

ALE WIVES, OLD WIVES, WIDOWS AND WITCHES: THE OLDER WOMAN IN ENGLISH RENAISSANCE LITERATURE

Patricia Shaw
University of Oviedo. Spain

It is the object of this paper to analyse and evaluate the rôle and function of the older woman in English literary writings of the Renaissance period, that is to say, in works written approximately between 1500 and 1625. The theme is related to other studies of the present writer, dedicated to the same end, but dealing with the earlier periods of Old and Middle English Literature¹. It may be of some interest, I believe, to see to what extent the rôles played by the older woman in the Renaissance period coincide with our findings referred to the earlier literature, or to what extent there are innovations or amplifications thereof in a period obviously much shorter, but on the other hand, undeniably much richer in literary manifestations of all kinds, and in fiction, and in the drama in particular.

First of all, however, we must define what we mean by “older woman”, which is, indeed, a loose term, age, of course, being an extremely relative concept in the history of mankind. The rôle, for example, played by Lady Capulet in Shakespeare’s play has not been taken into consideration because on her own admission, she was brought to bed of Juliet at Juliet’s age -i.e. fourteen, and is, therefore, only twenty-eight, but, in fact, a certain flexibility would seem to be in order. What we have in mind, roughly speaking, are middle-aged women who may be wives and mothers of some

¹ Shaw, Patricia, “Loathly Ladies, Lither Ladies and Leading Ladies: the rôle of the Older Woman in Middle English Literature”, *Actas del Primer Congreso Internacional de la Sociedad Española de Lengua y Literatura Inglesa Medieval (SELIM)*. Universidad de Oviedo (1989); and id., “Monster-Mothers and Minster-Mothers: the rôle of the Older Woman in Anglo-Saxon Writing”, *Actas del Segundo Congreso Internacional de SELIM*. Universidad de Córdoba (1990).

years standing, and elderly to old women tending towards the “gammer” variety. In other words, women who are, generally speaking, in clear contrast to the young, marriageable or seducible heroine who has tended to occupy the forefront of imaginative literature, at least, until the twentieth century and the advent of the Mrs. Moores, the Mrs. Ramsays, or, indeed, in our day, the protagonists of novels by Fay Weldon or Margaret Drabble.

In the restricted corpus of the Anglo-Saxon period, and referring to works of pure imagination, we already find the seeds of the types of older women who make a more frequent appearance in Middle English Literature: that is to say, the hag species or “loathly lady” supremely embodied by Grendel’s mother in *Beowulf*, the “lither” or villainous older woman represented by Dionysias in the fragmentary *Apolonius of Tyre*, the licentious old bawd personified by Ælfric’s Aphrodisia, and the domineering virago exemplified by Cynewulf’s unattractive Saint Helena, without forgetting the scattered references to witches found in the *Charms*, and even in Alfred’s *Laws*. There are really no attractive literary rôles assigned to the older woman in the whole Anglo-Saxon canon.

The same may be said with regard to the Middle English period: there do not seem to be any instances of elderly women being cast in sympathetic rôles: apart from a few anodyne characters, like the Maries in the mystery plays, the older women who make their way into the literature of the period tend to fall into the above-mentioned categories of loathly ladies (in *The Wife of Bath’s Tale*, for example), lither ladies (the wicked mothers-in-law or step-mothers of the romances), lewd ladies (like Dame Siriz), or leading ladies of the domineering, hen-pecking species such as Noah’s wife, and, supremely, the Wife of Bath. With the exception of this latter, such characters really possess very little life of their own -their presence is justified in the respective works by the functions they perform *vis-à-vis* other more relevant characters: the loathly ladies are in any case really beautiful young damsels bewitched, and exist merely to put the knight’s “truth” to test, the wicked stepmothers or mothers-in-law serve to trigger off the hero or heroine’s wanderings when sent into exile, the lewd, bawdy characters like Dame Siriz are there to put some woman’s virtue on trial or to help some enamoured suitor to achieve his ends, and the viragos to give their male creators the opportunity to criticize the defects of women in general.

A tentative survey of a series of representative works of the Renaissance period proves, we believe, that on the whole, females “of a certain age”, or frankly advanced in years, continue to perform a series of unsympathetic and perfunctory rôles, the increase in number and variety of the texts, in fact lending themselves to an amplification of disagreeable literary possibilities: thus, as will be seen, the ranks of the “monstrous regiment” of hags, viragos and villainesses of the earlier literature are swollen by a further cohort of older and elderly women either given to the bottle, or to bawdry, or to both! It is perhaps worth remembering in this context, that there is a significant lack in Renaissance literature of older women performing what would obviously be one of their most sympathetic rôles -that of a daughter’s loving mother. This lack is notorious in Elizabethan and Jacobean drama and fiction, where motherless heroines abound (think of Miranda, Portia, Jessica, Beatrice, Hero, Ophelia, Isabella and Mariana, Rosalind and Celia, etc in the Shakespearean canon). Since the works are set in, and are a product of, a patriarchal society, the mother-figure is unnecessary, generally speaking, for the development of the plot, and, indeed, her absence gives the heroines more scope to exercise their liberty and acquire the independence which makes the English Renaissance heroine so attractive, but the fact remains that the older woman is thus deprived of the opportunity of performing a sympathetic literary rôle, a rôle, incidentally, whose possibilities are manifest, as will be seen, in the handful of examples of the mother-figure, principally mothers of *sons*, who actually *do* make their way into Renaissance literature. It is interesting to note that these mother-figures are often widows, and as such act as surrogates for the father-figure, whose functions they can assume.

A *caveat* must also be added to these observations: it is a truth universally acknowledged that vice is, from a literary point of view, far more productive and interesting than virtue: it is hardly surprising, therefore, if the *virtuous* older woman should tend to be limited to playing perfunctory rôles, however interesting or original in character she may be, or, indeed, to playing none at all -or at least, that is how things tended to be before Mrs. Moore was converted into an Indian goddess, and Mrs. Ramsay “triumphed again” at the beginning of this century. There are, obviously, exceptions: exceptions of a kind which we do not find exemplified in the earlier literature, and it will hardly come as a surprise to find Shakespeare, the “chameleon poet”, with his universal sympathy, adopting occasionally a more positive attitude to the dramatic possibilities of the virtuous member of the age-group which concerns us here.

However, before commenting on these rare instances of exemplary elderly womanhood, a look should perhaps be taken at some of the more disagreeable manifestations of the older woman which find their way into English Renaissance literature.

The tradition of the older woman as hag or loathly lady is maintained and, indeed, carried to horrific extremes in the “ribald fantasy”² *The Tunnyng of Elynour Rummyngge*, composed by Henry VIII’s poet-laureate, John Skelton, in, probably, about 1517, whilst in exile from a London menaced by an epidemic of the sweating sickness, and in conditions, therefore “very likely those in which the Decameron was born.”³ In this 624-line fabliau-like poem, written in characteristic “Skeltonics” and possibly based on an old fifteenth century poem concerning a gathering of “gosyps” similar to, one imagines, the Malmsey-drinking group that Noah’s wife is loth to leave in the Chester pageant, Skelton presents a series of memorable vignettes, a veritable rogues’ gallery of repulsive female portraits, *habituées* of the tavern (the “tunnyng” of the title), presided over by Elynour Rummyngge, a *vetula* of “lothely lere” (l. 12), “well worne in age” (l. 8), who is a virago, witch and loathly lady all rolled into one, for “The devyl and she be syb” (l. 100).

When it comes to offering a physical description of Elynour and her commères, Skelton truly outgowers Gower and it is obvious that these repulsive old women, based though they may be on the real life clientèle of such sordid dens as “The Running Horse” tavern at Leatherhad, like the “auncian dame” of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, or Elde in Chaucer’s (?) *Romaunt of the Rose*, perform an allegorical function as representations of ugliness and old age,⁴ as well as the didactic one of discouraging “amorous desire, a feature which the author stresses on more than one occasion,”⁵ by a horrific evocation of all that is most sordid and repellent

² Pollet, Maurice, *John Skelton Poet of Tudor England*. Translated by John Warrington (London: Dent, 1971) 105.

³ *Ibidem*.

⁴ As Maurice Pollet actually points out, Elynour Rummyngge is, as it were, the anti-Jane Scrope, whose praises in Skelton’s *Book of Phyllyp Sparowe*, consist in a series of variations on the theme of youth and beauty: they may thus both be considered as partially allegorical figures.

⁵ Pollet 106.

about an ageing and undisciplined female anatomy, in some cases “marked with the stigmata of a vice that no doctor could fail to diagnose.”⁶ Skelton dedicates 90 lines at the beginning of the poem to describing Elynour’s repulsive physical appearance and her filthy garb, and follows this up with a series of illustrations of her domineering nature and her sluttish habits, including that of mixing hendroppings into the ale-mash, which, according to her, endows her ale with rejuvenating properties, a truth, she adds, borne out by her own continuing appeal for her husband:

Whan we kys and play
 In lust and in lykynge
 (...)
 Than swetely together we ly,
 As two pygges in a sty.

(ll. 221-2; 233-4)

The image is very appropriate, for pigs are very much to the fore in this “tunnyng”, where swine roam at liberty, drinking from the swilling-tub and rubbing their rumps against the benches, and, indeed, Elynour’s wrinkled face is compared to “... a rost pygges eare brystled with here” (ll. 20-1).

Skelton’s evocation of her repulsive physical appearance is, indeed, a virtuoso performance consisting, as it does, in a sustained litany of loathly attributes: a hefty (“tonnysh”) woman, she is droopy and drowsy, scurvy and lousy, wrinkled and blowsy, with lubber lips, a crooked, dripping nose and slack chin; she is, likewise, bleary-eyed, grey-haired, heavy-jawed, wide-gummed, heavy-hipped, crane-legged and splay-footed which explains why she needs shoes with heels “As brode as two wheles” (l. 84), with which to drive “downe the dewe” (l. 82) just as the Wife of Bath has “... on hir feet a paire of spores sharpe”, Elynour’s weighty and complicated headgear being likewise reminiscent of Chaucer’s indomitable pilgrim’s ten-pound “coverchiefs”.

The slatternly *habituées* of Elynour’s establishment described collectively at the end of the *Primus passus*, single or married and not necessarily all old, are birds of the same feather, with their uncombed hair, their unlaced bosoms, and their scabby unwashed faces. After offering this

⁶ Pollet109.

general panorama, Skelton in the following *passi* presents a series of individualised portraits, the majority of which are of repulsive and undisciplined old women: waspish Joan, an unnamed “foule slut” with stinking breath and a rumbling belly, drunken Alice who speaks through her nose and, on this occasion, “pyst where she stood”, half-witted Kit, hook-nosed Margery Milkduck showing off her sturdy legs, another old woman, half-doctor half-witch who could sail to Bordeaux “With the feders of a quale” (l. 453), and thick-lipped, onion-sided, dropsical Maud Ruggy, “foggy-fat” and racked with the palsy, to sleep with whom, comments Skelton, would make you vomit (“cast his craw”) and to see whom naked would make your head ache! Following on Maud’s heels, there comes limping another old woman, who being lame of an ulcerated chilblain, trips over the dintel, falling so !... wyde open / That one might se her token” (l. 497), which Elynour, incidentally, “Lyke an honest dame” bids her to cover up! It would, in short, be difficult to find elsewhere in English literature a more horrifying set of variations on the theme of the *Ebria, squalida, sordida femina* as Skelton puts it in the Latin colophon to his “libellum”, or “trifel”, than those who stagger, trip, or stride over dame Elynour’s threshold, nor one more calculated to induce misogyny! And, in this context, we may note that Thomas Nashe in his *Pierce Penniless*, at the end of the century, suggests as his idea of hell for a lecher, that he be “constrained (the more to augment his misery) to have a congress every houre with haggess and old witches.”⁷ A similar situation faces the knights in the “loathly lady” stories!

A similarly Hogarthian evocation of older women given up to carousing is to be found in Act III, Sc. 2 of Middleton’s *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside*, on the occasion of the christening of Mrs. Allwit’s last born which she presides over from her bed, and which is celebrated with great abundance of comfits and wine, both of which her nurse and her neighbours and gossips partake of to such excess, that one of them likewise falls flat on her face. When they finally leave, the room is in a complete shambles, the stools upturned, the rushes filthy and the floor soaking wet! The object of Middleton’s satire here is not only *ebria, sordida, squalida femina*, but, above all, *femina puritana*, since these drunken women belong to one of the

⁷ Nashe, Thomas, *Pierce Penilesse, His Supplication to the Divell* (1592). Elizabethan and Jacobean Quartos, ed. G.B. Harrison (Bodley Head Quartos), (Edinburgh University Press) 96.

stricter dissenting sects, and have here, as it were, been letting their hair down!

Like Skelton, Nashe, in his *Pierce Pennilesse*, (1592), refers to an ale-wife, in this case a well-known figure in Elizabethan London, Mother Bunch, as likewise adulterating her goods:

... others by slime as frogs, which may be alluded to
Mother Bunches slimie ale, that hath made her, and some
other of her fil-pot facultie so wealthie.⁸

Mother Bunch, in fact, acquired fame not only as an ale-wife, but also as a witch, or at least as one skilled in magic arts, above all, when these were applied to amorous activities, rather like dame Siriz; and as such, she acquired also literary fame of a sort, as is shown by the fact that her name appeared at the head of a chap-book extant in Samuel Pepys' collection:

Mother Bunch's / Closet / newly broke open. / Wherein is
discovered many Rare Secrets of / Art & Nature; / Tryed and
Experienced by Learned Phylo / sophers, and recommended to
all inge / nious Young Men and Maids / Teaching Young-Men
(in a Natural way) / how to get *Good Wifes*, & Maids Good
Husbands...⁹

Although printed in the 1680s, the material in Pepys' chap-books dates, much of it, back to the sixteenth century.

Indeed, the association of old women with witchcraft is a constant in many cultures, and hardly surprising in a country whose king had written a treatise on *Demonologie*, (1597), in which the subject is treated at some length. It is hardly surprising, either, that when Shakespeare wrote a play to please that king, witches should play an essential part in it, and should be described as "withered" women, "wild in their attire", with "choppy fingers", "skinny lips" and "beards", all attributes, of course, of old age, and characteristic of the hag species. The rôle of witch or prophetess is, in fact,

⁸ Nashe 96.

⁹ Samuel Pepys' *Penny Merriments...* Selected and Edited by Roger Thompson, Constable (London, 1976) 65.

one that is not infrequently assigned to the elderly woman in Elizabethan and Jacobean drama: indeed, Middleton's play *The Witch*, (produced in 1610-1616), as its name suggests, introduces the figure of Hecate, protectress of enchanters and witches, as an aid to a murder plot, and as has been pointed out, "part of the interest of the play lies in the comparison between this Hecate and Shakespeare's *Macbeth*."¹⁰ One must be careful, though, here, for the Elizabethan managers may well have conceived of Hecate, not as an old witch, but rather as an ageless goddess. The name of a well-known Elizabethan fortune-teller, *Mother Bombie*, provides the title for John Lyly's Plautine comedy, and in *Endimion*, he introduces an enchantress, Dipsas, who is characterised by her "hoary hairs", her "one tooth" and "a chin (that) almost toucheth her knees", as well as, like Shakespeare's weird sisters, her evil intentions:

... were it in my power to place affections by appointment,
I would make such evil appetites, such inordinate lusts, such
cursed desires, as all the world should be filled both with
superstitious heats, and extreme loves. (1. 4)

Drunkenness, evil intentions and a turn for invective are likewise ascribed to Psiteria, in Gascoigne's translation of Ariosto's comedy, *Supposes*, a rather sketchy character, who, however, is described in the *dramatis personae* as "an old hag", and declared to be an "old witch" and an "old whore" by one of her enemies. The function of such enchantresses and witches is to mislead in some way or other the principal actors in the play (as *Macbeth* is misled by the weird sisters) -they have really no character of their own, their evil-doing being obviously a convention to get the plot moving.

There is, however, an interesting exception in this clutch of crones: the eponymous *Witch of Edmonton* in the play by Dekker, Ford and Rowley, performed probably in 1621/1623. The part of Elizabeth Sawyer, the old woman in question, was probably written by Dekker, and in this tragicomedy, revolving round bigamy and murder, the most sympathetic treatment is given precisely to the "witch", portrayed as an ignorant, helpless old woman driven to witchcraft by the persecution of her neighbours, for Elizabeth Sawyer sells her soul to the devil, not for knowledge, like Dr. Faustus, but to be revenged on those who have falsely accused her of

¹⁰ Charles Lamb, for example, has indicated the differences between them in his *Specimens of English Dramatic Poets contemporary with Shakespeare*, 1808.

witchcraft. Dekker tended to see the best in people, and it is characteristic of him that he should have interpreted his “witch” as a victim of society, rather than the embodiment of gratuitous evil.

This popular attitude which identifies elderly, unattractive females with witches is, of course, satirised in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, where we learn that Mrs. Ford’s maid’s aunt -a fat woman from Brainford- is accused by Mr. Ford of being a witch whom he will beat if he catches her in his house; and, indeed, when Falstaff appears disguised as this personage, Ford is quick to call her “a witch, and an old cozening quean,” who, as a fortune-teller, works by “charms, by spells, by the figure and such daubery as this”, and Sir John is beaten out of doors to the tune of “you witch, you rag, you baggage, you polecat, you ronyon” (4. 3)!

The loathly lady rears her ugly head again in Spenser’s *Faerie Queene*, which is, of course, full of mediaeval reminiscences and allegorical monsters, some with womanish attributes: *Impotence* and *Impatience*, for example, are embodied by “two wicked Hags / With hoary Lockes all loose and visage grim” (2. 11), and *Envy* and *Detraction*, (5. 12), are evoked as two loathly ladies, “two old, ill-favoured Hags”, “Two grisly creatures”, by a description which recalls that of Chaucer or Gower in their loathly lady tales. Especially interesting in this context, however, is the character of *Duessa*, who represents, apparently, the Roman Catholic Church (in Book I), and Mary, Queen of Scots (in Book II). She is presented as a “false sorceress”, who in the first Book constitutes an interesting case of the loathly lady in reverse: she appears to the knight Fradubio to be such a “faire Lady” that she can compete in beauty with his own lady-love, Fraelissa, and, indeed, eventually becomes his paramour. He “... in the witch unweeting joyd long time” (1. 2. 40), until on the day marked out for witches “to do penance for their crime”, he sees her in her true shape, as she really is, that is to say, as a loathly lady and “divelish hag”:

A filthy foule old woman...
 (...)
 Her nether parts misshapen, monstrous
 (...)
 But they did seeme more foul and hideous
 Then womans shape man would beleeve to bee.

(1. 2. 41)

Of course, it is not necessary to acquire the status of a witch to become an evil-doer, and there are several examples of elderly villainesses or “lither ladies” to be found in Renaissance literature. Thus, in Sidney’s *Arcadia*, or rather, in the “*New*” *Arcadia*, wicked Queen Cecropia, seeing herself deprived of the crown of *Arcadia* by Basilius’ daughters, the heroines of the romance, does not scruple to abduct them, together with the disguised Pyrocles, and hold them captive in her castle, where she attempts, by the most cruel devices, to make one or other of the girls marry her son. Some years later, Shakespeare was to present a similar situation in *Cymbeline*, (1610/1611), in which Imogen’s “step-dame false” is furious that the girl’s secret marriage to Posthumus has made it impossible for her to marry her own son, as was her wish. Described by Imogen as a “tyrant”, and by Doctor Cornelius as “malicious”, the queen is a born dissembler who insists to Imogen that:

... you shall not find me, daughter,
After the slander of most step-mothers,
Evil-eyed unto you... (1. 1)

whilst, in fact, preparing a vial of poison for Imogen’s husband’s consumption, which, she assures the audience, in an aside, Imogen herself:

Except she bend her humour, shall be assur’d
To taste of too. (1. 5)

With her dying breath, this venomous creature confesses to her doctor all her evil intentions and sentiments, including her abhorrence of her husband and her desire to kill him by slow poison. The motivation for all this malice springs, however, from a maternal sentiment -a perverted love, but maternal nevertheless: her wish to see her foolish son elevated to the throne. Her melodramatic affirmations apart, however, this anonymous queen has little consistency and is really there to provide the excuse for the separation of the young couple, and the trial of fidelity subsequent on it, which constitutes the main plot.

To the same category of wicked women belongs the sketchily introduced Old Queen of Navarre in Marlowe’s *Massacre at Paris*, (1600), determines “to dissolve with blood and cruelty” her own daughter’s marriage, and Dionyza, familiar from the Old English *Appolonius of Tyre*, in Shakespeare’s *Pericles*: she is Marina’s foster-mother, and orders the girl to

be killed because in beauty she outshines her own daughter -another case, therefore, of perverted mother-love. Like Lady Macbeth, she overrules her more humane husband who feels instant remorse for having abandoned the helpless victim, and who accuses Dionyza of being “like the harpy”:

Which for to betray dost with thine angel face,
Seize with thine eagle's talons. (4. 4)

A more realistic murderess makes a brief appearance in Deloney's *Thomas of Reading*, (1599), in the person of the hostess of the inn at Colebrook where Thomas spends the night. We learn that she and her husband dedicate themselves to murdering their richer patrons by means of an ingenious device involving a trap-door and a cauldron. We do not know her age, but as we learn that the couple have “despatched” some sixty customers over the years, she is obviously experienced -at least in the art of murder! Particularly interesting about this anonymous character, is her similarity to Lady Macbeth and, indeed, the similarity of the whole scene to that of Duncan's murder in Shakespeare's play. Like Lady Macbeth, it is she who encourages her husband when he decides “it is not best to meddle” with Thomas: “What man (quoth she) faint you now? Have you done so many and do you shrink at this?”

Incidentally, Lady Macbeth would be an obvious candidate for a place in this gallery of “lither ladies”, but one hesitates to include her in the category of older women, on the grounds, primarily, of Macbeth's famous injunction: “Bring forth male children only” (1. 7), which may be taken as meaning literally what he says -that she is still of child-bearing age and probably relatively young. A similar doubt arises as to the approximate age of Lear's elder daughters: since the king's extreme old age is so insisted on in the play, one's immediate impression is that Goneril and Regan are mature women who may have been married for some time. They may well, therefore, fit into our category of older, wicked women. The classification does not rest merely on their lack of charity towards Lear, but also to their active participation in the cruel blinding of Gloucester, the stabbing of the attendant who reproaches them, and the adulterous sexual attraction they both feel for Edmund.

Even more evil is Tamora, Queen of the Goths, in *Titus Andronicus*, who, although the mother of four grown-up sons, is still sexually attractive to both the Roman emperor, Saturnine, and to her paramour of long standing,

Aaron the Moor, by whom, in fact, she has a “dusky” child. In a play notorious for its piling up of horrors, Tamora is directly responsible for her sons’ raping of Lavinia, for ordering the dusky baby to be killed, for the stabbing of her brother-in-law, for sentencing to death two of Titus Andronicus’ sons on a false accusation, but all, in this Senecan tragedy, for Revenge -revenge on Titus and on Rome for the killing of her eldest son, whose life she pleads for at the beginning of the play in a very fine speech which attracts the hearer’s sympathy to her, until her true nature is revealed. In this excessively violent play, where it is difficult to distinguish one male character from another, Tamora certainly dominates the action and represents a “lither lady” of the finest water!

The wicked mother / mother-in-law figure rears her vicious head again in prose fiction at the end of the sixteenth century, and beginning of the seventeenth, in Richard Johnstone’s neo-chivalric romance, *Tom a Lincolne*, (I, 1599; II, 1607?). In a tale supposedly told by Sir Lancelot du Lake, and intercalated into the main story of the adventures of Tom a Lincolne, alias the Red Rose Knight, Valentine, the son of the Greek Emperor, falls in love with Dulcippa, one of his mother’s ladies-in-waiting, and the daughter of a country gentleman, who returns his affection. The Empress, however, catches them one day kissing in the gallery, and “moved in her secret hate” (“thinking it a scandal to her sonnes birth to match in marriage with one of so base a parentage”), swears to “crosse their loves with dismall stratagemes and dreary tragedies”, and decides, finally, after much “tragicall imagination” on the “horrore” of having Dulcippa poisoned by the court doctor. The poor man, terrorised by the “bloody queene” and her threats, for her mind is “fraught with rage and blood”, accepts the task but secretly decides to administer to Dulcippa a sleeping-draught rather than a cup of poison.¹¹ All, therefore, eventually ends well, but it is a foolish story as, indeed, the whole of *Tom a Lincolne* is a foolish story, distinguished only by the number of chivalric commonplaces that Johnstone has managed to squeeze into one single text. As in mediaeval romances, no attempt whatsoever is made to characterise the wicked Empress in any way.

The second part of *Tom a Lincolne*, which from the point of view of narrative power is even weaker than the first, contains two more examples of

¹¹ *Tom a Lincolne* is included in *Early English prose Romances*, ed. W.J. Thoms, 3 vols., London, 1858; rep. New York: Ams Press Inc., 1970, vol. 3.

wicked older women. The reader is aware from the beginning of the story that the eponymous hero is the illegitimate son of King Arthur by Angellica, daughter to the Earl of London, known as the Nun of Lincolne, since she retires to a monastery in that city, the more discreetly to receive the visits of her royal lover. This secret is revealed by King Arthur himself on his death-bed when his son is forty years of age, which means that Angellica must be about sixty and Queen Guinevere (never mentioned, however, by name in the text) presumably older. Arthur's last minute revelations, as might be expected, lead to nothing but trouble, for "the Queene in a raging jalousie fretted at her marriage wrongs" and "protested in her heart to be revenged of the Nun of Lincolne". The widowed queen in her thirst for vengeance is, indeed, compared to "ireful Hecuba" and "jealous Juno" although it takes her two years to make up her mind as to the form it shall take; eventually she sends Angellica, "the vile strumpet", by a messenger, seven different instruments of death, enumerated and classified with ghoulish glee by Johnstone, in order that she may herself choose the one she likes best! After her death, by donning "empoisoned robes", the messenger gives such a glowing report of her patience and magnanimity towards her persecutrix, that the queen is struck with remorse, and having first perversely punished her servitors for obeying her orders, eventually hangs herself from the bed post with the girdle she wore on her wedding-day! The moral, says Johnstone, is that "blood... being guiltlesse shed, is quitted againe with bloode".

More interesting, from a literary point of view, perhaps, is the behaviour of the third member of this trio of wicked older women, Anglitora, daughter of Prester John, and wife to the Red Rose Knight, who, on learning that her husband is illegitimate, thinks him, on this account, "as ominous to her sight as the killing cockatrice", and leaves him forthwith, accompanied by their son, the Black Knight, so named for his "fierce courage". The Red Rose Knight, desolated by this dual abandonment, sets out to find them again. Anglitora, although not very old, is certainly an older woman at this point, with a grown-up son, not unlike Queen Gertrude, whom to a certain extent she resembles. It may be remembered here that Shakespeare's *Hamlet* was probably performed in 1603/4 and that it was published in quarto in 1604, whilst the second part of Johnstone's romance did not appear until 1607 (?). Anglitora, her son and an Indian slave having finally disembarked in a strange land, are made welcome by the so-called Knight of the Castle. Anglitora's son goes hunting in the forest where he is to remain lost for several years, whilst his mother and their kindly host give themselves up to

their “wanton affections” and “lewd lives”. The slave, scandalized by his mistress’s conduct, sets sail for England in order to warn the Red Rose Knight of his wife’s infidelity, and the latter immediately seeks her out, appearing eventually at the castle in the guise of a pilgrim. On recognising her husband, Anglitora, aided and abetted by her lover, decides to send the palmer “to his last abiding” by violent death. “At that houre of night when mischiefes are acted”, says Johnstone, in a passage evocative of the atmosphere surrounding the murder of Duncan (including a reference to the “croaking of the night owles”), the “spitefull lady”, Anglitora, chokes her husband, the hero of the romance, to death and buries his body in a dunghill without the gate of the castle, after staking the indiscreet Indian firmly to the ground. The similarity to *Hamlet* so far is slight, but in the following chapter, the scene changes to the forest, where Anglitora’s son has been leading a Tarzan-like existence for seven years. Accompanied by “unnatural portents” (trees violently uprooted, birds falling lifeless from the air), the ghost of the Red Rose Knight, “newly murdered” appears before him, demanding that he revenge his death upon his adulterous mother, and threatening to haunt him for the rest of his life if he does not comply with his wishes. Miraculously led out of the forest at last by an *Ignis Fatuus*, the Black Knight reaches the castle, rescues the slave and has his worst fears confirmed as regards the evil behaviour of his mother. Deciding to wreak his vengeance at midnight, he finds the adulterous couple “secretly sleeping in each other’s arms”, and although he plucks up courage to run his sword through the body of the Knight of the Castle, wavers when his mother implores him, on her knees, to spare her. However, the remembrance of his father’s ghost, and his “angry looks” threatening him, finally gives him the decision to stab the wicked Anglitora through the heart and thus sacrifice her blood “unto the soule of (his) murdered father”.

Mother of a grown-up son, who, indeed, affirms that she is of an age when “the hey-day in the blood is tame”, Gertrude, in *Hamlet*, may be considered as another outstanding example of the lither lady who has deceived her husband with his own brother and has, at the least, been a passive accessory to his murderous act, for which some sort of remorse is suggested, when Hamlet’s accusing words enter “like daggers... in (her) ears”. From the powerful wording of the text, we get the impression that Gertrude’s sin is “frailty” rather than villainy, due to her lasciviousness; she would, says Hamlet, “hang on” her first husband,

As if increase of appetite had grown

By what it fed on; (1. 2)

and sexual images abound in his references to her relationship with her second: she posts “with wicked speed” to “incestuous sheets”, and lives:

In the rank sweat of an enseamed bed,
Stew'd in corruption, honeying and making love
O'er the nasty sty...

One is almost reminded of Elynour Rummyng! However, this is Hamlet's vision of the situation, and, in a way, Gertrude is a shadowy figure, providing part of the motivation for Claudio's ambition and aiding a fillip to Hamlet's general sense of disgust.

A few years later, Middleton was to create a much more impressive example of the wicked and lascivious older woman in the person of Livia in *Women Beware Women*, (1621). Livia, twice widowed, is, at the age thirty-nine, a law unto herself; of a masculine strength of mind, she turns her considerable intelligence to serving the sexual appetites of the Duke of Florence and of her own brother by procuring an originally virtuous young married woman, Bianca, for the former, and his own niece for the latter. Since Livia is herself consumed with sexual passion for Bianca's husband, she “procures” him for herself, by means of her great wealth. She eventually dies at the hands of her incestuous brother, who hopes thus to redeem the honour of the family! Witty, ironical and frank, Livia, like Iago, for example, is almost likeable at times, but there is no denying her villainy: she breaks up a happy marriage by prostituting Bianca, transforms Bianca's mother into a virago, and tricks her own niece into an incestuous relationship with her uncle. Not for nothing did Middleton call the play *Women Beware Women!* It is worth noting that we have here one of the rare examples of a wicked older woman playing the central rôle in the plot and in the play. Indeed, Livia combines in one person *two* of the characteristic rôles assigned, as we are seeing, to the older woman: on the one hand, the lascivious widow or wife, and, on the other, the procuress, the former rôle being a characteristic phenomenon of the Renaissance period, bawds such as Aphrodisia and Dame Siriz having already made fleeting appearances in the earlier literature.

Professional or amateur bawds do, indeed, tend to be identified with elderly women, and the term may be said to embrace as well such characters as elderly nurses who at least encourage their young charges in their

amorous proclivities: thus in Gascoigne's *Supposes*, Polynesta asks her nurse, Balia:

... who first brought (Dilippo) into my chamber? Who first taught him the way to me bed but you? Fie, nurse, fie! (1. 1).

whilst Juliet's old nurse reiterates ad nauseam her husband's joke about Juliet "falling backward" when she comes of age, and shows herself willing to fetch the ladder by means of which Juliet "shall bear the burden soon at night", albeit, thanks to Friar Laurence, it will be a legitimate "burden". A nurse makes a brief but humorously interesting appearance in Marlowe's *Dido Queen of Carthage*, (1594), in the final scene of Act IV in which she leads away "Cupid as Ascanius" to her home, and who, quite gratuitously - except that the child is really *Cupid*- begins to think of taking a lover or a husband, for although she is over eighty and has no teeth, "love is sweet", and she regrets some past refusal on her part to *carpere diem*. Marlowe here, presumably, is demonstrating Cupid's power over all and sundry!

There are a couple of examples of elderly bawds in Shakespeare: the significantly named Mistress Overdone in *Measure for Measure*, who runs a brothel in Vienna, and whose function in the play is to inform the audience of Claudio's arrest (for, of course, a sexual crime), and to lament the recent decline in trade! More essential to the plot is the elderly bawd in *Pericles*, who is the owner of the brothel into which Marina is sold by pirates. She plies her trade with great professionalism and supplies the play with a couple of scenes full of grim humour and grotesque realism; firstly, to make the acquisition of Marina more convincing, she deplores the fact that she cannot attend all her commitments, for:

We were never so much out of creatures. We have but poor three, and they can do no more than they can do; and they with continual action are even as good as rotten. (2. 2)

Grimly humorous, too, are the instructions that the bawd gives to Marina as to how she must behave in her new profession:

Mark me, you must seem to do that fearfully, which you commit willingly; to despise profit where you have most gain. To weep that you live as ye do makes pity in your lovers;

seldom but that pity begets you a good opinion, and that opinion a mere profit. (4. 4)

More black humour awaits the audience in the following scene, in which the bawd discovers, to her horror, that Marina is preaching “holiness” to her prospective clients, and has sent away the Governor “as cold as a snowball!” “Fie, fie upon her!”, she exclaims in rage:

... she is able to freeze the god Priapus, and undo a whole generation, we must either get her ravished, or be rid of her. (4. 6)

However, such grim humour does not prevent Shakespeare from presenting her as a genuine “lither lady”, whose lack of humanity impels her to command one of her pimps to rape Marina: the bawd in *Pericles*, albeit performing a purely functional rôle, is no mere shadowy figure.

A certain protagonism is likewise given to a bawd, the widowed Arsace, in Chapman’s play *The Widow’s Tears*, (produced 1605/6), who is obviously a mature woman, as is also the “widow” of the title; although appearing briefly, Arsace shows herself to have great psychological insight when dealing with the Countess Eudora, and, therefore, to be instrumental to the success of one of the two plots which make up the play. Her cunning words are what induce this apparently unshakeable widow to accept Tharsalio. For, in this play, we find another instance of the lascivious widow, apparently “Like Niobe all tears”, as Hamlet says of Gertrude lamenting her husband’s death, but consenting willingly enough to be consoled by the pleasures of a renewed marital relationship. Both of the plots aim at presenting women as being frail of flesh. Although Eudora has vowed “to preserve till death the unstain’d honour of a widow’s bed”, she finally accepts the younger, and very enterprising Tharsalio, who is after her fortune, when he makes references to his “weight on (her) bed”, or jokes about “tossing in sheets”. There is a notorious scene in the play when the supposedly reformed panderess, Arsace, arouses Eudora’s curiosity and, indeed, her repressed sensuality, by warning her against her suitor on the grounds that he is “... the most incontinent and insatiate man of women that ever Venus blest with ability to please them” (2. 2), capable as she knows professionally of making “nine in a night... mad with his love”: this apparently, is what decides Eudora to accept him!

A similar situation is presented in Middleton's *More Dissemblers Besides Women*, (c. 1615), in which the widowed Duchess of Milan, who has likewise vowed never to remarry, is also betrayed by her awakened passion, in this case, for a man who loves another, and whom, she decides to renounce, in fact, on that account, and renew her vows of chastity. The older woman's frailty of the flesh is, indeed, likewise castigated in Sidney's *Arcadia*, in the person of Basilius' wife, Queen Gynecia, who falls in love with the disguised Pyrocles, instinctively recognising his manhood under the woman's disguise, which leads her husband into worse folly. Sidney, indeed, exploits the incongruous emotions of the couple to censure what he sees as love run wild, and to instill into his readers the need for seemliness and self-discipline. Gynecia is, indeed, one of the rare examples of would-be adulteresses within our age-group (Alice in *Arden of Feversham* is obviously a younger woman), and her presence in the work is explained by Sidney's didactic bent. Pyrocles describes Gynecia's passion thus:

... love and mischief... have set Gynecia also on such a fire towards me, as will never (I fear) be quenched but with my destruction... all her countenances, words and gestures, are miserable portraitures of a desperate affection.¹²

Gynecia, "carried with the beere of violent love" is madly jealous of her own daughter, for which Sidney, with his desire to delight and instruct, makes sure that she is punished, although at the end of the novel there is a happy ending and a general pardon for all misdemeanours.

It might be mentioned here that this vision of older and experienced women as being sexually insatiable is likewise reflected in the popular literature of the time; in once of the chap-books collected by Pepys, printed in the 1680s but containing much earlier material, called *The Parliament of Women*, the first law passed by this female conclave is:

That instead of allowing Men two wives, women, especially the strongest and greatest Vessels, shall have two or three husbands.

and another clause stipulates that:

¹² *Elizabethan Fiction*, ed. with Introduction and notes by Robert Ashley and Edwin M. Moseley (London and New York, 1963) 164.

... all women should have their Husbands tenants at will, and that they should do them Night service, and have their homage paid before sun-raising, or at every Weeks end, or at utmost between the Quarters, and not a day longer to be deferr'd unless it be in the Dog-days. Then let our husbands remember, though it be a trick of them to forsake our beds in the dog-days, yet let them take notice there is no Dog-nights.¹³

Infidelity is not the only hazard in marriage, and it is hardly surprising that Renaissance literature should continue, as in the Middle Ages, to offer instances of the time-honoured species of the virago or hen-pecking, scolding old wife, ever determined, like the Wife of Bath, to have the *maistrie*. In Deloney's delightful novel, *Jack of Newbury*, (1597), for example, the good young apprentice, Jack, is tricked into marriage by his elderly mistress (another widow with a "likerous tooth"), but is obliged to assert his authority over her or be hen-pecked for life, as he had already foreseen, knowing she would "disdain being governed by him"! Certain of her commères, assuring her that "so lusty a young man":

... would never love her being so ancient.¹⁴

she decides to take him down a peg or two, and spends her time gadding about with friends and acquaintance; when Jack remonstrates with her, she replies furiously that he has been her servant, and he is not going to be her master! After a series of comic marital skirmishes, involving locking each other out of the house at night, Jack decides to leave her to her "wilfulness", calling her a "shrew". She then changes her tune and admits that "women will yield to their husbands where they are not too much crossed", and promises that, having given him her *will*, she will no longer offend him with her *wilfulness*. Jack's old wife has the makings of a latter-day Wife of Bath, but it was Deloney's intention to instruct and delight, and he uses the whole episode to show how a hard-working apprentice may make his way in the world, and how a little give and take is necessary in all satisfactory human relationships. The old wife is never given a name, because she is purely an ancillary to Jack's progress.

¹³ Ashley and Moseley 258-259.

¹⁴ *The Novels of Thomas Deloney*, ed. M.E. Lawlis (Indiana Univ. Press, 1961; rep. G Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1978) 22.

A similar scold is Mistress Merrythought in Beaumont and Fletcher's *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, (1613), who is constantly irritated by her husband's carelessness as regards money, and the popular attitude to the subject of shrewish women is again reflected in Pepy's copy of *The Parliament of Women*, who include among their laws:

- 1) That Women might vex, perplex, and anyways torment their husbands.
- 2) That Women may twattle as well as their Husbands.
- 3) That Women may feast, Banquet and Gossip when and where they please.¹⁵

Maudlin Yellowhammer, in Middleton's *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside*, offers another instance of the domineering virago, who rather than hen-pecking her husband, makes her daughter's life a misery, by insisting on marrying her to the disgusting Sir Walter Whorehound. Her tyrannical behaviour to her daughter is worthy of earning her "the slander of *step-mothers*", for being so "evil-eyed" to the young girl, and, indeed, her indulgence towards her foolish son, does remind one again of Cymbeline's queen.

Elderly viragos also tyrannise their servants: thus in Nicholas Breton's little-known picaresque narrative, *The Miseries of Mabillia*, (1606), the unfortunate heroine finds herself working for a thoroughly disagreeable, vituperative and, indeed, repulsive old countrywoman, who in her last illness spits "filthy phlegm" about the chamber, and who, in health, was given to "laying on" Mavillia with a "faggot stick". If Elynour Rummynge is the antithesis of the feminine and desirable, Mavillia's old peasant mistress and her country world are the very antithesis of the idealised pastoral world of the many Arcadian evocations to be found in the narrative prose of the period.

There is nothing very Arcadian either about the rustic world evoked in the early anonymous comedy, *Gammer Gurton's Needle*, (1563, or earlier), and the Gammer herself is a cantankerous soul in all conscience, who "chides, blames and beats" her maid, Tib, "all t'hours of the day", and calls her "whore", but has a soft spot for her boy, Cock: it is another case of

¹⁵ Lawlis 258-259.

“women beware women”! Equally vituperative and aggressive is Gammer Gurton’s neighbour, Dame Chat, who may be a little younger, and who, on hearing that she is being falsely accused of theft, is quick to curse the Gammer by means of expressions such as:

The pox light on her whore’s sides, a pestilence and a mischief! (2. 2)

Gammer Gurton gives as good as she gets, calling Dame Chat, a “false quean”, a “false vixen” and a “callet”, and the whole of Act III, scene 3, is taken up by a slanging-match between these two harpies, which constitutes an absolute anthology of Elizabethan invective, both old women accusing each other mutually of being: a drab, an old witch, an arrant witch, a rump, a rig, a callet, a hog, a slut, a cut, a rakes, a jakes, a scald “bald, rotten and glutton”, a bawdy bitch, a withered witch, a turl leather and a vixen!

On a higher literary plane, we have Shakespeare’s two historical viragos: Queen Elinor in *King John* and Margaret of Anjou, who appears in the three parts of *Henry VI*, and then in Richard III. John’s mother, Elinor, has all the makings of a domineering virago, whose gift for vituperation is finely reflected in Act II, Scene 1, in which she quarrels with, and insults, Constance of Brittany. She has little to do in the play, after this early scene. Margaret of Anjou, however, is a character whom Shakespeare developed more and more in the different plays she appears in: fiery and domineering as a young woman, this “Amazonian trull” and “she-wolf of France” is the inspirer of Shakespeare’s celebrated line:

O tiger’s heart wrapped in a woman’s hide!¹⁶

Married to a weak king, and having an illicit affection for the much more intrepid Duke of Suffolk, Margaret, by the time she appears in the third part of *Henry VI*, as a mature woman, is an impressive figure indeed: “Her looks”, on her first entrance in this play, “so bewray her ire”, that the Duke

¹⁶ Parodied by Robert Greene in his attack on Shakespeare in his *Groats-Worth of Witte, bought with a million of Repentance*, 1592: “for there is an upstart Crow, beautified with our feathers, that with his *Tygers hart wrapt in a Players hyde*, supposes he is as well able to bombast out a blanke verse as the best of you: and being an absolute *Iohannes fac totum*, is in his owne conceit the onely Shake-scene in a country.”

of Exeter and the king himself, try "to steal away". She is justifiably furious, since the king has, under pressure, disinherited their son: in a powerful speech, she declares herself a rebel, who will seek help from the disaffected northern lords for her just cause: from then on, Margaret becomes a martial matron, merciless in victory, mocking at the vanquished Duke of York, before finally stabbing him to death herself. Victim, in her turn, of the fortunes of war, she pleads her cause in France, and indomitably lays aside "her mourning weeds" "to put armour on", and encourages her soldiers with a fine stirring speech, which makes her son declare in admiration that: "... a woman of this valiant spirit" would infuse "magnanimity" in the most cowardly breast. Finally captured, and her son killed before her eyes, like the Roman matrons of old, she beseeches her captors to despatch her too -which they refuse to do. Her gift for insult and invective has not lessened in *Richard III*, and Shakespeare continues to assign her long speeches of great rhetorical force, which earn her the epithets of "withered hag", "false-boding woman" and "lunatic", from Edward IVth's three brothers who she commends to God's hate! In the very fine scene (4. 4), in which Margaret is able to say "I told you so" to Queen Elizabeth and the Duchess of York, she warns them against Richard, "hell's black intelligence", in a series of fiery speeches making her final exit, glorying in her skill "to pierce with words". Shakespeare, undoubtedly saw her as an admirable character, if an unlovable one!

Having then surveyed some of the less agreeable rôles played by the older woman in Renaissance literature: those of the drunkard, the witch, the lecheress, the bawd, the villainess and the virago, rôles to a greater or lesser degree adumbrated in the earlier literature, and practically the only ones allowed to the older woman therein, the question to be asked is: are there any virtuous, but dynamic, interesting or, at least, dignified, rôles assigned in Renaissance literature to the older woman?

To begin with, it may be said that there are to a greater degree than in the Middle English period a few of what we may call anodyne or perfunctory parts for older women to play within their literary contexts: the parts played by such characters as Margery Mumblecrust in Udall's early comedy, *Ralph Roister Doister*, (1540), Dame Custance's nurse, a simple soul whose activities are confined to delivering Ralph's famous letter to her mistress, or "gammer" Madge, in *The Old Wives' Tale*, (1595), a kindly and generous body, who is willing to entertain three unexpected guests by telling them "an

old wives' winter's tale" - a tale which barely has she begun to tell, than the action thereof is enacted on the stage- her contribution being really to set the ball rolling! Similarly, Calphurnia's brief appearance in *Julius Caesar*, is exclusively to prophesy in sleep the murder of Caesar, and on that account, as an affectionate wife, to beg him not to go out. In *All's Well That Ends Well*, the widow, Diana's mother, has no function other than being her daughter's companion, and, more or less, protector, and the shelterer of Helena.

The mention of "a winter's tale", of course, brings to mind Shakespeare's bitter-sweet work but here, the older Hermione, who is brought back to life at the end of the play, has no active part to play, although it is true that her brief, final appearance is very sympathetic, demonstrating as it does, her deep affection for her daughter, the hope of finding whom has given her strength to go on living. It is a proof of Shakespeare's infinite dramatic tact that he does not have her addressing any forgiveness speeches to the despicable Leontes.

The dying Zenocrate, in the second part of Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*, (1590), is like-wise a dignified figure, redeemed from pure conventionality, perhaps, by her continued adoration for her all-conquering husband: her function in the play, both as the young captured slave, and then, as the mature wife and mother, is to endow Tamburlaine himself with a human dimension -manifest in his love for her- to contrast with the ruthlessly mechanical litany of his military exploits. A brief, but to a certain extent, unconventional rôle is assigned to the Abbess -presumably an older woman- in *The Comedy of Errors*, whose function it is to upbraid Adriana, a scold, for making her husband's life a misery!

In fact, the most sympathetic rôles allotted to older women would appear to occur in Renaissance drama (rather than in other *genres*), and to concern above all mothers of sons, either in pieces of pure imagination, or in plays based on historical facts. In the works of imagination, however, this sympathetic rôle is very often restricted to the expression on the part of a bereaved mother (generally, but not always, a widow) of a lament for her dead son, in the form, in some cases, of very fine poetry. This is true, for example, of Isabella's superb pre-suicide speech in Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy*, (1594), (4. 2), delivered whilst she is trying to cut down the trees in the arbour where her son, Horatio, had been found hanging murdered. In

Thomas Preston's *Cambyses, King of Persia*, (1569?), although the verses are but indifferent, the strength of the passion in the mother's lament over her child, butchered by the cruel king, is equally moving (ll. 579-599), and magnificent is the dirge intoned by Cornelia in Webster's *The White Devil*, (1608), whilst in a state of distraction, reminiscent of Ophelia's in *Hamlet*:

Call for the robin red-breast and the wren
 Since o'er shady groves they hover,
 And with leaves and flowers do cover
 The friendless bodies of unburied men.
 Call unto his funeral dole
 The ant, the field-mouse and the mole,
 To rear him hillocks that shall keep him warm,
 And (when gay tombs are robbed) sustain no harm:
 But keep the wolf far hence, that's foe to men,
 For with his nails he'll dig them up again. (4. 4)

Indeed, the mother of three children, a wicked son and daughter, and this innocent youngest one, Cornelia has one of the few really significant rôles to be played by an older woman in Renaissance drama: her horror at her daughter's licentiousness, and her elder son's pandering activities, expressed in a series of powerful speeches, she clearly dominates Marcello's shrouding-scene by the striking lines Webster assigns to her. She does not, of course, dominate the play - Vittoria Corombona does that!

In *All's Well That Ends Well*, Shakespeare provides a dignified rôle for the widowed Countess of Roussillon to play: she shows deep affection not only for her son, but also for Helena, the daughter of an old friend whom she loves dearly and who replaces the daughter she desired and never had. She, indeed, provides a refreshing antidote to so many evil step-mothers, foster-mothers and mothers-in-law, such as have been mentioned, with her affirmation that:

Adoption strives with nature, and choice breeds
 A native slip to us from foreign seeds:
 You ne'er oppressed me with a mother's groan,
 Yet I express to you a mother's care. (1. 3)

She not only approves of Helena as a future daughter-in-law, but is personally responsible for helping the girl to get to Paris, and seek out her

son, and shows a charming side to her nature in her lively repartee with the clown (2. 3).

A splendid example of an older woman playing a magnificent and really determining rôle, is to be found in the character of Volumnia, Coriolanus' mother in Shakespeare's play: Macbeth's injunction to "bring forth men-children only" would be eminently appropriate too for this martial-minded and patriotic Roman matron, who glories in her son's wounds, and who encouraged him, when he was but "tender-bodied" and "the only son of (her) womb", "to seek danger where he was like to find fame" (1. 3). She is enchanted that her little grandson "would rather see the swords and hear the drum, than look upon his school-master". An indomitable figure, of great dignity and intelligence, Shakespeare has Volumnia face the difficult problem of trying to persuade her impetuous son to woo the Senate diplomatically, that he may become consul. As she explains:

I have a heart of mettle, apt as yours,
But yet a brain that leads my use of anger,
To better vantage. (3. 1)

At the end of the play she has the more difficult task of persuading him to sign a peace with Rome, rather than betray his country, as leader of the Volscians. Shakespeare assigns to her, for this purpose, one of his finest speeches, in which she brings all the resources of her forceful personality and intelligence to bear on influencing Coriolanus for his own good and that of his country. She wins the day, but, of course, in the last instance, the decision she has wrung out of him leads inexorably to his death. Particularly fine, as well, are the two speeches pronounced by Coriolanus, on going into exile, in which he eulogises his mother's former valour, her "ancient courage", reminding her that she was "wont to say" "if (she) had been the wife of Hercules / Six of his labours (sh'd) have done, and sav'd / (her) husband so much sweat". Seldom, as we have been seeing, do we hear such tributes dedicated to an older woman.

Another determining rôle allotted to an older woman is to be found a few years later in *A Fair Quarrel*, (1617), by Middleton and Rowley. Lady Ager, the mother of a grown-up son and seven years a widow, is falsely and maliciously accused of having been unfaithful to her husband in his lifetime. Her son, Captain Ager, wishes impetuously to defend her honour and his

own (as a putative bastard) in a duel. Lady Ager, at first highly incensed on hearing of the insult, then begins to fear for her son's life, and in order to prevent him from fighting, makes the supreme sacrifice of admitting to him (falsely) that the accusation is just. This being the case, he will not insist on fighting. Lady Ager is, therefore, the protagonist of an extremely dramatic situation, although, since the play is a comedy, it is finally resolved more or less satisfactorily: she is, however, one of the rare examples of an older woman being essential to the plot of the play she appears in, and of being given some excellent lines to deliver!

There are, of course, as we have mentioned, some mothers of sons in Shakespeare's history plays who perform pertinent rôles, although it is not always easy to judge their age: thus, the widowed Constance, Arthur's mother, in *King John*, is, probably, still quite young; she is certainly presented in a most sympathetic light, both as a loving mother and a prudent counsellor, albeit capable of being moved to a fiery response by Queen Elinor's cruel taunts. Shakespeare has endowed her too with some fine emotional speeches, above all on the capture and abduction of her young son by the English. Similarly, the "old" Duchess of York, albeit making a brief appearance in Richard II, is spurred to passionate speeches in order to save her son's life.

It is, finally, Shakespeare, too, who offers us a delightful play completely protagonised by older, or, at least, mature women, a protagonism reflected in the title: *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. Practically the whole of the action revolves round the jokes these lively, intelligent, and essentially honourable married women think up in order to be revenged on Sir John Falstaff, for his paying his addresses, not to one, but to both of them, simultaneously. On receiving their respective love-letters, both, as it were, examine their consciences, to see if they have given him any encouragement, and satisfied of their innocence, set out to pay him back, and, in the case of Mrs Ford, to see if she can, once and for all, put paid to her husband's foolish and totally unjustified jealousy. In this play, composed, as rumour would have it, at Queen Elizabeth's request, because she wanted to see Sir John Falstaff in love, the fat knight has little to do but be the victim of these merry women, so incensed at his daring that Mrs Page affirms that she will "exhibit a bill in the parliament for the putting down of men!" All the initiatives in the play are taken by "the wives" including the evocation of a ghostly forester, in the final scene, although in this case, they can count on

their husbands' support. For, although the wives are merry, they are yet prudent, and know exactly when their menfolk should be brought into the secret. True it is that Mrs Page does not immediately support her daughter's choice of a husband, but, from her point of view, Dr. Caius is the more prudent match. Nor does she waste time crying over spilt milk when Ann *does* marry Fenton, but good-heartedly blesses them saying:

Heaven give you, many, many, merry days, (5. 5)

and, in fact, in an earlier scene, had already assured Fenton that she would question her daughter, and take into account her feelings on the matter. The play is one of the most delightful in the whole canon, and proves that Shakespeare at least saw the dramatic possibilities for comedy too offered by older, experienced women.

Mistress Quickly is but a "maid" in *The Merry Wives*, presumably quite young, and desirous of getting married, but Shakespeare, of course, had already incorporated her into the action of *Henry IV*, Parts I and II, in the second of which she is obviously older and a widow. Shakespeare endows her with some delightful malapropisms, and her sparring sessions in her tavern with Falstaff and also with the law, enliven the play considerably. Although essentially there as a foil for Falstaff, she yet manages to have a recognisable personality of her own. *Henry V*, written probably the same year as *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, finds her married to Pistol, and Shakespeare assigns to her one of his most idiosyncratic yet moving speeches, that describing the death of Falstaff, now, as she endearingly affirms "in Arthur's bosom".

In conclusion, then, it may be affirmed, from a survey of some of the most representative works of the period, that, although the literary rôles assigned to the older woman in earlier periods continue to be allotted to them in the Renaissance, i.e. there continue to be witches, villainesses and viragos, there are, however, a few instances in which these rôles are not included purely for the convenience of the plot or to contribute to the development of other major characters, but offer the opportunity to see an older woman as a fully-rounded character with a determining part to play in the action: such are, the "lither lady" Livia, and probably, Tamora, the virago, Margaret of Anjou, and the victimised witch of Edmonton. To these categories must be

added, in the Renaissance, the new rôles of the intemperate or lascivious older woman, generally speaking, unredeemably disagreeable rôles.

Whereas, however, in Old and Middle English literature, we find no actively sympathetic parts to be played by the older or old woman, we do find, in the Renaissance, with the amplification of literary *genres* and, above all, thanks to Shakespeare and his talent for reflecting human nature in its multiple manifestations, some instances, at least, of sympathetic, and even unconventional determining rôles to be played by the older woman, principally, as loving mothers of sons. Not only do we have the funeral laments assigned to otherwise uncharacterised mothers, but, we also have the essential rôles such as those played by Cornelia, Lady Ager, the Countess of Roussillon, Constance or Volumnia, without whom the plays would be inexistent. They are women whose emotions we can identify with, just as it is possible to do so with the older heroines of numerous twentieth century novels, and in the case of Mrs Ford and Mrs Page, we can take delight in the fact that youth is not always allowed to monopolise the comic page, that the “merry war” between the sexes is not restricted to the Beatrices and the Benedicks, but may be waged by those with more marital experience, and perhaps to more purpose, for the pleasure of an audience convinced by Shakespeare that, as Mrs Page puts it:

Wives may be merry, yet honest too!

THE BIRTH OF THE BIBLE IN ENGLISH

Macario Olivera Villacampa
University of Zaragoza. Spain

Reverence for the *King James Bible*, 1611 Bible, is not entirely a sentiment or prejudice. The Englishman's Bible, no matter how frequently or infrequently he opens it, is as essential a part of the national culture as the works of Chaucer and Shakespeare. There is a consensus of opinion among English people that a valuable institution like the Bible should not be subject to fluctuations of linguistic taste. And this view is apparently shared by other European peoples (Partridge, 1973). But we are not dealing with this religious literary treasure on this paper. Reaching the summit of a mountain demands careful previous preparation; much in the same way as a leading book, The Book in this case, cannot be analysed linguistically (Semantics included) without a full account of its socio-cultural background. We are planning to reach the summit step by step, hoping to end up in the future, as we think that new conferences on Renaissance Studies will be held in the following years. So, the birth of the Bible in English.

The Bible known and used in the earliest English Church, as in the British and Irish Churches, was the Latin Bible, which came to mean the version made by St. Jerome at the end of the fourth century, and which is commonly known as the Latin Vulgate. From the earliest days of English Christianity the gospel story, which, of course, is based on the Bible, was told to the people of England in their own language; but the preaching of the gospel in English hardly amounts to the beginnings of the Bible in English. Apart from telling the gospel story occasionally, one of the most permanent means of teaching people the Bible was the decoration of church buildings with wall paintings and relief carvings, with which, for example, in the seventh century Wilfrid adorned the church of York, and Benedict Biscop the church of Wearmouth. From the same period we have the carved panels, representing scenes from the gospels, on the Ruthwell Cross, which also contains extracts from one of the greatest of Old English poems, *The Dream of the Rood*, in which a mystic vision of the true cross is described with

fervid and tender devotion. There also some writers and translators, such as Bede and Alfred the Great, who gave lay people some parts of the New Testament in their own tongue, as they had a concern for the spiritual welfare of their less learned fellow countrymen. In the same way, one form which early translations of the biblical texts into English took was that of interlinear glosses in Latin manuscripts, frequently written by monks or priests, to help people who could not understand the Latin text itself. And we have a Middle English work called *Ormulum*, by an Augustinian monk named Orm, a kind of poetical version of the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles, accompanied by a commentary.

But the first translation of the whole Bible into English is associated with the name of John Wyclif (1330-1384). Although technically a parish priest, he was in fact an Oxford don; he was far more interested in ideas and debates than in people. He was a scholar and a critic; a man of strong feelings, his indignation was quickly aroused by what he regarded as abuses, and he was always ready to strike out. When we examine his teaching, we find that it was closely bound up with the idea of "dominion". Feudalism taught that each man held whatever position and authority he had from his immediate superior to whom he was responsible. The Church adopted a similar doctrine, even more, it had for long been engaged in a struggle to make the secular and temporal power dependent upon the spiritual dominion. Wyclif struck at the whole theory of dominion, whether temporal or spiritual, by declaring that all dominion is derived directly from God. Such doctrine cut right across the whole idea of authority in Church and State; and this was indeed what Wyclif proceeded to do. In his book *De Dominio Divino* he argued that, since each man is responsible to God alone, there can be no need for a hierarchy and no distinction between priest and layman. All are equal in the sight of God.

Consequently, he began to lash out on all sides with great vigour. The Church was rich, powerful and corrupt. Beginning with the papacy, he had an easy target, for the popes had long been exiles in France, and then the Great Schism set up two rival popes. He turned to criticize and condemn the secular clergy, for he was convinced that the power of the clergy rested upon false teaching about the sacraments. By the way, the real presence of Christ in Eucharist Wyclif never denied, but the formal doctrine of Transubstantiation he substituted for the theory of Consubstantiation. The monks he called "possessioners", and all monasteries should be dissolved.

The friars were wicked and he denounced their apostasy and degeneration. Wyclif was thus essentially a critic and a satirist, lashing out at the abuses which were so obvious. But to counteract the evils of the day, he made a very positive contribution: the translation of the Bible into English (Moorman, 1980).

According to Wyclif's theory of "dominion by grace", each man is immediately responsible to God, and immediately responsible to obey his Law. And by God's Law he does not mean canon law, which he repudiated, but the Bible. The Bible is the rule of faith and practice. Therefore, if every man is responsible to obey the Bible, it follows that every man must know what to obey, and so the whole Bible should be accessible to him in a form that he can understand. The Bible as a whole is applicable to the whole of human life, and should be available in the vernacular. It is doubtful whether Wyclif himself took any direct part in all the work of Bible translation, but, no doubt, it was under his inspiration and by his friends and colleagues that the work was done. This work distinguishes two versions, an earlier and a later. Both of them were based on the Latin Vulgate, and both were copied and recopied by hand. The invention of the printing was still to come.

The earliest version is an extremely literal rendering of the Latin original. Latin constructions and Latin word order are preserved even where they conflict with English. This reflects one theory about Bible translation, according to which the sacred quality of the text could be preserved in translation only by the most painstaking word-for-word procedure. The first paragraph of the Epistle to the Hebrews may serve as a sample:

Multifariam multisque modis olim Deus loquens
 Manyfold and many maners some tyme God spekinge
patribus in prophetis, novissime diebus istis
 to fadris in prophetis, at the laste in thes daies
locutus est nobis in filio: quem constituit heredem
 spak to us in the sone: whom he ordeynede eyr
universorum, per quem fecit et saecula.
 of alle thingis, by whom he made and the worldis.

But a translation of this kind would have been of little value for ordinary people. It is clear that the translation must be intelligible without

reference to the original, and if so, it must convey the sense, the true and plain sense, without difficulty to the reader whose only language is English.

The later version shows a feeling for native English throughout, and was bound to make a much greater appeal to his fellow countrymen than a word-for-word rendering. Thus, the same paragraph quoted above shows the difference:

God, that spak sum tyme bi prophetis in many maneres to oure fadris, at laste in these daies he hath spoke to us bi the sone; whom he hath ordeyned eir of alle thingis, and bi whom he made the worldis.

Because of his bitter attacks against the Church, Wyclif was branded and condemned as a heretic, even as "archheretic", as Thomas More said (Bruce, 1979). And so were all his writings, the two versions of the Bible included. But, even if we granted that he was a heretic, we could not say that the two versions are heretical "ipso facto", although they are not "Authorized", which is another question. We dare say they are not heretical because the holy text is not purposely corrupted: which is obvious about the very literal rendering of the Latin Vulgate, and also about the late translation, where there is a change of linguistic procedure so as to make the sentence, rather than the individual word, the sense unit, which amounts to "meaning for meaning" translation. How legitimate this procedure is can be proved just by remembering that the translators of the New English Bible, 1970, an Authorized Version, followed the same method.

Thus, Wyclif, with all his faults, succeeded in lighting a candle which burnt steadily through many years of trial and which is by no means extinguished at the present day.

A new situation began to develop in the history of the English Bible with the production of the first printed English Bible, which was translated, not from the Latin, but from the original tongues, Hebrew and Greek.

It was a happy coincidence that the discovery of printing should have been followed so quickly by the Revival of Learning. So far as the history of the English Bible is concerned, there are some representatives of this Revival specially worth of mention.

John Colet (1467-1535), who became Dean of St. Paul's in London, delivered a course of lectures on the Epistles of St. Paul at the University of Oxford, which made a deep impression on many who heard them. In his principles of biblical interpretation he made a clean break with the methods of the mediaeval scholastics, and expounded the text in accordance with the plain meaning of the words viewed in relation to their historical context.

Erasmus (1466-1536) paid several visits to England, mainly to Cambridge, where he served as Professor of Greek, and he gave himself to the study of St. Jerome and the New Testament, and laid the foundations of his edition of the Greek Testament.

Martin Luther, the famous Augustinian monk and Professor of Theology in the University of Wittenberg, in November 1515 began to expound Paul's Epistle to the Romans to his students. He came more and more to grasp the crucial character of St. Paul's teaching about justification by faith. When at last he understood what Paul was getting at, and applied it to himself, he said: "I felt myself to be reborn and to have gone through open doors into paradise. The whole of Scripture took on a new meaning, and whereas before the righteousness of God had filled me with hate, now it became to me inexpressibly sweet in greater love. This passage of Paul became to me a gateway to heaven" (Bruce, 1979:27). Luther himself did not foresee what his teaching would lead to, but in the light of the sequel we look back to that action as the one which more than any other sparked off the Reformation in England. And the progress of the Reformation is closely bound up with the history of the first printed Bible in the vernaculars, specially the first printed Bibles in English.

Thomas More (1478-1535), a wonderful scholar and politician, understood the Revival mainly as related to the Classics and Classical Languages, and so he wrote *Utopia* in Latin. From the deepest of his conviction he objected to the translation of the Bible into English, as he believed it was a deviation from the faith. He made suffer the new translators, although not as much as he suffered himself in the Tower of London where he was beheaded because of his opposition to the divorce of Henry VIII and his refusal to sign the Act of Supremacy.

William Tyndale's translation was the first English *New Testament* to be printed; it appeared in 1526. Tyndale had the conviction that the root

cause of much confusion in people's mind on the matters of faith was ignorance of the Scripture. If this ignorance could be corrected, the eyes of all would be opened and the truth made clearly known. Perhaps the knowledge that Luther had given his countrymen the German New Testament in 1522 was a further stimulus to Tyndale to do the like service for his countrymen. But it would not be politic to mention Luther's name in this connection, as Luther was disapproved of in the highest quarters in England. In fact, king Henry VIII had published his *Assertion of the Seven Sacraments* against Luther, and received thereby from Pope Leo X the title of "Defender of the Faith", which his successors have borne to this day. By the way, this is most probably the root reason why Anglicans have never liked being named Protestants.

The incidental resemblances between Tyndale's New Testament and Luther's have led some people to suppose that Tyndale did little more than translate Luther's version into English. But this is far from being the truth. Although he had Luther's German New Testament at his hands for reference, and also the Latin Vulgate, his work is a translation of Erasmus's edition of the Greek Testament. Tyndale was a better Greek scholar than Luther, and he turns the Greek text into good English, not into a literal rendering of the original text.

Thomas More wrote a book entitled *The Confutation of Tyndale*. Tyndale's New Testament, said More, was so perverted in the interests of heresy that it was not worthy to be called Christ's Testament, but either Tyndale's own testament or the testament of his master Antichrist (Bruce, 1979). It affords no pleasure to us today to contemplate two great Englishmen, men of principle who were both to suffer death for conscience' sake, engaging in bitter controversy. Yet More was not obscurantist; he was a leading humanist and patron of the new learning, and a warm friend of Erasmus, whose Greek New Testament Tyndale had now turned into good English. We can only be surprised that a scholar like More should go to such lengths in denouncing so good an achievement. When his charges are examined, they amount to nothing more than a complaint that Tyndale translated certain ecclesiastical terms by English words which lacked ecclesiastical associations. Thus, he used "congregation" and not "church"; "senior" and not "priest"; "repentance" and not "penance"; "love" and not "charity", and so forth. But no faults can be found with Tyndale from the standpoint of Semantics. And indeed Tyndale could point to Erasmus, More's

great friend, for a precedent. For Erasmus had not only edited the New Testament in Greek, he had also translated it into Latin, and in Erasmus's Latin translation the Greek word "ekklesia" appears as "congregatio"; Greek "presbyteros" appears as "senior", and so forth. Why should such translations be branded as heretical in Tyndale's English version when they were tolerated in Erasmus's Latin version? Because, said More, he found no such malicious intent in Erasmus as he found in Tyndale. We may well rub our eyes at these charges.

If Tyndale had given himself exclusively to his Bible translation, he might have come to translate the whole Bible. By 1530 he had completed and published the translation of the first five books of the Old Testament from Hebrew, and then translated several other books, but the whole of it never did. He was anxious to continue his work, but he was accused of Lutheranism, sent to prison, found guilty of heresy, and handed over to the secular power for execution.

We may say that Tyndale's version of the New Testament and most part of the Old Testament is basic to the successive versions, more particularly the Authorized Version, or King James Bible. Tyndale's simple directness and magical simplicity of phrase, his modest music, gave an authority to his wording that has imposed itself on all later versions. A new version of the Bible in English, drawn largely upon his own work, was circulating with King Henry's permission some months before his death. The new translator was Coverdale, and Coverdale's Bible was the first complete printed Bible in English. But more about this and later Biblical Translations, up to King James Bible, in future conferences on Renaissance Studies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barr, J. *The Semantics of Biblical Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961
 Bruce, F. F. *History of the Bible in English*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1979.
 Chadwick, O. *The Reformation*. London: Penguin, 1986.
 Crystal, D. and Davy, T. *Investigating English Style*. London: Longman, 1969.
 Moorman, J. R. H. *A History of the Church in England*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1980.
 Partridge, A. G. *English Biblical Translation*. London: A. Deutsh, 1973.

- Schwarz, W. *Principles and Problems of Biblical Translation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955.
- Southern, R. W. *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages*. London: Penguin, 1988.

DIALECTICAL TENSION IN SIR WALTER RALEIGH'S LIFE AND WORK¹⁷

Socorro Suárez y Juan E. Tazón
University of Oviedo. Spain

"La libertad es uno de los más preciados dones que a los hombres dieron los cielos; con ella no pueden igualarse los tesoros que encierra la tierra ni el mar encubre; por la libertad, así como por la honra, se puede y se debe aventurar la vida, y, por el contrario, el cautiverio es el mayor mal que puede venir a los hombres."

Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de la Mancha*

On 12th June 1617 the last Elizabethan hero sailed from Plymouth on a voyage which meant much more than any other conventional piratical enterprise of the time. His destiny: El Dorado, or to be more exact, Guiana.

A noble player was betting his life in what was going to be the saddest hand of a long gambling life. A victory in such a risky business would mean freedom and honour; a defeat... history can tell well enough. The protagonist we refer to was no other than Sir Walter Raleigh, the last of a chosen few who, by the time we have just mentioned, had already seen an unforgettable generation disappear: Queen Elizabeth, Shakespeare, Marlowe etc. He did not know, however, that the rules of such a dangerous game had changed. His long imprisonment in the Tower of London had made him, among other things, recollect and think, but his recollections no longer coincided with the realities of a time which, by 1617, had a new referee:

¹⁷ All quotations of a literary kind have been taken from the Penguin edition *Sir Walter Raleigh's Selected Writings* (London, 1984).

King James. A man who, at least in this matter, was eager to please a most peculiar character who figures among the most brilliant figures Spain has ever had in the diplomatic world: el Conde de Gondomar. Intelligent, witty, cunning and convincing, he was there to drop into James' ear the exact words at the proper moment. All with a double aim: to preserve the integrity of the Spanish American colonies and to make his royal master in Madrid, Philip III, taste revenge in the name of his father on a time and characters that only a few years earlier had made the whole of Spain swallow some of the most bitter moments of its history. Raleigh alone symbolized that time and those characters.

The struggle was long and fought at a long distance: while the English sailor moved in the dream-land of El Dorado, Gondomar and James prepared a most horrid reception which reached its climax on the 10th August 1618. That morning Raleigh was taken to the Tower for the third time in his life. On this particular occasion, however, there was not going to be a way out, not even one possibility of gambling all once again for the sake of honour and freedom as Cervantes had written in our most precious book. The voyage to Guiana had been, as can be well imagine, a failure. It had to be. The odds against it had been overwhelming. For a start the diplomatic labours of Gondomar at the Jacobean court had been in themselves a masterpiece of Machiavellian skill. In the second place, and this is perhaps even more decisive, Raleigh's pattern of life demanded such an outcome, for his, as the voyage itself, had been an existence that had nearly always moved from hope to despair and from hot dreams to cold reality:

Hero has left no lamp to guide her love
Thou lookest for light in vain, and storms arise.¹⁸

He had once called himself Death's subject and death, his master, came to him at the scaffold in a raw October morning of 1618. Not long before he had written: "It is therefore Death alone that can suddenly make a man to know himself...Thou (Death) has drawn together all the far stretched greatness, all the pride, cruelty, and ambition of man and covered it all over with these two narrow words, *Hic jacet*."¹⁹ We are not to understand those words, however, as the product of a man who had consciously rejected in life

¹⁸ "The Ocean to Cynthia", 21st Book.

¹⁹ Winton J., *Sir Walter Raleigh* (1975) 342-343.

greatness, pride, cruelty and ambition knowing that they were to prove worthless at the last minute. Quite the contrary actually; he strove:

To seek new worlds, for gold, for praise, for glory,
To try desire, to try love (...)²⁰

It is precisely this paradox which makes of Raleigh's one of the most puzzling biographies of the Elizabethan period. Nearly all his contemporaries would have agreed that he ranked as one of the greatest, proudest and most ambitious characters of the age. Cruelty can be left aside, though it is true that he was not totally ignorant of it. Six hundred corpses of Spaniards and Italians at Smerwick, Ireland, proved in 1580 that he could use the sword with a degree of coldness similar to that used by the executioners of Tyburn prison. How, then, are we to conjugate both realities? How are we to understand, for example, that the man who knew in life that ambition presents a ridiculous aspect when facing death, should have behaved as one of the most tiring 'noble beggars' to surround Queen Elizabeth? "When will you stop begging favours from me?", the virgin Queen is reputed to have asked him at a given time. The answer, despite its brilliancy, contradicts the man who had once written that "death takes the account of the rich and proves him a beggar": "when you stop granting them".

Raleigh's life, therefore, presents the historian and the critic with a good number of questions which apparently have no easy answer. It is not a unique case. Would any serious reader, for instance, believe that the author of *Doctor Faustus* was considered to be a menace to society on the grounds of his firm atheism if he ignored the information about 'secret reunions' attended, among others, by the subject of our talk?

Quevedo, our most noble cynic, may have the solution to the problem raised: "Amo la vida con saber que es muerte". Raleigh himself could have signed these words. His attitude to life, after all, shows the suitability of the statement. "What is life?" is one of his most well-known rhetorical questions.²¹ "A play of passion", "a short comedy" are the answers. True, but comedy after all. The inevitability of death is there ("we dye in earnest, that's

²⁰ "The Ocean to Cynthia", 21st Book.

²¹ "On the Life of Man."

no jest"), but also that of birth. He was always conscious of those two truths and of their inflexible chronological order. Life inevitably comes first and the stage of the Elizabethan world had a lot to offer to a man of his qualities who were ready to "act to the life". It is only natural that he tried to grasp the whole of it. "All men in one man": husband, father, parliamentarian, soldier, courtier, pirate, alchemist, philosopher, poet, hero, villain, lover, explorer, falconer, gardener, botanist, historian, war reporter and antiquary. This list, nearly always quoted to shock the reader, should show, however, the restlessness of a Renaissance spirit. If we do not understand this we will approach the analysis of Raleigh's life from a wrong angle for his was an existence impregnated of a Faustian quality and totally dominated by the consequences of the personal solution to one of the gravest dilemmas, to die living or to live dead. Raleigh's answer to it had been from the start clear and, once again, he would have agreed with Quevedo: "mejor vida es morir que vivir muerto". It was the choice of the difficult path taken at the crossroads where 'the many and the few' must part:

False love, Desire and Beauty frail, adieu
Dead is the root whence all these fancies grew.²²

The consequences, of course, are always grave as literary works well show, but it would not be especially risky to state that they were more so in the case of Raleigh for the stakes are always higher in highly competitive circles, and the one around Queen Elizabeth was indeed a tough one. 'To taste the court' alone would have demanded all the energies of a common man. That Raleigh could do so for a long time and at the same time lead a family life, study, write and risk his life in maritime expeditions only proves that he was the possessor of very uncommon qualities only shared by a selected group. Still, this 'rich' life had tremendous fissures, the most obvious ones being fear and tension. It is easy to understand the first. At a given time Raleigh counted himself among the happiest of mortals: he was the owner of vast estates in Ireland, attractive rents given to him by the Crown and several houses in London, among which Sherburne stood as a highly esteemed treasure; he enjoyed the love of a faithful wife, the delights of fatherhood and a brilliant reputation, enriched in his case by a good number of anecdotes the London audience was eager to applaud. And more important than that, he had freedom to fly, as his first expedition to Guiana had proved.

²² "A Farewell to False Love."

But all this did not rest on solid ground and he knew it. A word, a gesture could do away with it all. His was the fear of the actor to the central soliloquy of a play and from this fear arose tension. His literary lines are dominated by adversatives and by the sad awareness that man is a puppet in the hands of an always capricious destiny. He summarizes this position in a line from "Farewell to the Court": "My love misled...my life in Fortune's hand".

Raleigh's capricious destiny had a name, and a royal one at that, and her power over him rested on a contradiction: Queen Elizabeth's love for Sir Walter, her attachment to him, prevented the man from fulfilling his dreams; he was tied by her love, a love he desired and cherished throughout his life, but that he was ready to discard for more earthly attachments. He sings to his goddess and muse, but wants to walk side by side with his plain wife and sail towards fame and riches. On the other hand, Elizabeth wants to remain, and be worshipped daily, as his "Laura", "Cynthia", "Diana", his "Faerie Queene", his nymph... She is the bearer of his pain but also the hand that soothes his fancy:

Such a one did I meet, good Sir,
Such an Angelique face,
Who like a queen, like a nymph, did appear
By her gate, by her grace

She hath left me here all alone,
All alone and unknown,
Who sometimes did me lead with her self,
And me loved as her own.²³

Elizabeth proves to be Raleigh's gravity and he soars towards her through life and death, but she also constitutes an enigma never to be solved in his poems: the Queen is Raleigh's "fair and harmless light", his "glory of the night", but also "a gilded hook", a "fever of the mind". This polarized game of attraction and repulsion is probably the very essence of Elizabeth's existence, who lived fulfilling the function of a delicate balance.

The climatic literary articulation between Raleigh and the Queen is expressed in "Fain would I", a poem built upon a consistent rhythm of

²³ "Walsingham."

negatives, where a wish is uttered to be immediately thwarted by its inviability, and an action is accomplished to be proved futile right away. It is indeed the depiction of a lover chasing a falling-star. The poem has three points of articulation "I", "you" and "not": "I" stands for Sir Walter Raleigh, "you" for the Queen and "not" exemplifies the contradictory relationship of the two plus the difficult life led by Sir Walter after meeting the Queen. The audio-visual effect of repetitions in every stanza and the carefully structured lines carry the reader along riddle-like images and concepts, loaded with autobiographical experience and historical meanings. A stanza must suffice to give evidence of the poetical force:

Fain would I, but I dare not.
I dare, but yet I may not.
I may although I care not
For pleasure when I play not.

There was a time when Raleigh would spread his best cloak on a muddy puddle for Elizabeth to step on dry ground, when he still considered that:

...true love is a durable fire,
In the mind ever burning,
Never sick, never old, never dead,
From itself never turning.²⁴

Not long afterwards, however, Raleigh acquired a more accurate, more mature attitude towards his queen, but, by then, time, age, and worries had fed on her looks and Elizabeth's displeasure with herself would make her adamant to more appropriate considerations:

Our passions are most like to floods and streams,
The shallow murmur, but the deep are dumb.
So, when affections yield discourse, it seems
The bottom is but shallow whence they come.
They that are rich in words must needs discover
That they are poor in that which makes a lover.²⁵

²⁴ "As you came from the holy land."

²⁵ "Sir Walter Raleigh to Queen Elizabeth."

The contrast between "talking" and "loving" soothes, for Raleigh, the Queen's estrangement from him. He chooses to believe that their mutual affections are deep, if dumb, but the framing words command the poem: he knows that Elizabeth would only accept a passionate lover or nothing at all.

Sir Walter still played with the courtier notion of a virginal, ever-young queen in his poetry, toying around with words and structures, as in his most famous conjectural poem "Her face, her tongue, her wit", where the poet remains at a surface level, drawing an archetypical portrait, allegedly of the queen, but good to fit any renaissance ideal love, as its own structure, pointing to all directions, evidently shows. It can be read line by line or structured in semantic squares, four lines to each and each line cesured in three; it can also be read lineally or diagonally, from top to bottom or viceversa, and left to right or conversely. The poem might have been written by Raleigh or not, but it is a good example of a poet's desire to be taken as an uncommitted lover of beauty and sensuality and not as a serious, moral slave to love.

When Elizabeth's ire closes on him after his marriage and he falls from fortune, Raleigh's poems become darker with political omens, moral warnings and maxims. The peak of this period is the long poem *The Lie*. By the titles alone we can read the difference in tone: *The advice*, *The excuse*, *Farewell to the Court*, *The Hermit poor* and the definitive and eloquent *My body in the walls captived*.

The lie is a gallery of negative portraits ranging from the Church to the Court, through Physics, Art, the City and the Potentates; they are organized around a powerful coda repeated at the end of each stanza:

if reply
Then give them all the lie.

This sentence alone carries the bitterness of Raleigh's soul as his prime disappears with his best hopes and dreams. It alternates one word according to the nature of the subject in each stanza, and the command is temperate with a modal verb in some cases, but there is no doubt as to the articulation of Raleigh's feelings. The stanza that best epitomizes the course of his life runs as follows:

Tell age it daily wasteth,

Tell honour how it alters,
 Tell beauty how she blasteth,
 Tell favour how it falters;
 And as they shall reply,
 Give every one the lie.

It is a felicitous blending of Raleigh's decay and what caused it; as age and beauty (symbolizing the Queen) disappear, the honour and favour she conveyed on Sir Walter also wave. The forceful rhyme of negative concepts fits in the semantic field of the whole stanza and gives it a masterly finish.

Similarly in *My body in the walls captived* Raleigh writes a lucid blending of the two poles dominating his existence: the Queen, courtier love, romance, light and, on the other hand, death warrants, absences silence and darkness. The effort the poet makes not only to compare them but to superimpose them throws extra-literary light on both sets of concepts: it places them as opposites poles but qualifies the love of the queen as deadly and the imprisonment in the tower as a maturing process; and, once more, Raleigh depicts himself as caught in the pains and pleasures of his contradictory life:

Such prison erst was so delightful
 As it desired no other dwelling place,
 But time's effects, and destinies despiteful,
 Have changed both my keeper and my fare.

The fragment admits two readings, depending on the value we assign to the different lines, and the clue to this duality is given, ostentatiously, in the last one. The first line contains already the pair of contraries that polarize the poem, "prison" and "delightful"; since they are antithetical by nature we tend to think immediately that "prison" has, here, a peculiar connotation having to do with the "desire" of the next line. But, in spite of the positive meaning of love, the tone of the fragment is set by the pervading negative effect of "prison", "despiteful" and "keeper", one in every line. Were this prison "delightful" and "desired", as the beginning of the fragment seems to intimate, the "But" of the third line destroys the hopeful atmosphere, and the "change" of the next line rounds the darker picture off. The prison and the keeper take on their real dimension, and the Queen remains in the background commanding destinies.

The elegiac poem *Ocean to Cynthia*, found only partially and probably left unfinished by Raleigh's untimely death, is a recapitulation of the tensions that shattered his existence. The text, allegedly consisting of twenty books, seems to be in a draft stage, considering the care with which Raleigh finished off his poems, but speaks the language it has us accustomed to:

Such heat in ice, such fire in frost remained,
Such trust in doubt, such comfort in despair.

These structural oppositions acquire further meaning as the poem progresses, an intensifying effect Raleigh has developed throughout his work, and lines 85 to 91 amplify the contradiction and admit a double reading similar to the one we have exemplified before:

So my forsaken heart, my withered mind,
Widow of all the joys it once possessed,
My hopes clean out of sight, with forced wind
To kingdoms strange, to lands far-off addressed,
Alone, forsaken, friendless on the shore,
With many wounds, with death's cold pangs embraced,
Writes in the dust, as one that could no more.

The composition of this poem coincides chronologically with the immense task of writing *The History of the World* and, as both works progress, Raleigh moves from the particular to the general in *The Ocean to Cynthia*; *the person, place, and passages forgotten* he embarks on considerations of "Nature's wonders", "Virtue's choices" and "Time's begettings" as they appear at different times and places in history and always tinted by a strain of pessimism and doom. Towards the end of the book Raleigh resumes the theme of his heart's desire and summarizes magnificently his "leit motiv" and his new concern (that his end is near); lines 517-522 end the poem and inscribe an epitaph to his vital trajectory:

To God I leave it, who first gave it me,
And I her gave, and she returned again,
As it was hers. So let His mercies be
Of my last comforts the essential mean.
But be it so, or not, th'effects are past.
Her love hath end: my woe must ever last.

PLATONISM AND THE IDEA OF LOVE IN SPENSER'S MINOR POEMS

Santiago Fernández-Corugedo
University of Oviedo. Spain

I would like to warn the possible audience of these considerations about the fact that I shall be mainly dealing with some very specific shorter poems by Edmund Spenser (*London, circa 1552 - †Westminster, 1599), instead of quoting lavishly from his two longer works as it seems that contemporary readers of English Renaissance poetry appear to delight themselves in the sonnet collections and other shorter poems which thus would enable their readers to appreciate the spark of genius of their authors in very little time, though I would assume as well that they may also consider several of the great poetic achievements of the late Tudor period as rather cumbersome. Cumbersome because in most cases their frequent overwhelming extension hinders the possibility of reading them in just one quiet afternoon or in a dark and stormy night. *Caveat emptor & co.*

Contemporary passion for saving time in any activity in order to devote it to some idle occupations, a passion that Elizabethans shared as well, is not the only reason responsible for the removing of these literary works to rather remote shelves of the present-day everyman's library of poetic diction, reasonable poetry and sensible taste. I would like to remark that there is a good number of 16th and 17th century poems that constitute quite an ordeal even for the most biased amateur of verse, as these are representative of a world that has been fully discarded by modern fashion and by poetic usage. And I would even add that this phenomenon has happened especially after the singular devotion that a certain group of the English Romantic Poets felt for them, and after the essays of a swarm of critics influenced by T.S. Eliot and F.R. Leavis's ideas and opinions. Not to

mention that some of those Renaissance poems were already exceedingly boring in the opinion of the contemporaries of their authors.²⁶

I must confess that one may be inclined to corroborate such a supposition if we were just to take into account the number of scholarly and popular editions both of the longer and shorter poems of Elizabethan times that have appeared in the four last decades of the current century.²⁷ Spenser's *Faery Queene*, and *Amoretti*, (1594-95), for instance have been issued in Britain just once²⁸ (Roche, 1978; and Evans, 1977 respectively)²⁹, though *The Shepherds Calender*, (1579) is still waiting for a sound edition; Sidney's magnificent *Astrophil & Stella*, (1591), as a whole has reappeared but twice (Ringler, 1962; Evans, 1977); Samuel Daniel's fifty five sonnets *To Delia*, (1594) have been edited twice (Sprague, 1972; Evans 1977); and Michael Drayton's *Ideas Mirrour. Amours in quatorzains*, (1594), have appeared only in Evans' edition (Evans, 1977). And most people would grant, Shakespeare is altogether quite a different case in terms of both audience and editions.

The consequence hence is that there seems to be a real need for new and authorised editions of most of the poetry that I would like to discuss, and

²⁶ For instance, the *Passionate Centurie of Love*, by Thomas Wilson (London, 1582), is possibly one of the dullest sonnet collections in Elizabethan poetry.

²⁷ I.e. 1950-1990, being the years surveyed.

²⁸ The *Epithalamion*, however, though it was printed in the same volume as the sonnet collection, probably following after the intention of its author, is not included in Evans, 1977. If modesty would not forbid such an arrogance, I would probably include in this list my own Spanish edition of Spenser's *Amoretti & Epithalamion*, as it includes the original 1595 texts.

²⁹ Evans' *Elizabethan Sonnets*, is an excellent and still easily available collection of the shorter type of Elizabethan poetry we have been discussing so far. However it is not a critical edition (neither it has that intention), of any of the texts included. Professor Evans actually says (1977, xxxi): "The reader who hopes to taste the full flavour of the minor Elizabethan sonnets should read the exquisite miniature editions of the 1590s in the British Museum. (...) I have tried to retain something of that flavour by avoiding a standardized and uniform presentation of the varying texts; but the reader who takes one of the original octavos in his hand will feel something of the excitement which a new book of poems must have produced in the relative infancy of printing, and be unusually conscious that he is handling an artefact."

that is specially true in the case of Edmund Spenser's poetry. The only accessible text of Spenser's works is still A.C. Smith & E. de Selincourt's comprehensive Oxford edition. Though very good, it dates from 1912 and the criteria with which it was prepared have varied very much indeed in the course of time.³⁰ The excellent American *Variorum* edition is nevertheless printed in a very inconvenient size and in several volumes.³¹ Therefore it may only be easily handled within the bounds of University and Research Libraries.

But my concern should be more specific from this moment onwards in order to try to illustrate which were the sort of ideas about love that predominated in the literary world during the second half of the 16th century in England, ideas which ultimately seem to derive from a wider conception of love as seen from the scope of the ideas about man and the world. The part played by the ideas on love during the period of our concern, and how this so very sensible an emotion takes on a new dignified status during the English Renaissance can be very well followed in a series of shorter poems by Spenser and in several of those sonnet sequences I have already mentioned.

If we consider Spenser an archetypical Elizabethan poet, we will be able to illustrate as well how these ideas appear in those poems of our author that deal specifically with this uchronic and attractive topic in the moment in which the narrative quality of English love poetry was turning from the discursive into the lyrical mode that it adopted after the waning of the Middle Ages. Poems included in the *Fowre Hymnes*, (1596), and in *Amoretti & Epithalamion*, (1595), together with the *Prothalamion*, (1596), I expect, will help us to the better understanding of the development of the idea of love in Spenser and other Elizabethans.³² Moreover, we shall probably

³⁰ It is therefore the text employed for quotation in this paper (Smith & Selincourt, 1977).

³¹ This American edition of Spenser's works occupies 11 volumes: vols. I-VI include *The Faerie Queene*; vols. VII & VIII the *Minor Poems*; vol. IX the *Prose Works*; vol. X is a *Life of Spenser*; and vol. XI a general *Index* to the previous volumes. Vid. Greenlaw et al., 1932-1966.

³² Though the sonnet sequence *Amoretti* was published together with the *Epithalamion* these are poems significantly separate in theme and purpose. The *Epithalamion* assumedly relates Spenser's own (poetic?) marriage with Elizabeth

manage as well to scan what I consider to be the progressive and irresistible transition from his early Platonic mannerisms to the kind of pre-baroque concept of love that he was probably having in the latter part of his life. I think we should take into consideration as well that Spenser was a mature man in his forties and had just married³³ when he wrote most of the poems

Boyle, and it does so in a most classical way: it is a pageant describing the bride's and bridegroom's progress first towards the temple, then to the bridal bed, and finally the purposed consummation of love within the bounds of marriage when the longed-for night arrives at last. Therefore *Epithalamion* can be more easily related to *Prothalamion*, as this shorter poem which deals with the double marriage of Elizabeth and Katherine Somerset, is also written in the same classical mode: the brides are carried over the river Thames to the Temple Embankment where their bridegrooms are waiting for them. Both *Epithalamion* and *Prothalamion* refer to married love, whereas the sonnets of *Amoretti* seem to represent the courtship of Spenser's in 1594, and the kind of love presented in them is not necessarily of a bridal character. See below for further discussion.

³³ There has been some discussion about Spenser's married life. It is absolutely certain that he married Elizabeth Boyle on the 11th of June, 1594, but there is an increasingly strong critical opinion which favours (founded, unfortunately, mainly on internal evidence of the poems) that this was Spenser's second marriage, as he could have married "Machabyas Childe" (being either the name of his bride or the name of his bride's father), several years before, maybe some time in between 1576 and 1580. The character "Rosalind" in *The Shepherds Calender*, could hence be identified with Machabyas Childe, though a second "Rosalind" appears in *Colin Clovts Come Home Againe*, (1595), and the characters can be very easily identified with the former "Rosalind" of 1579, (*The Shepherds Calender*: "January" Ll. 59-66; Smith & Selincourt, 1977: 422): "Ah foolish *Hobbinol*, thy gifts bene vayne: / *Colin* them giues to *Rosalind* againe. / I loue thilke lasse, (alas why doe I loue?) / And am forlorne, (alas why am I lorne?) / Shee deignes not my good will, but doth reprove, / And of my rurall musick holdeth scorne. / Shepherds deuise she hateth as the snake, / And laughes the songes, that *Colin Clout* doth make." In 1595, we find the same proof of nobility in "Faire *Rosalind*," (*Colin Clovts Come Home Againe*, 939-9446; Smith & Selincourt, 1977: 545): "Yet so much grace let her vouchsafe to grant / To simple sawine, sith her I may not loue: / Yet that I may her honour paravant, / And praise her worth, though far my wit aboue, / Such grace shall be some guerdon for the grieffe, / And long affliction which I haue endured: / Such grace sometimes shall giue me some reliefe, / And ease of paine which cannot be recured." So far we still lack some sound historical evidence which may provide us with proof about who might have been the lady or ladies impersonated by "Rosalind" and about Spenser's first wife. Anyway, a full reinterpretation of Spenser's early poems might be possible by taking into account the possibility of

under discussion, whereas he was a younger man in his late twenties when he published *The Shepherds Calender*.

For the English Renaissance men love was a dual entity, just as man was conformed by body, soul and spirit,³⁴ though the physical support provided by man's mortal flesh was no longer to have sinful Christian connotations but rather instead to imply that man's senses were to and could be controlled. And man had also been created after the image of God, which implied a constant need to match the traditions of Christian thought with the renewed philosophy of the ancient Greeks. Love and beauty became highly prized qualities, and both love and beauty hence could have bodily and spiritual senses. That is what we have to assume when approaching Spenser's *Fowre Hymnes*, as two of them present to the reader love and beauty from the point of view of those physical ideas, whereas the other two deal with "heavenly love" and "heavenly beauty."

At this moment I think it will be most convenient to analyze the hymns on love included in *Fowre Hymnes*, in order to assess my hypothesis. In the introductory letter to the Countesses of Cumberland and Warwick, Spenser states:

Hauing in the greener times of my youth, composed these former two Hymnes in the praise of Loue and beutie, and finding that the same too much pleased those of like age and disposition, which being too vehemently caried with that kind of affection, do rather sucke out poyson to their strong passion, then hony to their honest delight, I was moued by the one of you two most excellent Ladies, to call in the same. But being vnable so to doe, by reason that many copies thereof were formerly scattered abroad, I resolued at last to amend, and by way of retractation to reforme them, making in stead of those two Hymnes of earthly or naturall loue and beutie, two others of heauenly and celestiall. The which I doe dedicate ioyntly vnto you two honorable sisters, as to the most

seeing him as a married man when he wrote them. For further discussion see H. Shire, 1978: 2-34; Hudson, 1949; and below in this essay.

³⁴ These three concepts follow after the ideas of "corpus," "anima et animus," so dear to the Academic School, and they are most probably founded in Aristotle's *De natura animalium*.

excellent and rare ornaments of all true loue and beautie, both
in the one and the other kinde, ...³⁵

Spenser points out to one and the other kind of love: earthly love and heavenly love. In the first composition, *An Hymne in Honovr of Love*, (*HL*), what he presents is a classical allegorical vision including Cupid and his mother, Venus (*HL*. 23-26):

Out of thy siluer bowres and secret blisse,
Where thou doest sit in *Venus* lap aboue,
Bathing thy wings in her ambrosiall kisse,
That sweeter farre then any Nectar is;

alongside with the god of love's own daughter (*HL*. 287-288):

There with thy daughter *Pleasure* they doe play
Their hurtlesse sports, without rebuke or blame,

and the usual appeal to literary authority by means of introducing the examples of the loves and fates of Greco-Roman characters such as Tantalus, Leander, Æneas, Achilles, Orpheus, etc.

The concept of love that Spenser has been using here seems to follow rather closely the Neoplatonic conception of love expressed by the most outstanding Italian Renaissance philosophers.³⁶ The values of classical

³⁵ Smith & Selincourt, 1977: 586.

³⁶ I think there can be no doubt whatsoever about Spenser having been acquainted with Marsilio Ficino's *De Amore: Commentarium in Convivium Platonis*, (*DA*); and the *Dialoghi d'Amore* by Leo Abarbanel (also known as Leone Hebreo, Leo Hebraevs, León Hebreo, or Leon the Hebrew). Ficino for instance says "che la bellezza è cosa spirituale," and that it must be something shared by virtue, shapes and voices; (*DA*, Discourse V, chapter III), these being the underlying ideas that one may find in both the *Hymne in Honour of Love*, and the *Hymne on Heavenly Love*, and in several of the sonnets from *Amoretti*, f.i. n° XXXIX, LXI, or LXXXIII. Vid. Villa, 1986: 91; Soria & Romano, 1986. To illustrate the influences of different Italian poets who also follow after the ideas of Neoplatonism on love, see Lewis, 1967: 1-63; and Lotspeich, 1977; Blanchard, 1977; Neil Dodge, 1977; Alpers, 1977; Tuve, 1977 (all in Bayley, P. ed. 1977: 49-100); Smith & Selincourt, 1977: xxxv-xxxviii. About the influence of the Florentine Neoplatonic thought on Spenser, vid Shire, 1978: 82-83.

antiquity: ethical behaviour and the wonderful delight of being alive, which might have led into the topic expressed in the line “gather ye rosebuds while ye may,” are now confronted with a new “human” character whose ideal is the search for virtue.³⁷ This humanism derives from Aristotelian ethics once they have been filtered through Christianity and confronted with Plato’s newly reborn writings. Renaissance Italy and France³⁸ had already seen by the 1550s the discussion of humanism and its adaptation to Christian values. In England that discussion seems to take place once the religious confrontations have been officially settled by the last of the Tudor monarchs.

My next main consideration about the idea of love in Spenser’s poetry is concerned with the problem of reality as surveyed by Renaissance Neoplatonism: that the physical world is just a puzzling gathering of imperfect versions of the ideas that do only exist -that are hence real- in the spiritual world. In the same way that God created the world and then created Adam in his image, man can also create things in his own image, but then, although God’s creatures are real and hence perfect, man’s creations, unless they be inspired by divine power, are mere illusions, imperfect shapes. God created out of His love, and as God’s main feature is His spiritual nature, His creatures derive their perfection from the real world of ideas. Man, as a bodily creature, “Then shall return to earth as it was;” but Man as a being participating of God’s own nature, has a soul, “and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it,” thus completing the cycle of creation.³⁹ And therefore Man’s creations should not be loved but merely appreciated, admired, or coveted. Man ought to love God, and thus that kind of love will be perfect and duly rewarded, this love having both a Christian and a Platonic justification.

But Man can also love other human creatures both as reflections of the spiritual idea of beauty -which is the kind of explanation provided in

³⁷ The concept indeed is better expressed in the Italian word: *Virtù*. Virtue or Vertue are hence the qualities of substantial to man -*vir*-, and closely deriving from truth -*veritas*.

³⁸ It is convenient to remember that Spenser’s early models are fundamentally French (Marot, Du Bellay), and that the poetry of Ariosto, Tasso, and other Italians influenced him later, or previously filtered through French poets. Vid. Renwick, 1933; Kermode, 1973.

³⁹ Vid *Ecclesiastes*, 12: 7.

Plato's *Symposium*, and in Ficino's *de Amore*- and as further examples (albeit the own self) of God's perfect creatures -which is the Renaissance interpretation of Christian blood and flesh love.

The concept of love then has a dual nature as well -carnal and spiritual-, and it can be considered as the main principle of conduct in human behaviour. This is the sort of discussion that Spenser presents in the allegorical *Colin Clovts Come Home Againe* (1595),⁴⁰ as the shepherds who talk about Cynthia, review in detail and ponder about her virtues comparing her to other shepherdesses -Neæra, Stella, Galathea, Amaryllis, etc.- in terms of perfection in beauty and love. The course of true love seems to be a progression, the climbing of a scale towards perception first, and then the delight in ideal beauty. We could now re-examine why Drayton's *Ideas Mirroure* does embed in its very title the concept to be developed in his sonnets, or why is it that Sidney's Astrophil -the star-lover-, pursues a star -Stella; or why Spenser also writes about "the Idea playne" in his sonnets We would probably guess that love's dual nature also implies that its effects can be both admirable and destructive.

Those effects of love do also present an antithesis in terms of the origin and development of ideal love, as the image imprinted in the deepest part of the lover's wit is obtained by means of the contemplation of the person or object beloved -the old idea that love enters the mind of the lover through the lover's sight-, followed by the compulsory thoughts that the lover has to dedicate himself to obtaining the attention of the person beloved. We can possibly see it in *An Hymne in Honovr of Love*, (*HL*, 215-217):

His harts enshrined saint, his heauens queene,
Fairer then fairest, in his fayning eye,
Whose sole aspects he counts felicitye.

but then still insisting upon some of the medieval ideas about the service of love that one is accustomed to find in Courtly Love situations (*HL*. 176-182):

For loue is a Lord of truth and loialtie,

⁴⁰ Smith & Selincourt, 1977: 536-545. In lines 463-588 of the poem one can find the discussion we are concerned with.

Gustav Ungerer

Lifting himselfe out of the lowly dust,
 Of golden plumes vp to the purest skie,
 About the reach of loathly sinfull lust,
 Whose base affect through cowardly distrust
 Of his weake wings, dare not to heauen fly,
 But like a moldwarpe in the earth doth ly.

We could hence deduce that if indeed this poem is a result of those “*greener times of my youth*,” it does fit very well indeed with the sort of ideas that we are to expect from an Elizabethan whose education has been founded on that Neoplatonic model. I think that the lines (HL. 183-189), that follow the previous stanza as we find them in *An Hymne in Honovr of Love*:⁴¹

His dunghill thoughts, which do themselves enure
 To dirtie drosse, no higher dare aspyre,
 Ne can his feeble earthly eyes endure
 The flaming light of that celestial fyre,
 Which kindleth loue in generous desyre,
 And makes him mount about the natiue might
 Of heaue earth, vp to the heauens hight.

do present a remarkable similitude with some lines included in Sidney’s *An Apology for Poetry*: (Shepherd, 1984: 116):

... sometimes, under the pretty tales of wolves and sheep,
 can include the whole considerations of wrong-doing and
 patience; sometimes show that contention for trifles can get
 but a trifling victory; where perchance a man may see that
 even Alexander and Darius, when they strave who should be
 cock of this world’s dunghill, the benefit they got was that the
 afterlivers may say,
Haec memini et victum frustra contendere Thirsin:
Ex illo Corydon, Corydon es tempore nobis.

and it is precisely Sidney who indicates very clearly why would English poets follow the path of Platonism (Shepherd, 1984: 128):

⁴¹ Vid. Smith & Selincourt, 1977: 588.

But now indeed my burden is great; now Plato's name is laid upon me, whom, I must confess, of all philosophers I have ever esteemed most worthy of reverence, and with great reason: since of all philosophers he is the most poetical.

If we were to assume that the ideas about love and beauty that Spenser stated in his hymn on Love were to last, we would probably be shocked about what we can read in his later *An Hymne of Heavenly Love* (HHL, 258-273):

Learne him to loue, that loued thee so deare,
 And in thy brest his blessed image beare.
 With all thy hart, with all thy soule and mind,
 Thou must him loue, and his behests embrace;
 All other loues, with which the world doth blind
 Weake fancies, and stirre vp affections base,
 Thou must renounce, and utterly displace,
 And giue thy selfe vnto him full and free,
 That full and freely gaue himself to thee.

Then shalt thou feele thy spirit so possesst,
 And rausht with deuouring great desire
 Of his deare selfe, that shall thy feeble brest
 In flame with loue, and set thee all on fire
 With burning zeale, through euery part entire,
 That in no earthly thing thou shalt delight,
 But in his sweet and amiable sight.

Here we do not find any longer the pure Neoplatonic concepts of love and beauty as ideal elements. We are to consider instead that though in his youthful verses Spenser declared that it is most agreeable to find truth and kindness in the object of love, that it is more pleasant to look at a beautiful body than to observe despicable limbs, and that the sweet accord of voices is delightful because it is not corporeal, some twenty years later his ideas about love and beauty have changed. Indeed we should be just stating that Spenser is at first an English Neoplatonic poet who is merely applying the ideas on love of his own times. And then we are thus to assume that the spiritual world in which poetry is to find its fundamental justification -the true universe of man's mind-, really prefers these qualities because they are well known to it as they seem to be deprived of a bodily appearance and hence they may be closer in their nature and attributes to the immortal soul of man,

to that world where shapes do not count any longer because the observer is only able to see a stage inhabited by shadows that reincarnate and descend to this unhappy world. In the Elizabethan quest for the establishing of an acceptable set of social and philosophical values, the search for happiness includes automatically those three concepts we have alluded to, three virtues⁴² that will be highly admired and appreciated even many years after the Renaissance fashions and customs had been substituted by those currently deriving from the Baroque modes, although that substitution was probably effected by the very same group of poets who introduced them.

I think there can be no superciliousness about considering that this change took place in the late years of the 16th century and the early decades of the 17th, as one can easily point at the differences, for instance, in between the attitude towards life in general that can be detected in the early love-poetry of John Donne's *Songs and Sonnets*, and his later *Divine Sonnets*, or the remarkable treatment of love-scenes and performance techniques that we are able to discuss when contrasting Shakespeare's *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, and *The Tempest*. The transitions that modified the attitudes and modes of Renaissance Platonism in literature all over Western Europe might very well be linked to the general need for a spiritual synthesis of the opposing religious attitudes of Roman Catholicism or Protestantism, both Christian forms at any rate, and the principles derived from an intellectual longing for classical paganism. This is the sort of discussion that one may find recorded in many Spenserian critics, and it is the sort of discussion which led to a rather sound proposal by C.S. Lewis, (1967: 59):

Every lover looks for qualities in the beloved that remind him of the god he followed in a former life. They 'keep their eyes fixed upon the god, and as they reach and grasp him by memory they are inspired and receive from him character and habits, so far as it is possible for a man to have a part in God.' (...) Such doctrines, then, were to be found in the works of the Platonists. But granted that, how could Spenser call himself a Christian and believe in them? Two very different answers to this question occur; and each may in part be true. The first is that the whole school of thought to which Spenser belonged felt that in the long run *everything* must be reconcilable. There

⁴² It might be convenient to pay attention to the fact that by "virtue" I am really alluding to an "inherent character," henceforth using it in a rather Platonic sense.

was no belief, however pagan or bizarre it might seem, that could not be accommodated somehow, if only it were right understood. The other answer is that Spenser may not have intended the doctrines as articles of belief at all.

Though one is also able to detect in Lewis's attitude the same dichotomy (*Two very different answers to this question occur, and each may in part be true*); that Spenser and his contemporaries had to, or at least tried to solve.

However one could also say that Platonism as understood in the late 16th century, informs the relation of image to idea, and hence in Spenser's poems it usually implies a system of ideas and images of ideas. And then, also following after the Platonic principle of the opposing complementary selves, which can be expounded into a system which includes complementary worlds, we will find the most elaborate universe of ideas and counter-ideas: a system in which ideas and images of ideas, that can very easily be attributed a good moral finality, will be confronted by a false system of ideas and a false system of images of ideas. Thus the dichotomy in between Platonism and Christianity may be seen from the scope of a new meaning based on the decision that both the poet and his audience have to take when they have to match the real world and the reality of the worlds created by Spenser. It may follow as well that Elizabethans were actually trying to implement the equation in which Christianity is a world of good moral ideas which have to be confronted by a Platonic world which is at the same time good inasmuch as it can be levelled with the Christian one, and evil, because it is to that ideal world where falsehood belongs. If we are to accept this basic principle, then we may be able to understand much better how those two answers are different and how each one is true.

Even in those cases in which Spenser does not introduce, or just does not wish to introduce, this dual universe, his whole conception of reality and fantasy prove illusory, because the opposition no longer affects imitations and realities, and instead he offers us emblems, symbols, images, and so on, twice over, in true and false forms which are very difficult to separate one from the other. The principle of complementation is always adamant in Renaissance authors, though it is much more a manneristic effect in the case of Spenser because it seems to be his own version of Plato's dialectic principle. If we can accept that Spenser is actually "a mind in progress" during the 1590s, then we shall be able to determine that the concepts of

mannerism and baroque are to be found in his minor poems. It is possible to illustrate this dialectics for instance in sonnet 7 from *Amoretti*:⁴³

Fayre eyes, the myrrour of my mazed hart,
 what wondrous vertue is contaynd in you
 the which both lyfe and death forth from you dart
 into the obiect of your mighty view?

For when ye mildly looke with louely hew,
 then is my soule with life and loue inspired,
 but when ye lowre, or looke on me askew,
 then doe I die, as one with lightning fyred.

But since that lyfe is more then death desyred,
 looke euer louely, as becomes you best,
 that your bright beams of my weak eies admyred,
 may kindle liuing fire within my brest.

Such life should be the honor of your light,
 such death the sad ensample of your might.

because as it was the case of *An Hymne in Honovr of Love*, the topic of the eyes⁴⁴ which introduces the discussion about the poet's "lyfe and death," indeed helps Spenser to present the dichotomy about the dual nature of love, though the underlying discussion of the sonnet may rest upon the confrontation of opposed principles which are resolved in the final couplet. But I would like to point out especially to the first lines in the second stanza:

For when ye mildly looke with louely hew,
 then is my soule with life and loue inspired,

as in these we find the clue for the explanation of the antithesis presented, because it appears that the poet's life seems to be sustained by the mere spiritual contemplation of the "wondrous vertue contayned in you," needing little else. And that is a purely Neoplatonic attitude. Yet it can be quite

⁴³ Vid. Smith & Selincourt, 1977: 563; González Corugedo, 1983: 84-85.

⁴⁴ This is a very dear topic to English literature. One may for instance remember that in the late 12th century, the clerk who is responsible for the *Ancrene Riwe* also uses the eyes, or the eyesight rather, as "Beginnunge ant rote of al þis ilke reowle was a liht sihlfe." Vid. Tolkien, 1962.

interesting to compare sonnet 7 -which we can assume to have been written several months before the latter poems of *Amoretti*-, with sonnet 88,⁴⁵ in terms of the idea of love that Spenser has been constructing and depicting in the series, because in sonnet 88 we meet the *Idea*, which is introduced by means of the customary routine about the sight and the contemplation derived from it:

Since I have lackt the comfort of that light,
The which was wont to lead my thoughts astray:
I wander as in darknesse of the night,
affrayd of every dangers least dismay.

Ne ought I see, though in the clearest day,
when others gaze upon theyr shadowes vayne:
but th'onely image of that heavenly ray,
whereof some glance doth mine eye remayne.

Of which beholding the Idea playne,
through contemplation of my purest part:
with light thereof I doe my selfe sustayne,
and thereon feed my love-affamisht hart.

But with such brightnesse whylest I fill my mind,
I starve my body and myne eyes doe blynd.

If I am not very much mistaken, I think we could detect that there has been a significant change in the way in which Spenser feeds his “love-affamisht hart” as he seems to be quite unhappy with the mere spiritual contemplation of his beloved one. At the same time that he is able to fill his mind to probable full satisfaction, he starves his body and blinds his eyes, thus expressing utter unhappiness. All that is no longer a purely Neoplatonic concept. We could deduce then that this new (physical?) requirement might have imperative connections with the kinds of love that will be expressed and confronted in the two couples of ideas appearing in *Fowre Hymnes: An Hymne of Heavenly Love* and *An Hymne of Heavenly Beavtie*, and the earlier *An Hymne in Honovr of Love*, and *An Hymne in Honovr of Beavtie*.

⁴⁵ Smith & Selincourt, 1977: 577.

Spenser substitutes, maybe just partially, but in a way which I think to be significant enough, the Neoplatonic ideas of his earlier compositions for a new concept of love and beauty which permeates a change in the world of the mind: The double love that is to be found in the soul has been somewhat transformed in Spenser's late poems: it is more elaborate, less purely Platonic and more Christianized, though none the less rational and polemic. It might have been just a consequence implied by a mere fact of worldly character: that the poet advances in age. But it may also have been a consequence of a deeper change in the world of ideas

The double love of earthly character has also changed: it is no longer incontinent and distempered, but quite chaste and sober. All these features concerning the origin, nature, and effects of love in their gradual transformation may be proof enough to determine that whereas in the late 1580s Spenser and other remarkable Elizabethans were still wondering about the problem of adapting Neoplatonism, by the 1590s they had completed the sort of transition that one may find in a very noticeable way in John Donne's *Songs and Sonnets*, and very especially in the intertwining of the three characters that appear in Shakespeare's sonnet sequence. It is a transition that we could identify very well with the end of English Renaissance and the dawn of a brave new Baroque.

REFERENCES

- Alpers, P.J. "Spenser's Use of Ariosto." Ed. Bayley, P. 1977 (1967) 69-73.
 Bayley, P. (Ed.). *The Faerie Queene. A Casebook*. London: Macmillan Press, 1977.
 Blanchard, H.H. "Spenser and Boiardo." Ed. Bayley, P. 1977(1925): 58-65.
 Evans, M. *Elizabethan Sonnets*. London: Dent & Sons Ltd., 1977.
 González Corugedo, S. *Edmund Spenser: Amoretti & Epithalamion*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1983.
 Greenlaw, E. et. al. (Eds.). *The Works of Edmund Spenser*. 11 vols. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1932-1966 (*Variorum* edition).
 Hudson, A.C. *Life of Spenser*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1949 (*Variorum* edition) vol. 10.
 Kermode, F. *Renaissance Essays*. London: Fontana, 1973.
 Lewis, C.S. *Spenser's Images of Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

- Lotspeich, H.G. "Classical Mythology in Spenser's Poetry." Ed. Bayley, P., 1977 (1932) 49-57.
- Neil Dodge, R.E. "Spenser's Imitations from Ariosto." Bayley, P. (ed.), 1977 (1897) 66-68.
- Renwick, W.L. *Edmund Spenser: An Essay on Renaissance Poetry*. London: Arnold, 1933.
- Ringler, W.A. *The Poems of Sir Philip Sidney*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Roche, T. P. *The Faerie Queene*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1978.
- Shepherd, G. *An Apology for Poetry*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984.
- Shire, H. *A Preface to Spenser*. London: Longman, 1978.
- Smith, J.C. & Selincourt, E. de . *Spenser: Poetical Works*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977 (1912).
- Soria Olmedo, A. & Romano, D. *Diálogos de amor de León Hebreo*. Madrid: Tecnos, 1986.
- Sprague, A.C. *Samuel Daniel: Poems and A Defence of Ryme*. London: Oxford University Press, London, 1972.
- Tolkien, J.R.R. *Ancrene Wisse, Corpus Christi College Cambridge MS. 402*. [E.E.T.S.] Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Tuve, R. "Spenser and Medieval Romances." Ed. Bayley, P., 1977: (1966) 74-100.
- Villa Ardura, R. de la . *Marsilio Ficino: De Amore*. Madrid: Ed. Tecnos, 1986.

SPANISH POETRY TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH: THE CASE OF *ENGLAND'S HELICON*

José Luis Chamosa
University of León. Spain

When considering the antiquity pastoral poetry has as a genre as compared with comedy or tragedy George Puttenham clearly states the following:

I do deny that the Eglogue should be the first and most auncient forme of artificiall Poesie, being persuaded that the Poet devised the Eglogue long after the other dramatic poems, not of purpose to counterfeit or represent the rusticall manner of loves and communication: but under the vaile of homely passions and in rude speeches to insinuate and glauce at greater matters.⁴⁶

If we assume Puttenham's theory to be correct (and we do not have reasons for not doing so) we would then have a very good explanation for the popularity pastoral literature enjoyed for most of the Renaissance in Western Europe.

Pastoral literature and its world of archetypes are very far away from the present day sensibility and it is hardly easy to understand how such a stereotyped production was ever thought to be the touchstone of a writer's talent and capacity. But facts, as Mr. Gradgrind would delight in saying⁴⁷,

⁴⁶ George Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie*, ed. Gladys Doidge Willcock & Alice Walker (Cambridge: Cambridge U.P. 1936, rpt. 1970) 38.

⁴⁷ "Now what I want is, Facts. Teach these boys and girls nothing but Facts. Facts alone are wanted in life. Plant nothing else, and root out everything else" (Ch. Dickens, *Hard Times*, chapter 1).

tend to impose the strength of their rule over preconceived ideas of all kinds and judging on the past (or the future) having our own reality as a starting point is by no means a good guide to apprehend what reality was or is going to be.

But, what do I mean when I say that pastoral literature was popular? Let me take the example of what is probably the most well known Spanish pastoral romance of the time (and, perhaps, the most influential piece of narrative of the genre); I am talking of Jorge de Montemayor's *Los siete libros de la Diana*. The first edition was published in 1559, there is a second printed in Milan in 1560, a third in Zaragoza in the same year, four different ones in Antwerp, Barcelona, Cuenca and Valladolid in 1561... To make a long story short, there were twenty six different editions in Spanish until the end of the 16th century. No less than ten editions in French during the same period and an English translation in 1598⁴⁸. Something of the like is going to happen with Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia* in England.

The case is much the same if we turn our attention to poetry. In what is a classical study in the topic, W.W. Greig's *Pastoral Poetry and Pastoral Drama*, the author (in chapter II, the one devoted to pastoral poetry in England) reviews a field from which not a single great name seems to be missing: Shakespeare, Spenser, Sidney, Milton, Marlowe... Even though circulation and readership of romances would for the first time make of a book what we could call a "best-seller", as far as genres are concerned poetry is what we are interested in.

Greg underlines the peculiarly the English pastoral has when compared with that of other countries: "On the one hand the spontaneous and popular impulse towards a form of pastoralism appears to have been stronger and more consistent than elsewhere; on the other the foreign and literary

⁴⁸ The actual version had been made in 1581, or 1582, although according to its translator, it had remained a manuscript for nearly twenty years. *Vide* Bartholomew Yong's preface to his translation of the *Dianas* in J.M. Kennedy, *A Critical Edition of Yong's Translation of George of Montemayor's Diana and Gil Polo's Enamoured Diana* (Oxford: Oxford U. P., 1968).

the indication they afford of the trend of literary fashion"⁵². This is a statement I cannot share in the very least. Could, for instance, the *Shepherds Calendar* ever come to being but as the natural evolution of a movement initiated by Barclay's and Googe's productions to a very great extent translations themselves) or George Turberville's translation of Mantuan's eclogues (1567)⁵³?

In what is, I think, a very accurate description of the actual momentous importance this task of translating had at the time (and this by the pen of a contemporary writer, something we are not going to be able to find in England), J. Peletier, the French theoretician of *La Pléiade*, says: "La plus vraie espèce d'Imitation, c'est de traduire: car imiter n'est autre chose que vouloir faire ce que fait un autre: ainsi que fait le Traducteur qui s'asservit non seulement à l'invention d'autrui, mais aussi à la Disposition: et encore à l'Elocution tant qu'il peut, parce que l'efficace d'un Ecrit, bien souvent consiste en la propriété des mots et locutions: laquelle omise, ôte la grace et défraude le sens de l'Auteur"⁵⁴. The importance of the things said justifies the length of the quotation and makes it worthwhile for serious consideration. In opposition to the apparent unimportance of translations as considered by Greg (if we make an exception of their value as proof of the "trend of literary fashion"), here we find not only the underlining of their importance because of their contents, but also because of the way they are organised and, what matters even more, because of the wording used in them (if you allow me to use such an inexact equivalent of *Elocution as wording is*). A certain pattern of conventions of metre and rhyme, for instance, is established, which can be used not only when translating but when writing original poetry as well.

And here we come to the point of the translation of poetry: was such an undertaking something frequent in those days? Translation and culture are concepts that mutually refer to each other in the 16th century. During that period at least one out of every five books published in England (some authors could raise the figure to one in four) was a translation either from a classical language or from a vernacular (mainly French, Italian and Spanish).

⁵² Greg, 78.

⁵³ The first translation of Theocritus' *Idyllia* was not published until 1588.

⁵⁴ Quoted by Hélène Nais in "Traduction et imitation chez quelques poètes du XVI^e siècle", *Revue des Sciences Humaines*, tome LII, 180 (Octobre-Décembre 1980) 35.

A hundred volumes out of a total amount of about 2.000 titles⁵⁵ were translations from the Spanish. How many of them were translations of poetry? Not a single one. Only a hundred lines by Garcilaso (and some by the Marquis of Santillana) find their way into the English language thanks to Minsheu, in whose dictionary they are included⁵⁶.

But if the interest in translating verse per se seems to have been scarce, this is not the case when we come to consider the very abundant pieces of translated poetry we are going to come across when reading Spanish romances translated into English. Here the abundance is the norm more than the exception. *England's Helicon*, the only anthology of poetry that includes compositions translated from the Spanish is a pastoral exception to the norm. And I say it is a pastoral exception because all those translated poems have as a source three Spanish pastoral romances: Montemayor's *Diana*. Gil Polo's *Diana enamorada*, and Alonso Perez's *Segunda Diana*.

"*England's Helicon* is generally considered the finest of the Elizabethan poetical miscellanies and it draws upon the work of some of the most famous poets of the age"⁵⁷. These are the initial words with which D.E.L. Crane starts his Introductory Note to the Scholar Press facsimile edition of the famous anthology. Published by John Flasket in 1600 (it ran a second edition in 1614), under the patronage of John Bodenham, it pays tribute to the popularity of the genre we have alluded to at the very beginning of this paper. Its undoubted quality is based on the names of its contributors. Let me recall some of them: William Shakespeare, Philip Sidney, Michael Drayton, Christopher Marlowe, and Edmund Spenser. But its most remarkable characteristic (and one that has puzzled critics for years) is that the main contributor to the anthology by far is Bartholomew Yong, with twenty five translations from the Spanish *Dianas*. Yong's translation had been published only two years before (1598). Opinions on the actual reasons for this preeminence are divergent. Bullen, the anthology's first modern

⁵⁵ Vide H. S. Bennett, *English Books and Readers 1475 to 1557 & English Books and Readers 1558-1603* (London: Cambridge U. P. 1970 & 1965 respectively).

⁵⁶ John Minsheu, *A Dictionarie in Spanish and English, first published into the English tongue by Ric. Perciuale Gent. Now enlarged and amplified with many thousand words* (London: 1599).

⁵⁷ *England's Helicon (1600)*. A Scholar Press Facsimile with an Introductory Note by D.E.L. Crane (Menston and London: The Scholar Press, 1973).

editor, would even allude to the possibility of the links of friendship between Yong and the compiler⁵⁸. The poems have not been appreciated as being up to the standard of the whole of the anthology, which makes of their abundance a fact all the more surprising. But this is a point we shall look into later on. Let us turn our attention to the actual approach to the work the translator made use of by concentrating on the texts.

The whole affair of translating poetry is so complex and opinions and ideas on the topic are so varied and divergent that it would be impossible (and out of the question) to try summarize them here. I am going to use a quotation from Paul Selver's *The Art of Translating Poetry* as a starting point for the brief analysis that follows.

"What are the main ingredients of a poem? These three seem to provide a working analysis:

1. Its actual contents or subject-matter.
2. Its rhythmic structure.
3. Its verbal effects, including some features as musical qualities, subtleties of style, and so forth."⁵⁹

Yong made a daring choice when he decided to translate poetry for poetry and not use prose instead. In the Preface to his translation of the *Dianas* Yong had declared, when acknowledging the knew the French translations (that must have had a wide circulation at the time -we have to keep in mind that Elizabethans had an easier access to French and its book market than to Spanish-), "the first Part to be exquisite; the other two corruptly done with a confusion of verse into Prose"⁶⁰. Obviously, from his words we can see he never even imagined having done otherwise but trying his hand at translating the Spanish original into English verse. Not an easy

⁵⁸ "Possibly Bartholomew Yong (an unpoetical name) may even find here and there an admirer; but in my judgement he seldom rises above, and not seldom falls below, mediocrity. The selections (of the poems included in *Englands Helicon*) are made for the most part with such excellent taste that the constant occurrence of Yong's name can only be explained on the assumption that he was a close friend of the indulgent editor", *Englands Helicon*, (Ed.) A.H. Bullen (London: 1887).

⁵⁹ Paul Selver, *The Art of Translating Poetry* (London: John Baker, 1966) 21.

⁶⁰ J.M. Kennedy, 6.

task at all when we consider that the Spanish romances embody an incredible variety of metres and rhyme patterns, which makes of them a kind of practical handbook in the art of metrics.

We have no evidence that Yong wrote poetry of his own: having the taste for letters he had and the ability he shows in producing translations from the Spanish, he undoubtedly must have written some. Otherwise, his first attempt (this of his translation from the *Dianas*) could not have been so successful. His version carefully imitates the structure of the rhyme in the originals, if we make an exception of the quatrains with rhyme *abba* that are systematically changed into *abab*. There is a tendency towards longer English solutions and we can say, in this sense, that the translated poems grow as compared with their originals. Yong tries to account for all of his model in his own version. Such is the case, for instance, of the poem that glosses the famous verse.

Guarda mi las Vaccas
Carillo, por tu fe,
Besa mi Primero,
Yo te las Guardare.

Alonso Perez, in his *Segunda Diana*, would write seven eight-line stanzas of octosyllables from that starting point. The sixth, in the mouth of the shepherd Cariso, reads

En extremo eres hermosa,
Y en extremo braua y dura:
O si fuesses tan piadosa
Como muestra tu figura.
Si tu rostro me assegura,
Y me espanta tu crueldad,
En tanta contrariedad
Que remedio buscaré.⁶¹

For which we have *two* stanzas in English

O in extreame thou art mos faire,

⁶¹ Alonso Perez, *Segunda Parte de la Diana de George de Montemayor*, (Anvers: Pedro Bellerio, 1581) fol. 175 r.

And in extreame vniust despaire
 Thy cruelty maintaines:
 O that hou wert so pittifull
 Vnto these torments that doo pull
 My soule with sencelesse paines,
 As thou shew'st in that face of thine:
 Where pittie and mild grace should shine

If that thy faire and sweetest face
 Assureth me both peace and grace,
 Thy hard and cruel hart:
 Which in that white breast thou doo'st beare,
 dooth make me tremble yet for feare
 Thou wilt not end my smart.
 In contraries of such kind:
 Tell me what succour shall I finde?⁶²

The English is common measure (eights and sixes) in which the rhyme structure has varied from *ababbccd* (coplas de arte menor) to *aabccdee*. Yong would usually make recourse to common measure, iambic pentametres for Spanish endecasyllables, iambic trimetres and pentametres for Spanish coplas reales (10 octosyllable verses in two five line stanzas rhyming *abaabcdccd*) and so son. He is continually striving to find an equivalent to the form of the Spanish (one that is acceptable in English). In this task he had to deal with what were imported pastoral poetry metres in Spanish like *octavas reales* (introduced in Spanish upon the model of Bocaccio), translating them into English iambic pentametres, just as he does in this poem from Alonso Perez's first book:

Quien gusta del manjar del dios Cupido,
 De pasto a su appetito quando quiera:
 Ai aliuio en sus beuidas ha sentido,
 A su plazer amate su sed fiera:
 Y si sus armas bien le han parecido,
 Siga el tal su estandarte, y su vadera:
 Que yo en hallarme del libre y essento,
 Estoy allegre, vfano y muy contento.⁶³

⁶² All the quotations from *England's Helicon* are taken from the 1973 edition of the Scolar Press (no pagination).

⁶³ A. Perez, fol. 10 r.

Who hath of Cupids cates and dainties prayed,
 May feed his stomack with them at his pleasure:
 If in his drinke some ease he hath assayed,
 Then let him quench his thirsting without measure:
 And if his weapons pleasant in their manner,
 Let him embrace his standard and his banner.
 For being free from him, and quite exempted:
 Ioyfull I am, and proud, and well contented.

But he also did very well when tackling the difficulties of metres that had lain in the oblivion of Spanish literature for centuries⁶⁴. Running the risk of tiring you with long textual quotations I include what is one of the best examples of the richness of rhythms in these translations (from Gil Polo's *Diana enamorada*, an epithalamion song on the occasion of Sirenus' wedding).

De flores matizadas se vista el verde prado,
 retumbe el hueco bosque de voces deleitosas,
 olor tengan más fino las coloradas rosas,
 floridos ramos mueva el veinto sossegado.
 El río apressurado
 sus aguas acreciente,
 y pues tan libre queda la fatigada gente
 del congoxoso llanto,
 moved hermosas ninfas, regozijado canto.⁶⁵

Let now each Meade with flowers be depainted,
 Of sundry colours sweetest odours glowing:
 Roses yeeld foorth your smells so finely tainted,
 Calme winds the green leaues moouue with gentle blowing,
 The Christall Riuers flowing
 With waters be encreased:
 And since each one from sorrow now hath ceased,
 From mournfull plains and sadnes.
 Ring foorth faire Nymphs your ioyfull Songs for gladnes.

⁶⁴ "Tras un destierro de casi dos siglos, el alejandrino reapareció en una canción del libro cuarto de la *Diana* de Gil Polo", in Tomás Navarro Tomás, *Métrica española* (Madrid, Barcelona: Guadarrama, 1974) 225.

⁶⁵ Gaspar Gil Polo, *Diana enamorada* (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1973), p. 206.

The Spanish original is formed by a group of 7 nine-line stanzas in which verses 5, 6, and 8 are heptasyllabic and the rest Alexandrine. The English keeps the same number of stanzas interweaving pentametre and trimetre lines. The result is so interesting that Susanne Woods, for instance, in her well known essay on English versification from Chaucer to Dryden, would include it as an example of "the late Elizabethan attempt at euphonious variety in both strophic construction and linear rhythm"⁶⁶.

When deciding upon the supremacy of form Yong had to subordinate Selver's points one and three (contents and verbal effects) to what was priority n.º 1: rhythmic structure. But as we had the chance of announcing some lines before he would not give up his attempt of accounting for every constituent element of the original without a fight. In this sense, we are obliged to acknowledge that after a thorough comparison of the twenty five original poems and their translations we have been unable to trace omissions of any serious importance. On the few occasions in which we come across a line that has simply been dropped there is a compensatory movement on the part of the translator that restores equivalence. Let us consider, for instance, his version of this stanza from Perez's *Diana* (Book VI):

| | |
|--|---|
| La vida me faltara | Pale Atropos my vitall string |
| Mas no aura falta en amarte: | Shall cut, and life offend: |
| El río atras boluera, | The streames shall first turne to their |
| | spring. |
| El cielo se parará, | The world shall end, and euery thing, |
| Antes que pueda olvidarte. ⁶⁷ | Before my loue shall end. |

The translator introduces a metaphor, geminating the first line, and compensating in this way the omission of "Mas no aura falta en amarte", the contents of which anyway are redundant since the last line conveys the same basic meaning.

There is in Yong's work a permanent tendency to enlarge the translated texts in comparison to their originals. That is a phenomenon we have already pointed out. An evident desire of making things clear for the

⁶⁶ Susanne Woods, *Natural emphasis. English versification from Chaucer to Dryden* (San Marino: The Nuntington Library, 1984) 196.

⁶⁷ A. Perez, fol. 172 r.

reader is apparent throughout his work: of course, the temptation of adding innovations of his own creation shows from time to time here and there but, in general terms, the new bits and pieces are usually based on the context basically redundant and come to add to a prose that in itself tends to be slow in movement. The same principle applies to poetry, although there we find extra powerful reasons to justify this procedure. The choice of metre and rhythm determines the adding of fragments that can fill the voids in patterns. This factor and the translator's will to preserve every nuance in the contents of the original make for the growth translated texts undergo. Occasionally they offer an easy way of finding a rhyme (Perez's *Diana*, Book VI):

| | |
|---|--|
| No es possible qu'en amar | Impossible it is (my friend) |
| Pueda ser yo procedido | That any one should excell |
| Qualquiera sera vencido | In loue, whose loue I will ressell |
| Si conmigo ha de lidiar | If that with me he will contend: |
| Es mi amor sin tener par... ⁶⁸ | My loue no equal hath, nor end. |

And lastly, what is the opinion we can form on Yong's attempt at imitating and preserving the verbal effects of the originals? Jakobson was very clear when signalling paronomasia as the touchstone of any translation of poetry. Verbal effects, being intimately and inextricably linked to every tongue make our efforts to preserve them in a different one a task bound to fail. In the case of Yong's translations he is very aware of tropes, which are usually solved with ease. What Jakobson calls *paronomasia* suffers modifications depending ultimately on the needs of the metre and the rhyme or on the degree of awareness of such phenomena the translator has. Sometimes the demands of contents and form prove to be too much for Yong. Take, for instance, the case of the following stanza in which the alliteration of the velar voiceless plosive is not reproduced in English:

| | |
|---|--|
| ¿Qué desseaste alcançar | What didst thou wish, tell me (sweete Louer) |
| que tal contento te diesse? | Whereby thou might'st such ioy recouer? |
| -Querer a quin me quisiesse | To loue where loue should be inspired: |
| que no hay más que dessear. ⁶⁹ | Since there's no more to be devised. |

⁶⁸ *Ibidem*, fol 169 a.

⁶⁹ Jorge de Montemayor, *Los siete libros de la Diana* (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1970).

Summing up now the brief notes on Yong's technical assumptions and the characteristics of his work as a translator we can affirm that his first priority is formal as

1. He makes decisions of metre and rhyme to which he subordinates contents. The archetypal world of pastoral literature demands an open avowal to established conventions and Yong's decisions as far as these formal conventions are concerned seem to be the right ones. The inclusion of his poems in *England's Helicon* and the fact that there are no other references to authorship but those of the name of the translator at the bottom of the page are good proof that his translations read as originals⁷⁰.

2. Contents are preserved as far as possible. Solutions systematically longer than the originals try to reconcile the demands of metre with those of fidelity to the source texts.

3. Opinions on the quality of his work have been biased after Bullen's statement doubting on the convenience of his *overpresence* in the anthology. Much of the blame in this field has to be put on the actual Spanish poems (especially those by Perez). I agree with Rollins when he says that "Yong's twenty-five poems are translations, and as such they are not at all below the Elizabethan standard (...). Yong's *Diana* was the most readily accessible storehouse of pastoral songs, none of them objectionably bad: to pick from them a large number was the most natural thing any editor could have done"⁷¹.

What really matters when judging on this topic is that his poems found a place in the system of the target literature. There is no better praise for a translator.

⁷⁰ The only translation from Montemayor's *Diana* by Sir Philip Sidney included in the anthology (that of "¡Cabellos, quanta mudança!") show this legend: "translated by S. Phil. Sidney, out of *Diana* of Montmaior".

⁷¹ *England's Helicon (1600-1614)*, ed. Hyder Edward Rollins, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard U. P., 1935), 2 vols.

SOME ASPECTS OF RHYME AND SUFFIXATION IN *LUCRECE*

Celia Florén Serrano
University of Zaragoza. Spain

Lucrece is one of Shakespeare's poems, but it is one of the least known. It has been comparatively neglected by the critics. For F. T. Prince⁷² "*Lucrece*, narrative in form, is in substance a tragedy." It has been called a failure⁷³, but it must be remembered that if it is so it is only considering Shakespeare's greater achievements in other works. Nevertheless its study can contribute to a better insight of Shakespeare's poetry.

In this case I have selected the poem because, being the longest of Shakespeare's long poems, (*Venus and Adonis*, *The Passionate Pilgrim* and *The Phoenix and the Turtle*) it gives more scope to study some aspects of rhyme and suffixation. It is easy to understand that phenomena which involve recurrence are better considered in longer works.

In Quirk's *Contemporary Grammar of English* the different kinds of prominence are described as "serving the total sequential organization of the message." The author says that studying these aspects of linguistic structure makes one aware of language as a linearly organized communication system, in which judicious ordering and placing of emphasis may be important for the proper understanding of the message"⁷⁴. He goes on, "The neutral position of focus is what we may call end-focus, that is, (generally speaking) chief prominence on the last open-class item or proper noun in the clause."⁷⁵

⁷² In his introduction to *The Poems*, p. xxxiv

⁷³ Prince says "*Lucrece* is undoubtedly as a whole an artistic failure, despite the magnificence of many of its parts." p. xxv

⁷⁴ Prince, 14.1, 937.

⁷⁵ Prince, 14.3, 967.

In a poem this position which carries special prominence often corresponds to the last stressed word in the verse, which is where the rhyme is, the end of the clause or the end of the phrase.

Of course one must take into account that syntactic units and rhythmic measures can coincide with one another or cut across them. I mean that a verse may belong to one syntactic unit or this unit may overflow into the next verse, which is called *enjambment*. In the case of Shakespeare's *Lucrece* the second procedure is highly infrequent. At one glance it is easy to perceive how many lines end with commas, semicolons, colons, fullstops, question marks or admiration marks. Even the absence of punctuation marks does not mean that there is enjambment. This poem is composed of verses which can be described as "end-stopped lines" as opposed to "run-on lines".

Versification includes some patterns of sound, arranged through parallelism, which form rhythm and rhyme. For the rhyme in English it is necessary that the final measure of the verse is constant, that is, repeated in another verse where it must coincide with the last stressed syllable onwards.

So, we can see how the end of verse position attracts importance on one hand through its final situation, the end-focus, and on the other hand through rhyme repetition, which undoubtedly fixes the reader's attention making this part of the verse more memorable.

It can be argued that word order in poetry is governed by less restrictive rules than prose, and so what was said about end-focus should be invalidated for the end of verse position. Apart from quoting the poem itself, it is also obvious that through versification we can see the interplay of linguistic deviance and conformity. Rhythm and rhyme come under linguistic deviance, but the position of the rhyme, which is fixed and expected, acts as part of conformity within the linguistic deviance.

To sum up, the last position of the verse, which carries rhyme, is given prominence both through the importance of the content and the originality of the form. This has led me to study the words which appear in this position, at the end of the verse in *Lucrece*.

Lucrece is a poem consisting of 1.868 verses, with a total of 16.234 words, of which obviously only 1.868 are placed at the final position of the

verse and the rest, 14.366 words, appear inside the verse. The proportion of end of verse words with inside verse words is 0.13.

From what has been said previously it can be deduced that certain classes of words cannot appear in this final position. There can be no determiners, prepositions or conjunctions. Adjectives are greatly restricted in this position; they can only appear if they are predicative. Personal pronouns can appear either in the object or the subject form; in the latter case appearance must be due to emphasis or to inversion. Only some adverbs can appear in this position.

So the final position is almost exclusively restricted to open-ended word classes: nouns, verbs and, with limitations, adjectives and adverbs. These word classes are, on the other hand, susceptible to variation through suffixes, which can be an extremely interesting fact when we consider the position. It can be assumed as a hypothesis that suffixation can help rhyme, through repetition. This is what I am going to test in *Lucrece*. As a methodological question, suffixes will only be significant if there is a certain degree of repetition at the end of the verse.

First I shall consider those suffixes due to inflexion, what we may call grammatical suffixes:

-ing

In *Lucrece* we find it 301 times inside verse and 49 times in final position, which brings about a ratio of 0.162. As the general ratio between inside verse and final position words in *Lucrece* is 0.13 it can be said that the *-ing* suffix is slightly more frequent than the ordinary ratio.

-ed (including *-'d*)

The suffix for the past and past participle, which I only consider as *-ed*, brings the following results:

In *Lucrece* we find it 450 times inside verse *versus* 162 times in final position, which brings about a ratio of 0.36, superior to the ordinary ratio of 0.13; so *-ed* is also significant.

If I differentiate *-d* from the full suffix the results alter:

-d

We then obtain 219 times inside verse versus 33 times in final position, which makes a ratio of 0.15, slightly higher than 0.13.

-ied

On the other hand, if we consider the suffix as *-ied*, results come higher: 9 times inside verse versus 8 times in final position, bringing about a ratio of 0.888, clearly superior to 0.13.

Next I am going to contrast the *-es* suffix. I consider it as *-es* and not as *-s*, along the same lines as the past/past participle suffix. I do not differentiate the 3rd person suffix from the plural suffix. On the other hand I cannot take into account the saxon genitive, because it never appears at the end of verse.

-es

We find it 200 times inside verse versus 62 times in final position, bringing about a ratio of 0.31, which is higher than 0.13.

-eth

This suffix is quite significant in *Lucrece*. The important fact is that it appears very frequently in final position. It appears 18 times inside verse and 18 times, the same amount, in final position, bringing about a ratio of 1, clearly superior to 0.13. Jespersen⁷⁶ says that in Shakespeare "the rule may be laid down that *-th* belongs more to the solemn and dignified speeches than to everyday talk, although this is by no means carried through everywhere.". One must realize that I have counted the suffix as *-eth*, and I have not taken into consideration the suffix in auxiliaries, like *hath* and *doth*, which never appear at the final position, although *hath* appears 37 times and *doth* 69 in middle position.

⁷⁶ Jespersen, O. *A Modern English Grammar* (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1961) 6. 19.

-est

The second person singular ending *-est* appears sometimes, although it is more frequent in its syncopated form, *-'st*. However it is not important for my purpose because it is never present in the final position.

As for the *-est* suffix of the superlative, it is negligible, for it appears 4 times inside verse and only once at the end of the verse; with this limited number of occurrences it is not significant, even though the ratio might have been considered important, 0.25, had there been more examples of the suffix in the poem.

-er, the comparative suffix is more abundant, but it is not significant for the rhyme, as it appears 37 times inside verse and 4 at the final position, bringing about a ratio of 0.11, which is under the ordinary proportion of 0.13.

So far I have been dealing with grammatical suffixes. Now I am going to study the lexical suffixes most frequently used in this poem. The figures show follow the pattern used so far: first the number of occurrences of the suffix in question in inside verse position, then occurrence of the suffix at the end of verse, then the proportion of these occurrences, followed by the ratio the poem has end of verse words *versus* inside of verse words.

| | | | | |
|--------------|----|----|--------|------|
| <i>-tion</i> | 31 | 22 | =0.71 | 0.13 |
| <i>-sion</i> | 15 | 5 | =0.33 | 0.13 |
| <i>-age</i> | 20 | 17 | =0.85 | 0.13 |
| <i>-ness</i> | 14 | 5 | =0.36 | 0.13 |
| <i>-less</i> | 59 | 2 | =0.033 | 0.13 |
| <i>-ly</i> | 95 | 8 | =0.084 | 0.13 |
| <i>-ment</i> | 16 | 12 | =0.75 | 0.13 |
| <i>-ance</i> | 19 | 10 | =0.52 | 0.13 |
| <i>-ble</i> | 22 | 3 | =0.136 | 0.13 |
| <i>-ous</i> | 36 | 0 | | |
| <i>-ant</i> | 14 | 0 | | |
| <i>-ful</i> | 43 | 0 | | |

In grammatical suffixes we have seen how they are in general, (-*est*, and -*er* excepted) proportionally more frequent at the end of verse position. But when dealing with lexical suffixes the situation varies. Some of them are never at the end of verse while others, with even a smaller number of total occurrences, are in that position in a ratio proportionally significant. If we take into account the type of the suffixes which are significant for the rhyme according to the word categories they belong to, we must point at nominal suffixes as the most important.

The results of my findings can be accounted to a certain extent by Shakespeare's style but the use of poetic language in that period may also have some influence in this aspect. This consideration has led me to contrast the results with two other poets of his time, repeating the calculations in a *corpus* as similar as possible.

I have chosen Donne for this purpose because he is one of the greatest poets in English and is a contemporary of Shakespeare. There were certain difficulties in finding a *corpus* resembling the one used first, as the nature and length of Donne's poems differ greatly from *Lucrece*. Nevertheless I have selected a *corpus* which includes the two longest poems written by Donne: *The Anatomie of the World* and *The Progresse of the Soule*. Both of them are poems of the same type, they are elegies, and they deal with the same theme, as they are funeral elegies for the first and second anniversaries of the death of Mistress Elizabeth Dury. As it is they form a total of 1.216 verses with 10.769 words, of which, as it is easy to deduce, there are 1.216 words placed at the final position of the verse. The ratio is 0.127, which is slightly lower than the one in *Lucrece*, 0.13.

The other poet I have selected is Milton. The *corpus* is more homogeneous than the one selected for Donne, as it belongs to one poem, instead of being formed by two poems, but the poem is not complete, it is only part of it. I have considered the first two books of *Paradise Lost*. *Paradise Lost*, like *Lucrece*, is a narrative poem. The part selected is nearer in length to *Lucrece*: it consists of 1.862 verses, formed with 15.772 words, of which 13.910 words are inside the verse and 1.862 at the end of the verse. The proportion is 0.134, slightly higher than the one in *Lucrece*, 0.13.

The reason why I chose Milton is that I wanted to contrast results with a poem where the final position of the verse has a different type of

prominence, because there is no rhyme; we are now dealing with blank verse and in blank verse some kind of enjambment is to be expected.

We can see that the results vary considerably:

-ing

| | | | | |
|----------------|-----|----|--------|-------|
| In Shakespeare | 301 | 49 | =0.16 | 0.13 |
| In Donne | 92 | 5 | =0.054 | 0.127 |
| In Milton | 238 | 15 | =0.063 | 0.134 |

-ed (including -'d)

| | | | | |
|----------------|-----|-----|--------|-------|
| In Shakespeare | 450 | 162 | =0.36 | 0.13 |
| In Donne | 176 | 35 | =0.198 | 0.127 |
| In Milton | 463 | 166 | =0.358 | 0.134 |

If I differentiate *-d* from the full suffix the results alter:

-'d

| | | | | |
|----------------|-----|----|-------|-------|
| In Shakespeare | 219 | 33 | =0.15 | 0.13 |
| In Donne | 100 | 17 | =0.17 | 0.127 |
| In Milton | 0 | 0 | | |

-ied

| | | | | |
|----------------|---|----|--------|-------|
| In Shakespeare | 9 | 8 | =0.888 | 0.13 |
| In Donne | 6 | 1 | =0.166 | 0.127 |
| In Milton | 7 | 10 | =1.428 | 0.134 |

-es

| | | | | |
|----------------|-----|----|--------|-------|
| In Shakespeare | 200 | 62 | =0.31 | 0.13 |
| In Donne | 259 | 40 | =0.154 | 0.127 |
| In Milton | 154 | 58 | =0.376 | 0.134 |

-ies

| | | | | |
|----------------|----|----|--------|-------|
| In Shakespeare | 23 | 30 | =1.304 | 0.13 |
| In Donne | 44 | 12 | =0.272 | 0.127 |
| In Milton | 26 | 9 | =0.346 | 0.134 |

-eth

| | | | | |
|----------------|----|----|----|------|
| In Shakespeare | 18 | 18 | =1 | 0.13 |
| In Donne | 1 | 0 | =0 | |
| In Milton | 0 | 0 | =0 | |

-est second person suffix is present in the three poets but it never appears at the end of verse.

-est (superlative suffix)

| | | | | |
|----------------|----|---|-------|-------|
| In Shakespeare | 4 | 1 | =0.25 | 0.13 |
| In Donne | 19 | 5 | =0.26 | 0.127 |
| In Milton | 50 | 3 | =0.06 | |

It may be interesting to note that the only superlative which appears in final position in the three authors is the same, *best*.

-er (comparative suffix)

| | | | | |
|----------------|----|---|--------|------|
| In Shakespeare | 37 | 4 | =0.108 | 0.13 |
| In Donne | 21 | 0 | =0 | |
| In Milton | 34 | 0 | =0 | |

-tion

| | | | | |
|----------------|----|----|--------|-------|
| In Shakespeare | 31 | 22 | =0.709 | 0.13 |
| In Donne | 28 | 23 | =0.821 | 0.127 |
| In Milton | 52 | 0 | =0 | |

-sion

| | | | | |
|----------------|----|---|-------|------|
| In Shakespeare | 15 | 5 | =0.25 | 0.13 |
| In Donne | 5 | 0 | =0 | |
| In Milton | 28 | 0 | =0 | |

Gustav Ungerer

-age

| | | | | |
|----------------|----|----|--------|-------|
| In Shakespeare | 20 | 17 | =0.85 | 0.13 |
| In Donne | 11 | 7 | =0.636 | 0.127 |
| In Milton | 32 | 8 | =0.25 | 0.134 |

-ness

| | | | | |
|----------------|----|---|--------|-------|
| In Shakespeare | 14 | 5 | =0.357 | 0.13 |
| In Donne | 0 | 0 | =0 | |
| In Milton | 26 | 2 | =0.076 | 0.134 |

-less

| | | | | |
|----------------|----|---|--------|-------|
| In Shakespeare | 59 | 2 | =0.033 | 0.13 |
| In Donne | 1 | 0 | =0 | |
| In Milton | 35 | 7 | =0.2 | 0.134 |

-ly

| | | | | |
|----------------|----|---|--------|-------|
| In Shakespeare | 95 | 8 | =0.084 | 0.13 |
| In Donne | 58 | 2 | =0.033 | 0.127 |
| In Milton | 0 | 0 | =0 | |

-ment

| | | | | |
|----------------|----|----|--------|-------|
| In Shakespeare | 16 | 12 | =0.75 | 0.13 |
| In Donne | 10 | 4 | =0.4 | 0.127 |
| In Milton | 14 | 9 | =0.642 | 0.134 |

-ance

| | | | | |
|----------------|----|----|--------|-------|
| In Shakespeare | 19 | 10 | =0.52 | |
| In Donne | 8 | 2 | =0.25 | 0.127 |
| In Milton | 33 | 9 | =0.272 | 0.134 |

-ous

| | | | | |
|----------------|-----|---|-------|-------|
| In Shakespeare | 36 | 0 | =0 | |
| In Donne | 22 | 3 | =0.12 | 0.127 |
| In Milton | 100 | 2 | =0.02 | 0.134 |

-ant

| | | | | |
|----------------|----|---|--------|-------|
| In Shakespeare | 14 | 0 | =0 | |
| In Donne | 7 | 2 | =0.285 | 0.127 |
| In Milton | 12 | 1 | =0.083 | 0.134 |

-ful

| | | | | |
|----------------|----|---|--------|-------|
| In Shakespeare | 43 | 0 | =0 | |
| In Donne | 1 | 0 | =0 | |
| In Milton | 42 | 1 | =0.023 | 0.134 |

-ble

| | | | | |
|----------------|----|---|--------|-------|
| In Shakespeare | 22 | 3 | =0.136 | 0.13 |
| In Donne | 9 | 0 | =0 | |
| In Milton | 48 | 5 | =0.094 | 0.134 |

The three poets show more similarities when dealing with grammatical suffixes than when we compare the use of lexical suffixes. Although we must grant that there exist great differences between them the three poets abound in grammatical suffixes at the end of verse position. It is true that a highly frequent suffix, *-ing*, does hardly ever take final position in Donne or Milton, while it is significant in Shakespeare. We must also note that Milton does not use the syncopated form of the suffix for the past/past participle, and that *-eth* is almost totally absent in Donne and totally absent in Milton. Nevertheless coincidence stands out far more than disparity.

If we compare the appearance of lexical suffixes personal style seems to be the reason for the choice, as the pattern changes almost with every suffix. Only two of them, *-ment* and *-ance* are significant (highly significant)

in the three poets. If, as I said before, Shakespeare shows his preference for nominal suffixes for the final position, this tendency is not followed by Donne.

So, it would seem that the occurrence of lexical suffixes at the end of verse, that is, suffixes which produce the rhyme, is a matter of personal choice, but the occurrence of grammatical suffixes in that position is backed by the usage of the three poets through works which differ in theme (narrative poems and elegies) and in the form (poems with rhyme and poems in blank verse).

From the data analysed in this brief paper we can see that suffixation helps rhyme considerably in *Lucrece*. The results can be attributed only partially to Shakespeare's style as the variation the other two poets show proves.

REFERENCES

- Donne, John. *Poetical Works*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933.
 Milton, John. *Poetical Works*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966.
 Jespersen, O. *A Modern English Grammar*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1961
 Quirk, R. et al. *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. Hong Kong: Longman, 1976.
 Shakespeare, W. "Lucrece". In *The Poems*. Ed. Prince, F.T. Ed. Bungay: Methuen & Co Ltd., 1960.

POLITICAL STRATEGIES OF DRAMA IN RENAISSANCE ENGLAND

José Manuel González Fernández de Sevilla
University of Alicante. Spain

Almost exactly at the mid-point of the seventeenth century the axe severed King Charles' neck. The sudden cease of majesty in 1649 was not only "the signal for an excited debate about what form of government might best succeed monarchy, and how authority might be reconciled with personal rights"⁷⁷ but also something desired by society and provoked by the dramatists since Elizabethan times. The imprisonment and murder of Richard II in Pomfret castle was its anticipation and premonition. The beheading of the king was the direct result of the Tudor and Stuart policy of extending the powers of the crown beyond acceptable limits. The theory of divine right was a natural ally of royal absolutism in politics for it placed the king legally and morally above all human law and restraint. It strengthened the right of the monarch to assert his authority without interference by Parliament or legal claim but eventually caused the disintegration of the hierarchical world when kings tried to retain the sacredness of status without fully accepting the sacred function and to impose their particular will and not the will of God. Under these conditions of despotism the Elizabethan world picture became less credible and more objectionable. The discrepancy between the ideal programme and the actual performance gave rise to a strong opposition and political awareness. The theatre became the popular dramatic framework to oppose the establishment. In this way Renaissance drama set out not only to teach and reflect reality but to change it. It was very conscious of the historical context. Therefore drama was more than just a literary genre. It was believed to be a powerful instrument for clarifying facts and opposing the present state of things. The theatre was for leisure and entertainment but also a place of social propaganda and political provocation since it was the

⁷⁷ G. Parry, *The Seventeenth Century. The Intellectual and Cultural Context of English Literature 1603-1700* (London and New York: Longman, 1989) 212.

consequence of a pragmatic conception of literature⁷⁸ with an almost exclusive emphasis on the effect of the theatrical artifact. What mattered was action and transformation. The dramatic performance was intended to have a metatheatrical performative dimension with an actual influence on the historical context, showing an interpretation of contemporary events and pretending to transform history. A new sensitivity to social reality and politics made possible the political consciousness of drama in Renaissance England. Thus literary drama became political theatre.

Renaissance preoccupation with politics in England was no less keen than that of twentieth century. It meant "a lively concern with men not only in their private and personal but in their public and formal relations. And this concern included questions of power and subordination, of mutual relations within a constituted society, of the ends and methods of public actions..."⁷⁹ Its application was immediate and restricted, with practical connotations since "They talked more of the monarch than of monarchy, more of the sovereign than of sovereignty"⁸⁰ There was political interest everywhere, drama being a social force shaping those efforts and expectations from a literary point of view. It is important to notice the peculiarity of the political approach through drama because it requires a literary presentation within a theatrical framework, enriching and enlarging its social potentialities. This singularity comes from the fact that the dramatist "thinks in the way a playwright thinks. He works through a form that deals not in theory but in practical demonstration, and his medium is the actor."⁸¹ So what we get is just the political concern presented in a dramatic sequence. We should bear in mind that literature at that time dealt with specific issues and aimed at concrete targets. It was the response to particular purposes and provocations:

Men wrote poetry or plays, composed meditations, or
devised treatises on one subject or another, but their writings

⁷⁸ Cfr. M. Roston, *Sixteenth-Century English Literature* (Hong-Kong: Macmillan, 1982), ch. 1, "The Dual Vision".

⁷⁹ L.C. Knights, "Shakespeare's Politics: with Some Reflections on the Nature of Tradition", (Ed) K. Muir, *Interpretations of Shakespeare* (Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1985) 86-87.

⁸⁰ Ch. Morris, *Political Thought in England: Tyndale to Hooker* (London: Oxford University Press, 1953) 1-2.

⁸¹ A. Leggatt, *Shakespeare's Political Drama* (London: Routledge, 1988) XI.

had a function, which was specific and addressed particular issues and problems that exerted pressure on the time. Writers were conscious of genres and conventions (without using such terms), as well as of the innumerable tropes of rhetoric, but these were means to an end, serviceable instruments that allowed access to the large subjects that exercised men's imaginations.⁸²

This might be the ultimate cause of the political implications of Renaissance literature in England⁸³ There was a positive interest in matters related to authority and the effective exercise of power. The political concern was intensely felt in drama because the theatre was the place where people shared their common awareness of the historical situation through the provocative action and manipulation of the playwright. This means that drama was not neutral at all. It was used and abused in order to subvert some forms of power and demystify imposed patterns of beliefs. This can be seen in tragedy, the genre that traditionally was thought to be most capable of transcending the historical moment and representing universal truths, which had a metatheatrical involvement in the transformation of reality. Contemporary formulations of the tragic made reference to particular affairs such as the representation of tyranny. The dramatist was not indifferent to the historical events that took place during his lifetime since the plays were reflection of his political positions. Thus "Marlowe, Massinger and Middleton all assumed that Spain was aggressive, expansionist and dangerous."⁸⁴ as shown in the distortion of the history portrayed in some of their plays. To make matters worse Middleton's *A Game of Chess* was seen as an offence against Spain, which made the Spanish Ambassador send a letter of protest to King James I, arguing that the play was a direct criticism of the king's pro-Spanish policy. That is the reason why D. Carlos Coloma wrote a detailed report of this play showing his indignation over its performance.

⁸² G. Parry, 5

⁸³ English poetry is also concerned with politics since "Some of the greatest English Renaissance poets were politicians, and all of them tried to influence public affairs through their writings... Sir Philip Sidney believed that writing could be as politically important as practical statecraft..." Cfr. D. Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984) 1.

⁸⁴ J. Loftis, *Renaissance Drama in England and Spain. Topical Allusions and History Plays* (Princeton University Press, 1987) 219.

Thus drama was used to criticize the government's policy. However this, in turn, saw it as a twofold political issue. It was considered either as a public danger threatening the security and stability of the state or as an entertainment which could keep people away from any kind of political involvement in that particular historical context. At this point it is interesting to observe the different policy followed by Queen Elizabeth I and King James I regarding the official view of drama. Hence in contrast to Elizabeth, James made it a matter of royal policy not only to seek control of drama but also to advocate the celebration of festivals. He saw in drama a very effective instrument for supporting monarchy and his personal formulation of divine rights, the court masque being "The principle vehicle for royal elevation throughout the reign"⁸⁵ in which all arts combined to honour the king. Ben Jonson was the dramatist who devised and created these masques where the monarch was the essential point of reference. He could be represented by the principle of harmony or the source of ideal beauty, as wisdom or heroic virtue. But the important thing to underline is that masques "functioned socially and politically"⁸⁶ In this way he "necessarily defined his authority in opposition to radical Protestantism where Elizabeth had successfully avoided such confrontation"⁸⁷ because her appreciation of this political issue was of a different kind. She was very careful not to arouse opposition to the central administration either by actively supporting the theatre or by enforcing rules that would suppress it in spite of the strong claims for enacting legislation against theatrical performances since they were considered negative practices that persisted despite the Reformation.

The bad times that the theatre faced is a revealing proof of its highly social reputation as a place of political subversion and opposition. There were strong warnings against the evils of the performances of popular theatre. Stephen Gosson in *Plays Confuted in fiue Actions* asserted that "stage playes are the doctrine and invention of the Devill...because playing is one of those politike hornes which our enemy dosseth against the Gospell"⁸⁸ As a social institution, professional theatre was viewed by the

⁸⁵ G. Parry, 16.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.* 17.

⁸⁷ L. Tennenhouse, "Strategies of State and Political Plays", (eds.) J. Dollimore and A. Sinfield, *Political Shakespeare. New Essays in Cultural Materialism* (Manchester University Press, 1985) 116.

⁸⁸ Stephen Gosson, *Plays Confuted in fiue Actions* (London, 1590).

authorities as harmful. It was at the mercy of prejudices and policy with local corporations being hostile to stage-playing. Thus most of the opposition to it came from the local government in London because the authorities thought that it was a real danger to the good order of the city. However it is convenient to point out that this pejorative consideration of the theatre was not only a moral issue but also a political one because as Thomas Nashe points out "there were already in existence plenty of brothels and places to gamble and booze"⁸⁹ and the players were the only to be "pitiously persecuted by the Lord Mayor"⁹⁰ In opposition to this situation of oppression and lack of freedom, the dramatist tried to answer dramatically the authorities with plays highly concerned with political matters. This was the case of *the Isle of Dogs*, written by Jonson and Nashe in collaboration. As a result of its performance the theatres of London were closed during the summer of 1597. Suppression was the long-term policy of the Corporation. However with theatres operating outside its immediate control, it had to change its tactics. If at present they could not suppress the actors, they might deprive them of their audiences. The attack on drama came from different sides. So preachers in the pulpit threatened perdition to anyone who entered a playhouse; writers were commissioned to denounce the theatre in pamphlets and the Corporation appealed to the freemen of London guilds not to allow their apprentices or servants to go to plays. It might well be that the moral concern about performances in playhouses was a consequence of the social fear of losing control of people because the official order maintained by the state and supported by the Church was in great danger of losing power. Finally they succeeded in the closing of the theatres. The drastic act of the Puritan Parliament on the 2 September 1642 made clear that "public stage-plays shall cease and be forborne". And a possible reason for their closure was a political one, "the distracted estate of England, threatened with a cloud of blood by civil war..." Therefore what was at stake was not the nature of the performance but the possibility of social disorder through dramatic action. The real point was that the control of the theatre meant the control of power.

Undoubtedly Renaissance drama presents a positive interest in political matters. It is not something fashionable in modern criticism or only

⁸⁹ En Simon Shepherd, *Marlowe and the Politics of Elizabethan Theatre* (Brighton: Harvester, 1986) 40.

⁹⁰ Thomas Nashe, in A.L. Rowse, *Shakespeare's Globe. His Intellectual and Moral Outlook* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1981) 44.

relevant in the case of Shakespeare as the proliferation of recent Shakespearean research shows⁹¹. It is certainly much more decisive and comprehensive than that. Political concern is one of the major preoccupations and intentions of Renaissance drama, which cannot be properly understood without this political involvement. Thus the dramatist becomes not only an artist but something else. His plays are not just mere literary artifacts. They have the aim of changing reality. The playwright acts as interpreter of historical events. He gives us his own personal interpretation through his dramatic approach provoking a certain attitude and predisposition in the audience. He is not neutral in his theatrical presentation of facts and social criticism. This is especially seen in the history play where the dramatist portrays historical events on the basis of certain assumptions. He takes history seriously and once he gets historical information, he manipulates and dramatically interprets the historical data available. In this way we may say that the playwright becomes a historian with his particular literary art and personal ideology. What we get is not historical evidence but a specific interpretation of reality with a concrete meaning. In this case the literary use of historical material is not only due to artistic, linguistic or aesthetic reasons. It is also a consequence of the personal and contextual experience of the author drawn from the ideas and practices of the culture he inhabits as well as of his historical awareness and political ideology. This is the metahistorical element which is essential for the interpretation of history and reality because without it both are meaningless. The term metahistory was coined by Hayden White⁹² proposing a new understanding of historical facts from a literary stand-point. For him a historical work is a verbal structure in the form of a narrative discourse. His conclusions can be summarized by saying that there is not history without interpretation. That is why the playwright translates reality into a specific message with a special code in order to convey a particular meaning to events. Thus the dramatization of historical material is not only intended for theatrical purposes but for historical connotations. Events are, therefore, interpreted in a personal sense. The story of the history

⁹¹ Cfr. L.B. Campbell, *Shakespeare's Histories Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy* (London: Methuen (1947, rpt.1980); W. Sanders: *The Dramatist and the Received Idea* (Cambridge University Press, 1980); J. Wilders, *The Lost Garden. A View of Shakespeare's English and Roman History Plays* (London: Methuen, 1978); G. Holderness (ed.) *The Shakespeare Myth* (Manchester University Press, 1988).

⁹² Cfr. H. White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth Century Europe*, (Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins Press, 1973), Introduction.

play is not irrelevant. It is not just a dramatic pretext for textual discourse. It has its intention. So we find that the dramatization of the reign of Edward II by Christopher Marlowe is more than a simple account of his life. He is trying to show another view of monarchy since he is investigating the workings of contradictory claims to kingship and the qualities demanded from the monarch in order to win both divine and popular justification for office. The king has no inalienable rights any more. If he is the chosen one, he must also be the most morally apt. Otherwise he should be deposed:

King Edward. Ah, Leicester, weigh how hardly I can brook
To lose my crown and kingdom without cause;
To give ambitious Mortimer my right,
That, like a mountain, overwhelms my bliss;
In which extreme my mind here murder'd is!
But what the heavens appoint I must obey.
Here, take my crown; the life of Edward too:

(5. 1. 51-57)

The life of a king has no sense without his crown. His deposition is not God's plan. His weakness, as in the case of Richard II, makes him unfitted for the throne. From this we learn that history is not pre-arranged because man is a decisive agent which makes it strongly motivated by individual decisions. The ambition of Mortimer makes it no longer possible for the king to reign. In this way drama becomes involved in history. The Elizabethan World Picture is not valid and real because the universe is not perfectly arranged. Man can break the chain and change the succession of historical events. Therefore there is a positive manipulation of history to reflect the playwright's social and political position as well as the common expectations shared by his audience who suffered the oppression of the royal power.

Political awareness, in this context, meant dramatic action which involved a radical desmytification. The dramatist devised his theatrical weapons to subvert a hierarchical order where man was nothing but a toy. Therefore he arranged his dramatic strategies to achieve his political aims. It was not just the consciousness that something should be done but the need to show specific forms of subversion and opposition to reality. One of the most recurrent and repeated strategies to change the historical situation is revenge. It seems to me that revenge was meaningful in Renaissance drama for several reasons. To see it only as a dramatic subgenre is not fully to understand its

complete function. Revenge is also relevant within the dramatic framework for its metatheatrical sense with social and political connotations. This major theme of Renaissance tragedy was popular "because it touched important questions of the day; the social problems of personal honour and the survival of feudal lawlessness, the political problem of tyranny and resistance; and the supreme question of providence."⁹³ Revenge was a tragic nonsense with existential implications. It is the only device Hieronimo has to carry out his own private vengeance because "Private blood-revenge...had no legal place in Elizabethan England"⁹⁴ He is out to avenge the murder, by Lorenzo and Balthazar, of his son Horatio. However he is not the only one seeking revenge in *The Spanish Tragedy*. Don Andrea looks for revenge for his death in battle at the hands of Balthazar. Bel-imperia, for her part, tries to avenge him because he was her lover. Balthazar and Lorenzo are very concerned with putting into practice their vengeful desires on Horatio for winning Bel-imperia's love. Thus revenge is omnipresent. That is why "vengeance shapes the entire action"⁹⁵ of the play. Its importance and relevance is stressed by the fact that Revenge is personified in the play being one of its characters. It is Hieronimo's obsession. He wants to remain within the law and to accept the rules of a divinely arranged society since the king is the supreme judge on earth as God's representative:

So, I tell you this, for learning and for law,
 There's not any advocate in Spain
 That can prevail, or will take half the pain
 That he will in pursuit of equity.

(3. 13. 51-54)

He expects justice to be prompt and fair in its workings. However it is long delayed and denied by the king. No doubt the latter is the only person qualified to free him from the burden and hardships of revenge. The king is introduced at the centre of an orderly court celebrating the end of a war whose cause was just. But justice seems not to be for all. It is delivered when

⁹³ L. Salinger in B. Ford (ed.), *The Pelican Guide to English Literature* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1965) II, 334.

⁹⁴ F.T. Bowers, *Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy 1587-1642* (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1959) 10.

⁹⁵ J.R. Mulryne (ed.), *The Spanish Tragedy* (London: A. and C. Black, (1970, rpt. 1985), Introduction, XX. This is the edition used in this paper.

both Horatio and Lorenzo claim to have captured Balthazar, and since both desire their rewards and honours, the king must arbitrate the matter. Thus there is no other way but to become the judge of his own cause. Hieronimo is doubtful about his determination because he prides himself on his devotion to justice, his madness being the result of the collision of his human sense of justice with the quite different processes of human and divine justice. His revisions and questions are endless:

How should we term your dealings to be just,
If you unjustly deal with those that in your justice trust?
(3. 2. 10-11)

However he must act without delay with such monstrous deeds", the monstrosity required for such injustice. Much of his conflict, therefore, arises from the split between the old order and the new one. His apparent irrationality is a consequence of a consistent choice: to carry out his existential imperative of restoring harmony and sense, opposing the infection and confusion of that corrupted dramatic universe where revenge becomes a powerful weapon to shape subversion. Thus a private act has political dimension.

A positive dramatic appreciation of womanhood in Renaissance England may be considered as another political strategy used by playwrights to subvert a patriarchal world where women are dependent on male claims. Subversion, in this case, meant rebellion against a situation with no expectations for women. The increasing oppressiveness they suffered from the dominant male ideology within a hierarchical order was theatrically counteracted by dramatic heroines who in Shakespeare's comedies are also presented as intellectually equal to men. Sometimes they are morally stronger, more perceptive and wittier than men. Even they may become more centrally important and psychologically meaningful like Cordelia who is forced to act as mother to her father. Other female characters like Lady Macbeth, Cleopatra and Volumnia dominate their men and decisively alter the course of events. Some of his plays even explore the consequences of female dominance. Thus Helena in *All's Well That Ends Well* imposes her intimate aspirations demanding her right to choose her own husband after defeating the most learned doctors in their male perceptions:

Hel. But, if I help, what do you promise me?
King. Make thy demand...

Hel. Then shalt thou give me with thy kingly hand
 What husband in thy power I will command.
 (2. 1. 188-193)

Now she is the winner in a masculine territory. The female universe has regained its role and position within a patriarchal order. This is what has recently been called "Shakespeare's Thatcher phenomenon"⁹⁶ which is not only his because other Renaissance dramatists regarded feminism as a powerful theatrical instrument to subvert male-dominated authority. Thus Abigail in *The Jew of Malta* imposes her femininity in a world of confrontation and radical disorder. She wants to be herself and to love but she finds "that there is no love on earth" (3.3.47). In spite of her innocence she is the cause of the quarrel between Ludowick and Matthias. Under these circumstances Marlowe forces her to challenge male dominance. She cannot live in a place where alienation and degradation are the result of corrupted values. Her radical opposition to such masculinity is directed towards Barabas, her father, the personification of imposed patriarchal repression through hypocrisy and corruption. Her revenge on paternal abuse is extreme. Her decision to fight against male prerogatives makes her enter a nunnery far away from manipulations and impositions. More radical and significant is the case of Beatrice in *The Changeling*, the play written in collaboration by Thomas Middleton and William Rowley. She is determined to create confusion and assume authority in order to be the ruler in that dramatic universe. She succeeds in shattering male expectations by challenging official restrictions in personal choices. It is not possible for her to love Alonzo on her father's wishes. Therefore she is obliged to plot her own dramatic liberation by using men's methods. In this way she becomes the "fair murd'ress" who brought chaos and destruction to a patriarchal world. Now she, being De Flores counterpart, achieves her complete transformation. Finally her deeds, like those of men, are evil.

Dramatic bullets were constantly being aimed at political targets. It was a repeated action carried out with different weapons that directly tried to subvert authority and demystify power through theatrical strategies. Thus the dramatic anticipation of a new world picture made people dream about the

⁹⁶ 20 E.A.J. Honigmann, *Myriad-Minded Shakespeare. Essays Chiefly on the Tragedies and the Problem Comedies* (London: Macmillan, 1989) 131.

possibility of changing reality and served to feed their social expectations. Finally theatrical failure meant political success.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF DEATH IN CH. MARLOWE'S *DR. FAUSTUS*

Miguel Martínez López
University of Granada. Spain

INTRODUCTION

Most of the twentieth-century critical interpretations of Christopher Marlowe's *The Tragical History of the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus* have been attracted to the numerous problems posed by the complex nature of Faustus' sin which seem to introduce damnation at the end of the play⁹⁷.

⁹⁷ See Th. McAlindon, "Classical mythology and Christian tradition in Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*", *P.M.L.A.*, LXXI (June, 1966) 214-223, particularly pp. 221-223; Lily B. Campbell, "Doctor Faustus: a case of conscience", *P.M.L.A.*, (LXVII, 2, March, 1952), 219-239, where she studies the problems of Faustus' sin in the light of a classic case of conflict of conscience (Spira's case) which she suggests influenced Marlowe in his design of his main character's anguish; Robert Ornstein, "Marlowe and God: the tragic theology of *Doctor Faustus*", *P.M.L.A.*, (LXXXIII, no. 5, October, 1968) 1378-1385, particularly pp. 1384-5; W.W. Greg, "The damnation of Faustus", Clifford Leech (ed.), *Marlowe. A Collection of Critical Essays*, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1964) 92-107. In considering Helen a succubus, Greg is the only critic (and also the editor of the most reliable editions of the text) who has insinuated the possibility of a diabolic influence on Faustus, though he did not explore the theme further than that; for a complementary interpretation to that of Greg, see J.P. Brockbank, "The damnation of Faustus", in Leech (ed.), 112-119; for an orthodox approach to this problem see Leo Kirschbaum (ed.), *The Plays of Ch. Marlowe*, (New York: 1962) and for an heterodox approach, Irving Ribner (ed.), *The Complete Plays of Ch. Marlowe*, (New York: 1963). For more recent interpretations, see Bruce Edwin Brandt, *Ch. Marlowe and the Metaphysical Problem Play*, (Salzburg: Institut für Anglistik und Amerikanistik, Universität Salzburg, 1985), especially its bibliography; and Roy T. Eriksen, *The Forms of Faustus' Fortunes*, (Oslo: Solum, 1987). For moral and theological questions, see J. Pieper, *Las Virtudes Fundamentales*, (Madrid: Rialp, 1988).

Elsewhere, I have suggested that criticism of this aspect of the play systematically fails to notice and account for a factor which -in my view- requires a different approach to the nature of Faustus' sin: namely the fact that Marlowe presents the figure of Dr. Faustus as one suffering from diabolic possession⁹⁸. In this paper, I intend to explore Faustus' problematic experience and intellectual apprehension of death; I will contend here that the 'secularization' of the protagonist's hope of immortality is responsible for his refusal to accept that death is a mode of being which life, when life itself begins, immediately adopts; this is the reason why Faustus rejects the licit sciences of the time. According to popular belief, as well as to the uninterrupted teaching of the Church, he is not fully responsible for many of the 'objective' sins critics have thought him to commit in the course of the play. On the contrary, no sin is committed, when the above-mentioned rejection formally occurs, because by then he is no longer really free to choose, since he is obsessed by the devil. His understanding cannot give sufficient information to his will:

Twas I, that when thou wer't i'the way to heuen,
Damb'd vp thy passage, when thou took'st the booke,
To view the Scriptures, then I turn'd the leaues
And led thine eye. [...] ⁹⁹,

⁹⁸ See my chapter "Marlowe's Faustus at the crossroads: mediaeval elements and diabolical games", Miguel Martínez (ed.), *Literature, Culture and Society of the Middle Ages*, (Barcelona: PPU, 1989) 2639-2718, particularly pp. 2681-2695, where I endeavour in a textual analysis which results in an unambiguous confirmation that "[...] Dr. Faustus is presented from the very beginning of the play under a state of diabolical influence, which develops into diabolical possession. Textual evidence for this result from semiotic and historical analysis (Faustus' split, pseudo-schizophrenic personality, the use Marlowe makes of the pronominal system [...], demonologic literature of the time [...]), to say nothing of the fact that the pact with the devil is generally regarded as implying diabolical possession, sometimes standing as one of its types" (pp. 2694-5). See also my article "The discovery of solitude and Ch. Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus*", *Il Confronto Letterario*, Padova, 1990 (in press) 14-18.

⁹⁹ 5. 1. 1988-1992. Quotations, when it is not stated to the contrary, are taken from the B-Text, *The Tragedie of Doctor Faustus* (1616) as set by W.W. Greg, Marlowe's "*Doctor Faustus*", 1604-1616. *Parallel Texts*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950). As I did in my Ph.D. Dissertation, (*Forms of Faustus' solitude: humanist themes and conventions of the Italian Renaissance in Ch. Marlowe's The Tragical History of the Life and Death of Dr. Faustus*, 3 vols., University of

says Mephostophilis, thus revealing how he prevented Faustus from reading the whole text¹⁰⁰. This lies at the very core of Faustus' existential solitude and greatly helps to explain both Marlowe's secret plan for his faustian creation and our contemporaries' interest in it. Faustus' history is that of his tragic life and death, but neither of these can be understood without the other, while the text gives us much more of his death than it tells us about his life.

LOVE AND DEATH.

Faustus' pathetic solitary death epitomizes well that savage death presided by unbearable feelings of horror before an oncoming Hell, which can be explained in part by referring to Renaissance individualism violently reacting against the end of man's life-time, a time that is, in turn, no longer conceived as 'passus' but as 'fractus'. Moreover, Marlowe's presentation of Faustus' death, with the paraphernalia of dramatic and macabre effects, announces the wedding between Eros and Tanatos which we find perfectly consolidated in our contemporary literature and cinematography. It is precisely by the end of the sixteenth century when Europe sees the beginning of that macabre imagination which, on the other hand, is particularly relevant in painting and literature; the chaste self-restraint of the fourteenth and fifteenth century 'dances of death' becomes a violent and erotic experience. Durer's "The Knight of the Apocalypse" is represented riding on an extremely thin horse that contrasts with the deliberately disproportionate dimension given to its genitals; in quite a similar way, as his last night approaches, Dr. Faustus seems only to care about food and sex, as preliminaries for a new and graver affair: demoniality.

The origin of Faustus' final recourse to Hellen in his useless attempt to escape damnation may be found within the second act, when he asks Mephostophilis for a wife:

Bologna, 1988), I will now consider and quote only those lines which are unquestionably Marlowe's.

¹⁰⁰ "Stipendia enim peccati, mors. Gratia autem Dei, vita aeterna, in Christo Jesu Domino nostro". Cfr. St. Paul's *Epistle to the Romans*, 6, 23. At the end of the play, we learn that in the opening scene, Faustus is reading from St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate, but he is not allowed to learn about Grace and repentance.

[...], let me haue a wife, the fairest Maid in
Germany, for I am wanton and lasciuious, and cannot liue
without a wife".

(2. 1. 533-4).

As usual, Faustus quite reasonably fails to get his wife, but not because -as many believe and the text misleadingly suggests- his petition implies a sacramental union which the devil obviously abominates (which is true), but rather because a prostitute is what Faustus is asking for, since, in his explanation, he reduces the concept to the realm of mere instinctive sexual behaviour. It is not difficult to agree with Hazo in that "to be loved [...] is normally to be singled out"¹⁰¹; however Dr. Faustus depersonalizes the choice as far as he can and thus he cannot love. What is foreshadowed in the second act finds ulterior confirmation by the end of the play: Faustus' relation with the spirit of Helen of Troy is designed so as to negate the principle of love. As death approaches, Faustus seems to give way to a highly disordered sexual passion which, if we follow Greg, leads to necrophilia and demoniality. But the main point is not whether he did so or not; the crucial aspect of this question is the way in which Marlowe describes the situation. Under the disguise of eros, separated from sex, Marlowe cleverly presents the inhumanity of sex without eros. Helen is considered as a mere means; she is not loved in or for herself, but simply functions as a vehicle through which Faustus will find fame rather than pleasure. Helen's fame, in turn, only serves to increase Faustus' fame, as far as he is capable of raising her up; but fame, in turn, is for Faustus a mere instrument to attempt at the achievement of a minor form of immortality, precisely that which he had abominated in his first soliloquy:

Be a Phisitian Faustus, heape vp gold,
And be eterniz'd for some wondrous cure:
[...] Why Faustus, hast thou not attain'd that end?
[...] Yet art thou still but Faustus, and a man.

(1. 1. 42-3; 46; 50)

However, nothing radically changes after the signing of the pact as far as Faustus' knowledge, pleasure and power are concerned¹⁰². When he kisses

¹⁰¹ Robert G. Hazo, *The Idea of Love* (New York: 1967).

¹⁰² "Pero además, el personaje Fausto -que se anuncia trágico, como Antonio en *Antonio y Cleopatra* de Shakespeare- a la postre se revela patético. Así, casi en la

her, and a touch of passion can be finally perceived, his soul is stolen and it flies away, in the form of a prologue to his immediate and ineluctable death. This episode of Helen and Faustus is commonly thought of as being rhetorically built up around irony and also around the "soul-in-the-kiss-conceit":

Was this the face that Launcht a thousand ships,
And burnt the toplesse Towers of Ilium?
Sweet Hellen make me immortall with a kisse:
Her lips sucke forth my soule, see where it flies.
Come Hellen, come, giue me my soule againe.

(5. 1. 1874-78).

I feel that, apart from the tone, there is scarce if any irony in this passage, particularly if we consider it within an appropriate context. Instead, there is inversion and a beautiful and singularly successful Elizabethan conceit¹⁰³. The most popular version of this theme in Marlowe's time was the *mors oculi*, according to which "To die was to be loved by a god, and partake through him of eternal bliss"¹⁰⁴ and "this kiss between soul and deity referred both to the soul's flight from the body to join rapturously with God during the highest stage of contemplation and to the ecstasy of a saintly death which unites the soul to God in the afterlife"¹⁰⁵. The inversion of this

mitad de las ocasiones (42.28%), los actos de habla en que Fausto se halla involucrado no obtienen el efecto perlocucionario deseado. No consigue casi nada de lo que anhela: ni satisfactoria respuesta a sus preguntas, ni el poder que se prometiera en el primer monólogo, ni la felicidad perdida, ni la 'esposa' deseada, ni la paz de la gloria, ni el perdón de su mundo, ni la comprensión de los estudiantes, ni un lugar en el tiempo... aunque sí consigue, desde su radical negación de lo moderno, un puesto imperecedero en la historia de la cultura de Occidente". See my paper "Principales resultados de un análisis semiótico del Doctor Fausto (Texto-A, 1604) de Christopher Marlowe", presented to the *II International Symposium of the Andalusian Semiotic Association*, Granada, 1989 (in press), 8 and 14. The above quotation is from p. 14. See also my Ph.D. Dissertation, *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 292-649 & Vol. III, pp. 765-787.

¹⁰³ Bruce E. Brandt has rightly seen this and discusses the conceit at some length in his article "Marlowe's Helen and Soul-in-the-kiss-conceit", *Philological Quarterly*, LXIV, 1 (Winter, 1985) 118-120.

¹⁰⁴ Edgar Wind, "Amor as a God of Death", Ch. 10 of *Pagan Mysteries of the Renaissance* (New York: Norton, 1968), 152-70, quoted by B.E. Brandt, 119.

¹⁰⁵ B.E. Brandt, 119.

doctrine works out both an explicit reference to the overall theme of death which is approaching and a metamorphosis of transcendental immortality into a minor form of immortality, the immortality produced by mankind's recollection of Faustus in the Faust myth and in those lines which carry the best-known kiss-conceit in English literature. Then, Faustus ends the Hellen-affair with a poor and devalued kind of immortality: his life of search and 'pilgrimage' is a projection of a type of life which, since his time, has never ceased to exist. In Faustus' life, we forbode the rhythm of the immortal life; of course, it is a "wordly immortality", and, obviously, it does not affect Faust as a person, but rather as a character of fiction, as a symbolic 'valence'. He has sold himself and all that matters nowadays is whatever he may represent.

Besides, the most important thing for the reader is to acknowledge how Faustus literally empties himself in his filling up of Hellen, instead of filling himself, which is what he would have done, had there still been love in him. That emptying himself out, which "vomits forth his soul" constitutes the ineluctable prolegomenon to death and proves the utter failure of his attempt at somewhat sweetening his existential solitude, (the cause and, at the same time, consequence of his adherence to the devil, who is, in life and doctrine, nobody, nothing, absolute lack, utter negativity). In this respect, Marlowe magnificently links with a secular tradition which contends, in a quite orthodox way of thinking, that -as Baudelaire suggested- the most skilful of all devilish tricks consists in his convincing us that he does not exist. An engraving -inspired by the devilish visions of Breughel and Bosco- and in which the devil was presented as a character with horns and hoofs but with an invisible body, circulated widely throughout seventeenth-century England; the title of the picture was "Nobody". The devil is the being qua not-being and he is represented as such in the play: a contradicting nothingness which infects mankind.

However, Faustus seemed to honestly search for eros in Hellen; he contemplates and praises her face (5.1. 1874). It is not strange that there are no more explicit sexual references than that subtle one to the kiss and subsequent departure of both characters together. Marlowe is quite orthodox in this point too: if in eros through sex the beloved one is looked for, in sex without eros only a pure objectivity (which only apparently produces pleasure) is pursued; and this is almost completely alienated from any sense of sexual or communicative plenitude. This is Faustus' case in connection

with Hellen's kiss; her kiss -that she kisses him and not the other way round must be noticed- is completely 'peripheral'; there is no passion in it for either of the participants; it is a kiss that, instead of symbolizing life, energy, passion, and vitality, clearly announces death, symbolically and otherwise. Faustus' sexuality -to put it in modern terms- lacks any sense of joy, of happiness or pleasure. He apparently arouses Hellen solely to give satisfaction to the scholars' request, almost in order to 'show off':

Gentlemen, for y I know your friendship is vnfain'd,
 It is not Faustus custome to deny
 The iust request of those that wish him well:
 You shall behold that peerelesse dame of Greece.
 (5. 1. 1794-97).

The result is that -after the kiss- desperation seems to be the only way out. In this as in many other aspects, Dr. Faustus presents disturbing parallelisms with modern man. Moreover, the relationship between sex and the diabolic, with evil spirits coming back to time and life to produce both physical and spiritual harm to the living, which is omnipresent in horror films and literature is by no means casual and it can be traced back to the Faust myth.

THE DEATH OF HOPE, I (DOCTRINAL APPROACH).

As we have seen above in relation to love, in the faustian sin we find the first dramatization of man's drive towards 'nothingness' which is perfected in the diabolic pact. However, as long as Faustus is alive, in the 'status viatoris', everything is under the principle of revocability, but Faustus knows that, when death comes, whatever his destiny may be, the contrary principle will be consolidated once and for ever. His attitude throughout the play is that of one who tries to convince himself of the non-irrevocability of death through the very negation of temporality. Now, I shall analyze one of the main reasons why I feel Faustus is incapable of assimilating the cosmic drama of death within the personal destiny of every man.

Dr. Faustus lacks both natural and supernatural hope. Instead, he epitomizes to perfection the two basic forms of negative hope: 'praesumptio' and 'desperatio'. I am talking about the classical concept of 'presumption'

which is closer to anticipation, or, at least, it is a form of it. Presumption is the unnatural anticipation of 'plenitude'. The concept should not pass unnoticed, since the Chorus advances it, if in disguise, at the very beginning of the play, when Faustus' 'history' is being summarized:

"And glutted now with learning golden gifts,
He surfets vpon cursed Necromancie".

(1. Prol. 24-5. The underlining is mine)

Desperation is also anticipation, furthermore, unnatural anticipation; but it is the unnatural anticipation of the lack of plenitude; to despair is, in short, a rather premature descent into hell, and Faustus does this from the first monologue's truncated quotation from St. Paul. With his desperation - which runs parallel to his progressive isolation as the play evolves, (his drive towards the devil, i.e., his drive towards 'nobody', towards absolute vacuum), Faustus destroys the very bases of the 'status viatoris' ("I repent, and yet I doe despaire" (V, i, 1831); the sense of petrification, the feeling of moral and intellectual stagnancy, of lack of progress which we perceive in Faustus' life is precisely derived from that despair which anticipates the final tragic end, whether presumption or desperation proper. This is the main weapon used by Mephistophilis against Faustus, and we tend to be particularly indifferent towards it nowadays; we are accustomed to judging human 'despair' as an inevitable disease that affects the will of a human being; however, despair in the case of Faustus was surely, though probably before the temporal reference of the first monologue -this play begins in media res- a rather voluntary decision. He who hopes as well as he who despairs adheres to hope or to despair with his own will. But there is a not unimportant qualification to be made here: despair is to believe that 'we' and 'I' myself will end badly, but Faustus, when in despair, despairs solely about himself and obliges the scholars to save themselves. Finally, he has for an instant broken his terrible isolation and detachment from all that is human and says:

Talke not of me, but saue your selues and depart.

(5.2. 1972)

Faustus, in his final attempt to go back to a sort of 'natural non-Christian man' (5. 2) is trying to avoid the terrible end of Christian despair. Indeed, whereas despair, for the pagan searcher, only implies the vacuum of inexistence, the return to nothingness which either makes history become absurd or the sense of progress has to be made relative (metempsychosis) -it

is irrelevant when you begin to 'progress'-, despair, for the Christian soul, brings in eternal damnation. This is the reason why the idea of 'via-tor' sounds unattainable: the way to Heaven can be glimpsed in the distance and there is Christ's ransoming blood:

See see where Christs blood streames in the firmamen.¹⁰⁶

By now, Faustus is already a possessed man and cannot even control his own movements¹⁰⁷ ("who puls me downe", 5.2. 2048). Despair could be considered to be his sin because he negates reality and he negates reality, (falling onto the nothingness of the devil), because he is deaf in the face of Mephostophilis' pretexts and lack of minimally satisfactory answers¹⁰⁸.

¹⁰⁶ 5.1. 1. 1463 of the A-Text; this line is missing from the B-Text, though it appears again in B2 as "See where Christs blood streames in the Firmament", which lacks strength because of the elimination of the repetition of 'see'.

¹⁰⁷ My contention that Faustus, from the very beginning of the play is obsessed by the devil rests, among others, on the following pieces of evidence: 1. He sees devils -in both forms, ugly and pleasant (1. 3. & ff.). 2. He hears the voices of devils and converses with them. 3. His first monologue shows no hints of a rational way of thinking, but rather, an attack of logorrhea, a symbolic formula, according to which his journey through the arts is merely rhetorical, for his *idée fixe* is to deprecate them all and to take up magic. 4. God's permission seems here fully justified, according to the theological background of the time, regardless of the fact that Faustus is finally saved (then it is for 'his chiefest bliss') or, in case he is damned, for us to 'regard his hellish fall / Whose fiendfull fortune may exhort the wise [...] (5. 2. 2117-8). 5. Faustus' imprudence has led him to sign a pact with the devil. 6. The pastime of the seven deadly sins delights him. 7. Faustus is physically threatened by the devil several times. 8. The alienating "thou Faustus" stands for a split personality of the type of the schizophrenic. 9. Faustus is supposed to be able to use five different languages (Greek, Latin, Hebrew, Italian and English), a quite uncommon thing in a young Doctor of Divinity. 10. Faustus himself admits to being obsessed in I, ii, 136, and his 'other self' fights and rebels against the devilish attack with the "homo fuge" inscription on his skin in 2.1. 465. Lines 1950-3 within Act V, scene ii are also overtly explicit in this sense. For a more detailed analysis about these and other points, see my above-cited dissertation (Vols. I & II) and chapter in M. Martínez (ed.), 2681-2691.

¹⁰⁸ See, for example, Mephostophilis' answers about Heaven and hell:

Faust. Tell me, where is the place that men call Hell?

Meph. Vnder the heauens.

Few texts present so clearly as this how despair anticipates damnation; and despair means, up to a point, desire, or better, "yearning for". Thus, that which we do not long for can be neither object of hope nor of desperation¹⁰⁹. In fact, Faustus longs for his own salvation and fulfils -as I have discussed elsewhere¹¹⁰- all the necessary stages according to the main treatises on repentance. Therefore, when I have discussed the process of satanic possession, I have had to admit with W. Ostrowski¹¹¹ that the door of salvation for Dr. Faustus is finally left, to say the least, half open. Let us analyze this question in the light of the Church's teaching, which -against the common belief that tends automatically to cast those sinners into hell- is less definite about the so-called sin against the Holy Ghost or sin of despair. When St. Thomas Aquinas comments on Matthew, 12, 32¹¹², he seems to be implementing St. Augustine's and St. Atanasio's suggestion in favour of a non-restrictive interpretation of this Biblical passage: they contend that the passage does not mean that sin against the Holy Ghost is absolutely unforgivable (as critics on Dr. Faustus have always believed), but rather that this sin will not be easily forgiven, since it often presupposes impenitence which closes the way to any possible benefit from Redemption. Obviously this is the source of Faustus' final distorted monologue, where he sees and yearns for goodness without being capable of reaching it. A brief analysis of the final act as far as the theme of death and afterlife is concerned will throw some light upon this question.

It has to be admitted that Faustus has twinges of conscience when he feels death approaching and that God the Judge is substituted by Faustus himself:

[...] I gaue them my soule for my cunning.

Faust. I, so are all things else [...] (5. 1. 509-10).

¹⁰⁹ See St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, 1-2, 40, 4 ad 3.

¹¹⁰ See my above-quoted dissertation, Vols. I & III.

¹¹¹ See Witold Ostrowski, "The interplay of the subjective and the objective in Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus* ", in *Studies in Language in Honour of Margaret Schlauch* (Warsaw: 1966) 293-305.

¹¹² "Et quicumque dixerit verbum contra filium hominis, remittetur ei: qui autem dixerit contra Spiritum Sanctum, non remittetur ei neque in hoc seculo neque in futuro" (*Mat.*, 12, 32). St. Thomas Aquinas' commentary is to be found in *Quaestiones disputatae de malo*, 3, 15.

[...] for the vaine pleasure of foure and twenty yeares
 hath Faustus lost eternall ioy and felicitie.
 (5. 2. 1960-1961)

It is interesting to notice how Marlowe closely adheres here to the popular iconography of the *ars moriendi*, which present the dying man as the protagonist of his own death. According to A. Tenenti¹¹³, there takes place a battle between two supernatural 'armies' and the dying man himself can do little to escape from it; however, his freedom is always respected. God ceases to be judge because the very dying-man takes up that rôle and judges and confesses himself before God the Son. He -like Dimas- has now the final power, in *hora mortis*, to gain or to lose everything. This is exactly the case for Dr. Faustus: he confesses his grave sins and -when the moment arrives- he even repents¹¹⁴. It is true, however, that he asks that time should stop so that death might never come ("That time may cease, and midnight neuer come" (5.2. 2040), but this is in order that "Faustus may repent, and saue his soul" (5.2. 2044). Finally, it is no less true that Faustus appeals to the doctrine of metempsychosis. Faustus continues to reject any transcendence from the 'status viatoris' to the 'status comprehensoris' or 'status termini', but that is only because he has suddenly realized that the diletantism which has permeated all his life has prevented his successfully living it in time, and now he wants to do it all at once, or, if not, he wants hell to be finite or Grace to operate in hell...anything that might help to save his soul.

Impose some end to my incessant paine:
 Let Faustus liue in hell a thousand yeares,
 [...]
 Ah Pythagoras Metempsychosis; were that true,
 This soule should flie from me and I be chang'd
 Into some brutish beast.
 (5. 2. 2068-69; 2074-76)

¹¹³ A. Tenenti, *La Vie et la Mort à travers l'art du XVe siècle* (Paris: A. Collin, 1952) 98 & ff.

¹¹⁴ His final words ("Ile burne my bookes") constitute a standard as well as crucial sign of repentance; I have discussed this in connection with one of the mediaeval sources of Marlowe's Dr. Faustus, (the legend of Simon Magus) in my paper "A mediaeval source and a forgotten game in Ch. Marlowe's Doctor Faustus", presented to the *II International Conference of SELIM*, Córdoba, 1989 (in press).

On the other hand, Faustus at the last minute appeals to a doctrine that has always tempted mankind to project onto it the experiences man observes in nature (the endless succession of seasons, death and rebirth, etc.); life is always followed by death and viceversa. Whenever man feels himself as part of a common nature, he soon convinces himself of the continuous return of his own life. Schleiermacher introduces some elements of these theories of transmigration and metamorphosis into the protestant domain. As for Dr. Faustus, life also behaves like a pendulum and the extremes are the terms of the dualistic 'good' and 'evil', 'God' and 'devil', etc. This partially explains Faustus' terrible lazyness, which has already been mentioned above: if our soul comes back to any sort of life, after death, it is indifferent that we begin working, making efforts now or after one thousand years. (Faustus very much resembles modern man in this as well). This, we may conclude, after this brief textual analysis of Faustus' facing death, that it is far too simplistic to say that Faustus is condemned in the end because he despairs. St. Thomas Aquinas applies Matthew's text only when there is the case of a persistent and blasphemous resistance against Grace, and, about despair, he simply says that there is some special difficulty in its being forgiven¹¹⁵. Faustus' philosophy of death is then doubtlessly orthodox in that it tells us of an order restored at the end of the tragedy, precisely through the ambiguity of doubt that leaving as at a deep level it does leave, the door of salvation half open, it does so without giving up to any of its moral and didactic teachings.

THE DEATH OF HOPE, II (ANTHROPOLOGICAL APPROACH)

If we analyze Faustus' despair from a purely anthropological point of view, I feel reasonably sure that we will not fail to notice that it takes its deepest roots in 'acedy' -a M.E. term which dates from 1623- or 'accidie' (M.E.), the sin of 'torpor' or 'sloth' a word already mentioned by Chaucer. Faustus' acedia is particularly close to Petrarch's 'accidia', and it is precisely in the light of this that Faustus' philosophy of death can be best understood¹¹⁶. Petrarch, like Faustus, is a solitary man; retired in Valchiusa, Petrarch -like Fasutus in his study- talks with the great spirits of the past, to

¹¹⁵ See St. Thomas Aquinas, *De Malo*, 3, 15.

¹¹⁶ I have compared at length the three figures (Marlowe, Petrarch and Faustus) in my Ph. D. Dissertation, Vol. III, 653-788.

himself, to some friends, to the world and to God; nevertheless, Faustus also talks to the devil, and the isolating drive acquires, for the latter a more tragic bent. Both are condemned to lead a secular and contemplative life: for them, the concepts of space and time are space and time of illusion. In Petrarch's 'dèssidia' ('accidia'), as happens with Dr. Faustus, we easily acknowledge the violent crash between the two cultures -Mediaeval and Renaissance-. Petrarch, like Faustus (his cosmology is completely old fashioned¹¹⁷), is not interested in the new scientific thought but rather he is obsessed by the moral sciences, by the drama of sin and Redemption within the individual conscience. His models, as is the case for Faustus¹¹⁸, are The Gospel, the Fathers (particularly Augustine) and the great Latin writers (Virgil, Cicero,...). In the *Secretum*, Petrarch's talk with St. Augustine, the former cannot win in the end and he proves unable to change his life. However, in the *Trionfi*, particularly in his "Trionfo dell'eternità", the permanently tormenting thoughts of Petrarch are sweetened in the expectation of an eternity when and where earthly loves will not be negated but transformed and sublimed into God's supreme peace. Petrarch announces here the things he most desires, and these largely coincide with those of Faustus: the death of time, that time which makes us live in anguish with its continuous mutations of our most beloved feelings, hopes and pleasures; now, Petrarch, like Faustus, dreams with a Paradise whose love, fame, knowledge -our essential humanity- meet in an everlasting spring¹¹⁹:

Trionfo dell'eternità

Quasi spianati dietro e 'nnanzi i poggi
 ch'occupavan la vista, non fia in cui
 vostro sperare e rimembrar s'appoggi;
 la qual varietà fa spesso altrui
 vaneggiar sí che 'l viver pare un gioco,
 pensando pur: "Che sarò io? che fui?".

¹¹⁷ See M. Nicholson, *Science and Imagination* (Now York: Cornell U.P., 1962).

¹¹⁸ For a complete account of Marlowe's use of the Bible, together with a splendid and coherent as well as unfortunately quite unknown interpretation of Marlowe's works in the light of the Bible, see R.M. Cornelius, *Marlowe's Use of the Bible* (Frankfurt & New York: The American U. P.-Peter Lang, 1984).

¹¹⁹ Mario Pazzaglia, *Letteratura Italiana*, 2nd ed., (rpt. 1989; Bologna: Zanichelli, 1985), 547. The text that follows "Trionfo dell'eternità" is taken from: F. Petrarca, *Trionfi*, a cura di C. Calcaterra, (Turin: UTET, 1923).

Non sarà più diviso a poco a poco, ma tutto
 insieme, e non più state o verno,
 ma morto il tempo e variato il loco;
 e non avranno in man li anni 'l governo
 de le fame mortali, anzi chi fia
 chiaro una volta fia chiaro in eterno.
 O felici quelle anime che 'n via
 sono e seranno di venire al fine
 di ch'io ragiono, quadunque e'si sia!
 E tra láltre leggiadre e pellegrine
 beatissima lei che Morte occise
 assai di qua del natural confine!
 Parranno allor l'angeliche divise
 e l'oneste parole e i pensier casti
 che nel cor giovenil Natura mise.
 Tanti volti, che Morte e l'Tempo ha guasti/
 torneranno al suo più fiorito stato,
 e vedrassi ove, Amor, tu mi legasti,
 ond'io a dito ne sarò mostrato:
 "Ecco chi pianse sempre, e nel suo pianto
 sovra 'l riso d'ogni altro fu beato!".
 E quella di ch'anchor piangendo canto
 avrà gran meraviglia di se stessa
 vedendosi fra tutte dar il vanto.

.....
 Questi Trionfi, i cinque in terra giuso
 avem veduto, ed alla fine il sesto,
 Dio permettente, vederem lassuso.
 E 'l Tempo a disfar tutto così presto,
 e Morte in sua ragion cotanto avara,
 morti insieme saranno e quella e questo.
 E quei che Fama meritaron chiara,
 che 'l Tempo spense, e i be' visi leggiadri
 che 'mpallidir fe' 'l Tempo e Morte amara,
 l'oblivion, gli aspetti oscuri ed adri,
 più che mai bei tornando, lasceranno
 a Morte impetuosa, a' Giorni ladri;
 ne l'età più fiorita e verde avranno
 con immortal bellezza eterna fama.
 Ma innanzi a tutte ch'a rifar si vanno,
 è quella che piangendo il mondo chiama
 con la mia lingua e con la stanca penna;
 ma 'l ciel pur di vederla intera brama.
 A riva un fiume che nasce in Gebenna

amor mi diè per lei sí lunga guerra
 che la memoria ancora il cor accenna.
 Felice sasso che 'l bel viso serra!
 ché, poi ch'avrà ripreso il suo bel velo,
 se fu beato chi la vide in terra,
 or che fia dunque a rivederla in cielo?.

This Renaissance 'acedy' is born in the first Italian Renaissance and constitutes one of the most effective anaesthetics -prologue to both a physical and spiritual death- of human conscience. Faustus is presented after his signing the pact as an idle being dominated by 'dessidia'. The pact itself (apart from being a futile attempt at an artificial advance of the 'status termini' and apart from the dogmatic inversions which it carries along with it) rather consists of a means to save the effort inherent to any human enterprise. Sloth and acedy soon contradict the impression created by the opening Chorus and by Faustus' first address. What Faustus really want is:

How am I glutted with conceipt of this?
 Shall I make spirits fetch me what I please?
 Resolue me of all ambiguities?

(1. 1. 105-7).

Faustus wants the ends, and wants them now, but he can not bear the means. Acedy, for the traditional teaching of the Church, is, above all, species tristitia¹²⁰. This goes straight to the point: Faustus is a sad man; in Dr. Faustus we acknowledge the truth of St. Paul's teachings when he contended that the acedia is tristitia saeculi, the sorrow of this world which introduces death¹²¹. The feeling of isolation and moral paralysis which we acknowledge in Dr. Faustus after the pact is rhetorically foreshadowed by the pendular movement and by a dilettantism which are incapable of transcending an eternal return which leaves no way out¹²². I have often

¹²⁰ See St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, 1-2, 35, 8.

¹²¹ Saeculi autem tristitia mortem operatur". Cfr. in St. Paul, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 7, 10.

¹²² For further details about these two questions see: Phoebe S. Spinrad, "The dilettante's lie in Doctor Faustus", *Texas Studies in Literature and Language (TSL)*, XXIV, no. 3, Fall, 1982, 243-254; F. de A. Carreres de Calatayud, "El movimiento pendular en el Fausto de Marlowe", *Filología Moderna*, XIII, no. 49, November, 1973, 29-64.

contended that Faustus' problem is originally of a psychological bent, and that, later, this is mainly due to the process and state of diabolic possession he undergoes; this is why -when referring to Faustus- I have always talked about peccatum in causa in the deeds of his life before he appears on stage in media res. Marlowe surely intended this precisely to produce that clever ambiguity¹²³. But the critical point is precisely the presumably psychological disease that prepared Faustus for the pact¹²⁴. Thus, we see Faustus severely affected by acedy: his will, his diseased capacity to want increasingly reduces the moral stature of the protagonist who does his best to escape from God, to find and hide himself in an untrodden corner of the universe -which does not exist- where he may temporarily remove his duties and rights as a son of God. His weakness, his horror when facing pain or contradiction leads him to a rather unconscious detestation of divinity which forces him to recognize that death is the ineluctable bridge towards perfection. Kierkegaard has said in his book *Disease and Death* that acedy is the "despair of frailty", a preliminary stage towards existential despair; the man who despairs does not want to be the same man; Faustus hides himself in the same way as Adam and Eve hid themselves after their Fall; Faustus blames others (his parents, Mephostophilis, ...) as Adam blames Eve, and Eve blames the Snake.

As if it were a family, acedy is accompanied by a whole family of symptoms of death which I have dealt with in my semiotic analysis of the A-Text of *Doctor Faustus* (see above, note no. 6). First of all, 'acedy' gives birth to a sort of 'wandering' spiritual uneasiness generally called 'evagatio mentis'.

¹²³ See M. Martínez (ed.), 2691-95.

¹²⁴ I have dealt with this theoretical question in my chapter "Libertad vs. obediencia" and in "Lenguaje apetitivo, economía social y libertad: una perspectiva pragmática", in A. Polaino-Lorente & M. Martínez, *La Agonía del Hombre Libertario* (Madrid: Universidad de Piura, 1987), 181-244 & 129-156. "La libertad es un modo de ser, pues es lo que explica cómo son los actos; habla de las formas en que la sustancia del ser se proyecta y actúa [...] La libertad es un modo de ser de la voluntad [...] A la voluntad lo que le es inherente es el querer, y, lógicamente no se puede querer lo que no se conoce [...] La inteligencia conoce y presenta a la voluntad aquellos actos u objetos que son susceptibles de ser elegidos, los malos como malos, los buenos como buenos y en tanto que buenos bienes que la voluntad procede a desear" (p. 212). As Faustus' intelligence has been obsessed since Mephostophilis passed the leaves of the Bible, his decision to sign the pact may not be completely free nor free enough to stand as a sole cause for damnation.

Since no man can base his whole life solely upon sadness, Dr. Faustus, who is -we learn- just a man condemned to die, 'does his best' to avoid and/or escape pain. In short, the main symptoms of the *evagatio mentis* are the following¹²⁵: a) *Verbositas* (Faustus' attacks of logorrhea -see 1.1 & 2-). b) *Curiositas* (i.e., an insatiable desire to know new things -2.1. & 1-). c) *Importunitas* (disorder which leads away from the things of the spirit and throws the human being to mundane objects). d) *Inquietudo*, inner lack of peace (2.1.). e) *Instabilitas loci vel propositi* (pendular movement, permanent doubts and contradictions -1.1. & 2-). Apart from the symptoms related to the *evagatio mentis*, we have a third member for this 'satanic family': Marlowe's text advances it at the very beginning, connects it with the history of Dr. Faustus, a paratextual and almost contextual element, and repeats it throughout the play: the sense of 'glutted' in the sense of fed-up indifference or as torpor, two typical consequences of the extremely individualistic search. For the sake of brevity and because they are so obvious that they can easily be felt even after a superficial reading of the text, I shall not here analyze the three basic characteristics commonly attached to 'torpor': *pusillanimitas*, i.e., lack of strength and will to decide for oneself as well as to assume responsibilities; special forgetfulness about God and God's things; and *malitia*, i.e., straightforward and open hate against the divine side of man. To conclude this chapter, it has to be noted that we find in Dr. Faustus simultaneously both 'presumption' and 'despair', and that they cohabit in a sort of complex and problematic synthesis of senile desperation with a tragic tenor, and childish presumption with a comic tone.

CONCLUSION

We have left Faustus' body destroyed by the devils in the same study where we saw him first, but we have learned that his limbs are "all torn asunder by the hand of death"; the scholar is quite right. Faustus has been defeated solely by death, the perishable and contingent nature of the humane which -with so little, if any, success- he had so much endeavoured to negate; and though his body has been destroyed, the question about the ultimate destiny of his soul is left unanswered. Faustus most desires an immortality

¹²⁵ For a full list and commentary, see St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, 2-2, 35, 4 ad 3; see also *De Malo*, 3, 14 ad 8.

without the previous passage of death (1.2. 10). Death is portrayed in Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus* according to the orthodox catholic thought of Marlowe's time (a religious dogma which has come down to us from Trent, 5th session, 1456), as a direct consequence of sin (Rom., 6, 23). Marlowe teaches us that life is a straight line, not a circle (from status viatoris to status termini); if one does not advance one goes back, and Faustus, with his pendular movement goes and returns in an endless move, without hope and direction. Suddenly time remains silent; the hands of the clock overlap and it is midnight, the beginning and the end of time -perfectly represented in the play- the time of spirits and ghosts. Faustus, facing the oncoming end of his days and the birth of a definitive state of being, falls into doubt and horror. He wanted to live -as many do today- as if death did not exist and comes to discover that 'nothing', 'nobody' was with the devil instead. Faustus' philosophy of death is brilliantly summed up by one of the scholars: "He is not well with being ouersolitary". The forms of Faustus' fortunes are the forms of Faustus' solitude: he gravely sinned and deeply felt repentance. The answer to the question "Where did Faustus go?" is up to a point irrelevant; he is here with us, in the form of a myth, in our literary memory, in recollection, and, in a quite different manner, in one way or another as we shall all be with him one day, come un vano desiderio di fuga.

CHARACTER DUPLICATION AND EMULATION IN *KING LEAR*: A STUDY OF *KING LEAR*

Maria Luisa Dañobeitia
Universidad de Granada. Spain

The precise idea of this paper is that of studying the process of duplication and emulation which seems to govern the structural development of *King Lear*. The general tendency is that of seeing Lear as a monolithic figure whose tragedy arises solely from some flaw in his character. Yet, it cannot be so. Lear is not alone and thus he cannot be the only one responsible for his misfortunes. In many ways Kent and Gloucester follow a pattern of behaviour that is similar to that of Lear. This prompts us to conjecture that Lear acts in such an idiosyncratic manner, wanting to know who loves him most, because he is sure that the test is going to work out to the satisfaction to his personal needs¹²⁶. Lear's drama arises not only from his attitude towards kingship, but from that of his chancellors. Surely they must have had to obey him regardless of the nature of his orders, and surely they must have humoured him to the point of emulating him in both deed and language.

Bearing in mind the idea of emulation and duplication we propose to explore two things. One is the manner in which Kent emulates Lear's language during his confrontation with Oswald¹²⁷. The other is the way in

¹²⁶ Lear's personal motives have been explored in a paper written by this author, "Lear's 'You have some cause': A Study of *King Lear*," *Miscelánea*, (Universidad de Zaragoza, Departamento de Filología Inglesa y Alemana, 1989) 10:17-45. We wish to refer the reader to this paper for the required bibliography.

¹²⁷ As far as we are aware, a detailed analysis of the intriguing fact that, one way or other, all the characters act as a mirror of Lear, has not been made. Frances A. Shirley in *Swearing and Perjury in Shakespeare's Plays* (London: George Allen & Unwin) 129, comments that Kent emulates Lear.

which Shakespeare has manipulated the names of Lear's daughters in order to create a system of duplication, not to say inclusion. A system that makes it possible to contain, partially or completely, Lear's name in those of his daughters or vice-versa¹²⁸. What is not contained yields similar phonetic patterns, which, in the case of Cordelia serve to express what she is going to signify in Lear's life, and in the nature of his drama through intriguing puns. His tragedy has been duplicated in that of Gloucester and indirectly in the person of Kent, although in the latter case it is grounded in a psychological attitude rather than in physical acts. The system of duplication and emulation indicates several things: that Lear is not alone; that Gloucester functions as Lear's surrogate when it comes to matters related to sex and procreation¹²⁹; that Kent's becomes Lear's wrathful duplication of his verbal anger; and that his daughters are Lear's replicas, with the exception of Cordelia, and that in Cordelia's case what is not contained in Lear's name communicates what she must be in his life, that is, an ordeal.

¹²⁸ In this case we cannot argue in favour of coincidence because the names have been sufficiently altered for us to ponder the possibility of a deliberate alteration. Shakespeare has introduced a number of significant changes in his source, (if it was his source), *The history of the Kings of Britain*. The most important one is that of the kings' name. From Leir he has changed the king's name to Lear, so making possible the full inclusion of Cordelia's name in his. In addition the word-play that we are going to discuss would not make sense if Shakespeare had not changed the thematic development of the story. See Geoffrey of Monmouth, *The History of the Kings of Britain* (London: Penguin Books, 1966), trans. Lewis Thorpe. Spenser in his *Faerie Queene*, Book II, Canto X, does not feel the need to change Lear's name, and thus years later, instead of Lear we find Leyr and instead Goneril, Gonorill and Cordelia, at times, is Cordeill. Only Regan's name has not been changed. In *The True Chronicle History of King Leir*, Lear's name is Leir and that of his daughters, Gonorill and Ragan and Cordella. In *Holinshed's* Lear is Leir, Regan is Regan, Cordelia is Cordeilla and Gonoril is Gonorilla. It is not always easy for the average reader to realise this because in some modern versions of *Holinshed*, published precisely for students of Shakespeare, the names have been changed to make them fit in with those of Shakespeare, See, *Shakespeare's Holinshed*, ed. Richard Hosley (New York: Capricorn Books, 1968). In *John Higgins*, Lear is Leire, Goneril is Gonerell, Regan is Ragan and Cordelia is Cordell or Cordile.

¹²⁹ For some critics *King Lear* is a play about sex. See Frank Kermode, *Shakespeare, Spencer and Donne*, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul) 178.

Lear gives the impression of being a man bent on having his will since he has never experienced in his life a real and direct opposition even from those who love him well. On account of this blind obedience he knows little about either his own family or his counsellors. At his court he is not the only one who knows little about himself and others. Gloucester's tragedy, in part, derives from his inability to evaluate the worth of his children properly. Gloucester is not only blind but irresponsible when he speaks to Kent about Edmund's birth and, very much like Lear, seems to know very little about the true nature of Edgar and Edmund.

Surely Gloucester's manifest lack of wisdom does not make him an ideal counsellor, because if he is not capable of seeing through the crude wiles of Edmund, how can we expect him to perceive the tricks of those who are not so close to him as his own children? In addition to this, he does not seem to have all that much tact or consideration towards the feelings of others, otherwise he would have not spoken as he did to Kent about Edmund's birth. The point is not, as some critics have stated, whether Edmund may or may not be close enough to hear him, but that he speaks slightly of Edmund's conception, thus showing little consideration towards both love and procreation. The point could be taken a little further since we do not know whether he was a widower or not by the time of Edmund's procreation. What we do know is that Edgar is older than Edmund and thus the possibility of adultery exists.

Gloucester's flippant attitude towards the act of begetting children and probably towards adultery serves to indicate that he is irrational and irresponsible when it comes to sexual matters, and this fact induces the reader to question Lear's attitude when it comes to sex and procreation. When considering Lear's age and that of his daughters, one is forced to ponder the embarrassing fact that Lear has not taken procreation as a serious duty to the crown, because he must have married very late in life. Even if his wife was not all that young, Lear, by natural deduction, has to be much older. The fact that Lear must have had a young wife is an explanation in itself of his natural proclivity to think in terms of adultery as soon as one of his daughters does not please him¹³⁰. When Cordelia does not gladden him he rejects his

¹³⁰ K. Muir says, "The revulsion against sex, besides being a well-known symptom of a certain form of madness, is linked with Lear's earlier suspicion that the mother of Goneril and Regan must be an adulteress, with Gloucester's pleasant

paternity¹³¹. In doing so Lear is repudiating aspects of his daughter's character that he cannot acknowledge because in his mind they do not fit in with his preconceived idea of what his daughter must be and thus he becomes suspicious about his paternity.

With Cordelia's departure Lear's drama begins. At this point even his daughters are alarmed by his performance. After watching Lear's proceedings one is forced to grant his two daughters a certain amount of commonsense, and specially when recalling the fact that there is no direct textual evidence to prompt us to conjecture that they hate Cordelia, or that they are elated with Kent's misfortunes:

You see how full of changes his age is; the observation we have made of it has not been little: he always lov'd our sister most; and with what poor judgment he hath now cast her off appears too grossly.¹³²

Basically there is nothing wrong with what they say about Lear and Cordelia. The way in which they answer Cordelia is acceptable in view of her open and direct accusation, since it is not a trivial one;

I know you what you are;
And like a sister am most loth to call
Your faults as they are named. Love well our father:
(1.1.268-10)

vices which led to the birth of Edmund and ultimately to his own blinding." See "Madness in *King Lear*", ed. Allardyce Nicoll, *Shakespeare Survey*, (London: Cambridge University Press, 1971) vol.13. 31. Perhaps Lear's anger at Kent's intercession must be understood as a manifestation of Lear's distrust regarding his paternity of Cordelia. What Lear screams at Kent, "avoid my sight," is very provocative.

¹³¹ According to David Sundelson, "King Lear contains Shakespeare's most terrible destruction of fathers, but it also contains the impulse to restore them." See *Shakespeare's Restorations of the Father* (New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1964) 2.

¹³² *King Lear*, ed. Kenneth Muir (London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1973) 1.1. 286-90. All quotations from this ed.

This is a severe statement coming from a person as young as Cordelia. Hearing her, one has the feeling that she is making a profession of her virtue, forgetting that she is about to leave Lear in their hands. The manner in which she answers her sisters serves to reveal one aspect of Cordelia's character that renders her similar to her father. She has a very strong character and can be as harsh as he is with those she does not like. Yet, what is contained of Lear's character in Cordelia's does not go beyond flaws that become serious only because she has been opposing a man who has the very same flaws. The confrontation of two strong wills makes it impossible for them to reach a sensible compromise because this must be on their own terms or nothing. Lear cannot accept Cordelia except on his own terms, but Cordelia cannot accept Lear's terms and thus they must part.

To bring Cordelia's flaws to the audience's attention is not an easy task due to the emotional appeal of the events, yet it must be done. To achieve this the playwright has presented both sisters at this point using words that are characterized by a note of decorum, with the purpose of contrasting them with those of Cordelia. If both sisters would have been hard, unreasonable and cruel, the audience would have missed the point because of their preoccupation with Cordelia's fate.

Watching Cordelia's departure and a Lear rejecting his paternity, the audience can well expect something similar to this happening again. This fact is so much in the courtier's minds that as soon as something is not quite right they feel no qualms about staining their wives' good name seemingly for no other reason than their children's apparent conduct. On hearing Lear exclaim that "by the marks of sovereignty/ Knowledge and Reasons, I should be false persuaded I had daughters," (1.4.253-4), or calling Goneril "degenerate bastard," the inevitable reaction is to wonder why he is so lacking in faith when it comes to his wife's chastity¹³³. Lear does not only reject his paternity

¹³³ Hamlet is very sensitive when it comes to sex, but, there is a reason, his mother's untimely wedding. Othello is blind because of his insecurity caused by the colour of his skin, but, there is nothing in Lear to justify this except his attitude to sex when he was young and the fact that his wife must have been a very young woman and he, old. During the storm, Lear's attention is focused on lust and even though Roland M. Frye in his *Shakespeare and the Christian Doctrine* (New Jersey, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982) 255, comments that Shakespeare could have placed Lear, but does not, in a Dantesque or Miltonic Hell, he is mistaken because Lear is in hell and so are Kent and Gloucester, not

but in Goneril's case he curses her in a manner that cannot be accepted on moral grounds. He pleads to the gods to make her barren. His curse constitutes a very serious aggression against nature because by wishing her to be sterile he is hoping to deprive her of a natural function innate to her sex. This hope relates to his obsession with illegal procreation whereby sterility becomes a desirable flaw in his daughter. Yet his curse makes sense only if we understand it as the product of mind that thinks that Goneril's issue cannot stem from his blood and that therefore it must be unlawful.

Goneril, like Lear, is not willing to accept a situation in which she is not in full command. She tries to be the only master of her castle, and although we cannot praise her attitude towards Lear, we cannot accept Lear's brutal reaction so easily because what she says does not merit Lear's unnatural curse. At this point we have not been presented with a sort of Lady Macbeth plotting to kill, but with a headstrong woman who wants at any cost to place her father where she feels he ought to be. In spite of his dreadful insults, Goneril is far more in control of herself than he is: she does not respond with violence to his affronts but insists on what she wants, which is to curb Lear's will. In her turn, Goneril is doing to Lear exactly the same thing as Lear did to Cordelia, that is, trying to impose her will on him.

If Goneril becomes a replica of Lear, so does Kent when Goneril acts towards Lear as hardheartedly as Lear did towards Cordelia. Kent, at this point, becomes not only a duplicate of Lear but a replica of the Fool. He loves Lear and defends a cause that, according to the Fool, only a fool would: a king who has not only banished him but has been on the point of killing him. The Fool makes some caustic comments about Kent's foolishness and the problem lies in the fact that we cannot dismiss his words as trifling talk¹³⁴. The Fool tells Kent that only a fool would remain attached to Lear's wheel when the wheel is rolling downhill:

to say the Fool. To grasp the fact that Lear is in Hell we need only bear in mind that in Dante's Hell, Canto V, the circle in which sins related to lust are punished, is described as a place where an everlasting tempest is raging so that whirling winds torment the sinners.

¹³⁴ According to John F. Danby, "The Fool appears to be as callous as the sisters, they are no more cruel than he. The Fool can see it all happening, and knows exactly how it works. But this knowledge leaves him no better off." *Shakespeare's Doctrine of Nature: a Study of King Lear* (London: Faber and Faber, 1982) 104. To know exactly what the Fool stands for, is not easy, but he

We'll set thee to school to an ant, to
 teach thee there's no labouring i'the' winter.[.....]
 Let go thy hold when a great wheel runs down a hill,
 lest it break they neck with following it; but the
 great one that goes upwards, let him draw thee
 after. When a wise man gives thee better
 counsel, give me mine again:

(2. 4. 65-74)

According to the Fool's remarks, Kent is as imprudent as Lear and in consequence he offers them both his coxcomb. When Kent asks the Fool why he should take his coxcomb, his reply prompts the reader to ponder that the Fool is right because Lear's fate is that of a Fool who, impelled by foolish rage, gave away his crown as if it were a coxcomb.

When Kent becomes enraged beyond reason with Oswald, the audience perceives why the Fool gave him his coxcomb. However Oswald should wear the fool's cap as much as Kent or Lear. Oswald, like Kent, is another fool by virtue of his devotion to Goneril. He, like Kent, does not question whether his lady is worthy of such attachment and loyalty, because serving means fidelity. When Kent becomes so angry with him, he cannot perceive that Oswald is merely a fool, a perfect idiot who serves a worthless cause and dies for it. At this point Kent is blind and his sightlessness causes in him a wrath that renders him Lear's equal. In his fury he mirrors Lear's vivid image so that unawares he is emulating Lear in both deed and language. He calls him,

could be the embodiment of a will to survive, signifying that heroic deeds are foolish if one cannot come out victorious. To live seems to be the basic principle of the Fool. Considering that in Shakespeare's time life was held cheap, his attitude makes sense. Thus to see him, as Danby does, merely as an "unilluminated head" is not the answer to the problem inherent in the Fool. *Ibidem* p.113. We agree with Robert H. Goldsmith, when he says that "about the Fool's doglike fidelity to Lear, a few further words are needful ... Perhaps, we ought to recall, parenthetically, that the Fool wavers in his loyalty for a long moment and only hurries after his king when commanded by Goneril." *Wise Fools in Shakespeare* (Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1963) 65. This appreciation of the Fool renders the emulating process more dramatic, because the Fool must behave as a fool since he has no other choice, but Kent does and so did Lear at the opening of the play.

A knave, a rascal, an eater of broken meats; a base, proud, shallow, beggarly, three-suited, hundred-pound, filthy worsted-stocking knave; a lily-livered, action-taking, whoreson, glass-glazing, super-serviceable, finical rogue; one-trunk-inheriting-slave; one that wouldst be a bawd in way of good service, and art nothing but the composition of a knave, beggar, coward, pander, and the son and heir of a mongrel bitch: one whom I will beat into clamorous whining if thou deni'st the least syllable of thy addition.

(2. 2. 13-23)

This is not a very satisfactory speech. The catalogue of insults is too strong, gross, long and shocking coming as it does from Kent. Here Shakespeare is twisting the screw very tight upon his audience. We wait to see what Oswald has to say but till Kent has finished reviling him, he says nothing. The problem with this type of vituperation lies in the fact that it always touches on a very delicate issue, that of the mother's reputation, this being a point that seems to obsess them all.

To think of mothers as creatures who must be adulterous or "a mongrel bitch" is like a dreadful infection that affects both innocent and guilty alike. To enhance this point, Oswald's reply comes as an unexpected shock which is difficult to digest in view of Kent's vituperation. There is continence, patience and control in Oswald's words, "Why, what a monstrous fellow art thou, thus to rail on one that is neither known to thee nor knows thee!" (2.2.24-5). A word like "monstrous" sounds almost like a kind complement when compared with "heir of a mongrel bitch" and the like. Is Oswald so tolerant to Kent because he thinks he is facing a mad fellow that belongs to the household? Be that what it may, the fact is that this type of language characterizes not only Lear, but Kent and Gloucester also.

It is not for nothing that Gloucester has to suffer the ordeal of being blinded, on account of Lear. Why he must undergo such a atrocious ordeal is clarified when he reveals that he has acted in such a way because "I would not see thy cruel nail/ Pluck out his poor eyes," (3.7.45-6). In essence both are blind because both have committed an aggression against nature by rejecting their children and therefore their paternity. Gloucester commits the deed, because owing to his sinful disposition there is an illicit child bent on destroying his legal one. Yet, he could not see this because his rash nature did not permit him to see things in their exact perspective, thus proving

himself to be as unenlightened about his children's nature as Lear has been. When he rejected Edgar he was blind and now he must become physically blind in order to perceive that he has been a sightless man. In his painful awareness that he has been like Lear, he is willing to become blind in Lear's stead so that, metaphorically speaking, because he takes Lear's place, Lear becomes, like him, a blind man.¹³⁵

Now Lear's daughters are bent on destroying his world, so they must destroy all that is like Lear. Their act of annihilation begins with that person who in their minds, and according to the text, is Lear's replica, Gloucester. He has sent Lear to Dover and so he stands alone to answer Goneril and Regan, and thus he becomes physically blind, while Lear has to withstand the blind rage of the tempest and consequently his ethical blindness¹³⁶. The situation becomes a sequence of a dramatic replica because while Lear confronts the storm and therefore his moral blindness, Gloucester, blinded in his stead, achieves the required anagnorisis and gives Lear the occasion to see that he is blind. His act places Lear in a situation what will permit him to see. Yet, in his madness Lear cannot perceive that Gloucester has become physically blind expressly because he is a blind man, and that because of Gloucester's physical blindness he will be able to perceive his moral blindness.

The point has been brought to the surface by means of Lear's attitude and apprehension of Gloucester's blindness, for, before he can recognize him,

¹³⁵ The process of acting in the king's stead is common and conforms to systems oriented to preserve the king's life in times of danger: systems that can be explained in anthropological terms. See Frazer's *Golden Bough: A Study of Magic and Religion*, Part VI, "The Scapegoat" (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1933). The point is important because when a process of substitution or willingness to spare the king from pain occurs, the person who suffers the punishment is like the king because he is the embodiment of the royal spirit, and thus the king.

¹³⁶ "Both Lear and Gloucester are the victims of filial ingratitude: the blinding of Gloucester is the physical equivalent to the madness of Lear. "See Theodore Spencer, *Shakespeare and the Nature of Man* (New York: Collier Macmillan Publishers, 1974) 136. Yes, but why blindness in Gloucester's case? The only explanation resides in the merging of the two men into one. What is interesting is to indicate that Spencer's conception of the play's development is that of one violation leading to another, till they resolve in death. *Ibidem*, 243.

he equates his blindness with Cupid's and thus with the general workings of love, as something to be avoided. The scene is unbearable but necessary. In this scene Lear is not only morally blind but physically blind because he cannot perceive that Gloucester has no eyes in his sockets, yet, his physical incapacity to see is not like that of Gloucester because he, unlike Gloucester, has eyes and therefore this prepares the reader for confronting Lear's imperfection when he must grasp the magnitude of his offence and its consequences, as opposed to Gloucester's ability to see the nature of his own shortcomings and their repercussions.

I remember thine eyes well enough. Dost thou squiny at me?
 No, do thy worst, blind Cupid; I'll not love.
 Read thou this challenge; mark but the penning of it.
 (4. 5. 135-7)

Lear begins to perceive, but not far, because he, like blind Cupid, lacks reason. In addition he is saturated with blind wrath and so he starts to blame others, such as his sons-in-law, for his misfortunes. His fury is now oriented towards his daughters' husbands but he is deceiving himself because, like blind Cupid, he is shooting arrows in the wrong direction: France and Albany are worthy men and as such undeserving of such anger:

It were a delicate stratagem to shoe
 A troop of horse with felt; I'll put't in proof,
 And when I have stol'n upon these son-in-laws,
 Then, kill, kill, kill, kill, kill!"
 (4. 5. 182-5)

The idea of destruction, death, and even treachery is very much in his mind. Now he is talking about "a troop of horse with felt" so that, much that characterizes his two daughters' disposition still controls of Lear's proclivities. In order to perceive how much of Lear is contained in his daughters we need only compare their names, using a phonetic deductive method. A method that shows that Lear and his daughters, because of their blood ties, and in spite of the father's doubts about his paternity, have much in common with the exception of Cordelia. We shall begin with Cordelia and Lear, Goneril and Lear and Regan and Lear.

Cordelia / Lear

- 1.- Corde[l]ia/[L]ear:l/l.
- 2.- Cord[e][l]ia/[L][e]ar: e-l/l-e.
- 3.- Co[r]d[e][l]ia/[L][e]a[r]:r-e-l/l-e-r.
- 4.- Co[r]d[e][l]i[a]/[l][e][a][r].r-e-l-a/l-e-a-r.

Lear's name is fully contained in Cordelia.

When looking at the scheme it is evident that there is not one single phonetic sign left over and therefore what is left is nothing and consequently its value must be that of 0. What is left from Cordelia's name is exactly Cod+i. The combination of "cod" and "i" is provocative because in addition to "cod" we have a phonetic sign that leads directly to the visual evocation of a phallic symbol. This evocation prompts the reader to relate it to the inherent or understood meaning of the word "cod". In Cordelia's case her father's name is not only fully contained in hers¹³⁷ but what is missing from Lear's to become Cordelia takes the reader directly to elements pertaining to sex and thus procreation.

¹³⁷ Iris Murdoch, in her novel *The Philosopher's Pupil*, uses the Lear theme, so to speak. The interesting point is that she has transformed the old father into a grand-father whose preoccupation is his grand-daughter's marriage. Lear's obsession with the mother-figure has been pointed out by Adrian Pool. He says, "the mother-figure for whom he is waiting is Regan, and she will enter reluctantly in a moment or two. It is then that Lear recalls the image of the dead wife in which he puts such absolute trust. If a man can talk about the 'mother' inside him, then one answer to this question 'where is this daughter?' might be that she was inside him too. [...] The 'mother' was an accepted medical myth in Shakespeare's time, a name for hysteria (which itself comes from the Greek for womb). In Harsnett's pamphlet exposing the Jesuit exorcism-racket, one of the demoniacs called Richard Mainy is supposed to suffer from the 'mother.'" *Tragedy: Shakespeare and the Greek Example* (New York: Basil Blackwell, 1987) 232-3. We completely agree with this because it explains why Lear's name is fully contained in that of Cordelia. Yet, if Lear thinks of Regan it is because she is the only daughter left. In reality the one that is fully accommodated in Lear's heart because he is fully contained in her, as the 'mother', is Cordelia.

Also there is a magnificent quibble in Cordelia's name that indicates what she must become in Lear's life: a dreadful ordeal, her death by hanging¹³⁸. To see this we must break her name into its components, Cord/delia; delia=deal. The breaking process offers the deal of the cord, or C-ordeal[i]. One must note that the phonetic sign that must be deducted is the [i]. In Lear's mind Cordelia is his ordeal, a tribulation that becomes a dreadful bargain, the cord that is used to hang her. The type of irrevocable trial that Lear must undergo is appropriate when considering the nature of his fault. The deal of the cord must be understood with all the sexual puns inherent in the word cord, (symbolized by the rigid and straight line of the "l" and "i"), and in that of the noose because it functions as a conceit of the metaphor inherent in the "wheel of fire."

Goneril / Lear

1.- Goneril/[L]ear:l/l.

2.- Gon[e]ri[l]/[L][e]ar:e-l/l-e

3.- Gon[e][r]i[l]/[L][e]a[r]:e-r-l/l-e-r.

As expected Lear's name cannot be fully contained in that of Goneril because Goneril becomes the fearful fiend. Yet, what is left of Goneril's name is in accord with the development of events. What we have is "GON[e]" plus the fearful symbol of the cord,"i". This indicates that Goneril is not fully contained in her father because what is positive in Lear, and must have been in Goneril's nature owing to their blood ties, as the action of the drama unfolds, disappears, is gone. Thus of what was positive there is left in her only a marked hatred that leads to the killing of Cordelia: a slaughter that is symbolized by the phonetic sign "i". What is left of Lear, an "a", is the beginning of the alphabet symbolizing the fact that she is his first issue.

Regan / Lear

¹³⁸ There are other quibbles inherent in Cordelia's name. In addition to the pun on heart with the word "cord" and the derivations inherent in Lear, such as the verb "lie", to bind, to tie, there is the obvious one on Heart with Cord. The possible act of severing the umbilical cord when Lear cuts the rope from which Cordelia hangs has been discussed in "Lear's You have somecause."

- 1.- [R]egan/Lea[r]: r/r
- 2.- [R][e]gan/L[e]a[r]:r-e/e-r.
- 3.- [R][e]g[a]n/L[e][a][r]:r-e-a/e-r-a.

This scheme yields similar results. In Regan's case, as in that of Goneril there is nothing left of Lear in her, and therefore what remains are two phonetic symbols that can be read as gone,"GN". There is another intriguing possibility about the meaning of GN, or NG, that of a date, the 28th of Oct. This possibility is not a far fetched one because according to the Beth-Luis-Nion calender "the NG tree was the Ngetal, or reed, [...] an ancient symbol of royalty"¹³⁹: a symbol that directs the reader to the "l" and the "i". What Shakespeare may have tried to conceal with this date is difficult to know. However this information could cast some light on Shakespeare's life and therefore on the cause of his "dark period." What is not contained of Lear in her, makes Lear responsible for Cordelia's death since it is not only the phonetic symbol,"l" but a graphic representation of the reed.

Cordelia / Regan

- 1.- Co[r]delia/[R]egan:r/r.
- 2.- Co[r]d[e]lia/[R][e]gan:r-e/r-e.
- 3.- Co[r]d[e]li[a]/[R][e]g[a]n:r-e-a/r-e-a.

When looking at the phonetic signs that have been isolated we have a very similar configuration to that of Goneril/Lear and Regan/ Lear. In Regan's case the G & N materializes again, signifying the same as it did in relation to Lear: a date, the 28th of Oct., and that the elements of Cordelia that were enclosed in Regan are gone. With Cordelia we have the same pattern as that of Lear because what is not included in Regan's name is COD+l+i. This is exactly what was left when we enclosed Cordelia's name in that of Lear.

¹³⁹ Robert Graves, *The White Goddess* (London: Faber and Faber, 1961) 184-5.

There is a minor difference here because there are two phonetic signs, the "I" and the "i". The dissimilitude is not a coincidence because it can be explained in terms of death. In the case of Lear only one symbol of death was left over because he is one person and therefore one single, inclusive symbol is enough. In this situation, surely the two symbols are necessary because two are the persons who want Cordelia's death. Both symbols serve to unite Goneril and Regan in the achievement of the same deed because both are the cause of her execution.

Cordelia / Goneril

- 1.- C[o]rdelia/G[o]neril:o/o.
- 2.- C[o][r]delia/G[o]ne[r]il:o-r/o-r.
- 3.- C[o][r]d[e]lia/G[o]n[e][r]il:o-r-e/o-e-r.
- 4.- C[o][r]d[e][l]ia/G[o]n[e][r][i]:o-r-e-l/o-e-r-l.
- 5.- C[o][r]d[e][l]ia/G[o]n[e][r][i]:o-r-e-l-i/o-e-r-i-l.

The pattern is almost the same. The "A" has appeared again, but as a surplus of Cordelia's name thus indicating that in Lear's mind there are no differences with regard to birthrights. The point achieves full force when bearing in mind that in the next scheme, the "A" has been allotted to Regan, proving that the action leads to an overlapping of roles and situations that takes place not only in Lear's mind but in that of the characters. At the end Cordelia must fight for the crown as if she were the eldest-born in order to restore her father to the throne. The three sisters fight for the same thing, for the crown, although their reasons are not identical. As occurred with Cordelia/Regan, the "GN" has emerged. The "CD" has materialized, and only the "O" is missing for it to be able to return to the configuration of the "COD".¹⁴⁰

Goneril / Regan

- 1.- Gone[r]il/[R]egan:r/r.
- 2.- Gon[e][r]il/[R][e]gan:e-r/r-e.
- 3.- [G]on[e][r]il/[R][e][g]an:g-e-r/r-e-g.
- 4.- [G]o[n][e][r]il/[R][e][g]a[n]:o-i-l/a.

¹⁴⁰ An additional meaning of "cod" is that of deceiving, mostly used now in Ireland. It is a fitting correlative in consideration to the fact that Lear's love trial is a trap, a way of deceiving his daughters and thus a gross joke. I am indebted for this observation to Ms. M. Gleeson.

In Regan's case what is left is again an "A". The meaning is obvious and indicates the final fight between the three sisters. What is left of Goneril's name is the fearful noose, that is to say, the "o" and the two symbols of the rope, the "i" and the "l".

Cordelia/Lear: Lear=0. Cordelia=Cod+i.

Goneril/Lear:Goneril= Gon+I/Lear=A.

Regan/Lear=Regan= GN/Lear= I.

Goneril/Cordelia: Goneril=NG/ Cordelia=CD+A.

Regan/Cordelia: Regan=GN/Cordelia= Cod+l+i.

Goneril/Regan:Regan=A/Goneril=O+i+l.

When looking at this chart it is obvious that the play's development of the plot evolves around a system of wheels within wheels. Lear, as we have stated at the beginning of this essay, is not a monolithic figure but part of a system that must include what he has created, three daughters. The scheme shows that the drama is made possible precisely due to the meaningful interrelation of characters. Owing to this interrelation one can conjecture on Lear's individuality since what he is and what he is not depends on what others reject or accept of him which, at the same time, depends on degrees of similarity with Lear rather than on differences. Goneril and Regan may have been badly treated by Lear since he is contained only in Cordelia and so they learn to hate him rather than to love him, till one day, blind rage and hatred controls them. Their love for Edmund could have become a horrifying replica of Edmund's begetting since he is the issue of Gloucester's lust, and thus Gloucester's lust becomes a source of lust for Lear's daughters. Kent is so much contained within Lear that when we see him emulating him so well, we wonder, at certain moments, if he is not repeating Lear's words. When bearing this in mind it becomes evident that the power of the play arises from a close-knit system of emulation and duplication: a system that owing to its dense pattern of interrelations awakes despair and terror in the audience. Such feelings arise from the ultimate effect of the play, that of not knowing where to turn for a breath of air because everything blurs into a hopeless

mass of nothingness since negative similarities abound while positive differences are scarce.

**ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS
FROM SPANISH THROUGH FRENCH
IN THE 17TH CENTURY:
A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL APPROACH**

Javier Sánchez Escribano
University of Zaragoza. Spain

Anglo-Spanish relations have a very long tradition that dates back to medieval times. From the Middle Ages onwards we can find a lot of Spanish Princesses who married English Princes and Kings, nearly always in the hope of securing an alliance between the Royal Houses. Henry II initiated this series of alliances when he gave his daughter Eleanor in marriage to Alfonso VIII of Castile. The extensive possessions in France made it imperative for England to have an ally who could pose a threat in the south. The clearest example of English help we have is when the Black Prince came to the peninsula in support of Pedro the Cruel of Castile (two of his daughters married English nobles) in his struggle against the bastard Henry of Trastámara, supported by Aragon and France. His victory at the battle of Nájera left a mark on literature in the romances of chivalry. The same state of affairs reappears on the 16th century when Spain attempted to secure the neutrality and support of England. Katherine of Aragon married Arthur and subsequently Henry VIII, and some years later Philip II married Henry's elder daughter Mary Tudor. In the 17th century there is another attempt, when Prince Charles, accompanied by the Duke of Buckingham, made the dangerous journey across France to Madrid to meet the Infanta, a romantic episode so well described by James Howell in his *Epistolæ Ho-Ellicianæ*. Unfortunately the Spanish Match, as it was known, was unsuccessful, and Prince Charles married Princess Henrietta-Maria of France.

Apart from the relations between the Royal Houses, there are others at a different level. Commercial interchange was very important especially after the discovery of America. Visits to Spain for religious reasons changed during the 16th century. Santiago de Compostela had attracted English pilgrims in the 15th century, but after the Henrician Reformation religion became a source of discord when Spain became a refuge for English Catholics and England for Spanish Protestants and dissenters.

All this movement of people fomented a special interest in Spanish books on a variety of subjects from the beginning of the 16th century onwards. The discovery and conquest of America, the voyage round the world, the different wars in Europe, caused chronicles of discovery, books on the art of navigation and war to be translated into English. The Armada was another subject which, for obvious reasons, provided printers with material and afforded some hispanists like Minsheu "corregidores", as some of the hidalgos taken prisoner settled in England.

Religious literature was also common. Spanish mystics like Fray Luis de Granada and the small group of Spanish reformers such as Antonio de Corro and Cipriano de Valera, had their books printed and sold in London, some in Latin, others in Spanish and the rest translated into English.

Spanish drama is only represented by *La Celestina* (1499), in part translated by John Rustell as *A New Comedy in English in Manner of an Interlude* (1515). The maturity of Spanish drama coincides with that of English Tudor and Stewart drama. The same is applicable to Spanish poetry, the main influence being Italian. On the other hand, other books belonging to supposedly less important genres were also translated. As an example, I would mention the rhymed proverbs of the Marquis of Santillana in the 16th century and the collection gathered and translated by James Howell in the 17th. Moral and courtesan treatises were also very well-known in England. In Tudor times eight of Antonio de Guevara's works appeared in London: *The Golden Boke*, *The Dispraise of the Life of a Courtier*, *Diall of Princes*, *The Art of Navigation*, *Familiar Letters*, for example, all of which ran for at least one edition.

But Spanish prose fiction was the most widespread genre in England. Spanish pastoral and chivalry romances were translated during the 16th and especially during the 17th century. As far as the picaresque is concern,

before the end of the Tudor era David Rowland's translation of *Lazarillo de Tormes* had run for four editions, and Mateo Alemán's *Guzman de Alfarache* appeared in English in 1599. It was in the 17th century that most Spanish prose was translated into English. Cervantes, Quevedo, Lope de Vega, Castillo Solórzano, Salas Barbadillo, etc. became very well known in England. Most of this prose was translated directly from Spanish but the following, for example, came through French versions.

Amadis de Gaula.

The Spanish original of this romance of chivalry (a revision of a lost original) consisted of four books (*Los Quatro Libros de Amadis de Gaula*). The additional 5 books were written by different authors. The English translations were made, according to A.F. Allison¹⁴¹, from the French versions of Nicholas de Herberay, and the volume numeration follows that of the French (English books 1-5=Spanish books 1-5; English book 6=Spanish book 7; English book 7=part of Spanish book 9; Spanish books 6 and 8 are omitted). The first five books were translated by or attributed to Anthony Munday (1, 1590?; 2, 1595; 1-4, 1619; 5, 1598). Book 6 was published in 1652. The translator was Francis Kirkman, a well-known bookseller, publisher and author, who translated several romances from the French into English. As far as I know, he never translated directly from Spanish. Book 7 was published in 1693 and the translator is unknown. The extracts from books 1-12 of the Amadis cycle had already been published in 1567 under the title *The most excellent and pleasant booke, entitled: the treasure of Amadis of Fraunce... Translated out of French into English*. The author was Thomas Paynel, a prolific translator of French and Latin books.

Miguel de Cervantes also had some of his prose works translated from French. There are three different versions in English of his *Novelas Ejemplares*. The first one was translated directly from the Spanish by "Don Diego Puede-Ser" (a pseudonym, a literal translation of James Mabbe into Spanish), and published in 1640 (there was a reissue in 1654). The second

¹⁴¹ Allison, A.F., *English Translations from the Spanish and Portuguese to the year 1700. An Annotated Catalogue of the Extant Printed Versions (excluding Dramatic Adaptations)* (Dawsons of Pall Mall, 1974). Vide entry to *Amadis*.

was by Roger L'Estrange and published in 1687, a second edition coming out in 1700, as *The Spanish Decameron, or ten novels...* The first five titles quoted on the title page are translations from Cervantes. The other five are from *La Garduña de Sevilla* of A. de Castillo Solórzano. The translator says in the Preface that he had translated from the French version, but it is, in fact, a plagiarised version of Mabbe's translation, with one or two stories inserted and the proper names altered. The third version was translated by the doctor, astronomer and writer Walter Pope directly from the Spanish in 1694. In his preface to the reader he says:

I have not endeavour'd to render my author word, for word, but my concern was, to make him speak English. In the first novel, I have taken more liberty, for its scene lying for the greatest part in England, the laws and customs whereof, Cervantes was not very well skill'd in, I have chang'd the names of some persons, and places, which are such in the original, as were never heard of in England. I have also left out some paragraphs, which I judg'd either impertinent to the story, or repeated. I have added nothing, but here and there a word, to make the sence more perspicuous. In fine. I have made all of them shorter, if not better, and brevity is always good.

This feeling seems common to a lot of translators.

His *Trabajos de Persiles y Segismunda* were also translated into English from the French version of Vital d'Audigier by an unknown translator and published in 1619.

Francisco de Quevedo y Villegas was another Spanish writer who attracted the attention of English readers. Three of his prose works were also translated from French versions. His *Sueños* had two different translations: *Visions or hels kingdome...* by Richard Croshaw in 1640, and *The Visions of dom Francisco de Quevedo Villegas...* by Roger L'Estrange in 1667 (there are eight different editions between 1667 and 1696. Both versions are free adaptations based on the French version of La Geneste. There is a seventh "Vision", *Discurso de Todos los Diablos o Infierno Enmendado*, originally published separately from the *Sueños*, and translated by an Edward Messervy through the French of La Geneste in 1641, as *Hell reformed or a Glass for favorits*.

His *Historia de la Vida del Buscon* (*The life and adventures of Buscon the witty Spaniard*), a Spanish Picaresque masterpiece, was translated into English by John Davies of Kidwelly through the French adaptation of La Geneste, and will be analyzed later, together with the works of Castillo Solórzano and Salas Barbadillo, also translated by the Welsh scholar.

Carlos García's *La desordenada codicia de los Bienes Ajenos* appeared in English under three different titles: *The sonne of the rogue or the politick theefe* in 1638, *Lavernae, or the Spanish Gipsy* in 1650, and *Guzman, Hinde and Hannam* published in 1657. It was translated by a certain William Melvin, and it seems that the changes in title for the second and third issues were intended to encourage sales by making the book appear new.

The case I want to analyse is that of Francisco de Quintana (some of his works were published under the name of Francisco de las Cuevas) a priest and man of letters from Madrid. A good theologian and an excellent preacher, he was a member of the Congregacion de San Pedro and in 1644 was appointed Governor of the Hospital de la Latina in the capital. He died in abject poverty in Madrid on 25th January 1658.

The two novels he wrote, *Experiencias de Amor y de Fortuna* (1626) and *Historia de Hipólito y Aminta* (1627), both of which were very popular during his lifetime, were translated into other languages and ran for more than one edition or reissue. In this lecture I am going to analyse the process of translation of the former into English¹⁴².

The Spanish edition I have used is that of 1626 and has the following manuscript inscription:

Este libro lo escribió el Doctor Franc. de Quintana como lo asegura el Dr. Juan Pérez de Montalván en el Prólogo, del libro tiempo de Regocijo y Carnestolendas de Madrid, de D. Alonso de Castillo Solorzano impreso en M. año de 1627.

¹⁴² He also wrote *Epítome de todas las Historias de España, República Imaginada, Del juicio eterno de los justos, Oración fúnebre*, and other works.

And on the title-page, written in the same hand, the year "1698" and the signature of "Isidro Granados":

EXPERIENCIAS / DE AMOR / Y FORTUNA. / A LOPE DE VEGA / Carpio, Procurador Fiscal de la Cámara Apos / tolica, y su Notario descrito en el Archivo / Romano, Familiar del Santo Oficio de / la Inquisición. /POR EL LICENCIADO FRANCISCO / DE LAS CUEVAS, NATURAL / DE MADRID. / AÑO 1626./ CON PRIVILEGIO./ EN MADRID./ Por la VIUDA DE ALONSO MARTIN.

The eleven editions it ran to are indicative of the success it had. They are in chronological order:

- 1.- Madrid, Viuda de Alonso Martín, 1626.
- 2.- Madrid, Viuda de Alonso Martín, 1632.¹⁴³
- 3.- Madrid, Francisco Martínez, 1632.¹⁴⁴
- 4.- Montilla, Francisco Martínez, 1632.
- 5.- Barcelona, Pedro Lacavallería, 1633.¹⁴⁵
- 6.- Madrid, Imprenta del reino, 1641.
- 7.- Jaén, Pedro de Cuesta, 1646.
- 8.- Zaragoza, Lanaja, 1647.¹⁴⁶
- 9.- Barcelona, Antonio Lacavallería, 1649.
- 10.- Madrid, Mateo de Espinosa, 1666.¹⁴⁷
- 11.- Madrid, Angel Pascual, 1723.

¹⁴³ According to López Estrada. In F. López Estrada et al., *Bibliografía de los libros de pastores en la literatura española* (Madrid: Universidad Complutense, 1984) 170.

¹⁴⁴ In the entry to Francisco de Quintana, Palau claims that this is the second edition. In Antonio Palau y Dulcet, *Manual del librero hispanoamericano... Bibliografía general española e hispanoamericana desde la invención de la imprenta hasta nuestros tiempos...* (Barcelona: Librería Palau, 1953).

¹⁴⁵ Rennert claimed to be in possession of a copy. In Hugo A. Rennert, *The Spanish Pastoral Romances* (New York: Biblo and Tannen, 1968 (1912)) 188.

¹⁴⁶ According to Palau y Dulcet, there was a copy in the Biblioteca Laserna in Santander (Spain).

¹⁴⁷ Palau y Dulcet says that this was the most widespread.

There also exists a version of this novel in French - I will discuss it later on - which was the one used by the translator of the English edition, and another in Italian, by Bartolomei della Bella (Venice, 1654). There is also an interesting adaptation by Manuel Andrés Iguual, published under the title

Aventuras de D. Félix de Salazar en Argel. Novela original por Don Francisco de Cuevas. Estractada de su obra titulada: *Experiencias de Amor*, y refundida por un aficionado a las obras originales española. (Manuel Andrés Iguual). B., en la Imp. de Ign. Estivill. Calle de la Borla, julio 1832.

Experiencias de Amor y de Fortuna is neither better nor worse than Quintana's second novel, *Historia de Hipólito y Aminta*, published in Madrid in 1627. The latter also attracted the interest of the English public, and the translation into English by the eminent English hispanist Captain John Stevens came out in two editions, one in 1718 and the other in 1729.

Quintana dedicates his *Experiencias...* to Lope de Vega, as Juan Pérez de Montalván and Doña María de Zayas did, some of whose works were also translated into English by John Davies of Kidwelly, who is generally thought to have been the translator of the *Experiencias...* He justifies himself in the dedicatory epistle:

A cuya causa (ô dignisimo FENIZ DE EUROPA) el mio mal seguro, entre apuestas dudas rezeloso, y entre varios rezelos indiferente, dudaua la elecció de Protector para este humilde trabajo, por no adquirir en algun yerro creditos de ignorante, hasta que despertaron à mi memoria del imprudente olvido en que asistia, las prendas con que à v.m. hizo tan singular el cielo, y el afecto que en mi por tantas razones es deuda, y que deue serlo en todos, menos los que aborreciendo la virtud no hazen estimacion de los merecimientos.

In order to justify his choice Quintana praises the poems, fables and the 1.300 comedies written by Lope de Vega. There follows a letter by Lope, the licences and a sonnet by Juan Pérez de Montalván, a ten-line stanza by Frutos de León y Tapia and a lay by Doña María de Zayas. And finally a letter to the reader in which, among other things, he justifies the structure of his *Experiencias...* :

Diuidole en Poëmas, porque Poëma es nombre generico, que no solo a los versos comprehende, sino a la prosa, como insinua Cic. lib. de Orat. y afirma Vicet. lib. I. Spc. doct. y porq este lleua algunos, demas de que si se consulta a la lengua Griega, cuyo es su origen, Poëma es lo mismo que invencion, que ni desdize destes sucessos, ni del modo de referirlos.

The book is divided into four "Poemas"¹⁴⁸, each of which is composed of different pastoral and chivalry stories, perfectly interrelated (although difficult for the reader to locate, as there is no index), with Feniso always as a witness, rather than a narrator. It is written in prose with some poems intercalated. I consider the book has all the components of an adventure in a pastoral setting. J. B. Avalle-Arce rejects the idea of it being a pastoral and regards it as a "novela de corte bizantino"¹⁴⁹. Whatever it is, the book is very difficult to classify, as I said before¹⁵⁰.

The French version is an extraordinarily rare book¹⁵¹. The title page says

LE / FENISE. / Histoire Espagnole. / Où se voyent les diuers efets de / l'Amour & de la Fortune. / A PARIS, / Chez ANTOINE DE SOMMAVILLE, / au Palais, en la petite Salle, à / l'Escu de France. / M.DC.XXXVI. AVEC PRIVILEGE DV ROY.

¹⁴⁸ Not five, as Rennert says, 189.

¹⁴⁹ *Vide* the Prologue of J. B. Avalle-Arce, *La novela pastoril española*, (Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1959).

¹⁵⁰ *Vide* Chapter V, "Labyrinths of Love: the Byzantine romances", in B. J. Randall Dole, *The Golden Tapestry: A Critical Survey of Non-Chivalric Spanish Fiction in English Translation (1543-1657)* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1963).

Paul Salzman, in his good bibliography, classifies it among the "*adventure and pastoral romances*". P. Salzman, *English Prose fiction 1558-1700. A Critical History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985) 357.

¹⁵¹ As far as I know, the only extant copy is in the Oesterreichische National-Bibliothek in Vienna, Signature BE. 5. X. 40. (2). It was localized thanks to Franklin P. Rolphe, "On the Bibliography of Seventeenth Century Prose Fiction", *PMLA*, 49, 4, (1934) 1078.

Nothing is known about the translator. The only clues we have are those given by the editor in the dedicatory Epistle to Mademoiselle de Rohan

Mademoiselle,

Cet Etranger, qui n'est taché d'aucun des defauts dont sa nation est legitimentement accusee, ayant l'humeur Françoisise comme l'origine Espagnole, n'a pas si tost apris la diuision de ces deux Couronnes, que se declarant du party plus iuste, il a voulu quitter sa patrie pour se ranger avec nous. Il a moins consideré sa naissance en ce rencontre, que ses inclinations, & a bien fait plus d'estat des peuples avec lesquels il sympatisoit d'humeur, que de ceux dont il tire son origine. Neantmoins, quoy qu'il soit tout courageux, il n'a pas laissé, sur les termes d'executer ce dessein, d'en redouter l'euement: la seule crainte de ne pas trouuer un support qui secondât son merite & son affection, a causé cette defiance; Toutesfois ie luy en ay leué le scrupule, l'assurant que vous le protegeriez. le voyla donc, MADEMOISELLE, qui vous vient rechercher pour son Azile; le voyla qui vous vient raconter ses aduantes: Mais i'adioûteray, qu'il vient encore plus volontiers pour vous admirer, que pour ces autres considerations. Je ne seray pas si temeraire toutesfois que d'en exagerer le sujet; Ce meslange precieux de beauté, de naissance & de vertu qui l'y oblige, est une chose si releuée, que ie serois punissable si i' entreprendois d'en dire un seul mot. Je ne passeray dons point les bornes que macondition me prescrit; mais laissant cette riche matiere aux beaux esprits dont i'imprime les ourages, il me suffira d'estre le conducteur de Fenise, & de me dire eternellement,

MADMOISELLE,

Vostre tres-humble & tres-obeissant seruiteur,
SOMMAVILLE.

This version is an adaptation of the Spanish, the only changes being the proper names. The poems are different and nothing of the poetical prose of the original is retained. Although there is no index, it is relatively easy for the reader to find his way about as each story is given a title:

LE FENISE DE FRANCISCO DE LAS COVERAS. Traduction Espagnole.

LIVRE PREMIER,

HISTOIRE DE FENISE

HISOTIRE DE DON LOVIS
 SVITTE DE L'HISTOIRE DE LAVRE
 SVITTE DE L'HISTOIRE DE DON LOVIS
 HISTOIRE DE LEONARD, D'EVFEMIE, ET DE TEODORE

LIVRE SECOND,
 HISTOIRE DE RVFINE, ET DE DON IOVAN
 HISTOIRE DES TRAGIQUES AMOUVRS DE MARCEL
 HISTOIRE DV SOLITAIRE SIMEON

LIVRE TROISIESME,
 HISTOIRE DE FEDERIC
 SVITTE DE L'HISTOIRE D'EVFEMIE
 HISTOIRE DE DON IAME

LIVRE QUATRIESME,
 HISTOIRE DE DON ANTONIO
 HISTOIRE DE D. CARLES ET DE VIOLANTE
 HISTOIRE PRODIGIEVSE D'VN FILS ET D'VNE MERE

The English version is a word for word translation of the French one.
 At the beginning, there is an index with the French titles translated into
 English:

The several Histories contained in this Booke

The History of *Fenise* and *Laure*
 The History of *Don Lovis*
 The continuation of the History of *Laure*
 The continuation of the History of *Don Lovis*
 The history of *Eufemie* and *Theodore*

The Second Booke

The History of *Rufine* and *Don Jovan*
 The History of the Tragick Loves of *Marcel*
 The History of solitary *Simeon*

The Third Book

The History of *Frederick*
 The continuation of the History of *Eufemie*
 The History of *Don Jame*

The Fourth Booke

The History of *Don Antonio*
 The History of *Don Charles* and *Violante*
 The History of *Don Gracia* and *Constance*

In order to see how the proper names differ from those in the Spanish version I have selected some examples from the first story:

- Silvio, el pastor - Poleron - Poleron
- Jacinta, la pastora - Jacinte - Jacinte
- Cardenio, el hermano de Jacinta - Lizeron, son frère - Lizeron, her brother
- Tireo, el zagal - Clitor, le Berger - Clitor, the Shepherd
- Feniso - Fenise - Fenise
- Laura - Laure - Laure
- hermano mayor de Laura - Don Oliban - Don Oliban
- Don Juã Velazquez - Don Ioüan de Velazquez - Don Jouan de Velazquez (Don Joän , p. 19)
- - Cigarales, qui sont les mestairies des citoyens de Toleda - Cigarades "the chiefest Farmes belonging to the citizens of Toledo".

The English version has this title page:

THE / HISTORY / OF / Don Fenise. / A NEW / ROMANCE,
 / Written in Spanish / BY / Francisco De las-Coveras. / And now
 Englished by / A PERSON OF HONOUR. / LONDON, / Printed for
Humphrey Moseley, and are to / be sold at his shop at the *Prince's*
Armes in / St Paul's Churchyard, 1651.

We do not exactly know who the translator was, which is all too often the case. The only thing we can do is to make suggestions. A. F. Allison¹⁵²

¹⁵² A. F. Allison, 154.

suggests John Davies of Kidwelly, because the translator describes himself in the same terms as Davies in his translation of the *Buscon*, "a person of honour". This is not really a valid argument because a considerable number of anonymous translations were made by "persons of honour". If we want to ascribe this translation to Davies there are other arguments. Pastoral and chivalry romances were the sort of novel he was interested in; the Spanish writers he translated, like Doña María de Zayas and Castillo Solórzano, were acquainted with Quintana; and all his translations of Spanish works were from the French.

There are other reasons for thinking that Davies may well have been the translator. He came from Kidwelly, Carmarthenshire, the same as his friend James Howell. From the very beginning he translated from the French. According to the *Dictionary of National Biography*¹⁵³ his first translation was *A Treatise against the Principles of Descartes* (1654). If this is true, *The History of Don Fenise* would have been his first translation, as it was published in 1651, when he was still in France. He returned to England in 1652.

John Davies of Kidwelly was a prolific translator of Spanish works. In 1657 appears *The Provident Knight, or, Sir Parsimonious Thift*, a translation of *Lettres du Chevalier de l'Epargne*, by La Geneste, that is an adaptation of Quevedo's *Las Cartas del Caballero Tenaza*. In this edition we also have the translation of *Buscón*, from the French version of La Geneste's *L'Aventurier Buscon*, 1633. The editor of the English version was Humphrey Moseley, who also edited *The History of Don Fenise*.

In 1663 appears *The History of Algiers and Slavery there*, translation of a French version of *Historia del Cautiverio de Manuel Aranda en Argelia*, Brussels, 1656, of the Aragonese Manuel Aranda. This story was translated into French, Latin, English and Flemish.

¹⁵³ Pilar Navarro has already studied the chronological publication of Davies' translations. In P. Navarro, "J. D. Primer traductor inglés del Buscón, reconstrucción de su biografía a través de los prefacios de sus traducciones", in *MISCELANEA*, 8 (Departamento de Filología Inglesa y Alemana, Universidad de Zaragoza, Spain, 1987) 33-60.

Alonso de Castillo Solórzano (c. 1560-c. 1650) was another Spanish writer whose works were translated into various languages, English among them, and had more than one reissue. The ones best known by the English reader were *Los Alivios de Casandra*, a collection of stories, and *La Garduña de Sevilla*. Of the former John Davies translated and adapted two of the novels through Paul Scarron's *Les Nouvelles Tragi-comiques*¹⁵⁴: "La confusión de una noche", novel n° 1, in French "Les deux Frères Rivaux", in English "The Rival Brothers"; and novel n° 3, "Los efectos que hace Amor", "Histoire de l'Amant Invisible" in French, "The Invisible Mistress" in English. Both are interpolated narratives in *Le Roman Comique* (Pt. 2, ch. 19)¹⁵⁵. The latter, *La Garduña de Sevilla y Ançuelo de Bolsas*, appeared in English in the same year, under the title

La picara, or the triumphs of female subtilty, display'd in the artifices and impostures of a beautiful woman... enriched with three pleasant novels. Render'd into English, with some alterations and additions, by John Davies of Kidwelly. London, W.W. for J. Starkey, 1665.

This is a translation and adaptation of the French version, attributed by many to F. Le Metel de Boisrobert and to A. Le Metel d'Ouville, entitled *La Fouyne de Seville, ou l'Hameçon des bourses*, and published in 1661¹⁵⁶. The "three pleasant novels" are three narratives intercalated in the original Spanish and also included in the French version. In Spanish they are "Quien todo lo quiere, todo lo pierde", "El conde de las legumbres" y "A lo que obliga el honor", which Davies called *All covet all lose*, *The Knight of the Marigold* and *The Trepanner trepann'd*. In the dedicatory epistle to Sir John Birkenhead, Davies says that

¹⁵⁴ His novels appeared in English, three were published separately in 1657, four in 1662 and they were published in one volume in 1665 (1667, 1694, and 1700), under the title *Scarron's Novels... Rendred into English, by John Davies of Kidwelly*.

¹⁵⁵ Novelas 1, 2 and 3 were also translated from Scarron by John Bulteel and by Thomas Brown, Mr. Savage and others.

¹⁵⁶ There are other versions by Roger L'Estrange and by one Mr. E. W. According to Allison, the former made a plagiarised version of Davies's translation, with the proper names altered, and the latter no more than an abridgment and adaptation of the same.

It is a Spanish relation written by D. Alonso de Castillo Savorsano [sic], a famous author of that nation. One of the most refin'd wits of France thought it worth his pains, to render it into the language of his country, with all the graces and advantages it might derive from either. I have done it out of the latter, with a freedom of alteration and addition, as my fancy led me ¹⁵⁷.

As we will later see, the translator of the *Experiencias...* uses the same argument, "*One of the most refin'd wits of France...*", to justify his translation into English.

John Davies also translated some of the *Novelas Amorasas y Exemplares* (Zaragoza, 1637) by Doña María de Zayas y Sotomayor (Madrid, 1590-c. 1650), who dedicated a lay to the *Experiencias...* as we have seen. They consist of ten short but very popular novels which had several reissues. Davies' source is the same he used for the translation of Castillo Solórzano's works, Scarron's *Nouvelles Tragi-comiques*. He translated four of the *Novelas...*: *El castigo de la miseria* (in English, *The chastisement of avarice*), *El Prevenido Engañado* (*The Fruitless Precaution*), *Al fin se paga todo* (*The Innocent Adultery*) and *El juez de su causa* (*The Judge in his own cause*, translation from *Le juge de sa Propre Cause*, one of the intercalated narratives in Scarron's *Le Roman Comique*).

From the same French source, John Davies translated *La Hija de la Celestina*, a picaresque novel also known under the title of *La ingeniosa Elena*, of Alonso Gerónimo de Salas Barbadillo. In English it is entitled *The Hypocrites*, included in his P. Scarron's *Novels*.

Going back to *The History of Don Fenise*, the introductory epistle to the reader calls for some comments:

Wee shall not need to throw away words in commendation of this History. Those that have read it, will save us that labour; and those that never saw it, now they censure it, will speake too late: For, the Book hath already had honourable Test from the best Judgements in the Court and Academies of Spaine. If you thinke them partiall; beleave an Enemy (one of

¹⁵⁷ Vide entry to Castillo Solórzano, *Alonso de*, in A. F. Allison, 42-46.

the greatest Wits of France)¹⁵⁸ who in a Letter, since printed, writes thus to his friend: Though I have little reason to doate on ought that but ast's of Spaine, which fights against us¹⁵⁹, and in one Summer robb'd me of a Brother and a Nephew: Yet I confesse I am much enamour'd on the Booke you sent me, The History of Don Fenise: The Plots are so well mannaged; the Passions cleane and naturall; the Language chosen and proper; and the whole Discourse so perfectly well wrought¹⁶⁰, that I am sorry it was written by an Enemy to our Country. I wish hee that speakes so excellently of Lovers, did not hate France. We allow'd them more Cunning, not more Wit. But this Author hath the happinesse of his own Nation & of ours.

By this time perhaps you like the Book, but doubt the Translation. 'Tis now in your power, and must speak for it selfe. All I aske (and 'tis no huge Request) that you would not pronounce upon it without comparing the original: Otherwise you may do more wrong to the Translator that he hath done to the Author. ¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁸ I would like to know the name of this enemy of Spain, who so seriously judges and appreciates Francisco de Quintana's work. We cannot forget that it might be a device on the part of the translator to justify his translation. Remember that John Davies says the same in his translation of Castillo Solórzano's *La Garduña de Sevilla*.

¹⁵⁹ Perhaps he is referring to the Thirty Years War, which officially ended in 1648, although the hostilities continued until the Peace of the Pyrenees was signed in 1659. Louis XIV was to marry Princess María Teresa, who renounced to her right to the Spanish throne. Under the terms of the Treaty, Spain lost almost all her possessions on French soil, Roussillon and Sardinia included. Queen Henrietta-Maria was in exile in France, enjoying the hospitality of the French Court and preparing the return of the Monarchy to Britain.

¹⁶⁰ Lope de Vega had said the same of the Spanish original. Rennert, who does not agree, had this to say about it: "The book, to the credit of its author, contains very little verse. It is written in the bad taste of much of the prose of the time, with a piling-up of epithets and constant resort to antithetical clauses. The *Experiencias of Love and Fortune*, should, however be expunged from the list of pastoral romance in which it has so long figured, for it is a romance of adventure simply, made up of most improbable incidents, the second "poem" containing an episode based upon the old story of *Ami et Amile*". H. Rennert, 191.

¹⁶¹ The translator seems to be very sure of the literary value of his work. Francisco de Quintana was equally praised by Lope de Vega in the prologue to the Spanish

As I have said, John Davies translated from French because he had no knowledge of Spanish. Why was this so frequently the case with English translators? There are various reasons. In the first place, French influence on England was more long-standing than Spanish influence. Other reasons include geographical proximity and historical interrelations. Knowledge of the language is also important. France was always ahead of England as far as knowledge of Spanish people and literature were concerned, and in the 17th century it became a sort of reservoir for the redistribution of peninsular culture. With the marriage of Charles I to Princess Henrietta-Maria after the failure of the Spanish Match, there was a revival of French influence and of some literary genres popular in Spain. Pastoral, music, platonic love, adventure, arcadism were elements the new Queen wished to see in literature in general and drama in particular (it is well known that there was a revival of pastoral drama thanks to the support given by the Queen, who herself took part in performances on occasions). This tradition lasted till the end of the century. Let me give an example of a not very well known play by James Howell:

The Nuptialis of / Peleus / and / Thetes / consisting of a /
Mask and a Comedy / or / The Great Royall Ball / Acted
lately in Paris six times / By / The King in Person / The Duke
of Yorke / with divers other Noble men / Also by / The
Princess Royall Henriette Marie / The Princess of Conty / with
many other Ladies of Honour / London / Printed for Henry
Honyman, and are to be sold at his / shop at the Ancor in the
lower walk of the New / Exchange, 1654 (Dedicated to
Katherine, Marchioness of Dorchester, etc.).

In this bibliographical approach we cannot forget Humphrey Moseley and his work. He was an influential editor and bookseller, and a member of the Stationers' Company. His first publication registered there was on 29th May 1630. He became the most important editor of the finer literature of his time. He was responsible for the first edition of Milton's Poems in 1645, in which, addressing the reader, he says: "*It is the love I have to our own language that hath made me diligent to collect and set forth such pieces, both in prose and verse, as may renew the wonted honour and esteem of our English tongue.*" He published the works of writers such as Howell, Waller,

version: "Sobre el fundamento de sus estudios de v.m.vino bien la elocuencia con que escribe, y el juicio con que dispone el argumento de que trata."

Crashaw, Denham, D'Avenant, Cartwright, Donne, Fanshawe, Henry Vaughan, Beaumont and Fletcher, Suckling, Shirley, Cowley and Joseph Rutter (some of them members of the so-called "Tribe of Ben"), and translations of Italian and Spanish novels and French romances.

In his edition of Joseph Rutter's *The Cid* in 1650 (1637), Moseley included an interesting bibliography of all his publications up until then, 59 titles in all. In *The History of Don Fenise*, published a year later, there is another one of 76 titles. They are divided into three groups, and some of them deal with Spain:

Various Histories, with curious Discourses
in Humane Learning, & c.

- 4, 5 and 6.- The three first volumes of James Howell's
Epistolae Ho-Eliaanae, Familiar Letters, Domestic and Forren .¹⁶²

- 10.- Mr. Howels *Instructions for Forren Travels*, with
diverse Additions, 1650.

- 13.- *Policy Unveiled, or Maximes of State*, done into
English by the Translator of *Gusman* the Spanish Rogue.

- 14.- *The History of the Inquisition*, composed by the R. F.
Paul Servita the compiler of the History of the Councell of Trent.

- 18.- Marques *Virgilio Malvezzi*, Of the success and chief
events of the Monarchy of *Spaine*, in the year 1639 of the Revolt of
the Catalonians, Englished by *Rob. Gentilis*.

- 20.- *Gracious Privilidges granted by the King of Spain unto
our English Merchants*.

- 22.- *The Antipathy between the French and the Spaniard*,
translated out of Spanish.

*Choice Poems, with excellent Translations, and
Incomparable
Comedies and Tragedies, written by Severall Ingenious
Authors* .

¹⁶² They were published in 1645, 1647 and 1650 respectively. The fourth and last volume was published in 1655. As far as I know, this is the first account we have in prose fiction of the negotiations of the Spanish Match. This Letters were written while he was in prison and addressed to different people, some real, some fictitious. They anticipate the epistolary novels of the 18th century.

- 38.- *Aurora Ismenia* and the Prince, with Oronsa the Cyprian Virgin, translated by Tho: Stanley Esq, the second edition corrected and amended, in 8° 1650.

This is a translation of the Spanish *La Hermosa Aurora*. It is novel nº 1 of Juan Pérez de Montalván's *Sucesos y Prodigios de Amor*. Novels 3, 5, 6 and 10 were also translated into English. This is the Montalván who dedicated a sonnet to *Experiencias de Amor y de Fortuna*. Thomas Stanley was John Davies's protector and personal friend, to whom he dedicated his translation of Paul Scarron's novels.

In the last section of the bibliography, *Severall Sermons...* (numbers 61 to 76) there are no works dealing with Spain.

I would like to finish by emphasising that we are dealing with three very rare books in each language. All of them deserve the attention of the bibliophile and, of course, those who are interested in the study of Spanish literary influence upon England in the 17th century and the development of English literature. The reading of these three versions will help us to improve and enrich our knowledge of the kind of literature that was read in 17th century England.

THE SPANISH JILT: THE FIRST ENGLISH VERSION OF *LA PICARA JUSTINA*

Ana Murillo Murillo
Universidad de Zaragoza. Spain

López de Ubeda's *La Pícaro Justina* was translated into English by Captain John Stevens, and published in 1707, a century after its publication in Spain (1605).

John Stevens, apart from his military career, was an important hispanist of the time who devoted himself to compile and translate works. His profound knowledge of Spanish and Portuguese points at a residence in one of these two countries. Stevens translated works by Quevedo, Herrera and Quintana; revised Shelton's English version of *Don Quijote*, and compiled a collection of voyages written by several Spanish authors: *A New Collection of Voyages and Travels*. Moreover, he prepared an important grammar: *A New Spanish Grammar* and *A New Spanish and English Dictionary*.¹⁶³

In 1707 a group of works translated and adapted by John Stevens were published under the title *The Spanish Libertines*. These works were: *Justina, the Country Jilt, Celestina, the Bawd of Madrid; The Comical Scoundrel or Estevanillo González* and D' Avila's comedy *An Evening's Intrigue*. All of them, very popular and successful in their own language, are in accordance with the horatian precept of *delectare prodesse* ("delight and

¹⁶³ Bibliography on J. Stevens: *The Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford Univ. Press, 1973) vol. XVIII; W.T. Lowndes, *The Bibliographer's manual of English Literature* (London: H.G. Bohn, 1863) Part I; *British Museum General Catalogue of Printed Books* (N.Y.: Readex Micropint Corporation, 1967) vol.24; A. Palau y Dulcet, *Manual del librero hispanoamericano* (Barcelona: Palau y Dulcet, 1970) vol.XII.

instruct"¹⁶⁴), states the translator in The Preface. Were this double purpose not to be accomplished, they would still be, at least, enjoyable, as they are works full of wit.¹⁶⁵

"THE RAPE COMMITTED ON JUSTINA BY THE SCHOLLARS"

This passage is one of the most important and relevant parts of the English translation since it provides the clues to understand the change of the title of the book and the nature of the main character: Justina.

La Pícaro Justina is structured in four books, each of them is divided into chapters, which have special divisions called "Números". The passage we are going to centre on corresponds to "Número" four of Chapter one and to the three first "Números" of Chapter two in "La Pícaro Romera", title of Book two, and it is summarized as follows:

The Feast under the Cart. The Rape committed on Justina by the Schollars; and how She worsted them All . (p.26)

But, in fact, this "rape" is not committed and so says Stevens in The Preface:

She has hitherto kept herself Honest as to her body. (p. 3)

And we can find several references in accordance with the translator's forecast along the passage:

I stood my Ground like an Amazon. (p. 32)

¹⁶⁴ J. Stevens, *The Spanish Jilt*, in *The Spanish Libertines* (London, 1707), The Preface, 2.

¹⁶⁵ *La Pícaro Justina* is not a didactic novel at all. As J.M. Oltra points out, "López de Ubeda escribe una novela contra el 'prodesse', cargandola tintas en el 'delectare'". (*La parodia como referente en La Pícaro Justina* (León: Institución Fray Bernardino de Sahagún / CSIC, 1985) 104. López de Ubeda, far from moralizing, criticizes and parodies.

To secure my reputation, I related the whole Adventure.
(p. 32)

They declar'd that my Honour was unspotted. (p. 33)

Therefore, there is not such a "rape" and Justina outdoes the scholars in wit, ("She worsted them all"). The word "robo" should have been translated as "abduction".¹⁶⁶

THE PROCESS OF TRANSLATION

Translating involves a series of changes such as word additions or suppressions and several explanations in order to help a better understanding of the work rendered; nevertheless, according to P. Newmark,

(the aim of a translation) should be to achieve "equivalent effect", i.e., to produce the same effect (or one as close as possible) on the readership of the translation as was obtained on the readership of the original.¹⁶⁷

In this section we are going to deal with these three phenomena as they occur in *The Spanish Jilt*:

¹⁶⁶ This episode of the abduction of Justina has been studied from different points of view: Marcel Bataillon, *Picaros y Picaresca* (Madrid: Taurus, 1982) 189, as a "masquerade-fiction". Bruno Damiani, in *Francisco López de Ubeda* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1977) has analysed its classical references (p. 31-2), biblical (p. 36), medieval (p. 39) and renaissance and baroque (p. 47). J.M. Oltra (*La Parodia...*, p.48) studies the folk motif of abduction and its inversion in the also folk motif of the abductor abducted. U. Stadler, in "Parodistisches in der Justina Dietzin Picara", *Arcadia*, VII (1972) 161, sees a hagiological parody of the martyrdom of St. Justina.

¹⁶⁷ P. Newmark, *A Textbook of Translation* (Prentice Hall International, 1988) 48.

1. SUPPRESSION AND CONCISENESS

Suppression is the most outstanding feature of John Stevens' translation, who, as he writes in The Preface, does not render the work as a whole; on the contrary, it is

An Extract of all that is Diverting and Good in the Original, which is swell'd up with so much Cant and Reflection, as really renders it tedious and unpleasant ; for which reason all that unsavoury part is omitted ... (Preface, p. 3)

Everything considered cant (thieves' slang, e. g. example number three in a lexical level) or reflection (López de Ubeda's philosophical or deep thoughts and commentaries made by Justina) is omitted for the sake of enjoyment in reading. Apart from the translator's own taste, suppression is a must if we are aware of the fact that Stevens gathered "four pieces full of wit" in one book; thus the selection of what was to be translated was necessary.

In *The Spanish Jilt*, the General Introduction Justina does prior to the narration of her adventures, as well as the little poems at the beginning of the "Números", glosses and several inner passages have been omitted and López de Ubeda's structural organization in Books, Chapters and "Números" disappears. Nevertheless, the gist remains and, for instance, we can find the eleven sequences J.M. Oltra¹⁶⁸ divides the episode of the abduction of Justina in the Spanish novel .

Conciseness, then, is carried out linguistically as follows:

a) Lexical Level:

Entre burlas y juego, siempre yo muy cuidadosa con que bebiese el obispo y fuese arreo. Hizolo él atan buen son, que, por decirles daos mucha prisa, hermanos, decía: - Daos murria

¹⁶⁸ J.M. Oltra, *La Parodia ...*, 113.

perra, hernandos."¹⁶⁹ "And at every bit I played them with a Health, till I perceived my Bishop lisped and clipped his words. (p. 31)

"Lisped and clipped" replaces the Bishop's speech. We are just told that the drunk Bishop mispronounced sounds and abbreviated words. Here we have another example of lexical conciseness and "other implements" stands in for the other elements in the enumeration:

... sin sombreros, sin capas, sin cuellos, sin ligas, sin ceñidores". (p.328)

"had left their Cloaks, Hats and other implements. (p. 32)

Next we have a case of lexical-semantic conciseness: "so big" replaces summarizing Justina's cant speech, which has no adequate English equivalence: "...Como el bellacon oyó que yo le hablaba a lo de venta y mote,y que yo había tomado el adobo de la lampa que él practicaba ..." (p.301) "...The Knave observing I talked so big..." (p.30)

b) Semantic Level:

The translation is carried out through the brevity of an idiom or saying or by simplifying the rhetoric of the original and aiming at the meaning:

La apretura y la estrechez en que se ve un entendimiento es la rueda en que cobra filos. (p. 299)

Necessity is the mother of Ingenuity. (p. 30)¹⁷⁰

... me pagase muy buen hallazgo, pues, por mi industria había sido librada del poder de la Bigornia. (p. 335)

¹⁶⁹ F. López de Ubeda, *La Pícaro Justina*, ed. A. Rey Hazas (Ed. Nacional: 1977) 1: 321.

¹⁷⁰ Stevens modifies the saying "Necessity is mother of invention". *Vide Dictionary of English Idioms* (Longman, 1979) 230.

... should give a good reward for bringing her home. (p. 33)

... no podía sentenciarse de remate su pleito en tan breve término como él pensaba. (p. 301)

... he expected such an easie conquest. (p. 30)

c) Morphosyntactic level:

Obviously, to translate into another language involves many phrasal and syntactic changes (e.g. somenoun phrases become prepositional phrases and vice versa) as in the following examples:

La Boneta tenía un buen tiple mudado. (p. 287)

he sang in a falset. (p. 28)

haciendo ademán como que la robaban ... (p. 287)

... pretending ... (p. 28)

Asomaban a querer tomar al carro a sacar su hacienda. (p. 328)

... to return for them. (p. 32)

d) Lexical, semantic and morphosyntactic levels:

Conciseness is accomplished in these levels whenever a dialogue in the Spanish work is replaced with a narration in the English translation. Several examples illustrate it:

Yo con un vaso de cuerno decía -*Brindis quoties*. Beba el obispo y vaya arreo. El obispo se excusaba de beber con una gracia (..) y era decir

- De vino, poco, que soy patriarcha de Jerusalén. (p. 319)

... and making my Mock Bishop pledge me, tho' against his will. (p. 31)

Another example is the Bishop's speech to the "Jilting crew" (the scholars, also called "la Bigornia" in the Spanish novel), which is summarized in free indirect speech and told in third person singular:

- Charos infanzones míos (...) y quiero que os extendáis por los lugares desta región (...) y no dejéis pollo, ni ganso, ni palomino a vida (...) A vueltas desto, no cesaréis de hacer perpetua demostración de la alegría que en vosotros causan mis esperanzas (...) (pp. 311-312)

... ordering them to disperse into the Neighbouring Villages, and there to steal all the Hens, Geese, Turkeys, Wine, and Bread they could meet with, to Celebrate the Festival of the Conquest he was like to gain over Justina, who as yet, he declared was untouch'd as She came into the world. (p. 31)

Or, finally, the ship allegory, which is left out in the English translation:

... cada cual comenzó a enderezar el norte de los ojos y el timón de su carreta al puerto de su pueblo. (...) Y ya los recios vientos de mi importuno baile habían ondeado (...) el flaco navío de mi cansado cuerpo, fuéme forzoso descansar un poco sobre una blanda arena adornada de oloroso tomillo, donde para mi descanso recliné y amarré mi navichuelo. (p. 289)

... every Gang began to make homewards, but I, who (...) was no less weary'd than the rest, step'd aside, and sat me down to rest on a Bank of Thyme, and other sweet Herbs. (p. 29)

Emblems had a main didactic purpose; they tried to "move" the reader. By using them, López de Ubeda parodies the emblematic literature¹⁷¹, so fashionable in Spain during the sixteenth and seventeenth

¹⁷¹ According to M. Bataillon (1982: 70), *La Pícaro Justina* was the book of hieroglyphics par excellence for the reader avid of fresh matter and López de Ubeda " is satirizing the popularity of hieroglyphics among fashionable pulpit

centuries. Stevens skipped the emblem, perhaps, because this kind of literature had "ceased to be a significant form of art in England in the second half of the seventeenth century"¹⁷², till its revival in the Victorian times; or owing to the fact that Stevens, missing its parodic function, considered it to the service of *prodesse* and not to the *delectare*.

2. ADDITION

Additions, due to expressive needs of the translator and the English language, provide a kind of information which is not in the original and, although it is not really relevant, helps a better understanding of the text and embellishes the translation, making it linguistically richer, as in the following examples:

leaving me alone with their infernal Monarch. (p. 31)

Dejáronme con él. (p. 315)

... told abundance of country tales, and all the Stories I had heard out of old Romances. (p. 31)

... comencé a contar cuentos, los más de risa que se me ofrecieron. (p. 315)

My Bishop had twenty falls before he got to it. (p. 31)

... de los muchos traspies que a cada paso daba. (p. 323)

Let them e'en Talk on, the Case is now alter'd and I am well improv'd. All the Country call'd me . (p. 33)

... lluevan dichos, que ya ahora no me sabían en mi pueblo con otro nombre sino. (p. 335)

orators". (J.R. Jones, "Hieroglyphics in *La Pícaro Justina* ", *Estudios Literarios de Hispanistas Norteamericanos dedicados a Helmut Hatzfeld con motivo de su 80 aniversario*, (Barcelona: Ediciones Hispam, 1974) 418.

¹⁷² K.J.Höltgen, *Aspects of the Emblem. Studies in the English Emblem Tradition* (Ed. Reichenberger: 1986) 141.

In our last example, Justina boasts her social condition improvement, but, paradoxically, this improvement points at the highest level of ignominy in the Picaresque Literature.

3. CHANGE

In the English translation of *La Pícaro Justina* we can find two different types of change: that which makes the work closer to the English reader and that produced by the own translator's variation wish. First of all, we shall deal with

a) Changes motivated by a variation wish:

These changes frequently involve a commentary or opinion on the part of Stevens. Some of the examples included in this section are related to the change of meaning of the title of the chapter; that is to say, to the translation of "robo" as "rape":

Yo soy palma de danzantes, Y hoy me llevan los
estudiantes. (p. 287)

I've gain'd the Prize of Dancing all this Day, And now,
alas, the Scholars force me away. (p. 28)

"Force me away" has the double meaning of withdrawal and rape.

... Unas veces decía hoy, hoy, y otras decía ay, ay, con
unos quejidos tales, que parecía que real y verdaderamente la
hurtaban. (p. 287)

Thenthe Chorus repeated the same, in such dismal manner
as if a womanhad really been Ravished. (p . 29)

... Y aunque yo no era la primera robada ni forzada del
mundo. (p. 291)

... I wasn't the first Woman that a Rape had been
committed upon. (p. 29)

Los principales de mi pueblo me miraban con otros ojos,
ya me llamaban de merced y las gorras bajaban. (p. 334)

The Topping men of the Town began to take Notice of
me; they gave me the Title of Mistress and lower'd their Caps.
(p. 33)

"Mistress" is a honourable female title but also designates a woman who has a continuing illicit relationship. Stevens puts special emphasis, we can see, on Justina's sexual features; even though where López de Ubeda does not or keeps them in ambiguity¹⁷³. Our next instance is in accordance with the book title:

... la mesonera burlona, aunque algunos me llamaban la
villana de las burlas. (p. 335)

All the Country then call'd me The Tricking Maid of the
Inn; or, The Jilting Country Wench. (p. 33)

We face again two possible meanings: Justina, tricking maid, not only makes Grullo believe she shall be his "bishopess", but she also makes people believe that her honour is kept intact. Justina is called "The Jilting Country Wench" either, and it refers to her condition of having been left by the "Jilting crew" of the scholars. There is a certain ambiguity about who jilts whom; on the one hand, there is the "Jilting crew"; on the other, the "Jilting Country Wench". But she had a proposal on the part of the Bishop to become

¹⁷³ "Justina fue entendida siempre como un dechado de honestidad sexual" writes A. Rey Hazas ("La compleja faz de una pícaro: hacia una interpretación de *La Pícaro Justina*", *Revista de Literatura*, (Madrid: C.S.I.C., 1983) XLV, 90: 87) in accordance with other scholars such as Menéndez Pelayo, Puyol y Alonso, Chandler or G. Sobejano. On the contrary, other scholars as B. Damiani (1977) have the opposite opinion. There are conciliatory positions and love duality of erotism and chastity is one of the eight features P.J. Ronquillo (*Retrato de la pícaro: la protagonista de la picaresca española del siglo XVII* (Madrid: Playor, 1980) ascribes to the "pícaras".

Others such as J. M. Oltra (1985) or U. Stadler (1972) deem that Justina's sexual behaviour is rather ambiguous since she sometimes presents herself as an untouched-by-any-man maid and, other times, as bold, out of syphilis; (contrast between the heroin and the narrator of her own adventures).

her a "bishopess" and, as U. Stadler¹⁷⁴ points out, it is her that starts the nuptial banquet which will finish up with a drunk bridegroom unable to fulfil his proposal because of too much drink. Besides, she is called *The Spanish Jilt* in the book title, so, it would not be too risky to conclude that it is Justina that has been jilted.

Moreover, the word "jilt" was formerly used to designate "a woman who had lost her chastity, a harlot or strumpet"¹⁷⁵; and if we take into account that nobody paid attention to Justina, while being abducted, because she was thought to be the "scoundrel strumpet" of "La Boneta" (the scholar in disguise), we discover a sexually-defined Justina, as the next example pictures:

Era boda de pícara y pícaro. (p. 317)

The Nuptials of a Whore and a Rogue. (p. 31)

"Picara" is translated as "whore" and "pícaro" as "rogue". Both should have been rendered as "rogue" (mischievous, dishonest or unprincipled person).

Other times, Stevens provides his opinion or commentary about the characters or a situation and, in our next example, "facción" becomes fraudulent people in "sharppers":

The Sharpers vanish'd leaving me ... (p. 31)

Los de su facción ... (p. 313)

Or, within the limits of a literal translation, he changes something in an attempt to improve the original:

... todo el pueblo y muchachos se llegó al ruido. (p. 329)

¹⁷⁴ U. Stadler, "Parodistisches in der Justina Dietzin Picara", 161.

¹⁷⁵ *The Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1989) VIII: 238.

... All the Boys and Mob of our Town. (p. 32)

where the word order proposed by Stevens seems more logical. Finally, and proving his great irony, the translator changes the destiny of Pero Grullo (The chief of the scholars), and instead of sending the Bishop to the imaginary Mandinga or Zape, leaves him making profit in Geneva:

... se fue de aquella tierra. Yo no dudo sino que no paró hasta Ginebra (...) se debió de ir a Mandinga o a Zape. (p. 332)

... made clear away, as I suppose, to Geneva, where he might safely Rail at all Bishops, till he could get himself into a good Fat See, and then prove as Ortodox as another. (p. 32)

b) Change to help understanding:

Generally there are two kinds of changes: those which point at making the original clearer (*La Pícaro Justina* is a very complex and enigmatic book) and those pointing at making it closer to the English reader of the time.

b.1) To make the original clearer:

¡Qué Faltiel para Muchol!, ¡Qué Absalón en guarda de Tamar!, sino un obispo de la Bigornia y capataz de la Bellecada!. (p. 299)

A special Guard of Eunuchs ... (p. 30)

The first half (Faltiel, Absalón) is omitted and a special emphasis is put on the second half, where "un obispo de la bigornia" becomes "a special Guard of Eunuchs" in the translation. Justina, ironically, compares the students to eunuchs because none of them is a menace for women, owing to the clerical condition of the former, exemplified in the following instance:

Viva el obispo y su bigornia. (p. 307)

Long live the Bishop and his clergy. (p. 30)

"clergy" is a better designation for those under the bishop's authority.

Ea, picarón de sobremarca, obispo de trasgos y trasgo de obispo; él no debe de haber medido los puntos del humor que calzo, (...) Amanse el trote y el trato, que el que por ahora usa es para motolitas que no saben de carro y todabroza, que las de mi calimbo saben hacer de una cara dos. (p. 300)

Hands off, Good Mr. Raking Bishop, I thought you had known me better. Fair and softly goes far with me, you must not think to catch old Birds with Chaff. (p. 30)

Justina is less aggressive in the English version. She simply says she already knows all these tricks; "An old bird is not caught with chaff", says the English proverb.

... comieron como unos leones. (p. 320)

... and fed like so many cormorants. (p. 31)

To feed like cormorants is much more despective, it connotes wastes or offals and refers metaphorically to rapacious or greedy people in colloquial English. Next, "Aquí la justicia" is rendered as "help", the usual way to ask for assistant or support in English:

- Aquí la justicia, que estos bellacos robaron la mula.
(p.327)

Help, help, here are the thieves that. (p. 32)

In the coming instance, *The Spanish Jilt*, we shall see, misses one of the essential parts of the hagiological parody: when the believers touch their saints in order to gain strength and virtue.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷⁶ U. Stadler, "Parodistisches in der Justina ..." , 162 : "Die Gläubigen berühren den Heiligen, um dadurch der Tugend und der Kraft, die ihn wundertätig werden liess, teilhaftig zu werden."

La gente (...) me tenían despalmada a puros abrazos, aunque no muy puros, que algunos me pellizcaban, que es uso de la tierra. (p. 334)

I was quite tir'd with Visits and Congratulations. (p. 33)

b.2) To make the original closer:

... más yo juraré pormis hermanos, que sila burla viniera a colmo, perdonaran la sangre por una banasta de sardinas. (p.293)

... my Brothers would have put up the wrong for a Buthel of Oats. (p. 29)

The buthel of oats is commoner and nearer than a "banasta de sardinas" for a peasant society; ale and alehouses played an important part in the economy in the preindustrial rural England¹⁷⁷. Still, It is worth noticing that oats is connected with the death of Justina's father; although it's barley that is mixed with chaff in the translation (p. 17) because, as Stevens explains in a footnote:

The Cattle there (in Spain) eat Barley instead of oats. (p. 8)

Her family does not accuse the murderer of the father because of the money they get from him. Her brothers, she thinks, would act again the same way they did.

... dio un silbo como de cazador o ladrón (...) y al reclamo acudió la Bigornia. (p. 307)

... Whistled like a Highway-Man, at which his Gang came about him. (p. 30)

¹⁷⁷ Vid. K.Wrightson, "Alehouses, Order & Reformation in Rural England, 1590-1660", *Popular Culture & Class Conflict 1590-1914. Explorations in the history of Labour and leisure*, Ed. E.& S.Yeo (Brighton: The harvester Press ltd, 1981) 1-27.

"Highway-Man" was a man on horseback who stole travellers in former times.

La justicia, sabido el caso, me adjudicó el despojo. (p.355)

Our Court of Aldermen adjudg'd me all the Booty. (p. 33)

"Court of Aldermen" was the council formed by the elderly members of a district or city in England and Ireland. Its rank was immediately inferior to the Mayor's.

RHETORIC, IRONY AND PARODY

The most striking and significant feature is the disappearance of most of López de Ubeda's ironic rhetoric in the course of translation. One should keep in mind that *La Pícaro Justina*, because of its complex satire that aims at the Spanish society in general and, in particular, at the political authority (D. Rodrigo Calderón, the favourite of the Duque of Lerma), or at literature (*El Guzmán de Alfarache* etc.), was really far from the English reader. Even further if we consider it was translated a century after its publication in Spain and that the Spanish writer proposes, according to J.M. Oltra¹⁷⁸ a historical-allegorical reading of this "court novel". Therefore, it is small wonder the translator dropped everything that only the contemporaries (some contemporaries) or nearer the author were able to understand completely. Still today

ni mucho menos queda aprehendido en su dimensión auténtica todo cuanto senos narra en torno a la Bigornia, en que el fuerte expresionismo del chocarrero médico queda supeditado a "un ajuste de cuentas" literio y deseado con algún círculo desconcido (...) ¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁸ J. M. Oltra, "Casuística estructural en *La Pícaro Justina* de Francisco López de Ubeda", *Estudios Humanísticos* (1982) V: 57.

¹⁷⁹ J.M. Oltra, *La Parodia...*, 98.

López de Ubeda's novel "is a lexicographical museum of jargon, slang, technical vocabulary, proverbs and dialect -not to mention imitations of the pronunciation of drunkards-, and a textbook of the figures of speech (...) and of thought"¹⁸⁰. Many of these puns and elaborate similes disappear when translated as the following instances show:

... y por este nombre eran conocidos en todos los Campos, y por esosolían también nombrarse los Campeones. (p. 286)

These were well known allthe Country about (...) and therefore call'd themselves the Champions. (p. 28)

... se recogieron todos derechamente al carro, aunque no tan directamente ni tan por nivel que no hicieran algunas digresiones de cabeza, paréntesis de cuerpo y equis de pies. (p. 322)

... made towards the Cart, not in a direct Line, for they reel'd and stagg'd that the broadest Street would scarce have held them. (p. 31)

On the contrary, there are occasions the translations presents puns and conceits which are not in *La Pícaro Justina*:

... Homewards, but I, who had lost my Cart and Carters, and was no less weary'd than the rest. (p. 29)

... los recios vientos de mi importuno baile habían ondeado (...) mi cansado cuerpo. (p. 289)

It is frequent, on the other hand, the use of proverbs, sayings and expressions in both works. Whenever there is an English equivalence, it is used. Other times, the saying or expression is missed or, as the third of the coming examples, appears in the translation despite not being in the original:

... había encontrado la horma de su zapato. (p. 301)

... he had met his Match. (p. 30)

¹⁸⁰ J.R. Jones, "Hieroglyphics in *La Pícaro Justina*", 415.

Más vale carnero en paz, que no pollo con agraz. (p. 303)

... there can be no pleasure where there is force. (p. 30)

... Amanse el trote y el trato, que el que por ahora usa es para motolitas que no saben de carro y toda broza. (p. 300)

you must not think to catch old Birds with Chaff. (p. 30)

In the second instance, the two expressions offer different implications; the former deals with food in a realistic way, whereas the latter has sexual connotations.

THE NAMES OF THE CHARACTERS

The nature of names is symbolic; thus, the name given to a person is relevant because it stands in for the person and designates them. In this section we shall discuss about the names and nicknames of the main characters of the passage: Justina, the Bishop and the scholars.

Justina

We are not dealing with the meaning of the name Justina, which has already been studied from a triple standpoint based on different traditions such as the hagiological, mythological, and popular by J. M. Oltra¹⁸¹.

Justina, due to the fact that she is the first-person-narrator, is the less named character as she refers to herself as "I". The only names and nicknames she gets are

Counterfeit Wench (p. 29)

¹⁸¹ J.M. Oltra, *La Parodia ...*, 83

Whore (p. 31) in the expression "The Nuptials of a Whore and Rogue"

Mistress (p.33)

The Tricking Maid of the Inn (p. 33)

The Jilting Country Wench (p. 33)

These five nicknames qualify Justina negatively. It is important to remember that misogyny is a necessary component in the picaresque novel with female main character¹⁸². They are respectively translation of:

la Boneta (p. 290)

pícaro (p.317) in "era boda de pícaro y pícaro."

merced (p. 334)

la mesonera burlona (p. 335)

la villana de las burlas (p. 335)

As they have already been dealt with, suffice is to add that none of them has been literally translated, but, on the contrary, have sexual connotations in English, either explicit as in "whore" or "Jilting Country Wench" or implicit, due to ambiguity, in the other examples.

The Bishop

He is never called by his own name, Pero Grullo, in the translation. It is small wonder Stevens refrains from naming the chief of the students that way, because it meant nothing to the English reader. Pero Grullo is a legendary character said to have lived in Spain during the fifteenth or sixteenth centuries. He is reported to be the origin of certain nonsense sayings and proverbs. Therefore, the proper name -if we can call it so- this

¹⁸² B. Damiani, *Francisco López de Ubeda*, 83

character gets is Bishop and it designates him as being the "spiritual guide" of the group of scholars. His other names and nicknames are:

the Scoundrel (p. 29)

Mr. Raking Bishop (p. 30)

A special Guard of Eunuchs (p. 30)

The Knave (p. 30)

Mr. Scoundrel (p. 30)

Paris (p. 30)

Infernal Monarch (p. 31)

Rogue (p. 31)

Mock Bishop (p. 31)

"The Scoundrel" (dishonest and unprincipled person) is Stevens' own comment on the character, since the subject of the sentence has been left out in Spanish. "Mr. Raking Bishop" is in place of "Picarón de sobremarca, obispo de trasgos y trasgo de obispos" (p. 300); Stevens, in this case, rather than translate the meaning, interpretes it.

"A special Guard of Eunuchs", as we have already seen, is in place of

!Qué Faltiel para Muchol! (...) sino un obispo de la Bigornia y capitán de la bellecada. (p. 299)

"The Knave" is literal translation of "El bellacon" (p. 301) and "Mr. Scoundrel" of "señor picarón" (p. 302).

"El gobernador de la Bigornia" (p. 310), translated as "My Paris", is a clear parodic allusion to the abduction of Helen of Troy by Paris; but neither the Bishop is the royal lover, nor Justina's abduction will break out any war, because her brothers "would put up the wrong for a Buthel of Oats". (p. 29)

"El" (p. 310) is rendered as "Infernal Monarch" and "Mock Bishop", instead of "obispo" or "obispote" (p.319), is an explanatory clue Stevens gives his readers.

The Scholars

About the scholars, we shall only say that, in contrast with the Spanish work, which introduces them one by one through their nicknames, all of them have the same collective identity in English. For the sake of conciseness, they are always named as a group except for "la Boneta" (Scoundrel Strumpet"). Stevens carries out a free "translation" of this name, which is no more than the four-cornered-hat used by seminarists or the clergy. This hat gives name to the scholar because he wears a disguise made of "bonetes" (the hat). Stevens changes it and chooses another one belonging to the sexual semantic field.

It is noticeable, however, that Stevens treats his characters harder than López de Ubeda. Whereas the Spanish work emphasizes the roguery and the trick, the English seems to put more emphasis on sexual aspects and meanness. As Stevens renders them, the characters are treated more rigorously than in the original.

A WAY OF CONCLUSION

Stevens translates and recreates *La Pícaro Justina*; thus, *The Spanish Jilt* renders certain passages, abbreviating others, and omitting everything considered "tedious and unpleasant" (Preface, p. 3); in part, perhaps, due to the translator did not completely grasp the irony of López de Ubeda's glosses and digressions, (the "subtext", in Newmark's words).

On the contrary, the chosen passages, except for some changes to help understanding, or those involved in the process of translating, are literal translation of the Spanish work. Surprisingly, the characters are treated in a different way; Stevens makes many ambiguities clear and stresses inner meanness and sexual features.

As a translator, he proves his profound knowledge of the Spanish language and the particular idiolects that appear in the novel. *The Spanish Jilt*, despite not showing, perhaps, López de Ubeda's vocabulary richness, is a good translation and, as such, tries to achieve the same objective as the original: enjoy the reader, and it accomplishes it because the translation is also a work full of wit.

PARADISE LOST AS A NOVEL

Andrew Monnickendam
University of Barcelona (A). Spain

In this paper I would like to discuss and discover to what extent one is justified in calling Milton's epic poem a novel. Initially, I would expect that very few readers of *Paradise Lost* could imagine the merging of two such different genres as epic and novel, a heroic poem and a middle-class orientated volume of prose, but eventually, through both a close reading of the poem and through a brief analysis of some ideas of the great Russian philosopher and literary critic Bakhtin¹⁸³ we will be able to accept that these polar concepts can reasonably find some middle ground. An approach such as mine must necessarily have as its starting point the belief that the ferocious attacks on Milton that were principally the work of the much maligned New Criticism contained within themselves an insistence on close reading which was really little else than a well-directed attempt to exclude uncomfortable political intertextuality. Milton becomes the dull authoritarian Puritan only when history, politics and religious controversy are pushed to one side: a politically gelded Milton is a docile animal whereas the contentious beast is not so easily handled. If art is divorced from history, this is done for cogent reasons, which, presumably, are as political as they are artistic: in fact it surely becomes impossible to swallow the cherished ideal that the former could ever exist without the latter; clearly the exclusion is itself inescapably politically motivated. Critics such as Christopher Hill¹⁸⁴ and Michael Wilding¹⁸⁵ have successfully managed to free Milton from the

¹⁸³ Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin (1895-1975). The best introduction to his life and thoughts is the critical biography *Mikhail Bakhtin* by Katerina Clark and Michael Holquist (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1984)

¹⁸⁴ See particularly *Milton and the English Revolution* (London: Faber and Faber, 1977)

¹⁸⁵ See *Dragons Teeth; Literature in the English Revolution* (Cambridge: Clarendon Press, 1987).

political strait-jacket in which he had effectively been tied up ; this political freedom and diversity, with clear tendencies toward such heresies as mortalism, make *Paradise Lost* a more dynamic poem for historian or politically motivated critic while simultaneously they inevitably lead to a greater freedom of aesthetic interpretation, if we can still accept this as a meaningful term. Once we discover the teeming multitude of political ideas in the poem, we can no longer accept the existence of rigidity which apparently restricts the poem's movements and turns it into a dull Puritan diatribe. Readers of the poem know that one of its central narrative strategies is the use of debates: it is unnecessary to comment on the striking effect of the devils' parliament or its contrast with the tight dialectics of the debate in Book III. The whole poem is full of argument and exchange of ideas: indeed, the whole central section of the poem, that is to say Books IV-VIII, only makes sense once the reader has begun to realise that it is only and always through dialogue that man receives knowledge, that the eating of the apple becomes, whether for male or female, the supreme act of egoism, in which the knowledge of and concern for otherness are pushed to one side and images of individualistic power and glory pour into the mind of the tempted. Hopefully, what should have emerged through my insistence on dialogue and multiplicity of significance of meaning, is my belief that *Paradise Lost* is an open poem, ready for the willing and inquisitive reader to partake of its fluidity.

The most fruitful approach (excuse the pun) to a reading of *Paradise Lost* is to start looking at the question of heroics. Blake's maxim has more or less centred the debate on Milton's attitude to politics and religion. Is Satan a republican hero or an exaggerated portrait of that most famous cavalier of them all, prince Rupert ? Blake's assertion that Milton is of the devil's party implies that this affiliation lies more in the subconscious than in the conscious. For many people (and for many years) the question of allegiance has been foremost: it would be reasonable to wonder why William Empson did not call his great study of the poem *Milton's Satan* rather than *Milton's God*.¹⁸⁶ Empson, as many readers have done, finds God a rather perplexing entity, and many other readers would possibly add just plain boring in speech and vindictive in deed. So, if we begin to study the question of heroics, it seems that we centre our attention on a fallen angel and dismiss the possibility that the heroic character might be God. In doing so, in insisting on

¹⁸⁶ *Milton's God* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1961).

the battle as being a two-sided affair, we omit other, equally fascinating possibilities. As possible candidates for the award of hero, we could also put forward the Son (Milton's insistence on this term rather than Christ or Saviour undoubtedly gives the poem heavy Oedipal overtones), Abdiel, Adam and Eve, Eve but not Adam, and finally, Adam but not Eve. We now have seven potential heroes. In addition to this list, we could use a different, though equally useful device: that is to define heroics in relationship to Milton's insistence on "the upright heart and pure" (Book I.18) as being the preferable virtues: could we gloss this as the heroic virtue of patience, necessary in both times of war and peace? My insistence on the variations of the Adam and Eve relationship has two important concepts within it. First of all, readers of the poem can see to what extent Milton uses both the P and Q versions of the Fall: the P version tells of simultaneous, egalitarian creation ("...in the image of God he created him: male and female he created them." *Genesis* 1.27) and the Q version, the story of consecutive creation from the rib. Furthermore, the possibility of one being heroic but not the other means that the Fall affects them differently and their reactions are noticeably dissimilar.

My assertion that Eve alone, or at least more than Adam, could be the possible hero, and for cogent reasons I use the word purposefully, could initially strike people as an instance of being persuaded by the very heated exchange of views that took place in *Critical Inquiry* and *PMLA*¹⁸⁷ some years back. Eating the apple becomes a bite for gnostic self-knowledge and freedom, a battle won against the invisible voices of patriarchal power. However, I would question assertions such as these, which have as much to do with questioning Freud's analysis of the visible and invisible as they do with Milton's poem. I think that we can detect some of Milton's views on a purely formal and conscious level. However persuasive analyses about gnosticism might be, they insist, rather as Blake did, that the intentions of the poem escape the author's intentions, and must, as a matter of course, reveal underneath, though not very deep down, the first of the masculinists.

¹⁸⁷ Christine Froula, *When Eve Reads Milton: Undoing the Canonical Economy*, *Critical Inquiry*, December 1983, 321-347. Edward Pechter, *When Pechter Reads Froula Pretending She's Eve Reading Milton: Or, New Feminist Is But Old Priest Writ Large* and Christine Froula's Riposte, *Pechter's Spectre; Milton's Bogey Writ Small*; or, "Why Is He Afraid Of Virginia Woolf?", *Critical Inquiry*, September 1984, 163-178. Sandra Gilbert, "Patriarchal Potry and Women Readers: Reflections on Milton's Bogey", *PMLA*, May 1978.

Classical culture, of which epic poetry is a part, is, many people will argue, a male domain which excluded women for centuries. This ultra-orthodox form of culture seems to be the framework which best suits descriptions of *Paradise Lost*. We know that Milton includes many formal features in his poem which all in all demonstrate the extent to which he is both a part of oppressive cultural values and a willing partner in their prolongation. This features include: beginning in *medias res*, councils of the gods about the fate of mortals, descent of the gods to intervene in human affairs, a parade of troops, a great battle¹⁸⁸ and so on, and stylistically we could explain (away) those famous extended similes as being Milton's indebtedness to classical tradition. Nevertheless, it is surely more important to notice when Milton breaks with classical tradition. This is most in evidence in the question of closure. One would expect, in the epic tradition, that the final speech, if not the final word, would go to the hero. This does not happen, unless we radically change our definition of heroism; the last words are Eve's:

Whence thou return'st, and whither went'st, I know,
 For God is also inn sleep, and dreams advise,
 Which he sent propitious, some great good
 Presaging, since with sorrow and heart's distress
 Wearied, I fell asleep: but now lead on;
 In me is no delay; with thee to go,
 Is to stay here, withou thee here to stay,
 Is to go unwilling, thou to me
 Art all things under heaven, all places thou,
 Who for my wilful crime art banished hence.
 This further consolation yet secure
 I carry hence; though all by me is lost,
 Such favour I unworthy am vouchsafed,
 By me the promised seed shall all restore.
 So spake our mother Eve, and Adam heard
 Well pleased, but answered not ...

(12. 610-625)

Any excerpt from such a dynamic poem as this leads to all sorts of discussion, so with obvious and hopefully excusable omissions, I would insist on a few, simple points. As far as initiative is concerned, the Fall becomes practically Eve's exclusive story. *Hubris* is hers and heroism will be

¹⁸⁸ These examples are from John Broadbent: *Paradise Lost*- Introduction (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972).

hers too, as *felix culpa* appears to be very much her province, perhaps exclusively so. Adam seems to be very much a submissive character whose future is acquiescence, silence and the history of the blank page. Again, I insist, not another word is spoken in the poem.

The poem continues for a few lines more and ends with an almost cinematic image of the reconciled couple walking hand in hand towards the future, or perhaps into history, or perhaps off the page and into our lives. If Eve's having the last word, I use this expression in its widest possible sense, is clearly an evocative moment for a male epic poem, equally perplexing are the final lines of the narrative itself:

The world was all before them, where to choose
 Their place to rest, and providence their guide:
 They hand in hand with wandering steps and slow,
 Through Eden took their solitary way.

(12. 646-649)

The beauty of these lines demonstrates that the most moving parts of the poem are often those where language is simplest. Readers have not been blinded by them to realise that Milton would try and cheer us up by making us see that Eden and by extension happiness, if that is not too strong a word, are not restricted to the garden therein, but to any place where reconciliation and dialogue take place. What undoes this vision of happiness is the conflict between the idea that providence will be their guide and that their way, as the last line indicates, will be solitary. Surely, Milton cannot have it both ways. Either providence helps them or it does not, and if it does, it cannot leave them solitary. Indeed, it cannot escape anyone's notice that the striking nature of the last line is due in part to the odd location of their qualifying solitary. Would it not be normal to expect to see a singular possessive before solitary? We do, do we not, get the impression that their reconciliation is more than necessary; has God left even more open to danger and temptation than before? The consequence of their earlier defencelessness brought about the major event in history, the Fall. What will this new situation be like? However much we feel that Milton, at the poem's closure, is very much the humanist whose faith in human perseverance is unswerving, it surely is peculiar to note that this humanism breathes agnosticism, for it is the vague notion of providence rather than the certainty of a protective God who would help Daniel in the lions' den which might, or might not, assist us.

Up to this point, I have attempted to demonstrate how Milton's epic, if it is an epic at all, is a rather strange and unorthodox one: the fact that Eve has the last word and that God or the gods seemingly melt away are only two of many of Milton's idiosyncracies. My initial proposal must take us on to the thorny problem of Milton's answerable style. *Paradise Lost* has been attacked on many occasions for its Latinate magniloquence, most notably by Samuel Johnson. Christopher Ricks¹⁸⁹ was able to demonstrate the flexibility and potential of Milton's style, even in those aspects which appear so classically static, like, for example, the extended similes. I have already hinted, at least, that like Christopher Ricks, I believe that Milton often uses the simplest of language, and occasionally has moments of monosyllabic priority (this is noticeable in the lines I have quoted). I do not think that Milton's intentions are particularly hard to discover, though they are extraordinarily significant. The most memorable speech in *Paradise Lost* is Eve's, in Book X:

The serpent beguiled me and I did eat.

(10. 162)

It is memorable in the sense that it is so easy to memorise; its importance is a result of its brevity. Its simplicity is a result not only of its brevity but because of its stark contrast with what has preceded it. Adam has gone on for nineteen lines, of which eighteen are superfluous. Whereas Eve uses everyday language, Adam indulges in a good piece of rhetoric, in which everything is everyone else's fault. He is severely reprimanded not only for blaming God for having given him Eve as a helper but also for trying to worm his way out of responsibility under a veil of rhetorical nonsense. God's preference for simplicity and honesty of speech, which are Eve's virtues, ensures that only when Adam can finally assimilate them, at the poem's end, will reconciliation between man and woman, and man, woman and God be possible.

This preference for simplicity again confirms those true virtues of heroism which are set out in the invocation to Book I; yet this idealistic simplicity would then have to make nonsense of those parts of the poem, and very substantial parts of the poem they are too, that are clearly rhetorical; this refers not only to what goes on in Pandemonium, but also to what occurs in

¹⁸⁹ Christopher Ricks, *Milton's Grand Style* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963).

the City of God. The arguments as to whether debate or discussion take place only in one part of the universe rather than in another are inextricable from arguments which see Satan as a hero or not. I do not intend to enter in this area, rather I intend to look at one section of the poem which although used as indicative of Milton's ideology is not usually referred to when we talk about Milton's language. It is part of the famous hymn to wedded love:

Hail wedded love, mysterious law, true source
 Of human offspring, sole propriety
 In Paradise of all things common else,
 By thee adulterous lust was driven from men
 Among the bestial herds to range, by thee
 Founded in reason, loyal, just, and pure,
 Relations dear, and all the charities
 Of father, son, and brother first were known.
 Far be it, that I should write thee sin or blame,
 Or think thee unbefitting holiest place,
 Perpetual fountain of domestic sweets,
 Whose bed is undefiled and chaste pronounced,
 Present, or past, as saints and patriachs used.
 Here Love his golden shafts employs, here lights
 His constant lamp, and waves his purple wings,
 Reigns here and revels, not in the bought smile
 Of harlots, loveless, joyless, unendeared,
 Casual fruition, nor in court amours
 Mixed dance, or wanton mask, or midnight ball,
 Or serenade, which the starved lover sings
 To his proud fair, best quitted with disdain.

(4. 750-770)

Many people have commented on the opposition Milton makes between a healthy sex life inside a stable middle class marriage and the unhealthy frustrations of what happens not in the home, but in the court. It cannot escape our attention that ironically or otherwise, for many years Milton's achievements as a writer were associated with *Comus*, a mask, one of the much maligned forms of aristocratic, elitist art. It is feasible to see Satan as the rake, the aristocrat interested only in egoism, pleasure and the court. He has built for himself a most sumptuous palace where falling angels sing songs about their heroic deeds; in a similar vein, the force of the extended simile in Book IX is to portray him as the potential seducer and rapist on the look out for a luscious country girl, innocent and sadly unable to save herself (Eve). But if it is impossible to separate language from deed, the

words of seduction from the seduction, likewise we cannot separate Satan from Satan's rhetoric. In rejecting courtly aesthetics Milton inevitably rejects courtly rhetoric as the model that man should follow. What he should follow is the simplicity and honesty demonstrated by Eve, which should become the ethos of the emerging middle classes. One of the effects of the Fall is that Adam begins to talk like Satan. At that moment, Eve has the answerable style with which to encounter the new world.

It cannot escape my readers' attention that if they accept that *Paradise Lost* is an epic criticising epic conventions, and I have analysed how this is done linguistically, this might seem acceptable if we look at certain parts of the poem. However, how can I apply this strategy to those most central parts of the poem which deal with warfare in great detail, and, arguably, with great relish? It is warfare which occupies the central position in the poem, leaning heavily on classical epic conventions of warfare. The answer that is the war to end all wars does not seem very satisfactory. A way out can be found if we have not forgotten that Milton himself makes some very clear statements about epics and warfare in the invocation, again the place where intentions are set out, to Book IX:

Wars, hitherto the only argument
 Heroic deemed, chief mastery to dissect
 With long and tedious havoc fabled knights
 In battle feigned, the better fortitude
 Of patience and heroic martyrdom
 Unsung, or tilting furniture, emblazoned shields
 Impreses quaint, caparisons and steeds,
 Bases and tinsel trappings, gorgeous knights
 At joust and tournament; then marshalled feast
 Served up in hall with sewers and seneschals,
 The skill of artifice or office mean,
 Not that which justly gives heroic name
 To person or to poem. Me of these
 Nor skilled nor studious ...

(9. 28-41)

Milton seems to be having us on: war is the central subject, in structural terms, of this and other epic poems. We could again try the idea that this accurately describes Satan and the falling angels both in Books I, II & particularly VI, with its jeering speeches addressed to the flagging army of God. Yet inevitably, we will consider that Milton's joke about his ignorance

of war is a rather feeble excuse for the destruction of war ethics, which after all, are the arms used to overthrow Satan: we might find accounts of boulders and mountains being thrown around the heavens tedious, but they are effective. God uses the expression "war wearied"(Book VI. 695) to justify the Son's intervention. That is probably the readers' sensation too, though we do not forget Milton's love of symmetry will require the Son's intervention on the third day. The Son is rather reluctant to intervene, and introduces a variation on the question of obedience and independence:

But whom thou hatest, I hate, and can put on
Thy terrors, as I put thy mildness on,
Image of thee in all things ...

(6. 732-734)

The Son would rather be mild, but circumstances demand that he be fierce; his natural mildness is replaced temporarily by the not-so-natural guise of the warrior. Man, as he is made in the image of God, should believe in the other form of heroics. As man and angels both possess seminal choice as their most outstanding feature, there is really little justification for war. Perhaps we are not so far away from the world of *El Quijote* at this point(which likewise deals with outmoded ethics). Clearly, Satan tilts at more important things than windmills, but his vision as to what is needed in the new world of humanism is badly dimmed. The Son resorts to militarism, but has the knowledge, as Milton has the desire, that this kind of solution is outdated. Not only must militarism and its ethos disappear, but so must its language. Speeches, such as Satan's "O friends, why come not on these victors proud ?"(Book VI. 609-619), can now surely be seen as parodic, full of courtliness, empty of relevance. They might enthuse the devils in hell or the courtiers, but neither the former nor the latter have much in importance in the world glimpsed at the end of Book XII. That world needs new ethics and new, simpler language. Heroics and rhetoric become inseparable. If heroics no longer serve any purpose, then the whole argument about who is the hero serves no purpose whatsoever. Heroics are evil, because heroics are so far away from the needs of the modern state. Similarly,lofty military rhetoric cannot describe the realities modern man encounters and is in the process of being supplanted by the prose of Bunyan or Defoe. *Paradise Lost* thus itself becomes the epic to end all epics. Some people might quarrel with the term *parody*. How can you, people will argue, insist that Milton parodies the centre of his poem ? Perhaps, we should extend the term *parody* to include not only the destruction of its ethos, but by suggesting what its replacement

will be. Something similar happens with the question of heroics. If we insist that Adam and Eve, the united bourgeois family are the true heroes of the poem, that seems to me perfectly acceptable if we realise that what we are given is a new code of heroics, that of the family, that of the novel, that of ordinary people.

Bakhtin's aesthetic theories place the epic and the novel as two polarities. The epic has a single voice and a tendency to be centripetal, to draw into itself all ideology towards a single world view. The controlling viewpoint of the national voice is clearly authoritative. The novel functions differently by being basically centrifugal. This idea can be synthesised thus:

To a greater or lesser extent, every novel is a dialogized system made up of the images of 'languages', styles and consciousness that are concrete and inseparable from language. Language in the novel not only represents, but itself serves as the object of representation. Novelistic discourse is always criticising itself.¹⁹⁰

Bakhtin suggests that a simple method of verification would be to analyse the effect of a poem or short extract of poetry spoken as a poem, and then go on to compare the different effect caused by inserting this poem into the voice of a character in a novel: friction would be immediately noticeable. Poetry becomes the static medium imprisoned within one voice and further restricted by rhythm, the novel the more dynamic medium where voices and languages meet and are appropriated by others to become others and others'. This process is best illustrated by the novels of Dostoyevsky. In the concluding section of this paper, I would like to demonstrate how such an analysis can be usefully applied to *Paradise Lost*.

Initially, it would seem to some that I have set myself an impossible task, as the rigidity of Milton's epic is well defined by Bakhtin. *Paradise Lost* has, it could be argued, the simple dogmatic basis of Thatcherism: there is no alternative ! However, it will help understand many things if we just bear in mind the idea that we are what we speak, or more eloquently, "The ideological becoming of a human being is the process of selectively

¹⁹⁰ Mikhail Bakhtin, *The Dialogical Imagination* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981) 49.

assimilating the words of others."¹⁹¹ If we go back to the discussion of Adam and Eve's respective explanations of what went wrong, we will remember that Eve simply explained what had happened whereas Adam resorted to rhetoric. In other words, Adam has assimilated the words, ideology and character of Satan: lustful, intolerant and egoistic. His fall, at this moment, is, or can be read as linguistic: he has spoken as Satan in the presence of God. The fate of Satan and the fallen angels yields itself to similar analysis. His transformation into a serpent confirms the inseparability of thought and deed: formally he became as a serpent and spoke as a serpent; after the Fall, the metamorphosis is taken to its logical conclusion to become his punishment: he will be what he feigned. Furthermore, the fallen angels suffer the same fate as they also assimilated Satanic rhetoric, and through their assent and acceptance of his proposals are as him. Their words make them accomplices to the crime.

There will always remain one unsurmountable difficulty in an analysis such as mine, which, I would like to believe, is beginning to make more sense to readers of *Paradise Lost* than it did a few minutes ago. Bakhtin insists that friction of languages is the defining factor (of the language of the novel). It must also be stated that the juxtaposition of two languages does not necessarily mean that that friction occurs. Placing a speech by Adam beside a speech by Abdiel does not create conflict. We are consequently obliged to consider, briefly and insufficiently, the daunting question of author, authorship and authorial intention. If we are to make sense of the poem from a Bakhtinian analysis we have to consider whether we see the poem as having a single, controlled voice that restricts the linguistic rebelliousness of its principal speakers, those entities who have at various times been considered heroes, or whether we believe that the speakers are able to move outside these restrictions of authorial control through discourse. The extent to which we accept the latter determines to what extent we are justified in calling *Paradise Lost* a novel. It must be stated that opinions concerning the openness or authoritarianism of *Paradise Lost* will eventually be many and diverse, each reading could turn out different interpretations, whether this be classified as the work or readers, reader communities, social determined groups, gender or whatever we consider to be the determining, dominant factor. From a Bakhtinian standpoint it must be stated that the prose of those seeking to confine Milton within a set of constricting parameters cannot

¹⁹¹ *Ibidem*, 341.

escape the conclusion that by imposing upon the poem the view or reading that Milton has a authoritarian voice intending to impose a monoglossic view upon language stands or falls by those same rules. The refusal to notice certain genres or discourse within a poem, something which I feel is quite clear in many of Milton's opponents' views is itself an act of authoritarianism, as the critic's or opponent's prose strives to suppress friction, with more or less success than that which is attributed to Milton himself. To insist that, for example, Satan or Eve, the most common alternative heroes, break down authority is such an act.

Finally, I am left with the task of identifying those parts of Miltonic discourse which, by being novel, break with the singular world view. Parody, one of the fundamental forms of discourse, is present, I have argued in Books VI & VI, which not only deflate the ethics of war, the central topic of epic poetry and the corresponding ethos of heroics, but give perspective to Satan's heroics, that very perspective he himself is unable to perceive. Without making too grand an assertion, it seems to me that the answer can be found in Adam and Eve. Here is Bakhtin again, referring to a situation that precedes the end of cultural hegemony:

The situation is analogous in those cases where a single and unitary literary language is at the same time another's language. What inevitably happens is a decay and collapse of the religious, political and ideological authority connected with that language. It is during this process of decay that that the decentred language consciousness of prose art ripens, finding its support in the social heteroglossia of national languages that are actually spoken.¹⁹²

This is the situation that we are shown in the closing lines of the novel. Milton's humanism is unable to sustain an authoritarian predestination of history, and it is for this reason alone that the role of 'providence' remains highly ambiguous. This quotation aptly describes the end of national epics and the next day in the life of two ordinary but extraordinary people will doubtlessly have to be told in the ripe language of the novel. It is for this reason that I insist that *Paradise Lost* is and can be handled as a novel, or is at least a highly significant step in that direction. I will close appropriately, in a

¹⁹² *Ibidem*, 370.

paper which has spoken at some length on appropriation with a quotation. Here is the reader reading me reading Bakhtin reading Hegel:

A man must educate himself or re-educate himself for life in a world that is, from his own point of view, enormous and foreign; he must make it his own, domesticate it. In Hegel's definition, the novel must educate man for life in bourgeois society.¹⁹³

Milton, I imagine, would agree.

¹⁹³ *Ibidem*, 234.

THE SEMANTIC FIELD OF LIGHT AND DARKNESS IN *PARADISE LOST*

Ricardo Mairal Usón
University of Zaragoza. Spain

"Words glisten. Words irradiate exquisite splendour.
Words carry magic and keep us spell-bound ... Words are like
glamorous bricks that constitute the fabric of any language
... Words are like roses that make the environment fragrant."

(Chand, n.d.: p. 3-4, quoted in Aitchinson, 1987: 4).

Man, through his intellect, organises reality. In the process of human knowledge - from the ontogenetic point of view - starts the formation of units at the level of perception. The process of structuralization is a cognitive property of man. Through perception, reality is not apprehended as a set of sensorial stimuli, but, these stimuli experiment an organization in sets in the light of a series of phenomena characteristic of perception: grouping phenomena with their factors of proximity, similarity and continuity.

Man delimits the real world in different and unitary sectors that make up a system of hierarchies. The limits of a given sector of reality are determined according to the relations which they hold with other sectors integrated in the same sphere, and also with sectors belonging to a superior sphere. Then, man tries to formalize reality - as a significant content of a language - in order to produce the essentialization and structuralization of that given reality. This point is based on the thesis of "Weltbild" (image of the world) of the language, which goes back to Humboldt and was also adopted by Sapir and Whorf:

que la lengua no es sólo un medio de intercambio, sino un mundo real que el espíritu debe poner entre él y los objetos con la actividad de su potencia interior.

(Humboldt, 1907: 176, quoted in Haensch et al., 1982: 325)

Therefore, the division within an individual language entails the process of decodification of a given reality through the concepts of an individual language. These concepts are not given before hand, man creates them when transforming the world into verbal substance. This point means that every language sets up frontiers and barriers where reality is conceived as a continuum. In this respect, Coseriu shows that in the determination of concepts for the linguistic organisation of an experience, reality does not supply linguistic categories:

Es, por lo tanto, absurdo pretender interpretar estructuraciones lingüísticas a partir de las supuestas estructuraciones de la realidad; el comienzo tiene que hacerse con la aserción de que no se trata de estructuras de la realidad, sino de estructuraciones que la interpretación humana ha impuesto a esa realidad.

(Coseriu, 1970: 17)

On this line, the notion of 'field' is intimately related to the notion of scheme, (Leborans, 1977: 29-ff). As Leborans claims, the notion of scheme comes about as a result of the process of the essentialization and structuralization of reality at the intellect sphere (cf. *supra*). The content of a concept, transformed into a linguistic meaning, involves the intellectual apprehension of all its essences and aspects. So, as Breson (Leborans, 1977: 31) shows "tenemos una noción intuitiva de la significación" and meaning "no se reduce a un sistema de relaciones, sino que sería una revelación o intuición de las esencias".

Then, a system of network realtions does not form the concept or the meaning, but, it is, on the other hand, fundamental to the definition of a semantic and conceptual field¹, formed not only by individual lexical units but also by a network of relations (privative, synonymy, contrast, etc.), which, will eventually, characterize the typology of a given reality, (cf.

¹ Both Leborans (1977: 33-ff) and Coseriu (Geckeller, 1976: 241) assert that there is a clear-cut difference between conceptual and semantic field. The former is defined as "la extensión significativa de un concepto genérico repartido entre varios conceptos" (Leborans, 1977: 3 4), whereas the latter is conceived as a lexical paradigm, (cf. Coseriu, 1977: 185)

infra). With these theoretical assumptions in mind Coseriu defines a semantic or lexical² field as:

(...) un paradigma léxico, es decir, una estructura lexemática opositiva. En cuanto tal, (...), se caracteriza por el hecho de que resulta de la repartición de su contenido léxico entre varios lexemas que se oponen de manera inmediata unos a otros, por medio de rasgos distintivos mínimos.

(Coseriu, 1977: 185).

We all agree that man structures and fragments reality as a set of lexical entries into a paradigm. Then in the field of language and mind, structure plays a predominant role. Our task is, to a large extent, one of expression rather than one of discovery. It is pointless to structure something of which that property is an intrinsic part. The results of the kind of investigations that I have made is to organise and make explicit this previously intuitive knowledge (cf. Brenson) of the lexical fields and the relations between their constituent lexemes; to replace what was previously performative knowledge with what might be called descriptive knowledge.

1. CHARACTERISTICS AND TYPOLOGY OF THE LEXICAL FIELDS

In the first stages, reality appears as a neutral, indefinite substantial complex. In this respect, and according to Hjelmslev's terminology, reality would be a non-formed "substance". Man, gradually, formalizes that substance up to a point where the level of formalization becomes an overriding factor³. There is an intermediary degree of formalization, characterized by the harmonious confluence of form and substance,

² The difference in terminology is almost irrelevant; the former will be framed within Semantics and the latter within Lexicology. The reader, no doubt, will understand the difference by recalling the Hjelmslevian dichotomy between the level of expression and the level of content.

³ Leborans, 45-ff.

representative of the linguistic unities man masters in every act of communication, and unities which integrate the semantic fields⁴.

Every attempt at formalizing⁵ the verbal substance of a lexical unit entails an effort of delimitation - through intellectual abstraction-, that is to say, one will look upon a minimal definition of the meaning of a form as a statement of semantic components that are sufficient to distinguish the meaning paradigmatically from the meanings of other forms in the language.

In a componential analysis⁶, each lexical unit is decomposed into the smallest distinctive features. Each feature represents a degree of formalization of the verbal substance. The last stage of formalization in a lexical unit gives rise to the *seme*, defined by Pottier as "le trait sémantique pertinent" ; then the *sememe* described as "l'ensemble des traits sémantiques pertinents (ou semes) entrant dans la définition de la substance d'un lexeme"⁷ and last but not least the *lexeme* defined as the lexical expression of a sememe. Pottier also distinguishes the notion of *archisememe* defined as a set of common semes which are relevant when neutralized, and whose lexical realization is called *archilexeme*⁸ or "cross-word" or "inclusif".⁹

The structure of this field will be defined according to the relations of the lexical items. Our first step will be to identify the type of formal lexematic oppositions that might be found in the field¹⁰. But the structuralization and functioning of a field does not only depend on the

⁴ I do not intend to give a precise account of the history and different approaches of the lexical theory. I refer the reader to Geckeller, 1976: 97-211.

⁵ For an exhaustive explanation of the concepts of form and substance, see. Coseriu, "Forma y sustancia en los sonidos del lenguaje" in *Teoría del lenguaje y lingüística general*. (Madrid : Gredos, 1962).

⁶ Pottier, Greimas and Coseriu are the three more relevant approaches at a componential analysis. For a precise historical account of componential semantics, see. Geckeller, 246-ff.

⁷ See. Pottier, *Reserches sur l'analyse semantique*. 8.

⁸ These semantic features mirror the phonological features *pheme*, *pheteme* and *phoneme*, introduced by the Prague School.

⁹ see. Pottier, *Présentation de la linguistique*.

¹⁰ Again, there is a clear parallel between phonology, whose typology is defined according to the oppositions which its members hold, and the lexicon.

formal type of oppositions but also on the type of extralinguistic relations that they organise.

A basic criteria for the typology of lexical fields is that of *dimension* (Coseriu, 1977:217) defined as the point of view or the focus of an opposition. In the case of a lexematic opposition, it is the semantic property that this type of opposition refers to.¹¹ From the point of view of dimension, fields are divided into "unidimensional" and "pluridimensional". Within each category, Coseriu distinguishes categories according to the relations of their constituents.

In this research, I have drawn two clear-cut frontiers; one which will cover the boundaries of denotation and the other of connotation within the semantic field of light and darkness. For the first one, I will decompose each unit into its semantic features (cf. *supra*) and I will describe the typology of this field according to the relations of those lexical items. I aim to give an account of how the lexical units which conform the semantic field are structured into a paradigm and show how vocabulary, as well as reality, undergoes a process of structuralization and essentialization through man's intellect, in this case through Milton's intellect.

With regards to the second part, I will present, no doubt, the most interesting points as far as Milton's view of the world is concerned. I will use the notion of *virtueme*, which belongs to the sphere of connotation, and is defined as "chaque lexie a ainsi un certain nombre de virtualités combinatoires, qu'on peut appeler ses virtuemes. Ceux-ci peuvent être caractérisés par un indice, très approximatif, de probabilité"¹². He even regards the *virtueme* as a special kind of seme: "Les sèmes variables forment le *virtueme* et son connotatifs (...)"¹³. I share Coseriu's view that the notion of *virtueme* is not intrinsic to the language, but a category founded in the light of our knowledge of the world. Doubtless, connotation is a dominant feature in the field of human signification. Man projects his peculiar subjectivity, in every linguistic sign and image, the base of

¹¹ See Coseriu (1977) for discussion of the notion of dimension. Coseriu attacks Lounsbury's theory.

¹² Cf. "Rehabilitación de la semántica". *Problemas y principios del estructuralismo lingüístico*. (Madrid, 1967) 55-63.

¹³ Cf. *Présentation de la linguistique*, 27

connotation, which constitutes the sense of every linguistic communication. In fact, connotation is closely linked to the creative role of the language. It is ilimited and based on the vague extension and comprehension of a concept. I will show how Milton not only orders and structures reality - dennotative part- but also imposes criteria of evaluation which seem to depend on his own semantic intuitions and creative capacity. These intuitions will be deeply rooted into a religious scenario and his lexical choices will serve as a vehicle to express his religious believes and ideas.

I think that, after this brief theoretical background, we are ready to enter into the practical corpus and draw conclusions that might help us reveal how Milton's semantic intuitions mirror his knowledge of the world and his intellect formalizes the verbal substance and frame it into a field.

2. LIGHT AND DARKNESS: DENOTATION AND CONNOTATION

The phenomenon of dualism seems to be an intrinsic element of man, perhaps the best naturally realized. As Leborans (1977: 75) shows:

El hombre, potencialmente abocado a la aprehensión del mundo , a la posesión inmaterial de su esencialidad, proyecta sobre él su psiquismo consciente de su "yoidad" individualizadora frente a la "otridad" del cosmos circundante. Surge así el primer dualismo.

One of the dualisms, determined by the rotation of the earth, which most influences man's psychic and biological development is that of light and darkness. From this biological view, "day" is the time when man carries a vital and dynamic development; sight and hearing exploit all their possibilities to the utmost, (cf. infra). However, "night", by virtue of its state of darkness, facilitates rest, a passive state and inactive vital development. These chartacteristics would conform the denotative meaning, but light and darkness have served, both sincronically and diachronically, as a vehicle for the expression of those connotative, emotive values. Connotated meaning conforms much a broader field than denotated meaning.

Primitive man reflected his belief in the intrinsic power of an eternal being through cosmoteluric external manifestations and symbols. By reason

of this belief, man elaborated a particular cosmogony formed by diverse personifications of celestial bodies and atmospheric phenomena. With regards to our dualism, man, before devising a mythology, attaches several significant connotations to light and darkness as cosmic natural phenomena, which pass one after the other cyclically and in perfect harmony. Light, as we will see later, is associated with God and Goodness whereas darkness with Satan and wickedness (cf. *infra*).

These connotated values have lasted throughout the centuries. In fact, Milton also makes use of them to express the supreme power and grace of God (light) and the terrifying power of Hell and Satan (dark), (cf. 2.2.).

2.1. In the description of the semantic field, I aim to show how vocabulary is organized into one paradigm. Bearing the theoretical assumptions in mind, (cf. *supra*), I will detail some of the main characteristics of the semantic field of light and darkness.¹⁴

The range of the corpus is quite broad. Hundreds of examples might be found: *light, glimmering, bright, unobscured, lucid, shine, illumine, radiant, darken'd, Night, day, deep, depth, darksome, starless, opacous, gloomy, dim, dawn*, etc. All these instances hold a privative relation based on the bipolar structure : + Light/-Light. In pure semantic terms, if we decompose each unit into its smallest constituents (semes), we will conclude that each word has one feature in common - either light or - light- but also characteristics which are intrinsic to each lexical unit and which differentiates them from the rest.

These characteristics allow each word to have its own semantic status and be neutralized in a given context:

light: (+light), (+bright).
 bright (+light), (+full intensity), (+shining)
 radiant (+light), (+shining), (light in all directions).

¹⁴ In this part, I will be very brief and I will just point out some characteristics with a view to showing how any piece of discourse - in our case Milton's- is organized into a structure. Although I will leave out the long process of the componential analysis of each unit, I will analyze a couple of instances so that the reader can understand the point I am trying to get across.

As we see, they share a common feature, which is the one responsible for bringing all these lexemes into one paradigm. However, within that paradigm, each unit neutralizes in a given context due to the existence of other distinctive semes which are characteristic of each lexeme.

With regards to the structure, we are faced with an "unidimensional" field. This field, according to the privative oppositions the lexical items hold, is antonymous¹⁵. It is based on privative oppositions, that is to say, of the kind X/no X¹⁶. Then, we have a bipolar field constituted by two lexical units, where one is the opposite of the other - light is the opposite of darkness.

In this bipolar structure, we do not find an archilexeme or an archiseme because the two sectors in which the field is structured can not be neutralised. As Trujillo (1970:82) asserts:

la no existencia de archilexema para el rasgo o rasgos comunes a todo el sistema (o campo) no quiere decir otra cosa que determinados tipos de oposición semántica no son nunca neutralizables aun teniendo los mismos miembros un contenido casi idéntico.

This bipolar field, characterized by an antonymic opposition, presents the following characteristics:

- a) The difficulty of finding an archilexeme for the two poles.
- b) The distinctive features (semes) are marked positive in all the words which belong to the sphere of light.

¹⁵ I will not enter into considerations about such an intricate problem as antonym. I refer the reader to Geckeller, 450-455 and Lyons, *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. (Cambridge, 1968) 460-470.

¹⁶ Leborans, 1977, 61 prefers to use the terminology "grado positivo/grado negativo

| | Light | | | Darkness | |
|------------|--------------|----------|--------|-----------------|---------|
| NOUNS | ADJECTIVES | VERBS | NOUS | ADJECTIVES | VERBS |
| Day | Bright | Illumine | Depth | Dark | obscure |
| Light | Gay | Shine | Shades | Gloomy | Darkn'd |
| Brightness | Lucid | Lights | Night | Nocturnal | Darkens |

So, this would be the structure of the semantic field. Within each category, lexical units hold a different type of opposition and are neutralised, according to their semantic components, in a given context. As indicated above, vocabulary, despite being an open category, might be organized into fields. Man, through his intellect, formalizes verbal substance and arranges it into a paradigm. In our case, we are dealing with a very particular paradigm, that of a religious scenario.

2.2. At first, the dualism light and darkness appeared in man's subconscious as an archetype, giving rise to one symbol, integrated in the primitive mythological mind with a connotative meaning. These connotative values come about as a result of the numerous forms of feeling and emotions derived from the influence that cosmic phenomena exercised on human psychic development. The connotative value never disappeared and, in fact, it still lasts as reflected in Milton (cf. *infra*).

In this section, we will divide this wider corpus into three main groups: one will refer to the connotated values of day and night; the second to light and darkness and the third to Fire and the Sun.

2.2.1. Day and Night have been the object, throughout the history, of numerous connotations. Sometimes, the use of some connotative values has become so generalized that some of them work, at a conceptual and linguistic level, as denotative. I have fragmented this group into several subgroups: each of them reflects a particular characteristic of day and night.

2.2.1.1. Several instances show the dangers and terrible things that take place at night, in contrast with the harmony and peace which occur

during the day time. In fact, it is at night that Satan speaks to Eve and tries to corrupt her:

(...) while Night
Invest the Sea, and wished Morning delays.
(*Paradise Lost*, 1. 207)

(...); And when Night
Darkens the Streets, then wander forth the Sons
of Belial, flown with insolence and wine.
(*Paradise Lost*, 1. 500)

2.2.1.2. Again, another contrast is expressed by these two lexemes: day is conceived as the time when man engages in vital and dynamic activities, hearing and sight exploit their possibilities to the utmost (cf. *supra*), whereas night is described as a period of rest and passive activities. In other words, day is intimately related to life and night to death:

In the wide womb of uncreated night,
Devoid of sense and motion?
(*Paradise Lost*, 2. 150)

These past, if any pass, the void profound
of unessential Night receives him next
Wide gaping, and with utter loss of being
Treatens him, pñung'd in that abortive gulf.
(*Paradise Lost*, 2. 438)

(...). Thus with the Year
Seasons return, but not to me returns
Day, or the sweet approach of Ev'n or Morn
Or sight of vernal bloom, or Summer's Rose,
Or flocks, or herds, or human face divine;
But cloud instead, and ever-during dark
surrounds me from the cheerful ways of men
Cut off, and for the Book of knowledge Fair
Presented with a universal blank
Of Nature's works to mee expung'd and raz'd'
And wisdom at one entrance quite shut out.
(*Paradise Lost*, 3. 40).

Of Night, and all things now retir'd to rest
Mind us of like repose, since God hath set

Labour and rest, as day and night to men (...)
(*Paradise Lost*, 4. 611)

2.2.1.3. Night, Chaos and Stan are presented as three colleagues who strive to create and expand wickedness. Night and Chaos are depicted, in some instances, as components of Hell, they seem to be two intrinsic properties of that "darkn'd Gulf". Night is also described as the consort of Satan:

And time and place are lost, where eldest Night
And Chaos, Ancestors of Nature, hold
Eternal Anarquy, amidst the noise
Of endless wars, and by confusion stand.
(*Paradise Lost*, 2. 894)

(...) ; when staight behold the Throne
Of Chaos, and his dark Pavillion spread
Wide on the wasteful Deep; with him Enthron'd
Sat Sable-rested Night, eldest of things
The consort of his Reign; (...)
(*Paradise Lost*, 2. 959)

And Spirits of this nethermost Abyss,
Chaos and ancient Night, I come no spy,
With purpose to explore or to disturb
The secrets of your Realm, (...)
(*Paradise Lost*, 2.960)

2.2.1.4. Night and day appear to struggle to dominate the cosmos. Here, I have picked out quite a revealing instance which portrays the regaining of the lost territory by the power of light. In connotative terms, the battle is between good (light) and evil(darkness):

Of light appears, and from the walls of Heav'n
Shoots far into the bossom of dim Night
A glimmering dawn; here Nature first begins
Her farthest verge, and Chaos to retire
As from her utmost works a brok'n foe.
(*Paradise Lost*, 2.1035)

Therefore, these instances are quite revealing in so far as they throw some light on the connotated meanings of day and night. The underlying

meaning which these two items convey is that of God and Evil. Here is a scheme of the connotated meaning of day and night found in Milton:

| | | | | | |
|-------|------------------|-------|---------|------------|----------|
| Day | harmony/peace | life | noise | good | light |
| <hr/> | | | | | |
| Night | terrible dangers | death | silence | evil/Chaos | darkness |

2.2.2. Within this group, I have discovered several subgroups: firstly, those lexemes that describe both Hell and Heaven; secondly, I have studied those lexical categories that Milton uses to describe God and Satan; thirdly, those that depict divine characters and evil characters; fourthly, those which show the antagonism light darkness as a battle.

2.2.2.1. Numerous instances have been collected in this subgroup. Milton quite accurately describes the two continents in the Universe: Hell and Heaven. Milton's semantic intuitions reveal his religious convictions.

Heaven is always described as a continent where everything is bright; every lexeme carries the semantic feature (+Light). From a connotative point of view, this means that Heaven is characterized as a place of peace, harmony and goodness; it is the place where God dwells. In Milton's poems, there are striking contrasts between Heaven as a good place where everything is positive and Hell, where Satan and evil characters dwell. Hell is depicted as a place of pain, sin, enemies, violence and wickedness. All these connotations are expressed through the lexemes which integrate the semantic field of light and darkness:

Here in the heart of Hell to work in Fire,
Or do his errands in the gloomy Deep;
What can it then avail though yet we feel
Strength undiminisht, or eternal being
To undergo eternal punishment?
(*Paradise Lost*, 1. 151)

(...)
Which way the nearest coast of darkness lies
Bordering on light.
(*Paradise Lost*, 2. 968)

Gustav Ungerer

Not far off Heav'n, in the Precincts of light. (...)
(*Paradise Lost*, 3. 88)

To that new world of light and bliss, (...)
(*Paradise Lost*, 2. 867)

Unbarr'd the gates of light (...)
(*Paradise Lost*, 4. 4)

From him, who is in the happy Realms of Light (...)
(*Paradise Lost*, 3. 394)

Dwell not unvisited of Heaven's fair Light
And hard, that out of Hell leads up to light.
(*Paradise Lost*, 2. 398)

These lexemes acquire a new dimension, which comes about as a result of Milton's subjective conception of the world. So, it would be impossible to understand the essence of the text without projecting the affective and emotive values of these words.

2.2.2.2. Milton identifies God with all the positive values, that is to say, with the lexemes carrying the seme (+light), whereas Satan (-Light or +Dark). God is conceived as the "Celestial Light" and brightness. Physically, God's attributes reflect light and brightness as symbols of wisdom, grace, Fountain of goodness, spiritual guidance, glory etc.:

Bright effluence of bright essence increate (...)
(*Paradise Lost*, 3. 6)

Ethereal King; the Author of all Being,
Fountain of Light, thyself invisible
amidst the glorious brightness where thou sitt'st.
(*Paradise Lost*, 3. 374)

Hail Holy light, (...)
(*Paradise Lost*, 3. 1)

Father, to see thy face, wherein no cloud
of anger shall remain, but peace assur'd
And reconcilements; (...)
(*Paradise Lost*, 3. 262)

That from his Lordly eye keep distance due,
 Dispenses bright from far; (...)
 (*Paradise Lost*, 3. 578)

Made visible the Almighty Father shines, (...)
 (*Paradise Lost*, 3. 386)

Let there be light" said God, and forthwith Light
 Ethereal, first of things (...)
 (*Paradise Lost*, 7. 242)

Milton does not hesitate in identifying God with light in an overt and clear way:

(...) since God is light (...)
 (*Paradise Lost*, 3. 3)

Jesuschrist is also depicted with (+light) lexemes and even Milton uses lexemes of this semantic field to express the aim of mankind:

The radiant image of his Glory sat,
 His only Son; (...)
 (*Paradise Lost*, 3. 63)

My Umpire Conscience, when if they will hear.
 light after light well us'd they shall attain.
 (*Paradise Lost*, 3. 195)

With regards to Satan, Milton depicts him as an evil character, as somebody devoid of light, grace, glory, wisdom etc (cf. God's attributes). Even when Satan appears, nature undergoes a process of darkening, and therefore wrath, envy etc appear:

The seat of Desolation void of light
 (*Paradise Lost*, 1. 181)

So spake the Sovran voice, and clouds began
 to darken all the hill, and smoke to roll
 in dusky wreaths, reluctant flames, the sign
 of wrath awak't.
 (*Paradise Lost*, 5. 557)

Satan, now first inflam'd with rage (...)
(*Paradise Lost*, 4. 9)

2.2.2.3. Divine characters, as well as God and Jesuschrist, are portrayed with lexemes that have the seme (+light). Evidently, these divine characters - angels - are God's pupils and therefore they have the same qualities as God:

Thither comes Uriel, gliding through the Even
On a Sunbeam, swift as a shooting Star.
(*Paradise Lost*, 4. 555)

Angels ascending and descending, bands
of Gurdians bright (...)
(*Paradise Lost*, 3. 511)

With regard to evil characters, obviously, they are depicted with negative properties conveyed by lexemes which belong to the subsystem (+dark). Milton refers to them as "doleful shades" or "shades of death".

2.2.2.4. Some instances portray the symbolic battle light and dark, or, to put it in another way, the battle between good and evil. Satan does not fear the power of light, of God. However, Milton, quite clearly shows the image of the Supreme power of light over darkness:

(...) This deep world
of darkness do we dread?
(*Paradise Lost*, 2. 262)

Must'ring their rage, and Heav'n resembles Hell?
As he our Darkness, cannot we his light
Imitate when we please.
(*Paradise Lost*, 2. 268)

2.2.3. In this final section, I have included other lexical units which, are indirectly related to our subject of study. These lexemes have the common seme (Fire and Sun)

A striking contrast is presented between Fire and the Sun. Fire is portrayed, throughout the poem, as an element of Hell. Fire is pernicious, painful. The places where Satan and the rest of evil characters meet are

surrounded by fire. It is also a weapon for Satan when he fights against God. Black fire and horror shot with equal rage. Whereas the Sun is a positive element; it illumines Heaven and it is the light that is "imparted" to all of us. Sun beams and rays convey a positive meaning and value. Here are some instances that illustrate this theory:

Where pain of unextinguishable fire
must exercise us without hope of end (...)
(*Paradise Lost*, 2. 65)

Glar'd lighting, and shot forth pernicious fire.
(*Paradise Lost*, 6. 849)

(...) , as when a wand'ring Fire
Compáct of unctuous vapour, which the Night
Condenses, and the cold environs round
Kindl'd through agitation to a Flame,
Which oft, they say, some Evil spirit attends (...)
(*Paradise Lost*, 9. 634)

Our prison strong, this huge convex of Fire,
Outrageous to devour, immunes us round (...)
(*Paradise Lost*, 2. 434)

With regards to the Sun, I have picked out, among others, the following instances:

The same whom John saw also in the Sun:
His back was turn'd, but not his brightness hid;
Of beaming sunny Rays, a golden tiar
Circl'd his head, nor less his Locks behind
Illustrious on his shoulders fledge with wings
Lay waving round; (...)
(*Paradise Lost*, 3. 623)

The Sun that light imparts to all, receives
From all his alimetal recompense
In humid exhalations, and at Even
Sups with the Ocean; (...)
(*Paradise Lost*, 5. 423)

(...)
Of day spring and the Sun, who scarce uprisen

With wheels yet hov'ring o'er the ocean brim,
 Shot parallel to the Earth his dewy ray.
 Discovering in wide Landscape all the East
 Of Paradise and Eden's happy Plains'(...)
 (*Paradise Lost*, 5. 139)

However, fire, in very specific contexts, is used to describe the apparition of an Angel or divine character. It is at this level that it acquires a positive dimension, fire, in this case, lightens an angel:

Th'unarmed youth of Heav'n (...)
 Hung high with Diamond flaming, and with Gold.
 (*Paradise Lost*, 4. 345)

There is an interesting instance that illustrates a change of meaning, motivated by a change of attitude of one character; it is that of "Morning Star", referring to Lucifer. From an etymological point of view, Lucifer meant the Prince of Light. He was absorbed by the world of darkness and he became an evil character. In this respect, Milton is aware of this change as is illustrated in this passage:

His count'nance as the Morning Star that guides
 The starry flock, allur'd them and with lies
 Drew after him the third part of Heav'n's Host;
 (*Paradise Lost*, 5. 708)

Every instance in this section 2.2. reflect, on the one hand, the connotative values of the lexemes of the semantic field light and darkness and, on the other hand, how Milton, through his semantic intuitions and intellect, not only organizes verbal substance (cf. 2.1.) but also expresses his knowledge of the world and his religious convictions.

3. CONCLUSIONS

My thesis on this paper has been to show how Milton organises and structures the semantic field of light and darkness both from a denotative and connotative point of view in *Paradise Lost*. On the one hand, Milton orders reality through his intellect and structures the text- set in a religious scenario-

both coherent and cohesively by grouping the lexical units into paradigms. These lexical units have a feature in common - that of light or darkness- and a distinctive feature which allow them to be neutralised in a given context. This sphere is what I have called the denotative part.

On the other hand, Milton, besides ordering reality, imposes some criteria of evaluation, which seem to depend, fundamentally, on his intuitive capacity or on his affective and emotive sphere. It is at this connotated level that Milton exploits his linguistic and literary creative capacity to the utmost and reveals his religious convictions .

Light and darkness as antonyms, rich in connotative values, are not an original creation in Milton's *Paradise Lost*. Milton follows an old tradition, (cf. Spanish mystic poetry and primitive cultures). The interest of this dualism, with respect to other symbols in Milton's work, lies on the human world of significance in general; light and darkness as physic and natural phenomena, as images and linguistic signs are meaningful to the religious man.

4. REFERENCES

- Aitchinson, Jean. *Words in the Mind. An Introduction to the Mental Lexicon*. New York: Basil Blackwell, 1987.
- Coseriu, Eugenio. *Einführung in die Strukturelle Betrachtung des Wortschatzes*. Tubinga, 1970.
- *Principios de semántica estructural*. Trans. Marcos Martínez Hernández. Madrid: Gredos, 1982.
- *Sincronía, Diacronía e Historia. El problema del cambio lingüístico*. Madrid: Gredos, 1978.
- *Teoría del lenguaje y lingüística general*. 3rd ed. Madrid : Gredos, 1982.
- Fernández Leborans, María Jesús. *Campo semántico y connotación*. Málaga: Planeta, 1977.
- Geckeller, Horst. *Semántica estructural y teoría del campo léxico*. Trans. Marcos Martínez Hernández. Madrid: Gredos, 1976.
- Haensch, Gunther, et. al. *La Lexicografía. De la lingüística teórica a la lexicografía práctica*. Madrid: Gredos, 1982.
- Hjemslev, Louis. *Prolegómenos a una teoría del lenguaje*. Trans. José Luis Díaz de Llaño. Madrid: Gredos, 1971.
- Lyons, John. *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge: 1968.

- Milton, John. *Paradise Lost*. Ed. Christopher Ricks. London: Penguin Classics, 1989.
- Pottier, Bernard. *Présentation de la linguistique. Fondements d'une théorie*. Paris: 1967.
- *Problemas y principios del estructuralismo lingüístico*. Madrid, 1967.
 - *Recherches sur l'analyse sémantique en linguistique et en traduction mécanique*. Nancy: 1963.
- Trujillo, R. *El campo semántico de la valoración intelectual en español*. La Laguna: Universidad, 1970.

SIR WILLIAM D'AVENANT'S SO-CALLED IMPROVEMENTS OF *MACBETH* (1674)

Blanca López Román
University of Granada. Spain

Reworkings and adaptations of Shakesperean drama were frequent during the Restoration period and in the eighteenth century. Two approaches have dominated the criticism of Shakesperean adaptations. On the one hand they are often studied as products of the rules of Restoration and eighteenth-century stage. On the other hand they are compared critically with the Shakesperean originals as a part of the history of attitudes towards Shakespeare and attacked in terms of dismay or amusement. Christopher Spencer attempted to regard them as new plays, taking into account the fact that they were extremely successful in their own time. We shall reconsider D'Avenant's adaptation of *Macbeth*¹⁹⁴, published in 1674, both as a product of the Restoration and as part of the history of attitudes towards Shakespeare. On the other hand the study of this adaptation might help to understand the process of adaptation in the more general context of contemporary adaptations. Modern theatre, television drama and films often rewrite Shakespeare with the intention of making his plays adequate for mass communication and the new audiovisual techniques. Shakesperean adaptations offer a unique opportunity for the comparison of techniques of transformations of literary works in different periods of the history of drama.

We shall reproduce some quotations from two of the most important critical voices of the Restoration period, Thomas Rymer and John Dryden, to illustrate the critical background of D'Avenant's adaptation of *Macbeth* (1674).

¹⁹⁴ *Five Restoration Adaptations of Shakespeare*, edited with an introduction by Christopher Spencer (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1965).

Thomas Rymer (1641-1713) was an antiquary and archeologist who defended classic drama and showed great grievances against English drama in *The Tragedies of the Last Age* (1677). John Dryden replied to him defending the English drama in *Heads of an Answer to Rymer* (1677). However in both cases, they admire or they attack, because they discover neoclassic principles in the great drama of the past. Rymer defends classic tragedy because it pleases and also profits, and because it reproduces the "constant order, that harmony and beauty of Providence."¹⁹⁵

I am confident whoever writes a Tragedy cannot please but must also profit; 'tis the Physick of the mind that he makes palatable.

And besides the purging of the passions something must stick by observing that constant order, that harmony and beauty of Providence, that necessary relation and chain whereby the causes and the effects, the virtues and rewards, the vices and their punishments are proportion'd and link'd together.

Rymer finds neoclassic virtues in the classic drama. Dryden in his reply to defend English drama and Shakespeare, does not discuss the neoclassic principles. On the contrary he defends that these great virtues are also found in the English "as well as in the ancients, or perhaps better". Dryden was so closely associated with D'Avenant that he collaborated with him in an adaptation of *The Tempest*.¹⁹⁶

It is a well known fact that D'Avanant, like other adapters of Shakespeare plays, tried to make *Macbeth* more suitable to the theatrical taste of the Restoration period. Hazelton Spencer ironically used the term of *improving* Shakespeare in his well known book on the Restoration versions of Shakespearean adaptations¹⁹⁷. We shall examine the so-called

¹⁹⁵ Thomas Rymer, *The Tragedies of the Last Age* (1677), in *Shakespeare, the Critical Heritage*, Vol. 1, 1623-92, (ed.) Brian Vickers (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974) 196.

¹⁹⁶ John Dryden, *Heads of an Answer to Rymer* (1677), in *Shakespeare the Critical Heritage*, vol. 1, 1623-92, 198.

¹⁹⁷ Hazelton Spencer, *Shakespeare Improved. The Restoration Versions in Quarto and on the Stage* (New York: Frederick Ungar publishing Co., 1927,1963).

improvement of Shakespeare's *Macbeth* through the neoclassic admiration for operistic devices, and through the new conception of characters and action, which make the play approach heroic tragedy. The third so-called *improvement* will be the destruction of Shakespearean metaphor and poetry with the obvious intention of clarifying the language of the play.

1. IMPROVEMENT THROUGH OPERISTIC DEVICES: NEOCLASSIC ADMIRATION.

The full title of D'Avenant's adaptation was: *Macbeth, a Tragedy. With all the alterations, amendments, additions and new songs, as it is now acted at the Dukes Theatre.*

This long title reflects what our Laureate Restoration playwright wanted to do with Shakespeare's text. It shows his intention of altering Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, by adding new elements, specially songs. This operatic character is the first ammend introduced by D'Avenant.

Davenant published his adaptation of *Macbeth* in the year 1674, after the reopening of the theatres. On the whole his adaptations were admired by his contemporaries although there were other dissenting voices who reproved him. Pepys's entries in his diary illustrate what the average educated spectator thought about D'Avenant's adaptation. Pepys saw *Macbeth* first on November 5, 1664, and frequently thereafter. He considered the play excellent, enjoyed the good acting and admired it in all respects, but specially in divertisement. He also enjoyed its dancing and music. Although it may seem incredible for us, the Restoration audience approved of a tragedy being transformed into an operistic divertisement, with great variety of music and songs¹⁹⁸.

¹⁹⁸ These entries are recorded in "Samuel Pepys on Shakespeare in the theatre, 1660-9", *Shakespeare, The Critical Heritage*, Vol. 1 1623-92, 30-2:
(November 5, 1664): with my wife to the Duke's house to a play, *Macbeth*, a pretty good play, but admirably acted.
(December 28, 1966): to the Duke's house, and there saw *Macbeth* most excellently acted, and most excellently played for variety.
(January 7, 1667): to the Duke's house, and saw *Macbeth*, which, though I saw it lately, yet appears a most excellent play in all respects, but specially in

The admiration for D'Avenant's *Macbeth* continued during the neoclassic period. Downes, writing in 1708, tells us that a special production of this play was made after the opening of the Duke's company at Dorset Garden and that this event took place in 1671. Downes describes *Macbeth* operatic character as follows¹⁹⁹:

The Tragedy of Macbeth, alter'd by Sir William Davenant; being dressed in all it's Finery, as new Cloath's, new Scenes, Machines, as flyings for the Witches; with all the Singing and Dancing in it: The first Compos'd by Mr. Lock, the other by Mr. Channell and Mr. Joseph Priest; it being all Excellently perform'd, being in the nature of an Opera, it Recompenc'd double the Expence; it proves still (1708) a lasting play.

Through this quotation we see that magnificent clothes, new songs, dances, complicated stage machinery and new scenes were added to the Elizabethan play and he clearly affirms his intention of making it into an Opera. He mentions finery and new clothes and pays attention to the new theatrical machinery enjoyed by the audience. D'Avenant maintains the opening scene of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, but his witches enter and exeunt flying. The supernatural Elizabethan evil is transformed into an acrobatic device by three actors, who hanging from ropes appeared on the new tennis court stage, which substituted the Elizabethan stage after the Restoration.

Dryden defines opera as "a poetical tale, or fiction, represented by vocal or instrumental music, adorned with scenes, machines, and dancing". But actually the type was less definite, and in common usage included what we would call spectacle and extravaganza. It consisted of spoken dialogue, songs, dances and mechanical effects--the last being quite as important as the music in turning a play into an opera. D'Avenant's version of *Macbeth*, for instance was operatic, since not only new songs and dances were provided for the witches, but those weird sisters frisked about in the air on slack wires

divertisement, though it be a deep tragedy; which is a strange perfection in a tragedy, it being most proper here and suitable.

(April, 19, 1667): We saw *Macbeth*, which, though I have seen it often, yet is it one of the best plays for a stage, and variety of dancing and musique, that ever I saw.

¹⁹⁹ "John Downes, Shakespeare in the Restoration Stage, 1708" in *Shakespeare, The Critical Heritage*, Vol. 2, 1693-1708, (Ed.) Brian Vickers, 189.

and trapezes. For example, in 3.5.40, there is one stage direction informing us that "Machine descends for the flight of the witches". In IV,1, another stage direction let us know about Musick, the witches's dance and a their cave sinking. D'Avenant allowed the witches additional scope for display and developed further Shakespeare's lines²⁰⁰:

Come, sisters, cheer we up his sprites,
And show the best of our delights.
I'll charm the air to give a sound,
While you perform your antic round.
(Shakespeare: *Macbeth*, 4. 1. 127-30)

Even Hecate has a flight with the witches on a machine in 3.3. Moreover, D'Avenant adds new songs sung by the witches and Hecate, such as the following one that we shall quote as an example:

Hec. Black Spirits, and white,
 Red Spirits and gray;
 Mingle, mingle, mingle
 You that mingle may
1 Witch Tiffin, Tiffin, keep it stiff in,
 Fire drake Puckey, make it lucky:
 Lyer Robin, you must bob in.
Chor. A round, a round, about, about
 All ill come running in, all good keep out.
 (D'Avenant: *Macbeth*, 4. 1. 44-49)

The operatic nature of the play also appears in the stage directions that indicate that the ghost descends (3, 4, 92) and that the ghost of Banquo rises at his feet (3. 4. 116).

2. IMPROVEMENT IN THE CONCEPTION OF ACTION AND CHARACTERS

²⁰⁰ *Macbeth*, edited by Kenneth Muir, The Arden Shakespeare (London: Methuen, 1987) 115.

Taking into account the fact that the action of a play is not the plot but the central motive or objective of the hero, in D'Avenant's *Macbeth* Shakespearean evil ambition is transformed into Restoration heroic ambition. In the same way Elizabethan values are substituted for neoclassic moral virtues and the new neoclassic conception of character.

i) TRANSFORMATION OF EVIL INTO AMBITION AND INTRODUCTION OF NEOCLASSIC VIRTUES

D'Avenant added five major passages, three new scenes of dialogue between the Macduffs, one of which involves the witches as well, a new scene between the Macbeths, and a passage between Lady Macduff and Lady Macbeth

The main reason for these additions, is that D'Avenant had altered the focus of *Macbeth* from evil to ambition and that the adapter was more interested in discussing his subject, and in showing the effect of ambition on the action of the play. Spencer mentions a passage added to V.ii in the Yale MS, but not in the printed versions of the play, in which Lennox comments on ambition, speaking to Malcolm and his army:²⁰¹

Ambition is a tree whose Roots are small,
Whose growth is high: whose shadow ever is
The blackness of the deed attending it,
Under which nothing prospers. All the fruit
It bears are doubts and troubles, with whose crowne
The over burdened tree at last falls downe.

The theme of the evil of ambition , with a young king returning among a chorus of praise to ascend his murdered father's throne , was no doubt complimentary to Charles II in the early 1660's. One notes that D'Avenant has Charles's ancestor Fleance return from France for the victory.

At some crucial moments we see grim Macbeth hesitating in the conventional manner between love and honour:

Yet why should Love since confin'd, desire
To control Ambition.

²⁰¹ Christopher Spencer, 16.

(D'Avenant: *Macbeth*, 4. 4. 14-15)

In a parallel way Lady Macbeth comes in also broken by remorse and heaping reproaches on her husband for having committed the initial crime. She thinks that Banquo's ghost is pursuing her and recognizes her errors:

Lady Macbeth. But the strange error of my Eyes
proceeds from the strange Action of his hands.
(D'Avenant: *Macbeth*, 4. 4. 37-38)

Lady Macbeth asks her husband to resign his "ill gain'd Crown" (4.4.46). When Macbeth accuses her of having blown his ambition she answered:

You were a man
And by the Charter of your Sex you shou'd
Have govern'd me.
(D'Avenant: *Macbeth*, 4. 4. 54-57)

The porter scene disappeared completely pehaps, because the mixture of tradedy and comedy was rejected. The murder of Lady Macduff and her children was not acted in front of the audience due to the fact that its brutal violence might shock the polite audience. Duncan's murder is softened. The scene of Banquo's murder does not appear on the stage. Even Lady Macbeth's wickedness, which is so important in the Elizabethan play, disappears in the end. The report of Macbeth's head being shown at the top of the castle is also supressed. Extreme violence also disappears from the imagery of the play. As illustration of it we shall watch the transformation of the following lines:

What hands are here? Ha! they pluck mine eyes
Will all great Neptune's ocean wash this blood
Clean from my hand? No, this my hand will rather
The multitudinous seas incardine,
Making the green one red .
(Shakespeare: *Macbeth*, 2. 2. 58-61)

The shakespearean imagery is substituted by what Joseph Donahue²⁰² called "the frigidly polite diction" of D'Avenant's version:

What hands are here! can the Sea afford
Water enough to wash away the stains?
No, they would sooner add a tincture to
The Sea, and turn the green into a red.

(D'Avenant: *Macbeth*, 2. 2. 59-62)

In the same way, the great principle of decorum clashed with several passages in D'Avenant's *Macbeth*. For example, "Empty my Nature of humanity and fill it up with cruelty" (1.5. 47-8), was used instead of the Shakespearean line "And fill me from the Crowne to the Toe, top-full of direst Cruelty". There are many other substitutions of words, such as "steel" and "sword" (1. 5. 57), (1. 7. 20) for "knife".

In D'Avenant version Macbeth receives his death wound and says simply: "Fairwell vain World, and what's most vain in it, Ambition". This recognition of error and implied regret, coupled with the visible punishment of Macbeth, apparently pleased the audience. The final speech of the play is given to Macduff, not to Malcolm and the final rhyming couple emphasizes the moral that vice has been punished and virtue reestablished:

His vice shall make your Virtue shine more Bright,
As a Fair Day succeeds a stormy Night.

There appear in D'Avenant's play many additions to the characters of Macduff and Lady Macduff, following the pattern of honour and developing their contrast with Macbeth and Lady Macbeth's lack of it. D'Avenant adds a new scene (1.5), where Lady Macduff lecture Lady Macbeth on honour. At the end of the play Malcolm wishes his Thanes and Kingsmen that the new honours given to them may still *flourish* on their families (5. 9. 27-8).

ii) MODIFICATION OF THE ELIZABETHAN CONCEPTION OF CHARACTER

²⁰² Joseph Donahue: "Macbeth in the eighteenth century", in *Theatre Quarterly*, Vol. I, No 3, (Jul-Sep. 1971) 20-24.

Following the new model of tragedy described by Dryden, D'Avenant develops the character of the Macduffs and transform them both into foils of the Macbeth. It is not permissible, Dryden declares, to set up a character as composed on mighty opposites.²⁰³

When a Poet has given the dignity of a King to one of his persons, in all his actions and speeches, that person must discover Majesty, Magnanimity, and jealousy of power; because these are suitable to the general manners of a King... When Virgil had once given the name of Pious to Aeneas, he was bound to show him such, in all his words and actions through the whole Poem... A character... is a composition of qualities which are not contrary to one another in the same person: thus the same man may be liberal and valiant, but not liberal and covetous

This principle lead D'Avenant to the personification of dominant characteristics and it comes pretty close to the humours theory of Ben Jonson. Once he surrendered to this principle, composition became largely a matter of antithesis. If one character stands for pride the other must represent humility. If Macbeth incarnates ambition Macduff must broadcast justice. Davenant saw the hero's Lady as a symbol of wicked ambition. Consequently he expanded the role of Lady Macduff and made her defend the opposing qualities. In his hands Lady Macduff became a most sanctified dame, and a much more important character than Shakespeare had made her.

Lady Macduff is transformed into a pious matron appearing for the first time in 1. 5, with several speeches preceding the reading of Macbeth's letter. Lady Macduff addresses to the wicked lady Macbeth, lecturing her on true human virtues:

The world mistakes the glories gain'd in war,
Thinking their Lustre true: alas, they are
But Comets, Vapours! by some men exhal'd
From others blood, and kindl'd in the Region
Of popular applause, in which they live
A-while; then vanish; and the very breath
Which first inflam'd them, blows them out again.
(D'Avenant: *Macbeth*, 1. 5. 22-28)

²⁰³ Dryden, Preface to *Troilus and Cressida*, ed. 1679, quoted by Hazelton Spencer in *Shakespeare Improved*, 158.

Lady Macduff gives several other lectures along the play. For example she lectures on the folly of believing these *Messengers of Darkness*, when in a new scene, added by D'Avenant, Macduff and Lady Macduff also watch the apparition of the witches (2. 5). In fact, in her character of good counselor, Lady Macbeth never lets an opportunity to slip:

If the Throne
was by Macbeth ill gain'd, Heaven Justice may,
Without your Sword, sufficient vengeance pay
Usurers lives have but a short extent.

(D'Avenant: *Macbeth*: 3. 2. 10-4)

The wish for antithesis leads D'Avenant to ridiculous extremes such as the need to invent a good prophecy for Macduff to be contrasted with that addressed to Macbeth and Banquo in Shakespeare:

1 *Witch*. Saving thy blood will cause it to be shed;
2 *Witch*. He'll bleed by thee, by whom thou first hast bled.
3 *Witch*. Thy wife shall shunning danger, dangers find,
And fatal be, to whom she most is kind.

(D'Avenant: *Macbeth*, 2. 5. 80-85)

3. IMPROVEMENT OF SHAKESPEARE THROUGH THE CLARIFICATION OF LANGUAGE

The opening of the D'Avenant's play begins to illustrate the desire to clarify language. Witch 1 asks 'Where's the place?', instead of the Shakespearean 'Where the place?'. Besides all of D'Avenant's witches say: 'To us fair weather's foul, and foul's fair!', in order to make the message as clear as possible. Much of the beauty and variety of Shakespeare's language is in his ability to suggest. The Augustans, however, wanted the plays to be explicit. D'Avenant made great efforts to achieve greater clearness in all the texts. For example his Macbeth soliloquizes in this way:

If it were well when done; then it were well
It were done quickly; if his death might be
Without the Death of nature in my self,
And killing my own rest; it wou'd suffice;

(D'Avenant: *Macbeth*, 1. 7. 1-4)

Shakespeare's soliloquy is cut from twenty eight lines to sixteen. D'Avenant tells us what his hero thought without the deep insight into Macbeth's state of mind provided by Shakespeare. In Act 3, 1, after Banquo has departed on his fatal ride, and the courtiers have been dismissed, Macbeth reveals his intentions unmistakably:

Macduff departed (privately) perhaps
 He is grown jealous; (I have sent for him
 To come to supper); he and Banquo must
 (meet) the same fate.

(D'Avenant: *Macbeth*, 3. 1. 37-41)

There are obvious alterations of the language with the intention of clarifying Shakespeare's text. Let us observe, how Shakespearean poetry is destroyed in the famous speech after Macbeth has heard of the death of his wife. We shall quote Shakespeare and D'Avenant's use of Shakespeare's text.

She should have died hereafter:
 There would have been a time for such a word--
 To-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow,
 Creeps in this petty pace from day to day,
 To the last syllable of recorded time;
 And all our yesterdays have lighted fools
 The way to dusty death.

(Shakespeare: *Macbeth*, 5. 5. 15-23)

D'Avenant is not interested in Shakespeare's suggestive poetry but in a clear manifestation of facts and ideas. The metaphorical language disappears completely from his translation:

She should have Di'd hereafter, I brought
 Her here, to see my Victimes, and not to Die.
 To morrow, and to Morrow, and to Morrow,
 Creeps in a stealing pace from Day to Day,
 To the last Minute of Recorded Time:
 And all uour Yesterdays have lighted Fools
 To their Eternal night;

(D'Avenant: *Macbeth*, 5. 5. 12-18)

A second example of the desire to clarify all the obscure points of Shakespeare's plot can be seen in the addition of many new scenes. Donalbain, the second of Duncan's sons disappears from Shakespeare's *Macbeth*. In D'Avenant Donalbain returns from Ireland and Fleance, Banquo's son, also returns from France to join Malcolm and the English Army against their battle against Macbeth. In scene 4 of act V we meet Malcolm, Seymour, Macduff and Lenox discussing the stratagy of the hewn

bough because for D'Avenant everything must be absolutely obvious. Finally Malcolm expresses his gratitude towards the English with these words:

How much we are
 Oblig'd to England, which like a kind Neighbour
 Lift's us up when we are Fall'n below
 Our own recovery.
 (D'Avenant: *Macbeth*, 5. 4. 2-9)

D'Avenant literalizes Shakespeare's figures of speech although the result is often annoying and ridiculous:

Approach the Chamber, and behold a sight
 Enough to turn spectators into a stone
 (D'Avenant: *Macbeth*, 3. 2. 85-6)

Shakespeare had written:
 Approach the Chamber, and destroy your sight
 With a new Gorgon
 (Shakespeare: *Macbeth*, 2. 3. 70-1)

To conclude our paper we shall observe that D'Avenant's adaptation of Shakespeare's *Macbeth* worked by removing *Macbeth* to the comparatively superficial level on which Restoration tragedy and characterization commonly operated. Simultaneously Shakespearean music and Elizabethan songs developed further to adopt the new fashion of the operatic ways. The hybrid result, although the poetry of his lines was destroyed, is relevant from the point of view of Shakespearean stage history and to understand the process and techniques of adaptation, and of rewriting of literary works.

THOMAS SHADWELL'S *The Libertine* (1675): A FORGOTTEN RESTORATION DON JUAN PLAY

Gustav Ungerer
University of Bern, Switzerland

While the London theatres remained closed during the Commonwealth, the companies of actors in Paris were vying with one another for the rights to stage their own French versions of Tirso de Molina's Don Juan play. The Paris audiences, to be precise, had been introduced to the legendary figure of Don Juan by the Italian actors. In 1658 the Italians performed, for the entertainment of the Parisians, *Il Convitato di pietra*, an adaptation made by Giacinto Andrea Cicognini from Tirso de Molina's *El Burlador de Sevilla y convidado de piedra*. There are a number of reasons why this Spanish play caught on with the Paris audiences in those days. One was the peace negotiations conducted between France and Spain, in 1659, and sumptuously celebrated, in 1660, by the marriage contract between Louis XIV and Maria Teresa, daughter of Philip IV. The Spanish Infanta brought along with her a company of Spanish actors which was to stay on in Paris until 1672. It is reasonable to assume that the Spanish actors seized the opportunity to capitalize on the interest of the court and town audiences awakened by the Italian and French adaptations of the *Burlador de Sevilla*.

In 1658, the actor Dorimond, inspired by the success of the Italian company, came out with a French version of his own, with *Le Festin de pierre ou le fils criminel*; the following year, Claude Deschamps, Sieur de Villiers, a member of a rival company, pieced together his own rifacimento, which he presented under the same title; and in 1665, Molière, still chafing at the strong disapproval of *Tartuffe*, hastened to bring out his *Dom Juan ou le festin de pierre*. Then in 1669, Claude La Rose, Sieur de Rosimond, put on *Le nouveau festin de pierre ou l'athée foudroyé*. It was Rosimond's rendering that caught Thomas Shadwell's attention, prompting him to write *The Libertine*. Save Molière's play, all the Don Juan adaptations just mentioned

have fallen into oblivion, Shadwell's included. It is the object of this paper to rehabilitate Shadwell as the author of an unjustly neglected and undervalued Restoration play based on the Don Juan legend.

Critical assessment of Shadwell's literary achievement has been controversial ever since, in 1668, Shadwell staged his first play, *The Sullen Lovers or the Impertinents*. In the preface to this comedy of humours, Shadwell initiated a professional debate over current modes of comedy, that is, over the comedy of manners, then championed by Dryden, and the comedy of humours, championed by Shadwell. An avowed disciple of the Jonsonian comedy of humours, young Shadwell took Dryden to task for having written, in his essay *Of Dramatic Poesy* (1668), that Ben Jonson's best plays lack wit. To make things worse, he was courting danger by ridiculing two of Dryden's brothers-in-law who happened to be dabbling with heroic drama, a genre he strongly disliked. Sir Positive, the omniscient braggart and purveyor of dramatic absurdities, in *The Sullen Lovers*, is a parody of Sir Robert Howard, one of the brothers-in-law, and the conceited poet Ninny a parody of Edward Howard, the other in-law. Shadwell and Dryden pursued their debate over the nature of comedy and the heroic play in the prefaces to their plays. The debate gradually escalated into a political quarrel, which reached its climax in 1682 with the publication of Dryden's *MacFlecknoe or A Satyr upon the True-Blew-Protestant Poet, T.S.* Dryden wrote this mordant lampoon in order to deal Shadwell a death-blow. The Satire celebrates Shadwell's mock coronation as the new poet laureate of boredom, the ceremony being conducted by Richard Flecknoe, the old laureate. Thus MacFlecknoe proclaims that

Sh- alone my perfect image bears,
Mature in dullness from his tender years.
Sh- alone, of all my Sons is he
Who stands confirmed in full stupidity.

These heroic couplets have come to represent for many students of Restoration literature the real Shadwell as well as the real Flecknoe. The damage done by this venomous invective to Shadwell's reputation has remained unparalleled in English literature.

Critical evaluation of Shadwell's dramatic output has not only been hampered by Dryden's animosity; it has also been impaired by moral objections which Victorian scholars and critics raised to Restoration drama

as a whole. Moreover, critical discussion of *The Libertine* has also been bedevilled by the generic issue. It is best defined as a satirical tragedy even if satire, as a rule, is held to be incompatible with tragedy. Shadwell himself called the play a tragedy and in the preface apologized for its "Irregularities" caused by "the Extravagance of the Subject". Allardice Nicoll, the distinguished historian of English drama, has chosen to call it a comedy; other critics, baffled by the "Irregularities", have preferred to ignore it.

The play was written, as Shadwell boasted, in something like three weeks and was produced in Dorset Garden in June 1675, possibly on the 15th, when the King was present. We have it on the authority of John Downes, the prompter and author of *Roscius Anglicanus* (1708), that "The Libertine, and Virtuoso ... were both very well acted, and got the Company great Reputation; the Libertine perform'd by Mr. Betterton crown'd the play". It remained a favourite in the repertoire until about the thirties of the 18th century. Thomas Betterton, the great actor and manager in the leading part of Don John, impressed the London audiences as the brutal leader of a trio of iconoclasts for whom all social, natural and religious laws are irrelevant. To believe Jacomo, the cowardly and self-pitying servant, Don John, together with his two disciples Don Lopez and Don Antonio, have committed "Some thirty Murders, Rapes innumerable, frequent Sacrilege, Parricide; in short, not one in all the Catalogue of Sins have scap'd" them. Don Lopez has killed his elder brother; Don Antonio has seduced and impregnated his own sisters; and Don John has killed Don Pedro, the Governor of Seville, and has also plotted the murder of his own father.

When the curtain rises, Don John's destructive life unfolds itself in a rapid series of fatal episodes. In a nocturnal scene, Don John murders Don Octavio, the lover of Maria. Then, using his victim's cloak as a disguise, he seduces Maria, the lady-in-waiting to his mistress Leonora, and slays Leonora's brother who has come to defend his sister's honour. Pursued by the vengeful Maria and her maid Flora, he first kills Flora and next Maria. On his flight from Seville, he kills the hospitable Don Francisco, whose two daughters Clara and Flavia he attempts to seduce and whose bridegrooms he wounds on the eve of their wedding. Next he poisons the faithful Leonora, who has come to help him escape. He beats off a group of shepherds and shepherdesses, rapes one of the shepherdesses, hies to the convent in which Clara and Flavia have taken shelter and tries to get hold of the two by setting the convent on fire. Finally he blasphemes Don Pedro's statue bid him

repent, he refuses. Not even the descent of his two companions into hell can move him. True to his ideal, without a hint of remorse, impervious to the thunderbolts from heaven, he sinks into hell, clouded by fire and accompanied by devils.

In the light of Restoration tragedy, the blood-curdling atrocities, perpetrated by Don John and his two henchmen, were quite common. Horror tragedy flourished in the mid-1670s; and to audiences, accustomed to seeing horror plays, the atrocities committed by Don John were quite in keeping with this mode. Shadwell's play must have reminded them of the uninhibited display of brutality, of overbearing lawlessness in such plays as Nathaniel Lee's *Nero* (1674) or Thomas Otway's *Alcibiades* (1675) or *Don Carlos* (1676).

The great success of *The Libertine* must also be accounted for by the fact that the play shares most of the conventions of the so-called Spanish cloak and sword plays, as they came into vogue in the first decade of the Restoration. The two London companies that came into being between 1660 and 1661 were short new plays. Therefore their managers were obliged either to stage old plays or to put on old plays accommodated to the new demands. Among the new drama that emerged within a few years, the type that prevailed was the Spanish cloak and sword play. The breakthrough was achieved in 1663 by Samuel Tuke's *The Adventures of Five Hours*. It is partly a translation, partly an adaptation, made at the instance of King Charles II, from Antonio Coello's *Los empeños de seis años*. Many more dramatists followed in the wake of Tuke such as Dryden with *The Rival Ladies* (1664) and *An Evening's Love or The Mock Astrologer* (1668). Shadwell's *The Libertine* conforms to most conventions of the Spanish cloak and sword plays, to wit: the Spanish setting and names, the mistaken identities and nocturnal rendezvous, the duels, the young woman disguised as a man and pursuing her faithless lover, the loquacious and cowardly servant participating reluctantly in his master's dangerous intrigues.

Despite the Spanish origin of the Don Juan legend and the popularity of the English variety of the cloak and sword plays, it would be misleading to consider *The Libertine* as the direct outcome of Anglo-Spanish literary relations. Spanish drama never exercised a formative influence on Shadwell. It is the French drama to which he owed a heavy debt. Molière's plays were his quarry, which he ransacked with consummate skill. Thus, he took the

plot of *The Sullen Lovers* from Molière's *Les Fâcheux* ; he tailored *Tartuffe* to meet the requirements of Restoration drama, dubbing his unpublished version *The Hypocrite* (1669); and in 1672, he transmogrified *L'Avare* into *The Miser*. We therefore feel free to speculate about the likelihood that if Molière's *Dom Juan* had been published in the 1660s, Shadwell would have fashioned *The Libertine* out of Molière's play. As things turned out, he laid his hands on Rosimond's *Le nouveau festin de pierre ou l'athée foudroyé*.

Rosimond, outstanding though he was as an actor who after Molière's death took over several of his roles, was a minor playwright. But his Don Juan version is the most provocative of the French adaptations. His protagonist is an unabashed libertine, an outspoken atheist, and an insensitive parricide. Tirso de Molina's Don Juan, let us emphasize the difference, is a young nobleman. He is arrogant, but dignified in his demeanour. He experiences the passage of time at a breath-taking speed. He does kill, but only in self-defence and in order to save his honour. He gives himself out to be as trickster addicted to playing pranks on women as well as on men. He is not an aesthetic seducer, a Casanova, who makes an art out of seduction. On the contrary, he is an impetuous madcap, deceiving his prey under the cover of darkness. "*Sevilla*," he boasts, "*a veces me llama el Burlador, y el mayor gusto que en mí puede haber, es burlar una mujer y dejarla sin honor.*" His identity as a trickster, as a scorner of social laws, as a manipulator of the world he lives in together with his love of disguise and need for freedom are characteristics he shares with the rake of the Restoration comedy.

The Don Juan figure, on its migration from Spain to Italy and thence to France, underwent a metamorphosis. The amorous games, played by the original wag, gradually degenerated into perverseness and brutality. Under the pen of Dorimond and Villiers, Don John became a savage rebel, enslaved to the dictates of his senses and deprived of all human dignity. Rosimond perfected the portrait of depravity by propping it up with libertinism. The following passage taken from Rosimond illustrates the attempt made by his Don Juan to cut a philosophical figure. It will be compared in due course with the equivalent passage in Shadwell's play. Dom Juan is expounding his philosophy to his servant Carrille (I. ii):

D. JUAN. Quoy! tousjours parler et sans vouloir m'entendre?
 Sans craindre mon courroux oses-tu me reprendre?
 Hé! que t'importe-t-il si je fais bien ou mal?

L'un ou l'autre pour toy n'est-il pas égal?
 Laisse-moy suivre en tout cette ardeur qui m'anime.
 J' obéis à mes sens, il est vray; mais quel crime?
 La nature m'en fait une nécessité,
 Et nostre corps n'agit que par sa volonté;
 C'est par les appétits qu'inspirent ses caprices,
 Qu'on court différemment aux vertus comme aux vices.
 Pour moy, qui de l'amour fais mes plus chers plaisirs,
 J'ose tout ce qui peut contenter mes désirs;
 Je n'examine point si j'ay droit de le faire:
 Tout est juste pour moy quand l'objet me peut plaire,
 Et ne prenant des lois que de ma passion,
 J'attache tous mes soins à la possession.

CARRILLE. Et sur le fondement de ces oires maximes,
 Vous n'avez point d'horreur de commettre des crimes?

D. JUAN. Apprens qu'il n'en est point pour un cœur généreux;
 La lascheté de l'homme en fait le nom affreux:
 Si tous les cœurs étoient et grands et magnanimes,
 Ces crimes qu'on nous peint ne seroient pas des crimes;
 Mais ce n'est qu'un effet d'un courage abattu,
 Dont la timidité veut passer pour vertu.
 Il n'est rien qu'un grand cœur ne se doive permettre,
 Et le crime est vertu pour qui l'ose commettre.

It would be wrong of us to conclude from this quotation that the French libertine as portrayed by Rosimond was quite new to Shadwell. He was not, and this for several reasons. Firstly, libertinism and its controversy about free will and unrestrained freedom of religious and moral conduct was a European phenomenon fostered, in France, by the rationalism of René Descartes and, in England, by the materialism of Thomas Hobbes. Secondly, the emergence of the libertine or rake was one of the most remarkable social and cultural phenomena of the Restoration. The English rake was bred in the hothouse of the Carolean court. The King himself set an example which was emulated by the Court Wits. Their prophet of libertinism was Hobbes whose theory of human nature appealed to them and seemed to free them from all inhibitions. Hobbes develops his theory by beginning with the senses. He considers them as basic to knowledge and as governing the will. The sense perceptions are the means whereby the brain receives the impressions, hence ideas and understanding. Upon these passions depend, and all the nature of

man is subject to them. From this theory the court rakes derived the one-sided view that the gratification of the senses was the only purpose of life.

The most outstanding among the aristocratic rakes to embrace Hobbism was John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester (1647-80). He was, in the words of the antiquary Anthony Wood, "*an absolute Hobbist.*" He plunged into the experiment of living the complete life of pleasure. The experiment ended in revulsion. Rochester openly denounced Hobbes's utilitarian ethics in his *Satyre against Mankind* (1679). This poem is a recantation of his former beliefs, a death-bed disavowal of Hobbes's mechanical universe. Rochester and some other upper-class pseudo Hobbists known to Shadwell must have inspired his venture of portraying a rake-hero who exceeded all bounds.

The rake as a stock-figure of the Restoration comedy of manners is now sorted into several categories. There is the polite rake, the debauched rake, the extravagant rake, the bisexual rake, the refined rake, the philosophical rake, and there is the Hobbesian rake or libertine. Whether debauched or philosophical, the stage rake invariably assumes the stance of an anti-matrimonialist, for love is the ultimate challenge to his pride and individualism. However, almost all of the rakes are reformable and almost all of them are forced by their self-assertive female partners to renounce their libertine beliefs, to give up the selfish pursuit of pleasure, and to accept the yoke of matrimony. The provision scenes of the comedy of manners provide a form of stylized agreement upon the pattern of a mutually satisfying marriage. Thus, Dorimant, in Etherege's *The Man of Mode* (1676), who was said to be modelled on the Earl of Rochester, is saved from degenerating into a wicked figure by his final submission to love. He is tamed by Harriet Woodvil.

In terms of Restoration drama, Shadwell's Don John must be defined as a Hobbesian stage rake, but unlike Dorimant he remains untamed and unreclaimed. He is a callous anti-matrimonialist who pits his entire being against all Christian ideas of love, law and order. What is quite unconventional about him is the fact that Shadwell has grafted a figure taken from the comedy of manners onto the framework of a tragedy. The shift in nature from comic to tragic hero can be justified in the light of English dramatic tradition. The native ancestor of the rake-hero is the Vice-Figure of the medieval and Tudor drama, who is both rogue and villain. Dohn John has

retained the double nature of the Vice-Figure. On the one hand, he is a persistent challenger and roguish adventurer, unswervingly shaping his course of life; on the other, he is a youthful villain or rather an artist of destruction, heading for disaster before having "*supped full with*" sinful pleasure.

The change of the comic into the tragic rake was obviously prompted by the French source at Shadwell's disposal. The atrocities committed by Dorimond's Dom Juan provided him with the vehicle for a satire on the Restoration stage libertine as well as on the excesses of popularized Hobbism. Shadwell's unconventional play is, as already mentioned, a satire cast in the form of a tragedy. The author pursued his experiment in generic crosscutting with Shakespeare's *Timon of Athens* (1677). He turned Shakespeare's tragedy into a satire with a view to laughing fashionable Hobbism to scorn.

The opening lines of Shadwell's play, which are inspired by the text of Rosimond just quoted, delineate the base assumptions of Don John's code. He and his boon companions Don Lopez and Don Antonio come together to discuss the crimes they have committed. They reaffirm their credo that conscience is merely cowardice. What others call sin, they call pleasure. Their arguments constitute one of the most elaborate statements of Hobbism on the Restoration stage:

*Enter Don John, Don Lopez, Don Antonio,
Jacomio, Don John's Valet.*

Don John. Thus far without a bound we have enjoy'd
Our prosp'rous pleasures, which dull Fools call Sins;
Laugh'd at old feeble Judges and weak Laws,
And at the fond fantastick thing, call'd Conscience,
Which serves for nothing but to make men Cowards;
An idle fear of future misery;
And is yet worse than all that we can fear.

D. Lop. Conscience made up of Dark and horried thoughts,
Rais'd from the fumes of a distemper'd Spleen.

D. Anto. A senseless fear would make us contradict
The only certain Guide, Infallible Nature;
And at the call of Melancholy Fools,
(Who stile all actions which they like not, Sins)

To silence all our Natural appetites.

D. John. Yet those conscientious Fools that would perswade us
To I know not what, which they call Piety,
Have in reserve private delicious Sins,
Great as the happy Libertine enjoys,
With which, in corners, wantonly they roul.

D. Lop. Don John, thou art our Oracle; thou hast
Dispell'd the Fumes which once clouded our Brains.

D. Anto. By thee, we have got loose from Education,
And the dull slavery of Pupillage,
Recover'd all the liberty of Nature,
Our own strong Reason now can go alone
Without the feeble props of splenatick Fools,
Who contradict our common Mother, Nature.

D. John. Nature gave us our Senses, which we please:
Nor does our Reason war against our Sense.
By Natures order, Sense should guide our Reason,
Since to the mind all objects Sense conveys.
But Fools for shaddows lose substantial pleasures,
For idle tales abandon true delight
And solid joys of day, for empty dreams at night.
Away, thou foolish thing, thou chollick of the mind,
Thou Worm by ill-digesting stomachs bred:
In spight of thee, we'll surfeit in delights,
And never think ought can be ill that's pleasant.

Jacom. A most excellent sermon, and no doubt, Gentlemen, you
have edifi't much by it.

D. John. Away! thou formal phlegmatick Coxcomb, thou
Hast neither courage nor yet wit enough
To sin thus. Thou art my dull conscientious Pimp.
And when I am wanton with my Whore within,
Thou, with thy Beads and Pray'r-Book keep'st the door.

Jacom. Sir, I find your Worship is no more afraid to be damn'd
than other fashionable Gentlemen of the Age: but, me-thinks,
Halters and Axes should terrifie you. With reverence to your
Worships, I've seen civiller men hand'g, and men of as pretty

parts too. There's scarce a City in *Spain* but is too hot for you, you have committed such outrages wheresoe'r you come.

Most of Don John's victims are marriageable women. Unlike the witty heroines of the Restoration comedy of manners who triumph over their freedom-loving rakes, they are no match for him. They are deceived and defeated just as are Clara and Flavia, the two daughters of Don Francisco, who rebel against their enforced marriage. In a desperate last-minute effort to escape parental authority, they decide to embark on a marriage of their own choice. Ironically or rather tragically, they set their sights upon Don John, the least likely of the rakes to succumb to wedlock. On the eve of their arranged marriages, each of them, without the knowledge of the other, gives in to Don John's advances and empty promises. The revolt against their impending marriages is worth quoting from act III:

Clar. Oh, *Flavia*, this will be our last happy night, to morrow is our Execution day; we must marry.

Flav. Ay, *Clara*, we are concern'd without reprieve. 'Tis better to live as we have done, kept from all men, than for each to be confin'd to one, whom yet we never saw and a thousand to one shall never like.

Clar. Out on't, a *Spanish* Wife has a worse life than a coop'd Chicken.

Flav. None live pleasantly here, but those who should be miserables: Strumpets. They can choose their Mates, but we must be like Slaves condemn'd to the Gallies; we have not liberty to sell our Selves, or venture one throw for our freedom.

Clar. O that we were in *England!* there, they say a Lady may chuse a Footman and run away with him, if she likes him, and no dishonour to the Family.

Flav. That's because the Families are so very Honourable that nothing can touch them: their Wives run and ramble whither and with whom they please and defie all censure.

Clar. Ay, and a jealous Husband is a more monstrous Creature there than a Wittal here, and wou'd be more pointed at: They

say, if a Man be jealous there, the Women will all joyn and pull him to pieces.

Flav. Oh happy Countrey! we ne'r touch Money, there the Wives can spend their Husband's Estate for 'em. Oh Bless'd Countrey!

Clar. Ay, there they say the Husbands are the prettiest civil easie good natur'd indifferent persons in the whole world; they ne'r mind what their Wives do, not they.

Flav. Nay, they say they love those men best that are kindest to their Wives. Good men! poor hearts. And here, if an honest Gentleman offers a Wife a civility by the By, our bloody butcherly Husbands are cutting of Thoats presently _____

Clar. Oh that we had these frank civil *Englishmen*, instead of our grave dull surly *Spanish* Blockheads, whose greatest Honour lies in preserving their Beards and Foreheads inviolable.

Flav. In *England*, if a Husband and Wife like not one another, they draw two several ways, and make no bones on't; while the Husband treats his Mistriss openly in his Glass-Coach, the Wife, for Decency's sake, puts on her Vizar and whips away in a Hackney with a Gallant, and no harm done.

Clar. Though of late 'tis as unfashionable for a Husband to love his Wife there, as 'tis here, yet 'tis fashionable for her to love some body else, and that's something.

Flav. Nay, they say, Gentlemen will keep company with a Cuckold there, as soon as another man, and ne'r wonder at him.

Clar. Oh happy Countrey! there a Woman may chuse for her self, and none will into the Trap of Matrimony unless she likes the Bait; but here we are tumbled headlong and blindfold into it.

Clara and Flavia, as you will have noticed, argue about marriage in terms of English stage brides who rebel against the English custom of enforced marriage. It was, indeed, customary for most Englishwomen to be overruled by parental and family interests. Those women who rebelled against the inequality of the sexes were either the female partners of the

stage rakes or, as Flavia intimates to Clara, the prostitutes. The first propagated marriage no longer as a sanctified union but as a social institution liable to redefinition by the individual. This view of marriage was grounded on The Civil Marriage Act of 1653, which, for the first time in English social history, transferred the jurisdiction over marriage from the ecclesiastical to the secular authorities. The second, together with the female brokers such as Mary Frith, alias Moll Cutpurse, and the notorious bawds such as Elizabeth Holland and Damrose Page, were among the few women to achieve economic independence and to enjoy some social power.

Clara, moreover, gives vent to her despair in a protest song in which she claims rights (3.4):

Woman who is by Nature wild,
Dull bearded men incloses;
Of Nature's freedom we're beguil'd
By laws which man imposes:
Who still himself continues free,
Yet we poor Slaves must fetter'd be.

Chor. A shame on the Curse.
Of, For better for worse;
'Tis a vile imposition on Nature:
For Women should shange
And have freedom to range
Like to every other wild Creature.

So gay a thing was n'er design'd
To be restrain'd from roving.
Heav'n meant so changeable a mind
Should have its change in loving.
By cunning we could make men smart,
But they strength o'ecome our Art.

Chor. A shame on the Curse
Of, For, & c.

How happy is the Village Maid
Whom onely Love can fetter;
By foolish Honour ne'r betra'd,
She serves a Pow'r much greater:
That lawful Prince the wisest rules,

Th' Usurper's Honour rules but Fools.

Chor. A shame on the Curse,
Of, For, & c.

Let us resume our antient right,
Make man at distance wonder;
Though he victorious be in fight,
In love we'll keep him under.
War and Ambition hence be hurl'd,
Let Love and Beauty rule the World.

Chor. A shame on the Curse
Of, For better, & c.

There is no denying that Shadwell's verse comes off badly when compared to the poetry of his contemporaries. But the lyrics of his plays, particularly those of *The Libertine*, deserve special attention. The incidental music of the songs was composed by William Turner (1651-1740), and the music for a special performance in 1692 was composed by Henry Purcell. Let me add on behalf of the melomaniacs among you that in 1817 Henry Rowley Bishop arranged the music of Mozart's *Don Giovanni* for his two-act opera *Don John or The Libertine*. The libretto by Isaac Pocock, a dramatist and painter, is based on Shadwell's play.

The lyrics of *The Libertine* are not additions or concessions made simply to satisfy the contemporary craze for operatic entertainment, which had been initiated by Sir William Davenant. Shadwell had pandered to this new vogue in writing an operatic version of Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (1674) and in appropriating the French ballet *Psyché* in 1675 from Molière, Corneille and Quinault. His Don Juan lyrics are an integral part of the play, serving to emphasize the implications of the action and theme. In act I, Shadwell has devised what may be called a song competition between Don John and Don Actavio. Its dramatic aim is to bring out the characters of the two suitors and their different attitudes towards sexuality. Don John, as already mentioned, has made up his mind to conquer Maria, the lady-in-waiting to his mistress Leonora, because Don Octavio is in love with her and "*besides, she is another Woman.*" A group of fiddlers, playing under her window, assist the nocturnal serenader in winning Maria with a song which acknowledges the reality of sexual lust:

Gustav Ungerer

Thou joy of all hearts and delight of all eyes,
 Nature's chief Treasure and Beauty's chief Prize,
 Look down, you'l discover
 Here's a faithful young vigorous Lover
 With a Heart full as true
 As e'r languish'd for you;
 Here's a faithful young vigorous Lover.
 The Heart that was once a Monarch in's Breast,
 Is now your poor Captive and can have no rest;
 'Twill never give over,
 But about your sweet bosom will hover.
 Dear Miss, let it in,
 By Heav'n 'tis no sin;
 Here's a faithful young vigorous vigorous Lover.

No sooner has the song cast a spell over Maria and deceived her into believing that Don John is her suitor Don Octavio than Don Octavio himself unexpectedly turns up, accompanied by another group of street fiddlers. Don John, not recognizing him in the dark, takes him for "*Some Serenading Coxcomb*" who is going to sing "*some damn'd Song or other, a Cloris, or a Phillis at least.*" The song Don Octavio sings is not a pastoral; it is rather a parody of the Platonic love lyric. It conforms to the artificial précieux love convention as it had been practised at the court of Queen Henrietta Maria and as it lingered on in the Restoration heroic drama. It is composed in the style that provoked Shadwell to write *The Sullen Lovers* and to deride Sir Positive and the poet Ninny as writers of heroic poems and plays:

When you dispense your Influence,
 Your dazling Beams are quick and clear,
 You so surprize and wound the Sense,
 So bright a Miracle y'appear.
 Admiring Mortals you astonish so,
 No other Deity they know,
 But think that all Divinity's below _____
 One charming Look from your illustrious Face
 Were able to subdue Mankind,
 So sweet, so powerful a Grace
 Makes all men Lovers but the blind:
 Nor can they freedom by resistance gain,
 For each embraces the soft Chain
 And never struggles with the pleasant pain.

If we analyze Don Octavio's song from the eavesdropper's point of view, that is from Don John's, his praise of Maria as a goddess is just balderdash, a jumble of unintelligible words. It smacks of the stale rhetoric of a lover wallowing in the sweet pleasures of the wound inflicted by the deified woman. It sounds artificial to a stage Hobbist who refuses to believe in miracles and who holds that if the senses are wounded, no perception, hence no understanding, hence no passion are possible. Don Octavio's song epitomizes for Don John the false spiritualization of the female human animal and the false sublimation of the male sexual drive. Don John's lyric, on the other hand, puts the animal vitality into the male-female relationship, precluding any form of pastoral escapism or of male submission to female tyranny. The winner of this fortuitous song competition is Don John. He kills Don Octavio under Maria's window and, wearing the cloak of his dead rival, is admitted into Maria's house, while his companions beat off the watch in a second nocturnal street fight.

A female invasion in act II prompts Don John to save his skin with a nuptial song. A "*whole Batallion of couragious Women*", to believe Jacomo, have seized Don John's mansion and claim to be married to the owner of the house. The rake, experienced in parrying female skirmishes, survives the assault in playing the six women off against each other. He makes each of them believe that he is hers. The blundering Jacomo spoils the game when offering them the opportunity of exclaiming all' unisono that Don John is their husband. Now Don John, caught in his own net, resorts to confessing that he is actually married to each of them and has "*above four-score more.*" The moment he is about to lose control of the situation, his musicians strike up his Epithalamium. His nuptial song is a profession of insatiable lust, a declaration of male superiority:

Since Liberty, Nature for all has design'd,
A pox on the Fool who to one is confin'd.
 All Creatures besides,
When they please, change their Brides.
 All Females they get when they can,
 Whilst they nothing but Nature obey,
 How happy, how happy are they?
 But the silly fond Animal, Man,
Makes Laws 'gainst himself, which his Appetites sway;
 Poor Fools, how unhappy are they?
Chor. Since Liberty, Nature for all has design'd,
 A pox on the Fool who to one is confin'd.

Gustav Ungerer

At the first going down, a Woman is good,
 But when e'er she comes up, I'll ne'r chew the Cud,
 But out she shall go.
 And I'll serve 'em all so.
 When with One my Stomack is cloy'd,
 Another shall soon be enjoy'd.
 Then how happy, how happy are we?
 Let the Coxcomb, when weary, drudge on,
 And foolishly stay when he wou'd fain be gone.
 Poor Fool! How unhappy is he?
Chor. At the first going down, & c.

Let the Rabble obey, I'll live like a Man
 Who, by Nature, is free to enjoy all he can:
 Wise nature does Teach
 More truth than Fools Preach;
 They bind us, but she gives us ease.
 I'll revel and love where I please.
 She, she's my infallible Guide.
 But were the Bless'd freedom deni'd
 Of variety in the things we love best,
 Dull Man were the slavishest Beast.
Chor. Let the Rabble obey, & c.

There is no need for Don John to identify the gulled wives. As victims the six are a negligible quantity. Yet each of them is crushed by the impact of the nuptial song and becomes a martyr to the illusion of faithfulness which Don John has created in her. And to crown it all, he leaves his duped wives to the mercy of his wanton companions. The fourth wife prefers committing suicide to being raped by Don Lopez. What began as a prank, played on the women in much the same spirit as the Burlador de Sevilla, has taken a tragic turn. The humiliation and suffering of the women is revenged in act V when Don John, true to his iconoclasm, descends into hell, to the sound of the Devil's Song, in the presence of the statue of the Governor of Seville and of the ghost of his father, of Leonora, Maria, Flora, Maria's brother, Don Francisco and other victims. He dies unrepentant whereas the Burlador de Sevilla repents.

Shadwell's play *The Libertine* is a striking "*collage*" made out of the Don Juan legend, the comedy of humours, the horror tragedy, and the Spanish cloak and sword plays. What lends coherence to the heterogeneous

material is the satiric portrait of Don John as a Hobbesian rake in anarchic pursuit of pleasure. Compared to Etherege's solution presented a year later in *The Man of Mode*, Shadwell's satire is less satisfactory. Etherege's Dorimant and Harriet create a life-style in which the passions are adjusted to the demands of the conjugal partnership. Their libertinism is not synonymous with the gratification of the senses and the satisfaction of carnal appetite. However, despite the "*Irregularities*" of Shadwell's satirical tragedy, the Restoration theatregoers were fascinated by the dramatic potential of the individual scenes and by the dynamic figure of Don John as acted by Thomas Betterton.

BOOKS CONSULTED

- Alleman, Gellert Spencer. *Matrimonial Law and the Materials of Restoration Comedy*. Philadelphia, 1942.
- Alssid, Michael W. *Thomas Shadwell*. New York: Twayne, 1967
- Borgman, A.S. *Thomas Shadwell: His Life and Comedies*. New York: New York University Press, 1928.
- Cecil, C.D. "Libertine and Précieux Elements in Restoration Comedy", *ESSAYS IN CRITICISM*, 9 (1959) 239-53.
- Dryden, John, *Poems: 1681-1684*. Ed. H.T. Swedenberg et al. in *The Works*, ii. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.
- Etherege, George. *The Man of Mode*. (Ed.) John Barnard in the New Mermaid series. London: Benn, 1979.
- Gendarme de Bevoite, Georges. *La légende de Don Juan: son évolution dans la littérature des origines au romantisme*. Paris: Hachette, 1906.
- Gagen, Jean Elizabeth. *The New Woman: Her Emergence in English Drama, 1660 to 1730*. New York: Twayne, 1954.
- Gnüg, Hiltrud. *Don Juans theatralische Existenz. Typ and Gattung*. München: Fink, 1974.
- Hume, Robert D. *The Development of English Drama in the Late 17th Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
- (1977): "The Myth of the Rake in Restoration Comedy", *STUDIES IN LITERARY IMAGINATION*, 10.
- (1983): *The Rakish Stage: Studies in English Drama, 1660-1800*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- La Rose, Claude, Sieur de Rosimond. *Le nouveau festin de pierre ou l'athée foudroyé*, ed. Victor Fournel in *Les contemporains de Molière*. Vol. iii. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1875.
- Link, Frederick M. *English Drama 1660-1800. A Guide to Information Sources*. Detroit: Gale Research Comp, 1976. 284-287.

- Loptis, John. *The Spanish Plays of Neoclassical England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, (1973).
- McDonald, Margaret Lamb. *The Independent Woman in the Restoration Comedy of Manners*. Salzburg, 1976.
- Mandel, Oscar (Ed.), *The Theatre of Don Juan: A Collection of Plays and Views, 1630-1953*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963.
- Molière. *Dom Juan*, in *Oeuvres Complètes*. Ed. Maurice Rat. Paris: Pléiade, 1951.
- Nicoll, Allardyce. *History of English Drama 1660-1900. I: A History of Restoration Drama. 1660-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952.
- Rochester, John Wilmot. *The Complete Poems*. Ed. David M. Vieth. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968.
- Shadwell, Thomas. *Works*. Ed. Montague Summers, 5 vols. London: Fortune Press, 1927.
- (1987): *The Libertine*. Ed. Helen Pellegrin. New York: Garland.
- Sola Pinto, Vivian de. "John Wilmot Earl of Rochester", Ed. B. Ford in *The New Pelican Guide to English Literature*. 3. Harmondsworth, 1982. 343-355.
- Stroup, Thomas B. "Shadwell's Use of Hobbes", *STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY*, 35. (1938) 405-32.
- Tirso de Molina. *El burlador de Sevilla y convidado de piedra*, in *Obras Dramáticas Completas*. Ed. Blanca de los Rios. Madrid: Aguilar, 1962.
- Underwood, D. *Etherege and the 17th-Century Comedy of Manners*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.
- Vernon, P.F. "Marriage of Convenience of the Moral Code of Restoration Comedy," *ESSAYS IN CRITICISM*, 12 (1962) 370-87.
- Weinstein, Leo. *The Metamorphoses of Don Juan*. Stanford, 1959 (rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1967).
- Weber, Harold M. *The Restoration Rake-Hero: Transformations in Sexual Understanding in 17th-Century England*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1986.
- Zimbaro, Rose A. *A Mirror to Nature: Transformations in Drama and Aesthetics, 1660-1732*. Lexington: Kentucky University Press, 1986.

