Connotations

A Journal for Critical Debate

Volume 6 (1996/97) Number 1
Waxmann Münster/New York

Connotations: A Journal for Critical Debate

Connotations wants to encourage scholarly communication in the field of English Literature (from the Middle English period to the present), as well as American and other Literatures in English. It focuses on the semantic and stylistic energy of the language of literature in a historical perspective and aims to represent different approaches.

Each issue consists of articles and a forum for discussion. The forum presents, for instance, research in progress, critical hypotheses, responses to articles published in *Connotations* and elsewhere, as well as to recent books.

Contributions will be published within five months after submission so that discussion can begin without delay.

Articles and responses should be forwarded to the editors. As a rule, articles should not exceed 12,000 words and follow the MLA Handbook. Responses should be limited to 4,000 words. If possible, all contributions should be submitted on diskette (preferably in WordPerfect), accompanied by a hard copy; they should be in English and must be proof-read before submission. Manuscripts and disks will not be returned unless accompanied by international reply coupons.

Connotations is published three times a year. Subscriptions are in Europe DM 60/year, in the U.S. and all other countries $ 50/year, including postage. A disk version in WordPerfect (DOS) is also available at DM 35 or $ 30/year. Single copies: DM 20/$ 18, plus postage.

M. M. Mahood, *Shakespeare's Wordplay:*
Some Reappraisals

ARTICLES and DISCUSSION

M. M. Mahood, *Shakespeares Wordplay*— Some Reappraisals Introducing the Subject

When I was a young girl a ticket for the gallery was 50 pfennigs (six-pence), and didn't I buy it and use it and wish to be tamed by Petruchio (who made his entrance by vaulting the rails) and cry over Gretchen in the dungeon, with the voice of heaven rendering Mephisto's verdict of guilty null and void, a blasphemy, a ridiculous presumption. The devil was a fool. Concerts were also to be had for 50 pfennigs but church music cost nothing at all, and so there was Bach, including *The Art of Fugue* played (for want of an even diviner instrument) on the organ and culminating in B-A-C-H (B and H meaning in German B flat and B).

So when I began studying literature, Aristotle and Horace and Quintilian had something to go on: of course there was such a thing as a cathartic experience through a work of art, in contrast with real pity and fear in real life, and of course poetry, especially dramatic poetry, makes it possible for us to be moved and delighted at the same time. Again of course, in poetry *nomen est omen* in the very sense that B-A-C-H is a fugal subject; no one makes this clearer than Shakespeare: "There are . . . books in brooks," and when ("only for a jest") Master Ford wants to be called Brook, the officiating Host employs a baptismal formula echoing Isaiah 9:6 and anticipating Handel's *Messiah*: "and thy name shall be Brook."

Yes, wordplay is a word to conjure by in the understanding of poetry. But, felt I, how to do it? For, if there is anything that needs a master, it is conjuring. As Sidney so very rightly says: for poetry to be brought into being it needs not only the divine fire but also a hard-won technique. Similarly, the pursuit of literary studies requires a natural affinity to that second nature as well as a detailed and extensive knowledge of it; both, however, will be of little use without a thorough

training in the art (or craft, or mystery) of interpretation. To proceed from appreciation to elucidation it needs valid criteria of how to read, that is to say, how to grasp the truly literal meaning of the words, uttered by the "tongues in trees" which are made audible by the language of poetry. Surely, "To hear with eyes belongs to love's fine wit," and the great thing is to learn that art of hearing.

One of the masters who helped me bridge the gap between the love of poetry and the interpretation of literary texts is M. M. Mahood, whose work I have found so especially congenial because she provides tools from the workshop of philology (and rhetoric and the history of literature and ideas) by which actually poetic matters can be handled. It goes without saying that they have to be used according to the poet's own "fore-conceit or idea of the work" and Professor Mahood does so use them, beginning with the most cherished plaything of poets, the word, and going on from there to the structured whole. In Shakespeare the words "word," "world," and "worth" recur as a triadic formula. The world and the word belong together as God's law and every jota of it, or as the grown tree and the seed in which all the "worth" is comprised, or as the poetic work and the single word which must not be lost or the whole structure collapses.

When we began to think of this re-review of *Shakespeare's Wordplay*, the chapter on *The Winter's Tale* seemed a likely choice because it reveals in an especially intriguing manner the poet's idea of play, be it with dramatic genres from ultra-modern pastoral tragicomedy to outgrown morality, or with the *dramatis personae* including Father Time and a live statue, or with the unities of place and time, or with the single word, which in this play is not only an element of play but called by that very name: "go play, boy, play."

My co-editors and I wish to thank Professors Gibbons, Hunt, Laird, and Muir for their contributions. Above all, we are grateful to Professor Mahood.—When this issue of *Connotations* was ready for the press the sad news reached us that Professor Kenneth Muir has passed away. Working with him was as great an honour as it was a pleasure and we shall miss him very much.

Inge Leimberg

The Magic of
M. M. Mahood's *Shakespeare's Wordplay*

DAVID LAIRD

There is kind of magic in Professor Mahood's essay on *The Winter's Tale*.[1]
She fixes her gaze on the play's images and pulls meanings from them
like so many wild rabbits from unsuspecting hats. Even after almost
forty years the effect continues to be a mix of wonder and surprise. If
the variety turns out to be less than infinite, if the rabbits more docile,
it is because the magician has a plan; she believes that parts comprise
a unity, and textures and tonalities are keyed to an emerging and
increasingly discernible architecture of meanings. A major claim is that
Shakespeare in the late plays renews his faith in the communicative
possibilities of language: "Belief in words is foremost among the lost
things which are found in Shakespeare's final comedies" (188). Mahood's
critical practice bespeaks a similar faith and delivers the good works
that constitute its vindication. That the tenor here has a theological ring
is not altogether accidental. Mahood reads *The Winter's Tale* as, among
other things, a morality play in which Everyman Leontes staggers blindly
through mists of error and remorse toward the high ground of
enlightenment, guided on the way by his good angels, Paulina and
Hermione. His progress is signaled in a series of double or triple puns
on words such as *disgrace, grace, issue, blood, breeding* and, perhaps most
tellingly, *play*, which juxtaposes or conjoins a multitude of meanings,
among them what children do with toys, what they and adults
sometimes do with fish ("I am angling now"), as well as games, sexual
play, playacting and disguising. Central to Mahood's thematic reading
is the use of the word to denote the unfettered, emancipatory play of
the imagination. Through the exercise of that faculty, Mahood argues,
characters find a foothold in a realm beyond the reach of Leontes'
authority and thereby manage to bring a touch of glory to their play.

For further contributions to this debate, please check the Connotations website at
<http://www.connotations.de/debmahood00601.htm>.

The focus is on what words do, on the duplicities and ambiguities of reference, the particular polyvalences to which auditors were once and may still be prepared to respond. Anne Barton, in a review of Tom Stoppard's *Arcadia*, suggests that Stoppard's puns, "far from being drearily Derridean, are something Shakespeare would have understood."[2] What Shakespeare would, presumably, have understood is the excitement of unforeseen connectedness, the suddenly perceived link between incongruous elements. Such a crossing is, perhaps, what Tony Tanner has in mind when he likens a pun to "an adulterous bed in which two meanings that should be separated are coupled together."[3]

Mahood's appreciation of such relationships and what she manages to make of them in relation to everything else are a continuation of or supplement to the work of critics who had initiated the careful study of linguistic and figural patterns. One effect of their endeavor was to counter both a preoccupation with the "lives" of Shakespeare's heroes and also a tendency to view the canon almost exclusively in the context of what was then understood to be "literary" history. L. C. Knights challenged the primacy of character interpretation by presenting the plays as dramatic poems, by drawing attention to the qualities of the verse, the controlled associations released by words, their emotional and intellectual force. Similarly concerned with the rhetoricity of language, G. Wilson Knight sought signification below or above the level of plot and character, exploring figural or musical patterns that were understood to organize the whole work. Caroline Spurgeon and Wolfgang Clemen made the study of imagery central to their respective methodologies, and it is, perhaps, especially in William Empson's linguistic analysis, his discussion of "honest" in *Othello* or "fool" in *Lear*, that Mahood found precedent for the project she was so productively to undertake. Together these critics and others including, for example, Cleanth Brooks and Robert Heilman pursue avenues of inquiry that, as Arthur Eastman reminds us, were to dominate criticism for half a century. It is revealing, I think, that in his essay on the history of modern criticism, Eastman should single out Mahood's contribution as meriting special attention.[4]

The extent of that contribution can be measured in a number of more recent studies, ranging from Inge Leimberg's work on the semiology of proper names in *The Winter's Tale*[5] to Gilian West's study of puns

in the play.[6] Mahood's influence is less evident in the work of the new historicists reluctant to accept claims of thematic unity or even textual intelligibility. The currents of meaning these critics seek to disclose run at depths beneath the surface, beneath, that is, the interplay of character and event, driven by forces of history and society more likely to be charted by anthropologists and cultural historians than by literary critics. In dealing with individual plays, the strategy is to construct explanatory models in which a surplus of signification, often a mix of discordant and contradictory elements, is brought to order, contained, made to serve an ideological argument, the plays transformed into unwitting instruments of social and political control. By focusing on a fairly narrow range of issues and concerns, the approach tends to encase texts in an historically distant, ideologically remote region, to represent them as museum pieces drawn from a warehouse of antique monuments, to isolate or cocoon them and thus to suppress any possible connectedness between the historical past and present. Accordingly, the past comes to resemble a foreign country the study of which is properly assigned to specialists who alone are possessed of the skills required to decipher what the natives say and their motives in saying it. Mahood, on the other hand, views a text as something other than a thing of the past, as less exclusively a product of the social and political forces that may have figured in its construction. At the same time, she is at pains to acknowledge the specificities of history and thereby to constrain and discipline the meanings she is prepared to pursue even as she seeks to capture those that are, if not universal, at least transhistorical. The line of inquiry is keyed to the assumption that language is decipherable, intelligible, that it is possible to grasp meanings as ambiguous and multifaceted as they often are and that the elucidation of texts is a worthwhile activity. For Mahood, worthwhileness depends in some measure on reaching a broad constituency, less exclusively an academic or professional one, and on an approach to literature that seeks to fulfill what is, in the words of Victor Brombert, "a permanent human need to account for experience."[7]

Acknowledgment of what was happening in England at the time Mahood was writing *Shakespeare's Wordplay* may help to explain not only the direction she takes but also what she chooses to leave out.

Conditions of production, dramatic conventions, the backgrounds and expectations of the original auditors are touched upon but not lingered over or developed in any detail. The ghosts of political and ideological controversy which some critics have glimpsed among the shadows do not abide the intensity of Mahood's daytime scrutiny. That *The Winter's Tale* raises questions about monarchical absolutism and the Stuart court or creates intelligent concern over the appropriation of language as an instrument of power is not a feature in which she appears to be much interested. She resists confining the play within its historical setting, hesitant to push it back into the past and thereby to distance it from the audiences she hopes to bring within its reach. For Mahood to dwell on the past is to put her project at risk. The task of the critic in the late fifties was understood to be an emancipatory one, its expressed aim to make accessible the riches of a culture for those social groups and classes previously denied. It was, after all, a society that had survived the turmoil of war. In the academy and elsewhere there was a deliberate attempt to build on a fragile sense of cultural solidarity and community that had momentarily arisen in the wake of that war. It is indicative of the mood of the period that William Empson, then Gresham Professor of Rhetoric, was persuaded to undertake a series of lectures on Elizabethan drama to be delivered to an anonymous audience whose members were recruited from the City of London and more likely to be in search of shelter than instruction in English literature. It is, perhaps, noteworthy in this regard that shortly after its publication, *Shakespeare's Wordplay* was included as a recommended text for students preparing for A level examinations and thus served to introduce a significant number of British school children to the study of Shakespeare.

In view of the circumstances that prevailed at the time the book was written, the critical tradition on which it drew and the desire to bring Shakespeare to a wider public, it is not surprising that Mahood is quite prepared to overlook more speculative matters having to do with the theoretical or semiotic implications of language. She is not much interested in the issues with which a subsequent criticism would be increasingly concerned such as, for example, post-structuralist arguments about the unreliability of language or the difficult passage from evidence to inference, from reference to representation. Mahood's fascination with

language and the wealth of meanings she routinely extracts from texts presuppose a vocabulary shared by playwright, audience, and critic alike. She believes that the voices which animated the plays for their first audiences continue to speak to other, more recent ones and that those voices constitute a channel of communication, a communicative link, across time, between whatever there once was and what there now is.

We return to her reading of *The Winter's Tale* as we do to other essays in *Shakespeare's Wordplay* to be reminded of the vicissitudes of critical taste and practice, to be challenged to look beyond disciplinary specialization, to be warned away from single-minded or reductive explanatory patterns, and, finally, to be told that literature counts and that criticism remains to tell us why.

California State University
Los Angeles

NOTES

[1]*Shakespeare's Wordplay* (London: Methuen, 1957).

[2]*New York Review of Books* 42.100 (June 8, 1995): 28.

[3]*Adultery and the Novel* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1979) 53.

[4]"Shakespeare Criticism," *William Shakespeare: His World, His Work, His Influence*, ed. John Andrews, vol. 3 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1985) 745.

[5]"'Golden Apollo, a poor humble swain . . .': A Study of Names in *The Winter's Tale*," *Shakespeare Jahrbuch West* (1991): 135-58.

[6]"Fuelling the Flames: Inadvertent Double Entendre in *The Winter's Tale*," *English Studies* 74 (1993): 520-23.

[7]Presidential Address 1989: "Mediating the Work: Or the Legitimate Aims of Criticism," *PMLA* 105 (1990): 391-97.

Poetry vs. Plot in *The Winter's Tale*: Modernity and Morality in M. M. Mahood's *Shakespeare's Wordplay*

MAURICE HUNT

No one, either before or since the publication in 1957 of *Shakespeare's Wordplay*, has matched M. M. Mahood in her ability to tease out the multiple meanings of Shakespeare's puns and verbal innuendoes so that local and distant thematic meanings coalesce. By valorizing, even dignifying, Shakespeare's puns, she completed the revolution of the Neoclassical judgment on Shakespeare's fatal Cleopatra. Mahood's insights have greatly benefited Shakespeare studies. She showed editors of the plays how wordplay could adjudicate matters of textual emendation.[1] A multitude of finely turned phrases conveyed her understanding of character in memorable jewels. Leontes' "moral rigidity," she informs us, is "born of a moral uncertainty" (154). By my count, she was the first commentator on *The Winter's Tale* to notice that in Perdita's presentation of flowers, time runs not forwards but backwards, "to fetch the age of gold, from winter herbs to August's carnations and striped gillyflowers, to the June marigold that goes to bed with the sun . . . and so back to the spring flowers she would give Florizel" (159). In the final chapter of *Shakespeare's Wordplay*, Mahood made early modern English philosophies of language available to Shakespeareans and so indirectly made possible later explorations of Shakespeare's wordplay (different from her own) by critics such as James Calderwood, Sigurd Burckhardt, W. H. Matchett, and Richard Proudfoot.[2] Proudfoot's demonstration of the interpenetration and presence of values associated with one half of the diptych-like *Winter's Tale* in the other half extended and confirmed Mahood's tendency to do the same with things Sicilian and Bohemian. In this respect, she was a pioneer.

_____

For further contributions to this debate, please check the Connotations website at
<http://www.connotations.de/debmahood00601.htm>.

Her strengths in *Shakespeare's Wordplay* were indeed many. She was the first (and in my opinion the most accomplished) analyst of the manner by which the libido invading Leontes' mind fights for "release in savage wordplay" (149), mainly in puns on words such as "neat," "dear," "die," "apparent," "stews," "business," and "satisfy." Her comprehensive knowledge of the technical meanings of certain early modern English words, meanings that precipitate puns where auditors never suspected they lurk, approached the legendary knowledge of G. L. Kittredge. M. M. Mahood understood that a Shakespeare character cannot have an unconscious mind. How then, she boldly wondered, can a character's puns be said to be unconscious? Her brilliant solution of this problem deserves quotation: "The vital wordplay in Shakespeare's writings is that between the characters and their creator, between the primary meanings of words in the context of a person's speech and their secondary meanings as part of the play's underlying pattern of thought. The chief function of the pun is to connect subject and object, inner force with outer form, the poetic vision with the characters in action that are its theoretical embodiment. The play's the thing—not the elusive mind of the playwright nor the illusory minds of his characters" (41). In other words, Shakespeare's wordplay ultimately amounts to resonant talk between Shakespeare and his creation—his characters—rather than primarily conversation between characters and on- and off-stage auditors or between characters and their conscious or unconscious minds.

Mahood's portrayal of Shakespeare's language as a private conversation between himself and his creation renders it modern—in that writers such as D. H. Lawrence, Proust, Joyce, and Virginia Woolf provided for their own and previous ages the aesthetic rationale for the circulation of private dialogue between author and characters—for language sometimes cryptic but usually dependent on wordplay for its significance.[3] My re-review of *Shakespeare's Wordplay* initially highlights the modernity of Mahood's reading strategies and linguistic analyses, especially with regard to her understanding of the plot of *The Winter's Tale* in relation to the play's poetry. Her modern idea of the drama's plot, however, apparently proved inadequate for the purposes of wordplay exploration. Consequently she reverted to a morality scheme contemporary with

Shakespeare to complete her reconstruction of the plot of *The Winter's Tale* so that it maximizes opportunities for the analysis of language.

Mahood's modernist context for interpretation materializes early in *Shakespeare's Wordplay* when she judges that "a generation that relishes *Finnegan's Wake* is more in danger of reading non-existent quibbles into Shakespeare's work than of missing his subtlest play of meaning" (11). But this disclaimer is unnecessary, for behind Mahood stands the authority of William Empson and his masterful discovery in *Seven Types of Ambiguity* (1930) of galaxies of wordplay. (And behind Empson stands the patriarch of twentieth-century, that is to say, modernist, linguistic philosophy, Ludwig Wittgenstein). It was Empson who paved the way for Mahood by defining the double grammar of Shakespeare's Sonnets and the two apparently unconnected meanings given simultaneously by Shakespeare's puns in plays like *Henry V*.[4]

But it is in her description of the plot of *The Winter's Tale* and its relation to the play's multivalent language that Mahood is most intriguingly modern. Surprisingly, much of her chapter on *The Winter's Tale*—perhaps as much as one half of it—concerns the nature and dynamics of the play's plot rather than those of its words. The following criterion of Mahood's helps to explain this emphasis: "The plays which are the theme of the following chapters are not necessarily those which are most rich in wordplay, but they are ones in which the wordplay appears to me to offer a valuable means of access to the heart of the drama" (55). "Although there are not very many puns in *The Winter's Tale*," she admits, "the few that are used generate a superb energy" (147). The energy of wordplay, as it radiates outward from its appearance to create thematic meanings from material in different parts of the play, crystallizes a kind of plot in *The Winter's Tale*. This phenomenon becomes apparent in Mahood's explication of Polixenes' "Nine Changes of the Watry-Starre hath been / The Shepheards Note, since we haue left our Throne / Without a Burthen":

> The moon's nine changes imply the themes of pregnancy (helped, perhaps, by 'Burthen'), of sudden changes of fortune, and of madness, which are all to become explicit in the course of the same scene. The whole image is the first of many taken from country things and the pastoral life, which persist throughout the Sicilian scenes of the play and so help to bridge the 'great gap'

of time and place over which we pass later to the shepherd kingdom of Bohemia. And the leading theme of these scenes in Bohemia, the summer harmony of heaven and earth, is prepared here by mention of the 'watery star' that draws the tides. (147)

Expressed this way, the rich poetry of *The Winter's Tale* not simply telescopes the plot of the play but more radically appears to first condense and then release it. Concerning "the full-grown symbolism of the last plays," Derek Traversi judged in a book published three years before Mahood's that in his last plays "Shakespeare's power of uniting poetry and drama is now such that the plot has become simply an extension, an extra vehicle of the poetry."[5] Mahood approaches Traversi's view when her articulation of the wordplay of Polixenes' opening lines in *The Winter's Tale* simultaneously unfolds the plot of the play from its encapsulation in richly connotative words and phrases. One could call this practice modern, for it were writers such as Joyce and Proust again who structured their plots, for example, according to the exfoliated verbal equivalents of musical phrases and leitmotifs and then just as quickly condensed them into a single word or unit of discourse (sometimes a pun).[6] This literary practice finds an analogue, actually its justification, in descriptions by physicists in the Einsteinian tradition of great worlds of matter created by maps compressed in tiny particles that explode in a grand, virtually unimaginable manner. Certain aspects of modern thought and aesthetics prepared Mahood to reject the paltry view of the plot of *The Winter's Tale* that she inherited from the Victorians in general and from Lytton Strachey in particular—that it was a fairy tale written by a bored, cynical old man.[7] Confidently, she could write that "each image, each turn of phrase, each play upon a word's meaning in [*The Winter's Tale*], compels us to feel that Shakespeare's total statement adds up to much more than the fairy-tale events of the plot" (146).

Nevertheless, wordplay and the poetry of *The Winter's Tale* were not for Mahood ultimately sufficient vehicles for or equivalents of the play's plot. This fact becomes clear when we realize that her elaborate reconstruction of the romance's plot is modernist in senses different from those just suggested. When she claims that Perdita is "a nature spirit,

the symbol of the renewing seasons" (187), she reveals that she stands in a line of twentieth-century commentators on *The Winter's Tale* that begins with F. C. Tinkler and ends (for Mahood's purposes) with F. D. Hoeniger and for whom certain values of Jesse Weston, Sir James Frazer, and T. S. Eliot were important.[8] Reading *The Winter's Tale* as a fertility myth in which the goddess-like Perdita and the invigorating qualities of Bohemia cause the wasteland of Sicilia to bloom again for its inhabitants, Tinkler made Shakespeare's late play accommodate the anthropology of Weston and Frazer and complement poems like Eliot's "The Waste Land," which were based upon it.[9] I have argued elsewhere that the despair and ennui resulting from the sense of devastation wrought by World War I and the Great Depression of the early 1930s encouraged this reading of *The Winter's Tale*.[10] In 1950, F. D. Hoeniger strengthened the allegorical dimension of this sterile-land-redeemed-by-fertility-characters interpretation by construing the play as Shakespeare's retelling of the Persephone myth.[11] When Mahood writes of "the fertility legend of a child healing an old man and so bringing prosperity to the land" (148), she indicates the degree to which her notion of the plot of *The Winter's Tale* is modernist in a sense peculiar to the decades between 1930 and 1950.

Giving a Christian coloring to the essentially pagan paradigm traced in the preceding paragraph was also a trait of criticism of *The Winter's Tale* written in the 1940s and 50s. It was S. L. Bethell who translated the scheme of Tinkler into one of the salvation of a spiritually barren winter king.[12] Mahood's indebtedness to Bethell for this aspect of her understanding of the plot of the play surfaces in sentences like the following: "The presiding deity of the play may be Apollo, but the Christian scheme of redemption is a leading element . . . in its pattern of ideas. *Grace*, with *gracious* a keyword in the play, is frequently used in its theological sense of 'the divine influence which operates in men to regenerate and sanctify'" (150-51). But Mahood goes beyond Bethell by asserting that in *The Winter's Tale* Shakespeare has created a Jacobean Morality play. In her interpretation of the plot, Leontes is "Everyman, Humanity," who is "able to recall a primeval innocence when he was 'Boy eternal'" (151). Once Leontes/Everyman exchanges "Innocence for Experience," Hermione enacts "the role of regenerative grace" for him.

But Everyman rejects Grace in the Eye of Apollo, who becomes Apollo the Destroyer. After Apollo kills his issue Mamillius, Leontes feels guilt and despair but repents. His penance becomes his "recreation," which finally, with the help of Perdita's life-giving grace, makes the king "'man new made'" (152).

This Morality plot of *The Winter's Tale* constitutes the vehicle—perhaps a better word is framework—for Mahood's analyses of Shakespeare's extensive play on words such as "grace," "eye," "issue," and "recreation." Her adaptation of the Morality plot to the play suggests that she would have found Traversi's idea that poetry on occasion becomes plot in Shakespeare's work unusable, if not mistaken. Throughout *Shakespeare's Wordplay* Mahood shows her fondness for the English Romantic poets, especially Coleridge and Blake, by citing them and their ideas frequently. The statement that Leontes exchanges Innocence for Experience obviously alludes to one of Blake's major conceptions.[13] This Romantic orientation most likely led Mahood to think of Florizel and Perdita as children. For Mahood, the miraculously renovative effect of the Wordsworthian child conflates with the new seed generation of the wasteland-renewed mythology of the play. She does refer to "the fertility legend of a *child* (my italics) healing an old man" (148). This Romantic archetype adds another element to Mahood's reconstruction of the plot of *The Winter's Tale*.

At this point, it begins to become apparent that her notion of the plot of the play does not always fit its details. As part of her analysis of the play's wordplay on "eye," Mahood characterizes Mamillius' "*welkin* eye—the adjective suggesting something providential and life-giving, and not merely 'clear and blue like the sky'" (154). This quality gets associated with the [Romantic] "non-moral vision of childhood, the state of the 'Boy eternal' who had not as yet the knowledge of good and evil" (154). Moreover, "if Hermione represents the grace of heaven towards Leontes, Perdita stands for his self-forgiveness, for his recapture of the child's non-moral acceptance of things as they are in Nature" (154). But while some truth may reside in these pronouncements, Perdita and even Mamillius are not the children that Mahood describes. Having had to reconstruct the plot of *The Winter's Tale* from several different components in order to provide a medium for her treatment of

Shakespeare's wordplay, she arrives at a hybrid that entails several interpretive problems, including a few misreadings. Mamillius' knowing, almost cynical, banter with Hermione's ladies about cosmetics and the facial symptoms of pregnancy exceeds the capacity of the Romantic child. If Leontes once was a boy eternal without the knowledge of evil, that "twinn'd lamb" also wore a dagger muzzled lest it should bite its master, a sign—in short—of nascent sexuality and the aggressiveness accompanying it. And far from being a child, Florizel, who most likely is twenty-one,[14] burns with a controlled passion for his mistress, an affection so intense however that he flees with her in order to marry her unconventionally. Finally, Perdita, rather than being a non-moral child, gives evidence of a rigid adult morality in her super-refined notion of decorum and the propriety essential to romantic courtship.

Other difficulties appear in Mahood's reconstructed plot of *The Winter's Tale*. The severity and uncommon nature of Leontes' psychosis hardly seem to make him Everyman or Humanity. It was J. I. M. Stewart who sketched the latent Freudian homosexual dynamic of Leontes' paranoid jealousy.[15] In the first full-fledged modern production of *The Winter's Tale*, Harley Granville-Barker's staging of it at the Savoy Theatre in 1912, Henry Ainley's unnaturally pale face, stringy hair, and abstracted gaze effectively conveyed this atypical dynamic.[16] This discrepancy suggests other challenges involved in reading the plot of *The Winter's Tale* as a Jacobean Morality play. For one thing, it cannot cover the vast drama. "So *The Winter's Tale* is a morality play," Mahood judges, "but its morality is wider, wiser and more humane than that of a Puritan inner drama of sin, guilt and contrition" (153). She admits that "something is omitted in the attempt made here to allegorize the play" (153). "We have had to leave out the sunburnt mirth of the scenes in Bohemia, the Clown, Mopsa, and the rogue Autolycus . . . . Worse still, Perdita is really unnecessary if we read *The Winter's Tale* as a kind of *Grace Abounding*" (153). Calling attention to this gap in her account of the play's plot allows Mahood to analyze the regenerative wordplay on "play" and related terms in the actions of Perdita and other Bohemian characters. What appeared a liability ingeniously becomes a local interpretive asset.

Worth remarking in this context is Mahood's above-noted identification of the Morality plot and Puritanism. Throughout *Shakespeare's Wordplay*

Mahood implies a less-than-ideal valuation of each term of this combination. Arguing that both *All's Well That Ends Well* and *Timon of Athens* have overt dramatic theses, she claims that this feature "brings them closer to being morality plays than true dramas" (48). In a note on Milton's *Comus*, Mahood writes, "it has been suggested by J. E. Crofts that Sabrina's role in the masque is very much that of a nature spirit such as Perdita. The Lady remains frozen in a Puritanical disapproval until the nymph releases her" (155). The negative weighting of "Puritanical" is subtle but distinct. The early modern cultural tension between Puritanical mores and old holiday pastimes that Leah Marcus has recently focused and explored informs Mahood's reconstruction of the plot of *The Winter's Tale*.[17] If a major function of the vaudeville-like "re-creations" of Bohemia is "to remind Everyman—Leontes and the audience—of his need for folly" (161), if "the scenes in Bohemia restore the child's or peasant's freedom from morbid preoccupations about good and evil" (156)—then the deadly seriousness of Leontes and his gloomy thoughts of sin will be foregrounded in Sicilia. If Perdita incarnates "innocent sexuality which represents the acceptance of the ways of nature that [she] is to restore to her father" (160), then Sicilia will be a place of corrupt sexuality.

Mahood stereotypes these fallen qualities of the winter half of the play as Puritan in her Morality pattern of fall and redemption. Barbara Kiefer Lewalski has recently argued, however, that the Reformation paradigm of sin, penance, contrition, and sanctification that Mahood utilizes is actually mainstream Church of England Protestant rather than Puritan.[18] The stereotyping of so-called Puritan traits has generally obscured the sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Protestant acceptance of the Reformation paradigm of salvation.[19] Shakespeare's mainly Protestant playgoers would have had a hard time thinking of a part of nature untouched by the curse of Original Sin. Mahood may claim that "in *The Winter's Tale* . . . Nature is neither morally good nor bad" (156), but she would have had a difficult task convincing Shakespeare's Protestant countrymen and women that anyone born within the realm of fallen nature inherently enjoys exemption from the effects of humankind's curse. That entailment proves to be the case even in the land of Bohemia, where shepherd wives die, men drown in offshore storms, bears eat

noblemen, the tyrannical threatenings of monarchy have force, and London rogues cut purses. The glimpse of a Sidneyan Golden Nature made possible by Perdita's play-acting the role of the goddess of flowers Flora proves, after all, fleeting—finally poignant because of its evanescence.

All this is to say that Mahood's painstaking reconstruction of *The Winter's Tale* shows many seams and not a few threads alien to the play. The considerable space given in her chapter on this late play to a fabrication of plot thus appears to be the result of her need for a vehicle (or medium) for her exemplary analysis of Shakespeare's wordplay. Other possibilities for conceiving of the plots of Shakespeare's plays in relation to their poetry exist, however. Lawrence Danson has shown that the action of *Coriolanus* amounts to a kinetic combination of two rhetorical tropes—metonymy and synecdoche—while Russ McDonald has argued that the plot of *The Winter's Tale* consists of a giant expansion of the play's typical poetic utterance—a statement made variously mysterious, ominous, and suspenseful by having several dependent phrases and clauses precede its final sense-giving main clause.[20]

> What distinguishes *The Winter's Tale* is that much of the poetic language is organized periodically: convoluted sentences or difficult speeches become coherent and meaningful only in their final clauses or movements," McDonald asserts; "a similar principle governs the arrangement of dramatic action: the shape and meaning of events become apparent only in the final moments of the tragicomedy.[21]

It is likely that schemes similar to Danson's and McDonald's models for relating the poetry and plot of a Shakespeare play could be devised for the distinctive wordplay of *The Winter's Tale* and the drama's broad action. Nevertheless, repeated readings of M. M. Mahood's *Shakespeare's Wordplay* will continue to edify students of the canon, even after the day that the above-described possibility becomes fact. They will do so because the penetrating insights of this exceptional critic of Shakespeare's plays survive her inevitably culture-bound assumptions.

Baylor University
Waco, Texas

NOTES

[1]M. M. Mahood, *Shakespeare's Wordplay* (1957; rpt. London: Methuen, 1968) 12-18.

[2]James Calderwood, *"Love's Labour's Lost*: A Wantoning with Words," *Studies in English Literature* 5 (1965): 317-22; and *"Coriolanus*: Wordless Meanings and Meaningless Words," *Studies in English Literature* 6 (1966): 211-24; Sigurd Burckhardt, *Shakespearean Meanings* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1968) esp. 22-46; William H. Matchett, "Some Dramatic Techniques in *The Winter's Tale," Shakespeare Survey* 22 (1969): 93-107; and Richard Proudfoot, "Verbal Reminiscence and the Two-part Structure of *The Winter's Tale," Shakespeare Survey* 29 (1976): 67-78.

[3]For this phenomenon in Lawrence, see Mark Schorer, "Technique as Discovery," *The World We Imagine* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1968) 3-23, esp. 13, 14-16; in Proust, Gérard Genette, "Proust and Indirect Language," *Figures of Literary Discourse*, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Columbia UP, 1982) 229-95; in Woolf, Joan Lidoff, "Virginia Woolf's Feminine Sentence: The Mother-Daughter World of *To the Lighthouse," Literature and Psychology* 32.3 (1986): 43-59, esp. 43-49. Certainly the Joycean stream-of-consciousness technique promotes private dialogues both between author and character and within character.

[4]See the second- and third-type ambiguities in William Empson, *Seven Types of Ambiguity* (1930; rpt. Cleveland: World Publ., 1955) 57-174.

[5]Derek Traversi, *Shakespeare: The Last Phase* (1954; rpt. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 1965) 3.

[6]In this respect, see—for Joyce—Timothy Martin, "Joyce, Wagner, and Literary Wagnerism," *Picking Up Airs: Hearing the Music in Joyce's Text*, ed. Ruth H. Bauerle (Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1993) 105-27, esp. 119-23; for Proust, J. M. Cocking, "Proust and Music," *Proust: Collected Essays on the Writer and His Art* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982) 109-29, esp. 126-29; and Richard E. Goodkin, "Proust and Wagner: The Climb to the Octave Above, or, the Scale of Love (and Death)," *Around Proust* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1991) 103-26.

[7]Lytton Strachey, *Books and Characters: French and English* (1906; rpt. London: Chatto & Windus, 1922) 58-59.

[8]F. C. Tinkler, *"The Winter's Tale," Scrutiny* 5 (1936-37): 344-64. Also see The Winter's Tale: *Critical Essays*, ed. Maurice Hunt (New York: Garland Publ., 1995) 20.

[9]Hunt 19-20.

[10]Hunt 20-21.

[11]F. David Hoeniger, "The Meaning of *The Winter's Tale," University of Toronto Quarterly* 20.1 (1950-51): 11-26.

[12]S. L. Bethell, The Winter's Tale: *A Study* (London: Staples P, 1947).

[13]"According to Blake's paradox," Mahood states, "the return of spiritual vision by which what now seemed finite and corrupt would appear infinite and holy was to be accomplished by 'an improvement of sensual enjoyment'; and such enjoyment is felt throughout the scenes in Bohemia" (157).

[14]For the calculation of this age, see Maurice Hunt, "The Three Seasons of Mankind: Age, Nature, and Art in *The Winter's Tale," Iowa State Journal of Research* 58 (1984): 299-309, esp. 300-1.

[15]J. I. M. Stewart, *Character and Motive in Shakespeare: Some Recent Appraisals Examined* (London: Longmans, 1949) 30-37.

[16]Dennis Bartholomeusz, The Winter's Tale in Performance in England and America 1611-1976 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982) 151.

[17]Leah Marcus, The Politics of Mirth: Herrick, Milton, Marvell, and the Defense of Old Holiday Pastimes (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1986).

[18]Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1979) 16-23.

[19]For a questioning of the accuracy and usefulness of the term "Puritan" for historical analysis, see Patrick Collinson, "A Comment: Concerning the Name Puritan," Journal of Ecclesiastical History 31 (1980): 483-88.

[20]Lawrence Danson, Tragic Alphabet: Shakespeare's Drama of Language (New Haven: Yale UP, 1974) 143-62; Russ McDonald, "Poetry and Plot in The Winter's Tale," Shakespeare Quarterly 36 (1985): 315-29.

[21]McDonald 316.

Doubles and Likenesses-with-difference:
The Comedy of Errors and *The Winter's Tale*

BRIAN GIBBONS

In her classic study, M. M. Mahood concentrated on wordplay in Shakespeare. My interest here is in non-verbal double meanings and their interplay with the verbal text. Structurally *The Winter's Tale* is obviously a double action divided by Time the Chorus. Part 1's narrative, the movement from court to country and from kings to shepherds, is reversed in Part 2's movement from country to court and from shepherds to kings, as if in a diptych or pair of hinged mirrors: and this double pattern is repeated in other terms: Part 1's suspected disguises are repeated in Part 2's real disguises, and in each part accusation is followed by flight, then by confrontation. At the hinge between the two Parts death meets birth; the end of Part 2 reunites the figures from the beginning of Part 1.

This pattern of doubling, the repetition in the two Parts of events and even individual words, composes patterns of likeness-with-difference —conceits which are far-fetched over a gap between tragedy and comedy, Sicily and Bohemia, winter and spring. Shakespeare makes his double design of the play emphatic but at the same time it is riddling, something that is most obviously emphasised by the two *coups de théâtre*—the bear and the statue—where the stage images embody deep conceits; but also by the mischievous spirit of travesty in which the whole pastoral episode of 4.4. is presented. The double design in fact extends to the smallest verbal links between the two halves of the play, as with the single word "hook," used by Leontes gloating at the prospect of seizing Hermione: "she / I can hook to me" (2.3.7) and by Polixenes rebuking Florizel: "Thou sceptre's heir, / That thus affectst a sheep-hook" (4.4.420): or the single word "slip," used by Perdita in 4.4.100 in the sense "a twig, sprig or small shoot taken from a plant or tree for purposes of grafting

---

or planting" (*OED* sb.[2] 1.) but earlier used in another sense, "sin," by her mother playfully ("slipp'd," 1.2.85) and her father savagely ("slippery," 1.2.273). There is something residually difficult in this whole pervasive system of likenesses-with-difference.[1]

Early in his career, Shakespeare deliberately explores varied comic styles. He is fascinated by extremes, concentrating intensely in *Love's Labour's Lost* on words and the idea of double meaning, while in *The Comedy of Errors* it is action and the meaning of the double which is thoroughly explored. It is presumably because *The Comedy of Errors* is chiefly concerned with the play of meanings in doubled persons and situations, rather than in words, that it did not earn itself a place in *Shakespeare's Wordplay*; nevertheless I have been struck when re-reading *The Winter's Tale* by the way it has kept reminding me of *The Comedy of Errors*, and looking again at this early comedy from the unusual perspective of *The Winter's Tale* seems to me to illuminate interesting features in both plays—there is the conscious pointing to the absurdity resulting from the extreme pressure placed on narrative conventions, there is the way a whole plot can have a double meaning apparent to an audience but not to the characters—although it is not so much in technique as in substance that the later Shakespeare is still able to draw inspiration from this early piece.

In *The Comedy of Errors* the changes Shakespeare makes to his main source, Plautus, emphasise the pathos of human capacity for error and man's subjection to the power of Fortune. The doubling of masters and servants results in situations in which innocent actions appear guilty; the fact of identical twins puts in question the very idea of Nature, as well as the human quest for self-knowledge. Shakespeare ensures that the audience know more of the situation than the characters do (except for the very last revelation), which increases the impression that the characters are victims, thereby producing effects both ridiculous and pathetic. The wife Adriana declares (2.2.110-46) her belief in the sanctity of marriage as a spiritual union, she and her husband being "undividable, incorporate." The audience is aware—though she is not—that her husband has an identical twin, and that it is to this man, a complete stranger, that she is declaring herself indissolubly knit. The metaphysical paradox that man and wife are one flesh is thus confronted by the

physical paradox that man and brother are identically the same. The longing for reunion that one twin feels for the other is contrasted with the frustration both husband and wife feel within the bonds of marriage. It is in this central concern with twins as a challenge to the exclusive union of man and wife that I find the strongest connection between *The Comedy of Errors* and *The Winter's Tale*; and with this common theme goes a similarity of dramatic technique (allowing for the general development in Shakespeare's art) in the dividing of an audience's attention so that an episode can be understood from two opposite points of view simultaneously—so that the narrative itself, in short, has a double meaning, and generates whole orders of subsidiary double meanings. A clear instance is the already-mentioned episode where the wife, Adriana, fearing her husband is being unfaithful, suddenly comes upon him. She passionately appeals to him to uphold the ideal of marriage as spiritual union:

> For know, my love, as easy mayst thou fall
> A drop of water in the breaking gulf,
> And take unmingled thence that drop again,
> Without addition or diminishing,
> As take from me thyself and not me too. (2.2.125-29)

The audience, knowing that this is not her husband but his twin, will not respond with full sympathy to her speech—they will be more interested in its effect on the bewildered Antipholus of Syracuse. He does his best to respond clearly and formally (2.2.147):

> Plead you to me, fair dame? I know you not:

but the situation gives this simple utterance two opposite meanings: the audience can see that it is perfectly reasonable—since he is a stranger—but it is equally clear that to Adriana it must appear to be frightening evidence of a sudden change in her husband—it is either calculated malice or madness. Moreover, Adriana's speech with its simile of the drop of water will have another quite unintended significance to this Antipholus, since in his first scene he had likened himself, seeking his lost twin, to

a drop of water,
That in the ocean seeks another drop,
Who, falling there to find his fellow forth
(Unseen, inquisitive), confounds himself. (1.2.35-38)

—a speech all the more poignant in retrospect since it marks his last moment of sanity before the entry of the wrong Dromio plunges him deeper and deeper into an ocean of confusion, until he fears he is among

Dark-working sorcerers that change the mind,
Soul-killing witches that deform the body (1.2.99-100)

Although the image of the drop of water, transparent and volatile, can be understood in Christian terms as the soul, in *The Comedy of Errors* these same qualities of transparency and volatility are also associated, ironically, with instability and loss of identity. In the play the image of the drop of water is used as a paradoxical simile both for the relationship between twin and twin and for husband and wife. As the play unfolds, Adriana's assertion of indivisible union with her husband is belied by her suspicion that he is unfaithful, by the audience's observation of his temper and of his relations with the courtesan, and by the remarks of the Abbess about jealous wives; so that the ultimate issue is the crisis in the marriage, something not caused, but only precipitated, by the arrival of the twin: thus a resonant double-meaning is focused in Adriana's passionate question:

How comes it now, my husband, O, how comes it,
That thou art then estranged from thyself? (2.2.119-120)

Here are several hints for the stagecraft as well as the subtext of Act 1 Scene 2 of *The Winter's Tale*, which likewise concerns a married couple, the husband having a (spiritual) twin brother, then being struck suddenly by mistaken jealousy, the wife virtuous but, victim of an apparently compromising situation, exposed to his madness and vindictive rage, amid accusations of witchcraft and conspiracy. Shakespeare in *The Winter's Tale* manipulates the audience's perception so that they see events in a double sense: the husband is a tyrant but at the same time

a victim, he is a tragic figure and at the same time as ridiculous as Antipholus of Ephesus in pursuit of Dr Pinch.

* * *

In 3.2. of *The Comedy of Errors* Luciana appeals to her brother-in-law Antipholus to be kinder to his wife: even if he does not love her, she says, at least he could conceal it: if he must commit adultery, then "do it by stealth," "Be secret-false,"

> Look sweet, speak fair, become disloyalty;
> Apparel vice like virtue's harbinger; (3.2.11-12)

Unfortunately she does not realise this is the wrong twin brother, who while being confused by much of what she says, reacts eagerly to what he thinks might be a sexual invitation:

> Lay open to my earthy, gross conceit
> Smothered in errors, feeble, shallow, weak,
> The folded meaning of your words deceit (3.2.34-36)

It is, characteristically for this play, the situation which gives this language its ambiguity. The word "folded" can be glossed (*OED* "folded" *ppl.a.*) as concealed, doubled, twisted, and is equivalent to "implied." Folding a letter before the ink is dry produces a double image; but of course the usual reason for folding is to conceal the contents. Still, in a play about undiscovered doubles, two sets of identical twins, "folding" seems a suggestive word for Antipholus to use here: doubled, concealed meanings are of the essence.

If, psychologically, a certain threat is inherent in self-mirroring, it may be because the self is naturally prone to division. In *The Comedy of Errors* there is no mistaking the fearful implications of the loss of self-possession, the idea of confounding, the suggestion of drowning implicit in the simile used by the twin to explain that he is "like a drop of water"

> That in the ocean seeks another drop,
> Who, falling there to find his fellow forth
> (Unseen, inquisitive), confounds himself. (1.2.36-38)

From his early plays forward Shakespeare shows a fascination with likenesses-without-difference, in twins and doubles. When Viola in *Twelfth Night* thinks of her lost twin brother she says, to reassure herself, "I my brother know / Yet living in my glass" (3.4.379-80); but when she and her brother, at last reunited, stand side by side, the sight unnerves the hitherto robust Antonio:

> How have you made division of yourself?
> An apple, cleft in twain, is not more twin. (5.1.222-23)

Her twin is identical except for his opposite sex—Shakespeare developing further from *The Comedy of Errors* his concern with same-sex identical twins, and hence producing in *Twelfth Night* a more complex treatment of issues of sexual identity as well as jealousy.

In *A Midsummer Night's Dream* 3.2. the idea is of spiritual twinning, of the growing together of the two girls Helena and Hermia:

> So we grew together,
> Like to a double cherry, seeming parted,
> But yet an union in partition,
> Two lovely berries moulded on one stem;
> So with two seeming bodies, but one heart, (3.2.208-12)

Their childhood unity is stressed at the point when sexual rivalry divides them. Helena appeals to Hermia to remember how in childhood they were like identical twins, but whatever she might pretend in these lines, the play makes it clear that the girls are physically quite unlike (e.g. 3.2.290-91). It was not physical but spiritual identity they shared so intensely, but Helena lets her rhetoric run away with her: the unintended confusion of the simile (does this double cherry have two stones or one?) reveals a certain emotional falseness in the speaker, especially as the cherry's propriety as an image of girlhood is undermined minutes earlier by the use Demetrius has made of it, addressing Helena: "Thy lips, those kissing cherries, tempting grow."

Helena's lines are too neatly divided, the similes whimsically pretty but too like one another, making an effect more repetitious than incremental:

> We, Hermia, like two artificial gods,
> Have with our needles created both one flower,
> Both on one sampler, sitting on one cushion,
> Both warbling of one song, both in one key,
> As if our hands, our sides, voices, and minds
> Had been incorporate: (3.2.203-8)

This is the rhetorical equivalent of a child's sampler, where time stands still; but for Helena and Hermia sexual love now involves growing apart. The episode concerns love's inducement to betrayal as much as self-betrayal—Helena is at least right to feel that it is intolerable to be treated as if she were a mere sexual token exchangeable for her erstwhile spiritual twin.

At the very beginning of *The Winter's Tale* a conversation between two courtiers stresses, as something extraordinary, the boyhood intimacy of the two kings Leontes and Polixenes—an intimacy which now must inevitably change:

> They were train'd together in their childhoods, and there rooted betwixt them then such an affection, which cannot choose but branch now. (1.1.22-24)

Polixenes asserts of himself and Leontes that they were

> Two lads that thought there was no more behind
> But such a day to-morrow as to-day,
> And to be boy eternal. (1.2.63-5)

The play's intense concern with double-meanings in language and stage-imagery—with true ambiguity in interpretation—springs from and returns to this original concern with twinning. In *The Comedy of Errors* the wrong Antipholus twin is unfortunately admitted by the other's wife to "dine above"—to an intimate reconciliation with the unwitting risk of adultery, and in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* the distress of Helena hinges on her erotic exchangeability with Hermia. In this play Leontes and Polixenes, as boys, feel themselves to be twin brothers, and there is the implication that their boyhood parting and their subsequent marriages involve a latent (however suppressed) sense of infidelity, since marriage constitutes a rival kind of union, expressed in the metaphysical

conceit that man and wife are one flesh. The stage action of 1.2. involves an audience in assessing the manner, the signals of voice, face and body, of three figures who at first seem undivided in affection—and the two kings may, in stage performance, be very similar in appearance. Yet the kings' continuing sense of being twins (both are prone to childhood reminiscences) means that Hermione is aware of being subtly excluded, while she is no less aware that, in sharing things with one, she is in a way also sharing with the other: she must find it difficult to distinguish between them in her manner. Her relation to Polixenes will naturally be a close one yet it must not break—and must not be believed to break—the taboos; although among people of royal rank, manner may permit itself some privileged largesse.

Shakespeare complicates the interpretation of body-language by drawing attention to Hermione's state of advanced pregnancy. This might be supposed to guarantee her a degree of sexual immunity: but while it may allow her a more relaxed closeness to Polixenes, it may involve a slight sexual distancing from her husband Leontes, which could naturally produce tension. Furthermore Polixenes' wife, although briefly referred to in 1.2., is absent, and this gives visual emphasis to an exclusive triangular relationship. As the action unfolds attention is concentrated on the way each of the three adults is divided in turn from the remaining pair; and then for Leontes there is a further stage of alienation triggered by the presence of his two offspring, the unborn child as significant as the boy Mamillius. Thus Hermione finds herself in this scene dividing her attention between the two kings, showing affection in different ways to both, and provoking equivocal responses from each. Polixenes is divided between an obligation to go home and requests that he stay. To Leontes the sense of sharing affection with these two is suddenly supplanted by the sense of division as decisive as that in a theatre between spectator and actors. He turns from Hermione, carrying the unborn child, to his boy Mamillius, as if they constituted another choice, rather than mirroring his self-division: the unborn child's survival as a branch of a family, though Leontes tries to kill it, will lead to the growth of a whole new narrative from Act 3 forwards.

Consulting the *OED* under "implicate" I find a quotation of 1610 describing how "the boughes and armes of trees twisted one within

another so implicated the woods together." Here the readiness of the writer (Holland) to exchange the word "armes" for "boughes" strikes a chord if one thinks of Shakespeare's stagecraft in 1.2. of *The Winter's Tale*. In 1.1. Camillo remarks of the two kings "They were trained together in their childhood" (22-23), and he will not let go of the image of the boys' intertwined arms: they "shook hands, as over a vast, and embraced, as it were, from the ends of opposed winds" (30-31). Here courtly hyperbole, as it seems, too abruptly magnifies, with the effect of distortion and painful strain—and "vast" can refer to a great stretch of time as well as space. The stress on vastness of scale seems apparently to be a function of courtly rhetorical style, to accentuate the positive, (as is the negative construction), but it will soon enough take on an opposite meaning, as untimely storms both emotional and actual cause destruction. And the onset of this storm will be in Leontes' sudden obsessive attention to simple on-stage actions of Hermione and Polixenes—joining hands, putting an arm round a waist, embracing. Several scenes later the image of arms is still obsessing him, in his Macbeth-like rumination: "the harlot king / Is quite beyond mine arm . . . but she / I can hook to me" (2.3.4-7).

In 1.2. Leontes disgustedly describes the two figures of Hermione and Polixenes: Polixenes "wears" Hermione

> like her medal hanging
> About his neck (1.2.307-8)

Not until the very last moment of the play is the "great gap of time" closed (5.3.154), its closing emphatically marked by the simple action as Hermione and Leontes enclose one another in embrace; at this Camillo exclaims "She hangs about his neck" (5.3.112). It seems evident from this remark that the major impact here is to be visual, in their embrace, and that the powerful verbal image of 1.2.307 is now triumphantly redeemed in being visually imprinted in action on stage.

In the first scene Camillo's courtly paradox "embraced, as it were, from the ends of opposed winds" (1.1.30-31) is so absurd one might almost suspect Shakespeare of a sly pun on Puttenham's term for hyperbole, which is "the over-reacher"—and yet embracing "from the ends of

opposed winds" will be seen retrospectively to be a surprisingly cogent, even epigrammatic comment on this weird story, where the defiant interplay between contrary emotions, surface and depth, microcosmic and macrocosmic scales, easily outdoes anything in Donne.

In the theatre a decision must be made as to how far, if at all, the behaviour of Hermione and Polixenes makes Leontes' interpretation plausible. In the important production of 1910 at New York the two kings were made to look extraordinarily similar, with identical neat, black Italianate beards and similar crowns and furred gowns. In 1.2. Hermione took the hand of Leontes as she spoke the line

> The one for ever earn'd a royal husband; (1.2.107)

and she turned to Polixenes with the next line

> Th'other for some while a friend.

and took his hand. Moving away, she sat by Polixenes and—as a photograph shows,[2] read his hand, their heads very close together. When Leontes spoke the lines

> To your own bents dispose you; you'll be found,
> Be you beneath the sky. (1.2.179-80)

Polixenes placed a shawl on Hermione's shoulders as they moved towards the garden. Such a staging, in placing central emphasis on the actors and reading the dialogue closely for explicit and implicit stage directions, maintains a lifeline to the non-scenic theatre of the Elizabethans; it shows the potential in the non-verbal codes of theatre for a play on meanings which is equivalent to that in the dialogue, and it maintains a tension between dialogue and action. Nevertheless *The Winter's Tale* was the subject of massive adaptation for the Victorian spectacular theatre, and productions continue to efface important features of Shakespeare's style by imposing cuts, changes and anachronistic ideas on the opening scenes. Anthony Quayle in 1948 at Stratford cut all but fifteen lines of 1.1., substituting a "Kean-like Bacchanalia of barbaric intensity: leaping, screaming, knife-throwing Russian dancers".[3] In this

production the court for 1.2. was macabre in red, black and gold, dominated by a Tartar Leontes, "the tyrant of the fairytale."[4] Such a context gave Shakespeare's sophisticated, witty, supple dialogue no chance, and summarily disposed of the question of Leontes' motivation. Trevor Nunn in 1969 disposed of the question with no less clarity, and imposed an alien set of ideas—this time Freudian—with no less force, if with more intellectual self-consciousness. He presented Leontes' soliloquies as part of a dream sequence, Polixenes and Hermione in the dim light, with alternately stylised and naturalistic gestures, enacting the sexual fantasies of Leontes: on the words "How she holds up the neb, the bill to him" Hermione raised her nose and lips to Polixenes in the half-dark.[5] Given the subtlety of the text, the frequent modern recourse to heavy-handed stage symbolism seems particularly obtuse.

A contrasting tradition is illustrated by Peter Wood's 1960 production which (like the 1910 New York production) showed how stage action and gesture can be derived in detail from the dialogue; this gave Leontes' outbreak of jealousy considerable plausibility. Leontes and Polixenes locked arms as Polixenes said "Farewell, our brother" (1.2.27) and Hermione took the hand of Polixenes and kissed it. At "Tongue-tied our queen" Leontes and Hermione held out their hands to Polixenes, then Leontes moved up-stage watching the other two unobserved, came downstage in time to hear "If you first sinned with us," Hermione embraced Leontes at "The one for ever earned a royal husband" and she embraced Polixenes on the next line, "Th'other for some while a friend," then drew him downstage, holding hands. Leontes was clasped round the waist by Mamillius after his soliloquy "O that is entertainment / My bosom likes not." Later, playing with Mamillius, he fell forward on his knees and Mamillius put his arm round him. A reviewer wrote of this interpretation of Leontes that its details "build a personality open to the storm like tissue paper to a fire."[6]

Even in stage productions closely attentive to the text there is still, after all, a considerable range of choice: Hermione and Polixenes may be shown to display nothing beyond conventional good manners, and in that case Leontes' comments will seem glaringly misplaced, implying him to be either already covertly a prisoner of obsession before the scene begins, or suddenly, inexplicably seized by it in mid-scene. Such an

interpretation, while legitimate, accords less well with the detailed texture
of the dialogue, and seems less interesting dramatically, than one where
Hermione and Polixenes do show affection which could plausibly be
misinterpreted—as in the production of 1910 in New York, or in 1960
by Wood, or more recently, Peter Hall.[7]

* * *

Happiness is identified with the negation of time, an idea Polixenes
touches on again when he says his small son "makes a July's day short
as December," preventing thoughts that "would thick my blood"
(1.2.171). He stresses the idea of youth as freedom from choice: that is
how it was with himself and Leontes,

> We were as twinn'd lambs that did frisk i' th' sun,
> And bleat the one at th'other. What we chang'd
> Was innocence for innocence, we knew not
> The doctrine of ill-doing, nor dream'd
> That any did. (1.2.67-71)

The two lambs replicated each other, their discourse was identical (well,
it was out of the mouths of babes and sucklings), sheer repetition of
innocence and innocence: though they were two there was no indi-
viduation nor self-division; but when change came (in dream as well
as waking) it was because their "weak spirits" were "reared with
stronger blood" and this had the direct consequence of guilt.

> Had we pursu'd that life,
> And our weak spirits ne'er been higher rear'd
> With stronger blood, we should have answer'd heaven
> Boldly, 'Not guilty'; (1.2.71-4)

This usage of "blood" is complicated: taken with "reared" it can literally
apply to the human child's progression from being milk-fed (like lambs)
to a red-meat diet; and while "blood" is, positively, the full vigour of
life, its negative connotation (according to "the doctrine of ill-doing")
is as the seat of animal or sensual appetite, lust and anger. Given the
royal status of the boys, the sense of "blood" meaning family and lineage

is present; and in the Bible "blood" often refers to blood shed in sacrifice, and this strengthens the typological association of the lamb with Christ, the redemptive power of innocence sacrificed. If there is a more pervasive Biblical influence in the play than the idea of the Garden of Eden it is (as in *The Comedy of Errors*) that of St Paul, in the Epistles. The idea that in childhood one is filled with the milk of innocence and this is only changed by one's being given a new diet, recalls Paul in Hebrews: "For every one that useth milke, is unexpert of the word of righteousness, for he is a babe. But strong meate belongeth to them that are perfect, even those which by reason of use, have their wits exercised to discerne both good and evil" (Heb. 5:13-14). Polixenes implies that with adulthood inevitably comes sin, specifically sexual sin, something from which they would have been protected by remaining boys and sharing boyhood affection. It should be noticed how firmly this identifies the adult world of the court with sexual guilt and contrasts it to the child's world of natural innocence, though at the same time implying that it is according to Nature that a child develops from a state of innocence to guilt; and this leaves the door ajar, so to speak, for the Freudian interpretation of childhood.

"Sicilia cannot show himself over-kind to Bohemia" (1.1.21-22) says Camillo, and he is, as M. M. Mahood says, ambiguous. He means "however strong the expression, it cannot exceed Leontes' feelings of love," but can also mean "Leontes tries but fails to keep up the appearance of love" and also "Leontes must not show that his love for Polixenes goes too far." The negative construction casts its shadow, touching as it seems unintentionally on just those areas which give maximum possible embarrassment. Yet this embarrassing issue is very important: it is the implicit concern with forbidden love which contributes greatly to the feeling of release at the end, in the lawful union of the two kings' children. The extent to which the love of the two kings involves anxiety is nevertheless left implicit, and this accounts for much of its power, and is a sign of Shakespeare's mature art. Comparison with *The Comedy of Errors* shows how explicitly, but therefore less deeply, that play explores the experience of delusion, sexual jealousy, cruelty, in relation to Christian ideas of demonic possession and redemption.

The Winter's Tale presents a fascinating exploration of the interplay of the categories of the civilised and the natural, as in the remark:

> They were train'd together in their childhoods; and there rooted betwixt them then such an affection, which cannot choose but branch now. (1.1.22-4)

"Training" in Shakespeare usually signifies educating, bringing-up, rearing, but in the horticultural sense training means artifically imposing a shape on a tree as it grows, often by use of a frame or espalier; whereas "branch," to put out a new growth, can also mean to divide into two lines, to deviate, and to turn single into double; and in genealogy—by extension from the metaphor of the family tree—"branch" is used to mean a child. This last sense is at the back of Leontes' mind when he takes his son Mamillius aside to examine his face, anxiously brooding on fatherhood and its shameful issue, cuckold's horns, in his words "o'er head and ears a fork'd one" (1.2.186). It is no accident that "fork'd" suggests not only the branching of horns above but also of the loins below: the image of man as "a poor bare forked animal." Nothing is more tricky than the *faux-naif* mode of Pastoral. We may think of branching as the natural doubling of a single line. Is it then less natural for identity, having once branched out from the main stem to single separateness, to divide again, become double? If double may mean twice the value of single, in Shakespeare single can also mean weak, and double can mean false.[8]

Implicit in the play's idea of nurture is the intermingling of human cultural practice with natural law, but also of the divine with both these: in the case of the two boys raised together, Nature apparently was made to go against her own idea of individuation as their roots intermingle: they become twins though they are not born twins, and they feel their later separation as damage. The two young princes grew into a loving intimacy like that of naturally-born twins, although they were not: and then this exclusive intimacy persisted beyond the normal time-span, which certainly diverges from cultural norms if not natural law: indeed, the courtier says, it was their royal rank that forced them apart ("royal necessities made separation of their society" 1.1.25-6) but despite that they continued to interchange "loving embassies." If one is aware that

"affection" could have the meaning "lust," however (as in *Lucrece* 271) then an alternative sense, almost the opposite, is implied: that there seeded itself between them this plant and now is its time to grow (branch), widening a division between them.

The image of branching recurs in the second part of the play when used by Leontes' disowned daughter, Perdita, who wishes she had flowers of the Spring for those shepherdesses

> That wear upon your virgin branches yet
> Your maidenheads growing . . . . (4.4.115-6)

In 1.1. Camillo says that the two young boys/trees were planted very close so that they could be trained together: and furthermore, as the gardener pruned and interwove their young branches by art, below ground their roots grew together by nature. Nature and culture impose their double authority, and this is interesting in relation to the phrase "cannot choose": the negative construction has the function of emphasis, stressing sheer irresistibility, but it does not quite efface associations of "branch" with "choice": so Christianity teaches that in due time comes man's adulthood, marked by acquisition of a capacity to exercise free will, not be enslaved to blind instinct.

Associated with this is the idea of natural law as expressed in the time taken by its proceedings, and the trouble caused by disruption of Nature's timing by delay or haste: so pruning aids growth, but must be done at the right time, and in nature too-forward young buds may be killed by late wintry storms. The first words of Polixenes assert that he has delayed his return to his duty and his family during nine months, the natural period for pregnancy but here a delay made by choice and associated with guilt. At a public level Polixenes shows good manners, but taken to an extreme; at a personal level his nine months stay involves over-favouring of his friend as well as neglect of his own wife.

Men and women, though subject to instinct, do also exercise choice in the case of marriage-partners. Leontes stresses that he chose Hermione for love (he makes no reference to dynastic considerations); and Hermione exercised her right of choice too—but Leontes recalls that "three crabbed months soured themselves to death" (another tree-image,

though this crab-apple seems not just characteristically sour but dying of a disease) as she delayed her choice. To Leontes in his jealousy, memory of Hermione's three months delay suddenly suggests a suspicious link to Polixenes, whose first words are of nine months. For Leontes—himself rashly jumping to conclusions and burning with impatience for revenge—haste, just as much as delay, can be a sign in others of guilt: in 1.2. Leontes obsessively supposes lustful Hermione and Polixenes driven to frantic impatience,

> wishing clocks more swift?
> Hours, minutes? noon, midnight? (1.2.289-90)

whereas Hermione good-humouredly teases Polixenes about when the due time came for him to experience temptation (1.2.75-86).

Shakespeare goes on to play obliquely with the idea of delay or haste in relation to Nature's measure of time, when Hermione's son Mamillius, surprisingly, shows a marked forwardness, a precociousness, in banter of a sexual kind with the court ladies in 2.1. In 2.3. the audience learns that Perdita's own birth was brought on by Leontes' rage: Hermione consequently was delivered "something before her time" (2.2.23). The second half of the play will open in 3.3. with the Old Shepherd's remark that youth is a prolonged wait for adulthood, a kind of delay in the life-cycle, producing nothing but impulsive disruption, "getting wenches with child, wronging the ancientry, stealing, fighting" (3.3.61-63). In 4.4. stress falls on the forwardness—the precociousness—of youthful Florizel as well as of young Perdita, and how this exposes them to a father's wrath. Perdita, unaware of her own past history, or her dead brother's, or of the present threat posed by Polixenes, dwells on the vulnerability of the very young to premature death, of young maids like flowers that risk a too-hasty appearance in early Spring "before the swallow dares," or like pale primroses

> That die unmarried, ere they can behold
> Bright Phoebus in his strength (a malady
> Most incident to maids) (4.4.123-25)

Perdita, in unaccustomed robes, with the rashness of extreme youth, disputes the theme of art and nature with Polixenes disguised as an old

man (4.4.83-103). She makes a point of insisting she will never touch slips from "bastard" plant varieties, wants nothing to do with "art" because it also can mean artifice. Shakespeare trips Perdita up; a shepherd's daughter, willing subject to clandestine royal courtship, costumed and garlanded as queen of a Spring festival, likened to Flora and alluding to Persephone: and does she claim herself free of artifice? For his part, Polixenes may very wisely declare that to marry a "gentle scion" to the "wildest stock" (4.4.93) is both natural and bettering nature, but this does not prevent him violently contradicting himself in practice only minutes later.

There is a clear element of travesty in this repetition of themes and episodes from the first half of the play—it goes beyond establishing the contrasting comic mode. When Polixenes does unmask in rage to disrupt the proceedings, Florizel, undismayed, declares himself "delay'd"

> But nothing alter'd; What I was, I am;
> More straining on for plucking back. (4.4.464-65)

Here this by now well-worn motif of delay/haste takes an unexpected form: and it is ingeniously echoed in the case of the Old Shepherd who, having successfully delayed death well beyond the traditional life-span of the Bible, three score and ten years, fears he is now to be all too hastily cut off:

> a man of fourscore three,
> That thought to fill his grave in quiet; yea,
> To die upon the bed my father died, ... (4.4.453-55)

Another example of the strain involved in uncovering patterns of likeness-with-difference in this play is the throw-away jocular remark of Autolycus about the Old Shepherd's fate: "Some say he shall be ston'd; but that fate is too soft for him, say I" (4.4.778-79): this collocation stoned/soft bizarrely anticipates the description of the Old Shepherd weeping "like a weather-bitten conduit of many kings' reigns" (5.2.55-56), a statue-image that reverses Autolycus' stoned/soft opposition, and which, though in travesty-form, anticipates the words of the "marble-breasted" Leontes before the statue of Hermione—"does not the stone rebuke me / For being more stone than it?" (5.3.37-38) and the reverse

transformation of Perdita, rapt in admiration, "Standing like stone" beside the statue of Hermione (5.3.42). Obliquely this is also a transformation of the haste/delay motif into that of eternity/time, art/nature.

The play ends with a final wry twist to this motif of time stretched by delay or compressed by haste, of time suspended in dream or illusion contrasted to time measured by the beat of the pulse. In the play's last moment Leontes looks back on its events and concludes that everybody present has "perform'd" a "part" in "this wide gap of time." His word "gap" signifies a measurable extent of time, between then and now, but also a sheer blank, a nothing. To Leontes it is almost as if time had been suspended while they performed a dream-like comedy of errors, and now they are awake again.

* * *

In *The Winter's Tale* successive local dramatic situations carry surface conviction, and drive forward a positively resolvable plot (since this is a Romance, and we know Perdita's true origins, it is ultimately a matter of time), whereas the system of patterning is fraught with discrepancies, with double-meanings. What is striking about the beginning of 1.2. is the stress on subtle divisions between the three figures even before Leontes begins to lose control. Act 5 scene 1 offers an intricate reflection of 1.2. since instead of Hermione and Polixenes it is Perdita and Florizel who confront Leontes, and in this instance comprise a complex of doubled images. The baby present though not yet born in 1.2., and disowned by Leontes, is here in 5.1. grown up: that is to say Perdita, first freed and enfranchised from her father's rage, then again subject to rage from Florizel's father, is now again with her own father and once again unintentionally provoking Leontes, this time erotically. Thanks to Paulina's strong presence, the scene is framed by memories of Hermione: as it begins, Leontes laments his rage that caused his son's death and Hermione's:

> I might have look'd upon my queen's full eyes,
> Have taken treasure from her lips . . . . (5.1.53-54)

As the scene ends Paulina reminds an emotionally reviving Leontes of how beautiful Hermione was, and he responds, in a tone of wonder, that while he has been gazing at Perdita it is Hermione he has been thinking of.

The first sight of Florizel is also a source of wonder to Leontes: he exclaims that Florizel looks like the young Polixenes:

> Your mother was most true to wedlock, Prince,
> For she did print your royal father off,
> Conceiving you. (5.1.124-6)

This recalls the moment in 1.2.122 when Leontes found comfort in Mamillius, saw they were alike, that in fact the boy's nose was "a copy out o'mine." There is also another echo, more interesting because more teasing, of 2.3., when Paulina insisted that Hermione's new-born baby reprinted Leontes' features:

> Behold, my lords,
> Although the print be little, the whole matter
> And copy of the father—eye, nose, lip;
> The trick of's frown, his forehead . . .   . (2.3.98-101)

Perhaps no-one in real life is on oath when first showing a father his new-born child, certainly not Paulina. Nevertheless, this insistence on minute details of facial likeness is striking. Now in 5.1. this child, which Paulina had so strongly urged to be a copy of Leontes, is said to be very like Hermione. Perdita is the child of Hermione and Florizel the child of Polixenes, but also, they are doubles for Leontes' two lost children, the baby and Mamillius.

That is to say, this pair, as they stand before Leontes, therefore represent three remembered figures from the past: his wife, his best friend, and himself. These are the very figures which tortured his alienated mind at the beginning of the play. Now the mood is altered, strange but auspicious. Paulina's concern, in reminding Leontes that Florizel was born in the very same hour as Mamillius, is to awaken loving associations in Leontes' mind, but to the play's spectators the information certainly is news, seeming to invite the suggestion that, in the form of a son-in-law, Leontes' lost son is redeemed—but also, more

obscurely, that the twinning of the fathers could have been replicated in the sons. And yet of course he cannot be redeemed, the deeds of 1.2. are irreversible, the fantasy of wish-fulfilment is impossible, loss is permanent, including loss of innocence and twinship.

The emphasis on the likeness of Mamillius and Perdita may be supported, in stage performance, by the same actor doubling the roles; what cannot be done plausibly (though it has been tried), and should not be done thematically, is for one actor to double the roles of Perdita and Hermione. There must be likeness-with-difference between them. Florizel and Perdita are like their parents, but they must not be exchangably identical to them: that would mean they are destined to repeat the cycle of events that constitute their Winter's Tale. Here contrast with *The Comedy of Errors* seems illuminating.

The question of the meaning of the double in *The Comedy of Errors* is distilled finally in stage images which are visually, conclusively, identically double. At the climax the entrance of the Abbess unwittingly brings the two long-separated pairs of twins together. A sense of incredulity combines with deep satisfaction and light-headedness all round: Antipholus wonders "If this be not a dream I see and hear" (5.1.377), but for his brother the preceding action, which the audience know to be entirely explicable as error, has been rather one of nightmare, in which the people he knows best have acted like strangers or treated him insolently or declared him a victim of witchcraft and satanic possession and insanity, and the simplest sensory experience has proved untrustworthy.

Astonishment, therefore, but also a powerful undertow of awe and fear, are palpable as the Duke sees the twins together: "which is the natural man, / And which the spirit?" (5.1.334-35) Their reunion results in the restoration to the Abbess of her sons, and then of her husband, rescued from the gallows in the nick of time. The Abbess, in a conceitful "over-reacher" remarkably anticipating the manner of *The Winter's Tale*, describes this separation as a pregnancy of thirty-three years now astonishingly delivered: "After so long grief, such nativity" (407), and Dromio jests to his twin: "Methinks you are my glass and not my brother" (418). The question of the double is resolved in the figure of the Abbess-mother, long-lost yet always present (though hidden),

combining the opposites of holiness and naturalness, priestess and wife, in a manner to be characterised by Edgar Wind's term of *serio ludere*;[9] it is Shakespeare playing with serious things and being serious in a playful style.

In the final scene of *The Winter's Tale* Florizel is not identical to, but only like, Polixenes, a likeness-with-difference. This crucially releases him, and his symbolic role, into the future: this is not to be the world of Beckett's *Play*. Perdita is emphatically identified with Hermione but then decisively separated from her, precisely at the point where the statue is seen to have (like old Aegeon in *The Comedy of Errors*) marks of "time's deformed hand" upon it. Hermione returns so much altered, unlike what she was (and Perdita shows what she was like) but truly like her present self, that is, alive to a revived Leontes.

The statue transformation is Hermione's play of incarnation, which distinguishes between the ideal, figurative meanings of Hermione—what she is like for her husband and for her child and for her husband's twin Polixenes—and the actual meaning to herself of being a woman with a husband and daughter, who exists in time, where truth is not to be divided from change.

In this play Shakespeare uses stagecraft, the composition of stage images and action, in the same spirit as he uses words: in the spirit of *serio ludere*. The play is a unique kind of tragicomedy in that it deliberately heightens one's sense of discrepancy and incommensurability, the impossibility of complete resolution, so that when a conclusion is achieved the surprise and pleasure are increased without suppressing the unassimilable elements—indeed it is clear how much must remain unredeemable, and this is the difference from *The Comedy of Errors*. The final stage image, then, can mean what it says, although it is by no means plain and unvarnished.

Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität
Münster

NOTES

[1]In her study *Shakespeare's Wordplay*, M. M. Mahood pointed to the ambiguity of the word "branch" in *The Winter's Tale*, and used it and other examples to suggest the complex verbal patterning of the text. In her wake, Richard Proudfoot, "Verbal reminiscence and the two-part structure of *The Winter's Tale*," *Shakespeare Survey* 29 (1976): 67-78, went on to add instances of verbal patterning between the two halves of the play, but noted "What the verbal links seem to invite is rather a toying with such associations than any attempt to use them as the basis for a systematic exegesis" (69). Proudfoot also suggested some possible doubling of parts which, in stage performance, might extend audience awareness of this two-part structure.

My own approach assumes that Shakespeare writes in the spirit of *serio ludere* (as described by Edgar Wind, see n9 below) and that the double patterns are the basis for a consciously paradoxical exegesis; on this see also Andrew Gurr, "The bear, the statue, and hysteria in *The Winter's Tale*," *SQ* 34 (1983): 420-25, or Brian Gibbons, *Shakespeare and Multiplicity* (Cambridge: CUP, 1993) 73-74 and chapter 8 generally.

All references to Shakespeare are to G. Blakemore Evans, ed., *The Riverside Shakespeare* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974).

[2]Reproduced in Dennis Bartholomeusz, The Winter's Tale *in Performance in England and America 1611-1976* (Cambridge: CUP, 1982) 139.

[3]Bartholomeusz 203.

[4]*The Times*, 7 June 1948, cit. Bartholomeusz 203.

[5]Bartholomeusz 217.

[6]*The Times* 31 August 1960, cit. Bartholomeusz 209.

[7]On Peter Hall see Irving Wardle's review of Hall in *The Times* 20 May 1988, and Roger Warren, *Staging Shakespeare's Late Plays* (Oxford: OUP, 1990) chapter 3.

[8]For "single" meaning weak see *2 Henry 4* 1.2.183, *Coriolanus* 2.1.37; for "double" meaning "false" see *Much Ado About Nothing* 5.1.169, *Coriolanus* 4.4.13. *Macbeth* offers a well-known instance at 1.6.15-16 of quibbles on "double" and "single": "All our service / In every point twice done, and then done double, / Were poor and single business."

[9]Edgar Wind, *Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance* (1958; rev. ed. London: Faber and Faber, 1968) 222-35 cites Cusanus, Pico and especially Bruno as important influences on Elizabethan writers in "naturalising" *serio ludere*: "experiments in metaphor, semi-magical exercises which would solemnly entertain and astonish the beholder. These serious games (*serio ludere*) consisted in finding within common experience an unusual object endowed with the kind of contradictory attributes which are difficult to imagine united in the deity" (222). Wind makes the point that the Renaissance thought a baffling account, patently incomplete, should be given, "so that the reader may be induced to figure out the concealed part for himself" (234).

Remembrance of Things Past

KENNETH MUIR

My immediate purpose is to explain how it came about that Molly
Mahood and I, at approximately the same time, published articles in
defence of Shakespeare's word-play. I am conscious of the fact that one's
memory of what happened forty-five years ago cannot be trusted—it
is liable to distortion by vanity or ane*cdotage*, a quibble may be forgiven
in the circumstances. I have tried to obtain confirmation from others,
but most of them are now dead. I appealed to Professor Richard Taylor,
the Head of the Department of Adult Continuing Education, and he
and two of his colleagues, have promised to help. So far he has been
able to correct me on one or two details, and Professor Roy Niblett, who
has wisely kept a diary of his engagements, assures me that he had
nothing to do with the conference on "Education through Art," which
I thought he had organised and which I certainly attended. What follows
is an attempt to give an accurate account of a particular assignment:
less fictional, I trust that Proust's use of his own past.

I start from the conviction that I had been asked to address an audience
consisting of painters and sculptors, probably at Grantley Hall, near
Fountains Abbey. Fifteen years before, when my first book was
published, I had met many well-known artists, introduced to them by
Gertrude Hermes, wood-engraver and sculptor, whom I admired and
knew well. With several of these artists I had kept in touch. When I was
elected to the Leeds City Council in 1945, I became Vice-Chairman of
the Libraries and Arts Sub-Committee, so I was not surprised when I
was invited to address an audience of artists.

It may seem peculiar that I chose to speak to such an audience on
Shakespeare's puns. The reason was simple. I had been working for years
on the Arden edition of *Macbeth* and had been commissioned to follow

---

it up with *King Lear*. My editorial labours had become obsessive. Furthermore, although I lost my seat in 1948 I was re-elected a year later for another ward. I remained on the council until I moved to Liverpool and my duties as a councillor involved many hours work. Since I also remained a full-time lecturer at the university, and was the honorary editor of a weekly newspaper, I had no time to search for a different topic on which to speak to the artists; but I hope the following paragraph will be enough to justify my choice, as it was one my audience appreciated.

In my talk I argued that as punning was an essential characteristic of Shakespeare's style, we ought to restore the belief that such word-play was legitimate in uncomic contexts. Having referred to T. S. Eliot who had followed in the footsteps of his favourite seventeenth-century divines in the art of quibbling, I concluded by suggesting

> It is not so much the pun itself that should be defended with uncompromising vigour but the attitude to language which the use of the quibble demands. Language is called upon to perform two main functions—to convey thoughts and to express feelings or states of mind. For the former function an unemotive, precise language is required. If we want to talk about the theory of relativity or nuclear fission, we should be as unambiguous and as straightforward as possible in our use of language. But if we are expressing complicated human feelings, the more scientifically precise we are, the greater the distortion. Where the human mind is in question we must take into consideration that the language has a life of its own, that every word has a different pedigreee, and a different emotive history, and that its relationships and derivations necessarily suggest to the speaker and to the listener the kind of association which is, in its most obvious form, the pun. In Henry Moore's sculpture it is always possible to perceive how his actual medium has influenced the finished work of art. He has collaborated, as it were, with the grain and texture of the wood or the markings on the stone, so that the reclining figures look almost as if they were works of nature rather than works of man—figures that were inherent in the tree or stone. In much the same way the artist in words must collaborate with the genius of the language. If he tries to write without due regard to his medium, his work will be thin, artificial and sterile. We can only master language by submitting to it.

It will be recalled that Molly Mahood and I were both on the Editorial Board of *Essays in Criticism*, then in its first years as what someone called "the Oxford antidote to *Scrutiny*." I knew therefore that "The Fatal

Cleopatra" was about to appear, and we exchanged proofs. Her article was the basis for part of the first chapter of *Shakespeare's Wordplay*. Whereas mine was a one-off recycling of my edition of *Macbeth*, hers was clearly the beginning of a work of literary criticism, whose endurance we are now celebrating.

* * *

To Molly Mahood, ". . . *The Winter's Tale* is a morality play; but its morality is wider, wiser and more humane that that of a Puritan inner drama of sin, guilt and contrition" (153). And as the play, so the players: Hermione plays the "symbolic role of Heavenly Grace" (150) and "reappears literally as Patience on a monument" (152) while "Perdita stands for his [Leontes'] self-forgiveness . . ." (154). I confess that I was unhappy with such an allegorising of *The Winter's Tale*, partly because it does not really depend on the evidence of word-play. It may be true that in the "great" tragedies a stoical endurance rather than a Christian hope is all that is offered to us, although I have elsewhere sought to show that all four are not incompatible with the teaching of all the main Christian denominations. Nor is there any doubt that *The Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest* use Christian ideas of forgiveness and redemption. Yet even in these plays there are other forces at work.

One of the great moments of the play is the welcoming of Florizel and Perdita as *Primavera*. "Welcome hither," says Leontes, "As is the spring to th'earth" (5.1.150-51). Although addressed to both lovers, Leontes singles out Perdita, whom he had previously addressed as "goddess!" (5.1.130). In Sicilia she is called Flora, the goddess she is impersonating; she refers to the story of Proserpine and the breath of Cytherea; she feels like a person acting in Whitsun Pastorals. Moreover, she frankly looks forward to the consummation of her love with Florizel, "quick, and in mine arms" (4.4.132). Not one of Shakespeare's heroines—not even Imogen and Miranda—has such a chorus of admiration from everyone she meets. It resembles the universal praise of Princess Elizabeth in celebration of whose marriage *The Winter's Tale* was performed (cf. Arden ed., p. xxiv).

Of course the play is concerned with Christian redemption, but I may suggest that Molly Mahood, by concentrating on Play, plays down the Sicilian scenes, ignoring the mythological background and Perdita's following of Leontes' description of his state of innocence when he repudiated the doctrine of Original Sin: "the imposition cleared / Hereditary ours" (I.2.73).

Yet Molly Mahood, as we might expect, has some brilliant insights. She shows that Shakespeare provided a resolution of the Life-versus-Art controversy in Florizel's description of Perdita's dancing:

> when you do dance, I wish you
> A wave o'th'Sea, that you might ever do
> Nothing but that, move still, still so,
> And own no other function. (4.4.140-43)

As Mahood comments:

> Drama comes nearest to life of all forms of *mimesis* because it is continually reanimated by living actors; . . . Shakespeare entrusts the weight of the play's meaning at this climax to a boy-actor's silent mimetic art. When Perdita dances, the old antagonism of art and nature disappears, for there is no way in which we can tell the dancer from the dance. (186)

This splendid passage, with its allusion to the last line of Yeats' "Among School Children," needs one revision. The effect depends not quite so much on the boy-actor's silent art but on the words spoken by Florizel.

I would make two further comments. One is that Perdita's delight in sex, perfectly natural in a peasant girl and equally in a hidden princess, has led to some bowdlerisation, even in the present century. My other comment is that I have seen a dozen or more Perditas and all of them have been disappointing. Some of them have been famous actresses, splendid in other roles; others have been girls straight from drama school, well-spoken, charming, and desperate to make names for themselves. Shakespeare was lucky in having boy-actors, as Molly Mahood realised. But they are not silent: they have to speak. Perhaps they were analogous to boy-sopranos of our own day, able to express thoughts beyond the reaches of their souls in singing the masterpieces of Bach or Handel.

<div align="right">University of Liverpool</div>

WORKS CITED

Mahood, M. M. *Shakespeare's Wordplay*. London: Methuen, 1957.

---. "The Fatal Cleopatra: Shakespeare and the Pun." *Essays in Criticism* 1 (1951): 193-207.

Muir, Kenneth. "The Uncomic Pun." *The Cambridge Journal* 4 (1950/51): 472-85.

Shakespeare, William. *The Winter's Tale*. Ed. J. H. P. Pafford (London: Methuen, 1963).

On Reading Early Accounts of the New World*

WILLIAM M. HAMLIN

In an age often given to various dogmatisms, interrogative and skeptical habits of thought can teach us a great deal. For this reason, I was pleased to discover Andrew Hadfield's recent essay on "Peter Martyr, Richard Eden and the New World: Reading, Experience, and Translation." Hadfield opens his piece by asking, quite appropriately, "How should we read the early colonial literature of the New World?" (1), and while he does not discuss this question as thoroughly as he might, he nonetheless offers several cautionary notes that writers on the subject of American colonialism will ignore at their peril. Specifically, he urges us to be attentive to the "diversity of colonial responses to the New World," alleging that descriptions of early cross-cultural encounters could and did become "invested with different meanings in different situations" (1). Moreover, he stresses "the dangers of teleological reading," arguing that we must beware of interpreting any particular New World account solely in terms of the large-scale historical process we have come to call "colonialism" (2). Hadfield concludes by making the substantial claim that what early texts like Martyr's *De Orbe Novo* reveal is "serious confusion regarding the value of their own and other cultures"; consequently, "it is vital that we recognise their unease with as well as their complicity in European expansion and do not dismiss them as simply monolithic apologies to be read with or against the grain" (19). Valuable points, to be sure—and refreshing in their lack of cynicism. What concerns me about Hadfield's conclusions is certainly not their open-endedness, which I admire; what concerns me is the possibility

---

*Reference: Andrew Hadfield, "Peter Martyr, Richard Eden and the New World: Reading, Experience, and Translation," *Connotations* 5.1 (1995/96): 1-22.

that in the very act of demonstrating how to read New World accounts more sensitively, Hadfield inadvertently falls back into an undue reliance upon models and categories which, according to his essay's own logic, we ought to regard with suspicion.

Before moving to his test case in Martyr's book, Hadfield positions himself comfortably in the recent critical posture that emphasizes openness to multiple textual significations and multiple colonial models. He cites the Myra Jehlen/Peter Hulme debate on the referentiality of "cannibalism" and quotes David Read on the hazards of "hypostatizing a single, stable version of colonialism out of the flux that surrounds the early English activity in North America" (1).[1] He claims, moreover, that he wishes "to supplement rather than challenge" readings of New World accounts composed in this spirit (1). And he does. Selecting an incident narrated by Martyr in the second decade of *De Orbe Novo*—an incident which, to my knowledge, has not been treated in detail before—Hadfield proceeds to offer an admirable précis and analysis of what he terms a "strange and fascinating confrontation" between Spanish *conquistadores* and native Americans during the early sixteenth century in what is now Panama (2).

Only a few relatively minor flaws mar this otherwise impressive analysis. For one thing, Hadfield might stress more emphatically that what principally prompts the second speech of King Comogrus's son (4, 8) is the need to answer convincingly the Spaniards' question regarding the "certeyne knoweleage" upon which he bases his claims regarding a nearby region of gold.[2] Hadfield is right to focus on the interesting social analysis embedded within this speech, but his claim that its discussion of the Comogruans' ambition and aggression amounts to the affirmation of a "universal malaise" (8) seems something of an exaggeration. Yes, the Comogruans do turn out to be "both savage critics and participators within the world of savagery" (9), but to highlight this fact, as Hadfield does, is to suggest that the categories ought somehow to be mutually exclusive—that we should be surprised that they are not. We are thus drawn back within the bounds of what Lewis Hanke once called "the 'dirty dog' and 'noble savage' schools of thought" about the native inhabitants of America.[3] And it is not at all clear that this is where Hadfield wishes us to be.

Second, Hadfield claims that we witness an "eccentric misreading" (7) when we see the Spaniards' reaction to the first speech of King Comogrus's son, the speech in which he condemns the Spaniards' "hunger of goulde" (64v). But it is not necessarily true, as Hadfield alleges, that the Spaniards attend to the young man's words "not, it seems, because of his forthright criticisms of their inordinate greed, but at the prospect of wealth beyond their wildest dreams" (4). It may be that the Spaniards do *both*. In other words, it is possible that they do indeed "ponder in theyr mindes, & ernestly consider his sayinges," and that their subsequent transformation of his "rasshenes" into "myrth and urbanitie" (65r) signals a partial acknowledgment of the aptness of his censure.[4] But this can still be followed by a resolve to continue on their obsessive quest for gold. My own view is that the Martyr/Eden text here is sufficiently opaque that we simply cannot know precisely how the Spaniards interpreted the son's oration. We thus have an instance of one of the default tropes of New World discourse: terminological ambiguity.

Hadfield writes that the confrontation between the Spaniards and the Comogruans contains "seemingly confused and conflicting messages" (9), but it might be more accurate to say that the prevailing discursive models within which we tend to situate and interpret this confrontation predispose us to see it as confused and conflicted. Similarly, Hadfield wonders whether we should read Martyr's description of the confrontation "as a piece of travel literature or as a specifically colonial text" (5)—as though these are the only two options, and as though it is self-evident exactly what these categorical terms mean. Thus, while Hadfield's large point about the uncertain significance of many New World accounts is salutary and, in my view, accurate, his operating procedures nonetheless occasionally undermine this point by exhibiting a reversion to easily assimilable schematic oppositions and reified categories. Not that such oppositions and categories are readily avoided—far from it. But it seems incumbent upon Hadfield, given his opening and closing remarks, to attempt to eschew theoretical templates and conceptual patterning as much as possible, and certainly during the initial phases of textual analysis. I am tempted to wonder if even the celebrated "politics of identity and difference" (19) may not be too confining an overlay through which to grapple with narratives of cultural encounter.

As I said earlier, however, these concerns strike me as relatively minor. On the whole, Hadfield's study is admirably perceptive, as well as remarkably persuasive given its reliance upon a single illustrative example. Hadfield asks excellent questions throughout, and makes many valuable observations in passing, such as those regarding the semantic instability in Martyr's text consequent upon shifting pronoun usage (5), the interesting deployment of *De Orbe Novo* by John Ponet in 1556 as a tool for the cultivation of anti-Hispanism and anti-Marian sentiment (13), and the various ways in which Eden's translation and marginal glossing of Martyr's book inflect its narratives with propagandistic innuendoes and soften the outlines of its internal contradictions (14-17). He also explores the political positionings of both Martyr and Eden with an eye toward demonstrating their potential connections to the modes of discursive representation in *De Orbe Novo* (compilation) and *The Decades of the Newe Worlde* (translation); and while some of my earlier reservations about schematic thinking apply here as well, in general I believe this is a laudable project, and one well suited to Hadfield's skill as a careful respondent to complicated texts.

How, then, should we read the early colonial literature of the New World? Perhaps, first of all, by not invariably designating it "colonial" from the outset. This idea seems implicit in Hadfield's concluding comments regarding the ways in which early accounts of America often "register profound disquiet with colonial expansion and, perhaps more importantly, hopes of a sympathetic *rapprochement* with the New World" (19), but it never moves into the realm of explicit pronouncement. Indeed, Hadfield seems overly dependent upon "colonial literature" as an interpretive category, and might do well to employ blander, more neutral terms such as "encounter narratives" or "exploration accounts." Certainly the idea of "colonial discourse" stands in no immediate danger of losing its currency.

But what else? Hadfield stresses that we should read with caution, with care not to impose teleological structures upon the texts, with attentiveness to biographical and political contexts and to potential confusions and uncertainties, and with a willingness to go beyond simply moving "with or against the grain" (9, 19). But there is still more that we can do. As Hadfield and many others have recognized, early modern

writers on the Americas often insist on the "unclassifiable newness of the data" (11) they present to their readers; Jean de Léry, for instance, claims that he will "speak of things that very likely no one before me has ever seen, much less written about."[5] And though we can be sure that assimilative habits of thought and powerful cultural predispositions often condition the nature of the perception, representation, and interpretation embedded within these voyaging accounts, we should always also keep open the possibility that the early writers, in some places and at some times, find ways of challenging the confines of their particular spheres of thought. Perhaps, at least in the cases of Martyr and Eden (who never travelled to the New World and therefore could not claim eye-witness authority), expectations of thoughtful confrontation with inherited models and biases are misplaced or unrealistic. Perhaps not. But it does seem a corollary of Hadfield's fine and open-minded investigation that we read early modern accounts of the New World with a willingness to suspend—if only temporarily—our overt critical presuppositions, and with a disposition to accept any invitations to consider, imagine, and respond to that world in all its unclassifiable newness.

Idaho State University
Pocatello

NOTES

[1]The Jehlen/Hulme debate may be found in *Critical Inquiry* 20 (1993-94): 179-91. Hadfield quotes from Read, "Colonialism and Coherence: The Case of Captain John Smith's *Generall Historie of Virginia*," *Modern Philology* 91 (1994): 446.

[2]I quote from Pietro Martire d'Anghiera, *The Decades of the Newe Worlde or West India*, trans. Richard Eden (London, 1555; facsimile rpt. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1966) 65v. Hereafter I will use in-text citations.

[3]Hanke, *All Mankind Is One: A Study of the Disputation Between Bartolomé de Las Casas and Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda in 1550 on the Intellectual and Religious Capacity of the American Indians* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois UP, 1974) 9.

[4]I have altered past to present tense in the quoted passage.

[5]Léry, *History of a Voyage to the Land of Brazil* (Geneva, 1578), trans. Janet Whatley (Berkeley: U California P, 1990) lxi.

"Monsters and Straunge Births": The Politics of Richard Eden. A Response to Andrew Hadfield[*]

CLAIRE JOWITT

Richard Eden is best known as the first English translator of Peter Martyr's *De Orbe Novo Decades* (1516).[1] In this text, and in his 1553 translation of sections of Sebastian Muenster's *Cosmographiae Universalis*, Eden, for the first time, made available detailed information about the New World to an English speaking readership. Consequently, his texts are highly significant in determining the ways in which Spanish control of New World territory and riches was mediated to an English audience. Eden translated these texts in a troubled and unstable political climate. England officially reverted to the old faith in 1553 after nearly twenty years of Protestantism. Mary Tudor married Philip of Spain in 1554, and some commentators argued that England, similar to the New World, became little more than a vassal of Spain.[2] Therefore, an analysis of this first English translation of descriptions of the New World is important in assessing whether Eden wanted his readership to support Spanish interests in the New World and England, or was urging the English nation to compete for territory abroad and remain staunchly independent of Spanish interference at home.

Recent accounts of Eden's politics have argued that, after the failure of the Wyatt rebellion in January 1554, Eden abandoned his Protestantism and "decided to throw in his lot with the new regime." Consequently, Eden has been found to be both "weak" and "vacillating" as, in order to safeguard his own position, he sacrificed his personal, religious and

---

political integrity.[3] What I want to suggest here is that the "Preface to the Reader" in Eden's 1555 translation of Martyr's *De Orbe Novo Decades* is not an attempt to ingratiate himself with Mary Tudor and her husband Prince Philip of Spain, but rather, a carefully encoded critique of the uneasy English political situation of the 1550s.

Andrew Hadfield has suggested that Eden's preamble should be read as an appeal for civil unity. As such, Eden's text is directed against Protestant malefactors whose "lyinge, rebellion, strife, contention, privie malice, slaunderynge, mutterynge, conspiracies, and such other devilysshe imaginations" have made England, according to Hadfield, a "perverse and unnatural motherland."[4] Hadfield's analysis firmly allies Eden with the Catholic monarchs and there is indeed plenty of textual evidence to support such a reading. The text is dedicated to Mary and Philip. Furthermore, in his Latin epistle, Eden explains the inspiration for his composition. He describes how, intoxicated by the shows and universal acclamations which greeted the procession of the royal couple as they entered London on 18th August 1554, he debated how best to commemorate their wedding ceremony. He relates that, unable to conceive of any original composition sufficiently worthy, he was led to consider the marvelous discoveries, conquests, and empire of the Spaniards.[5] Moreover, since it was hoped that children would be produced from this Anglo-Spanish union, Eden was able to imagine Spanish possessions as the inheritance of this anticipated royal infant. However, it seems that the authorities were dubious concerning the wholeheartedness of Eden's support for the Catholic monarchy. In September 1555, the month that the complete edition of his text was published, Eden was charged with heresy by Thomas Watson, Bishop of Lincoln, before Stephen Gardiner. Although Gardiner died on October 24th of that year, and it appears that the case did not come to trial, Eden lost his job in Philip's English treasury and "thereafter disappears from view for a number of years."[6]

Watson and Gardiner may very well have been correct in their assessment of Eden's support, or lack of it, for the Marian regime. Eden's emphasis on monsters and strange births in the preface to *Decades of the Newe World or West India* complicates this apparently laudatory text. During the summer of 1555, as the thirty-nine year old Queen anxiously

awaited the birth of the future heir to English and Spanish interests, such descriptions of "straunge births" appear, at the very least, astonishingly tactless. Was Eden criticising the Queen? Was he implicitly casting suspicion upon this hoped-for royal infant who might inherit English and Spanish interests?

Hadfield observes that Eden's association between New World monsters and the English political situation is an "astute rhetorical manoeuvre."[7] Such a strategy allowed Eden to debate the most sensitive issues of contemporary politics in terms of a less overtly political tradition of writing about New Worlds. Early descriptions of the New World had frequently represented indigenous Americans as aspects of humanity so unusual that they could be classed as monsters.[8] This was a theme which Eden discussed in his 1553 translation of part of book five of Sebastian Muenster's *Cosmographiae Universalis*. Entitled *Of the newe India*, Eden described "People deformed" with "greate mouthes, nosethrilles flyrtting upwarde and wyde, with greate eares and cruell eyes," "Giauntes" and "monsters" whose "eares [were] of suche breadth and length, that with one of them they might cover theyr hole head."[9] Similar to the prefatory remarks of his 1555 translation, in his "Epistle to the Reader" in *Of the newe India*, Eden appropriates these New World monsters as a way of discussing contemporary English politics. There are two references to monsters in the epistle. He represents Spanish America as the place "where the Eagle (yet not in every place) hath so spled his winges, that other poore byrdes may not without offence seke theyr praye without the compasse of the same, I wyll speake nothing hereof, bycause I wold be loth to lay an egge, whereof other men might hatch a serpent."[10] Here Eden's representation of discussion and speculation about English territorial competition with Spain as an unnatural birth—where a bird's egg might defy nature and hatch a serpent—ostensibly indicates his reluctance to advocate an explicitly hostile English imperial policy. Published less than a month before the death of Edward VI, Eden's statements have been seen as a politic method "of not compromising any future he might have in the civil service" upon the accession of Mary Tudor.[11] However, his paren-thetical remark "(yet not in every place)," implying that Spanish possession of New World territory is neither absolute nor indelible,

indicates that Eden's attitude to Spain is not wholly positive. Here, Eden anticipates the ambivalent and hostile representations of the Spanish imperium which were to become commonplace in England during the late-sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, particularly after the 1588 confrontation with the Armada.[12]

Eden's ambivalence towards Spanish dominion can also be detected at the end of his epistle. Eden returns to the theme of monsters, stating rather coyly:

> I had intended here (well beloved Reader) to have spoken somewhat of suche straunge thynges and Monsters, whereof mencion is made in thys Booke, to th[e]ende that suche as by the narownes of theyr understandinge are not of capacitie to conceave the causes and natures of thynges, myghte partely have been satisfyed wyth some sensyble reasons. But beynge at thys tyme otherwise hindered, it shall suffise al good and honest wittes, that whatsoever the Lorde hath pleased, that hath he done in heaven and earth, and in the Sea, and in all depe places.[13]

We can only speculate as to the events or schemes which were occupying Eden during this period—"beynge at this tyme otherwise hindered." Perhaps he was involved in the Duke of Northumberland's attempts, in the last few weeks of the dying King's life, to secure Edward's wish that the crown would descend through the Suffolk line.[14] Certainly such activities would correspond to the publishing history of Eden's *Of the newe India*. This text was published in June 1553 and dedicated to Northumberland. It was in this month that it became apparent to Northumberland that Edward VI's tuberculosis would soon prove fatal and action needed to be taken swiftly to ensure that the king's Catholic half-sister did not succeed. Undoubtedly Eden's father and uncle, George and Thomas Eden respectively, as well as John Dee—all men associated with Northumberland—took part in the scheme to put Lady Jane Grey on the throne.[15] Against this background Eden's rather cryptic and tantalising concluding remarks in his epistle begin to look very much like a comment about contemporary political events. But are the "straunge thynges and Monsters" he wishes, but is unable, to talk about Northumberland's fomenting rebellion or the spectre of Mary Tudor herself?

In this period monsters were commonly understood as one of the "signes and tokens, and things more than natural" by which God disclosed his will to humanity.[16] As Kathryn Brammall has recently argued, in the mid-Tudor period the language of monstrosity was a powerful rhetorical tool for English writers as they attempted "to come to terms with and find a cure for the widespread political, religious and social tensions."[17] There was, however, a key change in the ways images of monsters were deployed in the 1550s and 1560s. Instead of emphasising physical and visible deformity, the new language of monstrosity also denoted unnatural inner characteristics and qualities. Births of English monsters in the 1550s were, therefore, perceived as particular and immediate proclamations of God's displeasure at the way the kingdom was being governed. Between 1552 and 1556, and also from the 1560s, records of approximately thirty-five abnormal births have survived in broadsides and ballads and, perhaps more importantly, "the literate population believed that their numbers were increasing."[18]

It is these mid-1550s descriptions of strange births which we need to examine in order to evaluate Eden's views of the Marian regime. Anti-Marian exiles, in particular, described the rise in the number of monstrous births in England under Mary Tudor as a reflection of God's displeasure with England since the country was governed by a Catholic Queen.[19] By 1558, in John Knox's *First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women* and Anthony Gilby's *Admonition to England and Scotland to call them to Repentance*, the Queen was called a monster.[20] Knox, for example, calls Mary Tudor "that horrible monstre Jesabel of Englande."[21] Knox argues that women were not capable of rule since they were naturally passive; any woman who became monarch therefore did so in violation of God's teachings (Genesis III, I Timothy, and I Corinthians).[22] In summary, according to Knox, Mary was a "monstre in nature" and "a thing moste repugnant to Nature."[23] Knox's descriptions, then, are an early instance in which the new rhetoric of abnormality is used to define a variety of monster—a Catholic female monarch—which manifests no outward physical deformity. In this Calvinist Protestant rhetoric Mary's inner monstrousness was two-fold since both her gender and her Catholicism confirmed her deformed and unnatural status.

As early as 1556 anti-Marian exiles were linking the Queen with monstrosity. From Strasbourg, John Ponet, previously bishop of Rochester and Winchester, wrote a stinging invective against the regime entitled *A Short Treatise of Politike Power*.[24] This text, like Eden's *The Decades of the Newe World or West India*, contains descriptions of the Spanish New World, accounts of contemporary monstrous births and representations of the English queen.[25] All three of these topics are used to denounce the Marian regime. Spanish behaviour in the New World is condemned since "a great number of them [native Americans] (seeing them selves brought from so quiet a life to such miserie and slavery) of desperacion killed them selves."[26] The enforced slavery of these "simple and plaine men" by the Spaniards is used as a portent of what will happen to the English due to Philip of Spain's excessive influence on the queen.[27] Indeed, later in the text Ponet explicitly warns the English of "pride, crueltie and unmercifulnesse" of the Spanish.[28] Furthermore, if the English continue to allow Spanish interests to grow unchecked in their nation then the Spanish shall "invade Englande, and [the English] shalbe by shiploades (if no worse happen unto you) caried in to newe Spaine, and ther not lyve at libertie . . . ye shalbe tyed in chaynes, forced to rowe in the galie, to digge in the mynes and to pike up the golde in the hotte sande."[29]

In Ponet's descriptions of the three recent misbirths in Oxford, Coventry and London appeared a reflection of England's political chaos. The Oxford child of 1552 was born "wyth two heades and two partes of two evil shaped bodyes ioyned in one."[30] This conjoined twin he read as a symbol of the "diverse governours"—either Catholic and Protestant, or Spanish and English—which now uneasily rule England.[31] The turmoil caused by both Mary's reintroduction of Catholicism and her Spanish marriage have, according to Ponet, caused a division in the nation. The results of Mary's succession—where these two factions are "knytte together, but not in god proportion nor agrement"—is manifested in the body of the child.[32] The Coventry child of 1555 was born "without armes or legges."[33] This misbirth "without the principal membres to helpe and defende the body," Ponet saw as a reflection of England's debility since "the people of England shalbe helples, ready to be troden under the fote of every creature, and non to releve or

succour it."[34] Finally, in 1556 in London, an infant was delivered "with a great head, evil shaped, the armes with bagges hanging out at the Elbowes and heles, and fete lame."[35] This last misbirth Ponet saw as a portent of the catastrophes awaiting England. The enlarged head indicated that "the governours and headdes of England [shall] sucke out the wealth and substance of the people."[36] The "chief members (tharmes and legges)," in other words the nobility, were incapable of preventing such injustice since they were "so clogged with chaines of gold, and bagges of money" that they had become debilitated.[37] In summary, these children were physical manifestations of the weakness and defencelessness of England resulting from Mary's reign. England, he argues, must take radical steps to save the country from these tyrannical rulers. He suggests that his readers empower the nation by severing the irreparably corrupt head, and then re-establish unity among the remaining members of the body politic.[38]

Compared to Knox, Ponet's vitriol against the queen herself is restrained. Several times in *A Short Treatise of Politike Power* Mary is referred to as so weak and "womanly" that she is easily swayed by advice; from the bishop of London Edmund Bonner, the bishop of Winchester Stephen Gardiner, and from her husband.[39] But Ponet's most interesting and most damning comments about the Queen are concerned with her pregnancy. For example, whilst attacking Pharaoh's eugenic policy to destroy all male Israelite children, Ponet broadens his argument to discuss:

> those . . . that being desirous of chidren, procure the mydwyves to saye, they be with childe, whan their bely is puffed up with the dropsie or molle, and having bleared the common peoples eies with processioning, Te deum singing, and bonefire banketting, use all ceremomies and cryeng out, whilest an other birdes egge is layed in the nest.[40]

Here, Ponet reflects contemporary fears that a substitute, healthy child will be put in the place of Mary's own. Mary's pregnancy—"the dropsie or molle"—is represented as both a misbirth and, more importantly, a physical manifestation of her inward sinfulness. It seems that whereas Knox's descriptions of Mary's monstrousness had been a non-physical reflection of her inward sinfulness (her Catholicism), in Ponet's

descriptions this sinfulness is made manifest by the body of the misconceived child.[41]

The queen had announced her pregnancy in the autumn of 1554; the child was therefore expected to be born sometime during May or June 1555. By the end of April she had withdrawn from public life and nobody except her women and her husband was admitted to her privy apartments. Though there were several false alarms through the early summer, by early July it became clear that the Queen and her physicians had been mistaken.[42] In *Acts and Monuments of the English Martyrs* John Foxe reported that Isabel Malt, who had been safely delivered of a "man-child upon Whit Sunday in the morning, which was the 11th day of June" was approached by Lord North to part with him in secret.[43] Rumours of a substitution plot had been in circulation in March and Antoine de Noailles, the French Ambassador, had been told that Mary's condition was the result of a tumour. Again in May, Noailles was told that the pregnancy was false, and that Mary's midwife—not daring to tell her the truth—was deluding the queen with stories of inaccurate calculations. As late as 25 July her physicians, and some of her attendants, were maintaining the pretence. However, at some point between then and the 4 August the symptoms of pregnancy must have subsided to the point at which even Mary was convinced that she had been mistaken. There was no official or public announcement, but the court moved from Hampton Court to Oatlands, a much smaller residence, and the nursery staff were dismissed.[44]

Rumours of Mary's symptoms must have reached Ponet for him to be able to describe her condition as either the "dropsie or molle." Mary may have suffered a phantom pregnancy; but there are other possibilities. She may have been suffering from a tumour. Additionally, there had been a rumour that spring that she had passed "a lump of flesh." This condition, known as a "missed abortion," occurs when the fetus dies in the uterus, is partially reabsorbed and then discharged. Alternatively, conception may have occurred but the fetus and placenta may not have joined properly. In this situation the cells are cystically transformed into a "mole."[45] Noailles reported that spring that Mary was suffering from a "mola."[46] Foxe thought she was deceived by a "tympany," a morbid swelling particularly of the stomach.[47]

Richard Eden, in *The Decades of the Newe World or West India,* also uses the word "tympane" when discussing "the byrth of perles." Eden writes:

> Ageyne, the smaulest [pearls] differ from the byggest in a certayne swellynge or impostumation whiche the Spaniardes caule a tympane.[48]

This description forms part of a catalogue of flaws which occur in pearls with the result that they become mis-shaped or partly formed. Such a description seems to be an attack on the queen who, similar to an "oulde muscle" (an oyster), had only been able to grow a "warte, whiche beynge rased from the shell with fyle, is rounde and bryght but onely of one syde, and not precious."[49] The whole of the description of "the byrth of perles" is saturated with the language of childbirth; for example, when the Spaniards examine the opened oysters they "perceaved the pearles to bee inclosed in the myddest of their bellies, there to be norisshed and increase as an infante suckynge his moothers pappes within her wombe, before hee move to coome foorthe of her privye places."[50] Eden's translation is also markedly different in these passages from Martyr's original.[51] Though Martyr uses the phrase "Pati appellat Hispanus tympanum" the emphasis on misbirth, which is so strong in Eden's translation, is entirely absent.

The preface of *The Decades of the Newe World or West India* can also be read as a hostile comment on the queen's inability to bear children. King Ferdinand of Aragon, the grandfather of Mary and great-grandfather of Philip, is highly praised as both the instigator of the discovery of America and as someone from whom "noble braunches of isshewe were lyke to sprynge out."[52] Phrases such as "many kynges shulde come furth of his loynes" appear either as highly ironic or politically suicidal in the months following the queen's hapless pregnancy.[53] Furthermore, Eden ostensibly intends to correct the "dyvers interpretacions more monstrous then the monsters theim selves" which were in circulation concerning contemporary monstrous births.[54] To this end, Eden pronounces the "signification of thy monsters":

> Fyrst then consider that they are monsters of mankynde and not of other beastes. Secondarily marke well that in them al, the headde is perfect, so that

> the monstrositie groweth owt of the body, although not owt of the hole body
> but certyne partes therof. But not to go to farre.[55]

Eden's explanation is, like Ponet's, a reading of the body politic. But, in contrast to Ponet, Eden argues that the heads of the misbirths were "perfect"; consequently Eden perceives the problem with England to be the fault of the body, the people, rather than the nation's rulers. Explicitly then, Eden appears to be attacking those that have failed to support the Catholic queen.

But this politic body can be read another way. When this passage is examined in conjunction with Eden's earlier emphasis on Ferdinand and his descendants' fertility, another interpretation emerges. This is of Mary herself producing a "monstrositie . . . owt of the body." Her child, if there was one, was obviously perceived by some commentators as a physical monster since it was variously described as a "wart," a "tympany," or a "mola." Moreover, the survival of this child, the heir of combined Spanish and England interests, was a monstrous threat to the independence of England. Under such a monarch England would decline to the position of a satellite state under the control of another, far more powerful, country. Eden's message of "Stoope Englande stoope, and learne to knowe thy lorde and master, as horses and other brute beasts are taught to do" seems designed to goad the English into competition and hostility with Spain.[56] The central motivation behind Eden's "career trajectory" emerges as a constant desire to foster and encourage English expansion.[57] Therefore, in *Decades of the Newe World or West India* Eden praises Spanish achievements to the extent that it will, he gambles, rile Englishmen into a competitive determination to go and emulate Spanish achievements. In his representations of monsters and monstrous births—images of Mary Tudor and her sinfulness—we can see Eden's guarded hostility towards Spanish imperium. Mary may have become the possession of Spain but, Eden hopes, England will not need to stoop for much longer.

The similarity between Eden's and Marian exiles' descriptions of Mary's progeny would seem to indicate that there was, at the very least, a sympathy of ideas. Eden emerges, therefore, as a less conformist figure than has been previously assumed, maintaining the robust opposition

to Mary Tudor evident in his earlier works, only by more subtle means ("but not to go to farre"). Certainly, Eden's father and uncle felt so hostile to the Marian regime that they chose to live as exiles in Strasbourg. Perhaps, then, we can even go one step further, and speculate that Eden may have been a Protestant spy. Perhaps he was controlled by these Marian exiles with whom he shared a vocabulary of monstrosity as he, like Ponet, worked to undermine the credibility and legitimacy of Mary's Catholic regime?

University of Wales
Aberystwyth

NOTES

[1]Richard Eden, *The Decades of the Newe World or West India* (London: William Powell, 1555). Four different printers produced this work for Powell; they were Richard Jugge, Robert Toy, Edward Sutton, and William Seres. See John Parker, *Books to Build an Empire: A Biographical History of English Overseas Interests to 1620* (Amsterdam: N. Israel, 1965) 51. Eden's text is reprinted in *The First Three English Books on America*, ed. Edward Arber (London: Archibald Constable & Co, 1895) 43-398. All references are to this edition.

[2]For further details of hostile reactions to Mary's Spanish marriage see D. M. Loades, *Politics and the Nation, 1450-1660*, 4th ed. (London: Fontana, 1992) 244-52.

[3]David Gwyn, "Richard Eden, Cosmographer and Alchemist," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 15 (1984): 13-34 (28, 34).

[4]Eden, *Decades of the Newe World* 53; Hadfield, "Peter Martyr, Richard Eden and the New World" 17.

[5]Eden, "Potentissimo Ac Serenissimo Philippo, Ac Serenissimae Potentissimaeque Mariae," *The First Three English Books on America* 46.

[6]For details of Eden's life see Edward Arber, "The Life and Labours of Richard Eden," in *The First Three English books on America* xxxvii-xlviii. The *Calendar of Ancient Indictments* does not record Eden's case, and the Winchester consistory court book for 1555 is missing; hence it is impossible to ascertain whether Eden came to trial. Gwyn postulates that "Gardiner may simply have wished to frighten Eden into going abroad now that his usefulness was over." For further details see Gwyn, "Richard Eden, Cosmographer and Alchemist" 31.

[7]Hadfield, "Peter Martyr, Richard Eden and the New World" 17.

[8]See Dudley Wilson, *Signs and Portents: Monstrous Births from the Middle Ages to the Enlightenment* (London: Routledge, 1993) 4, 13, 74.

[9]Eden, *Of the newe India* (London: Edward Sutton, 1553); reprinted in *The First Three English Books on America* 23, 33, 35.

[10]Eden, *Of the Newe India* 9.

[11]Parker, *Books to Build an Empire* 40.

[12]See William S. Maltby, *The Black Legend in England: The Development of Anti-Spanish sentiment, 1558-1660* (Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1971). For example, in comparable circumstances, Francis Bacon expressed similar sentiments to Eden in *Advertisement touching an Holy War*. Written in 1622 whilst negotiations were in progress concerning a possible marriage between Prince Charles and the Spanish infanta, Bacon's criticisms of Spain were, of necessity, tempered. In this text, while ostensibly praising Spanish dominions on which "the sun never sets," Bacon nevertheless is noticeably reluctant to celebrate Spanish achievements. With some envy he writes concerning the immense wealth in silver and other resources which the New World empire had yielded to the Spaniards, "We see what floods of treasure have flowed into Europe by that action . . . . Besides, infinite is the access of territory and empire by the same enterprise." But Bacon also criticises the Spanish monarchy; it is "a beam of glory (though I cannot say it is so solid a body of glory)." Similar to Bacon, Eden attempts to arouse English interest in New World territory in his 1553 preface. See Francis Bacon, *Works of Francis Bacon*, ed. J. Spedding and others, 14 vols. (London: Longman, Green & Co, 1857-74) 7: 1-36 (20, 21).

[13]Eden, *Of the Newe India* 11.

[14]For accounts of Edward VI's and Northumberland's attempts to exclude Mary and Elizabeth from the succession, see D. M. Loades, *Politics and the Nation, 1450-1660* 235-67.

[15]Gwyn, "Richard Eden: Cosmographer and Alchemist" 26-27.

[16]John Partridge, *The Great Wonders That Are Chaunced in the Realme of Naples* (London: H. Denham, 1565-66), preface. For a history of Renaissance monsters see Katharine Park and Lorraine J. Daston, "Unnatural Conceptions: The Study of Monsters in Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century France and England," *Past and Present* 92 (1981): 20-54.

[17]Kathryn M. Brammall, "Monstrous Metamorphosis: Nature, Morality, and the Rhetoric of Monstrosity in Tudor England," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 27.1 (1996): 3-21 (3).

[18]Brammall, "Monstrous Metamorphosis" 8; see also Norman L. Jones, *The Birth of the Elizabethan Age: England in the 1560s* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993).

[19]See Christina H. Garrett, *The Marian Exiles: A Study of the Origins of Elizabethan Protestantism* (Cambridge: CUP, 1938).

[20]Antony Gilby, *An Admonition to England and Scotland to call them to Repentance* (Geneva, 1558); John Knox, *The First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women, Works*, ed. David Laing, 6 vols. (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1846-64) 4: 349-422. For further information see Constance Jordan, "Woman's Rule in Sixteenth-Century British Political Thought," *Renaissance Quarterly* 40 (1987): 421-51.

[21]Knox, *Works* 4: 420.

[22]Brammall, "Monstrous Metamorphosis" 20; Jordan, "Woman's Rule" 433.

[23]Knox, *Works* 4: 366, 376.

[24]D.I.P.B.R.W., *A Short Treatise of Politike Power* (Strasbourg: [Wolfgang Köpfel], 1556; facsimile rpt. Menston: Scolar, 1970). All references are to this edition.

[25]Ponet, *A Short Treatise*, sig. F7; sig. K3; sig. D4.

[26]Ponet, *A Short Treatise*, sig. F7ᵛ.

[27]Ponet, *A Short Treatise*, sig. F7ᵛ. For further details concerning Philip's influence on English politics while married to Mary, and contemporary fears about Spanish interference, see David Loades, *Mary Tudor: A Life* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1989) 223-73.

[28]Ponet, *A Short Treatise*, sig L4ʳ.

[29]Ponet, *A Short Treatise*, sig L4ʳ; Hadfield, "Peter Martyr, Richard Eden and the New World" 13.

[30]Ponet, *A Short Treatise*, sig. K3ᵛ.

[31]Ponet, *A Short Treatise*, sig. K4ᵛ.

[32]Ponet, *A Short Treatise*, sig. K4ᵛ.

[33]Ponet, *A Short Treatise*, sig. K3ᵛ.

[34]Ponet, *A Short Treatise*, sig. K4ᵛ.

[35]Ponet, *A Short Treatise*, sig. K3ᵛ.

[36]Ponet, *A Short Treatise*, sig. K5ʳ.

[37]Ponet, *A Short Treatise*, sig. K4ᵛ.

[38]Brammall, "Monstrous Metamorphosis" 13.

[39]Ponet, *A Short Treatise*, sig. E2ʳ, sig I5ʳ, sig. L4ʳ.

[40]Ponet, *A Short Treatise*, sig. D4ʳ⁻ᵛ.

[41]Women were often blamed for monstrous births because of their deviant sexual desires or their imagination. Misconceived children were thought to be caused by the maternal imagination which could rewrite biological paternal influence and hence determine the offspring's form. See Ruth Gilbert, "'Probleme of Sexes': Representing the Renaissance Hermaphrodite" (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Southampton, 1996).

[42]On 30 April Henry Machyn described one of these false alarms in his diary. "The last day of Aprell tydynges came to London that the Quen grace was delevered of a prynce, and so ther was grett ryngyng thrugh London, and dyvers places Te deum laudamus songe; and the morow after yt was tornyd odurways to the plesur of God. But yt shall be when it plesse God, for I trust God that he wyll remember ys tru servands that putt ther trust in hym." Cited by Loades, *Mary Tudor* 249.

[43]John Foxe, *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe*, ed. S. R. Cattley, 8 vols. (London: R. B. Seeley & W. Burnside, 1837-39) 7: 125-26; Loades, *Mary Tudor* 250.

[44]See Loades, *Mary Tudor* 248-51; Rosalind K. Marshall, *Mary I* (London: HMSO, 1993) 133-35.

[45]In *De Generatione Animalium*, Aristotle notes, "[Mola uteri] occurs in women occasionally only, but it does occur in some during pregnancy. They bring forth a 'mola'. . . . In such instances the objects which make their way out of the body are so hard that it is difficult to cut them into two even by means of an iron edge. . . . it looks as though Nature in these cases suffers from some inability, and is unable to complete her work and to bring the process of formation to its consummation." The word "mole" describes, then, an inability to fully produce a child, and the fetus is delivered as a shapeless body. Cited in Marie-Hélène Huet, *Monstrous Imagination* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1993) 136.

[46]See Marshall, *Mary I* 135.

[47]Foxe, *Acts and Monuments* 7: 126.

[48]Eden, *Decades of the Newe World* 180.

[49]Eden, *Decades of the Newe World* 180.

[50]Eden, *Decades of the Newe World* 179-80.

[51]Martyr writes "It is alleged that no pearl adheres to the shell as it grows old, but there grows in the shell itself a sort of round and brilliant lump which acquires lustre by filing. This, however, is not valuable, and takes its nature rather from the shell than from the pearl. The Spaniards call the tympanum pati." Peter Martyr, *De Orbe Novo: The Eight Decades of Peter Martyr D'Anghera*, trans. F.A. MacNutt, 2 vols. (New York: Knickerbocker P, 1912) 1: 399.

[52]Eden, *Decades of the Newe World* 51.

[53]Eden, *Decades of the Newe World* 52.

[54]Eden, *Decades of the Newe World* 53.

[55]Eden, *Decades of the Newe World* 53.

[56]Eden, *Decades of the Newe World* 52; Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992) 182.

[57]Hadfield, "Peter Martyr, Richard Eden and the New World" 13; Gwyn, "Richard Eden: Cosmographer and Alchemist" 34.

Peter Martyr and Richard Eden: A Letter*

Dear Editors,

Thank you for your copy of *Connotations* and for your suggestion that
I reply to Andrew Hadfield's interesting piece "Peter Martyr, Richard
Eden and the New World." I do not, however think that I have very
much to add: I certainly have nothing to criticise. Hadfield is surely
right—in particular about Martyr—to insist on the poverty of any reading
which attempts to understand such texts in terms of simple dichotomies
between "good" and "bad", "positive" and "negative," or "savage" and
"civilised." Martyr, like most observers anywhere did not carry such
formal categories about in his head and his texts were not written to
meet the demands of post-colonial *angst*. *De orbe novo* is a text which
constantly shifts its own terms of reference, as Martyr shifts both his
intended audience and the classical sources on which he is drawing.
There is also a problem, which Hadfield does not address (nor, so far
as I know does anyone else) of the textual relationship between *De orbe
novo* and the *Epistolarum*, since most of the set pieces in the latter began
life in the former. One thing that might be said, however, is that although
I am sure that Hadfield is right to say that Eden's translation is "as
double and contradictory as Peter Martyr's Latin original," it is also the
case that Eden's attitudes, and that of nearly all his contemporaries,
towards the Spanish and their conquests was at best ambivalent. Spain
may have been in a formal sense "the enemy," and the English traded
on stories of Spanish atrocities—of the kind which they lacked only the

---

*Reference: Andrew Hadfield, "Peter Martyr, Richard Eden and the New World:
Reading, Experience and Translation," *Connotations* 5.1 (1995/96): 1-22.

opportunity to emulate—but Spain was also, until well into the seventeenth century and the English crown's final renunciation of any attempt at formal conquests in America, a model for all future imperial projects.

Yours sincerely,

Anthony Pagden

Dialogue-wise:
Some Notes on the Irish Context of Spenser's *View**

WILLY MALEY

Two recent contributions to this journal by John Breen and Andrew Hadfield on Spenser's use of the dialogue form in *A View of the Present State of Ireland* have added much to the ongoing debate on Spenser's Irish experiences, and have begun to tackle Patricia Coughlan's complaint that "the textual fact of its dialogue form has still not been sufficiently attended to."[1] The first published edition of the *View*, that of James Ware in 1633, advertised it as being written 'Dialogue-wise,' yet few critics have hitherto been wise to the dialogue. While Breen's insertion of Spenser's prose treatise into the established genre of the Renaissance dialogue is important and appropriate, in this response I want to develop Hadfield's tantalising suggestion that there is a highly specific Irish context for the dialogue form, and good historical reasons for English authors intent on treating Irish affairs to adopt this mode of writing.[2] Picking up on Hadfield's helpful suggestion, I shall argue that there is a more specific literary lineage to which the *View* can usefully be seen to belong, that of the early modern discourse on Ireland, a genre that draws frequently on dialogue as an ideal mode within which to express opinions that may not have been welcomed by the metropolitan authorities. I also wish to introduce an unpublished manuscript that raises the troubled matters of repression and representation central to the Irish dialogue, a text which has not been read alongside the *View* in any systematic way, and one which may in future yield a fruitful comparison.

---

*Reference: John Breen, "Imagining Voices in *A View of the Present State of Ireland*: A Discussion of Recent Studies Concerning Edmund Spenser's Dialogue," *Connotations* 4.1-2 (1994/95): 119-32; Andrew Hadfield, "Who is Speaking in Spenser's *A View of the Present State of Ireland*? A Response to John Breen," *Connotations* 4.3 (1994/95): 233-41.

First though, some preliminary observations. John Breen has done a valuable service by reminding us all of the "generic complexity" of Spenser's *View*. Breen is correct to argue that the *View* has to be read in the context of the Renaissance dialogue, but Hadfield is right to emphasise the form's dominant voice and forcefulness as well as its irony and playfulness. The dialogue form ought not to be used to exonerate Spenser from some of the more extreme views voiced in his prose treatise. There is arguably a "monologism" at work within the "dialogism." Dialogue, for Mikhail Bakhtin, "is not a means for revealing, for bringing to the surface the already ready-made character of a person; no, in dialogue a person not only shows himself outwardly, but he becomes for the first time that which he is, not only for others but for himself as well. To be means to communicate dialogically."[3] The dialogue may be the most obvious literary form that suggests itself when "dialogism" is discussed, but a monologue may in the end be far more dialogic than a dialogue. Dialogism is a textual principle, a mixing of voices within a single text. A dialogue may well consist, as some critics feel the *View* does, of two voices coming to the same conclusion.

"Aporia," which Breen uses to refer to the rehearsing of contrary positions without assuming one, is not, in my reading, the mode followed in Spenser's dialogue. Whether or not one identifies Irenius as Spenser it is difficult not to feel that there is a dominant line being pursued, and that Eudoxus is in step by the end of the text. The element of undecidability is minimal. Yet Bruce Avery has taken issue with the critical tradition that has argued for the one-sidedness of Spenser's dialogue. Those who claim that "the *View*, though a dialogue, is essentially monovocal, seem to me to miss its most intriguing aspect: its polyvocality, its own contradictory mix of interpretations of, and speculations on, what might be the best view of Ireland."[4] Avery's reasons for believing that the *View* is polyvocal soon collapse back into the old poet-planter dichotomy:

> These contradictions were part of Spenser's own experience. He was both a poet *and* a part of the political administration of the British [sic] colonial government; he was an Englishman, yet he spent most of his life in Ireland: hence the *View* seems to waver between Irenius's eyewitness accounts, which might square with

> Spenser's interpretation of his experience of the place, and accounts which would be acceptable to the home authority represented by Eudoxus.[5]

Or, as Breen puts it: "The dialogue between Spenser's Irenius and Eudoxus is designed to complicate the authorial responsibility for what is spoken."[6] Thus "Spenser is the authority removed from the text."[7] This fits in with the contention of Kenneth Gross that "There runs through the dialogue a deep strain of scepticism about the place and power of such structures of order as myth, custom and law."[8] This is a different perspective from that of the tradition represented by Ciarán Brady which sees Eudoxus a mere foil for the arguments of Irenius/Spenser:

> The dramatic pretence of the dialogue form was adopted by Spenser because it was imperative for him to show that when confronted with a true interpretation, a view, of the means by which Ireland came to its present condition, the sensitive, informed and critical English intelligence would concede the complete failure of its own central assumptions regarding the reform of Ireland, as in due course Eudoxus does.[9]

The dialogue suggests an inter-view of sorts, an exchange between an official and a member of the public. According to Helena Shire, it "is a model for our modern form of communication, the interview on broadcast media between the specialist and the intelligent layman."[10]

Dialogue, though, does not necessarily imply a polite conversation or discussion. It can take the form of an interrogation. Coughlan, drawing on the work of Roger Deakin, observes that beneath "a superficial diversity of roles" there lie certain fundamental positions, such as "those of Master and Pupil, Objector and Answerer."[11] Coughlan argues for "the fictive mode of existence of the *View*, and against the treatment of it as an expository argument." She also shows that Spenser and other English writers on Ireland were working from established literary models and within a circumscribed discursive space.[12] For Roland Smith, Spenser's choice of form is a means of juxtaposing or opposing Ireland's present state with its desired condition, so that the "dialogue form emphasizes his strong inclination to draw contrasts between the reality of his Irish surroundings and the more ideal conditions which his proposed reforms would bring about."[13]

Anne Fogarty, drawing on the work of Jacques Derrida, contends that Spenser's treatise is polyvocal, that "the *View* is a form of bricolage, that is, a discourse which is patched together by borrowings from other linguistic systems and sub-systems."[14] Fogarty says of Book VI and the *View* that "both of these works present equivocal and divided accounts of the political ideologies which they wish to sustain. In both cases, the 'other space' projected by the text—the reordered Ireland of the *View* and the consolatory but doomed world of pastoral and faery in *The Faery Queene*—is realized with great difficulty."[15]

Spenser's dialogue, according to Donald Bruce, is written in "a form implying open-minded discussion." Bruce maintains that

> Irenius, the chief speaker, is neither Spenser's spokesman nor even a governmental recorder, since the *Viewe* was suppressed until 1633, when it could have little effect on official policy. Eudoxus, the second speaker, represents informed public opinion.[16]

The issue of censorship is a vexed one.[17] It could be argued that Ireland was both a site of unspeakable Otherness and a place where nothing but the same old story was endlessly related. It was at one and the same time an imaginative scene of pastoral retreat, and a domain characterised by political violence and martial law. It offered an archive of literary and cultural source-material, as well as an opportunity, like that given to Spenser, to combine the roles of secretary and sheriff.

The individual writer found in Ireland a crux of identity as well as a crucible of ideology. The formation of a self—the fashioning of a gentleman—could occur here, but so too could dissolution and crisis. Spenser was very much a man made in Ireland, but also one ruined there. For some critics, including Donald Bruce, the form of the *View* enacts a self-effacement rather than a self-fashioning: "Classical dialogue was a dramatic form, rendered objective by the self effacement of the author, who did no more than record disparate opinions, sometimes opposed to his own."[18] Conversely, John Day sees the author slyly obtruding his countenance upon his cardboard creations: "With only the barest fiction of conversation, no setting, and few digressions, the two thinly characterized speakers move methodically through an agenda."[19] The

hidden agenda is that of a Machiavellian figure who appears to stand back from his work the more to manipulate the reader.

According to Thomas Wright, Spenser, in composing the *View*, may have learned from Bryskett's *Discourse of Civill Life*, in which he had played a part, since this is a text that "offers in a prose dialogue materials presented in Sidney's *Arcadia* and Spenser's *Faerie Queene*."[20] John Day finds a more immediate influence in Richard Beacon's *Solon His Follie* (1594).[21] Beverley Sherry has pointed out Spenser's extensive use of dialogue in his poetic works: "*The Shepheardes Calender* is a series of dialogues in the tradition of the classical eclogue .... In *The Faerie Queene* there is a range of dialogue as well as indirect and reported speech."[22] One could add the Spenser-Harvey correspondence and *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* to this penchant for dialogue in Spenser.

Anne Fogarty has argued against the tendency to divide Spenser into planter and poet: "Not infrequently Spenser's work is protected by a grim determination to keep the role of poet and of Elizabethan colonist permanently distinct."[23] However, Fogarty herself may succumb to this temptation. The word "gentle" does not mean soft or pacifistic, just as the word "humanist" does not mean humanitarian. *The Faerie Queene* is a poem littered with corpses, arguably the most relentlessly violent verse in English literary history. The *View* is a model of civility in comparison. Yet critics of the calibre of Ciarán Brady can still ask: "How could the principal poet of the English Renaissance not merely tolerate or even defend, but actually celebrate the use of merciless and unrestrained violence against large numbers of his fellow men?"[24] The answer is, of course, with the greatest of ease.

David Baker argues that "Irenius is not Spenser's spokesman in a simple sense, but one voice in a dialectic Spenser constructs between inadmissible scepticism of royal policy and articulations of the official 'view,' articulations Spenser usually puts in the mouth of Eudoxus."[25] Ciarán Brady recognises that the Renaissance dialogue was popular in Ireland, and that the form was perhaps inflected in a colonial context:

> The use of the dialogue form was by no means unusual in English Renaissance literature, and appears to have been somewhat in fashion in Ireland in the 1590s. But whereas typically the genre was employed as a useful pedagogical technique,

as a means of conveying information and argument in a relaxed manner, Spenser
made a clear effort to return to the formally disputational character of the
platonic original. Unlike the ciphers of the other Irish dialogues, Eudoxus is
an intelligent, informed, if rather two-dimensional character.[26]

I am not so sure that Spenser differs so markedly from his English
contemporaries in Ireland, but Brady is right to stress the disputational
character of his treatise.

Having rehearsed some of the positions taken up in recent Spenser
criticism on the dialogue form of the *View*, I want to turn now to the place
of the dialogue within a wider colonial milieu. The notion that there was,
in the early modern period, a monolithic English "discourse on Ireland"
is fundamentally flawed. The "discourse on Ireland" is a complex, fraught
and heterogeneous genre. Within that diverse body of texts, the dialogue
occupies a special position. The Renaissance dialogue in an Irish context
raises questions of censorship and self-fashioning that impinge upon
English Renaissance culture at large. It was Barnaby Rich, in the context
of a dialogue written in 1615, who boasted: "thos wordes that in Englande
would be brought wythin the compasse of treason, they are accounted
wyth us in Ireland for ordynary table taulke."[27] "Table-talk," from the
cosy humanism of Bryskett's Dublin residence that provides the pretext
for his *Discourse of Civill Life*, to the informed exchange between Irenius
and Eudoxus, is the order of the day in early modern Ireland. Here was
a unique space in which free-thinking intellectuals could say what they
felt, not what they ought to say.

I want to conclude by introducing a contemporary dialogue that remains
in manuscript, despite having been prepared for publication around the
same time as Spenser's *View*. The "Dialogue of Sylvanus and Peregrine"
(1598), dedicated to the earl of Essex, is endorsed with the name of Sir
Thomas Wilson (c.1560-1629), Keeper of the Records in Whitehall, whom
Bagwell took to be a stalking horse for Spenser. The presence of an index,
coupled with the dedication—a controversial one—suggests that it was
intended for print. The *Dialogue*—at 74 folio pages or 40,000 words—is
a substantial text. Its participants, Sylvanus and Peregrine—the names
of Spenser's two sons, hence the historical association of the document
with Spenser—meet at Westminster and expound upon the vicissitudes

of Irish politics. They mirror the roles played by Eudoxus and Irenius respectively, with Sylvanus adopting the role of the probing questioner, and Peregrine assuming the air of one who is experienced in Irish affairs. Speaking of the *Dialogue* Gottfried writes "the dialogue form—not common among Irish state papers—suggests that the *View* may have served as a model."[28] I have already pointed out, however, that Spenser was by no means original in his choice of form.

The *Dialogue* is a composite treatise, a synthesis of divergent discourses divided into four books. The first book (ff. 284ʳ-312ᵛ) deals with events from "the latter ende of harvest 1597 untill March next ensuinge," and focuses upon King's county, or Offaly, part of the Leix-Offaly plantation. Peregrine claims to have little knowledge of Connaught (f. 331ʳ). Sir Edward Herbert, a courtier and Leix-Offaly planter, closely connected to the powerful "Erle of Pembrook," is singled out for praise on account of a piece of counter-insurgency performed by him around harvest time in 1597. Sylvanus recalls Herbert as "a suter at the Courte" who was well received by Elizabeth, and wonders that such a refined personage "should lye in such a remoate place, and emongst such vyle neighbours" (ff. 284ᵛ-285ᵛ). Sir Warham St. Leger, reported present at Bryskett's house in the *Discourse of Civill Life*, and installed as Governor of Leix in 1597, is accused of aiding and abetting the rebels (f. 293ʳ). Peregrine entertains his interviewer with a "Gallymauffery of knaves" (f. 304ʳ). The second book (ff. 313ʳ-331ʳ) "entreateth of matters concerninge south Leimpster [Leinster]." The third, covering Connaught and Ulster, is in two parts. In the first, Peregrine produces from the copious "noates" to which he makes repeated reference, a discourse on Connaught in the form of a dialogue between an old soldier and Jacob, a trader in cattle (ff. 331ᵛ-336ᵛ).

This dialogue within a dialogue is followed by a report on events in Ulster entitled "Ulster Occurences," which includes an eyewitness report of the defeat of English forces commanded by Sir Henry Bagenal (1556-1598) at the Yellow Ford on 14 August 1598. It concludes with a list of the officers who perished in this encounter, and is dated 25 August 1598 (ff. 337ʳ-342ᵛ). The discourse done, Sylvanus comments thus: "How say you brother is it not tyme to top this lofty pyne," to which Peregrine

replies "yee and chope the underwood too, or else all wilbe naught shortly" (f. 342ᵛ).

The fourth book (ff. 343ʳ-354ʳ) concerns "matters touching the Comon weale of the Contrie." Peregrine unearths from his private collection of manuscripts a discourse supposedly related to him at his residence in Dublin by an elderly Palesman who dined there with three friends. This treatise is culled from a variety of sources. There is a tension around the perceived threat of Irishness, especially relating to language:

> ffirst by reasone of combinacon with the Irish as aforesayde in crept there Languadge to be allmost generall emongst us, that within a shorte tyme scorninge our oulde Englishe speeche which our Ancestours brought with them at the first conquest thinking it to base by reasone whereof we thought our selves mightely well appoynted to be armed with two Languadges so that beinge thus furnished we were able to goe into the Irish countries: and truck with them comodity for comoditie whereas they in former tymes were driven to bringe theires unto us and either bought ours againe with the mony they newly receaved for it or bartered ware for ware for ware, by an interpreter. Now this kynde of intercourse with the Irish breadde such acquayntaunce amitie and frendshipp betwene them and us, beinge so furnisht with theire Languadge that wee cared not contrary to our duties in ballancing our creditte, to make fosteredg, gossiping, and marriadge as aforesaid with them so that now the English Pale and many other places of the kingdome that were planted with English at the first Conqueste are growne to a confusion (ff. 343ᵛ-344ʳ).

In order to ward off the awesome spectre of a loss of selfhood through "intercourse with the Irish," it was necessary to maintain the kind of "internal dialogue" that proliferated among the literary representatives of the English colonial community.

Interestingly, Eva Gold has suggested that Spenser's own choice of dialogue is determined by just such a fear of a loss of identity:

> Spenser's anxieties—his own included—about the English tendency to "degenerate" into the Irish may also account for the use of the dialogue form in the *View*. Why Spenser chose this form has occasioned some puzzlement, for it is not entirely clear why Spenser's material requires two voices. What may be important, however, is not so much the relation between what Eudoxus and Irenius say, but rather the mere presence of Eudoxus. Eudoxus may be there to keep Irenius from losing his mooring to English identity.[29]

The question of self-fashioning is crucially linked to the need for dialogue, with the colonist having to converse in order to avoid conversion. The process of identity formation is achieved through a deafening dialogue, not with, but over and against an Other whose exclusion from speech leaves a vacuum, a silence, a negative image, and a positively charged space in which the process of self-fashioning can occur.[30] The use of the dialogue form by English colonists in Ireland, Edmund Spenser included, reflects, on one level, a fundamental anxiety about identity, as well as an acute awareness of both the profit and the peril of being situated at a distance from the prying eye, and the cocked ear, of the State. It was by an act of self-censorship of sorts, a self-effacement that carved out a communal colonial sphere, that they imposed the binary opposition between coloniser and colonised that effectively ruled out debate, and kept the native Irish beyond the pale of "civill conversation." The planter-poets were in dialogue, but they were talking to themselves.

University of Glasgow

NOTES

[1]Patricia Coughlan, "'Some secret scourge which shall by her come unto England': Ireland and Incivility in Spenser," *Spenser and Ireland: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*, ed. Patricia Coughlan (Cork: Cork UP, 1989) 47.

[2]Arguably the earliest dialogue on Ireland, certainly the earliest to draw on classical precedents for Renaissance recolonisation, was "The conjectures of Edwarde Walshe tochinge the state of yrlande" (1552). See David Beers Quinn (ed.), "Edward Walshe's "Conjectures" concerning the state of Ireland," *Irish Historical Studies* 5, 20 (1947) 303-22. Other examples of the genre are the "Dialogue between Peregryne and Sylvanus, c. 1598," *State Papers, Ireland,* 63/203/119, ff. 283-357, London: Public Record Office; Richard Beacon, *Solon his follie, or A Politique Discourse, touching the Reformation of common-weales conquered, declined or corrupted* (Oxford, 1594); Barnaby Rich, *A Right Exelent and pleasaunt Dialogue, betwene Mercury and an English Souldier: Contayning his Supplication to Mars: Bewtified with sundry worthy Histories, rare inventions and politike devises* (London, 1574); E. M. Hinton (ed.), "Rych's "Anothomy of Ireland" [1615], with an account of the author," *PMLA* 55 (1940): 73-101; *A Catholicke Conference betweene Syr Tady Mac Mareall a popish priest of Waterforde, and Patricke Plaine a young student of Trinity Colledge by Dublin in Ireland* (London, 1612); Aidan Clarke (ed.), "A Discourse between two councillors of State, the one of England, and the other of Ireland (1642)," *Analecta Hibernica* 26 (1970): 159-75. The

question and answer format is a variation on the dialogue. See for example Norah
Carlin (ed.), *Certain Queries Propounded to the Consideration of such as were Intended
for the Service in Ireland (1649)* (London: Aporia Press, 1992); Hiram Morgan (ed.),
"A Booke of Questions and Answers concerning the Warrs or Rebellions of the
Kingdome of Irelande (1597)," *Analecta Hibernica* 36 (1994): 93-153. One could also
consider Lodowick Bryskett's *The Discourse of Civill Life*, in H. R. Plomer and T. P.
Cross (eds.), *The Life and Correspondence of Lodowick Bryskett* (Chicago: Chicago UP,
1927) 1-279. Richard Stanyhurst, the Dubliner, in his contribution to Holinshed's
Chronicles, referred to the dialogue form as "a kind of writing as it is used, so
commended of the learned." Cited in Edwin A. Greenlaw, "Spenser and British
imperialism," *MP* 9 (1912) 12.

[3]Cited in Roger Fowler (ed.), *A Dictionary of Modern Critical Terms* (London:
Routledge, 1991) 59. Patricia Coughlan complicates the "dialogism" of the *View*:
"It is true that the *View* lacks dialogicality in the sense of making two different
registers of language confront each other. Both voices are, linguistically speaking,
equally authoritative; both are standard users of official English; neither is lexically
or syntactically a less adequate formulator of judgement or description. But this
should not warrant any rash decision to write off the dialogue form, or assume it
merely a decoy or mantle to conceal an absolute decisiveness." See Coughlan, "'Some
secret scourge which shall by her come unto England'" 65-66.

[4]Bruce Avery, "Mapping the Irish Other: Spenser's *A View of the Present State of
Ireland*," *ELH* 57 (1990) 264.

[5]Avery, "Mapping the Irish Other" 264.

[6]Breen, "Imagining Voices" 124.

[7]Breen, "Imagining Voices" 126.

[8]Kenneth Gross, "Mythmaking in Hibernia (*A View of the Present State of Ireland*),"
Spenserian Poetics: Idolatry, Iconoclasm, and Magic (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1985) 81.

[9]Ciarán Brady, "The Road to the *View*: On the Decline of Reform Thought in Tudor
Ireland," *Spenser and Ireland*, ed. Coughlan, 41. Compare Andrew Hadfield, who
writes: "The implied reader of the *View* is manipulated into accepting Irenius's
arguments, which is why, I would argue, it was written as a dialogue." See Andrew
Hadfield, "Spenser, Ireland, and Sixteenth-century Political Theory', *MLR* 9 (1994)
7.

[10]Helena Shire, *A Preface to Spenser* (London: Longman, 1978; 1981) 49-51.

[11]Coughlan, "'Some secret scourge which shall by her come unto England'" 67.

[12]Coughlan, "'Some secret scourge which shall by her come unto England'" 71.

[13]Roland M. Smith, "Spenser's tale of the two sons of Milesio," *MLQ* 3 (1942) 554.

[14]Anne Fogarty, "The Colonization of Language: Narrative Strategy in *A View of
the Present State of Ireland* and *The Faerie Queene*, Book VI," *Spenser and Ireland*, ed.
Coughlan 83.

[15]Anne Fogarty, "The Colonization of Language" 104.

[16]Donald Bruce, "Edmund Spenser and the Irish Wars," *Contemporary Review* 266
(1995) 135-36.

[17]The arguments surrounding the apparent suppression of the *View* are incisively
rehearsed in Andrew Hadfield, "Was Spenser's *View of the Present State of Ireland*
Censored? A Review of the Evidence," *N&Q* 239 (1994): 459-63.

[18]Donald Bruce, "Spenser's Irenius and the nature of dialogue," *N&Q* n.s. 39 (1992): 355.

[19]John T. Day, "dialogue, prose," *The Spenser Encyclopedia*, ed. A. C. Hamilton (London: Routledge, 1990) 217.

[20]Thomas E. Wright, "Bryskett, Lodowick," *The Spenser Encyclopedia*, ed. Hamilton 119.

[21]Day, "Dialogue, prose" 217.

[22]Beverley Sherry, "Dialogue, poetic," *The Spenser Encyclopedia*, ed. Hamilton 216.

[23]Anne Fogarty, "The Colonization of Language: Narrative Strategy in *A View of the Present State of Ireland* and *The Faerie Queene*, Book VI," *Spenser and Ireland*, ed. Coughlan 76.

[24]Ciarán Brady, "Spenser's Irish Crisis: Humanism and Experience in the 1590s," *Past and Present* 111 (1986) 18.

[25] David J. Baker, "'Some Quirk, Some Subtle Evasion': Legal Subversion in Spenser's *A View of the Present State of Ireland*," *Spenser Studies* 6 (1986) 163.

[26]Brady, "Spenser's Irish Crisis" 40.

[27]See Hinton (ed.), "Rych's "Anothomy of Ireland" 91.

[28]R. B. Gottfried, "Spenser's *View* and Essex," *PMLA* 52 (1937) 647.

[29]Eva Gold, "Spenser the borderer: boundary, property, identity in *A View of the Present State of Ireland* and Book 6 of *The Faerie Queene*," *Journal of the Rocky Mountain Medieval and Renaissance Association* 14 (1993): 105-06.

[30]On self-fashioning and the construction of identity over and against an excluded Other, see Stephen Greenblatt, "To Fashion a Gentleman: Spenser and the Destruction of the Bower of Bliss," *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: Chicago UP, 1980) 157-92.

The End of Editing Shakespeare

MARVIN SPEVACK

Surveying editions of Shakespeare in 1853, the anonymous reviewer in the *Athenaeum* concluded: "As the demand increases for the plays of Shakespeare, so new editors will arise—all with notions and new readings of their own,—till it will end perhaps by every intelligent man turning editor for himself." Indeed, the first twenty-five or so years of the reign of Queen Victoria saw the publication of new (and revised) complete editions by Charles Knight, John Payne Collier, Samuel Weller Singer, Alexander Dyce, Howard Staunton, Richard Grant White, W. G. Clark and W. A. Wright, Thomas Keightley, and James Orchard Halliwell-Phillipps, among the more than eighty recorded in the British Library catalogue. One hundred and fifty years later the feverish activity does not seem to have abated very considerably. The past sixty years have seen the appearance of editions by Ridley, Kittredge, Neilson and Hill, Alexander, Harrison, Sisson, Munro, Craig, Harbage, Evans, Bevington, three by the Oxford team, as well as Arden 2 and Arden 3, Cambridge 3 and Cambridge 4, Yale 2, Pelican, Penguin, Signet, Bantam, Folger, etc. etc. (not to mention various clones and packagings), to name just a few among the seventeen columns devoted to editions of Shakespeare in *Books in Print*. While the sheer number does not quite mean every intelligent man or woman is turning out a Shakespeare, it may well indicate that the way is being cleared for Everyman and Everywoman turning editor. Or to put it another way: the plethora of editions stimulates me-tooism; the plethora of editions, born of free enterprise, spurs competition. The motto is: anything you can do I can do better. And, most important, the plethora of editions, like the excesses of ancient Rome, has modified the end—i.e. the extent or goal—and at the same time has spelled the end—i.e. the conclusion—of editions as

---

we have known them. A paradox, to be sure, like the fact that since I have so little space at my disposal I may be permitted to do the prohibited: to make sweeping generalizations. And in still another paradox: to attempt to show that such sweeping generalizations, customarily held to be untrue or viewed with utmost suspicion, are in this case undeniably true.

First, let us look at editions. The most striking fact about editions of Shakespeare over the past sixty years—and longer too—is that when all is said and done they are, in their core substance, interchangeable. Granted there are attempts at novelty: Kittredge (1936) retained (with impunity) numerous old spellings—e.g. "murther" and "mushrump"—for which his student, G. Blakemore Evans (Riverside 1974) has been taken to task; Oxford (1986), in its understandable attempt to scrape away the barnacles which have over centuries fixed themselves on the text, has even invented some in reinventing Shakespeare. Nor do I mean to overlook some inspired conjectures regarding single words or expressions. But the overriding fact of the matter is that as far as the editing of the text is concerned, the situation resembles that of an elephant pushing a peanut. Let me illustrate.

In my New Variorum edition of *Antony and Cleopatra* I fully collated fifty-two editions and partially collated another fifty-one against the First Folio. Although this historical collation was completed before I was able to consider such important editions as the Oxford and Bevington (among others after 1974), it does nevertheless reveal important facts about the stability of the text of Shakespeare. If we concentrate on substantive verbal changes—in, say, the first act—we find that there are only thirty proposed (most of them from the crafty hand of John Payne Collier) in the nineteenth century and only four in the first seventy-five years of this century. I must emphasize that these are alternative readings, assembled according to their mere appearance without regard to the quality of the editor or edition. Not a one of them has found general acceptance. A brief glance at the textual notes of the latest edition of *Antony* (Arden 3, 1995) reveals that all the substantive verbal changes not found in the First Folio originate no later than in Dr. Johnson's edition of 1765, the largest number already in the Second Folio of 1632, which in the main tidied up obvious misprints and slips in grammar.

Of course, it will be argued that *Antony,* aside from some confusion regarding lineation and the like, is acknowledged to be a good text and/or that my sample is too small or selective—that is, that I have been practicing a sleight of statistics. But if there are only four proposed verbal changes in 613 lines—and each line contains an average of, say, eight words—then the resulting percentage of change is 0.0008156. The conclusion is that either there is a paucity of evidence or imagination or courage on the part of the editors, or more likely that there is little or nothing left to manipulate. Even if larger numbers were conceded—say, twenty new substantive verbal changes per work in editions of the twentieth century, yielding a generous (if not fanciful) projection of eight hundred for the entire corpus—the percentage of change based on eight hundred divided by a total of some 885,000 word-tokens or graphic entities would be 0.0009039. Reluctantly, but inescapably, the conclusion must be that as far as substantive verbal changes are concerned the text of Shakespeare is for all intents and purposes fixed. Even admitting new works to the canon—itself a sign of impatience with the restrictions of a closed system?—would not appreciably increase the potential for manipulation.

The commentary situation is, surprisingly or not, much the same. The historical collation of the commentary notes in my New Variorum *Antony* reveals that, as far as the glossing of vocabulary (the dominant feature) is concerned, commentary has increased as the distance from Shakespeare has increased. Just as obvious, and natural, is the fact that word glosses have reached a point where there is a consensus as to which words require glossing. Certainly, a comparison of the glossaries which conclude one-volume editions of Shakespeare illustrates this fact. And editions of individual plays, having more space and perhaps a slightly different aim or audience, tend mainly to expand and localize the glosses already found in the one-volume editions or in an Ur-glossary like Onions/Eagleson or its big brother, the *Oxford English Dictionary.* In short, the vocabulary of Shakespeare has been culled, glossed, and recorded. As with the text, commentary on it is for all intents and purposes fixed. Perhaps more fixed than a comparison of various editions would indicate, for at least forty percent of the words glossed or defined in the Onions/Eagleson *Glossary* are to be found in a primer for non-English

speakers, like the *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*—certainly even more in any standard collegiate-type dictionary, not to mention bigger brothers.

The advent of hypertext has not altered the basic situation of text and commentary. Hypertext is a form of hypertrophy: an abnormal increase in size, an excrescence which is essentially additive and cumulative in nature. Having at one's disposal all the information that exists—old and new spelling editions, facsimiles, translations, commentaries, illustrations, stages, speakers, actors, directors, professors, and who- or whatever—can lead to a traffic jam, with standstill. However navigable the highway, however fluid the apparent movement, the click of the mouse is more likely to signal lane-changing, with its illusion of rapid forward movement. Ageless and universal, the whole is a kind of digitized mega-variorum. Many of us who come to realize that we use only one or two percent of the expensive software we have bought will be reminded of Socrates, who, strolling through the market-place, was struck by all the things he didn't want or need.

Even if we do not agree that hypertext may be more hype than text, there can be little doubt that, in whatever form or dimension, it can be of assistance to an editor—even if in the actual practice of editing, this often means the same picking and choosing, but from a grandiose environment, with an eye to avoiding what the competition has already picked and chosen. With hypertext, however, Everyman/Every-woman—or shall we say, Hyperperson—is invited to become editor: Hyperperson, rear'd arm poised with mouse, in his livery floppy disks and manuals.

This is not as new as imagined. To a certain extent editors of Shakespeare have been practicing hypertexticity from the very beginning: how else can one describe the attention to the chain of foul to fair copies, quarto to quartos, folio to folios, edition to editions? The aggressive proliferation of editions has been marked by a massive proliferation of information—relevant or not—and, increasingly, of ornamentation. As if sensing or perhaps agreeing (but not admitting) that text and vocabulary were settled, editing has taken to providing textual notes which give alternatives not adopted or even considered as such; has begun restoring the once-banished architectural ornamentation of act-

scene divisions; has begun reinventing the once-castigated expanded
stage directions and even the much-maligned aside; has begun
revitalizing stage practice, complete with the *de rigueur* photographs
(often campy) of actors and scenes, and embellished with illustrations,
in living color, by commissioned artists and designers. It has, moreover,
erected and stocked a supermarket of appendices: glossaries (selected,
to be sure), lists of the dramatis personae (commonly with the reader-
friendly designation "characters" or, better, "persons of the play"), lists
of first lines to the poems, annals, genealogical tables, records,
documents, maps, bibliographies, and more more more. Editing has
become rampantly encyclopedic, with commentary expanding to include
not merely the traditional diversions of sources and parallels but
interpretations and possible interpretations, with notes being complemen-
ted by longer notes, longer notes by appendices. Editing Shakespeare
has become in certain areas infoentertaining, in the manner of hypertext.
And in like manner, in attempting to make everything available to
everybody, it has come up with products which are essentially uniform
and interchangeable—and only moderately or partially useful once the
novelty of decoration has worn off, like so many computer games.

Most strikingly, editing shares with hypertext the threat of diffusing
the clear outlines of Shakespeare—of, in the long run, contributing
perhaps relatively much towards the history of scholarship but
commensurately little to our grasp of Shakespeare. It is not simply a
matter of losing the forest for the trees (on the one hand) or of
overspecialization (on the other), or the obeisance to what the Zeitgeist
or the publisher demands: bows to gender, ethnicity, economics, cultural
poli-poetics, and the rest. A most recent CD-ROM makes available folios,
quartos, and numerous major editions and adaptations of Shakespeare:
none, however, in original typography, all inputted (twice, of course,
for "correctness"), all in the same standard modern type and with the
obligatory search-possibilites, which cannot, however, distinguish stage
directions from spoken text. Just announced is the Arden Shakespeare
CD-ROM, which is to contain the second Arden edition of 1946-82
(although already being superseded by the third, the consultant editor
of the CD-ROM having himself pointed out the need for the third),
"facsimile images" of the appropriate Folio and quarto editions of the

sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Abbott's *Shakespearian Grammar* (1869, rev. 1871), Partridge's *Shakespeare's Bawdy* (1955, rev. 1968), to which still other "elements" are "added." It is unlikely that these elements—each with its own set of lemmata and wordforms, differing lineation conventions, and distinctive scholarly perspective—can be connected. That would require an engineering feat beyond the capacity of even all the king's hackers and all the king's netizens. The uninitiated users will doubtless be left to fend for themselves.

There has always been the dream of making Shakespeare available to the masses, a following incidentally which Shakespeare never had. The dream has increased over the centuries as social democracy has increased. And in its own way editing has been at it too, not merely by decorating Shakespeare with appendages but by "translating" Shakespeare, as Bottom was "translated," into another being. It has practiced the dubious semantics of offering a choice of modern dictionary definitions to a reader who is then expected to choose the "right" meaning for a word whose meaning was unknown to the reader in the first place. It has practiced the dubious semantics of giving other instances of a particular word in non-Shakespearean works, as if they were then automatically synonymous. It has practiced—demeaning to editor and reader, if not to Shakespeare—glossing the obvious: *fanged*, Onions/Eagleson informs us, means "having fangs"; *fatherly*, "as a father." Most insidious of all perhaps, it has made a patchwork of Shakespeare's language. Here is a small representative sample from a scene (3.10) in *Antony*. Antony has fled the battle, following Cleopatra.

CANIDIUS [the speech prefix ornamented in caps, *comme il faut*]
  Oh, he has given example for our flight
  Most grossly by his own!
ENOBARBUS   Ay, are you thereabouts?
  Why then, good night indeed.
CANIDIUS
  Toward Peloponnesus are they fled.
SCARUS
  'Tis easy to't, and there I will attend
  What further comes.
CANIDIUS   To Caesar will I render
  My legions and my horse.

If we integrate the notes in two recent editions into these lines we come up with: "Oh, he has given example for our flight / Most *flagrantly* by his own! / Ay, *is that what you're thinking? (are you of that mind, thinking of desertion?)* Why then, *that really is the end. (it's all over.)* / Toward Peloponnesus are they fled. / *It's easy to get there*, and there I will *wait and see* / What further comes. / To Caesar will I *give up, hand over, (surrender)* / My *foot soldiers and my cavalry.*" No matter that *grossly, attend, render, legion,* and *horse* are given in the *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*; no matter that we are directed for a definition of a word like *attend* to "*OED v.* 13c"; no matter that the absence of information about Peloponnesus seems to imply that the reader is better at geography than English.

This levelling is the natural concomitant of undifferentiated abundance. In this, editing has anticipated hypertext. And hypertext is the creation which will subsume its predecessor. On the surface at least this need not be alarming: civilization itself builds upon civilization, is additive and cumulative: paths become streets, which become avenues, which become highways, which become superhighways. But that is not the story I wish to tell.

If the end has been reached—i.e. the text of Shakespeare is fixed, and the frame for treating it called editing prescribed—then Hyperperson and faithful mouse can do it all too. Hypertext may be challenging for a small few, but it is intimidating for the large many. Like capitalism, the society of practicers of hypertexticity will be composed, on the one hand, of a miniscule minority devoted to the pleasure of luxurious hypertechnical pursuits resembling previous investigations (by an exclusive coterie) of compositors, typographical eccentricities, and assorted gadgetries, and, on the other hand, a megamajority of increasing illiteracy attempting to navigate through a bewilderingly billowing flood of information. Or, to change the metaphor: as the windows multiply and access becomes dazzlingly breakneck, Hyperperson, more adept at managing small games—i.e. window shopping at the corner store—will be confronted by a looming skyscraper with countless windows (each, of course, with "intel inside") which will reveal the ultimate secret of hypertext: the wider the perspective, the more diffuse the image; the deeper the penetration, the darker the picture. It is state-of-the-art

updating of the reaction more than a hundred years ago of one critic, himself the editor of a sixteen-volume folio edition of Shakespeare, to the second volume of Furness's variorum *Hamlet*: "There is much no doubt that is exceedingly clever, but, taken as a whole, an almost impenetrable mass of conflicting opinions, wild conjectures and leaden contemplations, a huge collection of antagonistic materials which, if not repulsive, is certainly appalling." In such an environment Hyperperson is, can only be, Hypoperson, with trusty mouse, searching those holes for bits of cheese, and then sending and in return receiving them world wide.

As Hamlet would say: Ay, madam, it is common denominator.

Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität
Münster

More on Reading "Domestic" Tragedy and *A Woman Killed with Kindness*: Another Response to Lisa Hopkins*

S. J. WISEMAN

In response to Lisa Hopkins's article "The False Domesticity of *A Woman Killed with Kindness*" I want to make one, brief, point: the catch-all category of the domestic is 'false'—or problematic—in a way additional to, though not contradicting, the one located in her article. It is a word which describes institutions and systems of thought which were in conflict in the seventeenth-century. 'Domestic' is a term at the lexical intersection of complementary meanings which are also potentially contradictory: home, household, service, possession, native, of the nation, making homely (domestication). Moreover, to an extent, the understanding of plays within the critical term 'domestic tragedy'—a term which seems to stem from nineteenth-century literary critical discourse—has tended to obscure the ways in which 'domestic's' connotations—'home', 'household', 'possession'—are in conflict as well as in harmony.

In the late seventeenth-century Ann Bradstreet wrote:

> When by the ruins oft I past
> My sorrowing eyes aside did cast.
> And here and there the places spy
> Where oft I sat and long did lie:
> Here stood that trunk, and there that chest,
> There lay that store I counted best.
> My pleasant things in ashes lie,
> And them behold no more shall I.[1]

Bradstreet's lament proposes as lost both household items and the domestic scene: items of value, store and order in the household—

---

*Reference: Lisa Hopkins, "The False Domesticity of *A Woman Killed with Kindness*," *Connotations* 4.1-2 (1994/95): 1-7.

"trunk," "chest," "store I counted best"—are valued in loss as they were experienced "oft I sat and long did lie." The loss is of the economically productive and the affective kinds, a combination which speaks to us of a lost economic and affective situation—not only of "house" but of "home." In Bradstreet's poem, then, the economic emphasis of household sits in harmony with the affective emphasis. I would suggest that the poem's linking of objects and relations produces a lost harmonious 'domestic' situation in a way that we do not find in *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, where 'household' and desired 'domestic' privacy are set in opposition.

Lute, house, land, hunting, Yorkshire are thematised, even partly allegorised. Yet Frankford's description of felicity "in a study" contrasts with Bradstreet's understanding of the interior space of the house in a way that exceeds obvious generic difference:

FRANKFORD
>How happy am I amongst other men
>That in my mean estate embrace content.
>I am a gentleman, and by my birth
>Companion with a king; a king's no more.
>I am possessed of many fair revenues,
>Sufficient to maintain a gentleman.
>Touching my mind, I am studied in all arts;
>The riches of my thought and of my time
>Have been a good proficient. But the chief
>Of all the sweet felicities of earth,
>I have a fair, a chaste, and loving wife,
>. . . (IV. 1-11)[2]

We have already been alerted to the fact that all is not well, that ironic knowledge is part of the scene. Frankford takes ill-founded contentment in the way in which his life, he thinks, brings his "revenues," study and status as gentleman into a productive harmony implicitly likely to increase both his wealth and status.

In *A Woman Killed*, ironically, it is precisely the intimate activities which take place in domestic spaces—secrets from the open economy of the household—which threaten this financially and socially productive economy. It seems to make sense, then, to begin to think of the 'domestic' as a category sometimes in competition with the other categories which

are often taken as equivalents—house, household—and even as potentially associated with that apparently alien additional meaning, 'pertaining to the nation.'[3]

The explicit connotation of Bradstreet's poem, that of a desired (and lost) ability to remove herself into an achieved privatised *domestic* space —"Where oft I sat and long did lie"—is not a category to be taken for granted (as Hopkins rightly argues) but one which is in question in *A Woman Killed with Kindness* and which, notably, fails to be achieved in the marriages presented in the two plots. Indeed, the narrative of the play could be described as the articulation of the possibility of the 'domestic' in the marriage of Ann and Frankford superseded by the reassertion of other *household* connections, particularly that of 'service' between servant and master.

In the scene in which the adultery is discovered Frankford and his servant Nick return to the house together, Nick providing a commentary, first for his master then for us. Nick hands him the key:

> FRANKFORD
>   . . . now to my gate.
> NICK
>   It must ope with far less noise than Cripplegate, or your plot's dashed.
> FRANKFORD
>   So, reach me my dark lantern to the rest.
>   Tread softly, softly.
> NICK
>   I will walk on eggs this pace. (XIII.17-22)

The union of master and servant in exposing Mistress Anne's adultery is a key moment in the emerging triumph of household over a desired domestic union. This is further complicated, though, by the different attitudes suggested in Frankford's allegorisation of props such as the key, suggesting the relationship between guilty secret and the divine law and Nick's proverbial and ironic comments. That a key scene in the play offers us two viewpoints of the meaning of female adultery, one emphasising intimacy and the divine, the other the colloquial, yet suggesting identification ("and the case were mine" (XIII,37)) suggests that even as it is happening the play is ambivalent, and invites the audience to ambivalence, about the competing claims of intimate

domesticity and the homosocially controlled household. These two ways of thinking about social arrangements are part of the constellation of ways of understanding female adultery, marriage and the household presented in the rest of the play. Arguably, the play's movingness and affective potential in production comes from the irreconcilability of the networks of meaning around contradictory understandings of marriage as—to put it schematically—affective/intimate/domestic versus economic/public/household.

I am suggesting, then, that one of the cultural struggles articulated in *A Woman Killed with Kindness* is around the question of 'household' and the 'domestic' as representing economic systems and affective demands not easily reconciled. It repeatedly signals the gaps and contradictions amongst these ideas (and ideals) and uses them to establish poignancy in the contradictions which cannot be resolved. The 'key' texts of the current canon of 'domestic tragedy'—*A Woman Killed with Kindness*, *Arden of Faversham*, and others—can be understood as activating an audience's confusions and desires about the place of the *household* in relation to other categories which compete for psychic and affective space without ever replacing the economic base that made households productive as well as consuming and affective units. Certainly, fantasies and problematic ideals about the private 'domestic' space of the couple at 'home' can be seen to be in conflict with a potentially rival value system to the ideal of the household as economically productive in both *A Woman Killed with Kindness* and Heywood's later rewriting of it, *The English Traveller*.

A second question about the 'domestic' is its critical use. Sometimes, as Lisa Hopkins suggests, critical use of the term 'domestic tragedy' indicates an unexamined and problematic distinction between 'high' and 'popular', with a few critics even using the label 'domestic tragedy' to justify reading the texts as unmediated evidence of early modern 'life', simply offering, as F. S. Boas saw it, 'evidence' about "Elizabethan times."[4] Such conceptualisation of these plays as offering 'evidence' is marked by its origins; the literary-critical category of 'domestic drama' and 'domestic tragedy' seems to have taken hold, if not come into being, at the turn of the nineteenth into the twentieth century. It shares discursive and ideological space not with the ideologies of early modern

England, but with the Angel in the House. As well as the plays' use
as evidence we find also a set of assumptions about the domestic coming
into being as the sub-canon of domestic drama comes to be formed.

As a retrospective genre, 'domestic tragedy' usefully designates a group
of plays. But perhaps such genericisation and canon-production has to
some extent obscured links—which Hopkins points out—to plays often
considered very different. Indeed, until very recently the genre of
domestic tragedy reaped the dubious benefit of a philological obsession
with categorisation and essentialisation following on from the
taxonomising scholarip of critics such as Boas and Schelling. This
sometimes leads to a rather circular location of the domestic in domestic
tragedy. Critics Ada and Herbert Carson mused, "both *Arden of Faversham*
and *Death of a Salesman* are domestic tragedies. Their essence is the same.
What is that essence?"[5] The essence they locate—revealed again and
again by critics of domestic tragedy—is that the plays are "realistic"
and "didactic" and—"domestic" (13). A recent critic, Andrew Clark,
recognises this but nevertheless writes of "a group of tragedies . . . which
are manifestly different from those dealing with persons of high estate.
. . . an obvious departure from the humanist, classical, conception of
drama . . . The playwrights may seldom employ the designation
'domestic'—certainly it did not pass into common usage with Elizabethan
dramatic critics—but they seem to be under no illusion as what they
were attempting."[6]

The assumption that the 'domestic' is synonymous or in harmony with
associated terms is accompanied by critical disavowal of its link to the
nation and issues which might exceed the imaginedly private bounds
of the domestic unit or household (though, of course, the assumption
that 'private' life begins at the door of the house is repeatedly questioned
in these plays where—as in *A Woman Killed*—the law is in a very intimate
relation to domestic desires). The 'domestic' is assumed to be remote
from the national-political; in 1908 Felix E. Schelling offers two categories,
"The National Historical Drama" is followed by "Domestic Drama."[7]
This enduring division instantiates a split in understandings much more
modern than early modern in its sense of the relation between private
and public spheres.

In sum, there is another 'false domestic' in domestic tragedy; the retroactive hiving off of the sphere of 'the domestic' in the critics of the turn of the century. We can return to the plays with a more problematic sense of the domestic as articulating fantasies and desires about early modern social being rather than, as Hopkins rightly notes, reading the plays as evidence of 'the domestic.' And the 'domestic' and associated desires and ideals can, I am arguing, be better understood as signifiying a competing system of ideals and desires not a self-evident or an evidentiary category.

The University of Warwick
Coventry

NOTES

[1] Ann Bradstreet, "Here Follows Some Verses upon the Burning of Our House July 10th, 1666."

[2] Thomas Heywood, *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, ed. Brian Scobie (London: A&C Black, 1985). Subsequent references in text.

[3] I am grateful to I. Leimberg for suggesting that I pursue this route.

[4] F. S. Boas, *Thomas Heywood* (London: Williams & Norgate, 1950) 45.

[5] Ada Lou Carson and Herbert L. Carson, *Domestic Tragedy in English: Brief Survey*, 2 vols. (Salzburg: Institut für Anglistik und Amerikanistik, Universität Salzburg, 1982) 1:3.

[6] Andrew Clark, *Domestic Drama: A Survey of the Origin of the Antecedents and Nature of the Domestic Play in England 1500-1640* (Salzburg: Institut für englische Sprache und Literatur, Universität Salzburg, 1975) 3.

[7] Felix E.Schelling, *Elizabethan Drama 1558-1642* (London: Archibald Constable, 1908) 310.

A Woman Killed with Kindness:
Author's Response*

LISA HOPKINS

My essay on *A Woman Killed with Kindness* has elicited a number of thoughtful and interesting responses, from Nancy Gutierrez, from Diana Henderson and Michael Wentworth, and most recently from Sue Wiseman; in turn, Inge Leimberg has kindly asked me to round off the discussion by a reply to the replies. I am very pleased to have been the occasion of so much informed comment on what seems to me to be a very sadly neglected genre; I am also very grateful for the opportunity to respond, since it seems to me a rare privilege actually to attempt to clarify one's own work in the light of others' reception of it.

Diana Henderson attributes to me the desire to "rescue" *A Woman Killed with Kindness* from the genre category of domestic tragedy (49), and cites my classification of the genre as "the rude, episodic, unshaped story of ordinary people, the stuff of journalistic ephemera, which was, moreover, very often centred on the domestic world and amorous passions so closely associated with women." She then wonders about my "rhetorical relationship" to this sentence. From the point of view of "author's intention," that is quite simple: it is ironic—a mode which perhaps does not always travel well. Henderson herself later notes that "This would seem to be an apt description of common sixteenth-century

---

associations, not the author's own" (52). Indeed I do not, as Henderson suggests, find the genre of domestic tragedy "seamy" (52); I just question how firmly *A Woman Killed with Kindness* fits into it.

What, in fact, I was interested in, was not my personal views on genres but Heywood's own project, particularly its intersection with the burgeoning category of domestic tragedy and whether the playwright might have been influenced by anything resembling a hierarchy of genres or an aesthetic of narrative shape. I had no intention of denigrating domestic tragedy *per se*—I am keenly alive to its manifold and powerful fascinations—but I do suspect Heywood of some awareness, however embryonic, of an emerging distinction between popular culture and art, and of wishing to align himself with the latter category while not sacrificing the vigour of the former. Whether such a cultural shift was actually present (and could be detected) is undoubtedly debatable, and I would like to see the debate: Michael Wentworth's article is particularly interesting in this respect, as is Sue Wiseman's lively and powerful discussion.

It has often been asserted that Shakespeare did not believe his plays would last, and yet they are highly self-conscious about their nature as art. In the case of domestic tragedy, much of it did *not* last—and this is what I was referring to when I talked of the ephemeral nature of the genre. Since the plays are lost, of course, discussion of their nature must perforce be highly speculative, except in so far as it can be guided by Adams' listings and by Charles Sisson's pioneering work in *Lost Plays of Shakespeare's Age*, and I was, therefore, perhaps rash to refer so categorically to "the journalistic, ad hoc air which has led to so many examples of the genre failing to survive" (though I note that Michael Wentworth makes a similar assumption about lost domestic tragedies [63]). Nevertheless, I still stand by what I tried to suggest in my original essay: I have personally no desire to "rescue" *A Woman Killed with Kindness* from the category of domestic tragedy, but I do wonder whether Heywood didn't.

That, of course, would take us into the realm of author's intentions, which is notoriously shaky ground. Nancy Gutierrez raises a rather similar point when she suggests that it is Puritan rather than Catholic ideology that Heywood seems to be exploring (243), and Michael

Wentworth also touches on this point. He wonders whether I "[mean] to suggest that Heywood's sympathies and intentions are pro-Catholic," since "such a stance would clearly contradict . . . his life-long interest in and glorification of the Protestant middle class. Alternatively, to read Heywood's treatment of Frankford's kindness, Anne's self-starvation, and related matters as a parody of Catholic beliefs just as clearly devalues the obvious homiletic structure of the play and Heywood's clearly sympathetic treatment of Frankford and Anne" (58). I certainly do not suggest that Heywood was personally pro-Catholic—that would be simply silly—but I do feel that, in the play, he shows considerable interest in the ways in which personal behaviour and psychology are inflected by shared social and spiritual beliefs. As I pointed out originally, Katie Mitchell's RSC production imaged these communal values as specifically Catholic, a decision which seems to me to make considerable sense, given the strong association between the Old Religion and the north of England. Nor need a representation of Catholic practice be automatically parody. Heywood's personal Protestantism is unlikely to have led him to a simple demonisation of Catholicism: there is plenty of evidence that individual Renaissance Protestants got on perfectly well with their individual Catholic neighbours. For a northern gentlewoman to be particularly aware of fasting practices might have been simply as much a factual matter as the presence of a castle in York or the tendency of the squirearchy to wager.

Whatever the specific doctrinal inflection of Anne's beliefs, what seems to me particularly remarkable about Heywood's play is the nature of his representation of her as traversed by cultural assumptions which seem, in many ways, so much stronger than her individual desires: in seminars, I have found that student response invariably focuses on the absence of clearly designated motivation for her adultery, and on the tension between the resulting apparent passivity of her character and the resolution of her actions. As Sue Wiseman so judiciously reminds us, the "domestic," in the early seventeenth century, was not a hived-off space; and in Anne Frankford we may well see a particularly striking example of the ways in which the public intersects with what we would now consider the private.

<div style="text-align: right">Sheffield Hallam University</div>

"Crossing the Bar"*

JEROME H. BUCKLEY

Robert F. Fleissner begins his "Grace Note: The Manuscript Evidence for a Christological 'Crossing the Bar'" with a call for a "closer reading of the manuscripts of the poem" as a guide to interpretation. He then cites the early version reproduced by photostat in my *Tennyson* (1960), but he makes no use of its "evidence," nor indeed offers any reason to believe that he has even seen it, for his reference to my book comes only at second hand from a 1963 note by Paull F. Baum regretting that the published text seems to him in some respects inferior to that early draft. Despite his demand for manuscript study, Fleissner draws only on the final version, of which he offers his own odd typescript, based on his reading of a facsimile obtained from the Tennyson Research Centre at Lincoln.

As "evidence" for his Christological "Crossing the Bar," Fleissner renders four ampersands in the manuscript not by *ands* but by plus signs (+), which he regards as encoded signs of the Cross. He admits to not having checked any other Tennyson poetic manuscript and so to having no notion of how frequently the poet made use of the ampersand in either religious or secular contexts. All Tennyson manuscripts, however, are available in the edition assembled by Christopher Ricks and Aidan Day in thirty-one volumes, published by Garland, 1989-1993. I have examined this great archive and have found, as I expected, Tennyson's use of the ampersand habitual throughout his career. There are only two extant versions of "Crossing the Bar," the Harvard manuscript (which I reproduced in 1960) and the final manuscript from Trinity

---

College, Cambridge. Each uses the ampersand four times, and neither gives the slightest warrant for reading that symbol as a cross or plus sign. The manuscript "evidence" to which Fleissner appeals, therefore, surely does not support his argument. And I know indeed of no instance elsewhere in English literature where an ampersand connotes a cross.

Nonetheless, Fleissner finds similar Christological significance in the spelling "crost" (in the last line of the poem), which provides in his argument "the crucial crossed 't.'" (In this connection he complains that the modern texts he has used "curiously" replace "crost" with "crossed," which to him has less spiritual value. Yet a quick check of my own Tennyson shelf shows eleven recent editors, including Christopher Ricks in his definitive text, still preferring "crost," though none comments on the poet's crossed "t." Tennyson himself used "crost" in a number of other poems; but "crossed" to denote the religious gesture, as in "The Lady of Shalott," where the knights "crossed themselves for fear.")

With such visual clues as "evidence," Fleissner extends his argument. He now detects in the crossing-boat a "subliminal" linkage with the biblical Ark, the symbol of the Church, and finds the association reinforced by the rhymes *dark* and *embark* and the assonantal recurrence elsewhere of the *ar* sound. The steersman Noah hence becomes "a type of the Christ-Peter-Pilot fusion." Moreover, the actual crossing of the boat at right angles over the sandbar seems to trace the pattern of a cross, "a cruciform image," and that in turn readily recalls the Crucifixion. The moaning of the bar then evokes the suffering of the crucified Christ, and the proscription of future moaning may signify "the true Christian's stalwart obligation to bear his own cross daily and without complaint."

To our likely demur that Tennyson would not have "condoned so close a reading," Fleissner replies that "an author's own overt signification or intent is . . . of lesser import than that of inner or archetypal meaning—or especially that of divine intent, presuming that that can be determined." But not all readers will presume to make that determination or even, on a far lower level, to fathom the poet's unconscious motivation. I do not question the strong religious overtone of "Crossing the Bar" or the identification of the Pilot with a figure of the Divinity, perhaps best to be defined in Tennyson's own general terms as "That Divine and Unseen Who is always guiding us" (*Memoir*, II,

376, a source which Fleissner fails to consider). But I am not convinced that what seems to me to be a labored search for some hidden secret code, "clandestine" or "subliminal," has provided any substantial "evidence" for a dogmatically Christological reading of "Crossing the Bar."

Harvard University

Some Thoughts on Faulkner's "Racism"*

Ursula Brumm

We live, fortunately, at a time which has done away with the conviction of white superiority and banned racial prejudice. This has come about during the last decades as a historic development; we may well ask ourselves how we would have, or have indeed, judged, acted or reacted on racial issues some fifty or sixty years ago, as, for instance William Faulkner did while living in a densely race-conscious Southern world.

At present, almost everybody is enlightened and reformed and it does not require any courage to accept and appreciate blacks, their achievements and humanity; it is simply a matter of conforming to general opinion. We are free to scrutinize works and personalities of the past for their racial attitudes voiced at a time which was not so enlightened as ours. To find them at fault can be even a matter of our covert self-congratulation.

Professor Philip Cohen in his essay on "Faulkner and Racism" in *Connotations* 5.1 has very perceptively traced the critical opinion over this period. I also agree with his judicious defence of Faulkner's position and work, I only regret that at the end of his essay he seems to agree with Professor Kinney's view that the figure of Dilsey in *The Sound and the Fury* is an elaborate version of the black mammy stereotype. For this reason, I should like to contribute some thoughts on race in this novel,

---

*Reference: Arthur F. Kinney, "Faulkner and Racism," *Connotations* 3.3 (1993/94): 265-78; Pamela Knights, "Faulkner's Racism: A Response to Arthur F. Kinney," *Connotations* 4.3 (1994/95): 283-99; John Cooley, "Faulkner, Race, Fidelity," *Connotations* 4.3 (1994/95): 300-12; Philip Cohen, "Faulkner and Racism: A Commentary on Arthur F. Kinney's 'Faulkner and Racism,'" *Connotations* 5.1 (1995/96): 112-22; Arthur F. Kinney, "Author's Commentary," *Connotations* 5.1 (1995/96): 119-24; Arthur F. Kinney, "Faulkner and Racial Mythology," *Connotations* 5.2-3 (1995/96): 259-75.

with special attention to the personality of Dilsey, a figure which was somewhat more positively but still rather guardedly discussed by Professor Cooley.

I may add here an observation which, I think, confirms Professor Cohen's arguments. It is interesting to discover that major critics of the fifties and sixties had no trouble to discern in Dilsey the representative of the "ethical norm" (Olga Vickery),[1] or "The ethical norm of Christian humanism" (Robert J. Griffin).[2] On the other hand, without reference to her race, Vickery considered her—very wrongly I think— "almost as inarticulate as Benjy" (296) and David Minter in a strangely contradictory statement judged "Though her understanding is small, her wisdom and love are large."[3] Perhaps the statements were made because at this time these were tacitly considered racial characteristics, even if no mammy-stereotype was involved.

The Sound and the Fury is a novel about a Southern family in decline, actually about two families, the Compsons (white) and their servants, the Gibsons (black). A probe of William Faulkner's racial bias might therefore begin with an assessment of the two families and their members, respectively. In the white family we have Mrs. Compson, a self-pitying, petulant, constantly nagging neurotic, who as an incompetent mother is largely responsible for the disintegration of her family. The responsibility is shared by her husband, Mr. Compson, a mildly cynic alcoholic, who is unable to assist his children or conduct the family's affairs. The two eldest children, Quentin and Candace, are linked in a tragic bond: Quentin, sensitive and weak, oppressed by the family's grand past and obsessed with his sister's sexual escapades, takes his life, while Candace's hunger for love ends in promiscuity; she is ostracized by her hypocritical mother and younger brother Jason. Jason, already mean as a child, reveals himself in a sarcastic monologue as totally self- and money-centered; in unabashed meanness, of which he is actually proud, he cheats his sister and niece of money and swindles his stupidly doting mother. There is finally Benjy, who as an "idiot" is the completely innocent youngest son, unable to reason or speak.

William Faulkner, a racist of an anti-white bias? Unthinkable how the critics would deal with him had he attributed this accumulation of weakness, selfishness, meanness, and failure to a black family! It should

be added that all minor white characters in *The Sound and the Fury*: Uncle Maury, Herbert Head, Gerald Bland, Dalton Ames, or Mr. Patterson are definitely less than likeable.

In contrast, the Gibson family is inoffensive and comparatively normal. Dilsey's husband Roskus serves as driver and handyman, their children Versh, T. P. and Frony take care of Benjy. Luster displays a childish "devilment," which his grandmother Dilsey likens to "Compson devilment." Among the Gibsons, Dilsey is of course the towering figure. In the draft of an introduction written in 1933—that is, long before the public or critical acknowledgement of black equality—Faulkner actually saw Dilsey in "towering" imagery:

> There was Dilsey to be the future, to stand above the fallen ruins of the family, like a ruined chimney, gaunt, patient and indomitable . . . .[4]

Pictures of houses destroyed or burned during the Civil War are powerful in Faulkner's visual imagination; the chimney as the only part left is a characteristic feature of Civil War photos and a symbol of survival and perseverance. At the beginning of chapter IV, told by an omniscient third-person narrator, Dilsey is described as she emerges from her cabin when "The Day dawned bleak and chill . . . ." Only a few lines of this marvelous description of the ancient time- and work-worn figure can be quoted here:

> She had been a big woman once but now her skeleton rose, draped loosely in unpadded skin that tightened again upon a paunch almost dropsical, as though muscle and tissue had been courage or fortitude which the days or the years had consumed until only the indomitable skeleton was left rising like a ruin or a landmark above the somnolent and impervious guts . . . .[5]

Dilsey's nature and her functions in this novel are revealed by the motifs Faulkner attaches to her. As she emerges at the beginning of chapter IV on the bleak and chilly Easter morning she collects wood in order to start the fire in her kitchen: to prepare breakfast, warm the house and fill Mrs. Compson's water bottle. Her activities are recorded in slow-motion detail and thus stress the fact that she starts and tends the fire on the hearth of the Compson family, feeds and takes care of the family's needs. When Mrs. Compson appears and frets in her usual peevish

manner, Dilsey peremptorily tells her to get back to bed and rejects her complaints; even reproves her:

> I don't see how you expect anybody to sleep, wid you standing in de hall hollein at folks fum de crack of dawn. (162)

This is very direct and graphic; it is certainly not "almost inarticulate," and it is not menial or submissive. Dilsey's tone toward her mistress generally in this chapter is astonishingly authoritative. I would therefore like to take issue with Professor Cooley's view that Dilsey "cannot change her circumstances" (*Connotations* 4, 307). She remains, of course, a black servant in a white family, but in 1928 she has changed her role, she is in control and virtually the mistress of the house. As to her command of language: she speaks Black English, and she uses it with acuity and wit. Two examples may stand for many: her critical comments on Benjy's change of names, which the blacks at once recognize as an evil omen because they have a natural feeling for the numinous quality of names. Dilsey says, "He aint wore out the name he was born with yet, is he?" (36), and she is quoted by her son Versh with "Your mammy is too proud for you" (43)—a wonderfully brief comment of Mrs. Compson's shallow and wrong-headed pride.

That Dilsey serves virtually as the mother for all the Compson children and especially for the weakest, the handicapped Benjy, is documented throughout the novel by a string of motifs. Not only that she feeds, dresses and undresses him, she waits on this unhappy imbecile with unflagging sympathy and loving care, and she knows how to relieve his wordless sorrow with a flower, fire and the satin slipper, symbol of the family's past grandeur.

At the end we see her, stroking the head of the 33-year-old Benjy:

> Dilsey led Ben to the bed and drew him down beside her and she held him, rocking back and forth, wiping his drooling mouth upon the hem of her skirt. "Hush now," she said, stroking his head. "Hush, Dilsey got you." But he bellowed slowly, abjectly, without tears; the grave hopeless sound of all voiceless misery under the sun. (188)

Finally, Dilsey's stature is confirmed by the respect she receives from the black community as she walks with Benjy and her daughter to the

Easter service in the black church. For the occasion she is dressed in "colours regal and moribund" (158):

> The cabin door opened and Dilsey emerged, again in the maroon cape and the purple gown, and wearing soiled white elbow-length gloves and minus her headcloth now. (171)

On the one hand, a pathetic imitation of white custom, on the other hand a claim to nobility, proudly expressed by stylish garments, and long cherished pride of belonging to a family of ancient prominence.

The Sound and the Fury, a novel about the decline of the South, exemplified in the decline of the Compson family, is also a testimonial to the humanity of their black servant Dilsey, who serves them with dedication, loving attention, and prudence. To judge her understanding "small" can only be explained by the inadvertent projection of earlier racial prejudice. Faulkner in motifs characterizing Dilsey, in her words and comments, and those of others, documents her deep understanding of every member of the family and of their tragic decline. As a woman of deep and broad understanding and humanity she is placed by Faulkner outside of any stereotype. Perhaps we have to ask ourselves if the stereotype of the black mammy, which is so often applied in critical comment to figures like Dilsey, is not in our minds rather than in the text. When we interpret a black female character by making use of it, sometimes it may even serve to confirm lingering racial stereotypes.

<div align="right">Freie Universität Berlin</div>

NOTES

[1]Olga W. Vickery, "*The Sound and the Fury*: A Study in Perspective," *PMLA* 69 (1954): 1017-37, rpt. in William Faulkner, *The Sound and the Fury: An Authoritative Text, Backgrounds and Contexts, Criticism,* ed. David Minter (New York: Norton, 1987) 309.

[2]Robert Griffin, "Ethical Point of View in *The Sound and the Fury*," *Essays in Modern American Literature,* ed. Richard E. Langford (1963), rpt. in *Contemporary Literary Criticism,* ed. Roger Matuz, vol. 68 (Detroit: Gale, 1991) 119.

[3]David Minter, "Faulkner, Childhood, and the Making of the Novel," William Faulkner, *The Sound and the Fury: An Authoritative Text* 384.

[4]Faulkner 223.

[5]Faulkner 158-59. All quotations from the novel are from this edition.

Derek Walcott's Don Juans:
A Postilla*

D. L. MACDONALD

After publishing my article on "Derek Walcott's Don Juans" in *Connotations*, Dr. Leimberg sent a copy to James Mandrell, author of the admirable *Don Juan and the Point of Honor: Seduction, Patriarchal Society, and Literary Tradition* (1992), asking for his comments on it. Dr. Mandrell replied that "[w]hile [he] found it interesting, [he] didn't see any appropriate opening in [my] argument for the introduction of [his] own ideas about Don Juan as a literary character and social force. [He] therefore [did]n't see how [he] could write a response to the article itself." He suggested, however, that if I were "to open a dialogue with [him] through a coda or postilla to [my] article," he might be able to respond to that. So here goes.

The distance between Mandrell's position and my own has to do, I think, both with subject matter and with approach. Mandrell is interested primarily in Spanish-language versions of the story of Don Juan; I am interested primarily in English-language versions (particularly, in my article, those by Walcott). These two traditions have been divergent almost from their beginnings (the earliest English versions are based on Italian and French predecessors, not directly on the Spanish original, if it is the original); it is not surprising that they should have led us in different directions.

As Mandrell points out on the first page of his book, "the story of Don Juan is usually viewed as comprising two complementary parts—the one the history of a dissolute libertine, the other the motif of the double invitation," in which Don Juan invites some supernatural entity (typically

---

the statue of one of his victims) to dinner, accepts a return invitation, and meets his fate. Mandrell's Spanish texts have led him to the first part of the story, because of the relations he posits between seduction and honour, seduction and the patriarchy, seduction and the literary tradition. My English texts have led me to the second part, largely because, at this early stage in my research, it has seemed the more interesting; consequently, I was struck that in his long chapter on *El burlador de Sevilla* (50-86), Mandrell devotes only two consecutive pages (74-76) to the role of the Statue. (He returns to the subject interestingly, but not much more substantially, in his chapter on Zorrilla's *Don Juan Tenorio* [109-11].)

This difference is only one of emphasis: as Mandrell points out, the two parts of the story are, after all, complementary; otherwise it would hardly have been such a success. I will be interested to see whether it points to larger cultural differences. Discussing Don Juan as a seducer means concentrating on his relations with women; concentrating on Don Juan and the statue means, since the statue is typically that of a man, concentrating on Don Juan's relations with other men (Mandrell also makes some remarks about relations between men in Zorrilla [102-3, 106-7]). If I am really following the lead of the English-language versions in this regard, perhaps they will turn out to be even more preoccupied with masculinity than Mandrell's Spanish-language versions. Walcott has certainly been accused of such a preoccupation, notably by Elaine Savory Fido, who objects to his "stereotypical attitudes towards women" (111) but praises his portrayal of "male pairs" (116). I have argued that she is unfair to the Isabella of Walcott's *The Joker of Seville*, who articulates the play's hope for the future; but she may be right about *Omeros*, in which the male rivals, Hector and Achille, are much more interesting than Helen, the object of their rivalry. Or the preoccupation may simply be my own. (I am also interested in another relation, about which Mandrell has even less to say than about the Statue: that between Don Juan and his servant.)

Since the confrontation between Don Juan and the Statue is less a matter of seduction than of force (the Statue portrays a victim of Don Juan's violence, and sends him forcibly to hell), perhaps the English versions are more preoccupied with power and violence than the Spanish

ones. A cursory glance might suggest that this is the case. The Don Juan figure in the first, partial English treatment of the story, *The Tragedy of Ovid* (1662), by Sir Aston Cokain, is a soldier; his offense against women is not seduction but the ripping of a fetus out of its mother's womb. The Don John of *The Libertine* (1675), by Thomas Shadwell, the first complete English version of the story, is an astonishing Hobbesian monster who in the course of the play is responsible, along with his two companions, for a robbery, a suicide, seven rapes (and six attempted ones), seven fights, and ten murders; at the beginning of the fifth act, they set fire to a convent to get at the nuns. In their idle moments, which are few, they reminisce about their past accomplishments, which include incest, fratricide, patricide, over thirty ordinary murders, over eighty bigamous marriages, and "Rapes innumerable" (15; I.i.137). The libertines do also engage in three seductions, but these can hardly be called central to their activities. In the versions with which my article was concerned, Walcott insistently associates both parts of the story with violence. In *The Joker of Seville*, Don Juan is a conquistador; his Moorish servant Catalinion draws an emphatic parallel between Don Juan's enslavement of himself and his subsequent conquest of Tisbea. In *Omeros*, the statue comes to stand for (among other things) the institutionalized violence of colonial imperialism.

These differences in subject matter (or emphases on different aspects of the subject matter) suggest different models of literary history. Mandrell's emphasis on seduction suggests an emphasis on the continuity of literary history: not only is the story of Don Juan about the oppression of women, it perpetuates this oppression, and it tends to seduce later authors and critics into doing the same (268). His discussion of the statue in *Don Juan Tenorio* lays the same emphasis on sameness and continuity: both Don Juan and the creator of the statue are self-representations of Zorrilla, and the main significance of the sculptor is to suggest "the triumph of the artist over his single most meaningful rival: time" (108).

My emphasis on the confrontation with the statue suggests instead an emphasis on the discontinuity of literary history. The English versions may stress this confrontation because the story, which originated, as Ian Watt has pointed out, in the Counter-Reformation (120-37), came into English in the immediate aftermath of the Puritan revolution. In

English history, this period was marked, like much of the preceding century, by widespread iconoclasm. (In 1644, for example, at Cambridge, Cokain's alma mater, a government commission "brake down 1000 Pictures superstitious" in a single chapel [Phillips 186].) Iconoclasm represents the principled rejection of works of visual art (for example, statues) as a source of moral religious and religious authority, and Cokain, a Catholic, clearly intends his Don Juan figure, Hannibal, to be associated with the great iconoclast Cromwell (Macdonald, "Iconoclasm"). So pervasive is the theme of iconoclasm in Cokain's play, in fact, that even Helvidius, the spectral character corresponding to Tirso's statue, is an iconoclast: he has been hanged for destroying a statue.[1] The literary implications are obvious (see Gilman): the English Don Juans tend to assume a confrontational posture, not only towards the visual art of the past, but also towards the literature of the past. Harold Bloom, accordingly, has recently characterized Don Giovanni as a kind of enemy of the Western Canon (29). Since that canon includes all the previous versions of the Don Juan story, what the English Don Juans most conspicuously share is, paradoxically, their differences from each other, the confrontational postures that they (or rather their authors) assume towards each other.

These different models of literary history suggest, in turn, the difference between Mandrell's approach and my own. Mandrell's approach might be described as primarily theoretical; he says in his introduction: "My intention is not to write a *history* of Don Juan, but to elucidate a theory that responds to the historical vicissitudes of the character *and* his interpretation. I therefore leave to others the development of similar interpretations with respect to literary texts not treated in this study" (4). My own approach is primarily critical; I am one of the others to whom he leaves the task of interpretation. My intention (so far still mostly an intention) is precisely to write a history of English-language Don Juans. The difference is, again, one of emphasis: nobody who had read Mandrell's richly detailed analyses of Tirso and his successors would believe that he had developed his theory without interpreting any individual works; and nobody would ever believe that I (or anybody else) undertook interpretation with an innocent eye.

Nevertheless, it is, I think, a significant difference. In his letter to Dr. Leimberg, Dr. Mandrell says that he thinks of Don Juan "as a literary character and social force." My own sense of the English Don Juans is that they are many different characters, in very different works, which have equally divergent social implications and effects. As Chris Baldick points out, "The vitality of myths lies precisely in their capacity for change, their adaptability and openness to new combinations of meaning" (4). Mandrell quite rightly critiques the "sort of ahistorical collective classification" too often indulged in by critics who refer to the Don Juan story as a "myth" (23); but his own theoretical approach has something of the same effect. Mandrell describes Don Juan as "a positive force *in* patriarchy," by which he means partly that the character is positive *for* patriarchy (11). But patriarchy is a large concept: large enough to be called trans-historical if not ahistorical. Mandrell does describe the specific historical moment of Tirso, "poised . . . between the old and the new," between the feudal and capitalist orders; but he doesn't seem to think that the transition is ultimately important: "The commodity value attached to women remains constant even as the nature of the *meaning* of that value alters" (262-63).[2] Now, the transition from feudalism to capitalism was a fairly large historical event; if it is ultimately unimportant for the oppression of women, then presumably less dramatic historical events (though Mandrell does not ignore them) are even less important. It is one such comparatively minor event, the decline of the British empire, that forms the historical context for my reading of Walcott.

The difference between us is, again, one of emphasis: according to Mandrell, Tirso and his successors show that women are *only* being oppressed in new ways; according to me, they show that women (and men) are being oppressed in *new* ways. On the one hand it is important that women are still being oppressed; but on the other hand, it is also important to know something about "women's oppression today," in Michèle Barrett's phrase, if we're going to do anything specific about it.[3]

Unlike Mandrell, I am not uncomfortable about calling the Don Juan story a myth; as Baldick argues, to deny the existence of modern myths is precisely to subscribe to a Romantic "myth of myth" (1). I would insist,

however, that the story of Don Juan is a *modern* myth, indeed a myth about modernity. It may be that this aspect of the myth is especially prominent in the English-language versions; certainly, the iconoclastic and annihilating violence of Shadwell's Don John strikingly resembles the savage demystification Marx ascribes to the modern bourgeoisie:

> It has pitilessly torn asunder the motley feudal ties that bound man to his "natural superiors." . . . It has drowned the most heavenly ecstasies of religious fervor, of chivalrous enthusiasm, of Philistine sentimentalism in the icy water of egotistical calculation. . . . All that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned. . . . (Marx and Engels 9-10)

I doubt, however, that Shadwell is really unique. As Per Nykrog points out, Don Juans appeared all over Europe in about the same historical moment as the institution of the stock market (68).

Moreover, Nykrog points out that Don Juan was not the only quasi-mythical figure to appear in Europe at around the same moment (57): there was also Dr. Faustus (1587-92) and Don Quixote (1605-15); and one might add an English latecomer, Robinson Crusoe (1719), to make up Ian Watt's four "myths of modern individualism." The early modern period seems to have been unusually fertile in myths—and they are all myths about masters and servants: Dr. Faustus and Mephostophilis, Don Quixote and Sancho Panza, Don Juan and Catalinon/Sganarelle/Jacomo/Leporello, Crusoe and Friday (Watt 123). (The only later story to achieve anything like the same currency is also, in a way, the story of a master and a servant: Frankenstein and his monster [1818].)[4] One might infer from this that the advent of the capitalist order brought with it an acute set of anxieties about the relations between classes, anxieties that (judging from the continued popularity of the myths) are still with us. It seems especially unfortunate that Mandrell should have neglected this aspect of the story.

The space Mandrell devotes to the historical position of Tirso is scarcely greater than the space he devotes to a consideration of Tirso's Don Juan as an avatar of Cupid (62-64), a consideration which has, for me (despite a footnote emphasizing the importance of Cupid and Psyche for the *comedia* generally, 64n15), the effect of assimilating Don Juan to a mythological archetype (rather than of showing Tirso as modernizing

the myth, as Keats does, or as Walcott does to the myth of Don Juan). Tellingly, Mandrell refers to "Apuleius's retelling of the myth of Cupid and Psyche" (64); but Apuleius didn't retell the myth. He told it. He made it up. A recent editor of the tale notes bluntly: "The 'folktale' elements in *Cupid & Psyche* . . . are not attested in an immediately recognisable form in the extant corpus of Graeco-Roman legend and myth" (Kenney 17); he considers the story "an astonishing feat of originality" (21-22). It is another artificial myth, and if not exactly a modern one, it is determined by its own historical moment, which was, as Keats tells us, "too late for antique vows, / Too, too late for the fond believing lyre . . ." (36-37). Just as Mandrell assimilates Tirso to Apuleius, so his "retelling" assimilates Apuleius in turn to some timeless mythical archetype.

As I may not have made sufficiently clear, I have profited greatly from Mandrell's book, and I am grateful for his invitation to write this postilla, which has challenged me to think through the theoretical implications of my historical project. I only hope I can attain to a comparably broad perspective. But if I ever do, I know what I don't want to leave behind.

The University of Calgary

NOTES

[1]The theme of iconoclasm is present, though only marginally, in Walcott. The two acts of *The Joker of Seville* have epigraphs from Pound's *Pisan Cantos*: "With a painted paradise at the end of it . . ." (7) and "Without a painted paradise at the end of it . . ." (87). The movement from the presence to the absence of "a painted paradise" suggests a kind of iconoclasm. This suggestion is not present in the original, which offers the two states simply as alternatives (Pound 436).

[2]Compare Watt's account of the origins of the myth in "the transition from the social and intellectual system of the Middle Ages to the system dominated by modern individualist thought" (xii).

[3]In the Introduction to the revised edition of her book, Barrett warns, in fact, that even the "innocent little word 'today'" can occlude some important specificities (v).

[4]It may not be a coincidence that the historical moment of *Frankenstein* corresponds to the second great moment (after their Renaissance origins) in the evolution of Watts's myths of modern individualism: their "Romantic Apotheosis" (193-227).

Certainly nobody has ever thought it a coincidence that *Frankenstein* was written during the Industrial Revolution.

WORKS CITED

Baldick, Chris. *In Frankenstein's Shadow: Myth, Monstrosity, and Nineteenth-century Writing.* Oxford: Clarendon P, 1987.

Barrett, Michèle. *Women's Oppression Today: The Marxist/ Feminist Encounter.* Rev. ed. London: Verso, 1988.

Bloom, Harold. *The Western Canon: The Books and School of the Ages.* New York: Riverhead Books, 1994.

Cokain, Aston. *The Dramatic Works of Sir Aston Cokain.* Ed. James Maidment and W. H. Logan. Dramatists of the Restoration. Edinburgh: William Paterson, 1874.

Fido, Elaine Savory. "Value Judgements on Art and the Question of Macho Attitudes: The Case of Derek Walcott." *Journal of Commonwealth Literature* 21.1 (1986): 109-19.

Gilman, Ernest B. *Iconoclasm and Poetry in the English Reformation: Down Went Dagon.* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1986.

Keats, John. "Ode to Psyche." *Complete Poems.* Ed. Jack Stillinger. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1978. 275-77.

Kenney, E. J. Introduction. *Cupid & Psyche,* by Apuleius. Ed. E. J. Kenney. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990. 1-38.

Macdonald, D. L. "Derek Walcott's Don Juans." *Connotations* 4 (1994-95): 98-118.

---. "Iconoclasm and Witchcraft in *The Tragedy of Ovid.*" *Lumen* 15 (1996): forthcoming.

Mandrell, James. *Don Juan and the Point of Honor: Seduction, Patriarchal Society, and Literary Tradition.* University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1992.

Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. *Basic Writings on Politics and Philosophy.* Ed. Lewis S. Feuer. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1959.

Nykrog, Per. "The Literary Cousins of the Stock Market: On Mystification and Demystification in the Baroque Age." *Stanford French Review* 7 (1983): 57-71.

Phillips, John. *The Reformation of Images: Destruction of Art in England, 1535-1660.* Berkeley: U of California P, 1973.

Pound, Ezra. *The Cantos of Ezra Pound.* New York: New Directions, 1970.

Walcott, Derek. *The Joker of Seville and O Babylon!* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1978.

---. *Omeros.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1990.

Watt, Ian. *Myths of Modern Individualism: Faust, Don Quixote, Don Juan, Robinson Crusoe.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.

Response to D. L. Macdonald's "Postilla":
The One and the Same Redux*

JAMES MANDRELL

"You say eether and I say eyether . . . ."[1]

> The distance between Mandrell's position and my own has to do, I think, both
> with subject matter and approach. ("A Postilla")[2]

D. L. Macdonald is scrupulously correct in his account of the circum-
stances that have brought us together in the pages of *Connotations*. I am
grateful that my inability to find an opening in his article on Derek
Walcott's Don Juans—my blindness, if you will—did not prevent
Macdonald from creating the possibility for his own insightful remarks
on my version of Don Juan as set forth in my book *Don Juan and the
Point of Honor*. While reading and rereading Macdonald's article I had
the niggling feeling that I should be able to formulate a pithy
commentary of the analysis, but I couldn't put my finger on what was
troubling me. Now Macdonald's "Postilla" and his engagement with
me make clear the direction in which I should proceed in my response,
since the "Postilla" in essence provides the conceptual underpinnings
for the study of Walcott and for Macdonald's future work on Don Juan,
as is duly noted: "this postilla . . . has challenged me to think through
the theoretical implications of my historical project." It is in the
"theoretical implications," not surprisingly, that I find the entrée for
which I was initially left searching.

Indeed, the notion of "theory" or the "theoretical" is critical for
Macdonald's understanding of his work and mine. After rehearsing a
number of differences in "subject matter," Macdonald draws what is

---

*Reference: D. L. Macdonald, "Derek Walcott's Don Juans," *Connotations* 4.1-2
(1994/95) 98-118, and "Derek Walcott's Don Juans: A Postilla," *Connotations* 6.1
(1996/97): 103-10.

for him a central distinction between his project on English-language versions of Don Juan and my book dealing with Spanish versions. Whereas my "approach" is avowedly theoretical, Macdonald's is primarily historical: "My intention . . . is precisely to write a history of English-language Don Juans." Yet there is more, I think, to Macdonald's articulation of difference—a key concept for him—than initially meets the eye.

I have to admit that I was immediately suspicious when Macdonald began to catalog the different "emphases" to be found in our approaches to Don Juan. After all, if the theory of Don Juan that I elucidate is valid in a general and not merely a particular sense, it should prove useful not only for understanding Don Juan in Spain but for Macdonald's work on English-language Don Juans, too. Still, Macdonald finds a number of differences. Among the more notable, and for me more curious, are first, my "emphasis on the continuity of literary history" as opposed to his "emphasis on the discontinuity of literary history"; and second, that, "according to Mandrell, Tirso and his successors show that women are *only* being oppressed in new ways; according to me, they show that women (and men) are being oppressed in *new* ways" (emphasis in the original). Clearly, for Macdonald the key terms here are "continuity," "discontinuity," "only," and "new." But from my perspective, and from that of my book, the most important words are "continuity" and the peculiar locution "women (and men)."

Before I continue to sketch out my disagreements with Macdonald—and they are substantial—I need to acknowledge where I think he makes a genuine contribution to discussions of Don Juan. First and foremost, Macdonald deserves credit for making explicit the inclusion of Walcott's *The Joker of Seville* (1974) and *Omeros* (1990) in the canon of texts treating the *burlador* [trickster or joker]. Many critics have remarked on the absence of modern and contemporary Don Juans in literary—but not critical or theoretical—texts. Macdonald has shown that the literary tradition of this character extends not from the sixteenth century to the early-twentieth century but, in fact, to the mid- and late-twentieth century. Moreover, the inclusion of Walcott's texts foregrounds the crucial issues of colonialism and class, topics that are all too often left to one side. Finally, by bringing up colonialism and

class, Macdonald reintroduces the importance of the particularity of history, a putative lacuna in my own study that Macdonald proposes to rectify in his work on English-language Don Juans.

That said, and despite Macdonald's averral that he has "profited greatly" from my book, it seems to me that Macdonald has ignored one of the principal lines of argumentation in *Don Juan and the Point of Honor*, as I shall try to demonstrate.

"It was *déjà vu* all over again."[3]

> Mandrell's emphasis on seduction suggests an emphasis on the continuity of literary history: not only is the story of Don Juan about the oppression of women, it perpetuates this oppression, and it tends to seduce later authors and critics into doing the same (268). His discussion of the statue in *Don Juan Tenorio* lays the same emphasis on sameness and continuity . . . . ("A Postilla")

In the first full chapter in my book on Don Juan, I explore the ways in which Don Juan has been discussed, particularly those treatments that turn on the designation of his story as a "myth." What I discern in the various studies I cite is that an appeal to "an ahistorical and temporal category [such as] myth allows the critic to avoid all issues of writing and rewriting, as well as specific texts, in the search for either the so-called *original* Don Juan or *real meaning* of the story" (38). The end result of this appeal is a scheme in which "interpretations become ideological recapitulations." Ultimately, I admit that, "depending on how myth is defined, Don Juan is or is not a mythical figure" (40), meaning that Don Juan could indeed be a sort of "modern myth," as Macdonald argues in his "Postilla." But I go on to suggest that it is both more interesting and more useful to read Don Juan in terms of Marcel Detienne's notion of a "mythography," the writing of or on myth; all of the versions of Don Juan's story that we discuss are, in fact, written versions, since there is no originary oral tale that would qualify as a myth in its usual definition. This allows us to dispense with questions of the origins of Don Juan's story or some originary version to deal with the textual evidence and the meaning that it bears, all without having recourse to some unknown and, more likely, unknowable prior version. Moreover,

if we follow Claude Lévi-Strauss' view of myth—and it is curious that, even without direct mention, Macdonald seems to concur with Lévi-Strauss' student Roland Barthes with respect to modern myths but not to heed the words of the teacher as regards myth in general—, we recognize that, in spite of myth's startling propensity to change, it essentially remains constant throughout cultures and time, as does, I assert, much of the criticism relating to Don Juan and, indeed, the story of Don Juan itself.[4]

This is why the title of the first chapter of my book is "The One and the Same: Meaning and the Critical Myth of Don Juan." By reading the critical and literary treatments of the *burlador* through Lévi-Strauss as well as Jacques Derrida's reading of Jacques Lacan's reading of Edgar Allan Poe's "The Purloined Letter," I conclude that "Don Juan's story is an exceptionally powerful one, not only seductive in its ability to engender commentary, but also surprisingly preemptive in its capacity to control what would pass as explanation and analysis" (47). The interpretations of literary versions of Don Juan become yet other versions, in essence perpetuating the tradition of the character. We are therefore dealing not with "one" and "another," or "an other," but "one" and "the same."

I stress this point in order to disclose what, in at least one sense, is at the root of Macdonald's disagreement with the argument of my book: that I find in the various stories of Don Juan a constant and continuity and do not see the literature dealing with this character as evidencing few similarities or as somehow discontinuous. Macdonald is not the first to have given voice to this criticism, but its mention in the present context is neither as simple nor as insignificant as Macdonald might want to think. To be sure, where I see similarities, another reader might find difference, which merely means that, in any discussion of a character, concept, or trope and its deployment or development through time, I will privilege similarities over differences, since, I fear that if the differences are too great, what few unifying threads that serve to tie the discussion together will prove irrelevant. If this causes my approach to be marked as transhistorical or, worse yet, ahistorical, so be it.

However, Macdonald's distinction overlooks the fact that similarity and difference are central to my discussion of Don Juan, warranting an

entire chapter in *Don Juan and the Point of Honor* in which the multiple lines of argumentation are drawn together in terms of social principles and principles of exchange as they are implicated in Don Juan's story. As should by now be obvious, in my view Don Juan serves as a means of articulating the ties that bind a social and cultural community as well as a principle of differentiation with respect to gender and class. When Don Juan is drawn into critical and theoretical considerations, he becomes the embodiment of "the structuring as binary opposition that characterizes both the literary and critical treatments of the *burlador*" (*Don Juan and the Point of Honor* 268), the possibility expressed by the very title of and explored in Søren Kierkegaard's treatise on seduction and Don Juan, *Either/Or*.[5]

We will have occasion to return to the issue of my insistence on continuity in my treatment of Don Juan and its pertinence to the present discussion. More immediately significant in Macdonald's passing reference to the question of myth is the sense of *déjà vu* it provokes, both in terms of my book and in terms of the perspective from which I respond to Macdonald. As Macdonald points out, my book concludes that Don Juan and treatments of his story represent the ongoing hegemony of patriarchy. Although my hope was that the critical stance articulated in my study would allow it to escape inclusion in that hegemonic discourse—I suggest that it may be possible "to speak of Don Juan without resurrecting his seductive ways" (281)—I'm now more or less certain that the truth is otherwise. I do, however, remain convinced that I shifted the terms of the discussion in a way that is apparently discomfiting to many critics and therefore liable to correction. In this regard, Macdonald appears to execute what Harold Bloom might term a corrective swerve: Macdonald returns discussion to those timeworn topics whose absence he laments in my study, to wit, "Don Juan's relations with men," i.e., with his servant and with the Statue. It is as if Macdonald were writing *before* me or as if my book served as only a negative example of what *not* to say about Don Juan.[6] In this view of things, it really is *déjà vu* all over again, or "The One and the Same Redux."

"Cherchez la femme!"[7]

> Discussing Don Juan as a seducer means concentrating on his relations with
> women; concentrating on Don Juan and the statue means concentrating on
> Don Juan's relations with other men. ("A Postilla")

As a first step in my reading of Macdonald, allow me to trace the notion
of "woman" or "the feminine" through his article and "A Postilla." In
"Derek Walcott's Don Juans," women in *The Joker of Seville* and *Omeros*
serve chiefly to further the connection between the female and natural
bodies, between women and landscapes. Through this identification,
the traditional Homeric tale in *Omeros* is linked to the story of Don Juan:
the "topos [of woman-as-landscape] affects the portrayal of virtually
every woman in the poem [*Omeros*], and it is crucial to integrating the
allusions to Odysseus, who travels from land to land, with those to Don
Juan, who travels from woman to woman" ("Derek Walcott's Don Juans"
109). Yet, as Macdonald points out, the association of the female body
with the landscape is a commonplace not only in Walcott's *oeuvre*—"Don
Juan accomplishes his mission on a woman's body, much as Columbus,
in [Walcott's] *Midsummer*, accomplishes his on a feminized landscape"
("Derek Walcott's Don Juans" 105)—but belongs "to a sexism as old
as Judeo-Christianity and also to a more recent, imperialist tradition:
as Mary Louise Pratt has shown, the (typically male) European traveller
on the frontier typically thinks of himself as an Adam in a garden which
is itself his Eve" ("Derek Walcott's Don Juans" 109). In this way, Walcott
participates in a general cultural misogyny (I would have referred to
it as the discourse of patriarchy) and his works become part of that
tradition.

This, of course, is Elaine Savory Fido's position, which Macdonald
rejects, claiming "I think she [Fido] is wrong to suppose that Walcott
endorses it [misogyny]. Instead, he suggests that Don Juan's disgust
at the vagina, his sense of it as a grave, is essentially a reflection of his
self-disgust, his sense of the phallus as a corpse" ("Derek Walcott's Don
Juans" 101). Yet the darker side of the connection between the female
and natural bodies remains lurking in Macdonald's article; the
identification of the vagina as a grave, a culturally prevalent if not
innocent notion, does not disappear with this brief mention but is

trumped by the "sinister trope" in *The Joker of Seville* of identifying "Isabella's sexual desire with the Cyclops' cannibalism" ("Derek Walcott's Don Juans" 99).

If female desire and sexuality in Walcott presage death and destruction, it nonetheless falls to woman, at least in *The Joker of Seville*, to allude to the possibility of some form of redemption and renewal. At the level of culture, Macdonald points to the "exuberant celebration of Trinidadian music, dance, and sports like stick-fighting" ("Derek Walcott's Don Juans" 106); as for the personal, it is in Isabella who suggests "the play's hope for the future." Despite, then, the negative aspects of woman found in Walcott and voiced by Macdonald, a woman allows for the future. What we find in "Derek Walcott's Don Juans," is a coherent—and, for stories of Don Juan, an almost predictable—presentation of the role of the feminine and its importance in *The Joker of Seville* and *Omeros*.

The same cannot be said of "A Postilla." Where I attempted in *Don Juan and the Point of Honor* to turn discussions of Don Juan away from the Statue, from the second part of the traditional story, to seduction, the first part, Macdonald proposes to address again the notion of relations among men. Thus, woman disappears almost entirely from Macdonald's view of Don Juan, to be replaced by a concern for relations between and among men: between and among male characters, between and among male authors, between and among male authors and critics, between and among male critics, *inter alia*. This is similar, I think, to Macdonald's suggestion in the "Postilla" apropos of *Omeros* that "the male rivals, Hector and Achille, are much more interesting than Helen, the object of their rivalry." Or, as I say in *Don Juan and the Point of Honor* in the context of the nineteenth-century novel *La Regenta*, by Leopoldo Alas or "Clarín," "the function of woman . . . is to exist as the necessary yet secondary element in an equation involving three terms: to exist between two men, between families, between and author and the literary text. Woman is always the projection of masculine desire and in service to that projection" (160). All of which means that the discussion of women in the article "Derek Walcott's Don Juans" becomes the *pretext for* and *prologue to* the "Postilla" and a discussion of relations among men in English-language versions of Don Juan's story.

"On ne tarde pas à trouver l'homme."[8]

> If I am really following the lead of the English-language versions in this regard,
> perhaps they will turn out to be even more preoccupied with masculinity than
> Mandrell's Spanish-language versions. . . . Or the preoccupation may simply
> be my own. ("A Postilla")

Perhaps it is not remarkable that the focus shifts from the article to the "Postilla," from a more specific discussion of Don Juan in Walcott's *The Joker of Seville* and *Omeros* to a general explication of the historical and cultural meaning of Don Juan as found in English-language versions of the *burlador*. Still, I would argue that where there's smoke there's fire, and that the trajectory of Macdonald's argument is meaningful. Although I wouldn't go so far as to assert that Macdonald replaces my own attempt to recuperate the feminine in Don Juan with some type of celebration of the masculine, I do think that he implicitly assumes a critical position that approximates the dynamics of my theory of Don Juan, a suggestion that Macdonald would perhaps reject out of hand.

To be sure, it really is difficult to speak of Don Juan without implicitly discussing relations among men. And despite what Macdonald would lead readers to suspect, the topic of relations between and among men runs throughout my *Don Juan and the Point of Honor*. But I don't speak of the relations between men that appear to interest Macdonald, Don Juan's relations with his servant and with the Statue. Then again, neither does Macdonald, not in "Derek Walcott's Don Juans" nor in the "Postilla."

What Macdonald does suggest in the "Postilla," by means of his critique and the catalog of differences—including the way his study would differ from mine—is precisely the type of one-ups-manship that I suggest is at work in the story of Don Juan. The agonistic dimensions of Don Juan turn up in the earliest known version of Don Juan's story, Tirso de Molina's *El burlador de Sevilla o convidado de piedra* (c. 1630), where Don Juan is dragged to hell by the Statue. In contrast, in Zorrilla's *Don Juan Tenorio* (1844), Don Juan is saved by the love of a woman and ascends to heaven. As Macdonald would have it, via what I believe is a misreading of Chris Baldick's notion of the ways in which myth is adaptable and open "to new combinations of meaning" (4), this would

demonstrate the discontinuity at work in the story of Don Juan. I, on the other hand, would and did argue that the inversion in the endings of the two dramas marks not a difference in the story's *meaning* but is *meaningful* as regards the play of similarities and the way that Zorrilla marks his distance from Tirso. In Horatian terms, Zorrilla proves his worth by taking up the topic of Don Juan and showing how he can better a canonical author of Spain's Golden Age.

As for Macdonald, there are two ways in which the dynamics of rivalry are at work in "A Postilla" and to a lesser degree "Derek Walcott's Don Juans," first, in the types of comparisons that Macdonald draws between Walcott and other authors, and second, in his positioning of himself with regard to other critics, mainly me. With respect to the former, I don't think it's naive to detect a sense of literary rivalry, or an anxiety of influence, to use Bloom's phrase, in the discussion of the Homeric overtones in Walcott's writing. Macdonald himself indicates the extent to which such dynamics motivate his interest in the Don Juan stories with remarks such as this: "Walcott's 'Homeric parallels' are not, of course, simple or servile imitations, any more than Joyce's are. One of the ways in which Walcott asserts his independence from his Homeric material (as Joyce does) is precisely by the 'deliberate deflation of analogy'; another way is by combining it (as Joyce does) with other material, such as allusions to Tirso" ("Derek Walcott's Don Juans" 107). But Walcott's dialogue is not just with Homer. According to Macdonald and other critics, "Walcott's use of the motif of nothingness is a response to V. S. Naipaul" ("Derek Walcott's Don Juans" 104). Throughout his own reading of Walcott, Macdonald has attested to the agonistic dimensions of Walcott's versions of Don Juan's story and how these are integral to an understanding of the works as a whole.

Indeed, I wonder if an emphasis on discontinuity does not further the notion of rivalry and its importance to a study of English-language versions of Don Juan. Macdonald certainly seems to think so, even though he does not acknowledge as much. But what else are we to make of his line of argumentation in the context of a longer study? On the one hand, Macdonald claims to find male characters more interesting than female characters. On the other hand, and supposing that "the English versions are more preoccupied with power and violence than

the Spanish" texts, it comes as no surprise that Macdonald discerns through his "emphasis on the confrontation with the statue . . . an emphasis on the discontinuity of literary history."

What these claims lead to is inescapable for both Macdonald and me, but we see it in terms that are diametrically opposed. Macdonald obviously sees this sense of confrontation and difference as an example of discontinuity: "Since the canon includes all the previous versions of the Don Juan story, what the English Don Juans most conspicuously share is, paradoxically, their differences from each other, the confrontational postures that they (or rather their authors) assume towards each other." But I would and have argued that confrontation and difference are part and parcel of Don Juan as a character and of the story that contains him. If Macdonald is correct in linking masculinity to issues of violence and power—and there is clearly evidence to sustain this view—then why should we not understand Don Juan's story as exemplifying this aspect of masculinity and the confrontation between different versions as responding to the dynamics of the texts they explicate? Moreover, if Don Juan's story includes and elicits this "will to power" and if we can understand the dialogues and controversies between and among critics in this light, can't we then understand Macdonald's preoccupation with male rivals and interest in discontinuity in these same terms?

"Boys will be boys . . . ."[9]

   . . . I know what I don't want to leave behind. ("A Postilla")

Which is why I insist on the continuity of Don Juan's story and the need to recuperate the first part of the traditional story *and* on the central and not just secondary role of the feminine in my study of Spanish-language versions and my theory of Don Juan. It would be easy to speak only of Don Juan and the Statue or Don Juan and his servant, and, because "boys will be boys" and find stories about boys most interesting—and don't forget that Macdonald himself admits to a preoccupation with the male rivals—it would be even easier for us to shrug our shoulders

and pretend that it "wouldn't matter if we could only prevent girls from being girls." I believe, however, that Don Juan's story is too complex to interpret it as merely a tale of male rivalry in which the distinct versions have little to say to one another. Indeed, doesn't the fact that Macdonald and I have continued here in the pages of *Connotations* the type of rivalry found in in the different versions of Don Juan's story indicate the degree to which the story is *similar* in its many manifestations? After all, if there were nothing in common, there would be nothing to discuss. And is it insignificant that the major difference of opinion is over the relative roles of the masculine and the feminine in these stories? I rather think not.

But then again, critical trends being what they are, maybe I have seen Don Juan as an 80s kind of guy, and Macdonald is fashioning him as a man of the 90s.

<div style="text-align: right">

Brandeis University
Waltham, MA

</div>

NOTES

[1]From the song "Let's Call the Whole Thing Off," words by Ira Gershwin, music by George Gershwin. The song was written for Fred Astaire and Ginger Rogers in the 1937 film *Shall We Dance*.

[2]Citations are from Macdonald's "Postilla" published in this number of *Connotations*; when referring to the article "Derek Walcott's Don Juans," I give the title and page number.

[3]Attributed to Yogi Berra [Lawrence Peter].

[4]Lévi-Strauss claims with respect to change in the form of inversion: "Thus we arrive at a fundamental property of mythical thought . . . . When a mythical schema is transmitted from one population to another, and there exist differences in language, social organization, or way of life that make the myth difficult to communicate, it begins to become impoverished and confused. But one can find a limiting situation in which, instead of being finally obliterated by losing all its outlines, the myth is inverted and regains part of its precision" (2: 184). This *appears* to run counter to Macdonald's view of myth, at least as far as the authority he cites is concerned: "As Chris Baldick points out, 'The vitality of myths lies precisely in their capacity for change, their adaptability and openness to new combinations of meanings.'" Note that Baldick says "new combinations of meanings," which is not to say new meanings in and of themselves, as Baldick himself realizes: "A myth . . . is open to all kinds

of adaptation and elaboration, *but it will preserve at the same time a basic stability of meaning*" (2; my emphasis). In general, Baldick's is a good discussion of myth and his distinction between "myth" and "modern myth" is carefully drawn.

[5]For more on Kierkegaard in the context of my understanding of Don Juan, see *Don Juan and the Point of Honor* 2, 199-200, 213, 216, 234, 271, 281, but especially 126-27, 268-69.

[6]Bloom's ideas are too intricate to go into any detail here. Suffice it to say that he interprets literature as a confrontation between authors who attempt to deal with their "anxiety of influence." Bloom's ideas are set forth in *The Anxiety of Influence* and explained again in *A Map of Misreading*. See, too, David Fite's study of Bloom. I refer here to Bloom's notion of reversal or apophrades, in which an author triumphs by "having so stationed the precursor, in one's own work, that particular passages in *his* work seem to be not presages of one's own advent, but rather to be indebted to one's own achievement, and even (necessarily) to be lessened by one's greater splendor" (*Anxiety* 141). Bloom and the anxiety of influence figure in my own theory of Don Juan (*Don Juan and the Point of Honor* 6, 9, 46, 107 and note, 122, 228) as well as in Gustavo Pérez Firmat's reading of José Zorrilla's *Don Juan Tenorio* (*Literature and Liminality* 20-25).

[7]In *Les Mohicans de Paris*, Alexandre Dumas (père) writes:

   Jackal.—Il y a une femme dans toutes les affaires; aussitôt qu'on me fait un rapport, je dis: "Cherchez la femme!" On cherche la femme, et quand la femme est trouvée . . .

   Mme. Desmarets.—Eh bien!

   Jackal.—On ne tarde pas à trouver l'homme.

[8]See previous note.

[9]From Anthony Hope's *The Dolly Dialogues*. The entire quotation reads: "'There's no sin in a little betting, my dear. Boys will be boys—' 'And even that,' I interposed, "wouldn't matter if we could only prevent girls from being girls'" (Chapter 15).

D. L. Macdonald's "Derek Walcott's Don Juans": Walcott's Debt to Tirso de Molina*

RAYMOND CONLON

After many years as a hispanist teaching in an English department I have come to the somewhat disturbing conclusion that the literature of Spain is too often disregarded by students of other European languages or literatures. Surprisingly little interest is roused by any Spanish writer other than Cervantes and García Lorca (who too would probably be unknown but for his violent death and its political implications) and, strangely enough, scholars of the Elizabethan stage take little notice of Spain's coeval Golden Age drama, even though this theatrical efflorescence produced thousands of plays and exerted a pervasive and profound effect on the revered French classical theatre. Little known even to many of those who teach him in his nineteenth and twentieth century English incarnations is the Spanish genesis of the most famous figure to emerge from that tradition—Don Juan. D. L. Macdonald's essay is perhaps a first step towards a long overdo critical evaluation of the importance of Tirso on the Don Juan figure in the English tradition.

It seems unlikely that the ur-Don Juan play, *El burlador de Sevilla* by Tirso de Molina (Gabriel Tellez, 1580?-1648), should remain largely unexplored by scholars of English literature. But this is, indeed, the case. The field is almost completely open, and I will take the opportunity of this response to show that Tirso's play can provide some useful insights into the reason why its swashbuckling protagonist is so psychologically and dramaturgically agile that he can vault over the barriers of language and culture into the literary traditions of England and America, as well

---

*Reference: D. L. Macdonald, "Derek Walcott's Don Juans," *Connotations* 4.1-2 (1994/95): 98-118.

as so many others. To know what the original Don Juan is a reader acquainted with him only from his non-Spanish descendants ought to know what he is not. He is not, first of all, a prodigious lover. While the conquests of Mozart's Don Giovanni are so numerous that his capacity to recall them attests as much to his extraordinary memory ("Ma in Spagna son gia mille e tre") as to his ability to achieve them does his remarkable virility, Tirso's Don Juan seduces only three or at most four women (one triumph being controversial). Second, the manner of his "seductions" does not bring Don Juan enormous erotic credit, since all but one are effected by impersonating other men, the lovers of his "conquests," the men they really desire. Third, he is not a sensualist: Indeed, inasmuch as he articulates no keen physical desire for women, why he bothers with sex at all is a central question of the play. Fourth, he does not appear to be a misogynist (although this is a popular explanation for his seductions); at any rate, he does not say anything explicitly hostile about women, and his *burlas*, his sexual pranks (*burlar* means to joke at the expense of someone else) are directed as much at the lovers of the ladies he seduces as the women themselves. Finally, except arrogance, Don Juan seems to boast few human traits at all: Nothing he says suggests that he possesses any interiority.[1]

Leaving his protagonist hollow, denying him revealing soliloquies which would force us to concentrate on the motives for Don Juan's actions, Tirso de Molina, a Mercederian monk, in a theological play justifying damnation, compels us to focus on the actions themselves, their moral implications, and their infernal consequences. As to what Don Juan is psychologically (as opposed to morally), why he does what he does, Tirso allows others—his readers and his successors—to fill in and shape the empty mold as they will, color it as they wish, to create, in effect, their own conception of Don Juan.

A reader of Professor Macdonald's "Derek Walcott's Don Juans" soon realizes that the Nobel Laureate from Trinidad in *The Jokester of Seville* has created a Don Juan very much in the spirit—and often in details—of Tirso's Don Juan. Macdonald explicitly traces several of the dominant strains in Walcott's Don Juan directly from Tirso; other Tirsian qualities can be inferred from Macdonald's discussion.

No less a trait than the one which defines Walcott's Don Juan, for example, is first found in the Don Juan of *El burlador de Sevilla*. The egoistic isolation of Walcott's protagonist, the basic condition of his existence, which makes him "a nobody" whose "name is Nobody," is little more than a variation of the puerile selfishness of Tirso's Don Juan which renders him "a man without a name." Macdonald's observation about Walcott's protagonist is equally true of Tirso's: "Insofar as a man's identity is based on his relationships—on his being a husband, father, or son—then Don Juan, who repeatedly violates the loyalties that relationships depend on, is not a man" (99). Thus both figures are "nobodies."

A subtlety that plays a conspicuous role in Walcott's work concerning the relationship of Don Juan and the men he cuckolds also derives from the original Don Juan play. In both works, contrary to appearances, common sense and his own wishes, Don Juan is not the victimizer of these men. In Walcott and Tirso apparent male victims and their apparent victimizer engage in an unconscious conspiracy: Don Juan is the agent of their sexual malice. Walcott's Don Juan, in Macdonald's words, "acts out" (100) the inner desires of at least one of his male victims. He is a "wild card that can imitate any of the other cards but has no identity of its own" (105). Thus the cuckolds and Don Juan, according to Macdonald, are "mirror image[s]" (101) of one another. Tirso's Don Juan humiliates the *burlados'* women sexually as they (the male "victims") fear they will be sexually humiliated by their mistresses. The *Burlador*, in effect, makes pre-emptive strikes on their behalf. Additionally, these "surrenders" to Don Juan Tenorio by their mistresses offer these misogynists a psychological comfort: Such feminine "perfidy" reifies their vision of womankind as treacherous and lascivious.

The most bizarre element of the reaction to women by Walcott's protagonist—his morbidity—also has its roots in *El burlador de Sevilla*. Walcott's Don Juan sees death in female sexuality, identifying the female organ with the grave. This death's head view of sex is traceable to a passage in Tirso (though Macdonald does not say so) where Don Juan expatiates on the decaying conditions of prostitutes—their diseases and the slow, degrading ways they die. Walcott, it appears, seizes on the

psychological possibilities of this highly unusual "interest" in Tirso's Don Juan and fleshes it out into a trait in his own character.

This "fleshing out" here points to the fundamental difference between the Don Juans of Walcott and Tirso and a contradiction in Macdonald's analysis. The "interest" of Tirso's Don Juan reflects a sexual cruelty in the culture, but does not come from—indeed could not come from—the coreless *Burlador*. Clearly Walcott's Don Juan is not quite the wild card Macdonald says he is, since the character has feelings of his own, is not, like Tirso's protagonist, an emotional chamelion who absorbs the emotional colors of others. In Macdonald's own words, Walcott's Don Juan is filled with "self-disgust" (101). Moreover, according to Macdonald, the later Don Juan's sexual pessimism ultimately stems from "his sense of the phallus as a corpse" (101). Such feelings of self-disgust and sexual despair would of course be impossible for Tirso's Don Juan, a figure truly devoid of any interiority. The difference between the two figures is a basic one. The earlier Don Juan is a character whose behavior demonstrates various evils and his end the consequence of those evils: in sum, a study of moral cause and effect—sin and consequent damnation for him and by implication for the society whose corruption he symbolizes. The Don Juan of Walcott, on the other hand, is at least a somewhat more realized character, a "personality" with some intrinsic interest.

Because of the sexual hostility in their Don Juan plays Walcott and Tirso share an unhappy likeness: They are misinterpreted. Both are wrongly accused of writing misogynic plays. Macdonald denies this reading of Walcott. Don Juan's hostile equation of the female organ and the grave—the most extreme expression of his feelings about women—Macdonald explains, is not a position of the author (an "endorsement" [101]) but, as already mentioned, "a reflection of [Don Juan's] self-disgust" (101). In Tirso the misogynist misreading is so widespread as to be a received truth.[2] Equating *El burlador de Sevilla's* theme with the feelings of its principal character, however, overlooks two important facts: 1. the play's attitude towards Don Juan—one of unrelieved disdain; 2. the fact that Don Juan's damnation is clearly a just punishment for, among other sins, his cruel treatment of women.

In his discussions of how Tirso's Don Juan and Walcott's resemble one another and the general influence of *El burlador* on *The Jokester*, Macdonald's observations have firm textual grounding. Less securely linked to Tirso's text are his comments on the influence of *El burlador* on Walcott's *Omeros*. He declares the verse novel to be "an extension of the Creolization of *The Jokester of Seville*" (106-7), formed by the "weav[ing] of Tirsonian [sic] allusions" (106). To document Tirso's influence in *Omeros*, he points out that it contains a reminder of the statue of Don Gonzalo who pulls Tirso's Don Juan into hell: a "spectator [who is] a statue, in fact a marble bust of Omeros himself" (108). The presence of this statue, Macdonald claims, "marks a love scene [and, presumably, by implication the work as a whole] as specifically Don Juanesque . . ." (108). True, a statue is central to Tirso's play, and if this Walcott work contained other Tirsian traits, the verse novel could be legitimately considered Donjuanesque.

The evidence Macdonald adduces, however, to support this claim is not quite sufficient. He sees the two protagonists linked by mutual sexual incompetence. Tirso's Don Juan, however, though not a prodigious lover on the scale of Don Giovanni, is not a sexual fumbler; indeed he is effective. His seduction of Tisbea, a fishergirl, which does not entail an impersonation, establishes this. Thus, while it is true that his impersonations somehow mitigate his sexual accomplishments, he is an imposter not out of sexual necessity but because *burlas* involving impersonation are doubly effective—humiliating both the *burlados* as well as their women.

Macdonald also links the poet figure from *Omeros* with the Don Juan of *El burlador* on the grounds that Tirso's Don Juan, like Walcott's figure, has been "ironized" (108) and the "ironizing of the irresistible seducer" (108) has been a common feature of the Don Juan tradition since the time of Mozart. Here he is on rather weak ground. More to the point, the ground is shifting, from Tirso's Don Juan to the Don Juan tradition generally, which often created Don Juans quite different from the original. Whatever other ways Tirso punishes Don Juan he does not "ironize" him—indeed the sort of ironization of the Don Juan figure (one implying trivialization or poking fun at) we associate with some

later Don Juans would seem to be at odds with the somber religious message of the play.

Finally, according to Macdonald, Walcott's Don Juan-like figure in *Omeros*, the poet, resembles Tirso's Don Juan because the sexuality of the two figures is "identified with violence" (112). The scene from *El burlador de Sevilla* which he uses to substantiate this charge of violent sexuality, however, contains no sexual violence; nor is there a hint of sexual violence in any other scene. Moreover, for Tirso's Don Juan to employ violence to achieve his sexual ends would be at odds with his basic prankish character, one which demonstrates its superiority over others by besting them, often fooling them in such a way that they do not know they have been fooled.

In addition to saying that I found Macdonald's essay an insightful discussion of the influence of Tirso on Walcott I would make two closing points on the works he consulted in preparing it. The first is that Macdonald has not consulted any of the numerous studies of Tirso which have lately appeared in English. The second is a suggestion relating to the translation of Tirso's play used in this piece. While Roy Campbell's *The Jokester of Seville* is justified here because it was probably the translation Walcott used when he wrote the works under discussion, any prospective student of the Don Juan figure should know that since Walcott wrote his *The Jokester of Seville* and *Omeros*, other, far more accurate and poetic translations than Campell's unreliable and wooden one, have appeared, like those by Lynne Alvarez and Gwynne Edwards.

<div style="text-align:right">

Saint Peter's College
Jersey City, NJ

</div>

NOTES

[1] For a developed discussion of this interpretation of Don Juan, see Conlon, "Batricio" and "The burlador."

[2] Indeed an essay declaring *El buraldor* a work of a "serious misogynist" (Lundelius 13) was pronounced the "best" discussion of women in the play (Singer 67).

WORKS CITED

Conlon, Raymond. "Batricio in *El burlador de Sevilla*: The Pathology of Sexual Honor." *Tirso's Don Juan: The Metamorphosis of a Theme*. Ed. George E. Gingras and Josep Sola-Sole. Washington, D. C.: Catholic UP, 1988: 86-94.

---. "The burlador and the burlados: A Sinister Connection." *BCom* 42 (1990): 5-22.

Lundelius, Ruth. "Tirso's View of Women in *El burlador de Sevilla*." *BCom* 21 (1975): 5-13.

Macdonald, D. L. "Derek Walcott's Don Juans." *Connotations* 4 (1994-95): 98-118.

Singer, Armand. E. "Don Juan's Women in *El burlador de Sevilla*." *BCom* 33 (1981): 67-71.

Comparing the Trickster in a Postmodern Post-Colonial Critical World*

CAROL LAZZARO-WEIS

In his introduction to a collection of essays on Mozart's *Don Giovanni*, Jonathan Miller points out that the first problem a producer has to face when staging Mozart's opera is one of classification:

> With its perplexing alternations of farce and ferocity, natural comedy and gothic horror, it is notoriously hard to achieve dramatic consistency. The producer is often left with the paralysing conviction that he has failed to identify the framework within which these discrepancies of tone might otherwise be reconciled.[1]

The problem of how to classify Don Juan, however, is not reserved for producers of Mozart's opera. Throughout the long tradition of the legendary trickster and seducer's reincarnations, critics—academic, religious, political and otherwise—have had difficulty determining whether Juan is a hero or a fool, a revolutionary or a hypocritical coward. This is so because if one looks at the tradition in its European context only two constants emerge: Juan's ambiguous attitudes toward death and his relationship to burlesque comedy.[2] Don Juan's emergence as hero in Mozart's play established a heroic position in the face of death. Romantics continued to reinterpret Don Juan as the conqueror of various repressed fears and redeemed him from eternal damnation by endowing him with a moment of self-consciousness. On the comic side, critical parodies and *Stoffparodien* such as Max Frisch's *Don Juan oder die Liebe zur Geometrie* continue to burlesque elements of this long and rich literary myth.

Although D. L. Macdonald's article on Derek Walcott's Don Juans is not primarily concerned with problems of classification these same

---

*Reference: D. L. Macdonald, "Derek Walcott's Don Juans," *Connotations* 4.1-2 (1994/95): 98-118.

problems emerge under a different guise. Macdonald rephrases the hero or buffoon debate in terms of trickster and joker. Don Juan is not the West Indian folk hero trickster as some critics maintain, but rather a joker, "a wild card that can imitate any of the other cards but has no identity of his own" (105). Macdonald as critic walks the same tightrope between colonial and post-colonial theory as the author of the plays he studies. To justify his navigation of the many Western themes in Walcott's plays he calls Walcott a post-colonial writer, that is one who does not think in terms of reified polarities, or practices the us-versus-them rhetoric of blame.[3] In his opinion, Walcott appropriates or "creolizes" themes to make them speak in his voice. Walcott's Juans in *The Joker of Seville* and *Omeros* are empty, obsessively unscrupulous figures who, through a series of references to Western literature and native traditions critically expose European decadence and imperialism while at the same time they burlesque the poet's imitative and potentially collaborative self.

Post-colonial theory and women and gender studies are the two main fields which, according to Susan Bassnett, are replacing the discipline of comparative literature in the West.[4] Comparative literature, although conceived as an antinationalistic enterprise seeking to minimize differences among cultures and universalize the meaning of literary texts, has been faulted for practicing its own type of cultural colonialism that promoted likeness to its European origins and stifled the study of other literatures. Ironically, as Bassnett points out, the term comparative literature is still used in the Third World and the Far East to designate departments that study their own native literature. Some theorists blame comparative literature's identity crisis in the West on thematic studies which tended to emphasize a bogus sameness and universality with European texts at the center. According to Bassnett, however, the study of themes continues unabated in "areas of work defined under other headings than that of 'comparative literature,' such as post-colonial studies and gender studies (116).[5]

It is precisely over a theme that gender and post-colonial studies engage in a collision course in Macdonald's article. Aware of feminist scholarship that has concentrated on the misogyny of Walcott's images of women and their anatomy, Macdonald argues that these references are part of a vast network of borrowed images and references which represent Juan's

sense of self-disgust, "his sense of the phallus as a corpse (101)." Yet, paradoxically, these plays are concerned with the creation of an identity and a literature. If in *The Joker of Seville* Juan is a zero "who turns people into nothings (105)" like himself, in the poem *Omeros*, the wandering poet-Juan is redeemed by a last-minute act of self-accusation which here translates into recognition of and acceptance of complicity with the West and the part of himself formed by the western statues.

Feminist/female reactions to Juan also seem to have followed a colonial, post-colonial trajectory. For Elizabeth Hardwick, Don Juan is an incongruous buffoon who is only saved from ridicule by two actions: the killing of Anna's father and Elvira's (or any other woman's) love for him.[6] George Sand in her 1833 text *Lélia* had already refuted the "tragic" interpretation that women could tame the eternal seducer by redeeming him. As her protagonist states in a lecture on the true significance of Don Juan, God punished Don Juan to avenge his female victims. Women should undertake to umask the nothingness Juan and his promises represent instead of adopting the stance of the *donna abbandonata* and thereby facilitating Juan's next reincarnation.

Not all feminist/female critics see women in general as inevitable victims of Juan's philandering emptiness. Shoshana Felman reads the Don Juan myth as the key to understanding the confrontation of Benveniste's modern linguistics which still insists on determinate meanings in language with what may broadly be termed the "postmodern philosophy of language." Don Juan is a catalyst figure she employs to determine the similarities in the enterprise of two seemingly opposing philosophers of language, J. L. Austin and Jacques Lacan. Likewise, Julia Kristeva uses Juan to underline and explain continuity in Christianity's repression of erotism and the theories this repression produced.[7] Both readings deal with female complicity with an ambiguous hero/buffoon to show how similarity can become a critical tool to explain difference.

At first glance, it would seem that Hardwick and Sand's recommendations motivate the treatment of the Don Juan theme by prominent Italian feminist critic, novelist and playwright Dacia Maraini. However, through a network of references to both the tradition and its many interpretations, Maraini uses the work to effect a critique of "patriarchal" power on mythical, socio-political, economic and psychological levels.[8] In her 1976

play, Maraini's Juan is a leftist radical who convinces Elvira to kill her socialist-turned-fascist dictator father who had shown her the only tenderness she had known as a child. She then has to watch the endless parade of women seduced by Juan out of habit as part of his battle against the meaningless void of life and death. By collaborating with the killing of her father, Elvira both perpetuates the legacy of a violent mother and establishes her resemblance to Juan's mother whose fear of losing her son and desire to realize her own ambitions through him had caused the latter to become both literally and figuratively "a devourer of women." The theme of Don Juan also structures Maraini's 1984 novel *Il treno per Helsinki*. Narrator Armida is hopelessly entangled with a leftist student rebel Miele. Armida finally abandons the unfaithful Miele when she realizes how his powerful yet empty rhetoric continues to reinforce her preconceptions of women's inferiority and subservient nature. However here, the theoretical gaze of Armida allows her, like Walcott's poet, to enact a limited healing process as a result of the self-confrontation with the emptiness of Juan.

In arguing that the study of the literary representation of named personages is still a fruitful area for comparatists, Siegbert Prawer states such a study should focus not only on pointing out how a theme might appear and disappear across cultures as part of a study of literary history but how it could help to analyze why that process might have taken place.[9] Macdonald's analysis shows how Walcott's confrontation with Don Juan is part of a process of self-confrontation and accusation which results in a certainly partial and limited, "healing of the wounds created by history (116)." This way he is able to escape the predictable nihilism of Juan's actions which admirers and denigrators alike imitate. Likewise, Maraini not only deflates the desolate seducer but through the analysis of female fascination with masculine symbols of power and language creates an aesthetic that was not supposed to exist independently rather than bemoaning its suppression.

A truly comparative study of themes would not aim to list similarities although Maraini's Juans are formed by the same myths of power and domination (here translated into dependency and belonging) that have kept the seducer alive in the first place. Both works review the encounter with Juan in philosophical, psychological, political and historical terms specific to their own experience and aims. However, such a study would

assist the process of interdisciplinary debate on the critical level. If the "radical" reassessment of Western cultural models at present being undertaken in gender and cultural studies is to avoid the same self-promoting and resultant self-absorption of the field they are replacing, there needs to be more transfer and interdisciplinary exchange among these evolving fields. Comparative thematic studies would not only promote avenues for that kind of transfer but would also provide contexts for analyzing diversity and similarity in terms other than us-versus-them.

Southern University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

NOTES

[1]Jonathan Miller (ed.), *Don Giovanni: Myths of Seduction and Betrayal* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1990).

[2]Carol Lazzaro-Weis, "Parody and Farce in the Don Juan Myth in the Eighteenth Century," *Eighteenth Century Life* 3.3 (1983): 35-48. In studying the continuation of the theme in Italian and French versions in the eighteenth century, I argued that the Italian and French burlesque versions of Juan effected a parody of the Church's traditional teachings on death and eternal damnation.

[3]On post-colonial theory see Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993). See also Homi Bhabha, *Nation and Narration* (London: Routledge, 1990) and *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994).

[4]Susan Bassnett, *Comparative Literature: A Critical Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993): "Comparative literature as a discipline has had its day. Cross-cultural work in women's studies, in post-colonial theory, in cultural studies has changed the face of literary studies generally (161)."

[5]Clayton Koelb and Susan Noakes (eds.), *The Comparative Perspective on Literature: Approaches to Theory and Practice* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1988). Quoted in Bassnett 115. Koelb and Noakes emphasize the importance of the relationship in these fields between literary theory and comparative study and they assume that the study of movements and themes has moved into the background.

[6]Elizabeth Hardwick, "Seduction and Betrayal," *New York Book Review*, May 31, 1973. "Seduction may be baneful, even tragic, but the seducer at work is essentially comic."

[7]Shoshana Felman, *Le scandale du corps parlant: Don Juan avec Austin, ou la séduction en deux langues* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1980). Julia Kristeva, "Don Juan ou aimer pouvoir," *Histoires d'amour* (Paris: Deoel, 1983) 187-201.

[8]See Carol Lazzaro-Weis, "The Subject's Seduction: The Experience of Don Juan in Italian Feminist Fictions," *Annali d'italianistica* 7 (1989): 382-93.

[9]Siegbert Prawer, *Comparative Literary Studies: An Introduction* (London: Duckworth, 1973).