonic weapons. He “speaks daggers” to the humans by using their own language against them.

It is often said that Shakespeare used his plays as a disguised form of political commentary, either in a subversive or sycophantic manner. *Star Trek* also has been known to make disguised commentary on contemporary social issues, such as Cold War politics, homosexuality, and racism. Both forms of entertainment rely on a displacement of time and/or space to make their commentary, but when the latter relies on the former for authority, an inadvertent contemporary issue arises—the deification of Shakespeare and its ramifications. With the exception of *Star Trek VI*, which consciously uses the playwright to make a political statement, the use of Shakespeare in *Star Trek* is incidental. After all, Captain Picard is played by former Royal Shakespearean actor Patrick Stewart, and it was not unusual for the show’s writers to consult the master thespian in times of literary need. Incidental or not, however, the result of the numerous appropriations is another symptom of the Shakespeare-deification disease that started in the Restoration period, replacing a “Heap of Vice Absurdity” with the so-called “Presentation of the Noble Characters drawn by Shakespear...from whence it is impossible to return without strong Impressions of Honour and Humanity” (Taylor 62). The hypothetical history of *Star Trek* projects that our source of vice absurdity, television, will not last beyond the year 2040, but here at the cusp of the twenty-first century, this television show, though optimistic in its vision, provides us with a different vice—the fragmentation of Shakespeare and its use as a means of cultural assimilation. Resistance is not futile.

Works Cited

- Delpit, Lisa D. "The Silenced Dialogue: Power and Pedagogy in Educating Other People's Children." *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory*. Ed. Victor Villnueva, Jr. Urbana: NCTE, 1997.
- "Defector, The." Writ. Ronald D. Moore. Prod. Michael Pillar. Dir. Robert Scheerer. *Star Trek: The Next Generation*. WPIX. Dec. 30, 1989.
- "Encounter at Farpoint." Writ. D.C. Fontana and Gene Roddenberry. Prod. Gene Roddenberry. Dir. Corey Allen. *Star Trek: The Next Generation*. WPIX. Sep. 26, 1987.
- Gross, Edward, and Mark A. Altman. *Captains' Logs*. Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1995.
- Hegarty Emily. "Some Suspects of Ill: Shakespeare's Sonnets and 'The Perfect Mate.'" *Extrapolation* 36 (1995): 54-64.
- Star Trek VI: The Undiscovered Country*. Screenplay by Nicholas Meyer and Denny Martin Flinn. Paramount Pictures, 1991.
- Taylor, Gary. *Reinventing Shakespeare*. New York: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1989.

“Are You a Good Witch or a Bad Witch?”: Interpreting the Relationships of Prospero, Ariel, and Caliban in *The Tempest* through the Mythology of Northern Europe

Kevin Cavanaugh

Throughout the centuries, William Shakespeare's *The Tempest* has weathered myriad interpretations, from conservative defenses of royal legitimacy and natural order, to post-colonial and feminist critiques of power and its uses. Recently, though, much criticism has focused intensely on reading the play as a tract against the English colonialism of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth Centuries, citing Prospero as a domineering figure, selfishly controlling the lives of the other inhabitants of the island. However, while the evidence for this latter reading is interesting and difficult to dispute, it reflects a twentieth-century mindframe bent on making Shakespeare more political than he himself may have been. The original audience of the play would have viewed it as something wholly different; and they would have seen the play's leading character in a much more positive light. By looking at the mythology of Northern Europe, the influence of English folklore on a seventeenth-century audience, and the role of fairies in the “real” world, a reader sees that Prospero's control over Ariel and Caliban is legitimate in that the audience would have viewed that control as a logical reaction to encounters with otherworldly creatures.

In order to appreciate the mythological aspects of the characters in *The Tempest*, it is important to realize that the setting itself holds significance to such a reading. By locating the action of the play on an enchanted island, Shakespeare places his audience in a realm to which they would have easily related. Many northern European cultures held a belief in small islands located out in the ocean and inhabited by fairies, elves, goblins, gods, etc., which were perpetually in spring and could provide everything a person might need to survive (Froud and Lee). Certainly, by Shakespeare's day, such a theory had not diminished; rather, the reports from the explorers circulating England at that time would have bolstered such a belief. For instance, Sylvester Jourdain's *A Discovery of the Bermudas* paints a picture of the New World as a paradise, a “country so abundantly fruitful of all fit necessities for the sustenation and preservation of man's life” (qtd. in Graff and Phalen 126). The text of the play,

then, helps to show that Prospero's island is a reflection of the common belief in Edenic islands. It is a place "of subtle, tender, and delicate temperance" (2.1.4344) and one that is "lush and lusty" (2.1.53). Gonzalo, in Act 2, scene 1, discusses what life would be like if he lived on the island:

All things in common nature should produce
Without sweat or endeavor. Treason, felony,
Sword, pike, knife, gun, or need of engine
Would not I have; but nature should bring forth,
Of its own kind, all foison, all abundance,
To feed my innocent people. (2.1.159-64)

The idea that nature would provide without the need for human toil is a common ideal for paradisiacal living, and Prospero's island holds such promise for the humans who have landed on it. The island is not merely beautiful and bountiful, though; it is also enchanted. The sea travelers have landed here unscathed after a tumultuous wreck, with clothes "fresh" even though they were drenched in seawater (2.1.68-70). Of course, the reader also learns that fairies and beasts inhabit the island, and that it was once the domain of the witch Sycorax. All of these characteristics would have played on the beliefs of the contemporary audience, and that audience would have been ready to view the mythological characters in the play according to their natural response to such creatures, be it fear, awe, hatred, or simple curiosity.

Prospero is the first character the reader meets who invokes an aura of magic and otherworldliness. In Act 1, scene 2, Miranda states, "If by your art, my dearest father, you have / Put the wild waters in this roar, allay them" (1-2). The use of the word "art," meaning magic, and the suggestion that Prospero has power over natural forces tell the reader immediately that he is a wizard. The modern rendering of wizards as old men with long white beards, wearing conical hats and flowing robes, much like the pictures of Merlin from the Arthurian legend, do not quite coincide with prevailing views in Elizabethan and Jacobean England. To Shakespeare's contemporary audience, the wizard was a recognizable, though not overtly so, member of the community. There were basically two types of wizards during this time. As Cumberland Clark states, "many scholars and physicians and even priests of the church were reputed to deal" in magical arts. This type of wizard, often referred to as an exorcist, was seen as having "noble" intentions and provided protection against demons and "evil influences" (29). The second type of wizard, the magician, held darker purposes. Much less feared than his sister, the witch, the magician was still believed to call on devils to do his bidding and cause pain and suffering to the common populace. He often was thought to have sold his soul to the devil.

Which of these categories Prospero falls into is certainly subject to debate, especially since many readers view Prospero as self-serving and cruel. A closer look at his character, though, shows that he strongly resembles the former type of wizard and would have been recognized as such by the audience. Although his initial intentions are to enact revenge on his brother, Antonio, and King Alonso for banishing him, he enacts that revenge in a benevolent way. He makes sure that Ariel has shipwrecked them without harming any one: “But are they, Ariel, safe?” (1.2.217); and later, when his plan is nearly completed, he states of his enemies:

Though with their high wrongs I am struck to the quick,
 Yet with my nobler reason 'gainst my fury
 Do I take part. The rarer action is
 In virtue than in vengeance. (5.1.25-28)

In the end, Prospero chooses to be noble and act in forgiveness rather than with hatred or wicked intent.

Many critics would argue that even though Prospero feels his intentions are “good,” he continues to be oppressive in his actions. In order to show that the intentions in those actions remain noble, one must study Prospero’s relationship with Ariel and Caliban. As stated, many interpretations of the play see Prospero’s treatment of both creatures as cruel, self-serving, and undeserved. Once again, though, this view modernizes the characters’ relationships. One must take into account the Shakespearean audience’s attitudes towards fairies, pseudo-devils, and other magical creatures in order to understand how Shakespeare meant for Prospero to be perceived.

A belief in fairies was widespread in England during Shakespeare’s time. In an age when scientific discovery was beginning to shed light on the mysteries of the world, both the learned and uneducated still had difficulty shedding their superstitions. Even Queen Elizabeth and King James are believed to have held strong beliefs in the supernatural (Clark 21). The question, then, is not whether the original audience of *The Tempest* believed in the existence of a creature like Ariel, but rather what they believed Ariel capable of doing. The modern understanding of fairies as benevolent, like Tinkerbell in *Peter Pan*, largely contradicts the view of these creatures in Celtic and Teutonic myth, the sources for much of English folklore. Fairies “were neither harmless nor playful...they were very dangerous” (Silver 150). According to *The New Larousse Encyclopedia of Mythology*, a Teutonic fairy (on which Shakespeare’s fairies are believed to be largely based) either kidnapped or killed any human it came across (279). Fairies were creatures to be feared and were often associated with the “uncivilized” Celtic regions of Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. They were believed to act without motive,

causing havoc for the mere sake of havoc. One of their more popular “pranks” was to kidnap human children, sometimes replacing those children with deformed ones. They also were thought to work hand in hand with the oft-feared witch, called upon by those women to assist in their deceptions and destructions (Briggs 99-116). In general, the population in London in the early seventeenth-century was one that viewed fairies as evil, nasty, and deadly.

Ariel displays attributes that are easily associated with the original belief in fairy behavior. According to Carole G. Silver, natural disasters and storms were believed to have been conjured up by the fairy world (153). The reader finds out in Act 1, scene 2 that Ariel, not Prospero, causes the tempest to erupt: “Hast thou, spirit, / Performed to point the tempest that I bade thee?” (194-195). Fairies were also accused of leading men astray, often to their deaths (Silver 152). In *The Tempest*, Ariel ushers Trinculo, Stephano, and Caliban through “[t]oothed briers, sharp furzes, pricking gorse, and thorns” (4.1.180) and eventually to the condemnation of Prospero. If Prospero practiced darker magic, Ariel very well may have been leading them to their death.

Since Shakespeare’s audience was well aware of the characteristics of fairies, they would have viewed Ariel’s actions as typical and would have view him as they viewed all fairies. Therefore, they would not have seen Prospero as cold and domineering. Rather, they would have sympathized with his treatment of the sprite. The wizard, who acts in opposition to how many who dealt in the magical arts were often suspected of behaving, does require Ariel to do his bidding, but he does so because the fairy owes him a debt for his rescue from the spell of Sycorax. And Ariel’s insistence on his freedom and his impatience with Prospero stem from the fairy’s “intrinsically free nature” (Nathanson xiv), and not from a feeling that he is being mistreated. Ariel finds “servitude of any kind [to be] unnatural and irksome” (Clark 114). He is a creature of the air, accustomed to being free, and therefore this “bondage” bothers him greatly. And in many ways, he is free. No longer is he entrapped in the pine tree; he is able to move about the island and practice his skills with great power, only required to assist Prospero when called upon. It is true that Prospero threatens him, as in Act 1, scene 2: “I will rend an oak / And peg thee in his knotty entrails” (295-96). But, again, the audience would have seen this threat as a way of protecting the humans from the free reign of a fairy, and not as an overly cruel act of punishment.

Prospero’s treatment of Ariel “is typical of the control over the supernatural agencies which is possible to the enlightened mortal” (Clark 111). In the end, Prospero is benevolent to the sprite, releasing him from his debt earlier than he needs to. Ariel becomes free to return “to the elements” (5.1.318) and Prospero wishes him well. These final actions are hardly those of an obsessive, control-

hungry man; rather, they show a compassion and respect for the fairy, feelings that the audience would not have shared upon walking in to the theater, but very well may have assumed by the end.

It is, of course, impossible to discuss both Prospero and Ariel without also mentioning Caliban. If Ariel is Prospero's airborne servant, Caliban is the servant of the earth. But what exactly is Caliban? Under the character listings at the beginning of the play, Shakespeare calls him merely a "savage and deformed slave" (Graff and Phalen 10). The reader also finds out that he is the son of Sycorax, the witch, and that he is not "honored with / A human shape" (1.2.285). For the most part, though, his appearance and species is up for interpretation. If we continue to look to the mythology of Northern Europe, then, connections can be found between Ariel, as a fairy, and Caliban.

According to English folklore, fairies had an inherent "closeness to physical nature that linked them to the bestial and the wild" (Silver 150). Caliban is often referred to in terms of beasts: Prospero calls him a "whelp" (1.2.284), meaning the offspring of an animal; Trinculo and Stephano consistently refer to him as a "monster" throughout the play; and he is even hunted like an animal by a pack of "dogs" in Act 4, scene 1. Also, in *Fairy Mythology in Shakespeare*, Alfred Trubner Nutt states that fairies were "rude and course and earthy" (10). Since Caliban is consistently connected to the earth, and is also "rude and course" throughout the play, a definite connection can be made between Caliban and fairies.

A closer resemblance to Caliban's description can be found in Norse mythology, which greatly influenced ancient England and could certainly be said to have helped shape parts of English folklore. The Norse believed that when the giant Ymir died, "the maggots emerging from [his] corpse...transformed themselves into the Light Elves and the Dark Elves" (Froud and Lee). The Light Elves were believed to have inhabited the air, and were considered kind and benevolent creatures. The Dark Elves, though, took to the underground and were "swarthy, evil, and blighting" (Froud and Lee). The Norse made no distinction between elves and fairies, and therefore a strong connection can be made between this belief and the development of Ariel and Caliban. Ariel, obviously, represents the Light Elf, living in, even being made of, air, and performing his tasks in mainly benevolent ways. Caliban, though, represents the heinous, earthy side of fairies. And he portrays this violent and evil side of the fairy myth well; he attempts rape upon Miranda and plots to kill Prospero.

Most post-colonialist readers of *The Tempest* like to view Caliban's revolts against Prospero as a legitimate action against oppression, while other critics have seen the creature as a reflection of the Western ideal of the "noble" savage.

Again, both of these readings are interesting and supportable. However, Prospero's supposed "oppression" is more justifiable given the fact that Caliban is not noble at all. As Leonard Nathanson writes, "[Caliban] contradicts the whole body of assumptions underlying the myth of the noble savage, the concept of a primal virtue apart both from discursive reason and special revelation" (xv). Caliban admits in Act 1, scene 2 that Prospero took him in when the humans first arrived on the island. He "strook[ed]" Caliban, gave him flavored drinks, and taught him to speak. He even let the beast sleep in his cave. Caliban repays this courtesy by attacking Miranda, and then complains that Prospero took over his island. And again, he later plots to kill the magician. These are hardly "noble" acts. They reflect more upon his nature as a Dark Elf, one bent on evil and destruction.

Prospero certainly does not act overly kindly towards Caliban, but he has good cause. Caliban threatened not only the honor of Miranda, but also the code of conduct befitting one who wishes to be viewed as "noble." Most importantly, though, to judge Prospero and his treatment of Caliban, one must study Act 5. Prospero pardons Caliban for the attempt on his life (5.1.294) and eventually will leave him on the island to reclaim what Caliban feels is rightfully his. He could have easily banished or killed the savage, but instead ends their relationship in forgiveness. Once again, Prospero proves to be not a sinister wizard, but rather a man of honor and a man of his word, releasing both Ariel and Caliban from his charge and relinquishing his magic for good.

By the play's end, Prospero's role as a "white magician" is confirmed. His control over Ariel and Caliban is not oppressive because he lives up to his promises and acts according to their actions and nature. And Shakespeare's audience would have agreed. Given their devout belief and fear of fairies, they would have seen Prospero's actions as standard, if not somewhat lax. A belief in and fear of the supernatural was real and lasting, and as Carol G. Silver writes, those beliefs and fears still exist among many in the English Isles (185). So, even today, Prospero can be viewed as a noble character because his actions reflect a true understanding of the nature of the relationship between humans and the supernatural world.

Works Cited

- Briggs, K.M. *The Anatomy of Puck: An Examination of Fairy Beliefs among Shakespeare's Contemporaries and Successors*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1959.
- Clark, Cumberland. *Shakespeare and the Supernatural*. London: Williams and Norgate, Ltd., 1931.
- Froud, Brian and Alan Lee. *Fairies*. New York: Sovenier Press, 1978. (unpaginated)
- Graff, Gerald and James Phalen, Ed. *William Shakespeare, The Tempest: A Case Study in Critical Controversy*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000.
- Nathanson, Leonard. Introduction to *The Blackfriars Shakespeare: The Tempest*. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company, 1969.
- The New Larousse Encyclopedia of Mythology*. Translated by Richard Aldington and Delano Ames. London: The Hamlyn Publishing Group Limited, 1959.
- Nutt, Alfred. *The Fairy Mythology of Shakespeare*. London: David Nutt, 1900. Reprinted in New York: AMS Press, 1972.
- The Norton Shakespeare*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1997.
- Silver, Carole G. *Strange Peoples: Fairies and Victorian Consciousness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Shakespeare in Vogue: The Bard at the Cinema

Michelle Gatzert

Any solid piece of fictional literature with depth of plot and character that explores some truth of the human psyche will eventually be written as a screenplay or a made-for-TV film simply because it can be. The universality of the piece lends itself well to the creativity of someone who is committed to conquering a challenging piece or who has some vision he or she would like to convey to the populace. By the very nature of the challenge, or in an effort to realize their vision, or to do both and generate revenue in the process, filmmakers are naturally drawn to Shakespeare. His plays are open to interpretation, as he did not write with the scripted stage directions of a Tennessee Williams or an Arthur Miller; directors are therefore free to realize his plays as they choose. There is no copyright to adhere to, no authority which must be pleased. The malleability of Shakespeare's plays and the manner in which he adapted his sources to serve certain aesthetic, moral, biographical, or political aims invite each generation of readers anew to "reinvent" him through his work again.

When a play becomes a film, a particular reading is crystallized in time, rooted to the era in which it was produced and to the philosophy of the director. It represents a specific interpretation and is visualized in a way that could never happen through a simple reading. And the film may warrant merit as a text itself. Samuel Crowl notes that films are texts of sorts and cites Barbara Hodgson on this very topic: "On the one hand, there is a self-individuated project, resulting in a text (the critical reading) that *replaces* the play with another text; on the other hand, a collectively understood and collectively mediated performance, a public project that replaces the play within a theatrical and cultural space" (10-11). Choices of setting, cast, intonation, pauses, inflection, background action or scene, and staging become the focal point of the work, at times overshadowing language as that which captures the audience's attention and admiration and contributes toward sympathies.

What must be taken into account in the analysis of a film is the degree to which the director aimed to represent Shakespeare as his work would have been in the sixteenth century or aimed to adapt Shakespeare to fit a vision. Shakespeare made into film can serve either of the two aims: in the first, the play

is presented on screen very much as it would have been staged during Shakespeare's day; in the second, the play is re-set to a modern time in order to further appeal to a modern audience. In a review of the Luhrmann *Romeo+Juliet* (1996), Jeffrey Farance eloquently described this dilemma: "Whether 'tis nobler in the minds of Hollywood filmmakers to preserve the works of the Bard of Avon unaltered from the original or to dust off the centuries of cobwebs and transport the timeless saga into an era more familiar to today's audience: that is the question" (1). In other words, one is "Shakespeare on film," the other, "Shakespeare, the movie."

A film is necessarily a collision of text and image (Brown 2). It also has the ability to move far more quickly, perhaps in some cases portraying scenes with the rapidity Shakespeare might have intended. With film, the audience exists as part of the story through close-ups with clear facial expressions, cinematic effects and music which may heighten a mood, and a telescoped script. To think in terms of these benefits and drawbacks of cinematic adaptation is unavoidable as they are a byproduct of the nature of the genre, much as were those conventions of the stage which limited and guided Shakespeare, especially when the adaptation is "Shakespeare, the movie."

In two specific cases of films which transport the settings of Shakespeare, the Richard Loncraine *Richard III* starring Ian McKellan and the Baz Luhrmann *Romeo+Juliet* starring Leonardo DiCaprio and Claire Danes, the films become representative and reflective of the current mindset, playing to particular belief systems and interests. In short, they are exposés: they typify the political, social, and religious mores of the time, while intensifying them to attract and provoke audiences in much the same way Shakespeare himself might have directed his plays to be performed. Each film is alive with visual imagery, which Crowl believes is the true text of a film (12), and cinematic effects which cause the films to be not interpretations but adaptations of Shakespeare. While the cinematic effects necessitate "adaptation," they portray the mores of the time, or, more likely, serve to appeal to a particular audience, aiming for maximum impact and enticement. Modern audiences love their special effects: adults appreciate the Hitleresque imagery of *Richard III* set in "the decade that appeased fascist dictators" (Brown 2) because it is mature, impressive, intimidating, provocative, and scary. It awes them and creates an instant reference point for the evil and imperious nature of Richard Gloucester; no explanation is necessary when he is likened to Hitler, Mosley, or Oswald. Likewise, adolescents appreciate the visual stimulation, frenetic energy, and surreal nature of the music video-flavor of *Romeo+Juliet*, complete with exotic costuming, sensual water imagery, and the glamorous violence of mafioso undercurrent.

Directors are able to create their own world as they reinvent the plays. In order, then, to revitalize Shakespeare, these films, vibrant through fresh takes, telescoped scripts, and collisions between texts and images, modernize Shakespeare's work by focusing on settings, props, and actions. To this end, McKellan and Loncraine worked through setting to make *Richard III* as plausible as possible; they felt that the rise of an English king to a political dictator was feasible in 1930s Europe (9). What was fifteenth-century England is now an "imaginary" Europe of the 1930s, ("About the Production" 2) although the allusions to Mosley are prominent as well. In terms of props, this production abounds with 1930s relics. Loncraine felt that this was "a wonderful period visually—the clothes, the cars, the architecture are marvelous" (qtd. in "About" 6). The film is literally drenched in sensuous color: red fabrics drape Lady Anne, the royalty, and the room in which Richard delivers his coronation speech, bright navy contrasts with charcoal gray in military costume, metal hues abound in the battle scenes juxtaposed against luscious green fields. Additionally, costuming enables the audience to identify types easily, those in church, politics, the aristocracy, and the military (7), as does performance of certain scenes.

The staging and filming of the asides are particularly noteworthy in this production, as Loncraine capitalizes on the cinematic advantage of zooming in to Richard as he speaks. McKellan commented on this effect: "Richard, the consummate liar, always speaks the truth to the audience, but only to them. . . . That is meant to be disarming for an audience, because they alone are privy to what he intends to do, and they become accomplices to his schemes" (qtd. in "About" 3). The actions of the characters are modernized as well: Richard smokes a cigar when appropriate, Lady Anne is "going to hell the modern way" (Brown 2) as she smokes rolled-up banknotes and injects heroin into her thigh, an audio dream replaces the appearance of the ghosts near the end of the play, and the suicidal Richard plunges from a construction site, laughing on his descent to hell. A twentieth-century audience would be tormented by this, for Richard's flouting of religion, manipulation of women, and likeness to Mosley warrant retribution beyond words. That Richard dies laughing is the ultimate, unforgivable insult, an act which increases in horror each time it is revisited and is analogous to the increased abhorrence felt by society for Hitler's atrocious acts. In this way, *Richard III* speaks to the political and social abominations of the present audience's past.

Richard III is certainly not "Shakespeare on film," and yet it is not quite "Shakespeare, the movie" as Baz Luhrmann's *Romeo+Juliet* is. In this production, the modernization of setting, props, and actions based on the audience at which

Luhrmann aims. Fifteenth-century Verona, Italy is now current day Verona Beach, Florida, although shot in Mexico, and is not exactly a romantic “city by the bay.” Verona has all the trappings of an inner city: religious statues juxtaposed against corporate skyscrapers, ethnic barrios of low-income housing by the shore, abandoned, burned buildings on the beach, reminiscent of former majesty, and the ever-enticing element of the underworld where the wealthy monarchs are allusions to *The Godfather*. This is a film which takes full advantage of the variety of cinematic effects, with varied results. In the words of one critic, “If there is anything to complain about, it would be the opening half hour of the film. Luhrmann throws [in] everything but the kitchen sink in terms of filmmaking techniques, which can be overwhelming” (Leong 1). He goes on to say that the MTV-like editing and flashes of scenes are obtrusive for the audience, and yet he believes that there is tremendous worth in the film: “*R+J* adds value by putting the play into a different context, and through the use of interesting symbolism and imagery, adds a whole new level of interpretation” (1) to the work.

Luhrmann would be pleased because his goal in direction was to be as “rambunctious, sexy, violent, [and] entertaining [of a] storyteller” (“Production Notes” 3) as he believed Shakespeare was and would be if he were filming today. Like Loncraine, Luhrmann utilizes costuming to visually indicate character, stature, family, and role, he filled the screen with props indicative of the time, and he went to great lengths to cause text and images to collide in the form of advertising/labeling of products: “Sword,” “Phoenix gas,” “Thunder bullets,” and “Holy Water.” When combined with the camerawork, the film takes on the visual characteristics of a music video, complete with foreshadowing and flashbacks, and unrealistic exaggerations of scenery through excessive props. Luhrmann’s characters do Ecstasy, tote guns, and are the subjects of newscasts. Luhrmann has taken this timeless tale and used cinematics to attract a new generation of Shakespeareans, revealing the impact of pop culture to the previous generation, and making the experience, in DiCaprio’s words, “more dangerous, more interesting, and more liberating” (qtd. in “A Created World” 1).

Both of these films deliver Shakespeare’s plays from the period in which they are set and from the traditional constraints and rules by which the characters are played. They are not attempts to do “Shakespeare on film.” While the directors do stray from settings, it is blatantly clear that Loncraine and Luhrmann honor the texts of the respective plays; their fidelity to the plays is evident in the focus on language in the films. Luhrmann even hoped that the use of such familiar twentieth-century icons and images would “clarify what’s being said, because once [the audience] understands it, the power and beauty of the language works

its magic...by associating the characters and places with those images, the language would be freed from its cage of obscurity” (qtd. in “A Created World” 1). Necessarily, when the “two hours’ traffic of our stage” becomes the hour and forty-five minute summer blockbuster, some of Shakespeare’s original text is omitted, characters are merged, scenes are truncated or transposed, and the echoes of the page and the stage are filled in with cinematic effects. In these productions, Romeo and Juliet are thrown into a swimming pool, Tybalt packs a 9mm pistol instead of a sword, and Richard puffs on a Gitane while wearing Dolce and Gabbana (Nechak 3). These changes serve not to disgrace or desecrate Shakespeare, but rather to allow his work to be reborn into the twenty-first century, enticing new readers who will, inevitably, reinvent the plays anew.

Works Cited

- "A Created World: William Shakespeare's *Romeo+Juliet* Movie Notes." *Hollywood.Com* 17 May 2000 <<http://www.hollywood.com/videoguide/movies/romeo/text/4.html>>.
- "About the Production." *Richard III* Website. 1996. 17 May 2000 <<http://www.mgm.com/richard/production1.html>>.
- Brown, Geoff. "Now Showing: The Man Who Would Be King." Rev. of *Richard III*, dir. Richard Loncraine. *The New York Times* 25 April 1996. 16 May 2000 <<http://www.mckellan.com/media/clips/DDW2.htm>>.
- Corliss, Richard. "Superbly in Synch with Shakespeare." *Time* 20 April 1992: 91-91. Expanded Academic ASAP. Infotrac. SUNY New Paltz Sojourner Truth Lib., New Paltz. 29 Mar. 2000 <<http://web2.infotrac.galegroup.com>>.
- Crowl, Samuel. *Shakespeare Observed: Studies in Performance on Stage and Screen*. Athens: Ohio UP, 1992.
- Farance, Jeff. "'Romeo & Juliet' are Real Art." Rev. of *Romeo+Juliet*, dir. Baz Luhrmann. *News-Journal Center Web Edition* 1 Nov. 1996. 16 May 2000 <<http://www.n-jcenter.com/movie/filmmain.html>>.
- Leong, Anthony. "William Shakespeare's *Romeo+Juliet* Movie Review." Rev. of *Romeo+Juliet*, dir. Baz Luhrmann. 1997. 16 May 2000 <<http://users.aol.com.aleaong1631/romeo.html>>.
- Loncraine, Richard, dir. *Richard III*. Perf. Ian McKellan, Annette Bening, Jim Broadbent, Robert Downey Jr., Nigel Hawthorne, Kristen Scott Thomas, and Maggie Smith. MGM/UA, 1996.
- Luhrmann, Baz, dir. *Romeo+Juliet*. Perf. Leonardo DiCaprio, Claire Danes, Vondie Curtis-Hall, Brian Dennehy, John Leguizamo, Miriam Margoyles, Dash Mihok, and Harold Perrineau. Twentieth-Century Fox, 1996.
- Nechak, Paula. "Unsinkable Shakespeare: A Whirlwind History of the Bard on Film." 16 May 2000 <<http://www.geocities.com/SoHo/Nook/3946/shakspier/shakfilm.html>>.
- "Production Notes." *Romeo+Juliet* Website. 1996. 17 May 2000 <<http://206.117.182.55/players/pn1.html>>.

Shakespeare's Native Tongue: An Assessment of the Origins of the English Language

William Van Cleave & Debbie DePiero

Few scholars would debate William Shakespeare's place as one of the greatest writers of the English language. Members of the Fall 1999 Development of Modern English course at SUNY New Paltz, however, may find fault with the statement. Shakespeare's ability as a writer was irrelevant to us: our concern centered, instead, on whether or not he actually wrote in English. and moreover, whether the language we call English is really English.

As part of a class research project, we dissected and analyzed *The American Heritage Dictionary of the American Language, Third Edition*. We were asked to devise an appropriate approach and methodology for the project, to complete a word count, and to tabulate our results. After Professor Cinquemani assigned the project, we first decided upon a text and how we would divide the word count amongst ourselves. We chose as our text *The American Heritage Dictionary* because it is thorough without being overwhelming, because it is in current and common use, and because it includes word origins. We quickly devised a method of approaching the text without bias towards one grouping of letters or portion of the alphabet. Each student in the class was assigned 130 pages, of which he or she was to assess words on all odd pages, leaving each of us counting words on sixty-five pages. With this approach, words on half of all pages in the text would be assessed.

Three of the class members volunteered to begin the count of some of their assigned pages in advance, so they could discover some of the discrepancies we might encounter as a class when we began the count in earnest. They encountered a number of unusual words in their initial survey. Taking into account their observations, in our second meeting we decided to make a list of all specifics about which we could come to an agreement. The class quickly eliminated proper names from the count, defining them as all words with initial capital letters. We also eliminated words for which *American Heritage* made no mention of origin. These included those that varied only by a suffix from another word. For example, *American Heritage* gives "infer" a Latin origin but provides no origin for "inference"; we entered "infer" in the Latin column, and "inference" was omitted entirely from the count.

The American Heritage Dictionary has three delineations if a word's origin is uncertain: it notes that an origin is either "probably" from a particular language, "possibly" from a particular language, or "of unknown origin." The members of the class debated for some time concerning how we should count words that fall into those categories. Because we wanted a straightforward approach and an accurate count of known words, we decided that all words that fell into one of the above-mentioned categories would be counted as origin unknown for our survey. One issue that arose after we had begun the count concerned slang words; after some discussion, we decided to count them when an origin was provided, arguing that they were real words because of their usage and *American Heritage's* inclusion of them. One of the members of the class was assigned the task of developing a grid, copies of which were handed out to each class member. She used a textbook chart from *Problems in The Origins and Development of the English Language, Fourth Edition*, as a foundation for our chart, adapting it to our needs. Languages that were mentioned in minuscule quantities (perhaps with only one or two references) were grouped into a category entitled "other," for example.

When a word's origin could be traced historically through several languages, we had to decide which language should be counted. An example is the word "incantation," which originates in Middle English, from Old French, from Late Latin, and finally from Latin. The class discussed taking the original language in all cases, which would have put "incantation" in the Latin column. We also discussed counting the word in multiple columns, which would have placed "incantation" in four separate column counts. We settled instead on taking a word's most recent origin, unless that origin was Middle or Old English. In other words, while "incantation"'s most recent origin is Middle English, we counted it in the Old French column because its most recent origin other than English is Old French. Had we chosen to use the most recent origin for each word, including Middle and Old English, many more words would have fallen into these two categories. Since one of the goals of the class was to understand the diversity and complexity of our language, we assumed the responsibility of measuring that diversity with this project as well. Therefore, we looked beyond English origins for each word. Nevertheless, if the only origin listed for a word was either Middle or Old English, then the word was entered in the appropriate column because it represented a word created in one of those languages. A few words contained parts that came from separate languages, and after some discussion, we decided to count each part in the column in which it belonged.

Once each individual section was tabulated, we compiled the totals with interesting results. The class found that only 14.53 percent of what we call

English was actually native English, leaving the remaining 85.47 percent to a wide range of other languages and language families. Latin (29.95%) and French (29.5%) account for almost three fifths of the origin count for *The American Heritage Dictionary*, while Greek (6.18%), Spanish (2.27%), Italian (2.25%), Scandinavian (2.22%), High German (1.94%), and Low German (1.67%) make up an additional 17.15 percent. Semitic (.73), Sanskrit (.73), Celtic (.42), American Indian (.41), Japanese (.4), Portuguese (.35), Malayo-Polynesian (.3), Chinese (.23), Persian (.13), Turkish (.12), and African (.1) words represented less than one percent of the total words counted. Others (those words that did not fall in any of the above categories) only represented .7 percent, which pleased the class in that they felt they had not omitted any significant categories or languages in their assessment chart. Words of unknown origin, though perhaps Will would have known from whence they came, comprised 4.3 percent.

Once the tabulations were completed, Professor Cinquemani asked the students to investigate a word or word grouping that proved interesting to them, to give heart to the assignment. Often, the research created more questions than it answered, as was the case with the term “muliebrity,” which means “femininity.” While its origin, the Latin word *mulier*, for “woman,” is clear, its demise as a word in common usage posed many questions for discussion. It entered the language on or about 1592, during the reign of Elizabeth I.

“Stand,” a good example of a native English word, illustrates the fact that although native English words make up only 14% of the language, they are the most commonly used words. “Stand” serves as the base for twelve terms that begin with the word and is incorporated into many other words. Its twenty-eight definitions in the verb form and twelve as a noun, with meanings ranging from “rise” to “bleachers,” make it a diverse word of common usage.

Another student in the class, examining the evolutions of the words “crocodile” and “alligator,” discovered that, though similar in development, they came from entirely different origins. “Crocodile” comes from the Greek words for “gravel worm,” while alligator comes from a Spanish term meaning “lizard.” One class member even delved into the etymology of the term “bee,” with its use in an abundance of idioms and phrases. It was noted that, with the exception of “bee in your bonnet,” all idiomatic expressions from “quilting bee” to “making a beeline” have to do with industry and fecundity.

One classmate speculated that the origin for the word “flabbergast” was a combination of the words “flabby” and “aghost,” the facial expression caused when someone sees a ghost. “Donnybrook,” which has come to signify a tumultuous, brawling situation, comes from the name of an Irish town that hosted an annual trading fair at which vast quantities of liquor were consumed.

The necessity of creating words in order to keep pace with modern technology was also addressed, with mention made of the enormous vocabulary spawned by computers, including “screen saver,” “tool bar,” “plug in,” and “save as.” The computerese appropriation of the suffix “-able,” meaning “capable,” was noted, as in “downloadable.”

Although our analysis of the dictionary revealed that only 14.5 percent of the English language originated as native English, it does appear that the Bard was taking full advantage of these native words. In order to discover the origins of the terms Shakespeare used, we took a ninety-word sample from *Macbeth* and applied the same research techniques used to analyze the dictionary:

She should have died hereafter:
 There would have been a time for such a word.
 To-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow
 Creeps in this petty pace from day to day
 To the last syllable of recorded time,
 And all our yesterdays have lighted fools
 The way to dusty death. Out, out, brief candle!
 Life's but a walking shadow, a poor player
 That struts and frets his hour upon the stage
 And then is heard no more. It is a tale
 Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,
 Signifying nothing. (5.5.17-28)

When the word count is adjusted to eliminate repetitions, there are sixty-nine unique words. Of these, fifty-four, or 78.2 percent, are of native English origin. Only one of these, the article “a,” is from Middle English; the rest can be traced back to Old English, and even “a” is a variant of the Old English *an*. Of the fifteen borrowed words, ten are from Latin (14.5%), three (“syllable,” “hour,” and “idiot”) are Greek (4.3%), and two (“died” and “petty”) are derived from Old French (3%). If we carry this one step further and allow each word in this excerpt equal weight (counting, for example, the repeated “to-morrow” three times), we find that 75 of the 90 words (83.3%) in this speech by Macbeth are native English. Some of these words survived the transition from Old English without any change. Some went through transitions from Old to Middle to Modern English but are still recognizable (e.g., “creep” from ME *crepen* and OE *creopan*, and “fret,” from the OE *fretan*, which means “to devour”). Some modern words bear little resemblance to their Old English ancestors: “such” from OE *swylc* and “shadow” from OE *sceaduwe* are examples of the changes in English. What accounts for this great discrepancy between the fact that only 15 percent of *American Heritage's* words are derived from native English, yet more than four

out of five of Shakespeare's words fall into this category? One explanation is that the most frequently used words (e.g., the articles "a," "an," and "the"; pronouns such as "his" and "our"; prepositions including "of," "in" and "to"; and the word that most often appears in this quotation, "and") are all of native origin.

This research project, with its focus on both statistics and exploration, asked class members not only to develop an appropriate research protocol but also to explore what made them curious about their findings. Our language, with its incredible diversity, owes much to the languages from which it comes.

Works Cited

The American Heritage Dictionary of the American Language, 3rd ed. 1992.

Algeo, John. *Problems in the Origins and Development of the English Language*, 4th ed. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1993.

The Norton Shakespeare. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1997.

Poems and Translations

Catherine Aldington: *Imagiste*

A Sequence of Eight Short Poems

Catherine Aldington

Editorial note: Catherine Aldington is a poet, translator, and President Emerita of the Association for Provençal Culture in les Saintes-Maries-de-la-Mer, France. Her recent poetry—and we are pleased to present here a selection of these poems from her forthcoming collection, *Poems to be Blown Away*—carries a certain resonance of Imagism. Thus we have entitled this selection “Catherine Aldington: Imagiste,” with a deliberate echo of Ezra Pound’s *nom de plume* for Hilda Doolittle—“HD: Imagiste.” HD (1886-1961) was Catherine Aldington’s friend and colleague. Catherine’s father, Richard Aldington (married to HD 1913-1937), was a friend and colleague of Ezra Pound, W.B. Yeats, D.H. Lawrence and many others—a veritable rollcall of key figures in Modernism; and Aldington was a central figure in the movement known as “Imagism” (his disavowal of that roll notwithstanding).

Catherine Aldington’s “New Paltz Connection” dates from 1996 when Professor H.R. Stoneback, Director of the VIII International Hemingway Conference in les Saintes-Maries-de-la-Mer, invited her to be the Camargue Coordinator for the Conference, which brought more than 300 scholars and writers to the ancient pilgrimage village on the Camargue Coast of the Mediterranean, including a number of New Paltz graduate students and faculty. In recent years, Catherine Aldington has on several occasions hosted the visits of New Paltz graduate students and faculty to les Saintes-Maries, including most recently the 2000 International Richard Aldington Conference (which she co-directed with H.R. Stoneback), at which several New Paltz English Faculty presented papers. She sends her greetings to her many friends at SUNY New Paltz and looks forward to seeing them again at the 2002 “Writers in Provence” Conference in les Saintes-Maries. —H. R. S.

I
The Egret
For Norman

Outstretched, the egret
dips a toe
into the mirror
of the marsh.

He does not know
the beauty
of his oriental sketch
reflected.

He is looking for a fish.

II

Lightly the leaves fall
Like feathers, delight.

III

Spiral, upgoing wing,
scratch, plunge, down-up
ways to be.
rays of sunburnt blue
diving.

IV

Oleander yellow sliding
the dark way off.

Though the grey marshes
tend to the flight of the birds,
none can say where the beast is hiding:
Out there?
Or somewhere far along the shore?
Or just by the tamarisk shivering in the wind?...

This is a country of dreams and dreads
where all, even the strongest river,
come to an end.

V

Time drives time.
Pain meets pain
Where does the path
lead me?
through what waters,
Calm or turmoil?

I need you, whatever...

VI
Over

Jet black vomit
gushing fumes yellow.
month ink scrawling over
pages insane

are you afraid?

Yes.

But now it is almost over.

VII
Tramp the road

As far as I can see,
when it comes to flying,
the gulls know the way
without even trying;
the drunks know the way to drink,
the tramps, tramp their road
without ever asking...

But, as far as I can see
when it comes to dying
we don't know our way
for all our striving.

VIII
Chocolat Medal

Real good soldiers,
that's what we are.
We stand up under bombs
where no bombs are,
we stand up to fire
where not a shot is fired,
we live in the hell of war
where no war is fought.

We stand
UP.

Here's a medal for the poor
here's a medal for the sick
here's a medal for being a child
here's a medal for being a man
here's a medal for being.

And here is chocolat for all.

Have a chocolat for your pain.

Four Poems in French

(with facing-page translation by H.R. Stoneback)

Roger Asselineau

Editorial note: Professor Roger Asselineau of The Sorbonne is an internationally renowned Whitman and Hemingway scholar. One of the leading Americanists in Europe for more than half a century, his distinguished scholarly work is matched with his superb craft and art as a poet and translator. We are pleased to present here facing-page translations representing his work in both modes: 1) several poems from his *Poesies Incomplete II* (Paris: Le Meridien, 1989) translated by H.R. Stoneback; 2) his translation of Wordsworth's "England! the time is come..." (originally published under his *nom de plume*—or *nom de guerre*—Maurice Herra in *Poemes de Guerre* 1939-1944).

Scholar, poet, translator and member of the French Resistance during World War II—Professor Asselineau's record of distinction seems endless—he will celebrate his 88th birthday next year with the publication of another collection of his poems. And he hopes to visit SUNY New Paltz to renew his acquaintance with faculty and graduate students he has met at International Hemingway Conferences.

—H. R. S.

I

Pourquoi donc se méfier des mots
Et chercher querelle au langage?
Les mots chantent,
Les mots dansent
Sur la page
Mieux que moi.
J'aime les mots,
Sinon je dirais: oh!
J'aime leurs entrechats,
Sinon je dirais: ah!
Je le crois vrais,
Sinon je me tairais.

II

Les rimes, les rimes,
Ça ne sert à rien.
Ce ne sont que des enluminures des temps anciens,
Lentement, patiemment dessinées sur vélin
Par des moines myopes depuis longtemps défunts.
A bas la rime! Vive la rime!

III

La Moto

Sa moto bien serrée entre les jambes
Et couché sur la selle, il fonce dans l'espace
A deux cent kilomètres à l'heure—et le viole
A perdre conscience
Et à perdre haleine,
Longuement—aspuré par l'horizon
Qui recule sans cesse,
Mais, furieusement, il fonce.

I

So why not have faith in words
And why pick a fight with language?
Words sing
Words dance
On the page
Better than I can.
I love words,
If I didn't I'd intone: Oh!
I love their leaping *entrechats*,
If I didn't I'd declare: Ah!
I believe their truth,
If I didn't, I'd shut up.

II

Rhymes, rhymes—
They are absolutely useless.
Nothing but numinous illumination from the old times,
Slowly, patiently painted on parchment palimpsests
By myopic monks long defunct—
Down with rhyme! Long live rhyme!

III

The Motorbike

His motorbike held tight between his legs
and low mounted in his saddle, he charges
at 200 kilometers per hour—space-rape—
losing consciousness
losing breath,
sucked in towards the horizon
that retreats recedes endlessly:—
Yet, he rushes into the Void, furiously.

IV
Camargue

Mariage du ciel avec la terre et la mer
Dans ce pays où autrefois
Telle Vénus
Les Saintes Maries sont sorties
Des eaux.

Et il y a tellement d'eau
Pour emprisonner la lumière
Qu'il n'y fait jamais vraiment nuit.
La delta luit dans les ténèbres.

La mer, la terre et l'air sont si entremêlés
Que les oiseaux plongent dans l'eau
Tandis que les poissons s'envolent.

Les taureaux noirs,
Avec leurs cornes comme des croissants de lune,
Sont venus tout droit de la nuit des temps.
Les chevaux blancs couleur d'écume
Sont, eux, fils de Neptune
Et ils courent ou coulent sur les grèves
Comme des vagues
Sous leurs crinières qui ondulent.

Les Gitans, Peaux-Rouges de l'Occident,
Viennent ici rêver
A leur Asie natale
Et humblement prier Sainte Sarah,
Leur Déesse noire de la fécondité.

L'église-forteresse
Des Saintes Maries de la mer
Est une caverne de pierre.

IV
Camargue

Marriage: sacrament of sky and earth and sea
In this country where long ago
Like Venus
The Holy Marys came up from
The waters.

And there is so much water
To imprison the light
That it's never really night:
The delta's candleglow in tenebrous darkness.

The sea, the earth and "the air" are so intermingled
That the birds dive into the water
As the fish fly their finny flight.

The black bulls,
With their crescent-moon horns,
Have come directly from the darkness of Time.
The white horses, spindrift-seafoam-colored,
Are sons of Neptune
And they run or break on the beaches
Like waves
Under their undulant manes.

The Gypsies, "Redskins of the East,"
Make the Pilgrimage here to dream
Of their autochthonous Asia
And humbly pray to Saint Sarah,
Their dark Goddess of Fertility.

The fortified church
Of the Holy Marys of the Sea
Is a stone cave.

Wordsworth's "England! the time is come..."

(a French translation)

Roger Asselineau

Angleterre, l'heure vient de sevrer ton coeur,
D'écarter de toi tout aliment non viril,
De rejeter enfin tout mensonge futile;
Notre ordre ancien s'écroule, édifice trompeur.
La récolte pouvait être combien meilleure!
Mai tes crimes ont rendu la terre stérile.
Aux Indes et en Afrique, égoïste inutile,
Tu ne fais qu'exploiter l'effort du travailleur.
Toutes les nations sont d'accord pour t'accuser:
Mais bien pire et bien plus redoutable, qu'il aime
Ou bien qu'il hâisse, est ton Ennemi lui-même.
C'est pourquoi il est sage aujourd'hui d'oublier
Le poids énorme de tes péchés. O tristesse
Que nos plus chers espoirs soient en toi qui transgresses.

England! the time is come when though shouldst wean
Thy heart from its emasculating food;
The truth should now be better understood;
Old things have been unsettled; we have seen
Fair seed-time, better harvest might have been
But for thy trespasses; and, at this day,
If for Greece, Egypt, India, Africa,
Aught good were destined, thou wouldst step between.
England! all nations in this charge agree:
But worse, more ignorant in love and hate,
Far—far more abject, is thine Enemy:
Therefore the wise pray for thee, though the freight
Of thy offences be a heavy weight:
Oh grief that Earth's best hopes rest all with Thee!

Translations from Dante and Petrarch

A. M. Cinquemani

Dante addresses Arnaut Daniel in Provençal

El comenciò liberamente a dire:
“Tan m’abellis vostre cortes deman,
qu’ieu no me puesc ni voill a vos cobrire.
Ieu sui Arnaut, que plor e vai cantan;
consiros vei la passada folor,
e vei jausen lo joi qu’esper, denan.
Ara vos prec, per aquella valor
que vos guida al som de l’escalina,
sovenha vos a temps de ma dolor!”
Poi s’ascose nel foco che li affina.

(Purgatorio, xxvi. 139-148)

Petrarch encourages a young man to learning

La gola e ‘l sonno et l’oziose piume
anno del mondo ogni virtù sbandita,
ond’è dal corso suo quasi smarrita
nostra natura vinta dal costume;

et è sì spento ogni benigno lume
del ciel per cui s’informa umana vita,
che per cosa mirabile s’addita
chi vol far d’Elicona nascer fiume.

Qual vaghezza di lauro, qual di mirto?
“Povera et nuda vai, Filosofia,”
dice la turba al vil guadagno intesa.

Pochi compagni avrai per l’altra via:
tanto ti prego più, gentile spirto,
non lassar la magnanima tua impresa.

(Canzoniere, Sonnet 7)

Dante addresses Arnaut Daniel in Provençal

And freely he began to say to me:
“Your courteous demand so pleases me
that I cannot and would not evade you.
I am Arnaut, who weep and, singing, go;
afflicted, know my former foolishness;
with joy can see close by the wished-for day.
I beg you now, by virtue of that force
that draws you to the stairway’s highest step,
remember me in time, and all my pain.”
Then he withdrew into refining fire.

(Purgatorio, xxvi. 139-148)

Petrarch encourages a young man to learning

Gourmandizing, sleep, the easy and obscene,
have banished every virtue from the world,
and human nature, vanquished by routine,
has very nearly come to a dead end.

The loving light of heaven is so gone
(by which the life of mankind was informed)
that whoever draws a stream from Helicon
is taken for a weirdo and a fraud.

What is this wish for myrtle and for bay?
“Books and learning are so, like, uncool,”
Is what you’ll hear from any MBA.

No one will go the way you want to go.
So much the more I beg you not to blow
this chance! Transcend the mediocre rule!

(Canzoniere, Sonnet 7)

The laundering of Laura's veil

Non al suo amante più Diana piacque
quando per tal ventura tutta ignuda
la vide in mezzo de le gelide acque,

ch'a me la pastorella alpestra et cruda
posta a bagnar un leggiadretto velo
ch'a l'aura il vago et biondo capel chiuda;

tal che mi fece, or quand' egli arde 'l cielo,
tutto tremar d'un amoroso gielo.

(Canzoniere, Madrigal 52)

The laundering of Laura's veil

Diana did not please her lover more,
when quite by chance he saw her bathing nude
that day, immersed in water cold as ice,

as that harsh mountain shepherd girl pleased me,
bent as she was to wash a lovely veil
that keeps the wind from touching her blond hair;

so that, even now with the sky on fire,
she made me shiver in a loving cold.

(*Canzoniere*, Madrigal 52)

Heat

Dennis Doherty

Combed the woods of fallen branches and debris
with the hand that knows the land to nut, twig,
derelict bug shell, and owl coughed rat ball—
stacked the fagots on the lee of a shed and pine tree.

felled the standing dead ash and oak;
hauled the wet-heavy pall of trunks
chunk by chunk through knoll and trough,
then sawed them to size—knot, crotch, and all.

split the logs into jutty piles of shanks;
attacked the tortured joints of crooked growth,
witless years of wild, wavy knit
begrudged to flesh forced steel on steel;
sparking sledge on wedge the final peal.

Made a tidy fire with haphazard chips
and stockpiled sticks, with seasoned, husky thews
that fit the wood stove like brogans in a box.
consumed the labor of body's honest day,
the turning of the earth, the paradox of work.

And field mice move into the haven of a home.
Cats cruise the basement with a hungry nose.
A baby sucks sweets from her mother's kitchen tit.
Girls cavort, savage and subtle, in an orange strobe
before the cackling core. None wonder at the warmth.

Easter Break

Dennis Doherty

Tell me again how you know I'm not Christ.
Things rise and realize their essential rites.
Rub a lamb with herbs; eat its leg and die.
Thatch sprouts from every pore; my back begins

to bend like a SHARP CURVE arrow. Turn right.
I can see the destination. It's spring!
Anoint your breast with holy myth,
sweet sprigs of what gives breath its life:

symbol, or earth's own mire. Our loins
have struggled to mean more than mud pies.
Love's never far from bread and wine.
Bones know by rote the miracles they knit.

Wasn't that the simple parables' point?
Last supper was a literal goodbye.
True recognition needs the Judas kiss.
I feel alive each time this tumor ticks!

Outside, lily axils hoist globes of rain
in proffered sacrifice to stray titmice
who then flit to the business of birds,
earnest as my building haiku or hymn.

You want credentials; where'd thrush learn to sing?
A nest threaded with waste is a worship;
this project, inter-species co-op shrine
to belief that I, that all, claim glory.

90 Feet Away from You

for R. H.

David Fish

A strange light lonely rain at late winter—
Half frozen but melting as it hits the
Bare willow branches like spit, slithers down,
Drops at their tips onto flagstones in the
Half light and shatters coldly as my cat
Trots dimly up the walk, silver with mist.
A cardinal is nervous in the roses,
Awaiting his mate to search the thicket
For a bed. I have not lived here long though

I've seen him, as has my cat, when he was
Red against the fallen snow and blue sky,
Red in the dim yellow sun of noontime,
Now stark amidst the brown—a misplaced brush
Stroke, until she flies to him, hiding him
In the safety of anonymous gray.
My cat looks up, missing her alight on
The twig. He butts his head against my leg.
I snuff my half-gone smoke and turn the knob.

Boules at Night

for H.R.S.

Adam Romano

One cannot play *boules* at night,
and someone once told me
that a *boule* ball has only one function
after the sun goes down:
the *boule* ball, when needed,
can service as an alarm clock
if you put it in one of your hands
and drape that forearm
over the lip of your bed
and fall asleep
then you will awaken to the sound
of the bang of the *boule* ball
hitting the floor.
Refreshed from your brief cycle,
you will return to the world
and all its awful responsibilities,
and be more efficient than even
Benjamin Franklin,
(and more Parisian too)
and I'd sooner carry ten-thousand pennies
than stuff his fat face in my wallet.

At the Grave of Tom Chamberlain

Castine, Maine 1997

Robert Singleton

I should have known by the number of flags,
but I was searching for the grave of Lucy Little
and I passed by at first
with a minimum of curiosity.

The day was cool and a steady breeze blew off the distant harbor.

The axis of my search was from north to south.
I thought this was prophetic,
but I have come to alter that opinion
in the light of distant fires.

Down the slope a woman unloaded flowers from a gray jeep.

She took them from the present like a thief
while the text of time was suspended around us.

I said to her—We can accept the truths of these metaphysical storms
but only at the expense of judgment,
only by our own inclinations
driven before us like three-legged dogs in sepulcher time.

What we had thought of as the truth, now is unknown
like twin spheres in memorial speech
that lose us in complexity and imitate first desires.

What we have found in our own truth is the absence of fact.

If this hymn to silence goes unrecognized,
our speech is the mask of a hidden treasury
and we will place fires at the poles
to reverse the flow of magnetic attraction.

This is the perfect disguise that only love frees
like a soldier in the ice
who walked with drunken step to Delia's arms
and left his wings behind
for others to find.

Ashokan, Looking Westward

Robert Singleton

To convince myself there is no moment like this one I sit motionless in a cold wind off the mountains trying to feel anything of the spirit of the wind or the spirit of the water. To dwell in this minute as much as I can seems like the proper thing to do. The evergreens behind me click together like sewing needles, the boats at anchor creak like bees in the ash trees. They dwell in nests of paint that seep into what is left of the snow, layered white, yellow, and brown. I have come here as if there was something hidden in this immeasurable loneliness that was suddenly important for me to find. Last night I dreamed about you walking in these same mountains. I took it as a message, an outline I would find in these waves, stirred by no tide on this inland lake. Perhaps this is what I came for—to drive into nearness the hidden force that would suddenly wrap itself around my body and draw me near you, as if all this time had not been wasted, as if the rusted spike lying at my feet still anchored a living house.

Fannie's Stories

For Claire

Robert Singleton

Her stories travel by the shortest path
through ghosts of Concord and Harvard Square
in echoing droves of static electricity
and letters to sister Charlotte in Roxbury.

Prescott's autobiographical funeral
passes unveiled through her blindness
into the history of Boston—
via Emerson's lectures and Adam's books
stacked three tiers deep in Quincy granite.

The power of her lineage becomes the power of friendship
while archetypal ghosts hypothesize the ends of principles
in silk threads woven through the banners of regiments.

The brethren of the willing become the frescoes of her independence.

Lost in philosophies of microfilm newsprint
she dreams as she wishes to dream
and paints her own Hamlet
out of seagulls in Harpswell
moving toward the ocean
in Jenny Lind's clothes.

A Lovesong for Ellen Chesser¹

H.R. Stoneback

Time stood still for Ellen...in an exalted experience of rapture in being...Ellen lived apart from all the coarse necessities of earth-hungers.

—Elizabeth Madox Roberts, unpublished
notes on *The Time of Man* (Roberts
Papers, Library of Congress)

Oh Ellen I see you and I know you:
I know how lovely and a-liven you are.
And you are here, Ellen, in my heart
in the telluric weave of language,
the weft and warp of every way where wanderers
walk on stranger-roads: Walk deep into Place
and stay and farm and grow things until
they are truly home where they have made it.

Oh Ellen I *know* how lovely you are
and I here Allen Tate on his deathbed
telling me how you haunted his reveries
like some displaced Medieval Lady
on a Kentucky dirt-road: he wore your favor.
I hear Robert Penn Warren tell me how you
fertilized the garden of his spirit—
I hear Red and Jim Still and Jesse Stuart

Donald Davidson and Harriet Arnow
talking, our voices all agreeing:
there is nothing more magical in all
literature than the opening movement
of *The Time of Man*. And I know though he
did not tell me how Faulkner found the map
of Yoknapatawpha in your song, Ellen,
reverberant on the far mythical hills.

Oh Ellen I hear you, singing by the river:
“I’m Ellen Chesser. I’m here. I’m a-liven.”
And you live everywhere in the deep heart’s core,
in the rituals of rain and sun and time—
keenly aware of all ceremonies—
you do have the “honey of life” in your heart
and you have lifted the long black veil from our
eyes and we walk these hills with you, singing.

Once I sank slowly into the *terroir*
with you, felt the dignity of great stones
pass into rapt-being, felt secure, Placed,
all beautiful and near, working the soil
with you, cultivating chthonic earth-joy
and the practical physics of syzygy.
I have loved you before and beyond the Time
of Man, since that day you built your stone-altar,

Oh Ellen, on that virgin hillside
and summoned me to numinous communion.
Memory believes before knowing remembers—
I have worked on my Gravel Switch² farm with you—
you recollect Ellen that April we was
a-setten tobaccer in my creek bottomland
and that sudden storm came, that terrible tornado
and we ran breathless to the barn and then we—

memory believes before knowing remembers—
the cool calculus of the imagination
oh gentle alchemist of delicious tobacco
the hot heave of heart and heft of flesh oh—
Oh my my a body does get around
we done com a fur piece, terrific,
motionless on that urn, to sing old ballads
at your empty grave and you still a-liven.

Oh Ellen, I will always—now let us sing
all together, you and your cousins Dolly

Emmy Lou and Sparrow, tight clean harmonies—
 —“I will always love you”—
 For memory believes longer than recollects
 and we done come too fur to quit now
 (“Aint nobody ever said for you to quit”)
 and where was that place we all sang in Nashville?

And shall we sing a song for Elspeth,³ too,
 and her cool web of words that winds us in
 and holds her distance steady—(we can love
 you Ellen, but Elspeth resists, creates
 the place where love must make us generous)—
 stays alone in her room in Chicago, displaced
 Protestant mediating her rosary;
 then weaving in Stockbridge, writing Kentucky

in Massachusetts after the day's therapy—
 And did Dr. Riggs know you Elspeth?
 Did you share Ellen with him as you shunned
 the glib discourse of the sun, resisted
 the rhetoric of the rocks, until sudden
 heliophilic ecstasy took you
 to the place you made where topotherapy
 heals the pain of autobiography.

And did you drink with Norman Rockwell—who
 caricatured what you carved—at the Red Lion?
 Oh Ellen here we are—already Kentucky.
 So I will sing a circle round the sun
 for you and your maker dear sweet earthy-strong
 eternal infinite Ellen and Elspeth
 I chant fragments of half-forgotten earth-
 ballads for you, sing this litany of love:

Now that the trees have taught us to tell time;
 Now that the rocks have taught us to measure joy;
 (And only the river knows we were lovers);
 Now that the crops have learned our exaltation

in the rapture of being and the sky has sung
“Little Sparrow”⁴ with us where the fair and tender

road sings incessant songs of earth-hunger:
We rest beyond the Cross Roads of wonder.

(H.R. Stoneback 1999-2001)

Notes

1. Ellen Chesser is the protagonist of *The Time of Man*. This poem was composed for, and read as a kind of graveside litany at the Elizabeth Madox Roberts Memorial Poetry Reading in April 1999—held at the Roberts gravesite in Springfield, Kentucky.
2. Place-name. Lest the reader mistakenly pursue a symbol, it should be noted that the poet’s farm is near a village called Gravel Switch, in the Kentucky knob-lands, in the country of Elizabeth Madox Roberts’ fiction.
3. Elspeth was the nickname Elizabeth Madox Roberts used with her closest friends.
4. “Little Sparrow” is a traditional folksong used by Roberts in her fiction. It is still widely current in oral tradition.

Pedagogical Dilemma #1

(channeling Richard Brautigan)

Christopher Tanis

In my perfect world
—and don't ask why it isn't so—
I would measure my students
By height...
...and that's it.
You'd need at least
Five foot six
To get anything over
A "C"
Out of me, fella.
As for the ladies,
Well,
I'm afraid that it's platform time
From here on in.
And if you have the misfortune
To possess less than
Sixty inches,
Then I'm sorry.
Better luck next time,
Bub.
But if you're over six foot six,
Here's your diploma!
Cum Laude,
—and thanks a lot!

View of the Sculpture Farm, Shawangunk Ridge

Pauline Uchmanowicz

Red tile roofs, then
twilight. In front of Trekking

Buddha's Balinese pavilion,
its decks teak,

her chores *prana*,
Duck Feeder watches

pond water catch stars.
Next door at the ashram

drums rattle, witches
in serapes twirl,

shadows skimming teepee skin
like cocktail hour ice cubes.

Her charges squawk,
expecting power.

Metal forms they glide aside
tower the glade.

Hans's Backyard

Pauline Uchmanowicz

Garden buddha's crumbling shoulder
exposes long-cracked buddha's
rattler-smooth second skin.

Untended smells of thawing grass
make young buddha appear uncertain—
chickens pecking under his nose.

Old buddha suits the station
resigned between oak and sundial—
jays knocking his eardrums from
the roof of a fallen birdhouse—

right eye meeting right eye in glass.
Rumble passes. Drops splatter.
Young sits in front of old and vice versa,
breathing and listening back to back.

“Crab on its Back” Arles, 1889

Robert H. Waugh

Palps, pincers, the lockjaw claws stab
into the green ferocity that washes
it up, on the pale serviette, to the palette and brush.
Sea-once-at-home, you slobber

and boil off plate-bright in place of
the birds' nests, butterflies, catskulls and beetles
that gratified your cold home mud. The out-of-hearing heat,
the carapace salt suffer

cramps, your fist splays: the seizure tears
your knuckles up; it seizes
them up in the green-locked star—

vation fire of the green night seas,
mask-clench; the epilepsis bares
your crab eyes dead-red, lime-sour.

Lost Causes

Robert H. Waugh

The ocean's a fiasco. You can hear it
breaking up all the time, on rocks, on sand,
on its own criss-cross jumble; you can't not
but disbelieve its witness to its knit
power and coherence; you can't hear its own
voice, you can't make sense of its blather—it's
fiasco, it's the rundown world, it's waste,
it's trash and froth.

 You can't believe it either,
running on like a wet senility, it's
not panned out yet, it hiccups teal and cedar,
all treasures from the tropics, stone, it tosses
world-nourishment out for the excess rich
pile of its shore; you can't believe it, all
those vanguard voices that can't get enough of defeat.

Earthquake Ocean

Robert H. Waugh

It crumples up like everyday. It's not
a threat of earthquake, not a promise, not
a presage of the end; it's seismos made
the thing itself continuous and cut
straight along under your arms and the curve of your belly—
it doesn't lurch an inch or two or fall
out of your heels or mull it over, it's
here, again and again; it's renewal and ruin
so gross you can't discriminate the loss
it's always, you can't take it in, the rush
it opens and discloses, you can't be
the brief of it.

It's everyday it takes
itself apart and puts itself together,
threatens nothing; the gust of the end is now.

Sound and Sense in Elizabeth Madox Roberts's "On the Mountainside"¹

Steven J. Florczyk

William H. Slavick's article, "Taken with a Long-Handled Spoon: The Roberts Papers and Letters," gives us a sense of Elizabeth Madox Roberts's literary philosophy. In a comment regarding her novel *The Time of Man*, Roberts reveals the complex experience of living that she intends to relate. She refers to a

glorious selfishness that wishes to lift the self and its devious and divers [sic] connections all together forward as one object, in one mesh... We experience life deeply, realize it, when we *feel* alive, awake. 'I am living'—a feeling or sensation rather than an idea or a principle. This feeling or sensation is kinesthetic, organic, visual, and perhaps auditory. 'I am living!!' (757)

Roberts's note reminds us of Ellen Chesser's desire to carve her identity from the harsh landscapes of the natural world, an act that is accomplished by the "moments of union" between the outer world of reality and the inner world of the mind. Such sensations or perceptions of reality lead to a comprehension of the universe we occupy and ultimately result in a heightened quality of being; that is, we *feel* alive.

Roberts explores these notions once again in her short story "On the Mountainside." Printed in 1932 as part of the collection *The Haunted Mirror*, "On the Mountainside" is the story of Newt Reddix and his determination to leave home in the country and set out for the "settle-ments" (Roberts 19). Newt's passion for learning is awakened by Lester Hunter, the temporary school-teacher who takes his leave of Newt's town at the end of the term so that he can "see the other end of the world" (7). Newt's longing for his absent mentor leads him to undertake a similar journey, but the excitement of his adventure is qualified by a detachment and longing for home. Roberts employs the "auditory" sensations she identified above in order to portray Newt's divided self as he yearns for that which he does not comprehend, that which makes him *feel* alive.

Roberts's initial description of Newt Reddix while he waits outside the schoolhouse play-party focuses on the function of sound as it highlights a shift in Newt's understanding of the physical world, a "new way for Newt" (3). The narrator describes the change:

Before Lester came, Newt had let his ears have their own way of listening. Sounds had then been for but one purpose—to tell him what was happening or what was being said. Now the what of happenings and sayings was wrapped about with some unrelated feeling or prettiness, or it stood back beyond some heightened qualities. (3)

Newt's "new way" of listening, then, implies that his auditory sensations have become significant for reasons other than the mere provision of information. Sound now takes on an aesthetic quality for Newt; its function becomes artistic.

As the story progresses, we learn of the teacher, Lester Hunter, and his integral role in inspiring this aesthetic sensitivity in Newt. Newt is aware of Lester's own heightened sense of living when he observes the teacher dancing: "The teacher danced easily, bent to the curve of the music, neglectful and willing, giving the music the flowing lightness of his limp body" (5). But, as the narrator reports, Newt is unable to achieve this state of feeling for himself: "Newt wanted to dance as the teacher did, but he denied himself and kept the old harsh gesture, pounding the floor more roughly now and then with a deeply accented step... He wanted to be as the teacher was, but he could not" (5). We might consider the teacher's dance as typical of Roberts's desire to portray what Pearl Andelson Sherry refers to as a moment when "there is scarcely a breath between perceiver and perceived" (824). Newt admires the teacher's ability to merge with the music as one mesh, and Lester serves as a model of Roberts's philosophy of the effects of sensations and their ability to make one feel alive. The sensations of sound through music are internalized by the teacher, and the end-product is the aesthetic quality of the dance. Newt, however, is still unable to reach this pinnacle of "glorious selfishness," for his "harsh gesture" is not truly in touch with the scraping of the fiddle like the teacher's body, which is "bent to the curve of the music." But Newt's observations of the teacher's dance and his resulting desire establish the determination that leads him to seek out these heightened moments of awareness in his own life.

After the teacher leaves the mountainside town, we observe the effects of Newt's awakening as he begins to scrutinize the routine sounds of his daily experience. With the teacher's absence, Newt's world no longer reflects the excitement of the dance: "To Newt all the place seemed still since the teacher had left, idle, as if it had lost its uses and its future" (8). But, clearly, Newt senses a power lying underneath his daily chores and mundane duties of life. His trips to retrieve water inspire a spiritual thirst that cannot be quenched by the waters of the well. Newt observes the tools of his chore and cannot help but incorporate his new way of listening:

The noises gave him more than the mere report of a bucket falling into a well to get water; they gave him some comprehension of all things that were yet unknown. The sounds, rich with tonality, as the bucket struck the water, rang with a beat that was like something he could not define, some other, unlike fiddle playing but related to it in its unlikeness. A report had come to him from an outside world and a suspicion of more than he could know in his present state haunted him. (9)

This description of Newt's preoccupation with the significance of his daily routines broadens our understanding of Roberts's ideas connecting Newt's new aesthetic awareness to a deeper sense of life. We might compare the moment to Ellen Chesser's awareness of the ritual that lies behind her feeding of the turkeys in *The Time of Man*:

She was keenly aware of the ceremony and aware of her figure rising out of the fluttering birds, of all moving together about her. She would hear the mules crunching their fodder as she went past the first barn, and she would hear the swish of falling hay, the thud of a mule hoof on a board, a man's voice ordering or whistling a tune. (95)

Both passages rely on sound to relate the underlying ceremony in the daily tasks of her protagonists, presenting an attention to the sounds of nature that gives way to a heightened sense of living. It is this way of listening that evokes Ellen's question, "Oh, why am I here and what is it all for anyway?" (96).

In the introduction to his study of Roberts's novels, *Herald to Chaos*, Earl Rovit discusses these moments where routine reveals ceremony as "those points where 'poetry touches life'—where mind and matter, idea and sensation, vision and fact, intermingle, shape and are shaped, and produce conjointly a flood of identity within the perceiving spirit, wherein the outer order is creatively absorbed and the world of the mind comprises a new universe" (7). These notions are characteristic of Berkeleyan philosophy and reflect that philosophy in Roberts's work. We realize her concern for comprehending the order of the outside world through the patterning device of sensations. The portrayal of Newt's new way of listening and Ellen's enhanced perceptions of her feeding chores indicate Roberts's attempt to explore the power of auditory sensation as it connects to the need to comprehend, and both instances awaken a deeper thirst and a deeper hunger in her protagonists, Ellen and Newt. Newt's new way of listening and his awareness of sensations lead him to work at a discovery of this order which initially proves frustrating:

He cried out inwardly for the answer, or he looked about him and listened, remembering all that he could of what Lester Hunter had taught... he looked

intently and listened. He detected a throb in the sound, but again there was a beat in the hot sun over a moist field. One day he had thought he had divined a throb in numbers as he counted, a beat in the recurrences of kinds, but this evaded him. (9)

At first, Newt is unable to accept these sensations as an end to his discovery. They inspire a determination to leave his mountainside cove, and, like the teacher, he sets out to explore the “end of the world.” He is not satisfied with the “intolerable staleness that gave out meager tokens of withheld qualities and beings” (10). He rejects the “monotonous passing of the days, the clutter of feet on the stones by the door, the dull inconspicuous corn patch above” (12). Instead of the security of the “rock door step over which he had walked since he could first walk at all” (10), Newt chooses to seek out a “road for his feet” (12). The sensations that inspire Newt lead him to forsake his home so that he may embark upon his journey of discovery toward the “settle-ments.”

On the way, Newt learns of the risk and pain associated with moments of growth. As he travels through the rough country, Roberts employs auditory sensation to reflect Newt’s initial state of disorder. While Newt was able to distinguish between the sounds of the mountainside cove and explore those sensations thoroughly, his senses betray him as he travels away from home through the dense brush of the countryside: “The dry clatter of the higher boughs came to his ears, but it was mingled with the pricking snarls of the twigs on his face so that the one sense was not divided from the other” (13). This mingling of senses suggests a momentary lack of harmony between Newt and the land, and the country continues to fight him as he goes:

‘This durned ivy,’ he said when the laurel held him back. He matched his strength against the boughs or he flashed his wits against snarls and rebounds, hot and weary, tingling with sweat and with the pricking twigs. Pushed back at one place where he tried to find an opening, he assailed another and then another, throwing all his strength angrily against the brush and tearing himself through the mesh with *goddamns* of relief. (13)

While Roberts may be employing this description as metaphor for Newt’s growing pains, the reader must also be aware that he is at odds with an angry landscape. This might serve as a reminder of the importance of one’s connection with the land of home, a home that he has left so that he can “look to find learnen in the settle-ments” (22). This is not to say that his journey is a mistake: Newt’s original inspiring sensations anchor him during his travels, as we discover through his conversation with the old man at the stranger’s house.

When Newt comes upon the homey cabin in the country, complete with

accommodating hosts, a hot meal, and the warmth of a well-tended fire, his renewed passions lead him to burst into song. One of the highlights of his stay at the cabin, however, is his encounter with the old man, another traveler who works his way to return home after his own unfulfilling, life-long journey to the settlements. During their evening relaxation by the fire, the old man's speeches about the shortcomings of the settlements are underlined by his longing for home. Specifically, he mentions his yearning for the spring waters that Newt knows well and has drunk from on his own journey. The old man's reminiscences take on a profound sense of warning to Newt, who has possibly mistaken the significance of quenching one's thirst with "learnen" instead of drinking from springs of the countryside and connecting with the profound powers of the natural landscape. When he repeats "And to think you tasted them waters Tuesday 'twas a week ago!" the old man's words imply this misdirection (22). Newt cannot help but to long for his own home now, and he feels a sudden terror as he remembers:

The sound made by the bucket in the well as it rocked from wall to wall, as it finally struck the water, rolled acutely backward into his inner hearing. He saw the rope over the beam as he turned the wooden handle, drawing the full bucket to the top. Three long steps then to the door of the house, the feel of the bucket drawing at his arm. Up the loft ladder to his room, his hands drawing up his body, the simple act of climbing, of emerging from some lower place to a higher, and he was buried in the act, submerged in a deep sense of it. (24)

This passage conveys the ambivalence of Newt's journey. On the one hand, his senses have allowed him to "emerge" into a new way of listening and thinking, a new way of ordering his world. On the other hand, Newt is "buried" in the "deep sense" of this thought, which suggests his step away from home is necessary for understanding the profound influence of that place upon his character. The old man's advice is not lost on Newt when he punctuates these thoughts with his comment: "you may go far, but mark me as I say it, the places you knowed when you was a little tad will be the strongest in your remembrance... Your whole inside is made outen what you done first" (24).

The irony of Newt's journey is that he needs to go "a far piece" in order to understand the significance of home. Even with the old man's advice looming over the crackling fire that fades as Newt's eyes fill with tears of home-sickness, his determination for knowledge cannot be quelled, and the story closes with Newt's eager breath identified with the "word he cherished," namely, learning (25). The advice of the old man is not enough for Newt to complete his journey. He must experience these things for himself and work to order the feelings

evoked by his sensations so that he, too, may feel alive as the teacher does when he dances.

Roberts's story inspires the reader in much the same way. While she presents her literary philosophy of sensations as they inspire one to feel alive through the story of Newt Reddix, Roberts also appeals to her reader's auditory senses through her keen presentation of scraping fiddles, "footsteps on rough wood," howling dogs, and the echo of buckets as they bounce off the sides of stone wells (4). Perhaps, then, we might feel Roberts's philosophy in action as we read such detailed description in her literature and ruminate over these sounds and sensations as they lift us to a heightened awareness of ourselves, where we too might feel alive.

Notes

1. This paper was presented at the Second National Elizabeth Madox Roberts Conference, St. Catharine College, Kentucky, April 17, 2000.

Works Cited

- Roberts, Elizabeth Madox. *The Haunted Mirror*. New York: Viking Press, 1932.
- . *The Time of Man*. New York: Viking Press, 1963.
- Rovit, Earl. *Herald to Chaos*. Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1960.
- Sherry, Pearl Andelson. "Symbolism in the Letters of Elizabeth Madox Roberts." *The Southern Review* 20 (1984): 824-28.
- Slavick, William H. "Taken with a Long Handled Spoon: The Roberts Papers and Letters." *The Southern Review* 20 (1984): 752-773.

A Letter to Elizabeth Madox Roberts¹

Jenica Shapiro

Dear Ms. Elizabeth,

I am writing this letter to tell you about the profound effect your book has had on me. I am a twenty-four year old graduate student at SUNY New Paltz in New York, and I recently finished my first reading of *The Time of Man*. I had heard your book discussed previously by students in my class who were giving a presentation on your work, but I had never read you myself. I now understand why my classmates were so deeply touched by your words, by your story of a journey taken by all of us from the place we know to be home to a place that we must create by ourselves. A place where we can feel comfortable and look forward to each new day. A place that is safe. I also understand even more the power of words because your words are still helping form my thoughts and shape my feelings here in Kentucky, this place where I had never been, but that feels strangely like home.

It is this sense of home that is conveyed so poignantly in *The Time of Man*. Ellen Chesser leaves her home, leaves Nellie and Henry, to begin her life with Jasper Kent. Before this, we watch Ellen mature, watch her struggle with the land, not her knowledge of it or her dependency on it, but her love of it. As is written in the introduction to your book by Robert Penn Warren, *The Time of Man* is a story of the moments of contact between the self and the world. These moments taught me about a life that I have never known but came to understand and, at times, yearn for through your words.

You have captured the sensation of both time and space, the sensation of trying to belong in a world that both needs you and pushes you away. I do not have the experience of a farm in my own life, but through Ellen I learned how it is to watch tender plants grow and tend to animals and what it means to love and nurture both. In Ellen, you have created a character who has touched me with her caring, who tells the plants that she knows them and plants her garden in such a way that each of her children will have plenty of what they love best.

Ellen Chesser knows what she loves best in the world and she also knows what she needs. Ellen Chesser needs to be heard. While on her parents' tenant farms, Ellen yearns for human contact, yearns to have people to talk to. We watch her change through these yearnings. In the beginning of the book, Ellen feels trapped by the land and thinks that there are no oceans, that there is nothing beyond the land where she lives and works and breathes. Her sense of feeling trapped changes

as the book progresses and reaches a point where she is able to look at the hillside and realize that it is hers to see and have and she does not care if there is not an end, if there is anything beyond the land she is standing on.

Miss Roberts, you captured my imagination with your description of the land, and now being in Kentucky, I understand what the color green is and I understand why Ellen finds comfort in nature again and again. She cares for the hens and the turkeys and her cow on the farm and returns to them and the ritual of them over and over. In a way, the animals are something for Ellen to return to; they still need her even when others have gone from her life. Miss Roberts, you capture this need in your words:

She would take the turkey bread in her hand and go, bonnetless, up the gentle hill across the pasture in the light of sundown, calling the hens as she went. She was keenly aware of the ceremony and aware of her figure rising out of the fluttering birds, of all moving together about her. She would hear the mules crunching their fodder as she went past the first barn, and she would hear the swish of falling hay, the thud of a mule hoof on a board, a man's voice ordering or whistling a tune. She would take the flocks in at the gate, careful not to let any of the calves out, and she would know that John Bradshaw knew that she was there although he said nothing and looked nothing. She would crumble down the bread for each brood near its coop and she would make the count and see to the drinking pans. Then she would go back through the gate, only a wire fence dividing her from the milking group, and walk down the pasture in the dusk. That was all; the office would be over. (95)

These rituals sustain Ellen while she lives with her parents. They also sustain her questioning and her need to be heard.

Throughout *The Time of Man*, you give us Ellen calling out, telling the world, the universe, "Here I am!" "I'm Ellen Chesser! I'm here!" She needs to speak these words to hear them, to believe them. Ellen questions her existence throughout your novel, Miss Roberts, and in her questioning, she speaks for us all. After Ellen marries Jasper Kent and becomes a mother, she speaks of being at church with other tenant women:

There were other tenants living up and down the creek, some of the houses on the stony ridge where the creek bottom met the upland. Sometimes a woman would come up Ellen's hill to sit awhile, or Ellen would go to the church in the maple grove, taking Hen. Then she sat among the tenant women who gathered near the rear of the church, and she would listen to their murmur or speak a little herself. The wives of the farmers would sit at the front talking through the waiting hour. Ellen knew the names of those in her group and where each one lived. They would talk quietly as if half afraid of their own voices. (330)

There is irony in this last sentence. These women are strong in their lives, strong as wives and mothers and farmers, yet, they are “half afraid of their own voices.” This changes for Ellen at the end of the novel. When the hooded men drag her husband from the bed in the middle of the night, screaming “Barn-Burner” and lashing him with whips, Ellen walks into the circle of men: “She stood in the bare space left for the whips, and her coming was so headlong that blows fell upon her shoulders and on her breast before she was seen. She came with hard words and a deep malediction, laying curse on curse, speaking into the black rag faces without fear, careless of what came to her for it” (388). No longer afraid of her own voice, Ellen screamed at the men and broke the silence she had lived in her whole life: “You get offen him,” she said. “You white-trash! Rags on your faces! Take off your whips. You dirty low skunks! You hit him again now if you dare. Get back. I know you. I know the last one. I could call out your names. Lay your whips on me; you already hit me. Hit more. You skulken low- down trash!” (389). Ellen has stepped in to save her husband and also finally speak for the injustices in her life. Another important aspect of this passage is the assertion Ellen makes when she tells the men that she knows them. In many ways, Ellen is saying that they are all the same and that these men do not have the right to punish Jasper for a crime he may not have committed. Most of the characters in *The Time of Man* are struggling. Most of them are living with frost on the inside of their windows in the winter, and Ellen is telling these men that they do not have the right to judge Jasper. Ellen has affirmed the fact that she is here. Miss Roberts, I will conclude my letter to you by thanking you. You have inspired me to continue in my quest for place, in my search for a feeling of home. I thank you for the gift of your words and I want you to know that you have inspired us, teachers of literature and students of life, to help get *The Time of Man* put back into print. You have inspired us to fight for you because we know the importance of your words, of your sense of what is right with the world. Thank you for your words and the power of your voice. Thank you for giving us Ellen Chesser. We will keep your memory alive.

Sincerely,

Jenica Shapiro

Notes

1. This “letter” was a panel presentation at the Second National Elizabeth Madox Roberts Conference at St. Catharine College, Kentucky, April 17, 2000.

Works Cited

Roberts, Elizabeth Madox. *The Time of Man*. Lexington: Viking, 1926.

From International Trade to Shopping in London: Lynch Reconsiders the Eighteenth-Century Novel

Nancy E. Johnson

Deidre Shauna Lynch. *The Economy of Character: Novels, Market Culture, and the Business of Inner Meaning*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Lynch's *Economy of Character* is one of the most important books on the novel since Michael McKeon's landmark study, *Origins of the English Novel, 1600-1740* (1987). Responding to Ian Watt's enduring suggestion that the development of characters in the eighteenth-century novel emerges concomitant with "the rise of realism" and "the rise of the individual," Lynch offers an alternate historical reading of this phenomenon.¹ There is little doubt that the literary character in the British novel did indeed "fill out" over the course of the eighteenth century. The abstract, coarsely representative "Robinson Crusoe" of 1719 gives way to the self-reflective, psychologically tormented "Caleb Williams" of 1794. But why such a development occurred when it did has long been a part of larger questions about the origin and early history of the genre of the novel.

Lynch identifies her intent, in *Economy of Character*, as a "retelling [of] the story of Britons' relations to the imaginary people whom they encountered in books" (4). Her approach to the study of the narrative character is to consider how the reading public infused "value" into the fictional texts they read and how they used this literary encounter to acclimate themselves to an increasingly commercial environment. She discerns links between strategies of literary criticism and strategies used to negotiate the rapidly changing marketplace of eighteenth-century Britain, which was quickly becoming a vital player in international trade. What she offers is a "pragmatics of character," taking into account the "material contingency" that, she argues, has been ignored in most analyses of the novelistic character. Lynch's historicization zeroes in on the "convergence" of substantive transformations of the literary character and key economic events in Britain, such as the rise of credit, the import of luxury items (primarily from the East), the increase in consumer transactions, and the securing of new international trade routes. The reading public used the literary character, she argues, "to renegotiate social relations" in a commercial world, "to derive new kinds of pleasure from the

changes, to render their property truly private,” and “to cope with the embarrassment of riches” that trade was making available to a larger public (4-5).

Lynch’s book is divided into two parts. Part One begins in the first half of the eighteenth century but proceeds well into the 1780s. In this section, Lynch takes account of the earliest notions of the novelistic character embedded in a “typographical culture.” That is, she assesses characters who function as either physiognomists, emblems, or letter writers (as in the epistolary novel) and finds a correspondence between the systems of semiotics that such literary figures cultivate and the form of fiduciary exchange that characterizes early capitalism. The range of Lynch’s study is impressive. Her analysis incorporates observations on the image of the body politic, in political and economic discourse, as a form of character whose transformation into a grotesque, exaggerated figure reflects an economic crisis of consumerism and fears of overpopulation. She considers character as drawn by William Hogarth in a plethora of caricatures and as created by the actor David Garrick, whose changing faces on the stage were a form of symbolic capital. Throughout the first part, Lynch makes a point of including in her discussion both canonical figures such as Defoe, Richardson, Fielding, and Sterne and non-canonical authors such as Manley, Haywood, and Barker. In addition, she examines a host of rather odd narratives in which the protagonist is a form of currency: Charles Johnstone’s *Chrysal, or, The Adventures of a Guinea* (1760); Thomas Bridges’ *Adventures of a Bank-Note* (1770); and Helenus Scott’s *Adventures of a Rupee* (1782).

In Part Two, where the force and significance of the book’s argument is most evident, Lynch challenges assumptions about the developing interiority in the literary characters of Romantic fiction by insisting that literary “personalities,” endowed with deeper, often psychological meaning, be reconnected to specific economic contexts and social relations. One aspect of her argument that becomes particularly clear, in this second part, is the effect of the public’s reading on the form of the literary character. *Why* the public reads determines *how* it perceives the narrative figure. In *fin de siècle* Britain, she suggests, it was a paradoxical drive to grasp an individual identity and to escape one’s social confines, while also wanting to establish one’s social and intellectual status within the reading public, that led readers to invest characters with autonomous personas. The two chapters on Frances Burney and Jane Austen offer particularly lucid examples of Lynch’s argument at work, especially as it sheds new light on authors who have already received a great deal of critical attention. Burney’s characters, she observes, frequently undergo commodification that is the antithesis of self-definition. At crucial moments in the narrative, characters and

objects change places and selfhood takes a back seat to “musical instruments [that] play themselves” and “clockwork birds [that] are set singing” (165). Not surprisingly, commodification is a function of gender in Burney’s novels; the primary form of reification is “the merchandising of women” (167). However, rather than gender differentiation, Lynch’s central concern here is the construction of interiority by social discourse and economic development, how “the very dynamic of individuation was modified as luxury consumption came to function as an occasion on which one made the self an element of reflection” (168). A similar focus directs her study of Austen. She explains Austen’s renowned irony as a means of navigating the paradoxes in the business of reading: the simultaneous private and public gestures involved in writing and publishing; reading quietly and alone or audibly to others; imagining individual sensibilities and finding expressions of one’s selfhood in the text; or participating in a circulating library, reading reviews, and engaging in literary discussions. Lynch’s critique of Austen’s novels places interiority “at a relay point that articulates the personal with the mass-produced” (210).

Lynch’s readings of Burney and Austen, in particular, elucidate the contribution of *The Economy of Character* to scholarship on the novel of the long eighteenth century. She provides the historical and literary investigations so necessary to theoretical speculations on the relationship between the public and private spheres of eighteenth-century Britain, a topic that continues to be a preoccupation of Enlightenment and Romantic studies. Jürgen Habermas’s groundbreaking work on the transformation of the public sphere identifies the eighteenth-century novel as a major participant in the social reorganization that constitutes modernity.² The novel, he suggests, revolutionized relations between the author, the literary text, and the reading public and thereby defied perceived distinctions between the private and public sectors. Lynch’s book supplies the fundamental evidence, for theories such as Habermas’s, that borders between private and public were undoubtedly fluid at the very historical moment when they were perceived to be solidifying. Thus, *Economy of Character* makes a crucial contribution to both the theory of the novel and to literary history.

Notes

1. Ian Watt, *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1964), 9-34.

2. Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, translated by Thomas Burger (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989), 50.

“I’m a-liven”: The Enduring Value of Elizabeth Madox Roberts’s *The Time of Man*

Fiona Paton & John Langan

Elizabeth Madox Roberts. *The Time of Man*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2000.

The year 1926 was an auspicious one for American literature: Ernest Hemingway published *The Sun Also Rises*; William Faulkner published *Soldier’s Pay*; and Willa Cather published *My Mortal Enemy*. It was also the year that Elizabeth Madox Roberts published *The Time of Man*, and if her name and novel are less well-known than those of Hemingway, Faulkner, and Cather, that in no way reflects either Roberts’s ability as a writer or the accomplishment of her novel. Indeed, however one estimates such things, *The Time of Man* ranks as one of the great American novels of the last century. It is an unparalleled portrait of character and evocation of place that can hold its own with the best of Hemingway, Faulkner, and Cather, and with much else besides. The recent republication (Spring 2000) of the novel by the University of Kentucky Press after too many years out of print gives a new generation of readers the opportunity to discover it, while those who know and love the book now can share it with others.

The book’s story is straightforward: it is a bildungsroman, a novel of development, that follows the life of Ellen Chesser as she grows from adolescence to adulthood. Set in rural Kentucky during the early years of the twentieth century, the novel concerns itself with the lives of itinerant tobacco farmers, and if this does not seem the most fertile ground for narrative, it is a testament to Roberts’s skill as a storyteller that she makes Ellen’s journey from farm to farm, first with her parents, then with her husband, compelling. While the novel never loses sight of the frequently brutal facts of Ellen’s daily life, it is suffused with a joyous celebration of the details of her lived experience. The novel does not succumb to over-easy pessimism, but neither does it espouse a rosy-lensed pastoral ideal; rather, it balances the material deprivations of Ellen’s life with her existential growth into fuller selfhood. It is this growth that allows Roberts to evoke the universal through the particular: Ellen’s struggles, and her refusal to be worn down

or spiritually defeated by these struggles, speak to readers of all generations and regions, and give the novel its enduring power and appeal. In her portrait of Ellen Chesser, Roberts succeeds in creating one of the most complete characters in American fiction, a protagonist who achieves a fullness of being from the first page of the novel, when we see Ellen sitting on top of a wagon and writing her name in the air, declaring, "If I had all the money there is in the world, I'd go along in a big red wagon" (Roberts 9). Indeed, Roberts's skill at evoking the world around Ellen as she sees it remains under-appreciated; it may be in *The Time of Man* that the Jamesian representation of consciousness truly finds its heir.

Roberts's central consciousness is explored through a limited third person point of view; it is perhaps the book's greatest stylistic achievement that she represents Ellen's consciousness so vividly without using first person stream of consciousness. Roberts described her approach as "poetic realism," or the attempt to find the points of connection "between the world of the mind and the outer order" (qtd. in Warren xviii). The book abounds with these moments of conjunction between Ellen and her environment. Running away from home in the first chapter, for example, Ellen stops on a bridge:

She stood on the bridge high above the water and watched the stars above and below. . . . She stood very still at the edge of the bridge, scarcely breathing, leaning lightly on the wooden structure. Her own want was undefined, lying out among the dark trees and their dark images, and she reached for it with a great wish that shook her little body. (56)

One might note the scene's technical attributes, its use of such literary devices as repetition ("she stood," "above," "the bridge," "dark"), alliteration ("she stood," "water and watched," "leaning lightly"), consonance ("edge of the bridge," "own want was undefined"), and contrast ("above and below," "a great wish that shook her little body"). One might note its use of a relatively straightforward style whose backbone is a series of declarative sentences to describe a subtle mental state. One might note the way its description of the reflections of the stars and trees in the water bodies forth Ellen's thought process. What makes this scene, and a plentitude like it, particularly effective is the way that Ellen's inner experience, the undefined want that has brought her to this point in the first place, is linked to her surroundings, especially the bridge, which emerges as a fitting emblem of her interior state as she passes from girlhood into womanhood.

Although *The Time of Man* has attracted the attention of such critics as Ford Madox Ford, Sherwood Anderson, Allen Tate, and Robert Penn Warren, it has never achieved the lasting fame that would seem its inevitable due. The reasons for this are difficult to pin down with certitude; in his important article on

Roberts's work (wisely reprinted in the current edition of *The Time of Man*), Robert Penn Warren speculated that Roberts's work fell victim to the changing literary landscape of the 1930s, which did not find in it sufficient social protest to serve its political ends. Perhaps this is true; whatever the cause, *The Time of Man* slipped through the cracks of literary history and, despite several revivals of the book over the decades, has yet to find its place in the American canon. It is to be hoped that the current revival of Roberts's work, which had its beginnings largely at SUNY New Paltz in the 1990s,¹ will finally help this writer and her work find the place they deserve. Despite much talk in recent years about the tyranny literary texts inflict on their audiences, it is important to remember that works of literature, when all is said and done, are at our mercy as readers, teachers, and critics. To the extent that we choose to read, teach, and study a novel, it continues to live. That is our power: let us use it to ensure that a worthy book is given its due.

Notes

1. SUNY New Paltz faculty and graduate students founded the National Elizabeth Madox Roberts Society in 1999, and have held three national conferences (in Kentucky) devoted to her work.

News and Notes

In this column, we feature news from current and recent graduate students: honors, achievements, publications, conference papers, progress in Ph.D. programs, and other news. Please submit your news to the editors.

We are pleased to report the following news items from current and recent graduate students in English:

1. Four recent recipients of our MA continue their progress in Ph.D. programs: Lynne Crockett at NYU, Christopher Hartley at Fordham University, John Langan at CUNY, and Sharon Peelor at the University of Oklahoma.
2. Steven Florczyk, former TA (MA New Paltz 2001), currently a private tutor in Santa Barbara, California, is entertaining—as we go to press—several fellowship offers from Ph.D. programs.
3. Debbie DePiero, current TA at New Paltz, as been admitted to the Ph.D. program, with fellowship, at the University of Rhode Island.
4. Mark Bellomo, former TA and current Adjunct Professor of English, is currently writing a text book for Bedford/St. Martin's Press. He was the 2001 recipient of a Hemingway Society award for research in the Hemingway Archive of the John F. Kennedy Presidential Library.
5. New Paltz graduate students continue their extraordinary track record of scholarly presentations at conferences. For example, in the past year twelve of our graduate students have presented more than 30 papers at regional, national, and international conferences. Since we do not have citations for all of these presentations, we will not print an incomplete list. Students should please submit, at the end of each year, a complete list with date, place, and title of conference presentations, and we will print them in future issues.
6. Current and recent New Paltz graduate students swept the awards at the International Hemingway Conference in Bimini, Bahamas in January 2000, receiving nine of the fifteen awards given. Mark Bellomo, Michael Burns, Jane Massey Dionne, AnnMarie Meisel, Edward Meisel, and Michael Smith received Hagland-Helmer Awards for Literary Excellence in their conference presentations; Larry Beemer,

Mark Bellomo, and Steven Florczyk received Hemingway Society Conference Fellowships. The awards were presented by Nobel Laureate Derek Walcott and Conference Director Donald Junkins.

7. Jane Dionne and Steven Florczyk have had essays accepted for forthcoming publication in the special Hemingway issue of *North Dakota Quarterly*.
8. More than a dozen current and recent New Paltz MA candidates in English and graduate students delivered papers or made presentations at the third National Elizabeth Madox Roberts Conference in Kentucky (April 2001). Conference directors were John Langan (MA New Paltz 1999) and Professor H.R. Stoneback.
9. John Langan's novella *On Skua Island* will appear in the August 2001 issue of *Fantasy and Science Fiction* magazine.
10. Associate Professor Arnold Schmidt (MA New Paltz 1991; Ph.D. Vanderbilt 1995) of California State University Stanislaus reports that he has received early tenure and promotion and is now the Graduate Coordinator at Cal. State Stanislaus. He participated in an NEH Seminar in Italy in Summer 2000 and presented a paper at Oxford University dealing with nineteenth-century British-Italian authorial relationships.

Guidelines for Submissions

As the journal of the English Graduate Program, *Shawangunk Review* publishes the proceedings of the Annual Graduate Symposium. In addition, the editors welcome submissions from any graduate student in English concerning any area of literary studies: essays, explications, book reviews, and scholarly notes and queries. English graduate students and faculty are invited to submit poetry and translations of poetry, and faculty members are invited to submit book reviews and scholarly notes and queries.

Manuscripts should be original material on literary biography, history, theory and methods, analysis and interpretation, and critical syntheses that may emerge from courses or seminars taken at the college. Manuscripts should be prepared in the preferred style published by the Modern Language Association in its *MLA Handbook*. All manuscripts should include an abstract of 50 words or less and biographical information of four to six lines that indicates the author's professional, research, and literary interests. Please submit three copies.

Book reviews are invited that relate to specific courses or to literary interests having general appeal to the graduate student body. Book reviews should be scholarly in orientation and approximately 1,000 to 1,500 words in length. Please submit two copies.

Original poetry or translations of one to five pages may also be submitted for consideration. Please submit two copies.

Abstracts of MA Theses should be approximately 150 words in length. Degree candidates who have completed (or are nearing completion of) an MA thesis are encouraged to consult with their advisors in preparing an abstract. Please submit two copies.

Letters to the editor are invited to promote scholarly discussion and debate.

The deadline for all submissions is September 30, 2001. Manuscripts and other submissions should be accompanied by a diskette containing the word processor file and sent to *Shawangunk Review*, Department of English, State University of New York, New Paltz, New York, 12561.

Contributors

Eileen Abrahams is a candidate for the MA degree and a Teaching Assistant at New Paltz. In the autumn she will begin studies for the Ph.D. in English at the University of Texas at Austin.

Catherine Aldington (see introduction preceding poems, page 85)

Roger Asselineau (see introduction preceding poems, page 89)

Laurence Beemer is a candidate for the MA degree and former Teaching Assistant at New Paltz.

Kevin Cavanaugh is studying for the MA degree in English and is a Teaching Assistant in the English Department at New Paltz.

A.M. Cinquemani is professor of English at New Paltz and the author of *Glad to Go for a Feast: Milton, Buonmattei, and the Florentine Accademici*. He is currently teaching a graduate seminar in Petrarch.

Debbie DePiero is a candidate for the MA and a Teaching Assistant in the English Department at New Paltz. In the autumn, she will enter the Ph.D. program at the University of Rhode Island.

Dennis Doherty is a former Teaching Assistant in English who holds the New Paltz MA in English. Currently a Creative Writing Instructor in English, he is a widely published poet.

David Fish is at Teaching Assistant and candidate for the MA in English. He serves on the campus Poetry Board and is very active in New Paltz poetry circles

Steven J. Florczyk is a former Teaching Assistant and candidate for the New Paltz MA in English. He has presented numerous papers at national and international literary conferences and was the recipient of the Hemingway Society Fellowship at the Inter-national Hemingway Conference in Bimini.

Michelle Gatzten is studying for the MS in Secondary Education with a concentration in English. She is on the faculty of Monroe-Woodbury High School, where she teaches English.

Scott K. Jacobs-Royer is a candidate for the Masters of Professional Studies at New Paltz. He is currently on the faculty of Kingston High School, where he teaches English.

Nancy E. Johnson is an Assistant Professor of English at New Paltz, where she teaches courses in eighteenth-century literature, early American literature, and literary theory. She is currently completing a book manuscript entitled *Critiquing the Contract: The English Jacobin Novel on Rights, Property, and Law*.

David Scott Kastan is Professor of English and Comparative Literature at Columbia University. An accomplished and internationally acclaimed scholar of early modern English literature and culture, Professor Kastan serves on the boards of The Folger Institute, the Council of Shakespeare's Globe Theatre, and many professional journals. He is the author or editor of many works, including the recent *A Companion to Shakespeare* and *Shakespeare After Theory*.

John Langan is a former Teaching Assistant and recipient of the New Paltz MA in English. He is currently a Ph.D. candidate at the CUNY Graduate Center. A frequent contributor to these pages, he also serves as President of the Elizabeth Madox Roberts Society.

Elizabeth McGuffey is pursuing her MA in English at New Paltz and is a former Teaching Assistant in the English Department.

Brenda M. O'Connor is a graduate of The University of Bridgeport and is currently completing her MAT degree with a concentration in English at New Paltz.

Fiona Paton is Assistant Professor of English at New Paltz, where she specializes in The Beats and Contemporary American Literature. Recent publications include "Beyond Bakhtin: Towards a Cultural Stylistics" in *College English*.

Adam J. Romano is a Teaching Assistant and candidate for the MA in English at New Paltz. He is active in New Paltz poetry circles.

Jenica Shapiro is a candidate for the MA in English at New Paltz and a Teaching Assistant in the English Department

Robert Singleton (MA New Paltz) is a Ph.D. candidate at New York University. Adjunct Professor of English at New Paltz, he is also a widely published poet.

H.R. Stoneback is Professor of English and Director of Graduate Studies at New Paltz, a leading Hemingway scholar of international reputation, and the author of *Hemingway's Paris*, *Singing the Springs*, *Cafe Millennium*, and other works of literary criticism and poetry.

Christopher Tanis is a Teaching Assistant and candidate for the MA in English. He is active in local poetry circles.

Pauline Uchmanowicz is an Assistant Professor of English at New Paltz, where she specializes in theories of composition. She is also a widely published poet.

William Van Cleve will soon receive the MA in English at New Paltz. He is on the faculty of the Kildonan School, where he chairs the Literature and Technology Department.

Robert H. Waugh is an Associate Professor of English at New Paltz, where he specializes in Science Fiction and Fantasy and Joyce. He is a widely published poet.