

Sederi is the yearbook of the Spanish and Portuguese Society for English Renaissance Studies. It is a double-blind peer-reviewed annual publication devoted to current criticism and scholarship on English literature, language, and history of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Contents include original articles, notes, and book reviews selected by an international editorial board of distinguished scholars in the field.

Editors

Berta Cano Echevarría & Ana Sáez Hidalgo (University of Valladolid, Spain)

Editor for reviews

Francisco José Borge López (University of Oviedo, Spain)

Editorial Board

Clara Calvo López (U. Murcia, Spain)

Mark Hutchings (U. Reading, UK)

Tamara Pérez Fernández (U. Valladolid, Spain)

Jorge Figueroa Dorrego (U. Vigo, Spain)

Michael P. O'Brien (U. Kansas, US)

Juan A. Prieto Pablos (U. Sevilla, Spain)

Advisory Board

Rui Carvalho Homem (U. Porto, Portugal)

Pilar Cuder Domínguez (U. Huelva, Spain)

Michael Dobson (U. London, UK)

John Drakakis (U. Stirling, UK)

Teresa Fanego (U. Santiago de Compostela, Spain)

Manuel Gómez Lara (U. Sevilla, Spain)

Dolores González Álvarez (U. Vigo, Spain)

Santiago González Fernández-Corugedo (U. Oviedo, Spain)

Derek Hughes (U. Aberdeen, UK)

Jesús López-Peláez Casellas (U. Jaén, Spain)

Salomé Machado (U. Lisboa, Portugal)

Andrew Monnickendam (U. Autònoma Barcelona, Spain)

Javier Pérez Guerra (U. Vigo, Spain)

Rafael Portillo (U. Sevilla, Spain)

Tiffany Stern (U. Oxford, UK)

Keith Whitlock (Open U., UK)

Laura Wright (U. Cambridge, UK)

SEDERI is currently indexed in: *ABELL*, *Dialnet*, *FECYT-RECYT*, *DICE* (*CSIC-CINDOC-aneca*), *Latindex*, *MLAIB* and *Ulrich's Periodicals Directory*.

SEDERI. SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE SOCIETY FOR ENGLISH RENAISSANCE STUDIES

The aim of *SEDERI* is to promote, stimulate and give impulse to the study and research of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English language, literature, and history and their relationship with their Spanish and Portuguese counterparts.

Board

President: Juan Antonio Prieto Pablos (U. Sevilla); Secretary-Treasurer: Jesús Tronch Pérez (U. Valencia); Board members: Rui Carvalho Homem (U. Porto), Rafael Vélez Núñez (U. Cádiz); Publications: Berta Cano Echevarría (U. Valladolid). Honorary President: Francisco Javier Sánchez Escribano (U. Zaragoza)

www.sederi.org

© *SEDERI*, 2009

University of Valladolid · Facultad de Filosofía y Letras ·

Pza. del Campus s/n · E-47011 Valladolid (Spain)

ISSN: 1135-7789

Depósito Legal: J-687-2004

Imprime: Ambrosio Rodríguez S.L.



Special thanks are due to H. Adlington, B. Green, A. Bebian, R. Bromber, D. González Álvarez, M. Calbi, P. Cuder Domínguez, J. Díaz Vera, J. Drakakis, L. Filardo Llamas, M. Gómez Lara, S. González Fernández-Corugedo, K. Gregor, D. Hughes, J. Jowett, P. Kewes, D. Lanier, J. López-Peláez Casellas, Z. Luis Martínez, G. McMullan, A. Monnickendam, M. J. Mora Sena, J. Pearson, J. Pérez Guerra, R. Portillo García, G. Redworth, F.J. Sánchez Escribano, G. Shorrocks for their collaboration with *SEDERI*.

We are also grateful to Prof. José Antonio Álvarez Amorós for his expertise in font design.

Table of contents

Articles

| | |
|---|-----|
| Pamphlet literature against the Anglo-Spanish Match: Thomas Scott's <i>Vox Populi</i> (1620) Leticia Álvarez Recio | 5 |
| Representing Native American women in early colonial American writings: Álar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca, Juan Ortiz and John Smith M ^a Carmen Gomez Galisteo | 23 |
| Dividuated selves: on Renaissance criticism, critical finitude and the experience of ethical subjectivity John J. Joughin | 45 |
| Pericles' "unknown travels": the dimensions of geography in Shakespeare's <i>Pericles</i> Lorena Laureano Domínguez | 71 |
| "Mine ear is much enamour'd of thy note:" Shakespeare's intercultural dream in the Indian subcontinent Sofía Muñoz Valdivieso | 99 |
| Early stage history of Jules Romains' <i>Volpone</i> Purificación Ribes Traver | 121 |
| Looking for regional words in late seventeenth-century England: Bishop White Kennett and his ignored glossary to <i>Parochial Antiquities</i> (1695) Javier Ruano García | 151 |

Notes

| | |
|--|-----|
| Ariadne's adaptation of Alexander Oldys's <i>The Fair Extravagant</i> in <i>She Ventures and He Wins</i> Jorge Figueroa Dorrego | 177 |
| Henry Constable's sonnets to Arbella Stuart M ^a Jesús Pérez Jáuregui | 189 |

Reviews

| | |
|---|-----|
| <i>Tres tragedias de venganza: teatro renacentista inglés</i> 2006. Ed., intr. & transl. José Ramón Díaz Fernández. Madrid: Gredos (by Juan Antonio Prieto Pablos) | 205 |
| Ángel-Luis Pujante and Laura Campillo eds. 2007. <i>Shakespeare en España: Textos 1764-1916</i> . Murcia: Universidad de Murcia; Granada: Universidad de Granada (by Jesús Tronch Pérez) | 211 |

Opposing the Spanish Match: Thomas Scott's *Vox Populi* (1620)

Leticia Álvarez Recio
University of Sevilla

ABSTRACT

The beginning of negotiations in 1614 for a dynastic marriage between Prince Charles and the Infanta Maria of Spain caused great concern among English people who still held strong anti-Catholic and anti-Spanish prejudices. King James's decision in 1618 to use the marriage negotiations in order to mediate in the confessional conflict in Europe added to this concern. England was then politically divided between those willing to help James's son-in-law, Frederick, who had accepted the Bohemian crown following the rebellion of the Protestant estates against the Habsburg King Ferdinand, and those who supported the Stuart monarch's decision to keep England safe from continental struggles.

Despite the censorship of the state, a group of writers began a campaign against the Spanish Match which had a great influence on public opinion. Among the most prominent of these was Thomas Scott, whose first work, *Vox Populi* (1620), became one of the most controversial political tracts of the period. This article analyses Scott's pamphlet and considers how he also made use of the discourse against Catholicism and Spain to introduce further commentaries on the monarchical system and the citizens' right to participate in government.

KEYWORDS: Spanish Match, anti-Catholicism, anti-Spanish discourse, pamphlet literature, civic government.

1. Introduction

The Spanish Match became an important focus of study for a number of scholars in the late 1970s and 1980s, when the role the marriage negotiations played in James I's foreign and religious

policy began to receive attention (Albert L. Loomie, Johann P. Sommerville, Peter Lake and Richard Cust, among others). However, many of these studies centred on James's problems with the English Parliament and the religious controversy the Match generated, often depicting both powers, Catholic Spain and Protestant England, as mutually exclusive opposites. This view has been challenged in the last few years by historians such as Glyn Redworth, Fernando B. Benito, Alexander Samson and Robert Cross, who have reconsidered the reasons for the failure of the negotiations and, especially in Redworth's case, explored the cultural, political, intellectual and commercial elements that influenced the final outcome of the Match project.

The series of pamphlets written by the Puritan divine Thomas Scott against the Spanish Match in the early 1620s have been frequently examined since the 1980s, but, while early scholarship on the subject emphasized Scott's religious commitment as the main reason for his propaganda campaign against the Match (Cust 1986; Heinemann 1982: 151-172; Lake 1982), more recent studies have underlined other aspects which had passed unnoticed before, such as Scott's humanist ideas regarding civic government (Colclough 2005: 102-119; Peltonen 1995: 229-270). However, in both cases, these pamphlets have been considered as a group and, as far as I know, an analysis of each tract in itself has never been made.

The present article departs from this general tendency and focuses on Scott's *Vox Populi* as a single piece independent of the author's other writings –although some references are made to other texts by Scott and other writers who participated in the discursive network which aimed to promote a change in royal policy. There are several reasons for this. On the one hand, *Vox Populi* was the first step in the propaganda campaign the author developed against the marriage project; its popularity and wide reception among different social and political groups in England justify the need for a closer analysis of the work and the strategies employed by the pamphleteer to appeal to such a diverse audience. On the other, the fact that the pamphlet seemed to represent a threat to James I has been identified as one of the reasons why the monarch increased the censorship on works discussing his views on religion and politics. Moreover, it introduces some implicit references to the subjects' duty to the

commonwealth, demonstrating the author's classical humanist view on government, which has not yet been fully explored.

A brief summary of the historical and political background, as well as a brief account of pamphlet and news production in late Jacobean England, has been included in section II in order to place Scott's work in context. Section III considers some aspects of the writer's life and career and focuses on the controversy generated by the printing of *Vox Populi*. It also includes a textual analysis of the pamphlet essential to understanding its controversial nature.

2. The Spanish Match and the Palatinate crisis: The news boom and pamphlet literature in late Jacobean England

James's foreign policy was heavily influenced by the increasing territorial, political and religious divisions in Europe in the early decades of the seventeenth century. Far from pursuing a warlike policy which would involve England in these conflicts, James tried to keep a balance and protect the nation from continental struggle. Thus, in 1613 he entered a defensive alliance with the Evangelical Union and married his daughter Elizabeth to Frederick V, Elector Palatine and leader of the German Protestants (Adams 1983: 94-95).

In addition, the English monarch tried to maintain peaceful relations with Spain and welcomed Don Diego de Sarmiento y Acuña, Count of Gondomar, as the new Spanish ambassador in London. During his first embassy (1612-1618), Gondomar tried to dissuade James from any intervention in Europe and, to a lesser degree, assist the English Catholic community. In 1614, after James's dissolution of the so called "Addled Parliament", in which its members refused to grant the monarch any further subsidy, Gondomar proposed a Spanish Match as a means of solving the English king's economic problems. These measures did not contribute to the Spanish diplomat's popularity and he soon became the focus of the physical and verbal attacks from many English Protestants, especially during his second embassy, from 1620 to 1622 (Benito 2005: 75-77; Loomie 1973: vol. II, xvii-xix, 33, 106-110; Redworth 2003: 14-15; Tobíos 1987: 105-137, 184-240).

Such tensions had increased in 1618 when the Bohemian crisis began. James's son-in-law had accepted the crown that the

Bohemians had offered to him after rebelling against the Habsburg King Ferdinand. Soon afterwards, the Catholic League, led by Spain, occupied Frederick's lands in Bohemia and the Palatinate. Frederick and Elizabeth were exiled and thus became the perfect victimized heroes in the minds of many English Protestants, who considered that James should support the Palatine cause and abandon his diplomatic relations with the Spanish power.

The growing English public interest in the Palatinate crisis gave rise to an unprecedented news boom. Printed news and pamphlets became the main source of information about continental affairs, as they could reach a large and heterogeneous range of readers thanks to their small format and low prices (Halasz 1997: 11). However, despite the fact that printing presses specialized in publishing works on international matters, the number of printed copies they could produce was not high and many readers –mainly those not directly involved in politics or belonging to lower social groups– were sometimes unable to buy the texts. In such cases, oral transmission helped spread the contents of these writings. In fact, it was common to find groups of people hearing and debating the latest news around St. Paul's, while reading aloud also became a frequent and useful means of disseminating information (Baron 2001: 50-51; Cogswell 1989: 22-25). According to Joad Raymond, pamphlets then became "part of the everyday practice of politics, the primary means of creating public opinion" (26).

Clearly, King James was anxious about this popular debate on his foreign policy and considered this exchange of news and reading practices a direct offence against his prerogative and a threat to his diplomatic relations with Spain. This explains the repressive campaign against works which discussed religion and politics. Thus, "A Proclamation against Excesse of Lauish and Licentious Speech of Matters of State", issued on 24 December 1620, promised to punish not only those who "did intermeddle by pen or speech with causes of state, and secrets of government, either at home or abroad" but also those who gave "attention, or any manner of applause, or entertainment to such discourse, without acquainting some of Our Privie Counsell, or other principall officers therewithal, respective to the place where such speeches should be used" (Larkin and Hughes 1973: 519-521). However, the English sovereign's attempts to silence these critical voices were not completely successful, as books could

still be published illegally with no licence or without being registered, and many controversial printed works on current political affairs were often copied down by professional scribes hired by booksellers –since scribal texts were not affected by the restrictions on printing (Clegg 2001: 60, 185-187). In short, James's efforts to rule English public opinion were unsuccessful.

3. Thomas Scott's *Vox Populi*: printing, reception and textual analysis

Little is known about Thomas Scott's life before the 1620s. In 1616 he was listed as one of James I's chaplains, and he had important connections at court, especially after offering his services to William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke and leader of the anti-Spanish faction.¹ In 1620 he enrolled at St. Andrews University after obtaining a degree in Divinity from the University of Cambridge; later that year he would work as rector of St. Saviour's in Norwich (Kelsey 2004; Wright 1943: 150-154).

Scott wrote over twenty-five tracts from 1620 to 1625, thus becoming one of the most prolific pamphleteers of the time. He portrayed himself as a spokesman of English Protestantism and tended to moderate or even silence his Presbyterian sympathies in order to promote a united front against the Catholic enemy (Lake 1982: 808). Scott reproduced anti-Catholic and anti-Spanish prejudices common in England since the mid-sixteenth century and in general tried to encourage action against Spain.²

His first and possibly most controversial work was *Vox Populi, or Newes from Spayne*, first published in London around mid-November

¹ According to Thomas Cogswell, this faction was formed by a loose coalition of "patriots", led by Southampton, Pembroke and George Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury, set on a war on behalf of the Palatine exiles, Elizabeth and Frederick of Bohemia (1). They were highly critical of James's policy in the Netherlands and the Palatinate and fiercely opposed the Spanish Match.

² Anti-Spanish prejudices had been commonplace in anti-Catholic discourse from Mary Tudor's reign. However, it was in the 1580s, when the threat of a Spanish invasion was evident, that both discourses were combined. In the Jacobean period, detractors of the Spanish Match would constantly appeal to the link between them, while supporters of James's foreign policy tried to expose their artificial nature and to disassociate one from the other.

1620. The pamphlet, printed anonymously, caused considerable anxiety, mainly to King James, who believed it could seriously damage his diplomatic relations with Spain, as Simonds D'Ewes described in his diary: "[...] the king himself, hoping to get the Prince Elector, his son-in-law, to be restored to the Palatinate by an amicable treaty, was much incensed at the sight of it [*Vox Populi*], as being published at an unseasonable time, though otherwise it seemed to proceed from an honest English heart" (Halliwell 1845: 158-160). Indeed, Cyndia Clegg has suggested that the "Proclamation against Licentious Speech in Matters of State" issued in December 1620 might have been partly provoked by James's embarrassment at the publication of Scott's text (186). On the arrest of Scott's printer, the tract's authorship became known, but the pamphleteer was able to escape to the Low Countries, where he stayed until the controversy over the book subsided.³ According to Louis B. Wright,

Since Scott's ideas on the Spanish policy were similar to the views of his patron, the Earl of Pembroke, and exactly coincided with the anti-Spanish sentiments of George Abbot, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and reflected the beliefs of practically every English Protestant, not much zeal to prevent the author's escape to Holland was displayed. Indeed, there is every reason to believe that he was aided, not only to escape but to continue a campaign of pamphleteering.⁴ (153)

As a consequence, *Vox Populi* became one of the most controversial works in late Jacobean England. It was probably composed in 1619, in the early years of the German war, soon after the Count of Gondomar returned to Spain. It had already circulated in manuscript format before, and again even after it was printed in 1620;⁵ nine editions of the printed version came out in Holland and

³ He came back to England soon afterwards and was able to continue with his ecclesiastical duties there. Only in 1623, when he went to Utrecht as chaplain to the English garrison, did he move permanently to the Low Countries. He was assassinated in 1626 by an English soldier who, in spite of the prejudices of the time, confessed that he was neither a Catholic nor an agent of Spain (Kelsey 2004: 4; Wright 1943: 153-154).

⁴ In fact, Lake considers the pamphleteer to have been "an agent of a Palatinate connection embracing Abbot, Elizabeth of Bohemia, Maurice of Nassau and Sir Horace Vere among others" (813-814).

⁵ Folger Ms Va.402, compiled in the 1620s by Brian Cave, includes a transcript of *Vox Populi* (fols. 32r-56r), together with other texts dealing with England's international

London (Baron 2001: 43).⁶ It was largely distributed abroad –there was a French version in 1621 entitled *Voix du Peuple*– and it was reprinted in 1624 following Prince Charles’s return from Madrid (when a second part was added), and in subsequent years, for instance, in 1659 and 1679, when it was given different titles.⁷ The range of its popularity explains the fact that other authors appropriated its title to promote their own works.⁸

Scott’s tract purports to give a true account of the Spanish Council of State’s meeting following the Count of Gondomar’s arrival from England in 1618. The detailed information provided at the beginning of the pamphlet about the place, members and reasons for the calling of the Council ‘authenticates’ the text and presents this fictional account as a reliable report of Spanish state policies. The reader is not offered the pamphleteer’s explicit opinion but a series of bare facts from which he or she may infer his or her own conclusions. By such means Scott not only creates an illusion of reality but also shows his conviction regarding the verisimilitude of the events, which are thus portrayed in order to elicit a response from the reader. The dramatic presentation of the characters,⁹ who voice their different arguments in the form of dialogue and sometimes even differ in their views on Anglo-Spanish diplomacy, also contributes to the impression that the text is reliable.

policy, especially in relation to Spain. Ms Rawlinson B.151, compiled by Robert Horn (1565-1640) and now in the Bodleian library, also contains a copy of *Vox Populi* (fols. 19v-30r). On these manuscript collections, see Colclough (2005: 212-224) and Love (1998: 75, 96-97).

⁶ *Vox Populi* was included in two collections of works by Thomas Scott published in Holland in 1624: *Vox Populi. Vox Dei. Vox Regis. Digitus Dei. The Belgick Pismir. The Tongue Combat. Symmachia. The High Wayes of God and the King. The Proiecter; and The Workes of the Most Famous and Reuerend Diuine Mr Thomas Scot.*

⁷ Scott, *A Choice Narrative of Count Gondomar’s Transactions* (London, 1659) and *A Narrative of the Wicked Plots Carried on by Seignior Gondamore* (London, 1679).

⁸ See for example Samuel Harmar, *Vox Populi, or, Glostersheres Desire* (London, 1642) and the anonymous *Vox Populi, or, the People’s Humble Discovery* (London, 1642). On the different reprints and appropriations of Scott’s work, see Raymond (2003: 125) and Wright (1943: 160).

⁹ Among them, the Count of Gondomar, the Duke of Lerma, and the Pope’s nuncio, “together with the presidents of the Councell of Castile, of Arragon, of Italy, of Portugall, of the Indies, of the Treasure, of Warre, and especially of the holy Inquisition” (A2r).

The presence of the Pope's nuncio and the Council's willingness to satisfy him regarding the current state of Spanish affairs in England implies collaboration between Spain and the Holy See, and Spain's readiness to further the Pope's plans. Hence, Gondomar's mission is described as a scheme devised by the Church of Rome to spread Catholicism on the continent. However, the references to the internal rivalries of the counsellors and Lerma,¹⁰ and the nuncio's competition for preference, reveal their disharmony and ironically point out their taste for pomp and solemnity as a vain and empty façade:

But at length the Nuntio (supposing all the Counsel set) launched forth and came to roade in the Counsel chamber, where (after mutuall discharge of duetie from the company and blessing upon it from him) he sate downe in solemne silence, grieved at his oversight, when he saw the Duke of Lerma absent with whom he stroue as a competitor for pompe and Glorie. (A2v)¹¹

It is only when their respective interests are at risk that Lerma and the papal representative agree to cooperate, thus admitting the need felt by both Spain and Rome for mutual help in reaching their main goals: Universal Monarchy and a Universal Church. As Lerma indicates,

All our peace, our warre, our treaties, marriages, and whatsoeuer intendment else of ours, aimes at this principall end, to get the whole possession of the world, and to reduce all to unite under one temporall head, that our King may truly be what he is stiled, the catholick and universal King. As faith is therfore universal & the Church universal, yet so as it is under one head the Pope, whose seate is & must necessarily be at Rome where S. Peter sate: so must all men be subiect to our and their Catholique King, whose particular seate is here in Spayne, his uniuersall euery where. (A4r)

Lerma's justification of any means serving to achieve their ends points to his Machiavellian concept of policy and stresses the danger of trusting the Spanish. In this way, Spain's imperialist and colonial

¹⁰ Francisco de Sandoval (1553-1625), Duke of Lerma from 1599 and Chief Minister of Philip III of Spain from 1598 to 1618, when he fell into disrepute. That year he was created cardinal and retired to Lerma, where he died in 1625.

¹¹ Nonetheless, this depiction was highly conventional as it had largely been developed in numerous Elizabethan pamphlets and plays in which Spaniards' seriousness and solemnity were ridiculed, often interpreted as ways of covering up their weakness and hypocrisy.

ambitions are satisfied by the Pope, who authorizes and supports them as long as they contribute to the spread of Catholicism. Hence, the nuncio's triple identity, as papal representative, Spaniard and Jesuit, personifies the three-headed monster against which European and English Protestants were supposed to fight. The nuncio, like any other Jesuit, is deprived of any national identity and is purely seen as an agent of Spain (A4v, C4r).

After Lerma's opening, the meeting focuses on its main concerns: Gondomar's embassy and his actions to further the cause of Spain and Catholicism in the British Isles. So, Scott expresses –through Gondomar's voice– his reservations about the Jacobean court and the English recusants, who are depicted as corrupt and naturally evil people trying to benefit from England's weakness. Both groups are shown as the main promoters of the Spanish Match out of ambition or necessity:

Two sorts of people unmeasurably desired the match might proceed. First the begging and beggarly Courtyers, that they might have to furnish their wants. Secondly the Romish Catholiques, who hoped hereby at least for a moderation of synes and lawes, perhaps a tolleracion, and perhaps a total restauracion of their religion in England. (B2r)

Here Scott implicitly reminds his readers of their civic duty to their country. In fact, the idea that corruption takes place when people seek their own private gains instead of the common good was the very basis of civic humanism, according to which “it was only by a relentless pursuit of civic virtues that a man could serve the commonwealth and become a truly noble citizen” (Peltonen 1995: 11). Therefore, promoters of the Spanish Match are depicted as enemies of the country, opportunistic people who only care about their own good at the expense of the nation's health.¹² Thus, by means of his attack on recusants and courtiers,¹³ the pamphleteer

¹² This accusation is recurrent in many contemporary anti-Match works, both by Scott and others. See, for instance, Scott's *The Belgicke Pismire* (1622: 12, 26–28, 44, 82–83) and *The High-Waies of God* (1623: 59); Barnes (1624: 36, 43, 45); Sutton (1623: 9–10, 13–14, 39–40); Wither (1621: B1r–v, D5r–v).

¹³ Attacks on the court as a place of corruption were common in early seventeenth-century English political discourse. According to Marku Peltonen, such criticism was based on the history of imperial Rome and authors denouncing these attitudes usually made extensive use of Seneca and Tacitus to expose such vices as hypocrisy, flattery and dissimulation at the English court (1995: 128).

indirectly points to the need for true English citizens to take an active role against James's foreign policy.

Indeed, Scott's description of the hatred and malice of English recusants (B2v)¹⁴ stresses their treacherous behaviour and implies a clear criticism of James's irenic measures which distinguished between loyal and disloyal Catholics. In Scott's opinion, only Protestantism can be truly English whereas the evil nature of Catholics proves they are unable to reform or show any obedience to the legitimate monarch. Any conciliatory action towards recusants is doomed to failure; any concessions made to them in the context of a dynastic alliance –as was the case– could only endanger the *status quo*. Consequently, the apparent Catholic revival in London alluded to by Gondomar may have upset many Protestant readers:

[English Jesuits] may worke them [English people] to our ends, as Masters their servants, Tutors their schollers, fathers their children, Kings their subiects. And that they may doe this the more boldly and securely, I haue somewhat dasht the authoritie of their high commission [...] I haue caused the execution of their office to be slackened, that so an open way may be given to our spirituall instruments for the free exercise of their faculties [...] And if they should be sent to prison, even that place (of the most part) is made as a Sanctuary for them [...] so they liue safe in prison till we haue time to worke their libertie and assure their liues. And in the meane time their place of restraint is a study unto them, where they haue opportunitie to confer together as in a Colledge, and to arme themselves in unity against the single adversary abroad. (C4r-v)

However, according to Luis Tobíos, the situation of English Catholics was a secondary problem for the ambassador, whose main concern remained Spain's political alliance with England. In fact, Philip III had warned him against urging protection of Catholics, since this could provoke James's suspicions. Catholic interference in Gondomar's work was sometimes a motive of annoyance for the ambassador. Despite his involvement with the English Catholic cause, his relationship with his coreligionists was far from ideal (25-32).

¹⁴ For instance, they are accused of promoting enmity between England and the Low Countries and collecting money to develop their organization and weaken the State, as well as directly conspiring against the monarch's person in the Gunpowder Plot. Some reference to Father Baldwin, allegedly involved in the conspiracy and freed from prison before Gondomar departed in 1618, is thus unavoidable (C4r).

In addition, Scott blames the diplomat's faction at court for James's conflicts with the English Parliament, here described as the only guarantor of England's integrity and preserver of the Common Law. Through the attack on his parasites, James is indirectly criticised for his lack of respect for English liberties and his rejection of a more civic and interactive mode of government since the sovereign was seen to require counsel in the promotion of the commonwealth.

Religious indifference and general inertia after a twenty year peace are equally criticized as pernicious to the nation's welfare. Scott reveals again his humanist views on government by alluding, indirectly, to the old Roman ideal of the good noble citizen raising arms, according to which war was the principal means of achieving civic greatness.¹⁵ The generation of Englishmen who had fought against the Armada is presented as a model to follow, while nostalgia for the age of Elizabeth prompts Scott's censure of James's navy: "Their bodies by long disuse of armes were disabled and their mindes effeminated by peace and luxury, far from that they were in 88. when they were dayly flesht in our blood and made hearty by customary conquests" (B2v).¹⁶ Accordingly, Gondomar's insistence on the need to punish English attacks on the Spanish navy explains Scott's denunciation of the king's disregard for colonial and commercial investments.¹⁷ Memories of Elizabeth's promotion of English naval interests highlight the Stuart monarch's disregard for the imperial ideal of former times: "There by I [Gondomar] and their ovvne wants together haue kept them from furnishing their Navy,

¹⁵ For an analysis of the concept of civic greatness and the Roman idea of the noble citizen, see Peltonen (1995: 236, 253).

¹⁶ See other similar examples in Scott's *The Belgick Souldier* (28-29, 31, 36-37, 39); *The Proiecter* (1); Reynolds (1624: 31, 34-36); and Leighton (1624: 7-8, 42).

¹⁷ King James's opinion of merchants differed greatly from Scott's: "The Merchants think the whole common-wele ordained for making them up; and accounting it their lawfull gaine and trade, to enrich themselues vpon the losse of all the rest of the people, they transport from vs things necessarie; bringing backe sometimes unnecessary things, and other times nothing at all. They buy for vs the worst wares, and sell them at the dearest price: and albeit the victuals fall or rise of their prices, according to the abundance or skantnesse thereof; yet the prices of their wares euer rise, but neuer fall: being as constant in that their euill custome, as if it were a settled Law for them. They are also the speciall cause of the corruption of the coyne, transporting all our owne, and bringing in forraine, vpon what price they please to set on it." See *Basilicon Doron* (Edinburgh, 1598) in Sommerville (1994: 29-30).

which being the wal of their Island, & once the strongest in Christendome lies now at roade unarmed & fit for ruine" (B4r). Thus, the ambassador's celebration of the execution of the Elizabethan hero, Sir Walter Raleigh (C1r), exemplifies what the author considered a mistaken notion of international policy,¹⁸ and one which could only bring about England's general and dangerous impoverishment:

Thus stands the state of that poore miserable countrie [England], which had never more people and fewer men. So that if my master should resolve upon an invasion, the time never fits as at this present, securitie of this marriage and the disuse of armes having cast them into a dead sleepe, a strong and wakening faction being ever amongst them ready to assist us, and they being unprovided of shippes and armes, or hearts to fight, and universall discontentment filling all men. (C1v)

Contemporary dissent in Protestant ranks are held responsible for England's weakness, although divisions among Catholics are also referred to in an attempt to demystify their power and offer some hope of victory over the enemy (C1r-C2r). Spain's stratagems are also emphasized to explain the opposition between the Scottish clergy and the nobility, and so James's passivity is implicitly criticized for their lack of union. However, the potential ambiguities of the text are silenced and rebellious attitudes are discouraged, as they would favour Spanish interests. Hence, the notion of foreignness is associated with sedition, and detached from any true Protestant commitment to the nation's good, as the character of Gondomar explains:

He [King James] I say seekes to worke both Churches to uniformitie, and to this end made a journey into Scotland, but with no such successe as he expected, for diuers of ours attended the traine, who stirred up humors and factions, and cast in scruples and doubts to hinder & crosse the proceedings; yea those that seeme most aduerse to us and aduerse from our opinions, by their disobedience and example helpe forward our plots, and these are incouraged by a factious and heady multitude, by a faint and irresolute clergie, (many false brethrē being amōgst their Bps) & by the prodigal Nobilitie who maintained these stirs in the Church, that thereby they may safely keepe their Church liuings

¹⁸ England's detachment from the Netherlands is also explained as erroneous since it constitutes a lost opportunity to weaken Spain and satisfy English commercial interests (B4v).

in their hands, which they haue most sacrilegiously seased upon in the time of the first deformatiō, & which they feare would be recouered by the Clergy if they could be brought to brotherly peace & agreement; for they haue seene the King very bountiful in this kind, *hauing lately increased their pensiōs and settled the clergy a cōpetēt maintenance, & besides out of his owne meanes, which in the kingdome is not of the greatest, having brought in and restored whole Bishopriks to the Church, which were before in lay-mens hands, a great part of the Nobilities estates consisting of spirituall lands, which makes them cherish the puritanicall faction, who will be content to be trencher-fed with scraps and crummes,* and contributions and arbitrary beneuolences from their Lords and Lairds and Ladies, and their adherents and followers. (C2r-v; my emphasis)

References to the corruption of the nobility and the bishops and the fact that the “puritanicall faction” are now depicted as victims articulate Scott’s attack on both political and ecclesiastic hierarchies, which are described as contrary to Protestantism. In contrast, the term “Puritan” is re-evaluated as a synonym of the true Protestant, in no way dangerous to the *status quo*. Despite Scott’s attempts generally to assume a moderate position in his pamphlet, his Presbyterian sympathies are sometimes alluded to and presented as an ideal to adopt.

The submissive attitude of a significant part of the English clergy, described as dishonest and cowardly, is presented as negative, in contrast with the honest preachers persecuted for counselling their monarch against the Match. But their notion of civic duty, far from being rewarded, is punished by the king, thus making them into spiritual heroes courageous enough to challenge Gondomar’s manoeuvres:

The truth is my Lord (quoth the Ambassadour), that privately what they can, and publiquely what they dare, both in England & Scotland, all for the most part (except such as are of our faith) oppose this match to their utmost, by prayers, counsels, speeches, wishes; but if any be found longer tongued then his fellows, we haue still meanes to charme their sawcinesse, to silence them, and expell them the Court, to disgrace them and crosse their preferments, with the imputation pragmaticke Puritanisme. (C3r)

Scott identifies himself with these Protestant preachers and indirectly appropriates their alleged virtues, protecting his work against any possible accusation of disobedience or malice. His reference to a general dissatisfaction with the Match project allows

the pamphleteer to present himself as a spokesman for Protestant England.

Finally, Gondomar's triumphal account is interrupted by the sudden arrival of letters informing him of the recent apprehension of Barnavelt¹⁹ and the subsequent discovery of Spanish plans. Scott describes Spain's amazement at their defeat and presents it as a prelude to further Protestant victories. The biblical quotation from Daniel 4 at the end of the pamphlet distances the readers from the previous fictional report, and works as a moral through which they should read the previous account: "In the meane tyme, Let not those be secure, whom it concernes to be rowsed up, knowing that this aspiring Nebuchadnezzar wil not loose the glorie of his greatness, (who continueth still to magnifie himselfe in his great Babel) until it be spoken, thy kingdome is departed from thee" (D2r).²⁰ The quotation serves as a direct warning to the Spanish king, whose fall is prophesied using the analogy of Nebuchadnezzar's wickedness and pride.²¹ As W. Sibley Towner explains, the *Book of Daniel* "teaches that the God of justice and righteousness is not mocked by the powers of oppression that hold sway in the world. God will emerge from history as a victor, and those who choose to serve the causes of justice and righteousness are on the victor's side" (Towner

¹⁹ Oldenbarnaveldt was a prominent Dutch politician executed in The Hague on 13 May 1619, at the age of seventy-two, after being convicted of treason. He had been accused of conspiring with Spain in the Netherlands, though he maintained his innocence to the end. His case was of great interest in England. John Fletcher and Philip Massinger wrote a play on the subject, *The Tragedy of Sir John van Olden Barnavelt*, performed three months after his execution.

²⁰ These lines conclude Daniel's interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, as it appears in the King James Bible: "This is the interpretation, O king, and this is the decree of the most High, which is come upon my lord the king: That they shall drive thee from men, and thy dwelling shall be with the beasts of the field, and they shall make thee to eat grass as oxen, and they shall wet thee with the dew of heaven, and seven times shall pass over thee, till thou know that the most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will. And whereas they commanded to leave the stump of the tree roots; thy kingdom shall be sure unto thee, after that thou shalt have known that the heavens do rule. Wherefore, O king, let my counsel be acceptable unto thee, and break off thy sins by righteousness, and thine iniquities by shewing mercy to the poor; if it may be a lengthening of thy tranquillity" (Daniel 4. 24-27).

²¹ For anti-Catholic English writers, Nebuchadnezzar's imperialistic ambitions and invasion of Jerusalem worked as a perfect parallel for the Spanish monarch's intention to attain Universal Monarchy.

1993). So, Scott encourages his readers to support God's cause against the Spanish enemy and implicitly warns them of divine punishment for those who remain indifferent. The pamphleteer chooses the Bible in order to express his message but hides his own voice to protect himself from censure. The author's conclusion is thus covered under the appearance of a divine commandment.

To sum up, Scott's attack on Spain did not serve as a goal in itself, but encouraged further reflections on the interaction between the king and his subjects, and Englishmen's direct involvement in foreign and domestic affairs. His anti-Catholicism and prejudices about the Match and the Spanish faction at court allow for an implicit defence of Classical humanist values as the only means of saving the country from ruin. The popularity of *Vox Populi* suggests that his words did not fall on deaf ears and that there were already a number of Englishmen who welcomed the ideas he proposed. His more than probable collaboration with the "patriot" faction at court and his connections with leading figures in the Church of England and Bohemia may also imply that Scott was just another part of a complex political web of people who hoped to gain favour from the English Parliament and support from the populace against James's policy. The choice of the pamphlet format, together with a direct, dramatic and highly visual language, underlines his –and his benefactors'– interest in reaching a large popular audience. Thus, the controversy over *Vox Populi* was not only the result of Scott's critical view of royal policy, but of his ability to appeal to a wide and varied readership that was more politically involved, and therefore, more potentially threatening, than ever.

References

Primary Sources

- Anonymous 1642. *Vox Populi, or, the People's Humble Discovery*. London.
- Barnes, Thomas 1624. *The VVise-Mans Forecast against the Evill Time*. London.
- Harmar, Samuel 1642. *Vox Populi, or, Glostersheres Desire*. London.
- Leighton, Alexander 1624. *Speculum Belli Sacri: Or The Looking-Glasse of the Holy War wherein is Discovered: the Evill of War. The Good of Warr. The Guide of War. In the Last of These I Give a Scantling of the Christian Tackticks, from the Levying of the Souldier, to the Founding of the Retrait; together with a Modell of the Carryage, both of Conquerour and Conquered. I haue Applied the*

Generall Rules Warranted by the Word, to the Particular Necessity of our Present Times. Amsterdam.

Reynolds, John 1624. *Vox Coeli, or, Nevves from Heaven of a Consultation there Held by the High and Mighty Princes, King Hen.8. King Edw.6. Prince Henry. Queene Mary. Queene Elizabeth, and Queene Anne; wherein Spaines Ambition and Treacheries to most Kingdomes and Free Estates in Europe, are Vnmask'd and Truly Represented, but more Particularly towards England, and now more Especially vnder the Pretended Match of Prince Charles, with the Infanta Dona Maria. Whereunto is Annexed two Letters Written by Queene Mary from Heauen, the one to Count Gondomar, the Ambassadour of Spaine, the other to all the Romane Catholiques of England.* London.

Scott, Thomas 1620. *Vox Populi, or Newes from Spayne Translated according to the Spanish Coppie; which may Serue to Forwarn both England and the Vnited Provinces how farre to Trust to Spanish Pretences.* London.

Scott, Thomas 1622. *The Belgicke Pismire Stinging the Slothfull Sleeper, and Auuaking the Diligent to Fast, Watch, Pray and Worke out their owne Temporall and Etrnall Saluation with Feare and Trembling.* London.

Scott, Thomas 1623. *The High-Waies of God and the King wherein all Men ought to VValke in Holinesse Here, to Happinesse Hereafter. Deliuered in two Sermons Preached at Thetford in Norfolke, anno 1620.* Holland.

Scott, Thomas 1623. *The Proiecter Teaching a Direct, Sure, and Ready VVay to Restore the Decayes of the Church and State both in Honour and Revenue. Deliuered in a Sermon before the Iudges in Norvvich, at Summer Assises there Holden, Anno 1620. By Thomas Scot Batchelor in Diuinity.* Holland.

Scott, Thomas 1624. *The Belgick Souldier VVarre vvas a Blessing.* London.

Scott, Thomas 1624. *The Workes of the Most Famous and Reuerend Diuine Mr Thomas Scot.* Holland.

Scott, Thomas 1624. *Vox Populi. Vox Dei. Vox Regis. Digitus Dei. The Belgick Pismire. The Tongue Combat. Symmachia. The High Wayes of God and the King. The Proiecter.* Holland.

Scott, Thomas 1659. *A Choice Narrative of Count Gondomar's Transactions.* London.

Scott, Thomas 1679. *A Narrative of the Wicked Plots Carried on by Seignior Gondamore.* London.

Sommerville, Johann P. ed. 1994. *King James VI and I. Political Writings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sutton, Edward 1626. *The Serpent Anatomized A Morall Discourse voherein that Foule Serpentine Vice of Base Creeping Flattery is Manifestly Discouered, and Iustly Reproued. A Needfull Caution for the Credulous, and very Vsefull for these Times.* London.

The Bible. King James Version. Electronic Text Center. University of Virginia.
<url: etext.lib.virginia.edu/kjv.browse.html>. Accessed: 25 January 2009.
Wither, George 1621. *Wither's Motto. Nec Habeo, Nec Careo, Nec Curo.* London.

Secondary Sources

- Adams, Simon 1983. "Spain or the Netherlands? The Dilemmas of Early Stuart Foreign Policy." Ed. Howard Tomlinson. *Before the English Civil War. Essays on Early Stuart Politics and Government.* London: MacMillan: 79-101.
- Baron, Sabrina A. 2001. "The Guises of Dissemination in Early Seventeenth-Century England." Eds. Brendan Dooley and Sabrina Baron. *The Politics of Information in Early Modern Europe.* London and New York: Routledge: 44-53.
- Benito, Fernando Bartolomé 2005. *Don Diego Sarmiento de Acuña, Conde de Gondomar. El Maquiavelo español.* Gijón: Ediciones Trea.
- Clegg, Cyndia Susan 2001. *Press Censorship in Jacobean England.* Port Chester, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Colclough, David 2005. *Freedom of Speech in Early Stuart England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cogswell, Thomas 1989. *The Blessed Revolution. English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-1624.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cross, Robert 2007. "Pretense and Perception in the Spanish Match, or History in a Fake Beard." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 37/4: 563-583.
- Cust, Richard 1986. "News and Politics in Early Seventeenth-Century England." *Past and Present* 112: 60-90.
- Halasz, Alexandra 1997. *The Marketplace of Print. Pamphlets and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halliwell James O. ed. 1845. *The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds D'Ewes, Bart; During the Reigns of James I and Charles I.* Vol. I. London.
- Heinemann, Margot 1982. *Puritanism and Theatre. Thomas Middleton and Opposition Drama under the Early Stuarts.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kelsey, Sean 2004. "Scott, Thomas (d. 1626)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* Eds. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
<url:http://o-www.oxforddnb.com.fama.us.es/view/article/24916>.
Accessed: 14 January 2009.

- Lake, Peter 1982. "Constitutional Consensus and Puritan Opposition in the 1620s: Thomas Scott and the Spanish Match." *Historical Journal* 25/4: 805-825.
- Larkin, James F. and Paul L. Hughes eds. 1973. *Stuart Royal Proclamations. Royal Proclamations of James I. 1603-1625*. Vol. I. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Loomie, Albert J. 1973. *Spain and the Jacobean Catholics*. 2 vols. London: Catholic Record Society.
- Love, Harold 1998. *The Culture and Commerce of Texts: Scribal Publication in Seventeenth Century England*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Peltonen, Marku 1995. *Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought 1570-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Raymond, Joad 2003. *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Redworth, Glyn 2003. *The Prince and the Infanta. The Cultural Politics of the Spanish Match*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Samson, Alexander ed. 2006. *The Spanish Match: Prince Charles's Journey to Madrid, 1623*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Sommerville, Johann P. 1986. *Politics and Ideology in England, 1603-1640*. London and New York: Longman.
- The Columbia Encyclopedia*. 6th ed. 2001-2007. "Oldenbarneveldt, Johan Van." New York: Columbia University Press.
<url: www.bartleby.com/br/65.html>. Accessed: 25 January 2009.
- Tobíos, Luis 1987. *Gondomar y los católicos ingleses*. La Coruña: Publicaciones de Área de Ciencias Sociales y Políticas del Seminario de Estudios Gallegos.
- Towner, W. Sibley 1993. "Daniel, The Book of." *The Oxford Companion to the Bible*. Eds. Bruce M. Metzger and Michael D. Coogan. Oxford Reference Online. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
<url: www.oxfordreference.com/fama.us.es/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t120.e0172>. Accessed: 25 January 2009.
- Wright, Louis B. 1943. "Propaganda against James's 'Appeasement' of Spain." *The Huntington Library Quarterly* 6/2: 149-172.

How to cite this article:

Álvarez Recio, Leticia. "Opposing the Spanish Match: Thomas Scott's *Vox Populi* (1620)." *SEDERI* 19 (2009): 5-22.

Author's contact: leticiaar@us.es

Submission: 25/01/2009

Acceptance: 06/02/2009

Representing native American women in early colonial American writings: Álvaro Núñez Cabeza de Vaca, Juan Ortiz and John Smith

M^a del Carmen Gómez Galisteo
University of Alcalá de Henares

ABSTRACT

Most observers of Native Americans during the contact period between Europe and the Americas represented Native American women as monstrous beings posing potential threats to the Europeans' physical integrity. However, the most well known portrait of Native American women is John Smith's description of Pocahontas, the Native American princess who, the legend goes, saved Smith from being executed. Transformed into a children's tale, further popularized by the Disney movie, as well as being the object of innumerable historical studies questioning or asserting the veracity of Smith's claims, the fact remains that the Smith-Pocahontas story is at the very core of North American culture. Nevertheless, far from being original, John Smith's story had a precedent in the story of Spaniard Juan Ortiz, a member of the ill-fated Narváez expedition to Florida in 1527. Ortiz, who got lost in America and spent the rest of his life there, was also rescued by a Native American princess from being sacrificed in the course of a Native American ritual, as recounted by the Gentleman of Elvas, member of the Hernando de Soto expedition. Yet another vision of Native American women is that offered by Álvaro Núñez Cabeza de Vaca, another participant of the Narváez expedition who, during almost a decade in the Americas fulfilled a number of roles among the Native Americans, including some that were regarded as female roles. These female roles provided him with an opportunity to avert captivity as well as a better understanding of gender roles within Native American civilization. This essay explores the description of Native American women posed by John Smith, Juan Ortiz and Álvaro Núñez Cabeza de Vaca so as to illustrate different images of Native American women during the early contact period as conveyed by these works.

KEYWORDS: Native American women, Álvaro Núñez Cabeza de Vaca, *The Account*, *Naufragios*, Juan Ortiz, Captain John Smith, Pocahontas.

The discovery of America, from the European point of view, was a shock. The New World brought along a number of drastic changes in economy, thought, philosophy, geography, cartography and even history, shaking men's trust in biblical authority as well as in classical writers, who had ignored the existence of this new continent (Cevallos-Candau 1994: 1; Boorstin 1983: 256). America was not discovered just from a physical point of view but also mentally (Zerubavel 1992: 35), the phrase "unknown to the classics" becoming a recurrent one to describe the new lands that were being discovered.¹ One of the reasons why the "discovery" was so shocking was because the New World was inhabited by the "Indians," as they were called following Columbus's misidentification of America as the Indies. Europeans wondered if Native Americans were human and theologians and lay people alike engaged in this debate,² all the more heated because prior to 1492 the Europeans had had not even the slightest notion that there might be other people living across the Atlantic.³ Many thought Native Americans could not possibly be human, for, if they were, their ignorance of Catholicism would go against the biblical assertion that the gospel had been spread to all living beings (Lovejoy 1994: 604-605). The sudden appearance of this New World "might therefore be deemed at the very least an act of outrageous hubris, if not of downright blasphemy" (Sell 2002: 41). From the beginning of the discovery process, "difference and alterity constituted strategies of exploitation, exclusion and representation" (Zavala 1989: 329). In the words of Pastor,

¹ "Had I Ptolemy, Strabo, Pliny or Solinus here [...] I would put them to shame and confusion," wrote Spanish conquistador in Chile Barros in 1531 (quoted in Scammell 1969: 393).

² In Spain, Ginés de Sepúlveda and Bartolomé Las Casas got involved in a bitter debate over the Native Americans' having a soul or not that culminated in the Junta de Valladolid, a several-month talks in 1550 among various theologians.

³ Europeans had had some vague notion about the existence of Africa, India or China before they were thoroughly explored and reports written about these places, but America had been prior to 1492 absolutely ignored (Todorov 1989: 14).

a process of conquest is, inevitably, a process of destruction; that the chronicle of discovery had gradually turned into a chronicle of disillusionment, alienation and loss; that colonizing and enslaving a people really implies the loss of any possibility to understand the identity of the colonized and simultaneously, the loss of ones [sic] own in the irreducible challenge of the Other; that reducing the world to ones [sic] needs and dreams destroys any possibility of truly discovering new worlds. (1989: 153)

From a materialistic perspective, regarding Native Americans as beasts and brutes involved profitable financial prospects, for that allowed for their enslavement and subsequent exploitation by means of the “encomienda” system or similar ways of bondage.⁴

Colonial texts illustrate the encounter of Europeans with Native Americans –how one discovers, faces and negotiates the Other, who arouses attraction at the same time as rejection (Kristeva 1991: 116). Fascinated by the New World, early European observers devoted much of their accounts to the description of the Native Americans. These texts are permeated by the notions of mimesis and alterity, sameness and difference, the I (or we) versus the Other(s) (Wade 1999: 332). Very early in narratives describing European-Native contact, be them discovery, exploration or colonization accounts, the Native Americans came to represent the ubiquitous Other against whom Europeans described and defined themselves. The concept of national identity was a most pressing concern in the early modern period, “since it was then that various different notions directly connected with the formation of identity firstly appeared in a recognizable form: Europe (as a community of colour) and its others, whiteness and blackness (or ‘whites’ and ‘non-whites’), purity of blood and lineage, social belonging, gender adscription or the anxiety of origins” (López-Pelaéz Casellas and López-Pelaéz Casellas 2006: 9-10).

In shaping their own identity versus Native Americans, Europeans always defined themselves as superior, for “such a negative reference group was used to define White identity or to

⁴ The “encomienda” was the assignment to a conquistador of a lot of Native Americans along with an extension of land. He was to benefit from the Native Americans’ labor and, in exchange, had to provide them with housing, education and Christian instruction. Though legally the Native Americans were not slaves, abuses became a common feature.

prove White superiority over the worst fears of their own depravity" (Derounian-Stodola and Levernier 1993: 63-64). Beginning with Columbus, the difference of the Other is immediately considered inferior to Europeans (Todorov 1989: 50). Consequently, discovery and conquest greatly contributed to "the constitution of the modern ego, not only as a subjectivity, but as subjectivity that takes itself to be the center or end of history" (Dussel quoted in White 2003: 489).

It was a popular convention to present America as a female in many an early modern account.⁵ For instance, Sir Walter Raleigh wrote in *The Discoverie of Guiana* that "Guiana is a country that hath yet her maidenhead, never sacked, turned, nor wrought" (1998 [1910]).⁶ Raleigh continued with this trend of identifying America with the female in his naming Virginia so after Queen Elizabeth. For others, America was not a maiden, though, but rather a prostitute offering Europeans her services. Keymis, a member of Raleigh's expedition to Guiana, perceived America as such –"whole syeres of fruitfull rich groundes lying now waste for want of people, doe prostitute themselves vnto us, like a faire and beautifull woman in the pride and flower of desired yeares" (quoted in Fuller 1991: 63). One way or another, be America a maiden about to be (willingly or by the use of force) deflowered, the representation of America as a woman fulfilled an important aspect of imperial discourse:

the erotics of imperial conquest were also an erotics of engulfment. At one level, the representation of the land as female is a traumatic trope, occurring almost invariably, I suggest, in the aftermath of male boundary confusion, but as a historical, not archetypal, strategy of containment. As the visible trace of paranoia, feminizing the land is a compensatory gesture, disavowing male loss of boundary by reinscribing a ritual excess

⁵ For Montrose, English representations of America as a maiden are closely related to the circumstance that by then England was ruled by Elizabeth I, a monarch and a woman (1991: 3). Similarly, Castile was being ruled by a female monarch; analyzing Columbus' writings, Gerbi brings attention to "los límites expresivos que le imponía la majestad femenil de la soberana a quien se dirigía (y que, según ciertos estudiosos, le dictaron las idealizaciones de las costumbres sexuales de los indígenas, y la insistencia en su capacidad de ser convertidos al cristianismo" (1978: 27).

⁶ Fuller connects Guiana's maidenhead to Raleigh's temporary expulsion from court for having married one of Elizabeth's ladies in waiting (1991: 57-59).

of boundary, accompanied, all too often, by an excess of military violence.⁷ (McClintock 1995: 24)

The inferiority of the Native Americans rested on the negative representation of them in colonial texts (Zavala 1989: 325), picturing them more often than not as deceitful, cannibal savages (Montrose 1991: 5). An especially productive way of marking the Other's difference was the description of Native American women whose aspect was monstrous or whose sexual behavior was non-normative (Trexler 1995: 2). Moreover, "through the rubric of monstrously 'raced' Amerindian and African women, Europeans found a means to articulate shifting perceptions of themselves as religiously, culturally, and phenotypically superior to those black or brown persons they sought to define" (Morgan 1997: 168). Because there were no women travelers in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Hadfield 2001: 2), Native American women were marked as the Other in two aspects –for being non-European and for being females. The close interrelationship between sexuality (or sex) and alterity dates back to the first reported Others –the Danaides, Egypt natives who arrived in Argos, as re-told by Aeschylus (Kristeva 1991: 54). The Danaides' otherness is double-fold –in their coming from abroad and in their rejection of marriage (Kristeva 1991: 56); with this, they challenge society at several levels –physical origin and social conventions. Native American women, being native and non-male, were doubly marked as the Other. Portrayed as monstrous beings, Native American women came to represent "the epitome of sexual aberration and excess. Folklore saw them, even more than the men, as given to a lascivious venery so promiscuous as to border on the bestial" (McClintock 1995: 22).

Native American women figured prominently in the first instances of contact between Native American groups and the Europeans (Kidwell 1994: 149). Since Europeans filtered their perceptions of Native American gender and sexual mores through

⁷ So pervasive has been this identification of America with the female that in American literature "landscape is deeply imbued with female qualities. [...] It has the attributes simultaneously of a virginal bride and a non-threatening mother; its female qualities are articulated with respect to a male angle of vision; what can nature do for me, asks the hero, what can it give me? Of course, nature has been feminine and maternal from time immemorial. [...] The fantasies are infantile, concerned with power, mastery and total gratification: the all-nurturing mother, the all-passive bride" (Baym 1981: 135-136).

their own values (Montrose 1991: 2; Kidwell 1994: 150), Europeans' prejudices inevitably colored their perceptions of Native American society as well as reducing their scope to male tasks such as war, politics, or religion, on which women did not play any significant role (Rountree 1998: 2). Thus, Europeans usually remarked on women's subordinate role to their husbands and their industriousness when compared to Native American men's laziness (Bragdon 1996: 578; Lurie 1959: 57), what John Smith called the "duty of their women, exercise for their men" (Smith 1631).⁸ Instead of being reduced to secondary or anecdotal roles, Native American women fulfill a leading role in three fundamental accounts of the early contact period of American history: the account of the 1527 Pánfilo de Narváez expedition by Álvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca, the report of the 1539 Hernando de Soto expedition by the Hidalgo de Elvas and Captain John Smith's writings about the 1607 foundation of the English settlement of Jamestown in Virginia.

In 1527 Pánfilo de Narvaéz was appointed *Adelantado* (governor) of Florida with the assignment to conquer and populate the area. The expedition sailed from Sanlúcar de Barrameda in June 1527 and arrived in Florida the following year. A series of misfortunes resulted in the terrestrial expedition getting separated from the ships and ultimately lost; most of the members of the expedition died except for a few who fell captive into the hands of the Native Americans. Out of these, only four would eventually return to Spanish territory after spending almost a decade travelling across the U.S. Southwest. One of these four survivors, Álvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca, lived among several Native American groups and fulfilled a number of roles among the Native Americans, including some that were regarded as female tasks and which allowed him to get a better understanding of gender roles within Native American civilization. This constituted a formidable role reversal for "few historical documents depict long-term situations in which the colonizer becomes Other to those he came to colonize" (Wade 1999: 332). Cabeza de Vaca could not fulfill the role of conquistador because of his circumstances (Maura 1996: 55) and instead turned to an ethnographic discourse (Pastor 1989: 136).

⁸ Davis also comments on Frenchmen's views on the industriousness of Iroquois women in contrast to men's idleness (1994: 245).

Cabeza de Vaca was first employed by the Native Americans to pick their crops: “among many other afflictions, in order to eat I had to pull the roots from the ground under the water among the canes where they grew. My fingers were so worn by this that a light brush with a piece of straw would cause them to bleed” (Cabeza de Vaca 1993: 64). This was a female task, as he himself acknowledged in his *Account*, the testimony of his experiences, written after his return to Spain:

among these people men carry no loads, nor anything heavy. This is done by women and old people, who are the people they least esteem. [...] The women are worked very hard with many tasks, and out of the twenty-four hours in a day, they rest only six. They spend the rest of the night stoking their ovens to dry those roots that they eat. At dawn they begin to dig and carry firewood and water to their dwellings and to take care of other important needs. (Cabeza de Vaca 1993: 71)

Followingly, Cabeza de Vaca became a trader; despite the fact that being a trader was a female activity for the Native American societies Cabeza de Vaca lived among (Wade 1999: 333), he was most willing to perform this task –“I liked this trade, because it gave me the freedom to go wherever I wanted. I was obligated to nothing and was not a slave” (Cabeza de Vaca 1993: 65). As Wade (1999: 333) states, “his gender is irrelevant to the performance of these roles. He is same with women because he is not a warrior and he performs women’s work. Also like women, he enjoys safe conduct and can cross ethnic boundaries.”⁹ Even though he becomes a trader and a go-between among different Native American groups, he still remains a European at heart and offers a European explanation for his being comfortable with this role (Todorov 1989: 209).

Cabeza de Vaca escapes the usual fate of European men captured by the Native Americans (death) and, instead, like captive women and children (who were usually spared) must engage himself “in a deeply ambivalent dialectic between exploitation and negotiation” (Brooks 1996: 299). European captives to the Native Americans managed to find a space for themselves within Native

⁹ Cf. Gómez Galisteo (forthcoming in 2009). Both outsiders and berdaches were banned from active participation in warfare but, nevertheless, they could perform roles such as nursing the wounded, helping with the logistics... (Adorno 1991: 170; Fulton and Anderson 1992: 606; Callender and Kochems 1983: 449).

American society and so provide themselves with security and comfort (Brooks 1996: 301), and this is what Cabeza de Vaca does as a trader. Cabeza de Vaca benefitted from the fact that gender for a number of Native American groups of present-day United States was not a fixed category (as sex was), but, rather, a social category (Bragdon 1996). This consideration of gender as a convention, a cultural construction, allowed for people of one sex being able to perform tasks considered belonging to the other gender; in turn, their gender was determined not on accounts of their biological sex but according to their social gender (Wade 1999; Trexler 1995; Blackwood 1984: 41). This flexibility in terms of gender roles allowed Cabeza de Vaca to successfully fulfill female roles and improve his situation.

During his time in the Americas, Cabeza de Vaca realized that there existed what he termed “womanish men”: “I saw one wicked thing, and that was a man married to another man. There are womanish, impotent men who cover their bodies like women and do women’s tasks. They shoot bows and carry heavy loads. Among these people we saw many of these womanish men, who are more robust and taller than other men and who carry heavy load” (Cabeza de Vaca 1993: 90). The berdaches exemplify the flexibility of gender in Native American society: men who dressed, behaved, spoke, and worked as women –including performing passive sexual roles to other men (Trexler 1995: 65; Callender and Kochems 1983: 443).¹⁰ The Spanish term *berdache* came via the Arabic *bardag* or the Persian *bardaj*, meaning a boy captive who was used sexually (Fulton and Anderson 1992: 603; Blackwood 1984: 27). The semantics of the term led Europeans to identify homosexuality with berdaches although this was not exactly true, for although berdaches engaged in homosexual relationships in a passive role, “North American homosexuality transcended berdaches; though they were its most visible and –except for their spouses– its most consistent participants, their orientations could be bisexual or heterosexual” (Callender and Kochems 1983: 444). Also, the berdaches’ husbands were not other berdaches, but men who were regarded by their communities as heterosexual and who could have female wives (Callender and Kochems 1983: 449). The term preferred by Native

¹⁰ Female gender crossing was also possible among some Native American groups (Blackwood 1984: 28).

Americans to refer to berdaches indicate their dual nature – “halfman-halfwoman, man-woman, would-bewoman” (Callender and Kochems 1983: 443).

Apart from fulfilling female roles and activities, the berdaches performed a number of activities that were neither male nor female, but were reserved exclusively to them on account of their special status (Callender and Kochems 1983: 448) such as participating in rituals or being go-betweens (Fulton and Anderson 1992: 606). Cabeza de Vaca not only was a go-between among the Native Americans in his condition as trader (Wade 1999) but he also became a healer. Cabeza de Vaca explains that they were forced by the Native Americans to perform healings lest they would starve (Cabeza de Vaca 1993). Thus, Cabeza de Vaca and his companions adopted a new role that would give them a better status within Native American society, demanding payment in return for their services. Cabeza de Vaca learned to negotiate with the fear he and his companions aroused in the Native Americans – “Cabeza de Vaca and his party had not only survived hardship; they had survived their own fears and learned to manipulate of others” (Adorno 1991: 188).

Different from commonplace descriptions of Native American women as lustful creatures, for Cabeza de Vaca Native American women are not sexual beings, or, at least, they are not for him and his companions. In his account, Cabeza de Vaca does not include any sort of sexual remarks at all and he does not portray Native American women as lecherous but, on the contrary, as modest: “the women cover their private parts with grass and straw” (Cabeza de Vaca 1993: 105). For Cabeza de Vaca, Native American women are mothers rather than women, even mentioning pregnancy and nursing: “from the Isle of Misfortune to this land, all the Indians we encountered have the custom of not sleeping with their wives from the time they first notice they are pregnant until the child is two-years old. The children nurse at the breast until they are twelve years old, when they can look for food for themselves” (Cabeza de Vaca 1993: 85).

Cabeza de Vaca and the three other members of the expedition, Andrés Dorantes, Alonso del Castillo and the Moorish black slave Estebanico, were eventually found by Spanish troops led by captain Diego de Alcaraz and returned to New Spain. Cabeza de Vaca

became the most well-known member of the expedition by far due to the publication of the account of his experiences, *Naufragios* (Zamora, 1542; Valladolid, 1555), usually known in English as *The Account*. Back in Spain, Cabeza de Vaca returned and petitioned to be sent back to Florida as *Adelantado* of a new expedition to the area but the post went to Hernando de Soto instead. It was in the course of the expedition when De Soto found another missing member of the Narváez expedition, Juan Ortiz, in 1539.

Maybe because he never returned to Spain, Juan Ortiz is left out from the vast majority of accounts describing the Narváez expedition.¹¹ After searching in vain for the lost terrestrial expedition (of which Cabeza de Vaca was a member) for a year, the ships returned to Cuba, where Narváez's widow ordered them back to Florida in search for the missing expedition members. In present-day Charlotte Harbor, Florida, they saw a note on a stick. A boat with several men was sent to retrieve the note, believing it to have been left by the members of the terrestrial party. One of these men who disembarked was Ortiz, eighteen years old at the time. The note was part of an elaborate plan on the part of the Timicuan Native Americans of the Uzica village, a Calusa tribe, to mislead and lure the Spaniards (Elvas 1922).

The Uzica were no strangers to the participants of the Narváez expedition –after landing on Good Friday, April 15, 1528, in present-day Tampa Bay, Narváez decided to know where the natives had obtained the gold he saw in some of their adornments. In retaliation for the natives' refusal to tell him, Narváez ordered that the nose of their leader, Chief Hirrihugua, be cut off and had the Spaniards' dogs devour the chief's mother. When Ortiz and his companions fell into the trap and were captured by the Uzica, the Chief had three of them shot with arrows immediately after landing to make them pay for their previous misdeeds. Wrongly believing that Ortiz was

¹¹ Cabeza de Vaca himself fails to mention Juan Ortiz's disappearance, though he included a chapter (the thirty-eighth) on what happened to the people in the ships after the disappearance of the terrestrial expedition. A possible reason why Cabeza de Vaca did not include Juan Ortiz in his account was that, even if he learned about his story, in Cabeza de Vaca's eyes, Ortiz would have surely lost all legitimacy. Those who committed "acts of cultural betrayal," "ceased to have legitimacy in the Spanish Imperial context" (Sánchez 1992: 266). In contrast, Cabeza de Vaca repeatedly asserted that he always remained a Christian and never totally assimilated into Native American culture.

Narváez's son, Hirrihugua spared him for a special death known as "barbacoa," consisting of placing the captive over an open fire to be roasted alive:

by command of Ucita, Juan Ortiz was bound hand and foot to four stakes, and laid upon scaffolding, beneath which a fire was kindled, that he might be burned; but a daughter of the Chief entreated that he might be spared. Though one Christian, she said, might do no good, certainly he could do no harm, and it would be an honour to have one for a captive; to which the father acceded, directing the injuries to be healed. When Ortiz got well, he was put to watching a temple, that the wolves, in the night-time, might not carry off the dead there, which charge he took in hand, having commended himself to God. (Elvas 1922)

When Hirrihugua once more decided to sacrifice Ortiz, Uleleh, the chief's daughter, arranged it for Ortiz to move to a neighboring village ruled by Chief Mocoço, where Ortiz would spend the next nine years of his life. When he was found by the Spaniards, Ortiz looked like a Native American, painted and tattooed, and was no longer able to speak proper Spanish. He joined the De Soto expedition as an interpreter but he died in the course of this expedition and thus never returned to Spain (Elvas 1922).

Captain John Smith felt the thirst for adventures at a very early age and, at sixteen, after his father's death, he left his native village, Willoughby, in Lincolnshire, to become a mercenary soldier in several European campaigns. He soon distinguished himself for his bravery, which earned him the title of captain. Back in England, in 1606 he joined the Virginia Company of London, created to colonize the area and embarked in the 1607 expedition that would found the colony of Jamestown. Like Ortiz and Cabeza de Vaca, Smith soon became prisoner to the local natives. His testimony about his captivity at the hands of the Powhatans, though, differed in subsequent retellings as time went by. In his first book dealing with his experiences in Virginia, *True Relation*, published in 1608, Smith did not allude to any rescue and, instead, stressed Chief Powhatan's kindness and how he was returned safely and promptly to Jamestown:

the next night I lodged at a hunting town of Powhatams, and the next day arrived at Waranacomoco upon the river of Pamauncke, where the great king is resident. [...] Hee kindly welcomed me with such good wordes, and great Platters of sundrie Victuals,

assuring mee his friendship, and my libertie within foure days. Hee much delighted in Opechan Comoughs relation of what I had described to him, and oft examined me upon the same. Hee asked me the cause of our coming. [...] He desired mee to forsake Paspahagh, and to live with him upon his River, a Countrie called Capa Howasicke. Hee promised to give me Corne, Venison, or what I wanted to feede us: Hatchets and Copper wee should make him, and none should disturbe us. This request I promised to performe: and thus, having with all the kindnes hee could devise, sought to content me, hee sent me home, with 4 men: one that usually carried my Gowne and Knapsacke after me, two other loaded with bread, and one to accompanie me. (Smith 2003 [1608])

Accidentally wounded in 1609, Smith returned to England to receive medical treatment. In the meantime, the most famous account of the De Soto expedition, the narrative of an anonymous Portuguese gentleman from Elvas, first published in Evora, Portugal, in 1557,¹² had been published in English for the first time in 1609, under the title *Virginia richly valued by the Description of the Mainland of Florida* and edited by Richard Hakluyt.¹³ Chances are that Smith read about Ortiz's experience for books recounting it were widely available in London at the time (Coker quoted in Kaczor 1995).

In 1616, when Pocahontas, daughter of Chief Powhatan, now married to an Englishman, John Rolfe, and named Rebecca, was preparing her arrival in England, John Smith wrote a letter to Queen Anne, in which he spoke of Pocahontas in most praising terms and asked the Queen to make sure that this Native American princess receive the treatment she deserved –that is, as a royal.¹⁴ Smith credited the survival of Jamestown to Pocahontas: “she next under God, was still the instrument to preserve this colony from death,

¹² There are other accounts of the De Soto expedition. Another participant, Rangel, told his story to Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo, who included it in *Historia general y natural de las Indias* (1547). Garcilaso de la Vega el Inca based his account, *Florida del Ynca* (Lisbon, 1605), on a nobleman's oral testimony and the written stories of soldiers Alonzo de Carmona and Juan Coles. Biedma, the expedition's factor, wrote still another account.

¹³ It would be reprinted in 1611 as *The worthye and famous Historie of the Travailles, Discovery, and Conquest of Terra Florida*.

¹⁴ For Camboni (2008: 162), this letter is “the ground on which one of the founding myths of white, male America is rooted.”

famine and utter confusion" (Smith 1997 [1616]). In London, Smith met Pocahontas again:

I went to see her: After a modest salutation, without any word, she turned about, obscured her face, as not seeming well contented; and in that humour her husband, with diuers others, we all left her two or three houres, repenting my selfe to haue writ she could speake *English*. But not long after, she began to talke, and remembred mee well what courtesies shee had done: saying, You did promise *Powhatan* what was yours should bee his, and he the like to you; you called him father being in his land a stranger, and by the same reason so must I doe you: which though I would haue excused, I durst not allow of that title, because she was a Kings daughter; with a well set countenance she said, Were you not afraid to come into my fathers Countrie, and caused feare in him and all his people (but mee) and feare you here I should call you fater; I will, and you shall call mee childe, and so I will bee for euer and euer your Countrieman. They did tell vs alwaies you were dead, and I knew no other till I came to *Plimoth*; you *Powhatan* did command *Vttamatmakkin* to seeke you, and know the truth, because your Countriemen will lie much. (Smith 2006 [1624])

By 1624, when Smith's *General Historie* came out, Pocahontas had been dead for seven years.¹⁵ With Pocahontas dead and a celebrity, Smith decided to set the record straight about his experiences at Powhatan's hands, or so he claimed, and there, for the first time, he told about his having been rescued by Pocahontas from being sacrificed in the middle of a Native American ritual.¹⁶ Then, Smith for the first time had his letter to Queen Anne printed, which up to then had remained virtually unknown for everyone except for addressee and addresser. Smith told the story of his captivity and

¹⁵ After a season in London in which she was the rage of that season, Pocahontas, her husband and child sailed for Virginia, but Pocahontas died before leaving English waters.

¹⁶ Some modern ethnographers have claimed that rituals similar to that described by Smith or Ortiz are also reported by other observers but that the result was not sacrificial death but rather, a ceremonial, symbolic death by which the prisoner lost his former, European identity and, in turn, became one of them (Kidwell 1994; Puglisi 1991). One of the main critics of Smith's, ethnologist Helen C. Rountree, author of *The Powhatan Indians of Virginia and Pocahontas's People*, on the contrary, denies the veracity of Smith's testimony of the ritual and argues that "no eyewitness writer mentioned adoption customs as such [described by Smith] for the Powhatans" (1994: 236).

release from the Powhatans in the following way in the *General Historie*:

a long consultation was held, but the conclusion was, two great stones were brought before *Powhatan*: then as many as could layd hands on him, dragged him to them, and thereon laid his head, and being ready with their clubs, to beate out his braines, *Pocahontas* the Kings dearest daughter, when no intreaty could prevaile, got his head in her armes, and laid her owne vpon his to saue him from death: whereat the Emperour was contented he should liue to make him hatchets, and her bells, beads, and copper; for they thought him as well of all occupations as themselues.¹⁷ (Smith 2006)

This greatly differed from Smith's own testimony in *True Relation*. The similarities with Ortiz's story are obvious.

Veridical or not, both Smith's story and Elvas' recounting of Ortiz's rescue have their roots in a well-known myth at the time –the story of the Muslim (or Saracen) princess, which became particularly favored in the medieval *chansons de geste*. The exact origin of the story is unclear, though; some theories point to such diverse possibilities as “the classical figure of Medea, a story in Seneca's sixth controversia, tales in the Arabian Nights, an episode in the tenth-century Byzantine epic *Digenes Akrites*, and Orderic Vitalis' account of Bohemond and Melaz” or even that “the story does reflect actual historical events” (Balfour 1995). This story, basically, tells

the tale of an adventurer [...] who becomes the captive of the king of another country and another faith, and is rescued by his beautiful daughter, a princess who then gives up her land and her religion for his, is a story known to the popular literatures of many peoples for many centuries. The theme was so common in the Middle Ages that medieval scholars have a name for it: 'The Enamoured Moslem Princess.' This figure is a woman who characteristically offers herself to a captive Christian knight, the prisoner of her father, rescues him, is converted to Christianity, and goes to his native land –these events usually being followed

¹⁷ However, this is not the only passage in Smith's works resembling Ortiz's. Smith had in *True Travels* also reported how, as a captive to the Turks, Princess Tragabigzanda, who fell in love with him, had provided him the means for his escape. Both the Pocahontas and the princess Tragabigzanda episodes can be seen as grounding Smith's claims to the status of gentleman for he resisted the temptation of a love affair with this socially superior woman (Rozwenc 1959: 30).

by combat between his compatriots and hers. (Young 1972: 195-196)

George Percy, another Jamestown colonist, was among the very first to attack Smith's veracity and many other historians would follow his lead questioning Smith's authenticity.¹⁸ Some reasons can be put forward to deny Smith's claim. Apart from the striking resemblance to Ortiz's story, Pocahontas, at the time of her rescue of Smith, was a child, as Smith himself acknowledged: "being but a child of twelve or thirteen years of age" (Smith 1997). Be Pocahontas' story a tale or a true event,¹⁹ as time has gone by, subsequent retellings of the story have transformed it into an American foundational myth, the most important and pervasive myth of the colonial era, along with the Plymouth Rock landing and the celebration of the First Thanksgiving. The Pocahontas story has been used with different goals in mind so as to fit changing political and social situations, though, for this topic has already generated a vast literature, Ann Uhry Abrams' book *Pilgrims and Pocahontas: Rival Myths of American Origins* being one of the most well-known and complete scholarly studies.

For better or worse, Pocahontas has long entered the American popular imagination and folklore, becoming the protagonist of a romance and a children's tale, further popularized by the Disney movie that made the story well-known for people living in countries where it had been unheard of before and for whom the movie version would be factual (Kilpatrick 1995: 36). The movie met the opposition of various Native American voices, especially the Powhatan Nation, who publicly denounced that "it is unfortunate that this sad story, which Euro-Americans should find embarrassing,

¹⁸ See Gleach (1996) for a summary of divergent positions about Smith's veracity, especially 22-24. See Young (1972: 182-183) for Smith's literary and historical standing. Henry Adam's 1867 essay "Captain John Smith" in the *North American Review* opened a controversy with regionalist (Southern-Yankee) overtones (Rozwenc 1959: 27). For eyewitnesses' troubles to have their credibility asserted and Smith's attempts to have his own role as historian recognized, see Gurpegui and Gómez Galisteo forthcoming in 2009.

¹⁹ J. A. Leo Lemay's answer to the question *Did Pocahontas Save Captain John Smith?* (1992) met criticism from reviewers, such as Rountree, who finds Lemay's book biased and questioned the credibility of the book (1994: 236). Tilton also found Lemay's answer inconclusive and a starting point for debate rather than a definite answer to the question (1995: 715-716).

Disney makes 'entertainment' and perpetuates a dishonest and self-serving myth at the expense of the Powhatan Nation" (Chief Roy Crazy Horse n.d.).²⁰ From a more scholarly point of view, the Pocahontas story has become the object of historical studies questioning or asserting the veracity of Smith's claims and even the very existence of Pocahontas. One way or another, the Smith-Pocahontas story is at the very core of American popular culture.

To conclude, Álgvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca, Juan Ortiz and John Smith each offer a different, alternative vision of Native American women. The centrality of women in their respective accounts is significant. Cabeza de Vaca acculturated up to a certain extent into Native American culture by means of performing female roles. Juan Ortiz, in turn, though his deeds are by far much less known than Smith's or his fellow Cabeza de Vaca's, succeeded in totally acculturating to Native American society and spent the rest of his life among them. John Smith was a controversial historian, for his contemporaries and even for some historians nowadays, but he created one of the most popular American myths. In these three accounts we have Native American women as non-sexual objects (Cabeza de Vaca), as saviors (Ortiz) and as protagonists of intercultural "love" stories (Smith), respectively. These three experiences contribute to a better understanding of Native American women. More often than not,

American Indian people often seem to be silent in the history of early America. [...] The voices of Indian women are especially difficult to detect in records written by non-Indian men, who generally did not understand the role of women in Indian societies and usually did not solicit, or did not listen to, women's opinion. (Calloway 1994: v)

Since there are no first-hand Native American women's accounts, their voices are other's renderings, with a more or less visible agenda: "History has stereotyped Indian women as the hot-blooded Indian princess, à la Pocahontas, or the stolid drudge that

²⁰ Native American consultants were hired to keep the movie historically accurate but soon these consultants were silenced (Edgerton and Jackson 1996). Yet, James celebrates this Pocahontas as "the most subversive heroine in the Disney canon, a real-life princess who doesn't waltz off with the prince" (1995). Similarly Marcus comments that she is free from family responsibilities, her father's authority, conventions, sexual constraints and even guilt or regret (1995: 941-942).

[eighteenth-century Episcopalian missionary in Minnesota Joseph] Gilfillan described. Pocahontas and Sacagawea become heroines because their actions ultimately benefited the advancement of American society" (Kidwell 1994: 150). Far from the portrayal of Native American women as princesses or passive beings at the service of the Europeans, Cabeza de Vaca's account presents yet another view of the European-Native American contact in the Americas during the colonial period –that Europeans could become the Other by the adoption of female roles in the Native American gendered labor division. As Cabeza de Vaca's account proves, not only did Europeans represent Native American women in their accounts as they saw fit, sometimes European men were forced to adopt female Native American roles in order to survive. From Native American women being described as the Other by the gaze of European observers, we have the Other being a European man adopting Native American female roles.

References

- Abrams, Ann Uhry. 1999 *The Pilgrims and Pocahontas: Rival Myths of American Origins*. Boulder and Oxford: Westview Press.
- Adorno, Rolena. 1991 "The Negotiation of Fear in Cabeza de Vaca's *Naufragios*." *Representations* 33: 163-199.
- Balfour, Mark 1995. "Moses and the Princess: Josephus' *Antiquitates Judaicae* and the Chansons de Geste." *Medium Aevum* 64: 1-16.
- Baym, Nina. 1981. "Melodramas of Beset Manhood: How Theories of American Fiction Exclude Women Authors." *American Quarterly* 33/2: 123-139.
- Blackwood, Evelyn 1984. "Sexuality and Gender in Certain Native American Tribes: The Case of Cross-Gender Females." *Signs* 10/1: 27-42.
- Boorstin, Daniel J. 1983. *The Discoverers: A History of Man's Search to Know His World and Himself*. New York: Random House.
- Bragdon, Kathleen 1996. "Gender as a Social Category in Native Southern New England." *Ethnohistory* 43/4: 573-592.
- Brooks, James F. 1996. "'This Evil Extends Especially... To the Feminine Sex': Negotiating Captivity in the New Mexico Borderlands." *Feminist Studies* 22/2: 279-299.
- Cabeza de Vaca, Álgvar Núñez 1993. *The Account: Álgvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca's Relación*. Eds. Martín A. Favata and José B. Fernández. Houston: Arte Público Press.

- Callender, Charles and Lee M. Kochenus 1983. "The North American Berdache." *Current Anthropology* 24/4: 443-470.
- Calloway, Colin G. 1994. *The World Turned Upside Down. Indian Voices from Early America*. Boston, New York: Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press.
- Camboni, Marina 2008. "Two John Smiths and a Tent." *Aspeers: Emerging Voices in American Studies* 1: 161-165.
- Cevallos-Candau, Francisco Javier 1994. "Introduction." Eds. Francisco Javier Cevallos-Candau et. al. *Coded Encounters: Writing, Gender, and Ethnicity in Colonial Latin America*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press: 1-11.
- Crazy Horse, Chief Roy N.d. "The Pocahontas Myth." <url: <http://www.powhatan.org/pocc.html>>
- Davis, Natalie Zemon 1994. "Iroquois Women, European Women." Eds. Margo Hendrick and Patricia Parker. *Women, 'Race,' and Writing in the Early Modern Period*. London and New York: Routledge: 243-258.
- Derounian-Stodola, Kathryn Zabelle and Arthur James Levernier 1993. *The Indian Captivity Narrative, 1550-1900*. New York: Twayne.
- Edgerton, Gary and Kathy Merlock Jackson 1996. "Redesigning Pocahontas: Disney, the 'White's Man Indian,' and the Marketing of Dreams." *Journal of Popular Film and Television* 24/2: 90-98.
<url: <http://www.encyclopedia.com/printable.aspx?id=1G1:18838472>>
- Fuller, Mary C. 1991. "Raleigh's Fugitive Gold: Reference and Deferral in The Discoverie of Guiana." *Representations* 33: 42-64.
- Fulton, Robert and Steven W. Anderson 1992. "The Amerindian 'Man-Woman': Gender, Liminality, and Cultural Continuity." *Current Anthropology* 33/5: 603-610.
- Gerbi, Antonello 1978. *La naturaleza de las Indias Nuevas de Cristóbal Colón a Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo*. Trans. by Antonio Alatorre. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Gleach, Frederic W. 1996. "Controlled Speculation: Interpreting the Saga of Pocahontas and Captain John Smith." Eds. Jennifer S. H. Brown and Elizabeth Vibert. *Reading Beyond Words: Contexts for Native History*. Peterborough: Broadview: 21-42.
- Gómez Galisteo, M. Carmen Forthcoming (2009). "Subverting Gender Roles in the 16th Century: Cabeza de Vaca, the Conquistador Who Became a Native American Woman." Eds. Fay Yarbrough and Sandra Dale Slater. *Gender and Sexuality in the Native Americas, 1400-1850*.
- Gurpegui, José Antonio and Carmen Gómez Galisteo Forthcoming (2009). "Describing the 'New World': De dicto vs. de re, Historians vs. Eyewitnesses." Eds. Gerald E. Poyo and Tomás Ybarra-Fraustro.

- Recovering the U.S. Hispanic Literary Heritage Project VII*. Houston: Arte Público Press: 3-14.
- Hadfield, Andrew ed. 2001. *Amazons, Savages, and Machiavels. Travel and Colonial Writing in English, 1550-1630: An Anthology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hidalgo de Elvas 1922. *True Relation of the Vicissitudes that Attended the Governor Don Hernando De Soto and Some Nobles of Portugal in the Discovery of the Province of Florida Now Just Given By a Fidalgo of Elvas Viewed by the Lord Inquisitor*. Ed. Edward Gaylord Bourne. Trans. by Buckingham Smith. New York: Allerton Book Company. Mirror of a Transcription by Dr. Jon Muller.
<url: <http://www.floridahistory.com/elvas1.html>>.
- James, Caryn 1995. "Belle and Ariel Never Chose Duty Over Love." *The New York Times*.
<url:<http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=990CE7DB133DF93BA25755CoA963958260>>.
- Kaczor, Bill 1995. "Did Smith Plagiarize Pocahontas Tale?" *New Standard*.
<url:<http://archive.southcoasttoday.com/daily/07-95/07-11-95/0711APpocahontas.HTML>>.
- Kidwell, Clara Sue 1994. "What Would Pocahontas Think Now?: Women and Cultural Persistence." *Callaloo* 17/1: 149-159.
- Kilpatrick, Jacquelyn 1995. "Disney's 'Politically Correct' Pocahontas." *Cineaste* 21/4.
<url: <http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/MRC/Pocahontas.html>>.
- Kristeva, Julia 1991 (1988). *Extranjeros para nosotros mismos*. Trans. by Xavier Gispert. Barcelona: Plaza & Janés.
- López-Peláez Casellas, Jesús and Milagros López-Peláez Casellas 2006. "Introduction." *The Grove* 13: 9-18.
- Lovejoy, David S. 1994. "Satanizing the American Indian." *New England Quarterly* 67/4: 603-621.
- Lurie, Nancy Oestreich 1959. "Indian Cultural Adjustment to European Civilization." Ed. James Morton Smith. *Seventeenth-Century America: Essays in Colonial History*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press: 33-60.
- Maura, Juan Francisco ed. 1996. *Naufraios*. 2nd ed. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Marcus, Paul 1995. "Disney's Great Escape." *Psychoanalytic Review* 82/6: 940-943.
- McClintock, Anne 1995. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. New York, London: Routledge.

- Montrose, Louis 1991. "The Work of Gender in the Discourse of Discovery." *Representations* 33: 1-41.
- Morgan, Jennifer L. 1997. "'Some Could Suckle over Their Shoulder': Male Travelers, Female Bodies, and the Gendering of Racial Ideology, 1500-1770." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 54/1: 167-192.
- Pastor, Beatriz 1989. "Silence and Writing: The History of the Conquest." Eds. René Jara and Nicholas Spadaccini. *1492/1992: Re/Discovering Colonial Writing*. Minneapolis: The Prisma Institute: 121-163.
- Puglisi, Michael J. 1991. "Capt. John Smith, Pocahontas and a Clash of Cultures: A Case for the Ethnohistorical Perspective." *The History Teacher* 25/1: 97-103.
- Raleigh, Sir Walter. 1998 [1595]. *The Discovery of Guiana. Voyages and Travels: Ancient and Modern, with Introductions, Notes and Illustrations*. New York: P. F. Collier and son, The Harvard classics. *Modern History Sourcebook*. <url:<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1595raleigh-uiana.html>>.
- Rountree, Helen C. 1998. "Powhatan Indian Women: The People Captain John Smith Barely Saw." *Ethnohistory* 45/1: 1-29.
- Lemay, J.A. Leo 1994. Review of *Did Pocahontas Save Captain John Smith* by J. A. Leo Lemay. *The Journal of American History* 81/1: 236-237.
- Rozwenc, Edwin C. 1959. "Captain John Smith's Image of America." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 16/1: 27-36.
- Sánchez, Ramón 1992. "The First Captivity Narrative: Alvar Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca's 1542 La Relación." *Proceedings of the II Conference of SEDERI*: 261-275.
- Scammell, G. V. 1969. "The New Worlds and Europe in the Sixteenth century." *The Historical Journal* 12/3: 389-412.
- Sell, Jonathan P. A. 2002. "The Rhetoric of Wonder: the Representation of New Worlds in English Renaissance Travel Literature." Ph.D. dissertation, Universidad de Alcalá.
- Smith, John 1631. *Advertisements For the Unexperienced Planters of New England, or Any Where. OR, The Path-Way to Experience to Erect a Plantation*. London: John Haviland.
- Smith, John 2003 [1608]. "A True Relation of Occurrences and Accidents in Virginia, 1608." Electronic edition by Ralph Bauer. *Travels and Works of Captain John Smith, President of Virginia, and Admiral of New England, 1580-1631, Part I John Smith*. Edinburgh: John Grant, 1910. Maryland Institute for Technology in the Humanities (MITH). <url:http://www.mith2.umd.edu/eada/html/display.php?docs=smith_truerelation.xml&action=show>.

- Smith, John 1997 [1616]. "John Smith's Letter to Queen Anne Regarding Pocahontas." *Mayflower Web Pages*.
<url: <http://www.members.aol.com/mayflo1620/pocahontas.html>>
- Smith, John 2006 [1624]. *The Generall Historie of Virginia, New-England, and the Summer Isles*. London: I.D. and I.H. for Michael Sparkes.
<url:<http://docsouth.unc.edu/southlit/smith/smith.html>>.
- Tilton, Robert S. 1995. "Review of Did Pocahontas Save Captain John Smith? by J. A. Leo Lemay." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 52/4: 714-716.
- Todorov, Tzvetan 1989 [1982]. *La conquista de América: el problema del otro*. Trans. by Flora Botton Burlá. México: Siglo XXI.
- Trexler, Richard C. 1995. *Sex and Conquest: Gendered Violence, Political Order, and the European Conquest of the Americas*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Wade, Mariah 1999. "Go-between: The Roles of Native American Women and Alvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca in Southern Texas in the 16th Century." *The Journal of American Folklore* 112/445: 332-342.
- White, Ed 2003. "Captaine Smith, Colonial Novelist." *American Literature* 75/3: 487-513.
- Young, Philip 1972. "Pocahontas: The Mother of Us All." *Three Bags Full: Essays in American Fiction*. New York: Harcourt Brace: 175-203.
- Zavala, Iris M. 1989. "Representing the Colonial Subject." Eds. René Jara and Nicholas Spadaccini. 1492/1992: *Re/Discovering Colonial Writing*. Minneapolis: The Prisma Institute: 323-348.
- Zerubavel, Eviatar. 1992. *Terra Cognita: The Mental Discovery of America*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

How to cite this article:

Gómez Galisteo, M^a del Carmen. "Representing native American women in early colonial American writings: Álvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca, Juan Ortiz and John Smith." *SEDERI* 19 (2009): 23-43.

Author's contact: mcarmengomez@aol.com

Submission: 30/09/2008

Acceptance: 20/01/2009

Dividuated selves: on Renaissance criticism, critical finitude and the experience of ethical subjectivity

John J. Joughin
University of Central Lancashire

ABSTRACT

This paper situates the work of Renaissance criticism as a type of belated work of mourning or memorial aesthetics. In particular I want to focus on the emergence of a supposedly “modern” form of subjectivity during the theorisation of Renaissance criticism in the eighties –its distinctiveness as well as its occlusions. For the purpose of this essay I take the work of the British critic Francis Barker as, in some sense, broadly representative of a trend in political criticism that was focused on a recovery of the lost significance of the body as a site of subjection. However, I will also argue that the relocation of the mind-body split in the first wave theorisation of Renaissance criticism needs to be read again. The founding dividuation of self in this early criticism is now often criticised for positioning the subject in reductively functionalist or mechanistic terms, as the product of the discourse of power/knowledge that produced it. However, in much of the work that we label cultural materialist or new historicist, the experience of dualism also secreted an ethical standpoint that is worthy of our re-evaluation. In particular, and in building on the insights of Gillian Rose and Judith Butler on mourning, I suggest that the lyrical contemplation of lost bodies in radical criticism implicates our ties to others, as well as the relational ties to others implicit in any political sense of community. In turn, this suggests a more sophisticated account of political subjectivity, as well as a potential reparation of the concept of a political self for radical criticism.

KEYWORDS: memorial aesthetics, mourning, finitude, subjectivity, Shakespeare, cultural materialism.

1. Introduction

Strikingly, in any number of philosophical and literary texts, the contemplation of finitude –the condition of life as brutish and short and without any necessary or transcendent promise of salvation or afterlife– simultaneously marks a form of lyrical intensity for those who experience it. During the early modern period, in an increasingly secular modernity, for poets, philosophers and artists alike, the contemplation of a bounded, limited or transient self demands a response that could be characterised as “aesthetic” – insofar as art is still tied to a form of sensory encounter with the world and thereby becomes a type of “placeholder” for the embodiment of that experience which is now also under threat.¹

In René Descartes’ *Meditations on First Philosophy* for example, the instantiation of an experience that is formative in its insistence of a mind-body split (between the self and the world), simultaneously calls forth images of ruination, or “self-annihilation”, which casts the story of modernity in terms that anticipate the opening of a gothic romance:

I will suppose therefore that not God, who is supremely good and the source of truth, but rather some malicious demon of the utmost power and cunning has employed all his energies in order to deceive me. I shall think that the sky, the air, the earth, colours, shapes, sounds and all external things are merely the delusions of dreams which he has devised to ensnare my judgement. I shall consider my self as not having hands or eyes, or flesh, or blood or senses, but as falsely believing that I have all these things [...]. I shall have to toil not in the light, but amid the inextricable darkness of the problems I have now raised. (1986: 15)

Considered in this light, Descartes’ famous instantiation of a disembodied thinking self –“I shall consider myself as not having hands or eyes, or flesh, or blood or senses”– could just as easily be juxtaposed with Mary Shelley’s later reinvention of the human in *Frankenstein*. In short, it as if Cartesian dualism announces itself as a type of “exemplary horror tract” –an experiment bound to be repeated but best not imitated.² And it is in precisely these equivocal

¹ A claim that arguably reaches its culmination in modernist aesthetics. For a fuller account to which I am indebted here cf. Jay Bernstein (2006, esp. 1-45).

² I owe this reading of Descartes and the point that follows to Thomas Docherty. As he rightly observes: “It is this presentation of the philosophy as a kind of horror-tract that

terms, that Descartes warns us that: "The simple resolve to strip oneself of all opinions and beliefs formerly received is not to be regarded as an example that each man should follow [...] like one who walks alone in the twilight I resolved to go slowly" (quoted in Docherty 1996: 483). Descartes' sceptical attempt to inaugurate modern subjectivity "o'ercrows the spirit", or darkens proceedings, or is at the very least marked by trepidation and by a human body trembling or indeed merely tremulous.

If philosophers philosophise only in terror in their anticipation of the horrors of modern identity, then, in turn, modern artworks could also be said to authenticise their claim to validity only by "giving us a glimpse of the truth of finitude."³ As such my second opening takes its cue from Holbein's depiction of *Christ Entombed* (1522). Unlike the more conventional Italianate altarpieces that appeared throughout the Renaissance which idealised a just proportion between a divine and natural order of things; Holbein's radically "horizontal" take on death is, in some sense, as Jay Bernstein argues, a precursor of "painterly realism" and confirms an emergently secular imagination in "its severing of the dead body from even the thought of transcendence" (2006: 42). The tomb in Holbein's painting is visibly open and we are invited to look at the work that death is doing. The vulnerability of the flesh firmly earthbound –finite and dematerialising before our eyes, so that, as John Carroll points out:

Holbein kills Christ by demolishing the crucifixion. His Christ is no more than a dead body. It lies, life-size, inside the grave. We look in from the side and around the wounds in the visible foot, hand and side the flesh is black-green with decay. The dried-out hair and beard is jutting brittle black. The skeletal right hand, the hand of authority, is stiff with *rigor mortis*, the middle finger elongated and pressing down on the stone slab like a dead twig [...]. The expression on the face is one of horror, the mouth open, the white of the visible eye enlarged. This man died a gruelling death and in his last moments there was no peace or radiance, just the sheer terror of the pain and nothing beyond. (1993: 33)

makes it exciting and, despite Descartes proclamations to the contrary, *exemplary*" (Docherty 1996: 483).

³ I owe the expression to Simon Critchley (2007).

In Holbein's *Ambassadors*, the absent presence of an anamorphic skull allows a temporary sense of our viewing mastery, only to heighten our awareness of the unstable border between life and death. In *Christ Entombed*, the side view of the tomb provides the viewer with another asymmetrical view –this time between viewer and sacrificial victim– though once again only in the acknowledgement that separateness is the unity of our condition. Importantly, as Carroll reminds us, there is “no serene smile of redemption” in Holbein's representation of Christ:

What we see is rot and shrinkage, no different from a dead fish washed up on the beach. This man did not rise from the grave. There was no resurrection. Flesh is flesh, which means festering wounds, stiffening joints and the stench of decomposition. Death is death. The *Christ Corpse* has uncanny force [...]. No one can escape the elongated, bony middle finger of Holbein's Christ, as it collapses downwards on the stone slab –the new world is empty of authority. Mortality rules. (Carroll 1993: 33-34)

In summary, one might say that Descartes and Holbein track two of the most influential trajectories for later modernity. If the dissolution of self mapped by Cartesian subjectivity eventually locates the disembodied rationality which results in the scientific abstraction of the Enlightenment, then Holbein's “painterly realism” arguably configures an increasingly displaced and removed future for artworks –their transient particulars doubling as a mere residue of the meaningful loss produced by the loss of transcendent meaning. These two cultures of modernity –science versus art– each in their own way then make a merit of finitude. Yet, in the process, any attempt to shape, delineate and define the world is betrayed by mortification and alienation. In short, finitude constitutes an inextricable double-bind in producing meaning on the one hand only to confirm our own mortal limitations on the other. As a result, our knowledge of the world is almost inevitably cast as melancholic –tied to an experience of “not knowing” and in the same process making an “enigmatic” virtue of our vulnerability and loss.⁴

⁴ I am indebted to Judith Butler for this insight, see her account of *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence* (2006) to which I return below and cf. esp. 22.

2. Critical finitude⁵

This recognition of the “radical finitude” of the modern human subject, “i.e. that there is no God-like standpoint or point of reference outside of human experience from which the latter might be characterised and judged” (Critchley 1998: 10), was very much part of the radicalisation of Renaissance studies during the eighties, which was quick enough to locate the invention of the human as the unstable fiction that it actually is. In its acknowledgement of the contingency of human experience a dislodgement of the self was at the heart of a range of ground-breaking texts that introduced literary theory to Renaissance criticism, so that Jonathan Dollimore’s *Radical Tragedy* (1984), Catherine Belsey’s *The Subject of Tragedy* (1985) Stephen Greenblatt’s *Renaissance Self-fashioning* (1980) and Francis Barker’s *The Tremulous Private Body* (1984) –each, in some part, constituted essays on the history of subjection that refused the dogmatic fixities of the past. Yet, in critiquing the conditions of modern subjectivity and opposing the inscription of the self “as an object of rational knowledge”, cultural materialism and new historicism placed an emphasis on the negation of the self without weighing the consequence of this event reflectively enough. As such, even the most trenchant of the political criticism of the eighties remains alive to the transformative potential of Renaissance literature and its capacity to produce affects and meanings that question or unsettle our critical expectations, without then construing fully the implication of its own reading experience. I would want to argue that these readings were often unwittingly proto-aestheticist insofar as key paradigm shifts within cultural criticism are clearly themselves indirectly reliant on the transformative cognitive potential of the aesthetic. As a result, in the process of transgressively “overcoming the self”, for many critics, a certain lyrical singularity accrues from the inevitable ‘proximity’ of death and thinking. Here, for example, is Francis Barker speaking of

⁵ Critical finitude? My subtitle actually takes its cue from the contemporary philosopher Richard Rorty, whose critical stance I do not share, but who in speaking to the extremity of our situation nevertheless offers an acute diagnosis of the predicament I want to interrogate further here. So that, as Rorty observes: “[T]he problem of how to finitize while exhibiting a knowledge of one’s own finitude [...] is the problem of ironist theory. It is the problem of how to overcome authority without claiming authority” (1989: 104-105 as cited in Bowie 1997: 86).

the emergence of the private body –an emergence that, perhaps in homage to Descartes, remains “tremulous” and enigmatic:

The scene of writing and of reading, is, like the grave, a private place. We must explore the contents of this privacy, in relation to what is publicly speakable, and draw the diagram of the structure of confessions and denials of desire that gives this passage its peculiar numinosity, and, in principle, as a representative, a special place in history of the bourgeois soul.

In Pepys’ chamber, unlike the quiet tomb in which the dismembered but visible body of Marvell’s beloved was recently interred, if not echoing sounds, at least ghostly mutterings can indeed be heard, rustling among the feints and side-steps of the text’s involuted speech. (1984: 3-4)

For Barker, the intensity of the spectre of the dissolution of the self (and the impossibility of embracing the other) is palpable and poignant. More than most, his work endlessly returns to the ruinous excess exacted by the allegorisation of the body, or rather the incorporeal entity of its vanishing point –“numinous”, dismembered but still (barely) visible “beneath the winding sheet.”⁶

Such readings necessarily bear witness to the critic as insomniac –one who gleans his ungraspable remainder from an unquiet tomb. Barker sets the scene of writing and reading and immediately remarks a work of mourning and incompleteness. The hermeneutic yield of such moments and the scenes of suffering that follow lies, in no small part, in their refusal of the negation afforded by the “informational reading” that might make sense of it (“the history of the bourgeois soul” here represented by Pepys the navy clerk) and opens instead on to what Blanchot would term a responsiveness to what is “other than knowledge” (Haase and Large 2001: 55) –that which remains secret or at least not yet “publicly speakable.” Here, as elsewhere in Barker’s work (but perhaps this is the exemplary instance), the critical self, in this case the one who writes and reads, is cast as interrupted, exposed and responsive (despite itself) to an

⁶ One is reminded here of Maurice Blanchot for whom, as Ullrich Haase and William Large remind us, the reading experience is in part a process which “beneath the winding sheet like the secret of the tomb itself, refuses our grasp” see Haase and Large (2001: 14).

"excessive demand that calls into question the dominance of the subject."⁷

In other words the self is "dividuated" –in the Pepysian instance case riven, by a sexuality or desire that can no longer be frankly avowed. Moreover, this sense of dividuation is, I would want to argue, following Simon Critchley, precisely at the heart of the experience which determines an ethical subjectivity, so that, as Critchley recently reminds us:

The ethical subject is [...] *hetero-affectively* constituted. It is a *split subject* divided between itself and a demand that makes it the subject that it is, but which it cannot entirely fulfil. The sovereignty of my autonomy is always usurped by the heteronomous experience of the other's demand. The ethical subject is a *dividual*.⁸ (2007: 10-11)

In attending to the other's demand, a sense of dislocation and displacement also informs Barker's early attempt to "overcome the self", yet amidst the structures of confession and disavowal and especially in his cribbed confinement, it is also possible to discern a certain anxiety of influence in the opening to the book that secured his reputation. Pepys the navy clerk as a cipher for (and a rage against) traditional literary critics, writing and reading like Barker still within but also against the apparatus? Maybe all this is simply to say that from the earliest stage, Barker's own work always confronted the dilemma of critical finitude *in situ*, occupying a belated afterlife that always tried to remain responsive to the "ghostly mutterings" of that "involuted" speech which somehow resisted subordination. In this form, Barker's critical position also constituted a type of belonging in displacement and as such it was

⁷ Again the register is from Blanchot as formulated by Haase and Large (2001: 71).

⁸ Hetero-affectivity could be said to link poetry and its criticism to politics by confirming a profound disposition for dispossession. An ethical impulse which is reminiscent perhaps of Keats' sense of Shakespeare's "negative capability": a "sympathetic power of imagination" that is actually reliant on a form of "self-emptying" insofar as: "man [sic] is capable of being in uncertainties, mysteries, doubts, without any irritable reaching after fact and reason." In Keats' conception, the playwright's receptivity manifests an "excess of empathy" which is pitched against any restrictive tendency to abstract the facts of the matter. It is this ability to acknowledge the otherness of others that sets Shakespeare apart. See *Letters of John Keats to his Family and Friends* (1891: 48). I am grateful to Hartman (1996) for highlighting this connection to ethics.

entirely traditional in that it understood the openness of tradition as being itself “continually disrupted by the movement of writing and history” (cf. Haase and Large 2001: 118). And I will want to return to this sense of situatedness later on.

An unhealthy complicity between “Violence and Interpretation” (Barker 1993: 121-206) locates its fuller trajectory in Barker’s later work in *The Culture of Violence* where in a memorable essay⁹ on *Titus Andronicus* he critiques the then new historicism as agnostically non-reflective concerning its own critical practice; a species of culturalism which merely aestheticises suffering and in the groundlessness of its interpretation fails to distinguish adequately between “aesthetic and fictional practices.” The key passage comes halfway through the essay where Barker has cause to remark upon the unmotivated exit of the Clown:

This moment is stunning. The Clown is simply taken away to execution. Without cause given. We can speculate that the written “oration” the Clown delivers contains threats or curses, or that Saturninus interprets the knife wrapped in it as a symbolic offer of violence. But the point is that *our* interpretations would remain speculative. The emperor’s action in ordering the Clown’s death is inexplicable. Unexplained in the literal sense that no overt reason for it is given (and this is important because it contributes to the uncanniness of the incident), it is also unjustified in other senses. Not only does it lack credence according to the positive norms of behaviour the play assumes, but equally it fails to conform to the protocols of the deviations from those norms which the play more prominently foregrounds as the reality of Roman life: characters in *Titus Andronicus* may act “barbarously”, but their behaviour is rarely random or arbitrary, on the contrary it is invariably *ad hominem* and selfishly purposeful [...] as a whole this brief episode remains entirely enigmatic and arbitrary. It is as if, running one’s hand along a surface, something snags here. It is formally unmotivated in the sense of being aesthetically discrepant from the primitivism and the classicism of the rest of the play, and of lacking convincing preparation or legitimation in the thematic, narrative or hermeneutic codes of the text. It is inexplicable, as I have said, and never mentioned again. It is simply *there*: strange, *unheimlich*, and, I have found, haunting. (1993:167-168)

⁹ See “A wilderness of tigers”: 143-206.

Here again, something *unheimlich* or spectral snags against the reading consciousness, tracing a “haunting that is history.” Something disjoint or aesthetically discrepant applies, which traces an excess within representation itself related in turn to that which the text cannot represent more precisely perhaps it is “the transgression of the aesthetic” –in this case the formal aesthetic of classicism– “*through* the aesthetic.”¹⁰

In the absent present of the play’s afterlife, the death of the Clown confirms precisely the uneasy sense of writing and reading we have already had cause to notice. In this instance though, the exposure of the self to a form of non-justification (which is also, of course, in this case, the excessive demand of justice itself), might be said to be still more pressing, in that it presents us with these problems whilst also confronting us with somehow being presently involved (albeit at a distance) with these very same dilemmas. In performance it is as if the unendurable excess of bodies *in extremis* retains a sense of witness, for the audience that views them.

In the current instance the text is coy enough about its barbarism to spare us the spectacle, which for Barker at least only serves to make the excision more chilling. Here, and elsewhere in Barker’s work, this seems to confirm a wry sense of Walter Benjamin’s critique of the triumphal barbarism of culture itself,¹¹ even as it registers the allegorical force of Benjamin’s work *The Origin of German Tragic Drama* and his study of the baroque art of the Renaissance in the particular stage-form he terms *Trauerspiel*, or Mourning Play (1992). Not the least marvel of what Barker coins as early as *The Tremulous Private Body* the “glorious cruelties” of Jacobean drama is that here again finitude prevails, or, more accurately, it is as if this drama reminds us of that which we have chosen in our finite world to forget: precisely the constraints of finitude. As Barker infers, the *unheimlich* moment of such encounters inevitably serves to suggest that being-responsible is also paradoxically conjoint with not actually being-there. Indeed, in the case of the Clown’s death, we are certainly in some profound sense

¹⁰ Again I owe this formulation to Critchley (2007: 75).

¹¹ Cf. esp. the well known aphorism in Benjamin’s “Theses on the Philosophy of history” that: “There is no document of civilization that is not at the same time a document of barbarism” (1968: 248).

not present. This too is the “truth of finitude”, which prevails only insofar as, in the strictest sense, as Judith Butler reminds us: “the human is not identified with what is represented but neither is it identified with the unrepresentable; it is, rather, that which limits the success of any representational practice” (2006: 144). Furthermore, to be aware of these limits is also to be aware “of what is precarious in another life or, rather, the precariousness of life itself” (134).

3. Memorial aesthetics

Insofar as materialist and historicist criticism has remained fascinated with the hermeneutic yield provided by an allegorisation of the body *in extremis*, it has, as I have argued elsewhere (Joughin 2006a), re-enacted a type of “memorial aesthetics.” This focus on the representation of dead bodies, or on images of their dismemberment “fresh bleeding”, locates a paradigm-shift within the wider currents of cultural criticism itself, as, during the eighties and the nineties, we witnessed a shift from the “semantic to the somatic” –confirming, in some part, as Maurizio Calbi and Keir Elam have argued, a “reaction formation” against various brands of critical formalism that had hitherto prevailed, in order to confront what Elam refers to, as the: “irreducible and unrationalizable materiality” of “sheer untidy, asyntactic, pre-semantic bodliness” (Calbi 2001:13; and Elam cited in Calbi 2001: 13-14).

At its best, “radical thought” has illuminated the complex ways in which the history of modernity was itself compliant in the erasure, repression and supplementation of the body; and yet there are ways too, in which the recent affirmative corporeal “turn” of cultural criticism has also served to elide the political significance of a recovery of the importance of body, so that, as Terry Eagleton observes, despite the importance of this work: “a certain style of meditation on the body, on pleasures and surfaces, zones and techniques, has acted among other things as a convenient displacement of a less immediately corporeal politics, and acted also as an *ersatz* kind of ethics” (Eagleton 1990: 7). In short, there is, as Eagleton notes: “a privileged, privatised hedonism about such discourse, emerging as it does at just the historical point where certain less exotic forms of politics found themselves suffering a setback” (7). Within early variants of new historicism, suffering bodies regularly “staged history” and by doing so they became the

alibi for a Foucauldian inspired “poetics of (Elizabethan) power” –in the process there is often an occlusion of the political and ethical implications of theatrical performance itself. Instead, in Barker’s terms, in his critique of the new historicism, we are offered a “flattening out” of the ontological distinctions between theatre and society, as well as an oversimplification of the complex ways in which aesthetic and lived practices are inter-implicated in the process of informing our relation with others, both inside and outside the theatre (1993: 143-206).

The anguished complicities of Barker’s work –its sense of present remove combined with troubled self-implication– locates an affinity in some of the work of the new historicism. Stephen Greenblatt for one is also “haunted” by the past and famously draws a comparison between the shaman and the literary critic for whom the critical act is curiously non-appropriative –for it is, as Derrida might say, “conditioned by the spectral” –a form of possession that dispossesses– not the critic’s own voice but the voice of the other whose ghostly intensity is, Greenblatt informs us: “uncannily full of the will to be heard” (1988: 1). In continuing to speak with the dead in *Hamlet in Purgatory* (2001), Greenblatt goes still further, in pondering whether Shakespeare’s theatre might itself be construed as a “cult of the dead” commenting that: “More than anyone of his age, Shakespeare grasped that there were powerful links between his art and the haunting of spirits” (2001: 258-261, 157). As if Shakespeare’s theatre staged an elaborate “ontological argument”, an exercise in “quasi-dying”, where “the dead appear to live again” and in the same process revive contemporary theological debates concerning the status of suffrage and repentance (2001 *passim*).

In performance the dislocatory potential of this phantom-like economy of remembrance is simultaneously disconcerting and regenerative, and, however unsettling it proves to be, the restoration of the past can result in a “newly performed” openness to the unfulfillable demand of the other, as well as producing a newly evaluative understanding of the spectator’s role in conceding the limits of their own historical situation. As such, in the process of resurrecting the dead, Shakespeare’s theatre obviously has a direct role play in reconstituting and rehabilitating the transformative interaction of culture and memory. The ethical and political

implications of this hermeneutic encounter need to be interrogated and reconfigured in their relation to tragedy and history.

Again, for Barker, our own inability to conceive of the Renaissance body politic otherwise is already a mark of a considerable bourgeois forgetting, yet it also serves to witness a related affinity, as, despite its latter-day erasure and its present remove, the insistent materiality of the Jacobean corpus of Shakespeare and his contemporaries nevertheless retains its potential to light the poetic touch-paper:

The Jacobean body –the object, certainly, of terrible pressures– is distributed irreducibly through a theatre whose political and cultural centrality can only be measured against the marginality of the theatre today; and beyond the theatre it exists in the world whose most subtle inner organization is so different from that of our own not least because of the part played by the body in it. In the fullest sense of which it is now possible to conceive, from the other side of our own carnal guilt, it is a *corporeal* body, which, if it is already touched by the metaphysics of its later erasure, still contains a charge which, set off by the violent hands laid on it, will illuminate the scene, incite difference, and ignite poetry. This spectacular visible body is the proper gauge of what the bourgeoisie had to forget. (1984: 25)

In the performance of suffering, as Barker insinuates, there is a poetics, a pathos or ‘charge’ (maybe it is an obligation or a pleading in open “presence”?) that will repay further interrogation. Set off for Barker in this instance by violent hands (of interpretation no doubt) which will “illuminate the scene, incite difference, and ignite poetry.”

Again, such moments also clearly activate an interpersonal notion of “readerly responsibility” in exposing us directly to what an ethical criticism, influenced by the readings of Levinas and Derrida, might term the infinite demand or “irreducible otherness of the other.” Yet this demand for justice is distributed, as Barker himself puts it, “irreducibly throughout a theatre whose political and cultural centrality can only be measured against the marginality of the theatre today.” Beyond its savage re-appropriation, beyond its appropriation of savagery itself, in the process of its recuperation as “our tradition”, Jacobean poetry nonetheless ignites an ethical impulse which cannot be grounded by criticism, or much less located by its retrospective justification(s); but rather instead evokes

a sense of unrelinquished belatedness: the felt need to bear a “last witness”, an “inspiring insomnia,”¹² which haunts liberal humanists and historicists alike.

As Simon Critchley argues, it is this “exorbitant demand which heteronomously determines the ethical subject” yet, in turn, as he points out: “I am not the equal of the demand that is made upon me [...] this explains why, for Levinas, the relation to the other is asymmetrical. That is, the subject relates itself to something that exceeds its relational capacity” (2007: 57). In short, as Critchley puts it, as a “dividuated self” the “ethical subject” is defined: “in terms of a split between itself and an exorbitant demand that it can never meet, the demand to be infinitely responsible [...] the subject shapes itself in relation to a demand that it can never meet, which divides and sunders the subject” (2007: 40).

As such, even as cultural materialism and new historicism could be said to have overturned conventional forms of tragic individualism in their readings of tragedy and history, the critical formation is still beset by a haunting form of tragic guilt which is difficult to bear, as if asking, in Critchley’s terms: “How can I respond in infinite responsibility to the other without in turn extinguishing myself as a subject?” (2007: 69). Couched in these terms alone, the question of the dead remains unfulfillable. For how are we to eventually come to terms with the dead (and the living) and meet their demand, if their history is fated only to be construed as the figure of, and for, inconsolable loss? How are we to embrace the hyperbolic burden of the nameless undead?

4. Lamentations

In some sense, as I’ve already suggested, these remain the barely articulated yet key political questions that have haunted the work of materialist and historicist critics alike ever since. And if, in these circumstances, the fascination of much materialist historiography lies in tracing the erasure of corporeality, and in witnessing the simultaneous emergence of an uncanny sense of otherness concerning our own being; then it is precisely because the attraction of the body, and the manner in which our attempts to construe it are

¹² Again the register points to Blanchot.

exceeded (or takes us to the limit of representation), that the corpus of work that I am interrogating here traces the outline of something sublime. For, even as bourgeois history intrigues its disappearance, our body is also that which can never be laid to rest or closure. In short, it too constitutes a site that presents or expresses “a forever non-appearing inside, interiority, outside” –so that, as Jay Bernstein reminds us: “what cannot appear in itself, what cannot be made present (without the thought of its being simultaneously absent) is our autonomy” (1992: 23), or, as Hamlet famously puts it: “I have that within which passes show.”

In other words, the ontological uncertainties of “hauntology”¹³ and those spectres that exceed embodiment paradoxically ensure the emergence of an equivocal “self-consciousness”. A self, unsure of its “self”, equally unsure of its knowledge of the existence of others. Yet paradoxically of course, on this, the terrifying brink of the body's disappearance, new figures and forms of authenticity are simultaneously required to overcome and combat the condition of actually being individuated, or modern. And within the discourses that attempt to rationalize, justify and politicise the emergence of an autonomous self, every attempt is made to counteract the concomitant alienation and solitude that our possession of this dubious “freedom” of individuality entails. This gives rise to what Jay Bernstein aptly labels the “aporia of autonomy” (Bernstein 1993). So that, as a direct result of its positioning within the philosophical discourse of modernity, the “self” which would do away with the body now also simultaneously strives to reincorporate that which is heteronomous to the self –the body, history, community– even as it (the self) continues to locate substantially new figures which acknowledge in their very excess, the failure of these attempted acts of incorporation. In turn, the failure to re-assimilate that which is lost or beyond self-assimilation gives rise to the despairing mournful thought which was our first regret and our necessary accomplice in initially turning away from and doubting the body. And so, on it goes...

This sense of inconsolable loss simultaneously invokes an earlier legacy of lament that pre-dates early modern drama. In *Richard II* for example, as Richard casts himself as a sacrificial victim

¹³ To borrow Derrida's term, see *Specters of Marx* (1994).

and invites us to “peer into heart of nothing” his appeal is already directly reminiscent of the radical reflexivity of an earlier Christian tradition, where the path to a “saving self-knowledge” simultaneously locates an increasing “bemusement” concerning the self, so that, as Augustine puts it in his *Confessions*: “I became a great riddle to myself” (Cited in Aers 1992: 182; cf. Taylor 1989: 131). As such, Richard’s appeal is already curiously outmoded –reminiscent of the lyrical suffering evoked by antecedents of poetic subjectivity in sources as wide-ranging as hagiographic writing and courtly romance (also overlooked by cultural materialism) and especially in terms of the ‘confessional Augustinianism’ of Petrarch and other poets (cf. Aers 1992 *passim*). In short, Shakespeare’s “lamentable tragedy”, *Richard II*, is a Passion play, where the legacy of an incomprehensible grief and the aporetic configuration of its interiority is entwined with the homilectic *exemplum* –we are confronted with the sublime alterity of our own being configured as the “inward beholding” of an external truth in which we now may acknowledge a share. In this respect, Richard’s lyricism dramatises a process self-iconisation where Christological metaphors and allusions to sacrifice and martyrdom are painfully embodied in the act of performance itself:

I’ll give my jewels for a set of beads;
 My gorgeous palace for a hermitage;
 My gay apparel for an almsman’s gown;
 My figur’d goblets for a dish of wood;
 My sceptre for a palmer’s walking staff;
 My subjects for a pair of carved saints,
 And my little kingdom for a little grave. (3.3.147-153)

In his insistent apprehension of bereavement Richard eventually settles for casting himself in terms of those future commemorative practices that will canonise his memory and by which his anonymity will simultaneously guarantee his legacy –as the impossible object of his own grief.¹⁴

In its inversion of the worldly and the spiritual, Richard’s lamentation is reminiscent of Holbein’s “painterly realism” –each grounding us in mortality. Yet the risk is that Richard’s hyperbole will be taken literally, or rather as merely theatrical. Indeed, it is

¹⁴ For a fuller and more detailed engagement with *Richard II* as Mourning Play, which I partly depend on here, see Joughin (2006b) and also cf. Joughin (2006a).

precisely in these terms that Richard is often accused by his sceptical latter-day critics of waxing too lyrical, his overt theatricalisation of grief drawing the accusation of improbability, the tears of a “player king” re-enacting the terms of what Freud would term a “hysterical” mourning –interminably immersed in sad events that “occurred long ago.” Yet if the denial of Richard’s grief by others only consolidates the process by which he is cast as irretrievable, it also offers an audience a position from which to redeem themselves. In short, the extent of Richard’s over-dramatic isolation will in time also itself prove a measure or gauge of an audience’s willingness to overcome their scepticism and to commit to the very rites of pilgrimage he demands and envisages.

5. Inaugurated mourning?

Yet as I have suggested living up to this demand is not easy. And the question still remains how might we configure these forms of mourning and incompletion otherwise? In following Critchley’s recent work, I want to close by suggesting that the picture of human finitude is perhaps better approached as comic acknowledgement rather than tragic affirmation. In Critchley’s terms this is equally an acknowledgement of both “the ubiquity of the finite and its ungraspability.” But comedy, or maybe even the tragic-comic, simultaneously allow for a sense of reparation –one which allows the subject to bear the excessive burden of the ethical demand without that demand turning to mere melancholic entrapment, or hysterical mourning. In brief elaboration one could turn to the rites of memorial, if not of pilgrimage, that close Shakespeare’s *King Lear*:

EDGAR

The weight of this sad time we must obey,
Speak what we feel, not what we ought to say.
The oldest hath borne most; we that are young
Shall never see so much, nor live so long.
Exeunt with a dead march. (5.3. 322-325)

The passage is, as critics have remarked, at the very least ambivalent, yet in suggesting that: ‘we that are young / Shall never see so much, nor live so long’, Edgar’s speech is certainly earthbound in that it constitutes a reflection from within experience that inaugurates a degree of responsibility for those who come after. As if we need to live the conditionality of our inheritance, however fraught with

difficulty that “living” might be. Perhaps a clue resides in the words of the obligation that precede the play’s last testament?

The weight of this sad time we must obey,
Speak what we feel, not what we ought to say.

As Reg Foakes reminds us in his gloss on the line, there seems to be a conscious echo here of *Lear*’s opening scene: “in 1.1, Goneril and Regan spoke dutifully what they *ought to say*” (Foakes in Shakespeare 1997: 392; Foakes’s emphasis). But now we might notice that in closing there is also the more substantial temporal duty or “obedience”, which precedes what we merely “ought” to say: “The weight of this sad time *we must obey*” –a duty, that is to say, which is beyond mere public duty, and one which arguably marks an ethical turning point in coming after but now lying beyond the empty rhetoric which attended the official investment of power and responsibility at the beginning of the play. The outcome is discordant, yet it also arguably re-marks the recognition that “the obligations imposed by the dead *are* the obligations we discover and re-negotiate in life”¹⁵ –a form of ethical demand that lives on in our day-to-day commitments and continues to inform our relations with others in its development beyond the confines of mere unredeemable lament and future pilgrimage.¹⁶

Rather than to hypostasise the experience of suffering or to universalise its significance, this would be to suggest that the facticity of suffering actually “makes a virtue out of limitation” and resides in an openness to corrigibility. Here the difference between thinking and saying cannot be merely anticipated, so that –as the philosopher Gillian Rose puts it: “To grow in love-ability is to accept the boundaries of oneself and others, while remaining vulnerable, woundable, around the bounds” (Rose 1995: 98) –an ability that Cordelia arguably exhibits from the start of the play. And, unlikely as it seems, a morsel of this sentiment still survives in the play’s closing stanza, even after the enduring memory of her death at the end of the play. As a consequence, we are bound to acknowledge it,

¹⁵ I borrow this formulation directly from Wendy Wheeler who makes use of it (1999: 78) in her discussion of Graham Swift’s novel *Last Orders*. Though I should that both Wheeler and I are indebted in turn here to the work of the philosopher Gillian Rose see esp. *Mourning Becomes the Law* (1996).

¹⁶ For a more detailed consideration of the rites of memory at the end of *Lear* which I partially draw on here and below see Joughin (2002).

for its obligation is an ob-ligature, a binding-up, or bond, to which we are still bound.¹⁷

Moreover these ties and bonds seem crucial to any realisation of a future that moves us beyond mourning, even as this process is simultaneously bound up in the transformative impact of its loss, which could not have been anticipated in advance (cf. Butler 2004: 21). So that as Judith Butler observes in attempting to answer the question “What makes for a grievable life?”:

When we lose certain people, or when we are dispossessed from a place, or a community, we may simply feel that we are undergoing something temporary, that mourning will be over and some restoration of prior order will be achieved. But maybe when we undergo what we do, something about who we are is revealed, something that delineates the ties we have to others, that shows us that these ties constitute what we are, ties or bonds that compose us. It is not as if an “I” exists independently over here and then simply loses a “you” over there, especially if the attachment to “you” is part of what composes who “I” am. If I lose you, under these conditions, then I not only mourn the loss, but I become inscrutable to myself. Who “am” I, without you? When we lose some of these ties by which we are constituted, we do not know who we are or what to do. On one level, I think I have lost “you” only to discover that “I” have gone missing as well. At another level, perhaps what I have lost “in” you, that for which I have no ready vocabulary, is a relationality that is composed neither exclusively of myself nor you, but is to be conceived as *the tie* by which those terms are differentiated and related.

Many people think that grief is privatizing, that it returns us to a solitary situation and is, in that sense, depoliticizing. But I think it furnishes a sense of political community of a complex order, and it does this first of all by bringing to the fore the relational ties that have implications for theorizing fundamental dependency and ethical responsibility. If my fate is not originally or finally separable from yours, then the “we” is traversed by a relationality that we cannot easily argue against; or, rather, we can argue against it, but we would be denying something fundamental about the social conditions of our very formation

¹⁷ Again I am grateful to Wheeler 1999 for pointing out the “tie” between obligation and ligature (76).

[...]. Let's face it. We're undone by each other. And if we're not, we're missing something. (Butler 2004: 22-23; Butler's emphasis)

These questions are often explored, more or less directly, in many of Shakespeare's histories and tragedies, particularly when we are faced with acts of commemoration and mourning that are bound up in questions of political legacy. At the close of *Romeo and Juliet* for example, the tie "that binds us even as we are undone" appears as a form of obligation –in lieu of a dowry that is still in some part constitutes a form of gift:

CAPULET

O brother Montague, give me thy hand.
This is my daughter's jointure, for no more
Can I demand.

MONTAGUE

But I can give thee more.
For I will raise her statue in pure gold,
That whiles Verona by that name is known,
There shall no figure at such rate be set
As that of true and faithful Juliet.

CAPULET

As rich shall Romeo's by his lady's lie,
Poor sacrifices of our enmity! (5.3.296-304)

In this instance the exemplary force of "Romeo and Juliet" is founded less on the idealised symbolic merit or otherwise of the commemorative gold memorial (which for all its excess of signification remains an exorbitant figure a price too high to pay), but rather on their legacy of unsettling counterpoint, the impossible memory of each, and each other, dying and mourning before their time even whilst outliving the other. In effect, as Jacques Derrida suggests, in his wonderful aphoristic staging of Shakespeare's play, we are confronted with:

the theatre of the impossible: two people each outlive the other. The absolute certainty which rules over the *duel* (*Romeo and Juliet* is the *mis-en-scène* of all duels) is that one must die before the other. One of them must see the other die. To no matter whom, I must be able to say: since we are two, we know in an absolutely ineluctable way that one of us will die before the other. One of us will see the other die, one of us will live on, even if only for an

instant. One of us, only one of us, will carry the death of the other –and the mourning. It is impossible that we should each survive the other. That's the duel, the axiomatic of every duel, the scene which is most common and the least spoken of –or the most prohibited– concerning our relation to the other. Yet *the impossible happens* –not in “objective reality,” which has no say here, but in the experience of Romeo and Juliet. And under the law of the pledge, which commands every given world. They live *in turn* the death of the other, for a time the contretemps of their death. Both are in mourning –and both watch over the death of the other, attend to the death of the other. Double death sentence. Romeo dies before Juliet, whom he has seen dead. They both live, outlive the death of the other. (Derrida 1992: 422)

As Derrida suggests, this impossible “theatre of double survival,” and the lovers’ untimely death, remarks a death sentence that is also in part a “pledge” or promise. As such, it is a type of survival, a form of hope against hope anticipated perhaps by Romeo’s earlier premonition during 5.1 within a “strange dream” that opens a space for reanimation:

I dreamt my lady came and found me dead –
Strange dream that gives a dead man leave to think! –
And breathed such life with kisses in my lips
That I revived and was an emperor. (5.1.6-9)

Crucially, in the case of *Lear* and *Romeo and Juliet*, something will survive “between finitude and infinitude” that reveals the political ties of community, and begins the process of moving beyond mourning. Yet, unsurprisingly perhaps, in the face of interminable and inconsolable loss, for those that come after, the temptation is often to opt for the imposition of a more formal restoration of a prior order. However constrictive and unrelenting it might now seem to be, this is certainly “true” of Nahum Tate’s well known imposed comedic ending to *King Lear*, which unwittingly secretes its own testament to provisionality and improvisation even as it strives to forget the fact of that which will not be forgotten. Interestingly, Tate’s original Dedication to his adaptation of the play, actually hinges on its own admission of an impossible juggling act. In the course of defending his “New-modelling of this story [...] whereof I had no Ground in my Author” he protests that he was “wraught with no small Fears for so bold a change,” and although he locates his main justification for the “re-modelling” of the play in its

performance, protesting the change “well received by the audience,” he feels bound to add one further “theoretical” disclaimer:

Neither is it of so Trivial an Undertaking to make a Tragedy end happily, for 'tis more difficult to save than 'tis to Kill: The Dagger and Cup of Poison are always in Readiness; but to bring the Action to the last Extremity, and then by probable means to recover All, will require the Art and Judgement of a Writer, and cost him many a Pang in the Performance. (Tate 1992 (1681): 25-26)

Is it too fanciful to hear a trace of regretful overcompensation in Tate’s account of his ‘accomplishment’? In ‘hindsight’, perhaps the trick will be in preserving the spirit of Tate’s ethical intuition –his acknowledgement that *‘tis more difficult to save (or repair?) than 'tis to Kill’* – against the formal reconciliation that he finally opts for. Yet the admission of *‘probable means’* remains improbable. Faced with discordancy Tate opts for resolution, but the trace of protestation – *“tis more difficult to save [...] to bring the Action to the last Extremity, and then by probable means to recover All’* – almost saves Tate’s wishful thinking as a wishful need, acknowledging a part of truth which exceeds his grasp yet remains tantalising within reach. I would want to re-style Tate’s ‘improvement’ of *Lear* as a comedy finally recast as a drama of misrecognition, where to read Tate in the spirit of Gillian Rose reading Hegel: *“the drama of misrecognition [...] ensues at every stage and transition of the work –a ceaseless comedy, according to which our aims and outcomes constantly mismatch each other, and provoke yet another revised aim, action and discordant outcome”* (1996: 72). If we accept the comic possibility of the impossible recursion that admits that it is more difficult to save than it is to kill, even as Tate would rather save us from doing so, then it –the comic possibility– still potentially saves us. For then we uphold in hope against hope a form of “ceaseless comedy” against mere comic closure. And if we do not, we deny any attempt to imagine it otherwise.

6. Conclusion

There is no God to save us at the end of *King Lear* or, indeed, at the end game of *Romeo and Juliet*. Yet, in each play, even as they remark distinctly different types of political settlement, Shakespeare’s tragic-comic endings and their acts of finitude invite us to “make a virtue out of limitation.” What I have termed “critical finitude” marks a

form of situatedness that becomes creative and transformative precisely because, it is open to such renegotiation. In these terms many of the faultlines and rupture points of the “dissident criticism” of the eighties and nineties might well occupy the same terrain. As such, in the face of its apprehension of ruination, a critical subject encounters a type of limit –and yet experiences it as a form of situated ungrounding, which is simultaneously replete with the potential for new forms of productive mismatch between “aims and outcomes.” In these terms, as Jay Bernstein reminds us “[s]elf-reflection without transcendental reflection is the ethical act of self-consciousness that brings the subject before and into his or her historical situation” (Bernstein 1992: 16), as well as his or her ties to others.

In these circumstances, the key question still perhaps remains “how to overcome authority without claiming authority.”¹⁸ For many cultural critics, as we have seen, this dilemma marks a form of “belonging in displacement” that creates a form of “politics as interstitial distance,”¹⁹ as critics work simultaneously within, and against, the state apparatus of which they are part –in Benjamin’s terms “documents of civilisation” remain “documents of barbarism.” Yet, only through living on after, surviving the confession of disaster and experiencing the guilt and self-implication of critical finitude, is it possible to surmount the self and conjure the possibility of reconciliation into being (cf. Bernstein 1992: 16). Outside of melancholic encryptment, the experience of finitude, and our physical vulnerability, exposes the “relational ties to others” (cf. Butler 2004: 22-23) that are implicit in any political sense of community. This, in turn, suggests a more sophisticated account of political subjectivity, as well as a potential reparation of the concept of a political self for radical criticism. Finally, as Judith Butler observes, faced with the sequence of “violence, mourning and politics”:

Perhaps mourning has to do with agreeing to undergo a transformation (perhaps one should say *submitting* to a transformation) the full result of which one cannot know in advance. There is losing, as we know but there is also the

¹⁸ Cf. n. 6 above.

¹⁹ Again the phrase is borrowed from Critchley (2007: 111-114).

transformative effect of loss, and this latter cannot be charted or planned. (2004: 21)

In these terms, we might usefully learn to live with the consequence and legacy of historical difference and incalculable loss, as well as recognising its potentially transformative affinities, in the process of rebuilding our political future.

References

- Aers, David 1992. "A Whisper in the Ear of the Early Modernists; or, Reflections on Literary Critics Writing on the 'History of the Subject'." Ed. David Aers. *Culture and History, 1350-1600: Essays on English Communities, Identities and Writings*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press: 177-202.
- Barker, Francis 1984. *The Tremulous Private Body: Essays on Subjection*. London: Methuen.
- Barker, Francis 1993. *The Culture of Violence: Tragedy and History*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Belsey, Catherine 1985. *The Subject of Tragedy: Identity and Difference in Renaissance Drama*. London: Routledge.
- Benjamin, Walter 1968. *Illuminations*. Ed. Trans. H. Zohn, introd. H. Arendt. London: Fontana.
- Benjamin, Walter 1992 (1928). *The Origin of German Tragic Drama*. Trans. John Osborne. London: New Left Books.
- Bernstein, Jay 1992. *The Fate of Art: Aesthetic Alienation from Kant to Derrida and Adorno*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bernstein, Jay 1993. "Autonomy and Solitude." Ed. Keith Ansell Pearson. *Nietzsche and Modern German Thought*. London: Routledge: 192-215.
- Bernstein, Jay 2006. *Against Voluptuous Bodies: Late Modernism and the Meaning of Painting*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bowie, Andrew 1997. *From Romanticism to Critical Theory: The Philosophy of German Literary Theory*. London: Routledge.
- Bowie, Andrew 2003 (1990). *Aesthetics and Subjectivity: From Kant to Nietzsche*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Butler, Judith 2004. *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*. London: Verso.

- Calbi, Maurizio 2001. *Approximate Bodies: Aspects of the Figuration of Masculinity, Power and the Uncanny in Early Modern Drama and Anatomy*. Salerno: Oedipus.
- Carroll, John 1993. *Humanism: The Wreck of Western Culture*. London: Fontana Press.
- Critchley, Simon 1998. "Introduction: What is Continental Philosophy." Ed. Simon Critchley and William R Schroeder. *A Companion to Continental Philosophy*. Oxford: Blackwell: 1-17.
- Critchley, Simon 2007. *Infinitely Demanding: Ethics of Commitment, Politics of Resistance*. London: Verso.
- Derrida, Jacques 1992 (1986). "Aphorism Countertime." Ed. Derek Attridge. *Acts of Literature*. London: Routledge: 414-433.
- Derrida, Jacques 1994. *Specters of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning, and the New International*. Trans. P. Kamuf. London: Routledge.
- Descartes, Rene 1986 (1641). *Meditations on First Philosophy*. Trans. J. Cottingham. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Docherty, Thomas 1996. "Tragedy and the nationalist condition of criticism." *Textual Practice* 10/3: 479-505.
- Dollimore, Jonathan 1989 (1984). *Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology, and Power in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries*. Brighton: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Eagleton, Terence 1990. *The Ideology of the Aesthetic*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Foakes, R. A. 1997. "Introduction." Ed. R. A. Foakes. *King Lear*. Walton-on-Thames: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, The Arden Shakespeare: 1-151.
- Greenblatt, Stephen 1980. *Renaissance Self-fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Greenblatt, Stephen 1988. *Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Greenblatt, Stephen 2001. *Hamlet in Purgatory*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hartman, Geoffrey H. 1996. "Shakespeare and the Ethical Question." *English Literary History* 63: 1-23.
- Haase, Ullrich and Large, William 2001. *Maurice Blanchot*. London: Routledge.
- Joughin, John J. 2002. "Lear's Afterlife." *Shakespeare Survey* 55: 67-81.
- Joughin, John J. 2006a. "Shakespeare's Memorial Aesthetics." Ed. Peter Holland. *Shakespeare, Memory and Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 43-62.

- Joughin, John J. 2006b. "Richard II and the Performance of Grief." Eds. Dermot Cavanagh, Stuart Hampton-Reeves and Stephen Longstaffe. *Shakespeare's Histories and Counter-Histories*. Manchester: Manchester University Press: 15-31.
- Keats, John 1891. *Letters of John Keats to his Family and Friends*. Ed. by Sidney Colvin. London: Macmillan and Co.
- Rorty, Richard 1989. *Contingency, Irony and Solidarity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rose, Gillian 1995. *Love's Work*. London: Chatto and Windus.
- Rose, Gillian 1996. *Mourning Becomes the Law: Philosophy and Representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shakespeare, William 1991. *Richard II*. Ed. by Peter Ure. London: Arden.
- Shakespeare, William 1997. *King Lear*. Ed. by R. A. Foakes. Walton-on-Thames: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, The Arden Shakespeare.
- Shakespeare, William 1967. *Romeo and Juliet*. Ed. by T. J. B. Spencer. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, The New Penguin Shakespeare.
- Tate, Nahum 1992 (1681): "Dedication and Prologue to *King Lear*." Ed Frank Kermode. *Shakespeare: King Lear*. Basingstoke: Macmillan: 25-26.
- Taylor, Charles 1989. *Sources of the Self: The Making of Modern Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wheeler, Wendy 1999. "Melancholic Modernity and Contemporary Grief: The Novels of Graham Swift." Ed. Roger Luckhurst and P. Marks. *Literature and the Contemporary: Fictions and Theories of the Present*. Harlow: Longman: 63-79.

How to cite this article:

Joughin, John J. "Dividuated selves: on Renaissance criticism, critical finitude and the experience of ethical subjectivity." *SEDERI* 19 (2009): 45-69.

Author's contact: JJoughin@uclan.ac.uk

Submission: 19/01/2009

Acceptance: 24/02/2009

Pericles' "unknown travels": the dimensions of geography in Shakespeare's *Pericles*¹

Lorena Laureano Domínguez
University of Huelva

ABSTRACT

The present essay explores the complex notion of geography and its manifold implications in Shakespeare's first romance, *Pericles*. It will be argued that the role of geography and travelling in the play cannot be reduced to a mere formal strategy. In the play's treatment and representation of geography, psychological, moral and political aspects intertwine. Thus *Pericles* can be understood simultaneously as an individual's life journey, as a spiritual journey, and even as an exploration of different forms of government and power. Taking as a point of departure John Gillies' concept of "geographic imagination" and Freud's notion of "the uncanny," I will focus on the psychological meaning and on the poetic and dramatic effectiveness of the author's imaginative use of geography. Examination of the different locations demonstrates that, beyond their existence as specific external spaces, they are relevant as inner mental entities informing Pericles' experience and acquiring meaning within the hero's microcosm. With a special emphasis on the incest scene, it will be contended that in *Pericles* the geographical and the psychological fuse and that geographical locations work as different layers of the psyche. Geography will be analysed in relation to plot and characters, always taking into consideration its allegorical, psychological and poetic dimensions.

KEYWORDS: Shakespeare, *Pericles*, geography, space, psychoanalysis, barbarian, the uncanny.

¹ The author wishes to acknowledge the support of the Spanish Ministry of Education through a FPU scholarship (Programa de Formación de Profesorado Universitario).

In *Shakespeare and the Geography of Difference*, John Gillies makes an exhaustive and insightful exploration of the concept of geography in the Renaissance, and its classical and medieval antecedents, in order to analyse how this notion works imaginatively, poetically, and symbolically in Shakespeare's dramatic production. For his analysis, Gillies focuses on *Titus Andronicus*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *The Merchant of Venice*, *Othello* and *The Tempest*. But he leaves aside one of the plays in which geography and travel are more explicitly and deeply incorporated, both at the level of dramatic structure and semiotic texture: *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*, which is not even mentioned in his book. Although Gillies subsequently tackles specifically the question of place in some of Shakespeare's late plays, including *Pericles* (see Gillies 2005), the omission of the play from his book-length study on Shakespeare's use of geography is striking and significant.

If Gillies chose not to include *Pericles*, it is probably because geographical interest in this play is substantially different from the geographical interest displayed in the other plays. But where does the peculiarity of the geography of *Pericles* reside? An initial relationship may be established between the peculiar quality of the geographical representation in *Pericles* and the peculiarity of the play as a whole. Some preliminary considerations about the play may, then, be useful before focusing on its geography. *Pericles* is generally considered to be a "problem" play. This overall impression originates in certain indisputable facts: the textual problems the play presents, the controversy over its authorship, and the difficulty of categorizing it within the range of dramatic genres. The extent to which the first two aspects influence my approach to the treatment and significance of geography is, however, fairly limited. More relevant is the generic complexity of the play and its relation to the narrative tradition of romance.

The question of authorship has been a major subject of debate in the history of criticism of *Pericles* and, although complete agreement has not yet been achieved, one of the most widely accepted views is that *Pericles* was written in collaboration by George Wilkins and William Shakespeare. Roger Warren in his edition of the play for the Oxford Shakespeare –based on Gary Taylor and Macd. P. Jackson's previous reconstruction of the text– and Suzanne Gossett in her recent edition for the Arden Shakespeare are both proponents of this

theory. They offer good summaries of the evidence available supporting a Wilkins-Shakespeare collaboration. The editors of the play for the New Cambridge Shakespeare, Doreen DelVecchio and Antony Hammond, on the contrary, suggest Shakespeare's single authorship and regard the authorship debate as "an interesting *but fundamentally irrelevant* aspect of the process of reading and comprehension." Hammond and DelVecchio conclude their section on authorship by stating that they "don't really care who wrote *Pericles* (though we do believe it to be the product of a single creative imagination)" (1998: 15; see Warren 2003: 60-71; Gossett 2004: 62-70; Hammond and DelVecchio 1998: 8-15).

But what are the implications of the question of authorship as regards the artistic handling of geography? If Wilkins wrote the first two acts (scenes 1-9), as is commonly assumed, and since the geographical pattern of the play is evident from the very beginning, we may conclude that Shakespeare could have been influenced by the pattern that Wilkins had established. Moreover if, as Warren proposes, George Wilkins was responsible not only for the first acts but for the outline of the play, the basic dramatic arrangement and design of the source material, so highly dependent on geography, would have been the work of Wilkins.² I consider that my approach to the geography of *Pericles* would be essentially the same whether Shakespeare alone or in collaboration with Wilkins wrote the play. However, the possibility of regarding *Pericles* as the product of a design by Wilkins may explain the "oddity" of its geographic representation as well as the notable differences between the geography of *Pericles* and that of the rest of Shakespeare's plays, even those belonging to the same group: the romances.

Geography in *Pericles* is an extremely complex notion indissolubly linked with the idea of travelling. The dramatic unities are flagrantly overlooked. Years pass by and places follow one another in quick succession in front of our eyes. Time and space are

²One of the arguments Roger Warren provides as evidence supporting this idea is that "the plot of *Pericles* follows Gower's narrative closely." He argues that "[i]t is unusual for Shakespeare to stick so closely to a single narrative source and this is one of the reasons for thinking that the outline of the play may not have originated with him but with George Wilkins" (2003: 13-14). According to him, "[i]f Wilkins did offer a 'plot' or outline of the play to the King's Men, the credit for its construction should go to him" (2003: 5).

so fragmented that Gower “must stand in th’gaps” teaching us “[t]he stages of our story” (4.4.8-9).³ The striking episodic nature of the play as well as its spatial (and temporal) discontinuities evince the importance of geographic representation in a play whose structure, plot and characters are all defined by constant movement and transition. But geographical representation goes beyond the factual description that a ‘scientific’ understanding of geography may provide. Geography becomes in *Pericles* one more element subject to the creative and imaginative power of the author(s), in whose hands geographic representation turns out to be a poetic and symbolic complex in which psychological, moral and political aspects intertwine.

A point about which the various editors of the play agree –even those advocating the hypothesis of collaboration– is the “the overall coherence of design in the play” (Hammond and DelVecchio 1998: 13). Roger Warren states that *Pericles* “despite its unevenness and its wandering narrative, holds together in performance since it is well constructed, each half building to an act of healing” (2003: 5). Suzanne Gossett contends that “the text is complete in outline and carefully structured by repetition, parallel and contrast of characters and events” (2004: 9). Apparent stylistic disparity, irregularity or incoherence (on which the theory of collaboration is primarily founded) is compatible in most editions with the acknowledgement of the structural and thematic cohesion of the play.

In my view this sense of unity is achieved paradoxically through geographical fragmentation and through the representation of travelling. In the idea of journey the spatial and temporal dimensions converge. Apart from movement in space, “journeying” implies temporal change, thus becoming the medium through which not only places but also moments and episodes are connected; hence its suitability to represent the flow of human life. *Pericles* is particularly concerned with journeying and, consequently, geographical movement, and instability is more important than geographic description *per se*. This simple observation may explain, at least partially, the omission of the play from Gillies’ *Shakespeare and the Geography of Difference*. Gillies himself later offers some ideas

³ All quotations from *Pericles* as well as the spelling of the names of characters and places are taken from the New Cambridge edition.

reinforcing the peculiarity of the geography of Shakespeare's late plays and of *Pericles* in particular. "Place in these plays", Gillies asserts, "is without geographic interest as conventionally understood." For him "the most interesting way in which place inhabits these plays owes little or nothing to the new cartography, or to a conventional embeddedness within cartographic space" (2005: 176). Gillies observes, moreover, that "[p]lace in the later plays should be understood primarily in relation to the embodied self and its needs rather than to some abstract mathematized order" (2005: 177).

This inner dimension of geography, noted by Gillies, suggests that the spatial transition, which characterizes the structure of the play, is a visual reflection of the constant state of personal and psychological transition of the main character. The treatment of geography not as static setting but as a meaningful dynamic component of the story, intrinsic to the character of *Pericles*, fosters a reading of the play as an allegory of the human life. The image of life as a journey has become commonplace. What is interesting in *Pericles* is that the protagonist's inner journey is materialized in a real 'geographic' journey. He is caught in an incessant and apparently bootless odyssey around a sea which becomes an image of both life and death. Geographic localities represent different stages in a man's life. All of them are in close contact with the sea, as human life is in contact with birth and death, with loss and recovery.⁴ This allegorical dimension, perfectly captured in Marina's statement "This world to me is like a lasting storm" (4.1.19), is complicated by the psychological complexities that the behaviour of the main character presents at certain points and which will be analyzed later in this essay.

In the context of this allegorical and psychological understanding of geographic representation, the application of key ideas in Gillies' *Shakespeare and the Geography of Difference*, such as the concept of a geographic imagination or his understanding of the new geography not as a factual context in which the study of literary works can be grounded, but as poetic in itself, "as poetry [...] as a 'text' in its own right," may prove useful (1994: 38). On the one hand,

⁴ For an analysis of the significance of the journey and the sea imagery in *Pericles*, see for example, Delvecchio and Hammond's introduction (1998: 58-63).

his analysis of the “new geography” as a discipline with its own poetics and semiotics, with its own mechanisms to generate meanings and interpretations, grants geography a new status in the field of literary studies beyond being mere “context” or “data.” Geography is already charged with meaning –meaning that has accumulated from archaic, classical and medieval times– and “with poetic possibilities –with ideas, contradictions, traditions, paradoxes, figurations” (Gillies 1994: 55). His definition of a Shakespearean geographic imagination derives from this conception of geography. For him, “Shakespeare’s geographic imagination is informed by a rich geographic tradition which is already moralised, already inherently ‘poetic’ in the sense of being alive with human and dramaturgical meaning” (1994: 4). I will focus precisely on these two aspects: on the analysis of the subjective meaning, and on the poetic and dramatic effectiveness of Shakespeare’s imaginative use of geography. Two other key concepts in Gillies’ study –the figures of the “barbarian” and the “voyager”– will also be applied in my approach to *Pericles*.

The historical and literary contextualization of the play may explain, or at least shed some light on, the evident geographical awareness in *Pericles*. In the Renaissance a new era for geography begins. The 16th and 17th centuries meant a revolution as far as geographical knowledge is concerned, and Shakespeare and his contemporaries witnessed the birth of a ‘new geography,’ which is generally assumed to be based on ‘scientific’ principles in opposition to the mythical and poetic conceptions of geography of the ancient and medieval worlds. Nevertheless, in what Gillies calls “the Shakespearean moment” the new geography “would continue to be represented also in terms of the ancient poetic geography to the extent that ‘cosmography’ served as its vehicle” (1994: 35). The works of geography in this period are still far from scientific in the modern sense and reveal a strong dependence on ancient cosmography.

But, more important than the historical context or the external circumstances surrounding the writing of *Pericles* and its transmission are the inherent qualities of the play, especially as regards genre. It seems obvious that the prominence of travelling and geography in the play owes much to its source, the story of *Apollonius of Tyre* –as retold by Gower in Book VIII of his *Confessio*

Amantis and by Laurence Twine in his *Pattern of Painful Adventures* – and to the tradition of Greek romance to which it belongs.⁵ But *Pericles*' relation to romance is rather more complex. In this play, as in the rest of Shakespeare's romances, "related yet distinct historical developments of romance" converge: Greek romance, medieval chivalric romance, and the miracle and morality plays (Felperin 1972: 10-17). Among the conventional traits that define Greek romance, Howard Felperin points out that it "deals with the hardships of separated lovers, is replete with storms, shipwrecks, pirates and savage beasts, covers many countries and many years, and concludes with virtue preserved, nobility discovered, and lovers reunited in improbable recognition scenes" (1972: 11). Concerning time and place, the action of romance "sprawl[s] across continents and take[s] years to accomplish", thus "transcend[ing] considerations of time and place" (Felperin 1972: 8).

On the other hand, the adventurous quest, the force that shapes and articulates chivalric adventure, also underlies *Pericles* and is especially prominent in the first act of the play. Furthermore, there are particular episodes which are clearly reminiscent of the world of chivalry, such as the scene of the knights' tournament in Simonides' court. As regards morality plays, Felperin highlights two fundamental features: the treatment of time "arching [...] from cradle to grave" and the reformation of the hero (1972: 15). But the psychological depth in *Pericles* complicates the structure of the morality play and the figure of the morality hero. As Hurwitz contends, "the characters come forth as symbolic depictions of internal psychic processes, almost as one would imagine occurring in a psychologically complex morality play" (2002: 5).

In spite of its diversity, there is a common element intrinsic to all forms and manifestations of romance and intimately related to the idea of geographical movement: the "quest." For Northrop Frye, it is the defining feature of romance:

The essential element of plot in romance is adventure, which means that romance is naturally a sequential and processional form, hence we know it better from fiction than from drama [...] [As] a literary form, it tends to limit itself to a sequence of minor

⁵ For a thorough analysis of the relationship between Greek romance and Shakespeare's late plays, see Gesner (1970).

adventures leading up to a major or climacteric adventure, usually announced from the beginning, the completion of which rounds off the story. We may call this major adventure, the element that gives literary form to the romance, the quest. (1972: 186-187)

The formal pattern of romance, based on the quest, is inextricably related to the idea of geographical movement, and has often been interpreted from a psychological point of view. As stated by Martin Butler in his edition of *Cymbeline*, “[romance and folktale] stage collective desires and anxieties, and frequently invoke the politics of family life: the traumas of growing up, the difficult transition from childhood to adulthood and the realization of the self as an entity separate from the family” (2005: 7).

Geographical interest is by no means exclusive to *Pericles*. The role of geography in Shakespeare’s other romances, *Cymbeline*, *The Winter’s Tale* and *The Tempest*, also deserves attention. Their generic affinities lead Roger Warren to emphasize the features that *Pericles* shares with these plays. He detects a similar treatment of time and space and contends that in *Pericles* but also in the other romances “the external journeys mirror the psychological journeys of the central characters” (2003: 8). However, travelling in these plays does not have the relevance it has in *Pericles*. In *The Winter’s Tale* the action takes place essentially in two locations: the private space of the Sicilian court and the pastoral atmosphere of the Bohemian countryside. These two spaces correspond broadly to the two temporal segments in which the action is divided, with the sixteen-year gap announced by Time in the middle. At the end there is a return to Sicilia where Leontes, his daughter, Perdita, and his wife, Hermione, are finally reunited. The action of *The Winter’s Tale* features two journeys. In the first, Antigonus leaves newborn Perdita in the Bohemian seacoast. In the second, young Perdita runs away with Florizel and both arrive, following Camillo’s directions, in Sicilia. But Leontes remains in Sicilia from the first scene to the last as well as does Hermione: it is only Perdita who travels from Sicilia to Bohemia and back to Sicilia.⁶ Leontes is tied to a single setting, his

⁶ I am referring here to the journeys in which the central characters are involved. However, the action includes other journeys: the journeys of Polixenes and Camillo, who escape from Leontes’ court to Bohemia and return to Sicilia at the end of the play, and the journey to Delphos of two Sicilian lords, Cleomenes and Dion.

court in Sicilia, whereas Pericles is in a constant state of transition. And, although Leontes, goes through a long process of penitence and repentance, his “spiritual journey” –to use Warren’s expression– is not dramatized as an “external journey.”

In *Cymbeline*, the sense of geography (and also time) is more disjointed. The action moves from Rome to Britain (ancient and contemporary). The various geographical locales correspond to the several actions that comprise the plot. The political pseudo-historical plot of the war between Rome and Britain develops in the ancient settings. The alternation between Renaissance England and Italy is the basic frame of the wager plot of Iachimo, Posthumus and Innogen. Finally, the peculiar rustic atmosphere of Wales is the setting of the plot concerning the king’s lost sons, Arviragus and Guiderius. There is no figure, like Pericles, to unite the play’s geographic and temporal fragmentation. Finally, *The Tempest* is one of the plays in which Shakespeare scrupulously observes the dramatic unities of time and place. The action develops in the confined space of the island. The shipwreck dramatized in the play concerns the antagonists, and it is only by means of Prospero’s narration that the spectator learns that a previous journey and shipwreck had taken place twelve years before. The island seems to represent a significant and necessary parenthesis in the lives of the characters, in which the conflict is resolved. As regards geographic and temporal scope, *The Tempest* and *Pericles* are almost opposites: the action of *The Tempest* develops in three hours whereas the action of *Pericles* takes place over more than fourteen years; the only setting of *The Tempest* is the island, whereas in *Pericles* the action develops in six different locations. The number and variety of locations we find in *Pericles* does not have a parallel in any of the other romances.⁷

⁷ Roger Warren emphasizes the similarities among the romances but does not refer to the peculiarity of *Pericles* within the group: “The narrative of these plays is far-flung in both space and time: *Cymbeline* moves between ancient Britain, classical Rome, medieval Italy, and Renaissance England (and Wales), *The Winter’s Tale* between Sicilia and Bohemia, with a gap of sixteen years in the middle of the play. The action of *The Tempest* is restricted to one place, Prospero’s island in the Mediterranean and to the time it takes to perform; but by having Prospero recall and in the process re-experience the events in Naples twelve years before, the play, as it were, brings the outside world to the island itself; and by looking into the ‘dark backward and abyss of time’ through Prospero’s eyes, it emphasizes that it is essentially about his spiritual journey. In the two other plays, too, the external journeys mirror the psychological journeys of the central characters, Innogen and Posthumus in *Cymbeline* and Leontes

Geographically, Pericles' voyages cover the area of the Eastern Mediterranean and it is evident that geographical movement around this area determines the formal pattern of the play. Yet the role of geography and travelling cannot be reduced to a mere formal strategy. Geography becomes significant in relation to plot and characters and makes possible the inquiry into moral and psychological issues both in the private and public spheres. The plot unfolds in six different kingdoms –Antioch, Tyre, Tarsus, Pentapolis, Miteline and Ephesus– and Gower, conscious of the variety of places, asks spectators to use their imagination. His interventions show the difficulties of translating the narrative source material to the medium of drama.

Thus time we waste and longest leagues make short;
Sail seas in cockles, have and wish but for't,
Making to take your imagination
From bourn to bourn, region to region.
By you being pardoned we commit no crime
To use one language in each several clime
Where our scenes seem to live. (4.4.1-7)

Some critics have interpreted this superabundance of geographical locations as evidence to support the claim that *Pericles* is a burlesque of the romance form. Michael Saenger, for instance, argues that "the most obvious exaggeration [...] is the six episodic locales, a dizzying number even for a Renaissance romance play" (2000: 197). Add the shipwrecks and the various tempests and it seems excessive, especially if compared with the subsequent romances. This fact has been regarded as evidence of an evolution towards a more mature treatment of the romance mode. According to Saenger, once Pericles leaves Antioch, Antiochus and Antiochus' daughter "are barely heard from again", so, for him, "the five succeeding settings compound the absurdity" (2000: 197). For David Hoeniger, however, Shakespeare "consciously" decided to maintain the episodic nature of the source narrative, "the pattern of numerous short episodes [...] with frequent changes in locale" (1982: 465). This method of dramatization has a dramatic and symbolic significance. The geographical representation of the six cities on the Mediterranean coast and their indissoluble union with the sea

in *The Winter's Tale*, which are at the heart of each play and help to hold each together" (2003: 9-10).

represent an important poetic construction. The pattern is dramatically effective and highly symbolic: a powerful way of presenting the flux of human life.

The dramatic handling of geography and travelling in *Pericles* allows for a rich variety of interpretations and approaches to the role of space. From a psychological perspective, the play can be analyzed as the enactment of an inward life journey, that is, as the sum of the fears, desires, lived moments, experiences and memories constituting Pericles' self. But geography also acquires a political dimension if the play is considered as an exploration of different forms of government and power. These potential readings have been reflected in the various critical appraisals of the topic. Linda McJannet, for instance, though acknowledging the symbolic and poetic function of geography, devotes the greater part of her study to demonstrating the geographical and historical accuracy of the depiction of the Hellenistic world. Lisa Hopkins, on the contrary, minimizes the relevance of geographical accuracy and insists that "what we find in *Pericles* is not so much a Greece of the atlas but a Greece of the mind" (2000: 228).

According to McJannet, "the path of [Pericles'] voyages is geographically consistent with the navigational practices of ancient times" and thus is "far from purely fanciful" (1998: 96); whereas for Hopkins, "the true borders and the true journeys are of the mind" (2000: 228). Like Hopkins, Gillies argues that "[t]he various settings of the late plays tend, like the Near-Eastern cities of *Pericles* [...] to be qualitatively 'thin' and virtually interchangeable [...]. Instead of being boxed into 'settings,' I prefer to think of the placial imagination as informing the whole narrative, symbolic and dramatic life of the plays" (2005: 177). These various interpretations move from the play's actual geographical location(s) to its symbolism (see McJannet 1998; Hopkins 2000; Gillies 2005). In my view the consistency of the locations in the play with real geographic and historic locations is a secondary aspect with no real import in the understanding of the play.

Constance C. Relihan, for her part, offers a political reading of the play, highlighting the ambiguity and liminality of its Greek setting and tracing some correspondences between the political conflicts of the play and the contemporary politics of James I's court (Relihan 1992). Relihan has pointed out the ambivalent attitude in

the English Renaissance towards the Greek cultures presented in the play, an attitude oscillating between the “desire to claim the ancient world as European and Western” and the connection perceived at the time between “Greece and the infidel Turks” (1992: 282-283). In any case, by taking the reader to what traditionally has been considered, as DelVecchio and Hammond put it, the “cradle of civilisation” (1998: 59), Shakespeare is not only intending a geographical displacement but also a displacement in time (though not always consistent) to the Hellenic world.⁸ In addition, this setting is highly symbolic since it constitutes the meeting-point of the three ancient continents (Europe, Asia and Africa). Shakespeare is closer, in this respect, to the “geography of antiquity” (DelVecchio and Hammond 1998: 59) than to the ‘new geography’ of his time. This same argument is supported by Hopkins, for whom Shakespeare deliberately displays in *Pericles* “archaizing strategies,” revealing that “the author is [...] patently uninterested in more contemporary geographical perspectives and information” (2000: 233).⁹

In order to understand fully the relevance of geography in *Pericles* we need to stop thinking of geography as mere background, as the frame in which the plot develops and characters act –as Gillies points out, “the predominant structural modality of place here is not that of ‘setting’” (2005: 177)– but, rather, as an element charged with meaning and symbolism, and inherent to plot and character. David Skeeel’s study of the critical reception of *Pericles* (1998; see also Skeeel 2000) reveal that, apart from being a play that has “swung so

⁸ Linda McJannet has located the play very specifically in the historical period corresponding to the Seleucid times. According to her, “the urban locales; the geography of *Pericles*’ voyages; the political nomenclature; and the treatment of religion, language, and education are largely consistent with the East in Seleucid times” (1998: 95).

⁹ Gillies’ view as regards the ‘archaic’ or ‘modern’ character of Shakespeare’s use of geography is, in my opinion, particularly useful: “The paradox posed by the simultaneously ‘new’ and ancient character of Shakespeare’s geographic imagination should thus be seen in the context of the co-existence of ancient and modern values in the new geography. Eventually the new geography would break from its ancient legacies –both ‘cosmographic’ and ‘poetic geographic’– but not until after the passing of ‘the Shakespearean moment’. Perhaps the most compelling reason for the persistence of ancient poetic geographic values within the new geography was the imaginative insecurity of the new discourse. For all its self-consciousness, the new geography had yet to achieve a hermeneutic identity. It required the hermeneutic energy of the ancient geography, as well as the active complicity of Renaissance poets in order to fashion its own poesis” (1994: 35).

erratically, so violently between the poles of opprobrium and adoration" (Skeele 2000: 1), in its critical history two aspects have emerged as notable 'flaws': the fragmentation of the plot, some "streams" of which "appeared to dribble off into nowhere and evaporate" (Skeele 1998: 18), and its shallow, poor or simplistic characterization. In my view, *Pericles* displays a peculiar configuration of plot and character that cannot be adequately understood unless we analyse it from the perspective of geography and geographical movement. Both plot and character in *Pericles* are conceived *geographically*. The action advances as long as there is geographical movement, as long as the characters travel. The periods of spatial stasis correspond to moments in which the action is frozen. On the other hand, characters evolve as they travel. We come to know them as they are placed successively in different locations.¹⁰

From the opening scene in the play, we see a displaced Pericles. He is not in his court at Tyre, but in Antioch. The city is barely introduced by Gower as Antiochus' "chiefest seat" and as the "fairest in all Syria" (Prologue 18-19). The scene shows the court of "Antiochus the Great" whose most significant feature is the impaled heads of the previous unsuccessful suitors of Antiochus' daughter. For the spectator, the image of the "fairest" city is reduced to the appalling spectacle of the "grim looks" (Prologue 40), the "speechless tongues", the "semblance pale" (1.1.37) and the "dead cheeks" (1.1.40) of the suitors' impaled heads. Pericles is depicted in this first scene as the romance hero *par excellence*. He presents himself as "ready for the way of life or death" (I.i.97). He compares himself to a "bold champion" whose actions are dictated by no "other thought / But faithfulness and courage" (I.i.62-64). However, this opening scene also shows the first evidence of the psychological problematization of the archetype of the hero. As Suzanne Gossett rightly observes, in *Pericles* there is an "alternation between an archetypal structure and adumbrations of a psychological view of the hero" (2004: 107).

The only action that takes place in Antioch is Pericles' deciphering of the riddle and his subsequent awareness of an

¹⁰ This idea is especially relevant in the case of Pericles, which will be the focus of my analysis. He is the most complex character, in opposition to other characters such as Antiochus, or even Thaisa, who are almost flat, in part because they are physically static and remain fixed in a single location.

inescapable death, either by revealing or hiding what he knows. Once incest is discovered the role of Antioch is exhausted and the city as geographical location does not reappear. At this point, Pericles decides to sail away to Tyre. His motivation for travelling seems to be sheer fear, as he himself states: "Then lest my life be cropped, to keep you clear / By flight I'll shun the danger which I fear" (1.1.143-144).¹¹ Pericles does not denounce the corruption that he has discovered at the core of Antiochus' court, a corruption that threatens the moral order and the foundations of family and state. His voyages reflect his inability to cope with his awareness of incest. As Relihan puts it, he just "runs from his knowledge of the crime" (1992: 287).

Lisa Hopkins has noted that one of the most interesting aspects as regards Antioch is the association place/person. She argues that, in Gower's presentation of Antioch, the city is depicted as "virtually an extension of Antiochus's identity" (2000: 229). Going a step further in the identification place/person, we may notice that Antiochus embodies, in some respects, the features ascribed to the barbarian; and the barbarian, as John Gillies notes, is indissolubly related to the idea of geography and to the mental organization of space. This figure was located within the "dialectic of centre and border" or *oikumene* ("home world") and *eschatia* ("end zones") (1994: 7-8). For the Greeks, "the peoples of these regions will represent an extreme (savage, demonic or carnivalesque) inversion of Greek society" (Gillies 1994: 8-9). The barbarian, therefore, is physically located in the limits or outside the *oikumene*. Behind the construction of geographical spaces and of the figures attached to them, there seems to be an underlying psychological motivation. Figures like the "barbarian" or the "outsider" become mere receptacles of forbidden desires, fears or aspects of human nature that social and moral conventions make us bluntly reject.

Thus, as myth and cultural construct, the "barbarian" is depicted as promiscuous, as "transgressor of bounds" and "violation

¹¹ An opposing view is held by Linda McJannet who, on the historical basis of the Hellenistic political organization, considers that "Pericles' flight from Tyre need not be ascribed to immaturity or an errant desire for travel." According to her, Pericles' "fear of Antiochus's revenge", far from being irrational, "is understandable in light of the latter's far greater power and status. Antiochus's empire included Tyre and all the other locales of the play, except (perhaps) Pentapolis" (1998: 96-97).

of prohibitions" –above all "the prohibition of incest upon which rests the institution of the family and ultimately that of the state" (Gillies 1994: 14). The barbarian, therefore, proves to be extremely "destructive" for the family, "the symbolic economy within which the roles of husband, wife, parent, child, brother and sister have meaning." According to Gillies, "[t]he antithesis of barbarian and family is perhaps even more fundamental than the link between barbarians and incest" (1994: 18). Before this incestuous couple, which represents the moral annihilation of the family, stands the isolated figure of Pericles, an individual placed outside a family context. In fact, except for the scant references to his dead father, no mother, brothers or sisters of the main character are mentioned.¹² In a sense, what we find are two initial negations of the family. We are unable to ascribe a family role to Antiochus and his daughter because they have confounded these roles, but we cannot ascribe a family role to Pericles either because he is presented to us outside this economy: he is neither son, brother, husband nor father.¹³ Thus, confusion and absence of family roles open a play which ends with the apparently happy and satisfactory reunion of Pericles, his daughter and wife, which can be regarded as a celebration of family.¹⁴

As has already been pointed out, Antiochus, the incestuous king, displays the characteristic behaviour and features of the

¹² Pericles refers to his father on two occasions: in 2.1, when he recovers the armour he had inherited from his father and that he thought lost after the shipwreck (2.1.109-2.1.122); and in 2.3, when the image of Simonides reminds him of his father: "Yon King's to me like my father's picture" (2.3.36).

¹³ This fact has not been overlooked in criticism. Hurwitz, for instance, points out: "Pericles seems to be without either parent; indeed his mother is never mentioned in the text and his father only referred to a few times. This is another odd dramatic element in the text, given that Pericles is still an unmarried prince and presumably young enough to have both parents living. Drawing from archetypal heritage in presenting this situation, the play uses it for dramatic benefit, emphasizing Pericles' isolation" (2002: 41).

¹⁴ In her article "Riddled Romance: Kingship and Kinship in *Pericles*," Jeanie G. Moore argues that the incest scene problematizes the romance closure and that this scene does not stand morally in opposition but "underlies" all that comes after: "the events that have transpired between the time of Pericles' strange encounter in Antioch at the play's beginning and the happy reunions of the ending do not work on all levels toward a tidy romance closure; the emotion of father, daughter, and mother reunited –a strategy to effect that closure– does not eradicate the contradictions within the text which seem to resist romance" (2003: 33).

“barbarian.” What is interesting in *Pericles* is that the primal association of barbarian and foreignness, which is the basis of this cultural myth, dissolves. The city of Antioch is not located at the farthest ends of the known world; on the contrary, it seems to be at the centre of the Greek world of the play –midway between the protagonist’s native Tyre and Tarsus. Consequently, Antiochus is not an outsider, he is within the *oikumene*. And although the Renaissance audience may associate him with the other, within the dynamics of the play Pericles cannot possibly conceive of him as an outsider. Antiochus is a neighbouring monarch, and it is in his geographical closeness that Pericles sees the danger (literal and symbolic): the danger of being murdered, the danger of being morally polluted by the tyrant. Not only does Antiochus belong to the *oikumene*, but he is at the top of its cultural, social and political organization, what makes him a much more dangerous kind of barbarian.

In this first scene we encounter a highly paradoxical situation. The “barbarian,” the “outsider,” the “other” (figures constructed as the embodiment of characteristics that do not belong to “us” or that we are reluctant to acknowledge to be our own) is inside. Prospero’s words, “This thing of darkness / I acknowledge mine” (*The Tempest*, 5.1.274-275) are especially revealing in this context. Antioch is a different city but is still part of the same world to which the neighbouring Tyre, Tarsus or Pentapolis belong. Hence Pericles’ discovery of incest is doubly shocking. It is shocking, firstly, because of the meaning and implications of incest itself and, secondly, because incest is located at the core of his world and, by virtue of the psychological dimension of geography in the play, at the core of himself. The strange and the familiar cannot share the same space. These concepts are distinguished precisely because they occupy different spaces, because they belong to different spheres. What Pericles experiences in the first scene of the play is that incest, repulsive and morally reprehensible, is, for him, simultaneously foreign and familiar.

The feeling resulting from the blurring of the boundaries between the foreign and the familiar, between what is alien and what is one’s own, leads us to the Freudian concept of “the uncanny.” Freud’s discussion starts from the usual meaning of the word –“what is frightening”, “what arouses dread and horror”– but

he detects that the word “is not always used in a clearly definable sense” (1919: 930). If everything that is uncanny is frightening but not everything that is frightening is uncanny, there must be some nuance, some particularity in the experiences, feelings or actions described as “uncanny.” As Freud puts it, “we may expect that a special core of feeling is present which justifies the use of a special conceptual term” (1919: 930). In order to discover where the peculiarity of the uncanny rests, Freud adopts an etymological approach to the term. The German *unheimlich* (unhomely) is the opposite of *heimlich*, and both adjectives derive from the noun ‘Heim’ (home). The “uncanny” is defined, thus, in relation to a space (real and symbolic): the intimate, known space of the family home, and Freud’s initial discussion of the meaning of the “uncanny” revolves around ideas of home, family, familiarity, domesticity and their opposites.

Unheimlich implies a negation of what is known and familiar (apparently positive concepts) and this is the source of fear and fright associated with “uncanny” experiences. In Freud’s words “we are tempted to conclude that what is “uncanny” is frightening precisely because it is *not* known and familiar” (1919: 931). The “uncanny” comes to be associated with strangeness, foreignness, with what is unknown. However, Freud highlights another meaning of *heimlich*: “Concealed, kept from sight, so that others do not get to know of or about it, withheld from others” (1919: 933). In this second sense, *heimlich* is somehow associated with what is unknown and comes closer to the meaning of its opposite. Freud also refers to Schelling, for whom the *unheimlich* is everything “that ought to have remained secret and hidden but has come to light” (1919: 934).¹⁵

¹⁵ It is worth analyzing in some detail the vocabulary of the first scene of *Pericles*. Essential ideas in the definition of the “uncanny”, such as “knowing,” “seeing,” “revealing” and their opposites, “hiding” and “blinding” abound in this scene. Once Pericles discovers incest, he resolves that “[w]ho has a book of all that monarchs do, / He’s more secure to keep it shut, than shown; / For vice repeated is like the wandering wind, / Blows dust in other’s eyes to spread itself, / And yet the end of all is bought that dear, / The breath is gone, and the sore eyes see clear (1.1.94-100). Immediately after, Antiochus reveals his fear that Pericles may “trumpet forth [his] infamy” (1.1.146). In 1.2 Pericles states that Antiochus “Will think me speaking though I swear to silence” and that “what may make him blush in being known, He’ll stop the course by which it may be known” (1.2.19.23; emphasis added).

My interest is in the relationship between uncanniness and space. The conflation, fusion or confusion of notions which are spatial, at least in origin, like closeness and remoteness, inside and outside, foreignness and familiarity may awaken a particular feeling of “uncanniness”. The handling of space and geography can be, therefore, a very effective means to transmit the “uncanny.” Pericles’ feeling of “uncanniness” when confronted face to face with incest is dramatically represented by placing him in a foreign court, patently barbarous yet belonging to his world and close enough to prevent the protagonist from witnessing the events at Antioch with a feeling of detachment: he becomes strangely –almost mysteriously– and intimately involved in the incest.

The arrival in Tyre does not ameliorate Pericles’ uneasiness of mind and agitation. “Dull-eyed melancholy” has become Pericles’ companion, although he himself acknowledges that “danger which, I feared, is at Antioch / Whose arm seems far too short to hit me here” (1.2.7-8). Therefore, objective geographical distance is not enough to lessen Pericles’ anxiety, for, as Hopkins argues, he has “internalized his own Antiochus” (2000: 230), his own Antioch and what they represent: the violation of natural and familial bonds (incest) and its reflection and aftermath in the political sphere (tyranny). Antioch is no longer an external geographical location; it has become part of Pericles, who will be carrying in all his travelling “the emotional burden that he has acquired at Antioch” (Moore 2003: 38). Thus, this city represents a fundamental stage in the psychological characterization of Pericles, in the creation of the character’s identity. The way in which he confronts and reacts to the knowledge of incest reveals the deep impact this episode has on Pericles. Moore points out that the literal riddle represents, for Pericles, an “internal conflict” and that the riddle “on this metaphorical, psychological level [...] remains unsolved” (2003: 35).

In his account of the events in Antioch, Pericles relates to Helicanus the consequences: “Drew sleep out of mine eyes, blood from my cheeks, / Musings into my mind, with thousand doubts / How I might stop this tempest ere it came” (1.2.95-97). The quotation refers to the symbolic tempest which will accompany Pericles throughout his life and which will be mirrored by the several ‘real’ tempests that take place in the play. Pericles’ apparent motivation to set out on his travels is fear of Antiochus’ anger. He fears for his life

and Hellicanus understands his motivation: "Antiochus you fear / And justly too I think you fear the tyrant / who [...] will take away your life" (1.2.101-104); he advises the prince to "go travel for a while" (1.2.105). The reader/spectator may notice the paradoxical nature both of Hellicanus' advice and of Pericles' decision: he wants to escape death by exposing himself to a more than probable death. Voyaging, especially navigation was a "dangerous" and "inherently 'terminal'" activity (Gillies 1994: 19). In Hellicanus' words, Pericles "puts himself unto the shipman's toil / With whom each minute threatens life or death" (1.3.22-23).

Tarsus is the next location. In the same way that Antioch is identified with incest, Tarsus is identified with famine and starvation. Again, there are no specific details or particularities about the place. There is very little information that can be extracted from the lamentation speeches of Cleon and Dioniza. In fact, Cleon's description of the city is pervaded with conventional and commonplace terms in such a way that Tarsus could have been any city (see Hopkins 2000: 231-232). As Cleon laments:

O let those cities, that of plenty's cup
And her prosperities so largely taste
With their superfluous riots hear these tears
The misery of Tarsus may be theirs. (1.4.56)

Pericles shows in Tarsus his magnanimity and princely behaviour: he brings grain to mitigate the starvation of its people. Nevertheless, we never see the Prince of Tyre –no matter what the complete title of the play may suggest– acting as "a true prince" for the people. On the contrary, he neglects his duties as ruler and leaves the government of his kingdom in the hands of Hellicanus, his faithful counsellor, to embark on a series of voyages whose initial justification –Antiochus' threat– progressively blurs as the plot moves forward. Why does Pericles, then, continue with his travelling? Moore has linked, in a sort of cause-and-effect relationship, Pericles' disregard of his political –and also familial– obligations and his voyages by arguing that throughout the play Pericles is escaping "first from Antiochus, and later, unconsciously from the responsibilities of kingship and parenthood" (2003: 38).

The seeming purposelessness of Pericles' voyages –the lack of a logical cause-and-effect relationship that may explain or justify the prince's behaviour, the movement from one locale to another, or the

events taking place in each of them— make us wonder what kind of regions are portrayed in the play. Are the different locations different layers in the psyche: from the most unconscious of desires in Antioch to the final compliance with social rules and moral standards in Ephesus? The possibility of reading geographical spaces in a psychoanalytical key may shed some light on the handling of geography as well as contribute, at least partially, to clarify the meaning of the play and to explain its apparent inconsistencies. The consideration of the world we are entering in *Pericles*, with its multiple locales as a dramatic representation of the human psyche, opens up the possibility that places and events are linked to one another by the irrational forces of desire and fear.¹⁶

The presentation of different locations, separate, yet all of them connected by the sea, all of them related by similarities, repetitions and associations, is an effective way of portraying the working of the psyche. Antioch would represent in this sense the unconscious. Pericles' repressed incestuous desire, his oedipal complex, would be mirrored in the incestuous relation of Antiochus and his daughter.¹⁷ The repressed desire is confronted by the consummated deed. In his discussion of incest in relation to the Freudian notion of the

¹⁶ This psychoanalytical interpretation is greatly indebted to Gregg Andrew Hurwitz. He argues that "the pattern underlying the surface of the text and the mechanism driving its action are primarily psychological, that the play itself attempts to represent and resolve certain fundamental processes of the psyche" (2002: 4). Hurwitz views *Pericles* as a play "seeking to represent the psyche itself" (2002: 7), and contends that "the protagonist traverses a psychological landscape of sorts, facing and coming to terms with dramatic representations of elements of the unconscious" (2002: 5). Gillies also notices a psychological motivation in the action of *Pericles* and the rest of the romances. He observes that behind "what may sometimes strike us as unmotivated wanderings in these plays [Shakespeare's romances]" there is a "willed and abjectional element," "a sense of illegitimacy," originating in "sexual pollutiveness" (2005: 178).

¹⁷ Coppélia Kahn argues that "Pericles' episodic voyages from place to place, and his successive experiences of loss, are symbolic confrontations with oedipal desire and oedipal fear." According to her, Pericles "breaks out of time conceived as repetition of oedipal patterns and breaks into the future through his daughter and his own new family" (1980: 231). Similarly, Ruth Nevo claims that "Pericles travels out and away and back. He cannot escape, cannot cut the umbilical cord, and cannot resolve the later oedipal guilt" (1993: 169). Much in the same line, Hurwitz contends that "[f]rom a Freudian perspective, *Pericles* is a play about confronting and resolving the Oedipal complex" (2003: 18-19).

uncanny, Zenón Luis Martínez contends that “[t]he return of the repressed makes it clear that incestuous desire inscribes itself in the familial space as the homeliest, but also the most abhorrent, form of desire” (2002: 58). Therefore, Pericles must accept incest as part of himself, and the ambivalent geographical location of Antioch and his king as foreign and at the same time neighbouring, as strange and dangerously familiar, reinforces this idea. This interpretation would account for Pericles’ subsequent behaviour. Pericles does not denounce but remains silent about Antiochus’ incest. He keeps it as if it were a secret of his own. If we regard what happens in Antioch as something external to Pericles, there is no reason why he should remain silent even after the death of Antiochus and his daughter. Hurwitz points out:

Instinctually realizing his own implication in the riddle’s design, Pericles flees Antioch, representing the repression of his wishes [...]. Indeed, he will not even speak the monarch’s wrongs aloud before the very court in which they occur; having repressed his own desires, Pericles carefully avoids giving voice to any situation involving incest. (2002: 24)

With the burden of incest, Pericles travels from Antioch to Tyre and from Tyre to Tarsus, where the arrival of a messenger compels him to go on with his voyages. Here, the spectator witnesses the first tempest and subsequent shipwreck in the play, which is visually described by Gower: “And he, good prince, having all lost / By waves from coast to coast is tossed” (2.0.33-34). The sentence anticipates Pericles’ fate and future sufferings. Pericles saves his own life by reaching the coast of Pentapolis, a city that can be considered, in many respects, the opposite of Antioch. Warren argues:

As in the other late plays, the discoveries he makes upon his journey are both private and public and dramatized in contrasting extremes: he moves from a court at Antioch which is characterized by incest and murderous tyranny to another at Pentapolis which is its polar opposite, a world of love and benevolent absolutism. (1990: 211)

In light of these ideas, we could assert that in *Pericles*, geographical identity is constructed in pairs of opposites: the identity of Pentapolis is configured in opposition to that of Antioch. The same idea could be applied to Miteline and Ephesus: the moral baseness and licentiousness of the brothel in Miteline is opposed to the mysticism and sacred character of the temple of Diana in

Ephesus. However, the distinction between Antioch and Pentapolis is not so clear-cut. Certain resemblances between the two settings arise. In both kingdoms we encounter a father/daughter relationship and the absence of a queen-mother. Thus Pericles, at his arrival at the court of Pentapolis, confronts a similar situation to that of his arrival at Antioch. In both cases, moreover, we find the prince engaged in the search for a wife. Pentapolis somehow repeats Antioch.¹⁸ Recurrence, apart from being fundamental to the notion of the uncanny, connects the play with an atmosphere of nightmare or dream. The nightmare quality of the world of the play has been suggested by Jeanie Grant Moore. Derek Traversi also refers to the play as “a kind of dream” (1954: 35), and Ruth Nevo highlights “the oneiric dimension of its symbolism and the dream-like aspects of its representations” (1993: 151). It is in Hurwitz’s article that we find the idea developed in depth. According to Hurwitz, the play displays a “psycho-organic structure” where “events progress associatively rather than linearly.” He links this idea to the “non-temporal mode of expression” proper to “dreams and myths” (2002: 21).

Miteline is characterized by licentiousness and depravation embodied by the morally dubious governor of the city, Lysimachus, in contrast to the spirituality of Ephesus. This is the setting in which Thaisa, apparently dead, comes back to life. The reanimation of an inert body is also a source of the “uncanny.” According to Freud, “an uncanny experience occurs either when infantile complexes which have been repressed are once more revived by some impression, or when primitive beliefs which have been surmounted seem once more to be confirmed” (1919: 950). The first source of the uncanny has been illustrated in Pericles’ experience of incest in Antioch. In Ephesus, it is the primitive belief in the “return of dead”. However, as Freud also notes, the theme of the “re-animation of the dead” is

¹⁸ Kiefer points out that “when Pericles arrives in Pentapolis, he finds himself in a world resembling Antioch. Again a widowed king presides over a court. Again a nubile daughter attends the King. Again Pericles beholds the woman on a ceremonial occasion” (1991: 212). Hurwitz argues in this respect that “the similarities between the courts at Antioch and Pentapolis represent the repetition compulsion often displayed when people seek to solve a psychological problem”, and that “Pericles represents this repetition by two courts, which are indeed uncannily similar, yet opposite in many respects. By reliving his earlier trauma in more healthy fashion, Pericles alleviates much of his psychological problem” (2002: 28).

very common in “fairy stories” (1919: 948). Here the romance atmosphere dissipates the uncanniness of the scene:

O dear Diana, where am I? where’s my lord?

What world is this? (3.2.101-102)

Ephesus is portrayed, in fact, as a different world, one characterized by its supernatural and timeless atmosphere. As Relihan has remarked, Ephesus is the “land of lethargy and resignation” (2003: 289). But, for Thaisa, it is, above all, the land of oblivion. She forgets about her duties as wife under the groundless assumption that Pericles is dead, and as ruler since she is Simonides’ “only daughter and heir to the kingdom of Pentapolis” (Relihan 1992: 290). Most striking of all is her neglect of her role as mother. In her first speech after her miraculous resurrection, she does not even mention her daughter. In Ephesus, Thaisa absurdly resigns herself to the loss of her husband and daughter, renounces her past and partly forgets her identity. For Pericles, Ephesus means the completion of the long-life voyage that he began in Antioch. Trevor Nunn has pointed out that “Pericles is on a journey from the bestiality of Antiochus’ court to the temple of Diana. It is a metaphysical journey; rest only comes with self-knowledge” (Quoted in Warren 1990: 7). Nunn’s observation of Pericles’ “metaphysical journey” can be complemented with the idea of a psychological journey. Hurwitz views Pericles “as ego-hero passively undergo[ing] his misfortunes in order to increase the very quality of consciousness he represents.” His travels symbolize “the painful battle for consciousness and meaning” (2002: 9-10).

In *Pericles*, places are not just places; they become part of the identity of the characters. Examination of the different locations shows that, beyond their existence as external concrete spaces, they are relevant as inner, mental entities informing Pericles’ life experience, and also as reflections or materializations of his desires and fears. Pericles is the epitome of the wandering hero and probably the Shakespearean character who best embodies what Gillies calls “the voyager,” a “moral-geographic myth” (1994: 60) which he defines as “a Shakespearean figure [...] often related to the other,” as “a creature of extremity, a creature of horizons, an explorer of *terra incognita*” (1994: 3). The voyager is an extremely complex construction because it acquires different forms in the Renaissance and in Antiquity. The Renaissance attitude was that of

“glorifying the voyager as discoverer;” the ancient, that of “abominating him as transgressor” (Gillies 1994: 135). The violation of boundaries and the idea of conquest seem to be inherent in the voyager. To what extent, then, can this idea be applied to Pericles? What kind of voyager is he? The idea of geographical conquest is not present in the play. Pericles’ voyages are not motivated by a desire to transgress or to discover; or perhaps they are, but not in a literal sense. In *Pericles* geographic exploration cannot be exclusively understood literally, but in a more symbolic dimension as self-exploration or as exploration of the human psyche. Travel becomes inherent in him: Pericles is a character in a perpetual state of transition, in a state of flux. Thus, the bond between Pericles and Tyre is extremely weak. He is, for the most part an absent king, and at the end he becomes the King of Pentapolis, leaving the government of Tyre to Lysimachus.¹⁹

As a “creature of extremity” Pericles belongs nowhere. Hurwitz has analysed Pericles’ quality as voyager in terms of the “archetypal hero’s quest” (2003: 35):

A number of the elements of Pericles’ character have similarities to those of the archetypal hero, which can explain certain odd dramatic features of *Pericles*. The notion of hero as wanderer can perhaps explain the changing locale, which deliberately takes liberties with the third dramatic unity. (2002: 40)

The voyager as moral-geographic construction and the wandering hero as archetypal-psychological construction are not far apart in a play in which the geographical and the psychological fuse.

Shakespeare’s use of geography in *Pericles* is not restricted to “facts”; it is characterized by a richness of symbolic and poetic implication. Places are related and subservient to plot: once plot is exhausted, places disappear physically. But geographical locations make up, as well, the mental geography of the characters, in which none of the locations ceases to exist. Pericles has trespassed: he has encountered tyranny, murder and incest, human depravation and the sacred. And, although all these aspects could be concentrated in

19 Gillies argues that “Shakespeare’s voyagers are dangerous representatives of the commonwealth. Unlike the ruler, who characteristically controls the centre, the voyager controls the boundaries” (1994: 101). There seems to be an implicit opposition or incompatibility between the ruler and the voyager, which is well illustrated in the character of Pericles.

one single place, the author chooses to be faithful to the sources and to represent them in different spaces, all of them eventually converging in the character of Pericles. Shakespeare's focus, therefore, is not on objective geographical details but on a mental geography or, borrowing Lisa Hopkins' expression, on a "Greece of the mind," which contributes to the effective representation of the experiences and psychological conflicts of the main character. Pericles' uncanny experience of incest in Antioch underlies the whole play and transforms the hero's quest proper to romance, into an individual's complex passage through life. The reach of geographical exploration and travelling in this play cannot be fully grasped without considering its dramatic, allegorical and psychological implications.

References

- Felperin, Howard 1972. *Shakespearean Romance*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Freud, Sigmund 2001 (1919). "The Uncanny." Ed. Vincent B. Leith. *Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. New York: Norton & Company: 929-952.
- Frye, Northrop 1957. *Anatomy of Criticism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Gesner, Carol 1970. *Shakespeare and the Greek Romance: A study of Origins*. Lexington: Kentucky University Press.
- Gillies, John 1994. *Shakespeare and the Geography of Difference*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gillies, John 2005. "Place and Space in Three Late Plays." Ed. Richard Dutton and Jean E. Howard. *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works (Vol.IV): The Poems, Problem Comedies, Late Plays*. London: Blackwell: 175-193.
- Hoeniger, David F. 1982. "Gower and Shakespeare in *Pericles*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 33/4: 461-479.
- Hopkins, Lisa 2000. "The Shores of my Mortality": Pericles' Greece of the Mind." Ed. David Skeeel. *Pericles: Critical Essays*. New York: Garland: 228-237.
- Hurwitz, Gregg Andrew 2002. "A Tempest, a Birth and Death: Freud, Jung and Shakespeare's *Pericles*." *Sexuality and Culture* 6/3: 3-73.
- Kahn, Coppélia 1980. "The Providential Tempest and the Shakespearean Family." Eds. Murray M. Schwartz and Coppélia Kahn. *Representing*

- Shakespeare: New Psychoanalytic Essays*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press: 217-243.
- Kiefer, Frederick 1991. "Art, Nature, and Language in *Pericles*." *University of Toronto Quarterly* 61/2: 207-225.
- Luis Martínez, Zenón 2002. *In Words and Deeds: The Spectacle of Incest in English Renaissance Tragedy*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.
- McJannet, Linda 1998. "Genre and Geography: The Eastern Mediterranean in *Pericles* and *The Comedy of Errors*." Eds. John Gillies and Virginia Mason Vaughan. *Playing the Globe: Genre and Geography in English Renaissance Drama*. Madison and London: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press: 86-106.
- Moore, Jeanie Grant 2003. "Riddled Romance: Kingship and Kinship in *Pericles*." *Rocky Mountain Review* 57/1: 33-48.
- Nevo, Ruth 1993. "The Perils of *Pericles*." Ed. B.J. Sokol. *The Undiscover'd Country: New Essays on Psychoanalysis and Shakespeare*. London: Free Association Books: 150-178.
- Relihan, Constance C. 1992. "Liminal Geography: *Pericles* and the Politics of Place." *Philological Quarterly* 71/3: 281-299.
- Saenger, Michel Baird 2000. "*Pericles* and the Burlesque of Romance." Ed. David Skeeel. *Pericles: Critical Essays*. New York: Garland: 192-204.
- Shakespeare, William 1998 (1609). *Pericles*. Eds. Doreen DelVecchio and Antony Hammond. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shakespeare, William and George Wilkins 2003 (1609). *Pericles*. Ed. Roger Warren. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shakespeare, William and George Wilkins 2004 (1609). *Pericles*. Ed. Suzanne Gossett. London: Arden Shakespeare.
- Shakespeare, William 1996 (1623). *The Winter's Tale*. Ed. Stephen Orgel. *The Oxford Shakespeare*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shakespeare, William 2005 (1623). *Cymbeline*. Ed. Martin Butler. *The New Cambridge Shakespeare*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shakespeare, William 2002 (1623). *The Tempest*. Ed. David Lindley. *The New Cambridge Shakespeare*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Skeeel, David 1998. *Thwarting the Wayward Seas: A Critical and Theatrical History of Shakespeare's Pericles in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. Newark: University of Delaware Press.
- Skeeel, David 2000. "*Pericles* in Criticism and Production: A Brief History." Ed. D. Skeeel *Pericles: Critical Essays*. New York and London: Garland: 1-33.

- Tillyard, E.M.W. 1972 (1943). *The Elizabethan World Picture*. London: Penguin Books.
- Traversi, Derek 1979 (1954). *Shakespeare: The Last Phase*. London: Hollis & Carter.
- Warren, Roger 1990. *Staging Shakespeare's Late Plays*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

How to cite this article:

Laureano Domínguez, Lorena. "Pericles' 'unknown travels': the dimensions of geography in Shakespeare's *Pericles*." *SEDERI* 19 (2009): 71-97.

Author's contact: lorena.laureano@dfing.uhu.es

Submission: 31/10/2008

Acceptance: 20/01/2009

“Mine ear is much enamour’d of thy note:” Shakespeare’s intercultural dream in the Indian subcontinent

Sofía Muñoz Valdivieso
Universidad de Málaga

ABSTRACT

Tim Supple’s 2006 production of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* has been hailed by some critics as the successor of Peter Brook’s revolutionary 1970 version, a vision that changed perceptions of the play and became a classic in the history of its performance. Supple’s *Midsummer* uses about half of Shakespeare’s English text, with the rest translated into Hindi, Bengali, Marathi, Malayalam, Tamil, Sanskrit and Sinhala. It maintains the plot and characters intact, although it includes elements of local theatrical traditions in music, dance, martial arts and acrobatics. The production defies attempts at classification, since it presents features of “foreign” Shakespeare plays yet it braids the Indian-language dialogues into Shakespeare’s original English and extends the alienation effect of a foreign language production to audiences throughout the world. The international success of this production since it premiered in Britain as part of the 2006-2007 Royal Shakespeare Company’s Complete Works Festival at Stratford is meaningful beyond considerations of aesthetic and theatrical value. The present paper discusses Tim Supple’s *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* within the contexts of foreign Shakespearean performance and intercultural theatre, and it analyses the contribution of the production to current debates about the importance of Shakespeare as international cultural capital.

KEYWORDS: *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, intercultural theatre, performance studies, foreign Shakespeare.

Research for this paper was funded by the Andalusian Regional Government (Proyectos de Excelencia de la Junta de Andalucía): Research Project P07-HUM-02507.

In 1970 Peter Brook's Royal Shakespeare Company production of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* was hailed as a watershed in the history of performances of the play, a new way of perceiving Shakespeare's work that would affect its staging for generations to come. More than thirty years later, Tim Supple's 2006 multilingual version of *Midsummer* seems to have shaken the theatrical consciousness of international audiences and reviewers, and some of them have seen it as the heir to Peter Brook's production. Supple's *Midsummer* is the result of the work of a multicultural cast of twenty-three Indian and Sri Lankan dancers, musicians and actors who rehearsed in India and performed the play in four Indian cities before they brought it to Britain in June 2006 as part of the Royal Shakespeare Company's Complete Works Festival at Stratford. Around half of the original English text is maintained, so that Supple's production is not an example of "foreign" Shakespeare in the conventional sense, since with seven Indian languages circulating on stage the alienation effect of not understanding the dialogue colours not only the experience of English-speaking audiences, but that of spectators around the world.¹ To all audiences, including those in India, the words of the play in English, Hindi, Bengali, Marathi, Malayalam, Tamil, Sanskrit and Sinhala remain in part inscrutable and some of its language is perceived, as Stuart Hampton-Reeves states in his review, "as music, because it [cannot] be anything else" (Hampton-Reeves 2007: 200). With no surtitles provided for the performances, the music of the foreign languages necessarily becomes the score that accompanies the visual power of the play, and the surrender of the audience to the magic of the production implies a surrender to the music of its languages that brings to mind Titania's enchantment when, woken up from her bower by Bottom's song, she says "Mine ear is much enamour'd of thy note."

The reactions of critics and reviewers in the international press and in academic journals show that the reception of the play is marked by a celebration of what are perceived as its intercultural values and its ability to breathe new life into Shakespeare's text. Although the play has been praised for its aural originality, the

¹ In contemporary India English and Hindi serve as lingua franca, but the other languages are restricted to particular regions, with Sanskrit a classical language of literary texts and rituals but with very few contemporary speakers.

impressions that are used to describe it are mostly visual, and certain adjectives keep resurfacing in descriptions of the production, among them “sensational”, “spectacular”, “ravishing”, “sexy”, “entrancing”, “astonishing”, “vibrant”, “exhilarating”, “tantalizing”, “exuberant”, “colourful”, and, above all, “exotic”. The reception of Supple’s *Midsummer* is not fully disentangled from the contemporary Western consumption of the cultural other as what Graham Huggan has called the postcolonial exotic. The adjective “exotic” is indeed one of the most commonly used in descriptions of what critics have considered a gorgeous spectacle full of energy and colour, and the appeal of the mysteries of the East plays a major role in the attraction that the production has exerted on Western audiences and reviewers. The success of Supple’s Indian *Midsummer* on Western stages is meaningful beyond considerations of aesthetic and theatrical value, and the play can be understood as a contribution to current debates on Shakespeare as international cultural capital and analysed in the context of present discussions over the role of Shakespeare in our contemporary globalised cultural economy.

Michael Billington’s raving review of the original Stratford production for *The Guardian* in June 2006 set the tone for the subsequent reception of the play on stages worldwide: “In its strangeness, sexuality, and communal joy this is the most life-enhancing production of Shakespeare’s play since Peter Brook’s” (Billington 2006b). A few months later, Susanne Greenhalgh’s review for the *Shakespeare Bulletin* also mentioned Brook’s 1970 revolutionary version of *Midsummer* and suggested that “Tim Supple’s [production] left many in its audience convinced that they had shared in a theatrical event of equivalent artistry and significance” (Greenhalgh 2006: 65). In general, reviewers praised the energy of the production and highlighted its sensuality and exotic beauty, the multicultural approach of its seven Indian languages and its union of East and West theatrical traditions. The very first review that Michael Billington wrote on Supple’s version after seeing its initial performance in India a few weeks before its Stratford premiere suggested that, given its particular approach, the production would most likely provoke debate as well as delight and astonishment (Billington 2006a), but the reception of the play in the different locations in Europe, North America and Australia where it has played since its Stratford premiere shows plenty of delight and astonishment but, significantly enough, very little controversy and

debate. There seems to be a consensus among Western reviewers that the loss of the English text is more than made up by the energy of the production and by the force of the Shakespearean story coming through the foreignness of the actors, their Indian voices and the exotic setting, so that as a whole reviews contribute to the conception that “the performed play transcends, and is transmissible outside of, verbal communication: its dramatic value and power are intrinsic [...] [a] rationale that locates Shakespeare as a universal value which is not culture-specific” (Yong 2005: 529-530).

After its premiere at the Royal Shakespeare Company's Complete Works Festival in June 2006, Tim Supple's *Midsummer* has been on an international tour that continues at the end of 2008 and it has generally received enthusiastic responses and reviews in every location. Supple's *Midsummer* was one of the eight plays performed in foreign languages at the Stratford Festival by companies from abroad and, like *Twelfth Night*, it was the production of an English director with experience working with the Royal Shakespeare Company. The other plays in a foreign language were *The Two Gentleman of Verona* in Portuguese and English, *Henry V* in Italian, *Othello* and *Richard III* in German, *Coriolanus* and *Titus Andronicus* in Japanese, and *Twelfth Night* in Russian.² With its use of seven Indian languages, Supple's version does produce the distancing effect of foreign takes on Shakespeare, in this case a kaleidoscopic reproduction of a sense of foreignness throughout the globe, with no possible spectator in the world who could understand all the languages that circulate on the stage. The eight plays in foreign languages in the festival were allotted around one sixteenth of the total number of performances, with *Midsummer* performing on twelve occasions but some other foreign language plays running for only four or five days. Although reviewers seemed to agree that the most innovative productions were those of the visiting companies, the responses to the foreign Shakespeare plays “fluctuated between wary suspicion of what was alien and enthusiastic acclaim for what seemed new” (Parsons 2007a: 7). Of all the foreign-language productions at the festival, *Midsummer* was by far the most

² For an analysis of the foreign language plays at the festival see Parsons (2007a). For a general review of the festival see the special 2007 issue of *Cahiers Élisabéthains: A Biannual Journal of English Renaissance Studies* and Michael Dobson's “Shakespeare's Performances in England, 2006” (2007).

successful with audiences and critics, and some of them perceived it as the most striking and inventive contribution to the Complete Works Festival (Hampton-Reeves 2007: 200).³

Tim Supple is a highly reputed English director who has worked with the Royal National Theatre and the Royal Shakespeare Company and is known for “his commitment both to vivid, stripped-to-essentials story-telling and cross-cultural exploration” (Greenhalgh 2006: 65). Among his former intercultural works we find the adaptation of Salman Rushdie’s *Haroon and the Sea of Stories* for the RNT in 1999 and *Midnight’s Children* for the RSC in 2003, as well as a multicultural television version of *Twelfth Night* for Channel 4 in 2003 that was resonant with the themes of immigration and integration in contemporary Britain. *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* should thus be seen in the context of Tim Supple’s career as a multicultural director who enjoys taking classics and giving them a new spin and who has a particular link with Indian cultures, as shown by his previous transposition to the theatre of Salman Rushdie’s work.⁴ The seeds of the project of an Indian *Midsummer Night’s Dream* were planted at the end of 2004, when Tim Supple received a call from the British Council in Delhi and a request to put together “a large scale work with popular potential that embraces artists from different regions” (“British Council India”). In early 2005 different possible productions were being considered as Supple was travelling around India to become familiar with theatrical traditions and to meet local directors, performers and designers. He was already aware at the time that if he were to choose a Shakespeare play the Royal Shakespeare Company would be interested in inviting it to Stratford as part of the Complete Works Festival. He has explained in interviews that *Midsummer* was a play that he had wanted to do at some point but “had no particular passion about

³ Supple has expressed his astonishment at the reception: “I told the cast not to expect standing ovations at Stratford as I had never seen one for a Shakespeare production [...] it was a really, really moving occasion for us and the audience too when at the end they just stood and roared [...]. I wasn’t just surprised. I was overwhelmed. That happened at every one of the 12 performances” (“*A Midsummer Night’s Dream* Journalist Resource Pack”).

⁴ In the case of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* he had special challenges working with a multilingual cast, some of whom do not speak English –he admits that he was unable to communicate directly with all the cast members and his comments and instructions had to be translated.

doing [...] in a British context" (Cornwell 2008). After his immersion in Indian theatrical practices in early 2005 and his resolution to produce *Midsummer*, he decided that his version would combine the Western tendency to portray realism and psychological truth with the Indian theatrical ability to better represent "the ritualistic and ancient side" (Cornwell 2008) of Shakespeare.⁵

Tim Supple has not been very explicit about the overall vision of the play that guided him when assembling the performers, and in interviews he has frequently mentioned that the production reflects the multilingual multicultural situation of contemporary India, but he has rejected the idea that it may say anything else about India: "Everything about the show comes out of India but it's not making comments about India or trying to understand India in a superficial way" (Cornwell 2008).⁶ It is nevertheless inevitable that international audiences should feel that they are receiving some representation of India in the performance, and the production is not fully free of the dangers of consuming India as the postcolonial exotic, since audiences may walk away from this magic play with a renewed sense of the mysterious and enchanting nature of Indian culture and an image of the location and its people as exuberant, colourful and impenetrable –these were indeed the concerns that a few local critics expressed after the first performances of the show in India, when they "suggested that the play was a piece of exotica that would go down best with foreign audiences [and] asked whether the production's stress on eroticism, savagery and primitive ecstasy reinforced colonial stereotypes" (Billington 2006a). Western critics do highlight the exotic and mysterious nature of a production in which "the sets, the costumes and the performances [are] *exotic, sensuous* and as *mysterious* as the many languages [...] that the actors [speak]"

⁵ Supple is excited about the transformation he produced in the performers: "'The sex! The violence! The emotional truth! [...] At the beginning of rehearsals, hardly any of these actors would have expressed those things realistically and literally as they do in the show'" (Cornwell 2008). The pull toward realism results in a sexual physicality on stage that was excessive for many women auditioning for the roles (as well as for some Indian spectators), since it goes so very much against Indian social habits and acting styles, both on stage and in films.

⁶ "'It's never for me about the novelty [...]" says Supple addressing the possibility that this staging might be accused of exoticizing its performers, or repeating colonialist patterns. 'What is important is making possible a way of discovering what's in the play'" (Balser 2008).

(Hampton-Reeves 2007: 200; emphasis added). Western audiences lack an informed understanding of the specific aspects of Indian cultures that are integrated into the production and, as a result, the overall impression they may indeed have after the performance is a sense of having witnessed a set of magic transformations that are only vaguely understood as enchanting and ravishing to the senses – an effect that is in keeping with the Shakespearean text, but which may be entangled in perceptions of India as a whole as enchanting and ravishing, exotic and distant.

Most reviewers seem to be unaware of the danger of a renewed Orientalism that may lie behind the celebration of the mystery and the sensuality of the Indian performers, that is, the Western consumption of the cultural other as what Graham Huggan calls the postcolonial exotic –and even if they hint at its possibility they immediately dismiss it without any in-depth discussion, enchanted as they are by the theatrical magic that the production does conjure up in its deployment of the charm and the beauty of the East.⁷ Michael Dobson’s review for the *Shakespeare Survey* can be an example of the incomplete analysis of the dangers of exoticism in the performance even when they are acknowledged. He mentions what he calls a possible “uncharitable account of this production” (Dobson 2007: 301) which might describe it in the following terms:

Tim Supple had been given a budget to travel around the Indian subcontinent cherry-picking the best talents in a range of local types of performance and then simply gone through the script of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* deciding where they could each show off their respective acts to best effect, thereby assembling a show masquerading as a Shakespeare revival but really offering a composite, exoticized vision of India for audiences of *de facto* tourists. (Dobson 2007: 301)

The possibility for criticism is introduced, although Dobson immediately adds that this critique is difficult to sustain because, despite offering many of the pleasures of the exotic, the production “does ground itself in an intelligent, original and cogent reading of

⁷ Occasionally, the idea that we may be facing a production that exploits the popularity of Bollywood and all things Indian in the West is directly addressed by reviewers. Richard Ouzounian, for instance, energetically rejects it when he says: “This is no gimmicky production in which Indian trappings have been grafted onto Shakespeare’s play for trendy appeal” (Ouzounian 2008).

the play” (Dobson 2007: 302). The reviewer himself sounds seduced by the visual power of a performance in which gazing upon the beauty of the Eastern other on stage seems to determine an important part of the aesthetic pleasure it generates, with Dobson explicitly acknowledging that the production is “consistently enjoyable –not least, frankly, because its cast are all *unnaturally good-looking* and wear few clothes, and those beautiful” (Dobson 2007: 302; emphasis added). Indeed, Dobson only mentions and briefly describes one aspect of what he calls the original cogent reading of the play: its closeness to *Così fan tutte* in its suggestion that, when faced with a real chance, all the characters are likely to find adherence to monogamy difficult, so that the reunion of the couples and all the other disparate elements of this production in Act V is both a relief and a miracle (Dobson 2007: 302).

There are few reviews that look into the braiding of East and West in the play in detail, as does Susanne Greenhalgh writing for the *Shakespeare Bulletin*. Her review discusses relevant examples of the performance traditions of contemporary South Asia that are used in the production, from the martial art of Kalarippatayyu to the Sanskrit hymns that accompany most Hindu weddings. Her analysis of the production is a reasoned assessment of the Indian cultural elements that are at work in Supple’s version and it offers an overall evaluation of the performance that goes beyond praising the original mingling of languages in the play and its visual ravishing of the audience. Part of the exhilaration that most reviewers express when describing their experience of the play has echoes of John Russell Brown’s depiction of the critic’s reaction to Shakespearean productions in which the language is not understood: “A new sense of what had hitherto lain hidden begins to emerge from within the familiar Shakespeare text [...]. The critic comes away with an enthusiasm not easy to explain” (Brown 1993: 21). With around half of the text in English, however, Tim Supple’s *Midsummer* is an unusual example of “foreign” Shakespeare and it has been frequently perceived as an intercultural Shakespeare play which maintains characters and plot intact but presents them in a conglomerate of English and Indian languages and theatrical styles. He does not alter the text other than to translate it into the different Indian languages that each member of his cast feels is most natural for him or her, and he himself has described his version as a very faithful line-by-line production. Tim Supple’s comments on the

conception of the project are in this sense very revealing of his approach to intercultural theatre in his Indian *Midsummer*: “[T]he thing that led my interest was a desire to *hunt out* theatre of a very different texture than our (British) theatre [...]. In the West we are much better at servicing the *modern side* of Shakespeare [...] but we’re out of touch with the ritualistic and *ancient side*” (Cornwell 2008; emphasis added). We could say that Tim Supple chooses without hesitation one of the two contrasting ways of understanding Shakespeare across cultures that Yong Li Lan describes in “Shakespeare and the Fiction of the Intercultural”, that is, as an approach “centered in the text, which is taken as a stable entity that is refracted and enriched by the performance forms and perspectives of the other cultures” (Yong 2005: 539) –an approach that contributes to the sense that Shakespeare is a timeless universal value. The other way to understand the bard across cultures is described as “a de-centering foreignness, a strategic disruption of ‘Shakespearean’ meanings, and of the cultural power they evoke, through the deployment of a performance system that challenges the integrity, identity and singularity of ‘Shakespeare’” (Yong 2005: 539-540).⁸ The successful international career of Tim Supple’s *Midsummer* so far confirms that most audiences and critics are in tune with this vision of the Shakespearean text as a stable cultural entity that performance structures from other cultures serve to enrich and breathe new life into.

It is not easy to summarize the magic of the production that has captivated audiences and reviewers around the world and brought comparisons with Peter Brook’s 1970 vision.⁹ As in Brook’s conception, the scenography is kept simple, the result of a process of sketching and trying many things in the search for “something light, simple and suggestive” (Bate and Rasmussen 2008: 123). While Brook presented all the action in a white cube that was always under powerful white light, in Supple’s production the lighting effects contribute greatly to the changing of locations from the day world of

⁸ This distinction between universalizing and disruptive approaches to Shakespeare intercultural theatre has a lot in common with what other critics describe as celebratory vs. oppositional appropriations of Shakespeare’s works.

⁹ Details of the production in the present paper make reference to the performances of the play by the company at the Currant Theatre in San Francisco between 16 May and 1 June 2008.

the Athenian court to the dark and frequently nightmarish world of the wood or to the misty morning ambiance of the post-dream awakenings in IV.i. When the action begins in the Athenian palace with Theseus and Hippolyta delivering a couple of Shakespearean lines before quickly shifting into Malayalam, Athens is a silver-floored open space with a white back wall that is meant to suggest “something classical and solid” (Bate and Rasmussen 2008: 123). This wall is mounted on a bamboo scaffolding that will be later revealed and used extensively in the performance, and its apparently solid surface proves to be a thin film of white paper that will be ripped through when the fairies burst in from the back in II.i. and jump onto the ground of the wood –a powerful image of the very fine screen that separates the fairy world from the human world. The floor by then is no longer the sophisticated silver surface of Theseus’s palace, since with the entrance of the mechanicals in I.ii the ground silver covering has been removed to reveal red Indian soil. Throughout the performance three musicians are on the sides of the stage as witnesses of the actions, creating a musical environment for the story and punctuating it on occasion with flute, guitar and percussion instruments.

Maintaining Peter Brook’s now classic doubling of Theseus/Oberon, Hippolyta/Titania and Philostrate/Puck, this production begins with Philostrate (Ajay Kumar, who also plays Puck) as a master of ceremonies that plays a singing stone located in a small pool of water downstage, conveying the sense that in court as in the wood there is a stage manager controlling the performance. Ajay Kumar’s incarnation of the knavish sprite is a deliciously wicked combination of “punk trickster, fertility god and Indian *fakir*” (Greenhalgh 2007: 68). Dressed in a red loincloth and with a permanent mischievous grin of enjoyment, he is frequently present on stage as an observer of the actions of the high and low Athenians, and he particularly seems to relish the confusion of the lovers in the wood. This is indeed one the most visually powerful moments in the play, when the four lovers become entangled in a cat’s cradle of elastic rope that Puck slowly but relentlessly weaves around them as their disagreements grow into a verbal and then a physical fight in III.ii –the elastic trap a compelling embodiment of their rising confusion in the wood before they fall asleep and wake up to a new perception of themselves and their situation. Indeed a crucial part of the production’s magnetism arises from the vigorous materialization

of the wood as it comes alive through the wicked playful presence of the fairies. While the Athenians are dressed in luscious contemporary Indian clothes with a flavour of timelessness and a whiff of old, and the mechanicals in easily recognizable contemporary clothes so that they “bring a reality to the stage and [...] convince as working men from India’s streets” (Bate and Rasmussen 2008: 134), the fairies are dressed in black with much of their flesh on display, their acrobatic bodies another contribution to the circulation of sensuality on the stage as the silvery light of the watery moon shines over the wood’s confusion. As Supple himself indicates, “our fairies wear as few clothes as possible, all black [...] Flesh and muscle, legs, backs and arms: these are the key elements of our shadows’ costumes” (Bate and Rasmussen 2008: 149). Like Peter Brook, Tim Supple conceives the fairies as performers, in this case scantily dressed acrobats and popular entertainers from Indian cultures.

The magic world of the forest comes alive with particular force in its first appearance, when loud and whirling fairies burst through the white back wall of Athens in II.i and the wood suddenly manifests itself as a place of danger and mysterious beauty. The acrobatic spirits bring to life the night forest at other significant moments, as when they create the confusion of the wood for the rehearsing mechanicals in III.i (or for Hermia after waking up from her nightmare in II.ii) by holding big leaves and canes over their heads –just as Peter Brook’s fairies held at times entwined blocks of wire over the mechanicals to suggest the natural surroundings. There are several playful fairy interventions in the actions of the humans in the wood, such as the spirits’ bringing down long bands of red silk that they offer as forest beds for Lysander and Hermia in II.ii, with Peaseblossom flirtatiously enticing Lysander to his resting place. Like Peter Brook, Tim Supple makes use of the verticality of the stage in his inclusion of these descending red silk bands as the lovers’ bed and Titania’s bower, but mainly in the fairies’ expression of the magic world of the wood through acrobatic exercises, which are also part of Titania and Oberon’s Indian boy’s gymnastic performance –indeed one of the most widely used pictures of the production in reviews shows Titania as she is wrapping herself up in her red-silk bower-cum-sari, an image that captures the acrobatic nature of the performance and suggests its Indian grounding. Archana Ramaswamy, who is a trained classical dancer in

Bharatanatyam, is a fiery Titania worthy of her equally physical Oberon, performed by the actor P. R. Jijoy, who is also trained in various forms of martial arts, dance and music. Both transform themselves from fairy creatures to courtly characters in front of the audience, donning their more elaborate costumes as Theseus and Hippolyta as they finish delivering their lines as Oberon and Titania. The stage presence of Titania/Hippolyta is particularly engaging with English-speaking audiences since like other women characters in the production she is assigned more lines of the original Shakespearean text than the male characters, which makes her words more easily available in the midst of the Indian languages.¹⁰

In keeping with most post-Brook stage readings of *Midsummer*, Tim Supple's play presents the sensuality in the wood in its darkest hues, and the production is in fact rather more sexually explicit than can be expected from an Indian performance, not only in the open sexuality of Bottom (with donkey's ears and a big calabash as an enormous phallus he cannot manage to hide), or in the fairy encounters of Titania with her own husband, in which their argument has them "rolling on the stage, with their bodies locked together" (Parsons 2007b), but also in the case of the young lovers, who are very physical on the stage and end their night misadventures in the wood partly naked. The magic juice of the love-in-idleness flower –red powder that covers Lysander's and Demetrius's eyes and brows as the colours applied during Hindu festivals– brings out their lust, not their love, as they pursue the young girls in the confusion of the night wood. On the other hand, and also like Peter Brook, Supple chooses to take the mechanicals' performance seriously, so that they are not played for easy laughs but as craftsmen who put all their energy into a production that partly succeeds and is much more than pure farce. The mechanicals do look like contemporary Indian craftsmen and workers and like the high Athenians, most of them also participate in the polyphonic ensemble that moves Shakespeare's lines from English to some regional Indian language, Marathi for Bottom (Joy Fernandes) and Bengali and Hindi for Flute (Joyraj Bhattacharya). Joy Fernandes has

¹⁰ The women in the production do speak more English lines than the other characters. This distribution was not intentional, but a result of the casting of the actresses since, as Supple indicates, "[a] lot of women in India would not have been able to engage physically on stage [...] as I felt it had to be done" (Padmanabhan 2006).

been highly praised for his incarnation of Shakespeare's weaver as comic yet contained, "a sweetly serious Bottom [...] that is both wonderfully funny and faintly disturbing" (Munro 2007: 20) and his performance has been seen as epitomising the virtues of the production, since he has "weight, dignity, and the total dedication of the artisan-turned actor" (Billington 2007a).

When asked by an interviewer in Australia about Shakespeare's possible reaction to this "gorgeous, globalized version" of *Midsummer* (Cornwell 2008), Tim Supple's response points to his sense that it maintains the essence of the play: "[H]e'd recognise the heart and soul of the production and its physicality. He'd see himself there on the stage in the dust and the earth" (Cornwell 2008). Supple's *Midsummer* seems to be thus another confirmation that foreign performances of Shakespeare can attest to the mesmerizing power of his plays that defies their removal to local stages and foreign languages, a secret quality "which is not destroyed by adaptation, transposition, misrepresentation, spectacular simplification, or novel accretion" (Brown 1993: 22). Tim Supple's *Midsummer* has been conceived by the director and received by audiences and critics as a magic play whose power is better expressed in terms of antitheses: it is foreign yet authentic, exotic yet truly Shakespearean, distant yet uncannily close, and, as Billington suggested, securely rooted in Indian experience and at the same time paradoxically airborne (Billington 2006a).

The study of "foreign" Shakespeares is a relatively recent phenomenon, particularly when it comes to performance, since the field itself of Shakespeare in performance has developed in recent years, beginning with its (partial) institutionalization in the early eighties (Hodgdon 2005: 2). In his introduction to the pioneer volume *Foreign Shakespeare* (1993), Dennis Kennedy stressed the scant attention that English-language criticism of the plays had paid to foreign productions of Shakespeare and he described his volume on foreign Shakespeare as "an introductory project" (Kennedy 1993: xvii). The book blurb itself described it as the first collection to offer a considered account of contemporary Shakespeare performance in non-English-speaking theatres. Kennedy acknowledged the contribution of foreign productions to new understandings of the plays, given that they cannot place "the same emphasis on Shakespeare's verbal resourcefulness" and therefore are bound to

explore “scenographic and physical modes more openly than their Anglophone counterparts, often redefining the meaning of the plays in the process” (Kennedy 1993: 6). He felt at the time that the book’s concentration on European performances was justified since most of Shakespeare production outside English still took place in Europe, and European theatres led the way in redefining performance models (Kennedy 1993: xvii-xviii).

The visibility of foreign Shakespeare performances, including non-European productions, and the interest aroused by them among scholars and general audiences has increased considerably since Dennis Kennedy gathered the material for his book, and less than a decade after its publication a general volume on Shakespearean performance such as *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare on Stage* (2002) devotes three of its fifteen chapters to non-English-language performances (“International Shakespeare”, “Shakespeare on the Stages of Asia” and “Shakespeare and Africa”) and significantly boasts on its cover a photograph of Jiang Weiguo’s 1986 production of *Much Ado About Nothing* as background for the inset picture of the 2000 RSC production of *Henry IV, part 2*. As Barbara Hodgdon indicates, in the new millennium “the critical project of studying Shakespeare performances has come of age” (Hodgdon 2005: 7), and foreign performances are no longer in the periphery of this field of study. There are indeed many indications of this development –in which an important role has been played by the consolidation of the field of Shakespeare on film. Thus several of the performance books that Kennedy mentions in 1993 as not including information on foreign Shakespeares have been adding it in their new editions, for instance a chapter on Chinese productions in the case of Jay L. Halio’s 2003 *Midsummer* volume for the Manchester University Press “Shakespeare in Performance” series. Hodgdon’s volume *Shakespeare and Performance* (2005) announces the plan for another version of Kennedy’s volume, *Foreign Shakespeare 2: Performance in the New Asia* co-edited with Yong Li Lan (Hodgdon 2005: xv), and in recent years there has been a proliferation of publications on varied aspects of Shakespeare’s productions in the world, from those dealing with specific locations, such as Murray J. Levith’s *Shakespeare in China* (2004) or Poonam Trivedi and Dennis Bartholomeusz’s *India’s Shakespeare: Translation, Interpretation, and Performance* (2005), to those which attempt to bring together global and local Shakespeares such as Sonia Massai’s *World-Wide Shakespeares: Local Appropriations in*

Film and Performance (2005) or Martin Orkin's *Local Shakespeares: Proximations and Power* (2005). As the editors of *Native Shakespeares: Indigenous Appropriations on a Global Stage* (2008) indicate, "[t]here has been, in the last 10 years, an explosion of critical interest in the way that Shakespeare has been made to accommodate local cultures across the globe" (Dionne and Kapadia 2008: 5). A defining feature in the evolution of the field of non-English Shakespeare is the change of perspectives embodied in the nomenclature, from Kennedy's "foreign Shakespeare" in his 1993 volume to Sonia Massai's "world-wide Shakespeare", Martin Orkin's "local Shakespeares" or Craig Dionne and Parmita Kapadia's "native Shakespeares" in the new millennium. The relocation of the source of scholarship and study from Britain to global or local perspectives is clearly embodied in the shift from the term "foreign" in Kennedy's volume to the expressions "world-wide", "global" and "local" in more recent books, an indication of the movement both of performances and of scholarly and critical tasks away from the cultural centre of Britain and onto the world stage and the different local stages.

This explosion of interest in foreign, world-wide, global and local Shakespearean productions in the publishing world in recent years is part of the decentralizing movement in Shakespearean studies from traditional scholarly discussion of the plays as repositories of English *and* universal values towards the celebration of what we could call the carnivalization of Shakespearean studies, that is, the rising importance of scholarly discussions of issues that until the last years of the twentieth century would have been considered unworthy of academic study, such as Shakespearean plays on film and other visual media, textual poaching of Shakespeare's work through popular culture appropriations, and the proliferation of local Shakespeares that shape a multifarious global Shakespeare of kaleidoscopic irreverent forms. Tim Supple's production comes at a moment of intense awareness of the interplay between the local and the global, a moment of *glocalized* cultures in which artistic products can be promoted internationally by highlighting precisely their local values. The contending forces of the global and the local find their peaceful *entendre* in the fruitful notion of "intercultural theatre", the sense that the combining of two or more local tendencies can yield a chance for mutual enrichment and, in the case of the long dominant British cultural icon William Shakespeare and the cultural traditions of former countries of the

empire such as India, lead to a productive balance of the previously uneven cultural power play of colonizing and colonized people. As Parmita Kapadia indicates, the interest in “theatre that deliberately negotiates between distinct cultural boundaries” (Kapadia 2008: 95) has resulted in the proliferation of terms to describe it, including “postcolonial”, “intercultural”, “cross-cultural”, “syncretic”, “multicultural” and “transcultural”. The more enthusiastic among critics of Tim Supple’s production have raved about its mingling of traditions, which make of it, in the passionate perception of Richard Ouzounian for *The Toronto Star*, “an astonishing theatrical experience in which East and West totally unite” (Ouzounian 2008). The interculturality of Supple’s version is perceived as a given and, with few exceptions, reviewers do not express any concerns for possibly exoticizing readings of the production, nor do they seriously scrutinize what this all-Indian version of *Midsummer* tells the audience about the Indian subcontinent beyond their celebration of the multilingual cast. They seem to be satisfied with interpreting the production as the combination of Supple’s English vision and the energy of the Indian performers, in Billington’s words, “a collaborative alliance between Supple’s English sensibility and the particular skills of the south Asian actors” (Billington 2006a).

To understand the magic exerted by the production on critics and audiences it helps to place Tim Supple’s *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* in the history of the play in performance, from musical extravaganza in the seventeenth century and operatic and ballet spectacle in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to twenty-first century visions. This history has been seen as a repeated polarization between two extreme interpretations: “the ‘traditional’ (both innocent and pictorially elaborate) and the ‘modernist’ (represented pre-eminently by Brook’s landmark RSC production of 1970, obsessively re-engaged in subsequent productions)” (Shaughnessy 2005: 112). The perception of a dark side to the magic world of the Athenian wood only emerged on stage in the sixties in a development parallel to the pessimistic view of the comedies in Jan Kott’s *Shakespeare Our Contemporary* (1964). Inspired by Kott’s vision, Peter Brook’s 1970 production of the play received in its own time exalted praise (and some severe criticism) and has become a classic in its own right, a conception of the play that captured not only the vision of its director but the spirit of the times. Part circus entertainment, part minimalist distillation of Shakespearean values,

the production managed to unite the contemporary energies of the hippie movement with the darker possibilities in the play and an original scenography that, in its combination of stark white emptiness and colourful simplicity, captivated the imaginations of contemporary audiences and future generations of Shakespearean directors.

The success of Tim Supple's play with audiences and critics throughout the world lies in a similar combination of factors. On the one hand, his vision of *Midsummer* manages to unite elements of what Shaughnessy calls the two polarized stage interpretations of the play, the "traditional" and the "modernist" readings –he displaces the musical magic of the wood to the non-English and exotic sounds and forms of Indian music and dance, and therefore distances for Western audiences what may be considered the more sentimental aspects of the play; at the same time, however, he highlights the modern reading of the wood as a dark place of savagery and danger, with "an ability to bring out the demonic otherness of the Athenian wood" (Billington 2007a) that has been extremely appealing to critics, crucially because this demonic otherness is both dangerous and attractive. As the reviewer for the *Times Literary Supplement* puts it, Supple's production "demonstrates with wonderful ease and dignity *both* the joyous *lightness* and the erotically charged *darkness* of this remarkable play" (Lucy Munro 2007: 20; emphasis added). On the other hand, by employing an all-Indian cast and combining theatrical traditions of East and West, his production responds to twenty-first century interest in international, intercultural Shakespeares that manifest the forces of the local and the global in the world. Supple's production elaborates the tendency to bring into the performance of Shakespeare elements of other theatrical traditions that was already present in Peter Brook's, a tendency that according to Barbara Hodgdon is fully developed in the mid-nineties, when "whether drawing from Brecht, Beckett, Noh, Kabuki or kathakali, Shakespearean performances increasingly and freely borrowed, assimilated and reworked theatrical traditions" (Hodgdon 2005: 5). Peter Brook's production was a child of the sixties that has managed to remain fresh and engaging for subsequent generations of critics. Tim Supple's *Midsummer* is also a product of our times, a play that is presented and perceived as intercultural in its mingling of languages and theatrical traditions, and embodies the sense of Shakespeare as international cultural

capital that can circulate throughout the world, as it displays for international audiences a version of the play that claims to reach to the very essence of Shakespeare by removing his story to an Eastern location and his text to a multiplicity of Indian languages.

Only time will confirm whether Tim Supple's *A Midsummer Summer Night's Dream* is indeed the successor of Peter Brook's as the revolutionary production that can become a major influence on the contemporary stage. In our view, the play is most accurately described as a multicultural production in which different languages are mixed on the stage and elements from diverse Indian performance traditions are incorporated. It provides a dream of interculturality in the possibility of an even partnership between different cultural traditions, but it is not truly intercultural in the performance terms defined by Chinese director David Jiang as requiring "painstakingly minute negotiations between often opposed preconditions and conventions that characterize the target and the source cultures" (Li 2005: 40). There is no attempt to achieve an equal relation between English and Indian traditions, and their interaction does not strive to be balanced: as in the case of other Western directors in the past, the performance traditions of the East are there to bring new life to the Shakespearean text –as Supple has insisted, "[w]hat is important is making possible a way of discovering what's in the play" (Balser 2008). The production could be seen as intercultural theatre within the model proposed by Patrice Pavis, which typically assumes a European audience and encompasses exchanges between cultures that are mostly a one-way movement from East to West. The colonial and orientalist potential of this theory of interculturality has been denounced by critics like Rustom Bharucha, who offers an alternative model which envisions intercultural theatre as "a two-way street where the cultural sources are equally respected and theatre practitioners collaborate, moving back and forth with awareness of power differentials, to achieve consensus" (Daugherty 2005: 54). Tim Supple's production creates the illusion of an intercultural performance, a dream that vanishes as we reflect upon what we have seen on the stage: it is indeed polylingual and multicultural, since different Indian languages and elements from Indian traditions are given a place in the performance. The audience is mesmerized into perceiving they are watching an intercultural exchange of Eastern and Western traditions but this interaction is profoundly unequal –the Indian

performers and their skills are at the service of the greater value of Shakespeare. In fact the claim is made that the effect of using Indian performance styles has been paradoxically to bring out the essence of Shakespeare, not to change it in any way. This is indeed one of the ways in which Shakespeare still circulates as cultural capital in our globalised cultural economy, with the elements of other cultures strategically deployed to breathe new life into the ancient body of the Bard.

References

- Anon. 2007. "Tim Supple's *Midsummer Night's Dream* Goes on Tour" *The Watford Observer* 21 September.
 <url: <http://www.watfordobserver.co.uk/news/1705846.print/>>
- "A *Midsummer Night's Dream* Journalist Resource Pack." Luminato Festival, Toronto.
 <url:http://www.luminato.com/festival/eng/designedit/upload/A_Midsummer_Night%20s_Dream_JOURNALIST_RESOURCE_PACK.doc>.
- Balzer, David 2008. "British Director Tim Supple's Strange and Surprising Dream Lands at this Summer's Luminato Festival." *Eyeweekly* 28 May.
 <url: <http://www.eyeweekly.com/features/article/29036>>.
- Bate, Jonathan and Eric Rasmussen 2008. "A *Midsummer Night's Dream* in Performance: The RSC and Beyond." Eds. Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen. *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. London: Macmillan: 94-150.
- Bharucha, Rustom 1993. *Theatre and the World: Performance and the Politics of Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Billington, Michael 2006a. "Indian Summer." *The Guardian* 31 May.
 <url: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/stage/2006/may/31/theatre.india>>.
- Billington, Michael 2006b. "A *Midsummer Night's Dream*, Swan, Stratford." *The Guardian* 9 June.
 <url: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/stage/2006/jun/09/theatre.rsc>>.
- Billington, Michael 2007a. "A *Midsummer Night's Dream*." *The Guardian* 14 March.
 <url: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/stage/2007/mar/14/theatre1>>
- Billington, Michael 2007b. "The Delights and Dangers of Touring Shakespeare." *The Guardian* 15 November.
 <url:<http://www.guardian.co.uk/stage/theatreblog/2007/nov/15/the-delightsanddangersofto>>.
- "British Council India: *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Directed by Tim Supple"

- <url:<http://www.britishcouncil.org/india-connecting-north-march-2006-tim-supple1.htm>>.
- Brown, John Russell 1993. "Foreign Shakespeare and English-Speaking Audiences." Ed. Kennedy, Dennis. *Foreign Shakespeare: Contemporary Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 21-35.
- Cornwell, Jane 2008. "A Dream from Afar." *The Australian* 26 January. <url:<http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,25197,23091033-5013570,00.html>>.
- Daugherty, Diane 2005. "The Pendulum of Intercultural Performance: Kathakali King Lear at Shakespeare's Globe." *Asian Theatre Journal* 22/1 (Spring): 52-72.
- Dionne, Craig and Parmita Kapadia 2008. "Introduction." Eds. Craig Dionne and Parmita Kapadia. *Native Shakespeares: Indigenous Appropriations on a Global Stage*. Aldershot: Ashgate: 1-15.
- Dobson, Michael 2007. "Shakespeare Performances in England, 2006." *Shakespeare Survey* 60: 284-319.
- Greenhalgh, Susanne 2006. "A Midsummer Night's Dream." *Shakespeare Bulletin* 24/4 (Winter): 65-69.
- Hampton-Reeves, Stuart 2007. "Review of A Midsummer Night's Dream (directed by Tim Supple) at the Swan, June 2006 and the Roundhouse, London, April 2007." *Shakespeare* 3/2 (August): 200-202.
- Hodgdon, Barbara 2005. "Introduction: A Kind of History." Eds. Barbara Hodgdon and W.B. Worthen. *A Companion to Shakespeare and Performance*. Malden, MA: Blackwell: 1-9.
- Huggan, Graham 2001. *The Postcolonial Exotic: Marketing the Margins*. London: Routledge.
- Kapadia, Parmita 2008. "Jatra Shakespeare: Indigenous Indian Theater and the Postcolonial Stage." Eds. Craig Dionne and Parmita Kapadia. *Native Shakespeares: Indigenous Appropriations on a Global Stage*. Aldershot: Ashgate: 91-103.
- Kennedy, Dennis ed. 1993. *Foreign Shakespeare: Contemporary Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levith, Murray J. 2004. *Shakespeare in China*. London: Continuum.
- Li, Ruru 2005. "Negotiating Intercultural Spaces: Much Ado About Nothing and Romeo and Juliet on the Chinese Stage." Ed. Sonia Massai. *World-Wide Shakespeares: Local Appropriations in Film and Performance*. London: Routledge: 40-46.
- Munro, Lucy 2007. "Translated from Top to Bottom." *Times Literary Supplement* 23 March 20.

- Orkin, Martin 2005. *Local Shakespeares: Proximations and Power*. London: Routledge.
- Ouzounian, Richard 2008. "New Multicultural Adaptation of the Bard's Magical Play Seemed Tailor-Made for Toronto." *The Toronto Star* 31 May. <url: <http://www.thestar.com/Entertainment/article/433711>>.
- Padmanabhan, Mukund 2006. "In Conversation". *The Hindu*, 2 April. <url: <http://www.thehindu.com/thehindu/mag/2006/04/02/stories/2006040200100200.htm>>.
- Parsons, Elinor 2007a. "'This wide and universal theatre': Shakespeare in Different Voices." Eds. Peter J. Smith and Janice Valls-Russell, with Kath Bradley. *Cahiers Élisabéthains: A Biannual Journal of English Renaissance Studies*. Special Issue: 7-11.
- Parsons, Elinor 2007b. "Review of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*." Eds. Peter J. Smith and Janice Valls-Russell, with Kath Bradley. *Cahiers Élisabéthains: A Biannual Journal of English Renaissance Studies*: 38-39.
- Pavis, Patrice 1992. *Theatre at the Crossroads of Culture*. Trans. Loren Kruger. London: Routledge.
- Shaughnessy, Robert 2005. "Dreams of England." Ed. Sonia Massai. *World-Wide Shakespeares: Local Appropriations in Film and Performance*. London: Routledge: 112-121.
- Trivedi, Poonam and Dennis Bartholomeusz eds. 2005. *India's Shakespeare: Translation, Interpretation, and Performance*. Newark: University of Delaware Press.
- Yong, Li Lan 2005. "Shakespeare and the Fiction of the Intercultural." Eds. Barbara Hodgdon and W.B. Worthen. *A Companion to Shakespeare and Performance*. Malden, MA: Blackwell: 527-549.

How to cite this article:

Muñoz Valdivieso, Sofía. "'Mine ear is much enamour'd of thy note:' Shakespeare's intercultural dream in the Indian subcontinent." *SEDERI* 19 (2009): 99-119.

Author's contact: simunoz@uma.es

Submission: 15/11/2008

Acceptance: 18/02/2009

The early stage history of Jules Romain's *Volpone*

Purificación Ribes Traver
University of Valencia

ABSTRACT

No other adaptation of *Volpone* has ever received as enthusiastic a reception as Jules Romain's free version did when it premièred in 1928. It held the stage for over 250 nights and continued to attract large numbers of spectators when taken on tour during the seasons following. The aim of this paper is to uncover the reasons for such overwhelming success by analysing both the theatrical merits of the script and the performing abilities of Charles Dullin's and Charles Baret's ensembles. The information provided by playbills, theatre programmes and critical reviews cast light on the horizon of expectations of their audiences. They make possible an assessment of the ideological approach they favoured as well as of the staging techniques they preferred.

KEYWORDS: Romain, *Volpone*, text, performance.

Introduction

The aim of this paper¹ is to uncover the reasons why Jules Romain's French adaptation of *Volpone*, premièred in November 1928,² surpassed any other version of the play in audience appeal. The conclusion that I have reached after analyzing both the printed text and the critics' reactions to its numerous performances is that it fully met the horizon of expectations of his contemporaries.³

The tone of Romain's reworking of the text was undoubtedly appropriate to the tastes of his audience, as the observations of most

¹ Research for this essay was funded by Project UV-AE-20070217.

² It was first staged at the *Atelier*, Paris, on 23 November 1928.

³ Hans R. Jauss's "Erwartungshorizont", as defined in Jauss (1970).

theatre critics reveal. The play benefited, moreover, from a tight structure which helped the action progress in a logical way, while keeping the interest of the audience alive. A gallery of unforgettable and resourceful characters was also provided for the delight of spectators. But, as the evidence suggests, the performance would not have achieved the enormous success it did, had it not been staged by a first-rate cast, headed by an expert director. This was precisely what allowed Romains' version of *Volpone* to hold the Parisian stage for over 250 nights after its première.

Text-centred performance

Director Charles Dullin, who also played the leading role, offered a spectacle where every single element of the performance – setting, costumes, lighting, music– contributed to the actors' enactment of their roles. The text was made fully meaningful, since an experienced ensemble aptly nuanced every aspect of their performance, from body movement to facial gesture, delivery of lines, rhythm and intonation. The perfect conjunction of text and performance ensured a prolonged life of the play on stage: not only did Dullin's Company perform it regularly until 1945, but the comedy enjoyed a successful number of seasons on tour with Ch. Baret's Company.

The play's success was undoubtedly determined by the importance accorded to role-playing. Setting and accessories were at all times subsidiary to it. The schematic setting which André Barsacq devised for the Atelier in 1928 suited the performance so perfectly that Jean-Louis Barrault continued to use it when he staged the play at the Marigny in 1955.⁴ Barrault was one of Dullin's most outstanding disciples and shared his view on the centrality of the performer to a play.⁵ The production which he offered his audience

⁴ His setting and costumes were valued so highly that Baret's touring company advertised them in playbills and programmes as follows: "*Volpone* nous est annoncé pour bientôt par les Tournées Ch. Baret avec une interprétation de tout premier ordre et avec des décors, costumes et accessoires absolument semblables à ceux de la création" (Playbill 2.9.1929; 19.11.1929; 19.4.1930; 4.8.1930; "Les Avant-Premières" 8.1.1930, 22.11.1930).

⁵ For a more detailed explanation of Barrault's attention to diction, movement and precision of gesture, see Lyons (1967: 415-424).

was, therefore, close in outlook to that of Dullin, and, consequently enjoyed great acceptance, not only in France, but also abroad.

When Barrault took his production to the Winter Garden in New York in 1957, theatre critics underlined the admiration that this company aroused among American theatre-goers. In Gassner's view (1957: 118), they were envious of the Parisians, who had enjoyed Barrault's productions for two decades. Almost thirty years had gone by since Dullin's première, but the key to the play's success still lay in the happy combination of a good script and a responsive and professional cast.⁶

This fact was particularly clear to those American critics who attended the Rooftop production of *Volpone* that same year. Although the play was then performed in English, they felt that neither the text nor the production could equal that of the French company (Barbour 1957: 261). Curiously enough, the text was not as removed from theirs as one might imagine, although the standard set by Barrault was too high for an amateur company. The text which the Rooftop theatre had staged was Ruth Langner's English translation of Stefan Zweig's free version of the play. And the truth is that Langner's faithful translation of the German adaptation was fully satisfactory. Zweig's version, moreover, had been the point of departure of Romains' own adaptation, and had been successfully

⁶ This would also account for the success of Tourneur's film of *Volpone*, released in 1941, whose script was partly written by Romains. It would be misleading, however, to resort to Tourneur's film as a means of illustrating Dullin's 1928 theatrical production at L'Atelier. Even though both artistic products achieved remarkable standards of quality, their differences are too significant to consider them as equivalent. It cannot be ignored that Dullin and Tourneur employed different scripts, a different cast of actors, and, above all, a different artistic language. The theatrical style of filming characteristic of the pre-war period, moreover, had been replaced with a new cinematographic language which was not interchangeable with that of the theatre. The relevance, for example, which Tourneur gives to close-ups as a means of revealing the innermost thoughts of his characters cannot possibly be transferred to a playhouse, whose size removes the effectiveness of these gestures.

Certain similarities, however, seem to relate these accomplished products of the theatrical and filmic media, since both Dullin and Tourneur had to overcome important economic difficulties. Tourneur was particularly heroic since his film was shot under the Nazi occupation at a time when most cinematic activity had ceased in France. But, although his house in Paris had been destroyed by bombs, he continued to edit magnificent films, which, like *Volpone*, mirrored the political and social tensions of a period when hypocrisy and dishonesty were the rule.

performed all over Europe, starting in Vienna in 1926,⁷ and following in Germany and Switzerland soon afterwards.⁸ Translations into different languages soon followed, so that Zweig's version was taken to places as distant as the United States (1928) and Italy (1929).

Romains's adaptation of *Volpone*

Although Zweig's free version had the merit of effectively recovering Jonson's comedy for the modern stage, it was still liable to some improvement, particularly in relation to structural coherence and character consistency, as Romain's apt reworking of the text amply shows. His theatrical background included a practical knowledge of the possibilities that a text could offer for performance, as he had been training professional actors with Copeau and Jouvet during the early twenties (*cf.* Copeau 1974 (1913): 28-30) and was well aware of the importance that structural coherence and character consistency had for a successful performance.

Romains was also aware that the tastes of audiences change depending on their geographical, cultural and ideological background, so that some aspects of Zweig's version that pleased Austrian or German audiences could be valued less positively by French spectators, and vice-versa. Zweig must have shared this viewpoint, and, since he was acquainted with Romain's talent for drama, he did not ask him to render it literally in French, but fully trusted his ability to adapt it for the French stage. That is why, in a letter written in Salzburg in January 10 1929, Zweig told Romain: "J'ai pensé, si cela ne vous intéressait de vous en occuper –je ne dis pas traduire, mais *faire librement* une adaptation" (Romain 1928b; quoted Rony (1993: 333; my italics). And he showed complete confidence in its successful outcome: "Transformé pour la France par vous, cela pourrait [...] *remplir les théâtres deux ans*" (Romain 1928b; quoted Rony (1993: 333; my italics).

⁷ It was premièred at the National Theatre of Vienna (Wiener Burgtheater) on 6 November 1926.

⁸ It remained in the repertories of the National Theatres of the largest German towns until 1933, when the Nazi regime banned the play **of its Jewish adaptor**.

It certainly did, and more than one perceptive critic realized the reason why Romain's version had become so popular. Edmond Jaloux (*Temps*, 4.12.31), for example, summarized his contribution to the new version as follows: "M. Jules Romain a traduit la pièce de M. Zweig et l'a *adaptée au ton de Paris*." And, although he pointed out the changes which Zweig had introduced in order to modernize Jonson's comedy, "M. Stefan Zweig a recréé la pièce au goût des esprits modernes, *ajouté un personnage et modifié le dénouement*" (my italics), he suggested that French audiences required further modifications.

Zweig had removed the play's secondary plot in order to make it advance at a faster pace. All the characters from this plot disappeared except for Lady Would-Be, whom Zweig transformed into the Courtesan Canina. Like Jonson's character, she was forward and determined to have a share in Volpone's will. She tried to achieve her end by offering him her personal services for nothing, in the hope of becoming his legal wife –and, soon afterwards, his widow and sole heir. In the end she gets a consolation prize from Zweig's winning hero, Mosca, who finally inherits Volpone's estate. He buys her a husband to make the child she is expecting legitimate.

Zweig's version, unlike Jonson's, does not end in the stern punishment of all the greedy characters, but only in Volpone's exile from Venice. In the end, Mosca, who has discovered how useful a sudden stroke of generosity can be to make sure that nobody declares Volpone's testament invalid, turns into an openhanded host who gives the greedy characters some crumbs from Volpone's trencher in the form of gifts and an invitation to supper at his new mansion.

Romain had expressed confidence in his own capacity to offer a version of *Volpone* that could meet the needs and tastes of his countrymen. In *Correspondance* he had rhetorically asked: "Sommes-nous incapables, en France, de ce travail après tout facile et subalterne qui consiste à s'approprier discrètement un chef d'oeuvre?"⁹ And that is precisely what he did, for, instead of completely depending on Zweig's version for his own, he also turned to Jonson for inspiration, particularly in connection with the

⁹ Jules Romain, "Comment est née cette version de *Volpone*," *Correspondance* 2 (November 1928), quoted in Hélène Henry (1960: 199).

tone he chose for his adaptation. His approach to Jonson's hypotext (Cf. Genette 1987), however, was never servile, because, in his view, "[Volpone] ne peut revivre pour nous qu'à condition d'être remanié profondément, ou pour mieux dire, repensé et refait."¹⁰

Romains' méchant social vs. Zweig's méchant physiologique

A comparison between the published version of Zweig's (1926) and Romains' (1928) adaptations immediately reveals an essential difference of tone in both texts, for, whereas Zweig creates a gloomy and oppressive atmosphere with sadistic characters who delight in torturing others, Romains chooses a more amiable tone for his version. His characters still retain the necessary malice for the satirical approach of the play to be effectively conveyed, but he removes the excess of wickedness which he perhaps felt interferes with the happy ending which both Zweig and himself chose for their versions. Another possible reason behind his decision to create more humane characters is that it is closer to his own perception of the world. Romains' description of Volpone in "Avant-Première" subtly points to this essential difference of approach between Zweig's version and his own, although he never specifies that he is describing the character created by his Austrian friend. In Romains' own words:

Volpone est [...] *le méchant complexe, contrasté, tourmenté, méchant par intelligence, méchant par expérience [...] parce qu'il porte dans le dernier fond de son cœur [...] un certain idéal de l'homme et de la vie, un certain rêve de pureté, de générosité, de bonté, que toute son expérience des hommes est venue démentir.* (Paris-Soir: 23.11.1928; my italics)

And he then makes clear what traits his character does not have. Anybody acquainted with Zweig's *lieblose Komödie* can find here a shrewd description of his character:

[Volpone n'est pas] *le méchant physiologique*, le monstre pur, qui n'intéresse que le psychiatre, qui reste hors du domaine de la grande comédie, mais *le méchant social* [...] l'homme qui provoque la naissance autour de lui, la convergence vers lui de passions viles. (Paris-Soir: 23.11.1928; my italics)

¹⁰ Romains, "Comment est née cette version de *Volpone*," quoted in Henry (1960: 199).

It is precisely Volpone's ability to awaken men's basest instincts that reviewers of Romains' version repeatedly highlight. René Salomé, for example, describes him as

un avare [...] qui prend un malin, un démoniaque plaisir à exaspérer *la convoitise des trois voisins* [...] l'avilissement d'autrui l'intéresse et l'amuse [...] son esprit curieux et pervers se plaît à *sonder la malice humaine*. (*Études* 1929: 343; my italics)

This idea is also emphasized by D'Houville, from *Le Figaro*, when he says: "Autant que manier ses objets précieux et cachés, il [Volpone] lui plaît de jouer de la bassesse humaine" (3.12.1928: 2; my italics).¹¹

As Oliver Rony (1993: 574) aptly observes, the topic which Romains dealt with in *Volpone* was akin to his personal preferences,¹² and it offered him the possibility of condemning human rapacity:

Jules Romains, disposant d'un sujet miraculeusement accordé à son univers personnel, poursuit là *la même entreprise de dénonciation que dans ses pièces précédents* [...] une vision désabusée d'un monde mené par les passions [...] par sa *fascination pour la possession des biens* au détriment de toute générosité désintéressée (Rony 1993: 349).

It can be easily perceived that his awareness of human greediness would be particularly acute around the time when this piece was staged. The French economy was undergoing a miraculous recovery under Poincaré after seven years of post-war depression. The situation was being rapidly reversed, to the substantial benefit of a few who were quick to take advantage of the favourable circumstances.¹³

¹¹ Baret's Touring Company had taken special care to advertise this feature of Volpone's personality. In their Summer programme of 1929, they said: "Volpone [...] s'amuse, secondé par son valet et conseiller, Mosca, à augmenter sa richesse au détriment de ses amis trop cupides," and in November 1929, they specified that he liked to "bafouer la cupidité des gens qui l'entourent" (Muller 1929-1930; 1930-1931).

¹² It would reappear in different plays throughout his career. As Oliver Rony points out when he refers to *L'An Mil*, première on 13 March 1947, "Carcaïlle, nouveau Volpone, déploie une belle rhétorique pour faire admettre ses impostures et rejoint par là une galerie où figurent [...] ces hommes cyniques que le théâtre de Jules Romains privilégie depuis plus de vingt ans" (1993: 574).

¹³ Some novelists had tellingly echoed this painful situation which bears thematic connections to *Volpone*. As Catharine Savage comments on Roland Dorgelès' *Le Réveil*

Although perhaps less markedly than in France, this tendency was generalized in post-war Europe during the second half of the decade. Even Germany, although overwhelmed by its debts, experienced a spectacular recovery with the financial aid of the United States. A fever for consumption and speculation extended throughout Europe, and, especially, the United States, which would lead to an economic depression sooner than expected. In the same way that Volpone's greed would deprive him of all that he had got by obscure means, risky speculation would bring about the loss of great fortunes which had been swiftly made. Zweig left an eloquent depiction of man's natural inclination to greed both in his version of *Volpone* and in his *Die Welt von Gestern*, where he gave a telling description of the rapacity of his fellow men: "Wer zu bestechen wußte, kam vorwärts; wer spekulierte, profitierte [...] es gab keine Tugend als die einzige: geschick, geschmeidig, bedenkenlos zu sein und dem jagendem Roß auf den Rücken zu springen, statt sich von ihm zertrampeln zu lassen" (2007 (1942): 333).

As in previous pieces, Romain wanted his audience to be aware of the satirical intent of his version, and critics attending different performances seem to have perceived this satirical approach. This was the case of Bidou (1929), who declared that in *Volpone* "Il [Romain] a plutôt donné une moralité à une comédie," an idea which had already been expressed by René Salomé, according to whom, "La satire est manifeste et l'intention morale n'est pas voilée" (1929: 345).

This idea was emphasized by the Baret company (2.2.1929) when they announced in their programme that their aim was "le divertir tout en le forçant à réfléchir, à s'élever: *castigat ridendo mores*." Whether consciously or not, they were resorting to the same paratextual device as Jonson had in his own day to persuade their audience of the comedy's morality. He then echoed Horace's maxim *docere et delectare* in the Prologue to his play:

This we were bid to credit from our poet,

des Morts, published in 1923, it is "a novel concerning the post-war rebuilding of a ruined village near Soissons, [which] provides a vivid picture of war's effects in rural France. As if four years of German presence did not suffice, reconstruction brings new scourges – *profiteers who grow rich on development schemes and swindle the gullible*: [...] violation of laws meant to protect the vulnerable; *meanness and dishonesty at all levels*" (2005: 179; my italics).

Whose true scope if you would know it,
In all his poems still hath been this measure,
To mix profit with your pleasure. (I.1.5-8)

Jonson's audiences were allowed to profit from the moral message of the play in a very pleasurable way. Aware that he was going against the laws of comedy, which required a happy ending, he justified his choice in the *Epistle* addressed to the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, stating that he had looked back to the Classics for a model which could justify the harshness of his didactic ending:

And though my catastrophe may, in the strict rigour of comic law, meet with censure, as turning back to my promise; I desire the learned, and charitable critic to have so much faith in me, to think it was done of industry [...] But my special aim being to put the snaffle in their mouths that cry out, we never punish vice in our interludes &c., I took the more liberty; though not without some lines of example drawn even in the ancients themselves, the goings out of whose comedies are not always joyful, but oft-times, the bawds, the servants, the rivals, yea, and the masters are mulcted: and fitly, it being the office of a comic-Poet to imitate justice, and instruct to life. (ll. 119-133)

When Zweig rewrote the play for his audience he must have perceived a certain incongruity between the sympathy which these witty characters aroused in their audience and the stern tone of the punishment which they received. He probably realized that one reason why audiences sympathized with their tricks was that the rogues' "victims" were mainly greedy and despicable characters who deserved to be gulled. That is perhaps why Zweig provided the play with a more amiable ending where Volpone escapes Venice and returns to his own family, and Mosca is left with his fortune instead of being sent to the galleys. The problem, however, lies in the fact that Zweig did not limit his changes to the ending of the play, but modified the features of his characters, all of whom are moved by an inner need to inflict pain on others. The result of this radical transformation is a very dark comedy from which no one would expect a happy ending.¹⁴

¹⁴ However, even Herford and Simpson (1925-1952 v. 9: 207-208) seem to have been deceived by the tone of Zweig's adaptation, and particularly by the character of Mosca, whose tender feelings and generosity they do not question. Perhaps the reason for this assessment lies in their second-hand knowledge of the German version. Other

A dramatist as perceptive as Romaines was quick to realize the need to reduce the sadistic impulses that move many of the characters –especially Volpone– in order to make the ending more coherent with the rest of the play. As a result of his changes, his characters still keep Jonson’s lively malice and their ability to dupe greedy victims, but they are deprived of superfluous wickedness.

Although Romaines softened Zweig’s harshness of tone, he left enough to make the piece pungent. An overview of the reactions which his version provoked among French audiences makes clear that he carefully calculated how spicy his piece should be. He was aware that malice and violence for their own sake did not suit their tastes –as they did not his own either– but, at the same time, he also knew that his spectators were ready to enjoy a realistic portrayal of humans’ basest instincts, especially if done with intelligence and wit. That is probably why critics reviewing his Nice première celebrated its “truculences joyeuses” (*Éclaireur* 10.1.1930).

The critical reception of Romaines’ version

The descriptions that some reviewers make of the performances lead us to think that Romaines’ version was staged with very few cuts because he must have felt that all the passages from the text were suitable for public performance, even those which the critics described as “horrifying”. Reviews offer summaries and even quotations from the play which illustrate the tone of those scenes. When D’Houville refers to the sentence pronounced on Volpone at the end of the play, he specifies that “les affreuses [...] feront condamner son [Volpone’s] pseudo cadavre à la potence” (*Figaro* 3.12.1928: 2; my italics). Although Romaines removed from his version Zweig’s allusion to the nailing of Volpone’s tongue to the gallows after his dead body had been hanged, there was still enough to move the audience.

Bidou also gave a detailed summary of how Corvino tried to bring Volpone’s suffering to a swift end: “Le gredin Corvino, amer et jaloux, apporte trois cents sequins et une petite fiole d’une certaine

critics such as D. McPherson (1973: 82) and Forsyth (1981: 622) also praise the amiable tone of Zweig’s adaptation, probably because its happy ending leads them to ignore that the last-minute change is superficial.

drogue qui calme, qui calme énormément" (Bidou 1929). That makes the audience understand why Volpone hates him and his friends so deeply. Bidou this time quotes the exact words, so as to offer an accurate picture of the character: "Un beau jour, *je tombe malade [...]* malade de mourir [...] *et la danse commence au tour de mon or [...]* Comme ils m'aiment! [...] Ah! Que *j'aimerais les écraser tous ces cobras*" (Bidou 1929; my italics). As often in his version, Romains has omitted long passages where Volpone openly expresses his hate of mankind. He leaves just enough to make the character credible but removes all the traits that belong to a pathological personality. The general tone of the play, however, is often perceived as "deliciously shocking." Edmond Jaloux, for example, recalled that spectators attending the play had been "éblouis par la vie violente et bariolée [de Volpone]" (1931). This figure was so highly regarded that it minimized the negative effects of his devilish nature, as René Salomé declared: "Si Volpone est un monstre satanique, c'est *un monstre vivant, animé, tumultueux*" (1929: 344; my italics). And, of all his qualities, it was his quickness of mind that they valued most, even if he did not adhere to any moral code. Gabriel Davin de Champclos, for example, praised Janvier for having performed "avec [...] talent sûr et désinvolte, les âpres canailleries de Volpone" (1930). This positive assessment of Janvier's performance in November 1930 is in keeping with the appraisal that the critic of *Éclaireur* had made in January 1930 when the play was performed in Nice. He then remarked that Volpone, as played by Janvier, was "*plein de finesse et veuf de scruples*" (Davin de Champclos 1930).

Mosca's resourcefulness and imagination was similarly esteemed. His lack of scruples did not seem to interfere with a positive appraisal of the character, as de Champclos' assessment reveals when he describes Sablot's performance in Nice as "*amusant et amoral*" and delightedly recounts that Mosca "*amorce une canaillerie dans une pirouette*" (1930). Henry appears to be similarly fascinated by his quickness of mind when he underlines that Mosca "*était agile et suavement perfide*" (Henry 1960: 200; my italics).

Some critics have gone so far as to point out Mosca's role as moraliser in the play. But even those who recall his aptness at punishing the covetous birds of prey (Corbaccio, Corvino, Voltore) have at the same time stressed the delight he takes in teasing them. Thus, in Bidou's view, "Mosca [est] dilettante en fourberie et *coquin*

par plaisir, mais en même temps moralisateur et vengeur" (1929; my italics). He then explains his active part in inflicting punishment upon the greedy characters who covet Volpone's gold.

Critics, again, are responsive to the change in outlook that Romain's version presented as compared with Zweig's. He had transformed an ill-willed Volpone into a malicious character who aimed at punishing the avarice of his suitors. This is clearly explained in the plot summary which was included in the programmes available at the Atelier in November 1928. It recounted how Volpone revolted against the baseness of his dupes: "*La bassesse de ses dupes l'oeuure*" because "*Des voisins, bassement avides, cõvoient sa succession*" (*Programme pour Volpone* 1928; my italics). And he mentions how he conceived the idea of punishing them: "*Il voudrait les punir encore davantage leur bassesse*" with Mosca's help; "*Il charge Mosca d'inventer spécialement contre Corvino et Corbaccio une roverie vengereusse*" (1928; my italics). Mosca seems to have accepted his errand so willingly that Bidou (*Feuilleton du Journal des Débats* 26.8.1929) makes him fully responsible for the scheme: "*Et ce Mosca décide de châtier le vieux Corbaccio [...] il exercera de même sa justice sur l'affreux Corvino.*"¹⁵ The theatre programme for the Atelier (23.11.1928) then draws attention to the means which Mosca employs to bring about his vengeance: "*La courtisane Canina, qui projette de se faire épouser par Volpone, va fournir sans s'en douter à Mosca le moyen de manoeuvrer l'usurier et le marchand.*"

This summary indirectly highlights the importance assigned to structural coherence in Romain's version. In this case it offers a clear motivation for the presence of a character that was absent from Jonson's play but included in Zweig's reworking. Romain justified Canina's presence in the play and modified the character accordingly. Her appeal poses a serious threat to Corbaccio and Corvino, because she intends to marry Volpone. Mosca asks her to visit her competitors and ask them to attend her wedding as witnesses. Her seductive manners convince them that Volpone can be easily persuaded into marrying her, thus thwarting their hopes of inheriting his fortune. Mosca takes advantage of that fear and urges them to tempt Volpone with more valuable presents. Corbaccio then

¹⁵ Silvio D'Amico (1930) also realized Mosca's new relevance in Romain's version, "*facendolo divenire, di collaboratore che era, Deus ex machina e re del intrigo.*"

hurries to name Volpone his heir, and Corvino offers his own wife for Volpone's comfort.

Reviews of the performances reveal that Canina played her role convincingly before an admiring audience. Unlike in Austria, no voice was heard regretting her forwardness or indecent behaviour.¹⁶ It must be born in mind that Austria –and Vienna in particular– was well known for its defence of traditional values. This was particularly noticeable among the usual audience of its Burgtheater, where Zweig's *Volpone* was premièred.¹⁷ This attitude would prevent outstanding composers, playwrights and painters alike from exhibiting their work in Vienna. Thus, in 1905 Strauss's operatic version of *Salome* would be banned from the stage on grounds of its immorality (it would be successfully performed in Berlin and in ten other German opera houses soon afterwards) (Watson 2002: 68).¹⁸ As in the case of Strauss's *Salome*, German audiences –unlike their Austrian counterparts– found no fault with Canina's presumed forwardness and immorality. This came as no surprise to their European contemporaries, who were aware of the atmosphere of unrestrained libertinism which had made Berlin famous after World War I.¹⁹

¹⁶ See Wittner (1927: 20-22); Felusich (1926); B. (1926); Frank (1926). For a more detailed explanation, see Ribes (2007: 66-69).

¹⁷ As Michael Steinberg recalls, "The Burgtheater was the neo-baroque court theatre in Vienna. The neo-baroque becomes the Austrian historicist-conservative phenomenon par excellence" (2000: 2).

¹⁸ University professors would not prove more open-minded, as would be demonstrated by their airy reaction to what they deemed the perverse depiction of female nature in the paintings which the Faculty of Philosophy commissioned Gustav Klimt to complete in 1900 (Watson 2002: 48).

¹⁹ As Zweig remarks, "Alle Werte waren verändert und nicht nur im Materiellen [...] Was wir in Österreich gesehen, erwies sich nur als mildes und schüchternes Vorspiel dieses Hexensabbats, denn die Deutschen brachten ihre ganze Vehemenz und Systematik in die Perversion [...] Selbst das Rom des Sueton hat keine solche Orgien gekannt wie die Berliner Transvestiten-bälle [...] Eine Art Irrsinn ergriff im Sturz aller Werte gerade die bürgerlichen, in ihrer Ordnung bisher unerschütterlichen Kreise" (2007 (1942): 356-357).

In Walter Laqueur's view (*Weimar: une histoire culturelle de l'Allemagne des années vingt*. 1978: 300, qtd. Nouschi 1996: 115), the disenchantment which seized Germany after the armed conflict was the cause of these excesses: "Berlin became the European capital of sensuous enjoyment. Mutilated, ruined and the victim of a permanent economic crisis, Germany only thought of enjoying itself."

Unlike in Austria, French critics unanimously praise the part of Canina, which most actresses seem to have performed admirably. This must have been the case of Mlle. Hospstein, who, according to D'Houville (1928: 2), played at the Atelier “une bizarre Canina, très inspirée” and Mme. Darmont, who also shined in Bordeaux, “méritent les plus vifs compliments,” as the review in *Comedia* (1930) reads. If Mme. Darmont was praised as “charmante”, Mlle. Madge Derny must have caused a commotion at the Palais de la Méditerranée in Nice. The costume Barsacq devised for the première left the legs of the courtesan in full view of the audience, but critics were not as explicit as de Champclos when he expressed his profound admiration for Mlle. Derny’s charms: “Le rôle de la courtisane Canina donne à Mlle. Madge Derny l’occasion d’exhiber à la salle conquise la plus affriolante paire de jambes nues qui ait jamais illuminé un paysage vénitien –ou français” (Davin de Champclos 1930; my italics).

But it was not only Canina’s legs that were a source of admiration, since *Titayna* (Elizabeth Sauvy) (1929) dared emphasize the physical beauty of Daniel Lecourtois, who had played Mosca at the Atelier. His pleasant appearance was linked to his ability to dupe others, and, according to her, determined his lucky end: “[Daniel Lecourtois] prête au vice plaisant et facile un visage agréable et des jambes bien faites [...] Le rideau tombe sur la joie générale à voir échouer la fortune entre les mains d’un si charmant garçon.”

Audiences at the *Burgtheater* and *L’Atelier* compared

It may be illustrative to recall the contrasting atmospheres of Paris and Vienna at the turn of the century to appreciate the different degrees of freedom which artists of any type could dream of enjoying in these contrasting milieus. Whereas Paris was open to any new tendency and offered young artists the possibility of exhibiting their work –no matter how unconventional it might be– Vienna systematically banned any work of art which might go against its stern morality. That is why paintings showing the abject world of

brothels multiplied in Paris at the beginning of the century whereas the depiction of sensuality was prohibited in Vienna.²⁰

Even though the status of Vienna's national Burgtheater and the Atelier in Paris were substantially different, they nevertheless reflected the prevalent atmosphere of their respective countries. L'Atelier was a modest playhouse which only became well-known after 1922, when Charles Dullin took up its direction and replaced its commercial repertoire with intellectually demanding pieces. But, although the theatrical traditions of both theatres were different, their performance of classical plays during the 1920s shared a number of interesting features: both were persuaded that the classics could only be performed if properly updated and both were acutely aware of the importance of natural and polished diction. It cannot be ignored, however, that in spite of the high artistic standard achieved by the Atelier, productions at the Burgtheater were more lavish and its audience more conservative, which partly explains the different choices made by the theatre directors as well as the different reception received by their plays.

A playwright as experienced as Romaine would not have ignored the tastes of his countrymen. He knew how much they appreciated beauty, and how much they admired good-looking actors and actresses on stage. He was also aware of their tolerant attitude towards scenes which could shock more squeamish audiences. That is why he did not deem it necessary to remove any of those passages which Austrian critics labelled as indecorous or offensive.

However, this approach differed radically from his handling of violence. A couple of examples may suffice to illustrate how much the horizon of expectations of French audiences diverged from those of Austrian theatre-goers in these matters. A comparison between the promptbook which was used for the Burgtheater première in Vienna and Romaine's printed version of the play reveals that Romaine did not translate any of the passages which were removed from the 1926 performance, but even omitted some which had been retained in Vienna, whereas he rendered in French every single line

²⁰ For example, erotic paintings such as Picasso's *Demoiselles d'Avignon* (1907) or Matisse's *Bonheur de vivre* (1906) could be freely contemplated in Paris while the work of Klimt often met with opposition in Vienna.

which the Austrian promptbook deleted because it could be deemed indecorous.

Volpone's terrified description of torture, for example, was softened for performance at the Burgtheater, and Romaines must have thought that the description was still too upsetting, because his version further tempers it. In Zweig, Volpone exclaims:

Nein... ich gehe nicht zum Tribunal... ich weiß, wie sie inquirieren... *die Folter... der Strappado... hab's einmal gesehen, wie sie die Winden aufgezogen, wie's da knackte und knirschte in den zerbrochenen Gelenken... die Daumschrauben, die Zangen, die glühenden Zangen an den Nägeln... wie es pestete von verbranntem Fleisch, uh, uh... nein, ich gehe nicht...*²¹ (1926b: 52; my italics)

The Burgtheater promptbook reduces it to:

Nein... ich gehe nicht zum Tribunal... ich weiß, wie sie inquirieren... *die Folter... der Strappado... hab's einmal gesehen, wie's da knackte und knirschte in den zerbrochenen Gelenken... wie es pestete von verbranntem Fleisch, uh, uh... nein, ich gehe nicht...* (Zweig 1926b: 52)

And Romaines leaves it as:

Non. Je ne vais pas au tribunal... Je sais comment ils donnent la question... *le chevalet, l'estrapade...* J'ai vu ça, une fois... (1928: 143; my italics)

Corvino's threatening words to his wife, after Mosca makes him jealous by hinting at her flirtation with Venetian citizens, seems to

²¹ A look at the Jonsonian passage which inspired Zweig's scene reveals the thorough transformation which it had undergone in his hands. In Jonson it is Voltore who speaks these lines when ironically mentioning these types of torture to the judges as a means of proving Volpone's innocence. The Venetian Magnifico had been brought before the Court of Justice and lay motionless while Voltore resorted to this rhetorical device as a means of proving the slanderous nature of Bonario's accusation. He sardonically tells them: "The testimony comes, that will convince, / And put to utter dumbness their bold tongues. / See, grave fathers, here's the ravisher [...] / [...] do you not think, / These limbs should affect venery? / [...] / Perhaps, he doth dissemble? / [...] / Would you ha' him tortured? [...] / Best try him, then, with goads, or burning irons; / Put him to the strappado: I have heard, / The rack hath cured the gout, faith, give it him, / And help him of a malady, be courteous. / [...] I would ask, / With leave of your grave fatherhoods, if their plot / Have any face, or colour like to truth?" (IV.vi.30-45; my italics).

In Zweig's version, however, it is Volpone himself who truly fears that the Court of Justice may impose these kinds of torture upon him for his past crimes.

have bothered Austrian and French audiences in different ways, since Romans' omissions refer to physical and verbal violence whereas the Burgtheater only deletes potentially indecorous expressions.²² Austrian audiences therefore heard the following dialogue:

Corvino: Wann hast du Mosca zum letzten Male gesehen?

Colomba: O weh, *Ihr tut mir weh!* Ich kenne ja gar keinen Mosca.

Corvino: [...] Noch einmal, *wenn ich das Fenster offen finde, zerprügle ich dir alle Knochen.* (Zweig 1926b: 28; my italics).

French audiences were offered a different picture of the couple:

Corvino: Quand as-tu vu Mosca pour la dernière fois?

Colomba: Mosca? Quel Mosca?

Corvino: [...] Pas de fenêtres sur la rue. Tu pourras prendre l'air à ton aise! Et *je te ferai surveiller par des eunuques.* (Romains 1928: 73; my italics)

Similarly, Romans' version keeps the account which Volpone's servants gave of Canina's nightly visit to Volpone, while the Burgtheater cut it. Whereas spectators at the Burgtheater simply heard "[*Der erste Diener*]: Vorgestern war erst diese Canina da, die ganze Nacht" (Zweig 1926b: 5; my italics), French audiences were offered further details of her visit:

[Premier Serviteur]: *Avant-hier encore, la Canina a passé la nuit ici. Toute la nuit, ils ont fait danser le lit au-dessus de ma tête. Il fallait entendre craquer le plancher. Pour arriver à m'endormir, je me suis fourré les oreilles sous ma couverture.* (Romains 1928: 12; my italics)

²² The Viennese authorities had traditionally shown great care to prevent the exposure of their ladies to shocking words or expressions. That extreme sensitivity, however, seems to have been perfectly compatible with the quick expansion of a social Darwinism which fostered anti-Semitism at a time when 150,000 Jews were living in Vienna. It was the time when Hitler's *Mein Kampf* had just gone to press, and Zweig –himself a Jew– knew that an overwhelming majority of Austrians shared Hitler's viewpoint that Jews were an inferior race which should be kept at bay. This is probably the reason why Stefan Zweig's teasing allusion to the need that all Jews be burnt was not removed for performance at the Burgtheater. As he sadly anticipated, few of those sensitive ladies attending *Volpone* would show any discomfiture at Corvino's enraged exclamation when he was told that a Jewish doctor had given Volpone a drug which prevented him from dying: "[Corvino] Sag' ich's nicht immer, man soll sie brennen und austreiben, diese verdammten Juden! Überall müssen sie sich einmengen!" (Zweig 1926: 30; my italics).

Similarly, Romaines did not suppress the reasons that Canina gave Mosca for seeking marriage with Volpone, even though the Burgtheater had given a shortened version of the scene. While Austrian audiences were offered the following report, “[Canina]: Aber siehst du, *wenn man so seine zwölf Jahre immer andere hat, da dacht’ ich mir, versuchst es einmal mit einem Mann*” (Zweig 1926b: 26), Romaines thought his spectators would appreciate a fuller explanation:

[Canina]: Eh bien, *vois-tu quand on en a toujours changé depuis l’âge de douze ans, chaque nuit un nouveau –et ils vous demandent, et ils vous disent, et ils vous font tous la même chose– alors, ça devient ennuyeux aussi. Je voudrais essayer maintenant avec un seul.* (Romaines 1928: 64-65; my italics)

The same happens with Mosca’s description of the qualities which Canina’s future husband possesses. While the Vienna performance simply alluded to his nationality and family names, and was careful to omit Zweig’s specification of the candidate’s amorous preferences, Romaines offers his audience a complete description of the Spanish gentleman:

[Mosca]: Dir kauf’ ich einen Mann; kenn’ einen Schmarotzer, ist Spanier, hat einen Namen so lang wie der Kanal Grande, sieben Vornamen, neun Zunamen [*und hält’s nur mit Männern. Den kauf’ ich dir, der läßt dich in Frieden bei Tag und Nacht*]. (Zweig 1926b: 83; my italics)

Similarly, Romaines sees no reason to omit: “*Il ne fait la chose qu’avec les hommes. Je te l’achète. Il te laissera tranquille nuit et jour*” (Romaines 1928: 210; my italics).

On one occasion Romaines’ confidence in the audience’s positive reaction to his text leads him to modify a remark that Mosca makes regarding the proper use of gold. In Zweig’s text, he underlines how necessary the existence of spendthrifts is for prostitutes to earn their living: “*Wären wir nicht, [...] die Huren müßten’s aus Liebe tun*” (Zweig 1926b: 40). Although the Burgtheater omits the whole explanation, Romaines amplifies it by suggesting alternative means of subsistence: “*Sans nous, [...] les catins seraient obligés de faire l’amour entre elles*” (Romaines 1928: 112; my italics).

Romains' text and provincial audiences

The details these theatrical programmes highlight to advertise the play similarly point to a tolerant audience. That is why Baret's Company openly refers to Canina's means of persuading Volpone to marry her: "*La belle Canina, beauté professionnelle de Venise. Elle voudrait épouser Volpone in extremis, et lui offre ce qu'elle a, elle-même, et gratis, faveur exceptionnelle!*" (Muller 1929). The passages highlighted by reviewers further support this hypothesis. Bidou, for example, quotes Volpone's allusion to the power that gold has to entice women: "*Laisse-les [les ducats] reluire en paix. Les gens viendront tout offrir d'eux-mêmes. Tu verras femmes ramper vers ton lit*" (1929).

As mentioned earlier, no cuts were deemed necessary when the production was taken on tour because no passage was considered unfit for provincial audiences. The situation is slightly different with regard to the representation of violence. That is why playbills and programmes occasionally make the following warning: "*cette oeuvre truculent ne s'adresse pas précisément aux jeunes filles / jeunes personnes don't 'on coupe le pain en tartines*" (Playbill 1929b). This last observation minimizes the potential danger of these scenes, since it does not find fault with the production but with the immature minds of youngsters. The warning, moreover, does not seem to have been accompanied by strict measures to control admittance to the playhouse, since, although it informs the playgoer that this spectacle is not included in the season ticket to which they have subscribed,²³ they nevertheless are offered the possibility of keeping their usual seat at the theatre.²⁴

This situation shows, once more, that Romains was adept at calculating what both his Parisian and provincial audiences were willing to entertain. He could anticipate their delight in malicious and witty humour, and, as reviews reveal, he seems to have included enough to please his spectators. This, at least, is the impression that one gets when reading the review written by A.B.

²³ "Volpone n'est pas un spectacle pour les jeunes filles et pour cette raison, il a été retiré de l'abonnement" (Playbill 1930a).

²⁴ "Cependant les Abonnés qui désireront y assister pourront retenir leurs places habituelles avant l'ouverture de la location en bénéficiant des mêmes avantages" (Playbill 1930a).

for the *Vie Bordelaise* on August 4, 1930. It praises the setting which Barsacq created for the Atelier because it allowed the attention of the spectators to concentrate on the text:

Les décors stylisés sont nets, frappants. Quand le regard en a été ébloui, ils demeurent ensuite au second plan. C'est ainsi qu'à Volpone, après l'éclat de leur présentation, ils se sont comme effacés devant les mots, où la truculence même est geniale. (A.B. 1930)

Although reviewing a provincial performance, A.B. once more praises the harsh tone of the play which the simple setting highlights. His assessment reveals that audiences and critics perceived this play as highly enjoyable rather than dangerous.

The universality of its subject matter, moreover, made it appealing to a wide audience, as advertised at "Les Avant-Premières. Palais de la Méditerranée, Nice": "*Par son sujet, touche le fond de l'humanité et intéresse tous les publics*" (22.11.1930; my italics). And, as the playbill anticipated, "*séduira également la foule et les lettrés*" (Playbill 1930a; my italics). Romain's version, which benefitted from an attractive subject matter, found the exact tone, since, as *L'Éclaireur* (22.11.1930; my italics) reads, "*c'est écrit dans une langue à la fois éticelante et directe.*" It also offered a tight and varied structure which succeeded in holding the attention of the audience: "*L'histoire est originale, attachante, pleine de coups de théâtre, et de rebondissements*" (Les Avant Premières 1930b; my italics).

The international reception of Romain's version

An Italian translator of dramatic texts as perceptive as Mario Bellotti was quick to realize how much Romain had improved on Zweig's previous version. In his view, no further changes were needed for its international success: "*A mon modeste avis, le Volpone Zweig-Romain est le plus parfait et le plus digne d'être joué –fidèlement traduit– dans tous les pays*" (1929; my italics).

As evidence had amply proved, it was bound to succeed anywhere provided it was aptly performed. This is what happened in Brussels when it was staged at the Théâtre du Parc by the Company of the famous Belgian actor M. Gournat. The favourable reaction which G.R., from *Indépendance Belge*, describes resembles

that of French audiences: “La salle réagit, amusée par les boutades, les traits satiriques, la verdeur du langage, des personnages qui vivaient sur la scène” (1929). Like French spectators, they appreciated its harsh tone, which they deemed suitable to its subject matter. They found the play an “âpre et puissante comédie [...] extrêmement amusante, non sans ouvrir, sur l’humaine nature, de ces perspectives narquoisement véristes à la Molière” (G.R. 1929).

Their perception of Canina was surprisingly close to that of French spectators. Unlike Austrians, Belgians seem to have enjoyed the part. G.R., when commenting on Mlle. Flore Mahieu’s performance, praised “sa grace mutine, son jeu tendrement enveloppant, sa jeune et nerveuse beauté” (G.R. 1929). As pictures from the programme reveal, producers anticipated a favourable reception of the part. That is why they included in it a photograph of Mlle. Mahieu in a dress that allowed full contemplation of her legs. A note was placed underneath which tried to draw attention to the spiciness of the character: “*Canina (Mlle. Flore Mahieu) dans une des scènes le plus piquantes de Volpone*” (*Programme pour Volpone* 28.12.1929; my italics).

Such an approach to the role of Canina, however, would have been unimaginable in neighbouring Spain. As graphic evidence from the performances at the *Beatriz* reveal, the costume worn by Srta. Monero left only her shoes in view. The front part of her long skirt had been conveniently lengthened for a more modest presentation of the character (Calvo 1930). The lines Canina spoke had also been adapted to the requirements of Spanish audiences –and censors. That is why the translation Precioso and Sánchez Guerra (1930) made of Romain’s French version carefully removed all those expressions which could be deemed improper for the stage (Ribes 2006: 265-272). Some French reviewers would regret these cuts which, in their view, diminished the satirical force of the play. As Jean de Joannis aptly observes, “*Les traducteurs MM. A. Precioso et Sánchez Guerra ont cru utile d’édulcorer le texte et d’en faire disparaître des expressions don’t la crudité risqué de déplaire.*” And he adds: “*peut-être la satire perd-elle ainsi de sa force et de sa saveur*” (1930; my italics).

The truth is that Spanish spectators attending the première in Madrid²⁵ could not enjoy the play’s genuine force. But the reason for

²⁵ It was premièreed in Madrid, at the *Infanta Beatriz*, on 19 December 1929.

this did not lie exclusively in the nature of the text which was utilized but rather in the poor performance of the actors. The play was not completely void of satirical force, in spite of the cuts made by the translators. But the actors were not allowed enough time to offer a satisfactory performance.²⁶ The time of rehearsal was so short that they could not even learn their lines, much less discover the type of approach most suitable for their characters. The reason for this shortage of time was none other than a fierce competition to stage the play in Spain before other rival companies did. The success of Romain's version in France and elsewhere had resulted in the simultaneous rehearsal of three different versions of *Volpone*, but none of them gave a satisfactory performance as too much was left to improvisation.²⁷

Dullin's anti-naturalistic performance

As the Paris correspondent of *The Times* fittingly observed, Dullin's 1928 production of Romain's version at the Atelier produced "that sense of simultaneous exhilaration and satisfaction that only a perfect attunement of the literary and visual factors can give" (1929). He highlighted the importance of Director Charles Dullin who, like all the members of the *Cartel des Quatre*, "attempted to allow full scope to all the elements in a play, to achieve a real harmony of word and acting and action."

Like the other members of the *Cartel*, Charles Dullin took up Copeau's scenic reform, and, as Walter Volbach aptly concludes, "demonstrated that modern theatre needs *no elaborate realistic scenery* [...] but *an ensemble of performers* trained and so rehearsed that they live the characters and *project the inner meanings of the plays*" (1965: 213-214; my italics). This is, no doubt, what Dullin achieved in his production of *Volpone*, although it certainly was no easy task, as his friend and co-founder of the *Cartel*, Louis Jouvet, realized when he

²⁶ If reviews are to be trusted, neither were the leading characters in a proper command of their roles, nor was the sprightly rhythm of Romain's version taken advantage of. According to "Floridor", "Los artistas del Infanta Beatriz [...] no 'entraron' en sus respectivas figuraciones" (1929: 33), and, in E. Díez Canedo's view, "unos actores que aún no se habían aprendido sus papeles fueron arrastrando hasta el final de los cinco actos" (1929: 3).

²⁷ For a more detailed explanation, see Ribes (2005: 82-89).

agreed to direct the production. Initially, he was also going to play the leading part, but he gave up after several months because he found the role too complex.²⁸ Dullin then took over, but it is obvious that he did not improvise, since the comedy was not première until eight months later. There probably is no better account of how demanding it is for an actor to play the part of Volpone than Marquetty's report on Jouvet's deepest convictions:

Le personnage de Volpone est un personnage qui exige tout ensemble de la roverie et de la force, du charme et un certaine perversité. Il tient la scène d'un bout à l'autre du drame. Il ne laisse aucun repos et demande à être nuancé presque à chaque réplique. (1952: 121; my italics)

Dullin, too, must have been well aware of Volpone's elusive nature, as he shows in his *Souvenirs et notes de travail d'un acteur*, where he explains how hard he tried to discover his character for years:

Je l'ai retrouvé au cours de la vie et de mes voyages [...] *Cet insaisissable Volpone changeait souvent de visage* [...] le plus souvent il avait sa barbiche fin d'oriental, se détachant sur le visage maigre [...] un peu bilieux, arrogant ou servile [...] mais toujours avec son oeil aigu de voyeur d'âme et sa pelisse fourrée lui donnant une allure de renard argenté. (1946: 44; quoted in Henry 1960: 201; my italics)

His report reveals the influence of Stanislavsky's techniques. But, as he also explains in his *Souvenirs*, he was aware of the importance of self-control, which could only be achieved through disciplined practice (Dullin 1999 (1946): 394-395). His successful performance of Volpone was, no doubt, the result of his technical prowess, as Titayna (1929: 48) underlines when emphasizing that Dullin was "excellent en tant que technique," to the point of looking like "un acteur froid."

But few reviews are as illuminating as D'Houville's for us to understand how effectively Dullin nuanced the role of Volpone. He describes him as

Tour à tour gémissant d'une voix mourante [...] geignant, faible et doux, ou violent, reusité, flurant voluptueusement l'odeur de la

²⁸ And, as Paul Hahn highlights, Jouvet's greatest belief was "in the supremacy of the playwright" (1951: 345).

richesse et du mesonge démoniaque, caressant, railleur, orgueilleux, ou humble. (1928: 2)

J. Kessel's review also draws attention to Dullin's technical excellence when he points to his diction and movements: "C'est M. Charles Dullin qui donne à Volpone ses mouvements félins et sa diction cruelle" (1928).

As different accounts of the production show, the performance of the whole cast was highly satisfactory, since all the actors paid due attention to gesture, movement, range of voice, diction and intonation. D'Houville's detailed description of Corbaccio, as played by M.G. Seroff, also highlights his command of the part. He presents him as "hideux, centenaire, hailloneux, convulsé, tremblant son corps, son costume, sa voix, ses gestes, ses intonations, ses regards, ses mots, qui havent sont d'une inoubliable horreur" (1928: 2).

His depiction of Daniel Lecourtois' enactment of Mosca is no less revealing of his thorough training as actor:

Daniel Lecourtois joue le rôle difficile de ce Mosca, rôle de fourberie froide, impitoyable, où les tours de passe passe sont d'une ampleur telle que l'horrible y rejoint le burlesque. (D'Houville 1928: 2)

In all three cases, D'Houville shows unreserved admiration for the actors' ability to express horror.²⁹ However, he reduces its intensity by making clear that it is not expressed in a realistic way but by means of comic exaggeration, which he defines as *burlesque*. D'Houville's observation is in keeping with René Salomé's appraisal of the actors' performing style. In his view, Volpone is "un personnage d'une réalité impérieuse, en dépit de *tares grossies jusqu'à la caricature*" and he adds: "*pareils grossissements frappent chez Voltore, Corvino et Corbaccio*" (1929: 344; my italics). This is the same impression which Ceria, from *ABC*, received at the Paris première. The Spanish reviewer made the following assessment of Volpone: "La adaptación que acabamos de ver en el Atelier [...] es una tremenda *sátira burlesca* de la Humanidad arrodillada ante el poder del oro" (1928: 37; my italics).

²⁹ Davin de Champclos' description of Leone as performed by Ph. Role in Nice in November 1930 draws attention to the same features when he mentions the actors' "silhouette massive et verbe truculent" (1930).

When advertising the play, Baret's Touring Company similarly spoke of "*cette farce otrée, jusqu'à devenir tragique*" (Playbill 1929a), which, again, drew attention to the anti-naturalistic style which had been chosen to express its tragic subject matter. This rejection of naturalism had presided over Dullin's productions, in the same way as it had guided his predecessor Copeau and the performances of the *Cartel des Quatre*. It was the guiding principle which had determined their choice of set and stage props, which were always kept to a minimum so as to focus attention on the performers.³⁰ Charles Dullin therefore underlined the usefulness of Barsacq's "*décor unique*" for the second act because it directed the spectator's attention to the text:³¹ "*En faisant le décor unique du deuxième acte [...] on ne s'occupe plus que du texte*"³² (my italics).

Simple stage elements like a staircase could reinforce the significance of the text, as D'Houville's description of its use by actors at the end of the play makes clear: "[Volpone] disparaît dans l'escalier par où montaient les êtres atroces qu'il se plaisait à rendre encore plus vils" (1928: 2). This detailed picture of a defeated Volpone going down the stairs towards his exile while his greedy suitors go up to celebrate his "death" visually underlines the changing nature of Fortune in a world controlled by avarice. D'Houville's shrewd observation regarding the moral nature of the characters speaks of the ability of players to stage it. In his view, greedy characters do not improve their nature but become more despicable as the play advances. The possibility of inheriting Volpone's wealth awakens their basest instincts, which are not changed in spite of Volpone's apparent death. Their attitude towards Mosca, who has inherited everything, is as contemptible as before. It is him that they end up flattering. As a result, the tone is not cheerful but realistic. Through the magnifying lens of caricature it shows the

³⁰ For D'Houville, "la suppression d'un intérieur trop réaliste [...] entraîne le spectateur à concentrer toute son attention sur le texte, le jeu et la silhouette de l'acteur, sur l'expression juste des sentiments, en un mot sur l'essentiel" (D'Houville 1928: 2). His assessment, however, sounds so much like Dullin's own words because he was quoting him without acknowledging his source (*Correspondance* 10, Nov. 1929).

³¹ This performing style, of course, was not suitable for every kind of text, but, as A.B. points out, "Il faut qu'un texte soit puissant, généreux, que l'action rebondisse, captivante et fournie, pour se passer de tout l'apparat des accessoires" (1930).

³² Rony highlights that this simple setting had "plusieurs lieux évoqués en un même espace simultané" (1993: 347).

gullibility of greedy characters who are deluded by their own avarice. Their covetousness, in spite of all their wit, renders them unable to learn from experience and improve their behaviour.

This crude picture of human nature is so humorously portrayed that the comedy achieves the difficult task of conveying a moral message while, at the same time, delighting the audience. This may have been Jonson's aim, too. Romain's happy ending allows for an ambiguous and ironic presentation of universal greed. The absence of strict rules regarding poetic justice lends this satirical comedy greater subtlety since no single reading is imposed on an audience allowed to draw its own conclusions. Spectators can enjoy the malicious resourcefulness of the characters while simultaneously realizing the degrading effects of avarice.

As the analysis of different reactions to the play has shown, Romain's rediscovered *Volpone* for twentieth-century spectators and gave the play a new validity by offering a perfect synthesis of "*la force comique du sujet et l'âpre signification de la pièce*" (Les Avant-Premières 8.11.1930; my italics). His version, moreover, was perfectly calculated for professional ensembles like Dullin's or Barrault's to make it fully meaningful to their audiences.

References

- A.B. 1930. "Les décors de 'Volpone' au Grand-Théâtre." *Vie Bordelaise* 4.3.1930.
- "Au Théâtre Flamand." *L'Indépendance Belge*, 16.2.1930.
- B. 1926. "Theater, Kunst und Musik. Burgtheater. *Volpone*. Eine lieblose Komödie von Ben Jonson. Frei bearbeitet von Stefan Zweig." *Reichpost* 7.11.1926.
- Barbour, Thomas 1957. "Revivals and Revisions: Theatre Chronicle." *Hudson Review* 10/2: 261-262.
- Bellotti, Mario 1929. "La Comédie de Volpone." *Comedia* 14.12.1929.
- Bidou, Henry 1929. "La Semaine Dramatique." *Feuilleton du Journal des Débats* 26.8.1929.
- Boquet, G. 1991. "Romain's *Volpone*." *Cahiers Élisabethains* 40: 112-114.
- "Bordeaux. La Saison de Printemps. Creation de *Volpone*." *Comedia* 27.4.1930.
- Calvo, Luis 1930. "La visita de Volpone." *La Nación*, Marzo 1930.
- Ceria 1928. "ABC en París. Estreno de *Volpone*." *ABC*, 24.11.1928: 37.

- Copeau, Jacques 1974 (1913) "Un essai de rénovation dramatique." Eds. Marie-Hélène Dasté and Suzanne Maistre Saint Denis. *Appels. Registres*. Paris: Gallimard: 25-32.
- D'Amico, Silvio 1930. "Volpone all'Argentina." *Tribuna* 7.2.1930.
- Davin de Champclos, Gabriel 1930. "Palais de la Méditerranée. *Volpone*, pièce en cinq actes, de MM. Jules Romains et S. Zweig." *Éclaireur* 24.11.1930.
- D'Houville, Gérard 1928. "Chronique Dramatique du *Figaro*: Théâtre de l'Atelier: *Volpone*, comédie en 5 actes d'après Ben Jonson, par Stefan Zweig et Jules Romains." *Le Figaro* 3.12.1928: 2.
- Díez Canedo, Enrique 1929. *El Sol* 21.12.1929: 3.
- Dorgelès, Roland 1923. *Le Réveil des Morts*. Paris: Albin Michel.
- Dullin, Charles 1999 (1946). "Recuerdos y notas de trabajo de un actor (*Souvenirs et notes de travail d'un acteur*)." Ed. José A. Sánchez. *La escena moderna. Manifiestos y textos sobre teatro de la época de las vanguardias*. Madrid: Akal: 386-396.
- Felusich, Mirto 1926. "Kunst und Wissenschaft. Burgtheater. Zum ersten Mal: *Volpone*, eine lieblose Komödie nach Ben Jonson, frei bearbeitet von Stefan Zweig." *Österreichische Tageszeitung* 7.11.1926.
- Floridor 1929. *ABC* 20.12.1929: 33.
- Forsyth, Karen 1981. "Stefan Zweig's Adaptation of Jonson." *Modern Language Review* 76: 619-628.
- Frank, Paul 1926. "Burgtheater. Stefan Zweig: Ben Jonsons *Volpone*: eine lieblose Komödie." *Theaterzeitung* 7.11.1926.
- G.R. 1929. "Volpone. Au Théâtre du Parc de Bruxelles." *Indépendance Belge* 28.12.1929.
- Gassner, John 1957. "Broadway in Review." *Educational Theatre Journal* 9/1: 118.
- Genette, Gerard 1982. *Palimpsestes, la littérature au second degré*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- Genette, Gerard 1987. *Seuils*. Paris: Seuil Poétique.
- Griffith, Malcolm 1970. "Theatre in Review. *Volpone*. By Ben Jonson. Seattle Repertory Theatre. Seattle. November 1969." *Educational Theatre Journal* 22/1: 106-107.
- Hahn, Paul 1951. "Louis Juvet 1891-1951." *Educational Theatre Journal* 3/4: 345-346.
- Henry, Hélène 1960. "Charles Dullin et le théâtre Elisabéthain." *Études Anglaises* 13: 197-204.

- Herford, C.H. & Percy & Evelyn Simpson 1925-1952. *Ben Jonson IX*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 11 vols.
- Jaloux, Edmond 1928. "Les Alchimistes." *Le Temps* 28.12.1928.
- Jaloux, Edmond 1931. "Chronique. L'Auteur de *Volpone*." *Le Temps* 4.12.1931.
- Jauss, Hans Robert 1970. *Literaturgeschichte als Provokation der Literaturwissenschaft*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Joannis, Jean 1930. "*Volpone* III." *Chantecler* 18.1.1930.
- Kessel, J. 1928. "*Volpone* à l'Atelier." *Gringoire* 30.11.1928.
- Langner, Ruth 1928. *Ben Jonson's Volpone, A Loveless Comedy in Three Acts. Freely Adapted by Stefan Zweig and Translated from the German by Ruth Langner*. New York: The Viking Press.
- "Les Avant-Premières. Palais de la Méditerranée. Création à Nice de *Volpone*, pièce en 3 actes d'après Ben Jonson, adaptée par M.J. Romains et S. Zweig, musique de G. Auri." *Éclaireur* 8.1.1930.
- "Les Avant-Premières. Palais de la Méditerranée. Création à Nice de *Volpone*, pièce en 3 actes d'après Ben Jonson, adaptée par M.J. Romains et S. Zweig, musique de G. Auri." *Éclaireur* 22.11.1930.
- Lyons, Charles R. 1967. "La Compagnie Madeleine Renaud- Jean Louis Barrault: The Idea and the Aesthetic." *Educational Theatre Journal* 19/4: 415-424.
- Marquetty, Valentin 1952. *Mon Ami Jouvett*. Paris: Ed. Du Conquistador.
- McPherson, Donald 1973. "Rough Beast into Tame Fox: the Adaptations of *Volpone*." *Studies in the Literary Imagination* 6/1: 77-84.
- Muller, Carlos ed. 1929. *Programme de les Tournées Ch. Baret*. Société Janvier, Audier & Cie. *Volpone*. Comédie en 5 actes d'après Ben Jonson par Stéphan Zweig et Jules Romains. Paris: Rue du Rocher, 1929-1930; 1930-1931.
- Nouschi, Marc 1996. *Historia del Siglo XX. Todos los mundos, el mundo*. Madrid: Cátedra.
- "Palais de la Méditerranée. Création de *Volpone*, 5 actes de Ben Jonson, adaptées par MM. Jules Romain et S. Zweig." *Éclaireur* 10.1.1930.
- Paris Correspondent 1929. "Entertainments. The Paris Theatre. Ben Jonson's *Volpone*." *Times* 11.2.1929.
- Playbill. *Tournées Ch. Baret* 1929a. *Volpone*. Pau, Casino-Palace, 2.9.1929.
- Playbill. *Tournées Ch. Baret* 1929b. *Volpone*. Limoges, Theatre Municipal, 19.11.1929.
- Playbill. *Tournées Ch. Baret* 1930a. *Volpone*. Beauvais, Theatre Municipal, 19.4.1930.

- Playbill. *Tournées Ch. Baret 1930b. Volpone*. Le Tréport. Casino Municipal, 4.8.1930.
- Precioso, Artemio and Rafael Sánchez Guerra 1930. *Volpone. Comedia en cinco actos, arreglada por Stefan Zweig y Jules Romains*. Madrid: Colón.
- Programme pour Volpone. Comédie en 5 actes, d'après Ben Jonson, par Stefan Zweig et Jules Romains*. Direction Ch. Dullin. Théâtre de l'Atelier, 23.11.1928; 3.11.1929.
- Programme pour Volpone. Au Théâtre du Parc de Bruxelles* 28.12.1929.
- Ribes Traver, Purificación 2005. "Araquistáin's 1929 Version of *Volpone*." *Sederi* 15: 81-101.
- Ribes Traver, Purificación 2006. "Spanish Adaptations of Ben Jonson's *Volpone*." Ed. José Manuel González Fernández de Sevilla. *Spanish Studies in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*. Newark: University of Delaware Press: 262-298.
- Ribes Traver, Purificación 2007. "Stefan Zweig's *Volpone, eine lieblose Komödie* on Stage in Austria and Germany (1926-1927)." *The Ben Jonson Journal* 14/ 1: 61-78.
- Romains, Jules 1928a. *Volpone. En collaboration avec Stefan Zweig d'après Ben Jonson*. Paris: Les Oeuvres Libres.
- Romains, Jules 1928b. "Avant-Première." *Paris-Soir* 23.11.1928.
- Romains, Jules & Stefan Zweig 1950. *Volpone*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Rony, Oliver 1993. *Jules Romains ou l'appel au monde*. Paris: Éditions Robert Laffont.
- Salomé, René 1929. "Chronique Dramatique. *Volpone*. Départs." *Études* 5.2.1929: 342-345.
- Savage Brosnan, Catharine 2005. "French writing of the Great War." Ed. Vincent Sherry. *The Cambridge Companion to the Literature of the First World War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 166-190.
- Steinberg, Michael P. 2000 (1990). *Austria as Theatre and Ideology. The Meaning of the Salzburg Festival*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Titanya 1929. *Bonjour la Terre*. Paris: Éditions Louis Querelle.
- Volbach, Walter R. 1965. "Jacques Copeau, Appia's Finest Disciple." *Educational Theatre Journal* 17/ 3: 206-214.
- Watson, Peter 2002 (2000). *Historia intelectual del siglo XX (A Terrible Beauty. A History of the People and Ideas that Shaped the Modern Mind)*. Trans. David León Gómez. Barcelona: Crítica.
- Wittner, Victor 1927. "Wiener Schauspielabend." *Das Theater* 8/1: 20-22.

P. Ribes Traver

Zweig, Stefan 1926a. *Volpone. Eine Lieblose Komödie in drei Akten von Ben Jonson. Frei bearbeitet von Stefan Zweig*. Berlin-Wilmersdorf: Felix Bloch Erben.

Zweig, Stefan 1926b. *Ben Jonsons Volpone: eine lieblose Komödie in drei Akten*. Potsdam: Kiepenheuer Verlag.

Zweig, Stefan 2007 (1942). *Die Welt von Gestern. Erinnerungen eines Europäers*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag.

How to cite this article:

Ribes Traver, Purificación. "The early stage history of Jules Romains' *Volpone*." *SEDERI* 19 (2009): 121-150.

Author's contact: Purificacion.Ribes@uv.es

Submission: 09/06/2008

Acceptance: 18/10/2008

**Looking for regional words in late seventeenth-century
England:
Bishop White Kennett and his glossary to *Parochial
Antiquities* (1695)¹**

Javier Ruano-García
University of Salamanca

ABSTRACT

The analysis of regional dialects in the Early Modern period has commonly been disregarded in favour of an ample scholarly interest in the 'authorised' version of English which came to be eventually established as a standard. The history of regional 'Englishes' at this time still remains to a very great extent in oblivion, owing mainly to an apparent dearth of direct textual evidence which might provide trustworthy data. Research in this field has been for the most part focused on phonological, orthographical and morphological traits by virtue of the rather more abundant information that dialect testimonies yield about them. Regional lexical diversity has, on the contrary, deserved no special attention as uncertainty arises with regard to what was provincially restricted and what was not. This paper endeavours to offer additional data to the gloomy lexical setting of Early Modern regional English. It is our aim to give a descriptive account of the dialect words collated by Bishop White Kennett's glossary to *Parochial Antiquities* (1695). This underutilised specimen does actually widen the information furnished by other well known canonical word-lists and provides concrete geographical data that might contribute to bridging the gaps still existing in the history of lexical provincialisms at the time.

KEYWORDS: regional vocabulary, Early Modern English, dialects, Bishop White Kennett, lexicography, lexicology.

¹ I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers of this paper for their suggestions and comments on an earlier draft of these pages. Needless to say, any shortcomings are mine alone.

1. Introduction

It is a widely held fact that our knowledge of the regional ‘Englishes’ during the Early Modern period (henceforth EModE) is still patchy, as no extensive research has hitherto been undertaken. Over the past two decades, scholarly concerns for this intervening stage in the history of English have notably been biased, thereby providing a restricted and partial account of the linguistic setting during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (*cf.* Milroy 2007: 33). The privilege granted to the ‘authorised’ version of English has undoubtedly silenced the history of provincial speech, thus casting it aside into the margins. Fortunately for linguistic purposes, recent research has brought into focus the necessity of putting a remedy to this deficiency and has told the story of other varieties accordingly (e.g. Wales 2006). However, the reality of provincial speech in EModE remains to be thoroughly investigated. What little interest there has been shows a traditional concern for phonological or orthographical issues, whilst lexis has not been worthy of any in-depth analysis but for a few examples.²

There is a widespread misconception suggesting that the lack of lexical data from this period is due to a scarcity of sources. Indeed, precise geographical information is largely absent from EModE dictionaries; literary renditions of provincial speech very often furnish dialect passages with words broadly associated with southern or northern varieties; and derogatory comments cast by linguistic authorities of the time incidentally uncover the geographies of some branded words.

Yet it should be pointed out that the emergence of a linguistic standard was paralleled by an outstanding and seldom

² Osselton (1958), Wakelin (1987) and Görlach (1995; 1999: 499-506) are the most relevant sources where regional lexis presented by EModE dictionaries and glossaries is tackled more attentively. Weiner (1994; 1997) deals with the evidence supplied by probate inventories from a stimulating and challenging perspective. Fox (2000: 64-72) devotes a few pages of his illuminating chapter on sixteenth- and seventeenth-century popular speech to different glossaries and sources where lexical data may be attested. He mentions the specimen here evaluated too. Unfortunately, he refers to it in passing. Eckhardt (1910), Blake (1981: 63-107) and Blank (1996; 2006: 212-230) comment on the words used in literary portrayals of dialect. Wales (2006: 67-114) also refers to regional terms as evidenced by EModE literary dialects; some references to seventeenth-century glossaries of provincial vocabulary are made too.

acknowledged archaeological interest in alternative ‘Englishes’ which extends beyond the first general dialect dictionary *A Collection of English Words Not Generally Used* (1674) by John Ray. Most telling perhaps of this antiquarian fashion is Bishop White Kennett’s glossary to *Parochial Antiquities attempted in the History of Ambrosden, Burcester, and adjacent parts in Oxford and Bucks.* (1695). This was printed at Oxford in 1818, and later issued by the Rev. Walter W. Skeat for the English Dialect Society (EDS) with the title *Dialectal Words from “Kennett’s Parochial Antiquities”* (1879). As is true of Ray’s enterprise, Kennett provides localised regional data, although his southern and eastern words clearly outnumber northern terms. Furthermore, the author, albeit his indebtedness to Ray for a certain amount of his provincialisms, expands the available information supplied by earlier sources, therefore becoming a reliable repository of regional dialect words underutilised to date.

This paper seeks to bridge the gaps which have traditionally stretched from the Middle English period up to the late eighteenth century in terms of regional vocabulary. In so doing, it is our endeavour to repair a linguistic need in some measure, for, as Wakelin (1987: 174) claims, “all through the history of English, up to the nineteenth century, we are bedevilled by a less than perfect notion of what was and what was not regionally restricted.”

2. Dignifying forms of self-expression: EModE scholarly interest in regional vocabulary

It is well known that the gradual diffusion and supremacy of a standard model in England made learned scholars anxious about its codification, correctness and refinement. Peripheral forms of expression were consequently marginalised, as they would not form part of the ‘authorised’ language. Nonetheless, these subordinate dialects of English were not seen through disdainful filters by some scholars, and they even became the objects of worthy attention. Suffice it to say that the linguistic controversy which arose in the mid-sixteenth century as a result of the disputes over the use of inkhorn terms stimulated many to take nationalistic stands on lexical grounds in a serious attempt to recover the original linguistic purity of English. So much so that regional varieties, especially northern, were regarded as rich repositories of relics of the ancient Anglo-

Saxon past. Besides, the overwhelming development of historical and topographical investigations brought an interest in old words and etymologies.³

It is therefore not surprising that Laurence Nowell's *Vocabularium Saxonicum* (c.1567), the first extant dictionary of Anglo-Saxon published in 1952, made explicit reference to one hundred and seventy-three regional words which he marked as genuine to his native Lancashire. Amongst them, emphasis should be laid on *to dree* 'to endure', *pleck* 'a place', or *rowne* 'to whisper'. In addition, northern words –*gang* 'to go' or *gersume* 'reward'– also deserve attention, for, as Blank (2006: 221) states, "the rubble of northern English could be mined for fossils of the older language." Kentish and Wiltshire vocabulary was also included: *hawe* 'measure of land' or *sallow* 'plow' (Marckwardt 1947: 182).

In parallel, Richard Carew exhibited a similar linguistic pride when pointing at differences of vocabulary as indicative of his own country's rich lexical variety in "The Excellencie of the English Tongue":

Moreouer the copiousnesse of our language appeareth in the diuersitie of our Dialects, for wee haue Court and wee haue Countrey English, wee haue Northerne, and Southerne, grosse and ordinarie, which differ each from other [...] in many words, termes, and phrases, yet all right English alike, neither can any tongue (as I am perswaded) deliuer a matter with more varietie then ours. (1614: 42)

These lexical nationalistic affinities were further strengthened in *The Survey of Cornwall* (1602) where Carew listed eleven words which "require a speciall Dictionarie for their interpretation" (56): *bezibd* 'fortuned', *road* 'ayme', *scrip* 'escape', *pridy* 'handsome', *boobish* 'lubberly', *dule* 'comfort' or *lidden* 'by-word'.

As is true of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, the second half of the seventeenth century witnessed the continuation of this archaeological trend. Stephen Skinner, John Aubrey, John Ray and Thomas Browne looked for regional forms of

³ The Society of Antiquaries was founded as early as 1572 by Bishop Matthew Parker, Sir Robert Cotton or William Camden with the aim of preserving English antiquities. It existed until 1604 when James I abolished it for alleged political purposes. See further Wakelin (1991: 36-37).

self-expression to suit their etymological or antiquarian purposes. Actually, Shorrocks (2000: 85) avers that “No doubt the conservative tendencies of many of the regional dialects were felt to be interesting, and the dialectal evidence valuable for the light that it might throw on the history of standard English.”

Firstly, Skinner’s *Etymologicon Linguae Anglicanae* (1671) made provision for provincialisms. A careful analysis of the dictionary entries reveals a profuse incorporation of northern words which he, as an inhabitant of Lincoln, localised for the most part to this county. Secondly, John Aubrey’s survey of Surrey’s history and antiquities begun in 1673 (1719) also referred to genuine provincial items as part of his archaeological enquiry. According to Fox (2000: 65), he “was unusual among antiquaries of his generation in a research method which relied heavily on oral sources.” Thirdly, the work of John Ray has been and still is the mandatory reference whenever and wherever the lexicon of EModE regional dialects is approached. His *A Collection of English Words Not Generally Used* (1674) has deservedly been dignified as the cornerstone of English dialect lexicography by virtue of his innovative method of word-gathering and the abundant amount of lexical data recorded (Gladstone 1991; Ihalainen 1994: 200-205). As it is well known, its scientific impact is notably felt in later dialect treatises and contemporary dictionaries which consciously introduced regional words. To name but a couple of them, Elisha Coles’ *An English Dictionary* (1676) or John Kersey’s revision of Edward Philip’s *The New World of Words* (1706) (Starnes & Noyes 1946: 58-63; Bateley 1967; Wakelin 1987: 160-163; Görlach 1995: 93-94). Finally, Sir Thomas Browne collected twenty-six words “of no general reception in England but of common use in Norfolk, or peculiar to the East Angle Countries” (146) in his eighth treatise of *Certain Miscellany Tracts* (1683) entitled “Of Languages, and particularly of the Saxon Tongue.”

Side by side with this scholarly interest in provincialisms, the flowering of dialect literature went hand in hand with the appearance of short provincial glossaries appended to literary specimens. Their purpose was linguistic and literary at one and the same time: “instruction and entertainment were not felt to be mutually exclusive” (Shorrocks 2000: 86). It goes without saying that the question of regional lexis does loom large here. By way of illustration, George Meriton’s “Clavis” to his celebrated second

edition of *A Yorkshire Dialogue* (1685) offers numerous Yorkshire words which testify to the lexical history of the county. Also, the hitherto unpublished *A Yorkshire Dialogue between Will a Wally, and his Wife Pegg, & her Brother Roger, their Son Hobb, their Daughter Tib, their Neece Nan and their Landlord* (c.1690-1730), currently held at the Folger Shakespeare Library in MS V.a. 308, contains a list of provincial terms that shed light upon the lexical ascendancy of the region.⁴

Within this traditionally shadowed context where peripheral words held attraction for a modest but significant number of scholars and literary authors, Bishop White Kennett annexed a list of words to his *Parochial Antiquities* (1695). Despite Fox's (2000: 65) contention that they are all archaic words, it is a fact that the Vicar of Ambrosden collated northern, Midland, southern and eastern terms which were not all plundered from Ray's collections. In what follows, a close examination will be made of the evidence supplied by this list as regards regional vocabulary, its indebtedness to earlier lexicographical sources, and the interesting data it provides on EModE provincial varieties.

3. Bishop White Kennett's *Parochial Antiquities* (1695): a lexical survey

Born at St. Mary (Dover) in 1660, White Kennett was educated at Westminster School and St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford, where he published the translation of Erasmus' *In Praise of Folly*. In 1685 he was appointed Vicar of Ambrosden (Oxfordshire) where he held his living until he became the rector of St. Botolph's, Aldgate (London), in 1700. In 1701 he became Archdeacon of Huntingdon (Cambridgeshire), Dean of Peterborough, and was finally made Bishop of this city in 1718. He died at Westminster in 1728. Kennett

⁴ I would like to express my gratitude to Miss Bettina Smith (Image Request Coordinator of the Photography and Digital Imaging Department, Folger Shakespeare Library) for access to the microfilm printouts of this regional specimen, as well as detailed information on MS V.a. 308. This *Yorkshire Dialogue* and the glossary which is appended to it will be analysed in depth elsewhere. See Ruano-García (2008) for a thorough linguistic description of a Lancashire piece contained in this manuscript: *A Lancashire Tale* (c.1690-1730). This appears to antedate any other known written reproductions of genuine Lancashire speech before John Collier's celebrated *A View of the Lancashire Dialect* (1746).

published fifty-seven works and left behind several manuscripts which are held at the British Library as the Kennett Collection, Lansdowne MSS 935-1041.

Parochial Antiquities appeared in 1695 when the author moved to the small village of Ambrosden. Not republished until 1818, the word-list annexed to this work was issued separately in 1816 with the title 'A glossary to explain the original, the acceptance, and obsolescence of words and phrases; and to shew the rise, practice, and acceptance of customs, laws and manners'. To my knowledge, this glossary has gone relatively unnoticed for scholars and has considerably been ignored in recent times as a source for late seventeenth-century regionalisms. Yet, the importance of this work is clearly felt in view of its impact on later lexicographers and glossarists. As a matter of fact, it is referenced as a source in Halliwell's *Dictionary of Archaic and Provincial Words* (1847), Baker's *Glossary of Northamptonshire Words and Phrases* (1854), Dartnell & Goddard's *A Glossary of Words Used in the County of Wiltshire* (1893) or Joseph Wright's monumental *English Dialect Dictionary* (1898-1905) (Ruano-García 2009b). It is likewise referred to by Wright (1901) (Shorrocks 1988) and Kennedy (1927) as an important glossary. Skeat's (1879) reprint of the glossary for the EDS or Fox (2000: 65) are amongst the very few for whom this has deserved scholarly merit. Kennett's glossary was conceived as a collection of Latin terms which, in keeping with other contemporary treatises, were listed with a view to explaining some words scattered through the text, and to shedding light upon ascendancies. Indeed, English items were introduced by way of etymological illustrations which, according to Skeat (1879: 2), are erroneous in virtually every instance. The glossary was thus reshaped in its reprint to suit Skeat's interests in regionalisms themselves: four hundred and twenty-eight words were picked up and listed alphabetically, favouring regional lexical data to the detriment of etymologies. Cross-references to the Latin originals and some remarks were also added. This is the edition which has been used for this paper.

3.1. Classification of words

As the title suggests, the lexical antiquities collected very much pertain to the county of Oxfordshire and neighbouring areas such as

Buckinghamshire, both in the South-East. However, Kennett made use of other English words –regionally restricted and of a wider non-standard distribution– so as to illustrate the etymological connexions he proposed. A detailed evaluation of the entries indicates that items fall into different strands:

(a) (Un-)marked words which were seemingly natural to regional speech, whether southern, eastern, northern / Scottish, or Midland.

(b) Unlabelled lexical elements that probably had a wider distribution and did not reflect restricted provincial usages. It is worth noting that some of them were apparently distinguished by a colloquial flavour: *hobs* ‘clowns, [...] or jolt-headed country fellows’⁵ or *hopper-arsed* ‘lame in the hip’ which Grose (1787 s.v. *hoppet*) would mark as vulgar. Names of household utensils were also collected: *porringer* ‘a pottage-dish’ or *posnet* ‘a small metal pot or vessel for boiling, having a handle and three feet’ (*Oxford English Dictionary*, henceforth *OED*).⁶

(c) Terms that neither point to properly regional nor to more widespread non-standard vocabulary, namely ‘accepted’ words. For instance, *blur* ‘a blot, a blotch, a spot of deep tincture’, *bonnet* ‘a little cap or hat, or other covering for the head’, *plug* ‘a piece of wood to stop a hole’, or *slap* ‘a flat box [blow] with the open hand’.

⁵ If not otherwise indicated, all definitions are taken from Skeat (1879). The names of English counties correspond to pre-1974 administrative boundaries. See Upton & Widdowson (2006: 12–13). Conventional abbreviations for English dialects are used; see Wright’s *English Dialect Dictionary* (1981 (1898–1905)) (henceforth *EDD*).

⁶ These and other items are indeed interesting cases of study, for Skeat might have added them on account of the regional dialect status they had by the end of the nineteenth century. In fact, the *EDD* localises these examples to very specific areas in the light of available eighteenth- and nineteenth-century data. Still, the EModE linguistic setting was not necessarily identical, which implies that careful evaluation is strongly needed and comparison with contemporary evidence recommended. By way of clear illustration, *posnet* is quoted by the *EDD* in Dur., Cum., Wm., Yks., Lan. and Chs. Conversely, EModE dictionaries by no means suggest a northern and Midland restriction as evidenced by bilingual and monolingual treatises such as Cooper’s *Theasurus Linguae Romanae et Britannicae* (1584), Florio’s *A World of Words* (1598), Coles’ *An English Dictionary* (1676), or Kersey’s *English Dictionary* (1702). See further Weiner (1994, 1997) for an illuminating discussion on the widespread distribution of this kind of household vocabulary in EModE.

(d) Miscellaneous items that belonged to more technical domains such as architecture and building –*boltel* ‘a piece of timber that overlays upon a beam’, *bracket* ‘a small piece of wood to support a shelf’–, or husbandry: *soul* ‘a rope or halter to tie cattle in the stall’.⁷

3.2. Lexicographical sources

Given the scope of this paper, our attention will be focused on the first group of words in view of the regional data they provide. Nevertheless, it is worth stressing that many of them were plagiarised from other sources, namely Skinner’s etymological dictionary, Ray’s collections and Meriton’s glossary.

3.2.1. Items taken from Skinner’s *Etymologicon Linguae Anglicanae* (1671)

Three of Kennett’s words were also listed in Skinner’s dictionary where they were defined in Latin with exactly the same meaning: *hogs and hoggrels* ‘sheep of the first or second year’, *slape-ale* ‘plain ale’ and *cobbe* ‘a sea-cobbe, or coppe, is a bird with a tuft of plumes in the head’. It is somehow complex to ascertain precisely whether the Vicar relied on Skinner for these words or the information was directly taken from Ray’s lists, as the first two are quoted by the botanist. Yet, the fact that *cobbe* is not listed by Ray makes it plausible that Kennett could have had a first hand knowledge of the *Etymologicon* (1671).

⁷ A thorough evaluation of these words in the *EDD*, the *OED* and other EModE dictionaries suggests that they were not provincially restricted at the time. Indeed, the *OED*’s contemporary records for *boltel* and *bracket* point to their more widespread usage. Husbandry items also seem to have been distributed in general country usage. As a matter of fact, Tusser’s *Fiue Hundred Points of Good Husbandrie* (1573) and Worlidge’s *Dictionarium Rusticum* (1668) gather *soul* as a common word all over England.

3.2.2. Words gathered from Ray's *A Collection of English Words not Generally Used* (1674, 1691)

A summary comparison between *Parochial Antiquities* (1695) and Ray's lists discloses that Kennett relied heavily on them for a great deal of his terms. It appears quite likely that he could have been well acquainted with the first edition. Moreover, many of the items which were later incorporated into the second reprint were present in Kennett's glossary too, which makes it certainly possible that he also had a first-hand knowledge of the 1691 list.

For obvious reasons we cannot account here fully for every single word copied. In short, Ray's imprint is attested in one hundred and fifty-one terms, out of which ninety-two belong to northern counties and fifty-nine to southern and eastern dialects. Surprisingly, Kennett only marked sixty-six items as properly northern, and thirty-seven as southern / eastern. The rest were not assigned to any area; however, Ray's data suggest that they were distinguished by a regional restriction. Although it is clear that Kennett's purpose was not to differentiate between regional areas as Ray systematically did, it is not easy to elucidate why the Vicar omitted certain geographical data.

It is worth emphasising that Kennett's biographical connections with southern and eastern counties improved some of Ray's labels as he localised words to very particular dialects. For instance, *gibbet* 'any great cudgel thrown up in trees to beat down the fruit', *pitch* 'a pick-axe', *riddle* 'a hurdle', *seam* 'eight bushels, or a quarter' and *wind-row* 'the swaths of grass when turned a little dried are cast into *wind-rows*' were specifically quoted as Sus. or Ken. words. Also, the author supplied detailed information on the use of some items in other places. Firstly, *barken* 'a yard or backside' was given as a Wil. term (Ray cited it as a Sus. item). Secondly, *to heal up* '(i.e. cover up) a child in a cradle, or any other person in a bed', *lees* 'most of the wide common heaths or pastures', or *sheat* 'a young hog of the first year' were quoted as Ken. words (Ray labelled them as Sus. and Suf. terms). Thirdly, *shote* 'a young hog of the first year' apparently belonged to Sus. speech too (Ray localised it to Ess.). In a similar fashion, *aver* 'a sluggish horse or lazy beast' and *cod* 'a bolster or

pillow' were, according to Kennett's data, Wm. lexical items.⁸ Besides, *hoppet* 'a little hand-basket' and *ing* 'any open field or common' were assigned to Lin. (Ray marked all of them as generally northern).

3.2.3. Terms quoted from Meriton's 'Clavis' to *A Yorkshire Dialogue* (1685)

It is not a simple task to ascertain whether Kennett borrowed some terms and definitions from Ray (1691), or, on the contrary, relied directly on Meriton's information. There are a few words which were listed both by Meriton and Ray (1691) with virtually the same definition. Amongst them, *aud-farand* 'children when they are pert and witty beyond their years', *brake* 'an instrument with which they break flax or hemp', *dike* 'a ditch to dry a hedge', *feal* 'to hide any thing surreptitiously gotten', *gobble* 'to open the mouth wide and swallow greedily', *poke* 'the general word applied to all measures', *sock* 'a plough-share' or *steg* 'a gander'. Needless to say, the aid lent by Sir Francis Brokesby as regards the East Riding of Yks. helped John Ray augment his own data about this variety. By way of hypothesis, Kennett's access to Meriton's words might have been facilitated through Ray (1691) and, consequently, Brokesby. Nonetheless, there are two items, *garn* 'a yarn' and the metathetic variant *gers* 'grass', which are absent from Ray (1691) and therefore suggest that the Vicar could have known Meriton's work.

3.3. Additional dialect data

It is of obvious appeal to linguistic research in this field that Kennett referred to seventy-nine items of seemingly provincial usage that fill some documentary *lacunae* of EModE regional vocabulary. Unfortunately, the author did not tell about their geographical distribution as a rule. Still, unmarked words are sensibly less in

⁸ Notice that *cod*, for example, is marked as commonly northern by Skinner (1671), Coles (1676) or the anonymous *Gazophylacium Anglicanum* (1689). Kennett's information appears to improve the geographical vagueness provided by such labels. Interestingly, the noun is documented in an inventory dated to 1600 which was included in *The Account Book of William Wray*. *Cod* is listed as part of the everyday lexicon of William Wray, a native of Ripon, in the North Riding of Yks. (Ruano-García 2009a).

number; their dialectal status has been assessed in the light of regional data from contemporary and later periods. These regionalisms might be ordered into distinct groups that run as follows.

3.3.1. Northern words

(i) Unmarked items

Fourteen northern terms were not labelled by Kennett. They may be classified according to different semantic fields:

(a) Farming: *ern* ‘the same as to glean’; *ernes* ‘the loose scattered ears of corn that are left on the ground after the binding of the cocking of it’; *gise* ‘when the tenant feeds the ground not with his own stock, but takes in another cattle’; *gisement* ‘cattle which are taken in to graze at a certain price; also the money received for grazing cattle’ (OED).

(b) Fishing: *brokling* ‘for eels; a fishing term’; *garth-men* ‘poachers’; *garths*, *fish-garth* ‘nets and unlawful engines for catching fish’.⁹

(c) Measures: *swathe* ‘a swathe of meadow was a long ridge of ground, like a selion in arable land’.

(d) Mining: *bing* ‘the kiln of the furnace wherein charcoal is burnt for the melting of metals’.

(e) Miscellaneous: *coggles*, *cobbles* ‘the beach or pebbles with which they ballast a ship’; *cogue* ‘a little drinking-cup in the form of a boat, used especially at sea, and still retained in a *cogue* [keg] of brandy’; *hoppet* ‘a young child danced in the arms’; *snod* ‘to lie *snod* and *snug*, to lie close’;¹⁰ *sowl* ‘to pull and tie up’.

⁹ Coles (1676 s.v. *garth*) records *garth-man* and *fish-garth*, although no geographical label is provided. The northern usage of *garth* suggests that these compounds may have been characterised by a similar distribution. Indeed, the *EDD* quotes the former in a nineteenth-century example from Lin. (s.v. *garth*, 2 (1)) and the latter in a Nhb. glossary dated to 1842 (s.v. *fish sb*, 1 (9)).

¹⁰ Ray (1691 s.v. *snod* and *snog*) cites *snod* with the meaning ‘neat, handsome’ in collocation with *gear* and *malt*: ‘*snogly* gear’d, handsomely drest: *Snog* Malt, smooth with few Combs’. This is also marked as northern by Kennett in collocation with *tree*

(ii) Marked items

The geographical accuracy which characterises Kennett's southern and eastern terms also applies to some of the labels that he assigned to the sixteen words of this group. Firstly, *bing* 'the cistern into which crystallized allum is thrown, for the water to drain from it' was quoted as proper to Whitby, in the North Riding of Yks. Secondly, *ram-raise* 'the motion of stepping backward for the better advantage of taking a leap forward' was said to belong to the uppermost northern areas near Scotland. Thirdly, *slot* 'the bolt of a door' was localised to Nhb. Finally, *flecked* 'spotted', *miln* 'a mill',¹¹ *slape* 'smooth' and *stall* 'to feed or fill to make fat' were marked explicitly as Lin. terms. The other items were generally labelled as northern; these might be classified into several domains:

(a) Farming: *intock* 'any corner or out-part of a common field ploughed up and sowed (and sometimes fenced off) within that year wherein the rest of the same field lay fallow'; *sull* 'a plough'.¹²

(b) House: *hilling of a bed* 'the bed-clothes or covering'.

(c) Religion: *raises* 'the risings, the barrows or hillocks raised for the burial of the dead'.

(d) Miscellaneous: *copt* 'high'; *leasow* 'a meadow'; *sconce* 'a screen'; *snod* 'smooth'; *sporling* 'the *sporling* of a wheel, a wheel-track'.

(see below): 'A tree is *snod* when the top is cut smooth off'. The combination with the verb *to lie* is not recorded by Ray (1691).

¹¹ In spite of the fact that *miln* is a phonological and orthographic variant of the standard *mill*, it has been arranged into this group, for it is specifically localised to the county of Lin. Notice that this dialect is quoted as belonging to the North in this paper, since some areas of Lin. are certainly distinguished by linguistic traits natural to northern English. Indeed, Samuels (1989: 108) demonstrates that the Norse impact on northern England was also felt in Lin.: "spoken Scandinavian survived longer north of the Humber than south of it (with the exception of Lincs.)." Gil's description of northern dialects in his *Logonomia Anglica* (1619) also reveals that some of the features described correspond to his native Lin. speech; see Dobson (1968, vol. I: 131,142-143). In parallel, Skinner's localisation of many northern terms to Lin. in his etymological treatise does emphasise that the county shared a common linguistic background with neighbouring dialects.

¹² Interestingly, Worlidge (1668) and Coles (1676) mark this term as western.

3.3.2. Southern, eastern words

(i) Unmarked items

Nine terms and expressions are ordered within this group in view of their apparent southern distribution:

- *coul* ‘a vessel carried between two persons with a *coul-staff*’
- *fodder* ‘to *fodder* a room; i.e. to throw things loose about it’
- *keep a fodder* ‘to fling or scatter about’
- *oste-cloth* ‘the hair cloth on which the malt is laid’
- *pout* ‘a hay-cock’
- *puttock* ‘the same as *Buttock*’
- *scry* ‘to cleanse and separate corn’
- *seddle* / *settle* ‘the frame of wood to support the barrels in a buttery or cellar’
- *tass* ‘the yard of a man’¹³

(ii) Marked items

Kennett’s close acquaintance with southern, eastern speech is again well demonstrated. He referred to thirty-seven genuine terms. Remarkably, the author appears to have a sound knowledge of Ken., Wil. and Oxf. varieties; Ess., Sur., and Cmb. lexical items are documented too.

¹³ The scarcity of direct textual evidence from the period that may throw light on the status of these words has made our decisions depend on data from later stages. Hence, *fodder*, for instance, is quoted by the *EDD* only once in an example from eastern Suf.; the *OED* does not collect the sense indicated by Kennett. Likewise, *pout* is recorded by the *EDD* in Ken.; the *OED* (s.v. *pout* n³) cites its first occurrence in Plot’s *Nat. Hist. Staffs.* (1686), later examples suggesting a Ken. distribution: Pegge’s *Alphabet of Kenticisms* (c.1736) and Parish and Shaw’s *Dict. Kentish Dial.* (1887). Other items such as *puttock* may be traced to southern counties too, as *buttock* is assigned to London speech by Kennett himself. Significantly, the *OED* (s.v. *buttock* n., 5) gathers seventeenth-century documentations in which *buttock* seems to have been used in colloquial English. Actually, the dictionary labels it as a slang term in view of its attestation in canting dictionaries and Shadwell’s *The Squire of Alsatia* (1688).

(a) Twenty-one terms and expressions are marked as Ken.:

- *blouse* 'a red-faced wench' (s.v. *bloat-coloured*)
- *blousing colour* 'sanguine and high-coloured' (s.v. *bloat-coloured*)
- *cade* 'a *cade* of beef is any parcel or quantity of pieces under a whole quarter'
- *cantell* 'any indefinite number or dimension; [...] a *cantell* of people or cattle'
- *clodge* 'a lump of lay or dirt'
- *cop* 'a *cop* of hay, a *cop* of pease, a *cop* of straw, &c., a high rising heap'
- *dag-wool* 'lucks'
- *guzzle* 'a gutter'
- *hake* 'a kind of fish dried and salted, [...] A proverb in Kent "as dry as hake"'
- *horse-bin* 'that apartment of a stable where the chaff and cut meat is secured by a partition of boards' (s.v. *bin, bing*)
- *keeler* 'a broad shallow vessel of wood wherein they set their milk to cream, and their wort to cool'¹⁴
- *lees* 'most of the wide common heaths or pastures'
- *lucks* 'locks and flocks of coarse and refuse wool'¹⁵
- *make-weight* 'the least candle in the pound, put in to make weight'
- *nod of the neck* 'the nape of the neck'
- *sessle* 'to *sessle* about is to change seats very often'

¹⁴ Significantly, the *OED* (s.v. *keeler*², 1) records a quotation from *Richmond Wills* (1567) where *keeler* is also attested. In this vein, it is thus possible that this noun was not restricted to Ken. only.

¹⁵ *Lucks* seems to be an orthographic variant of *lock*; it might probably be suggestive of a Ken. pronunciation. The *OED* (s.v. *lock*, n¹) cites it as an eighteenth- and nineteenth-century dialect spelling.

- *swaddle your sides* ‘I’ll swaddle your side’, i.e. with a whip or wand I will strike and make it bend and meet round your body’

- *swink* ‘a hard labourer is said to *swink it away*’

- *toss* ‘a mow of corn in a barn’

- *trush* ‘a cushion of flags, for kneeling [upon] in churches’

- *whetkin* ‘a treat given to the tenants and labourers at the end of the wheat-harvest’

(b) Six words are quoted as natural to Wil.:

- *comb* ‘the bottom or lower ledge of it [a window]’

- *ear* ‘to plough’

- *fardingale* ‘the fourth part of an acre; called *fardingale* in Wiltshire’¹⁶

- *gushill* / *gooshill* ‘a gutter’

- *log* ‘sixteen foot and a half in length and four in breadth make one acre of land’

- *pissing-candle* ‘the least candle in the pound, put in to make weight’

(c) Six items are localised to Oxf.:

- *evenings* ‘the delivery, at even or night, of a certain portion of grass or corn to a customary tenant [...]’¹⁷

- *hitching* ‘any corner or out-part of a common field ploughed up and sowed [...] within that year within the rest of the same field lay fallow’

- *martin* ‘a spoiled heifer’¹⁸

¹⁶ As is the case with some previous examples, *fardingale* apparently represents a spelling variant characteristic of the Wil. dialect. In fact, Kennett refers to *fardingel*, *farundel*, and *farthindale* as alternatives of *ferling* which the *OED* gives as lemma. It is likely therefore that this term was not geographically restricted; rather, an indication about a Wil. variant is simply provided.

¹⁷ Although omitted by Skeat (1879), it is indicated in the 1818 edition of this work (s.v. *evenyns*) that this noun appears to have been natural to Burcester. In fact, *evenings* is quoted by the *EDD* as an Oxf. word; in particular, the dictionary provides a definition which also informs on its usage in the manor of Burcester.

- *seed-lip* 'a seed-cod'¹⁹
- *tod* 'a parcel of wool containing 29 pounds'
- *woddenel* 'a course sort of stuff used for the covering of cart-horses'

(d) Other counties:

- Ess.: *doke* 'a small brook or stream, of water'
- Sur.: *esh* 'the stubble after the corn is cut'
- Cmb.: *sizar* 'a servitor or one who is to live upon such an assized allowance'; *size of bread* 'the weight of bread prescribed by the Vice-Chancellor, and supervised by the clerk of the market'

This significant information may be arranged into several groups as well. Needless to say, further data are hereby added to some semantic fields hitherto, and still also, greatly incomplete. Amongst them, special notice should be given of measures and dimensions –*cade*, *cantell*, *fardingel*, *log*, *tod*–, farming words –*ear*, *hitching*, *lees*, *toss*, *whetkin*–, raw materials –*dag-wool*, *lucks*–, kinds of vessel –*keeler*, *seed-lip*–, animals –*martin*–, or kinds of tack: *woddenel*.

The hard retrieval of lexical data that might inform on the distinct names which were used to designate the same object in old provincial language is here little remedied. Yet, these data confirm Kennett's close acquaintance with southern vocabulary as *gushill* / *gooshill* and *guzzle* were given as Wil. and Ken. synonyms to indicate a gutter; *make-weight* and *pissing-candle* referred to 'the least candle in the pound' in Ken. and Wil., respectively; or *dag-wool* and *lucks* named the flocks of refuse wool in Ken.

3.3.3. Midland words

Only three instances of Midland vocabulary were recorded by Kennett. The information provided about them appears somehow unreliable, for contemporary evidence sometimes informs that these terms were not common to Midland districts only. Firstly, *leap* 'a

¹⁸ Notice that the *EDD* (s.v. *martin sb*³, 2) quotes this noun in North-East Lan. as well. It is also marked as an obsolete term.

¹⁹ This is also quoted by Worlidge (1668), although no geographical label is given.

‘weel’ made of willows or osiers, to catch fish’ was localised to Lei., at the same time as this was also attested in Best’s *Farm. Bks.* as a Yks. word (*OED* s.v. *leap* n², 1). Secondly, *groover* ‘a miner’ was said to belong to Der. It is worth indicating that *grove* ‘a gripe, grip, or ditch’, recorded by Kennett and Ray (1691) as a Lin. word, was listed in a late seventeenth-century glossary of mining terms appended to Thomas Houghton’s *Rara Avis in Terris: or the Compleat Miner* (1681) where it was quoted as a term natural to the Wapentakes of Wirksworth (Der.). A third item, *twinter* ‘an heifer of two winters’, was recorded as a general Midland noun. This rather contradicts the information supplied by the 1674 edition of Blount’s *Glossographia* that quoted it as a Bfd. word, or that provided by some non-literary texts that testify to its northern distribution (*OED* s.v. *twinter*, B). It is not clear whether the noun was used in the Midlands, as Kennett indicates, or, more plausibly, *twinter* was used in different areas over the country.²⁰ This does not mean that Kennett was wrong in his recognition of dialect terms, but rather that some of his dialect ascriptions should be taken with the necessary care, for words like these were in fact used in other districts as well.

4. Concluding remarks

It will be evident from this descriptive illustration that, despite some plagiarised words and a certain amount of irrelevant data for the present purpose, Kennett’s terms give us a considerable amount of dialect information that narrows the lexical gap extending from the Middle English period to later documented periods. The remarkable northern data hitherto provided by well known collections such as Ray (1674, 1691) or Meriton (1685) are further enriched by virtue of a few regionalisms which were not included in them. Also, Kennett’s southern, eastern linguistic background facilitates our access to a substantial number of genuine terms which are for the most part localised to Ken., Oxf. and Wil. dialects. In addition, the Vicar’s list seemingly improves some geographical labels of earlier works, which dignifies this glossary as an important store of provincial lexis useful for regional dialect investigation.

²⁰ Coles (1676) also localised it to Bdf., although his definition might have been copied from Blount’s (1674) treatise. The *OED* marks it as chiefly northern and Scottish. In particular, the dictionary quotes from the following EModE northern non-literary sources: *Durham Acc. Rolls* (1536), *Richmond Wills* (1567) and *Wills & Inv. N.C.* (1570).

Bishop White Kennett's glossary to *Parochial Antiquities* (1695) is in a nutshell another valuable lexical specimen which echoes archaeological and antiquarian trends commonly overlooked by linguistic tradition. All in all, it decidedly adds to our understanding of EModE regional vocabulary, and allows us to have a somewhat better knowledge of alternative 'Englishes' on the margins of standardisation.

References

Primary Sources

- Anonymous 1689. *Gazophylacium Anglicanum*. London: E.H. & W.H. <url:http://eebo.chadwyck.com>.
- Anonymous c.1690-1730. *A Yorkshire Dialogue between Will a Wally, and his Wife Pegg, & her Brother Roger, their Son Hobb, their Daughter Tib, their Neece Nan and their Landlord*. Folger Shakespeare Library MS, V.a. 308: fols. 61r-71v.
- Aubrey, John 1719. *The Natural History and Antiquities of the County of Surrey Begun in the Year 1673 [...]* In Five Volumes. London: Printed for E. Currl. <url:http://o-galenet.galegroup.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/>.
- Blount, Thomas 1674 (1656). *Glossographia*. London: Tho. Newcomb. <url:http://eebo.chadwyck.com>.
- Browne, Sir Thomas 1683. "Of Languages, and Particularly of the Saxon Tongue." *Certain Miscellany Tracts*. London: Printed for Charles Mearn: 129-150. <url:http://eebo.chadwyck.com>.
- Carew, Richard 1614. "The Excellencie of the English Tongue." Ed. William Camden. *Remaines Concerning Britaine*. London: John Legatt: 33-44. <url:http://eebo.chadwyck.com>.
- Carew, Richard 1602. *The Survey of Cornwall*. London: Printed by S.S. for Iohn Iaggard. <url:http://o-galenet.galegroup.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/>.
- Coles, Elisha 1676. *An English Dictionary*. London: Samuel Crouch. <url:http://eebo.chadwyck.com>.
- Cooper, Thomas 1584 (1565). *Thesaurus Linguae Romanae et Britannicae*. London. <url:http://eebo.chadwyck.com>.
- Florio, John 1598. *A World of Words*. London: Printed by Arnold Hatfield for Edward Blount. <url:http://eebo.chadwyck.com>.
- Gil, Alexander 1619. *Logonomia Anglica*. Londini: Excudit Iohannes Beale. <url: http://eebo.chadwyck.com>.

- Grose, Francis 1787. *A Provincial Glossary: with A Collection of Local Proverbs, and Popular Superstitions*. London: Printed for S. Hooper. <url:http://o-galenet.galegroup.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/servlet/ECCO>.
- Houghton, Thomas 1681. "An Explanation of The Miners Terms of Art Used in This Book." Ed. Thomas Houghton. *Rara Avis in Terris: or, the Compleat Miner, in Two Books*. London: Printed for William Cooper: fols.F-F4. <url:http://eebo.chadwyck.com>.
- Kennett, Bishop White 1818 (1695). "A Glossary to Show the Original, the Acceptation, and Obsolete-ness of Words and Phrases; and to Shew the Rise, Practice, and Alteration of Customs, Laws and Manners." Vol. 2. In *Parochial Antiquities Attempted in the History of Ambrosden, Burcester, and Adjacent Parts in Oxford and Bucks*. A New Edition in Two Volumes Greatly Enlarged from the Author's Manuscript Notes. Oxford: Clarendon Press: fols. A2-N.
- Kersey the younger, John 1702. *A New English Dictionary*. <url:http://leme.library.utoronto.ca>.
- Meriton, George 1685. "An Alphabetical Clavis, Unfolding The Meaning of All The Yorkshire Words Made Use in The Aforegoing Dialogue." In *A Yorkshire Dialogue*. York: John White: 79-113. <url:http://eebo.chadwyck.com>.
- Nowell, Laurence c.1567. *Vocabularium Saxonicum*. <url:http://leme.library.utoronto.ca>
- Ray, John 1674. *A Collection of English Words Not Generally Used*. London: Printed by H. Bruges for Tho. Barrell. <url:http://eebo.chadwyck.com>.
- Ray, John 1691 (1674). *A Collection of English Words Not Generally Used*. London: Printed for Christopher Wilkinson. <url:http://eebo.chadwyck.com>.
- Skeat, Rev. Walter W. 1879. *Dialectal Words from "Kennett's Parochial Antiquities"*. English Dialect Society. Series B. Reprinted Glossaries XVIII-XXII. London: Published for the English Dialect Society by N. Trübner & Co.
- Skinner, Stephen 1671. *Etymologicon Linguae Anglicanae*. Londini: Typis T. Roycroft. <url:http://eebo.chadwyck.com>.
- Tusser, Thomas 1573. *Fiue Hundreth Points of Good Husbandry*. London: Richard Tottell. <url:http://eebo.chadwyck.com>.
- Worlidge, John 1668. *Dictionarium Rusticum*. London: Printed by T. Johnson for Samuel Speed. <url:http://eebo.chadwyck.com>.

Secondary Sources

- Baker, Anne Elizabeth 1854. *Glossary of Northamptonshire Words and Phrases*. London: John Russell Smith.
- Bateley, Janet 1967. "Ray, Worlidge, and Kersey's Revisions of *The New World of English Words*." *Anglia* 85: 1-14.
- Blank, Paula 1996. *Broken English: Dialects and the Politics of Language in Renaissance Writings*. London: Routledge.
- Blank, Paula 2006. "The Babel of Renaissance English." Ed. Lynda Mugglestone. *The Oxford History of English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 212-239.
- Blake, Norman F. 1981. *Non-Standard Language in English Literature*. London: André Deutsch.
- Dartnell, George E. and Edward H. Goddard 1893. *A Glossary of Words Used in the County of Wiltshire*. London: Published for the English Dialect Society by Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press.
- Dobson, Eduard J. 1968. *English Pronunciation 1500-1700*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eckhardt, Eilert 1910. *Die Dialekt-und-Ausländertypen des älteren Englischen Dramas. Teil I: Die Dialekttypen*. Leipzig: A. Uystprust.
- Fox, Adam 2000. *Oral and Literate Culture in England 1500-1700*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gladstone, Jo 1991. "New World of English Words': John Ray, FRS, the Dialect Protagonist, in the Context of His Times (1658-1691)." Eds. Peter Burke and Roy Peter. *Language, Self, and Society. A Social History of Language*. Cambridge: Polity Press: 115-153.
- Görlach, Manfred 1995. "Dialect Lexis in Early Modern English Dictionaries." Ed. Manfred Görlach. *New Studies in the History of English*. Heidelberg: Universitätsvelag C.: 82-127.
- Görlach, Manfred 1999. "Regional and Social Variation." Ed. Roger Lass. *The Cambridge History of the English Language III 1476-1776*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 459-538.
- Halliwell, James O. 1847. *A Dictionary of Archaic and Provincial Words, Obsolete Phrases, Proverbs, and Ancient Customs, from the Fourteenth Century*. 2 vols. London: John Russell Smith.
- Ihalainen, Ossi 1994. "The Dialects of England since 1776." Ed. Robert Burchfield. *The Cambridge History of the English Language. V English in Britain and Overseas: Origin and Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 197-274.

- Kennedy, Arthur G. 1927. *A Bibliography of Writings on the English Language from the Beginning of Printing to the End of 1922*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Marckwardt, Albert H. 1947. "An Unnoted Source of English Dialect Vocabulary." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 46: 177-182.
- Milroy, James 2007. "The History of English." Ed. David Britain. *Language in the British Isles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 9-33.
- Orton, Harold, et al., eds. 1962-1971. *Survey of English Dialects (B) The Basic Material*. 4 vols. Leeds: E.J. Arnold & Son Limited.
- Osselton, Noel 1958. *Branded Words in English Dictionaries before Johnson*. Groningen: J.B. Walters.
- Oxford English Dictionary* 2004-2005 (1989). Eds. John S. Simpson and Edmund S.C. Weiner. Second Edition on CD-ROM. Version 3.1. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ruano-García, F. Javier 2008. "I'll tell o how Gilbert Scott sowd is mere Berry: 'A Lancashire Tale' (Folger Library MS, V.a. 308) as a Source for Lancashire Speech in Early Modern English." Paper presented at the *Thirteenth International Conference on Methods in Dialectology*, University of Leeds, 04-08 August 2008.
- Ruano-García, Javier 2009a. "'The Account Book of William Wray': An Evaluation of Yorkshire Lexis in Two Inventories (1599-1600)." Eds. Carlos Prado-Alonso, Lidia Gómez-García, Iria Pastor-Gómez and David Tizón-Couto. *New Trends and Methodologies in Applied English Language Research: Diachronic, Diatopic and Contrastive Studies*. Linguistic Insights 103. Bern, etc.: Peter Lang: 101-128.
- Ruano-García, Javier 2009b. "Investigating Joseph Wright's Sources: The Contribution of Bishop White Kennett's *Parochial Antiquities* (1695) to the *English Dialect Dictionary*." Paper presented at the *International Conference on Middle and Modern English Corpus Linguistics*, Universität Innsbruck, 05-09 July 2009.
- Samuels, Michael L. 1989. "The Great Scandinavian Belt." Eds. Angus McIntosh, Michael L. Samuels and Margaret Laing. *Middle English Dialectology*. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press: 106-115.
- Shorrocks, Graham 1988. "English Dialects. A Translation of Joseph Wright's 'Englische Mundarten'." *Journal of English Linguistics* 21/2: 127-136.
- Shorrocks, Graham 2000. "Purpose, Theory and Method in English Dialectology: Towards a More Objective History of the Discipline." Ed. Robert Penhallurick. *Debating Dialect: Essays on the Philosophy of Language*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press: 84-105.

- Starnes, T. De Witt and Gertrude E. Noyes 1946. *The English Dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson 1604-1755*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Upton, Clive and John D. A. Widdowson 2006. *An Atlas of English Dialects*. London, NY: Routledge.
- Wakelin, Martyn F. 1987. "The Treatment of Dialect in English Dictionaries." Ed. Robert Burchfield. *Studies in Lexicography*. Oxford: Clarendon Press: 156-177.
- Wakelin, Martyn F. 1991 (1972). *English Dialects: An Introduction*. London: The Athlone Press.
- Wales, Katie 2006. *Northern English: A Social and Cultural History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weiner, Edmund 1994. "Local History and Lexicography." *The Local Historian* 24: 164-173.
- Weiner, Edmund 1997. "The Use of Non-Literary Manuscripts for the Study of Dialect Lexis." Ed. Edgar W. Schneider. *Englisches Around the World Vol. 1. Studies in Honor of Manfred Görlach*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins: 235-253.
- Wright, Joseph 1901. "Englische Mundarten." Eds. Hermann Paul *et al.* *Grundriß der germanischen Philologie*. Band I. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner: 975-981.
- Wright, Joseph 1981 (1808-1905). *The English Dialect Dictionary*. 6 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

How to cite this article:

Ruano-García, Javier. "Looking for regional words in late seventeenth-century England: Bishop White Kennett and his glossary to *Parochial Antiquities* (1695)." *SEDERI* 19 (2009): 151-173.

Author's contact: javiruanogarcia@hotmail.com

Submission: 31/10/2008

Acceptance: 24/03/2009

Ariadne's adaptation of Alexander Oldys's *The Fair Extravagant* in *She Ventures and He Wins*¹

Jorge Figueroa Dorrego
University of Vigo

ABSTRACT

In the preface to *She Ventures and He Wins* (1695), the young woman signing as "Ariadne" says that the plot of this play is taken from "a small novel," the title of which she does not mention. Neither the editors Lyons and Morgan (1991) nor any of the few critics that have recently commented on this piece have identified the text upon which the play is drawn. The answer to this riddle is to be found in *The Lives and Characters of the English Dramatick Poets* (1699). The main plot of that comedy is Alexander Oldys's *The Fair Extravagant, or The Humorous Bride*, a practically unknown text that has not been reprinted since 1682. The aim of this paper is to (re-)unearth that source, and to analyse how Ariadne adapted the male-authored original for her own purposes as a woman dramatist, combined it with a farcical subplot, and endeavoured to tailor it to the new tastes of the town.

KEYWORDS: *She Ventures and He Wins*, adaptation, *The Fair Extravagant*, woman dramatist, Restoration drama.

She Ventures and He Wins is a comedy that was first performed at the New Theatre in Lincoln's Inn Fields in September 1695.² In the

¹ This contribution is part of the Research Project HUM2006-09252-FILO, funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Education, whose support is hereby acknowledged. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 18th International Conference of SEDERI, in Almagro, 22-25 April, 2008. I would like to thank Andrea Ruthven for her kind and keen help in linguistic and stylistic matters.

² The identity of its author was not revealed then, but the prologue announced that the play was "a woman's treat" (1991: 106), and the title-page of the printed version published in 1696 said it was written by "a young lady," who uses the pseudonym of "Ariadne" when signing the initial prose preface.

preface to the quarto published the following year, the “young lady” signing as “Ariadne” says that “[t]he plot was taken from a small novel; which, I must needs own, had design and scope enough to have made an excellent play, had it met with the good fortune to have fallen into better hands” (1991: 105). These last words are the customary sign of modesty that writers, and particularly women writers, used to insert in prefatory texts at the time. However, the first part of the statement, acknowledging the appropriation of a narrative plot, is noteworthy. According to Paulina Kewes (1998: 79), “[p]rior to the 1690s, dramatists did not signal their dependence on novels with any regularity,” and one of the examples she gives to support that, from that time onwards, this kind of acknowledgments starts becoming common is precisely this one by Ariadne. The problem is that this “young lady” does not actually mention the title of that “small novel.”

It is strange that neither the editors of *She Ventures and He Wins* in the anthology of comedies entitled *Female Playwrights of the Restoration* (1991) –Paddy Lyons and Fidelis Morgan– nor any of the few critics that have commented on the play have ever identified the source of the main plot.³ The answer to this riddle may be found in *The Lives and Characters of the English Dramatick Poets* compiled by Gerard Langbaine and Charles Gildon (1699: 168).⁴ The main plot of Ariadne’s comedy is borrowed from Alexander Oldys’s *The Fair Extravagant, or The Humorous Bride* (1682). The aims of the present note are to (re-)unearth that source and analyse how Ariadne adapted the male-authored original for her own purposes as a woman dramatist, combined it with a farcical subplot, and endeavoured to tailor it to the new tastes of the town.

³ As far as I could trace, only Pérez Vides (2002) and Spencer (1994) pay considerable attention to this play, but brief comments about it can also be found in Ballaster (1996), Hughes (1996), Hume (1976), Kewes (1998), Novak (1975), Pearson (1988), Rubik (1998) and Straznický (1997).

⁴ I am greatly indebted to one of the anonymous referees who has read this paper for letting me know this information, as my first source was *The Biographia Dramatica; or, A Companion to the Playhouse*, which was compiled to the year 1764 by David E. Baker, then continued to 1782 by Isaac Reed, extended to 1811 by Stephen Jones, and published the following year in three volumes. The information about *She Ventures and He Wins* is given in entry number 200, volume III, page 264.

Oldys's *The Fair Extravagant* is a practically unknown text that has not been reprinted since 1682.⁵ After Gildon, who qualified it as "a very pleasant witty Novel" (1699: 168), only two scholars apart from myself have commented on this novel.⁶ One is Charles Mish, who defined it as "a stage comedy in narrative form" (1969: 299) because action, dialogue, and settings are very similar to those of Restoration comedies. No wonder then that someone may have thought of making a dramatic adaptation of this story. The other critic is Nicholas Hudson (2005: 577-581), who considers Oldys's novels an early example of the conservative ideology that pervades the novel throughout the long eighteenth century. Hudson pays attention to the Tory, good-natured rake hero and the detailed description of the familiar setting in *The Fair Extravagant*.

The plot is about a rich heiress, curiously enough called Ariadne, who, in the company of her cousin Miranda and both dressed in men's clothes, decides to look for a husband. When she finds a suitable man, she urges him to marry her although they hardly know each other. Being aware of the possible mistake of such a decision and wishing to test this man called Polydor for some days, the "humorous bride" of the subtitle vanishes soon after the wedding, leaving the groom baffled and desperate. For the first trial, Ariadne asks her cousin Dorothea to impersonate her, make Polydor

⁵ This text is included in Wing's *Short Title Catalogue* (1640-1661), 0264B, and only available in microfilm or EEBO. Very little is known also about the author, apart from his having written another novel, *The Female Gallant, or, The Wife's the Cuckold* (1692) and an "Ode, by Way of Elegy, on the Universally Lamented Death of the Incomparable Mr Dryden" (1700). *The London Jilt; or, The Politick Whore* (1683) has sometimes been ascribed to him, though wrongly so according to Thompson (1975: 293) and Hinnant ed. (2007: 11 and 203). No word is said about Alexander Oldys in the DNB. *The Complete Newgate Calendar* records an episode in which he is described as a small, deformed man (Rayner & Crook eds. 1926, 2: 68). In the *Gentleman's Magazine* 54 (1784: 161) we can read that Oldys was sometimes called "The Little Poet" and "The English Scarron," names which seem to refer to his short height and his comic narrative style, close to that of the contemporary French writer, Paul Scarron. For Hudson (2005: 577), Oldys is "arguably an important and unjustly ignored innovator in the history of English prose fiction."

⁶ I have delivered two other papers about this novel: "Anxious Masculinity in Alexander Oldys's novel *The Fair Extravagant* (1682)" (at the XVIII International Conference of SEDERI, Cádiz. 7-9 March 2007), and "Alexander Oldys's Comic Displacement of Romance in *The Fair Extravagant*" (at the XXXI International Conference of AEDEAN, A Coruña, 14-17 November 2007). The former remains so far unpublished; for the latter see Figueroa Dorrego (2008).

believe he has married another person, and pretend that *she* (Dorothea claiming to be the true Ariadne) loves him and would like to be his wife. This perplexes and desolates him even more. The thought of having been cheated into marriage by a female fraud leads him to fits of anger in which he voices the harsh misogynistic discourse of the time. However, Polydor resists temptation and remains constant to Ariadne. Then the heroine resolves to try his courage further by asking her main suitor and a friend of Polydor's, called Marwoud, to challenge him to a duel. Polydor defeats Marwoud but both are wounded. This daring trial proves his valour and strength but could cause his death. And for the following test, Ariadne again uses Marwoud. She asks him to find someone to sue Polydor for a debt supposedly contracted by his wife before marriage. Thus the protagonist ends up in jail, where he proves not only his constancy and stoic self-control but also his charity towards fellow prisoners. Dorothea and Miranda then persuade Ariadne to give up tormenting Polydor "and rest satisfied with his good qualities after so many cruel Experiments" (Oldys 1682: 167 [H12r]). She consents to undeceive him on the condition that they allow her to arrange their respective marriages to Marwoud and her brother Sir Francis, whom they secretly and passively love. The story ends with the final reconciliation and multiple weddings that are so typical of comedy.

It must be pointed out that Polydor is an educated 30-year-old gentleman from a good family, but he is the youngest son and therefore has little money. Marrying a baronet's daughter worth 1,200 pounds a year, beautiful and aged seventeen, is certainly an opportunity he cannot afford to miss. But that very same plight that provides a pragmatic justification to his patient constancy is paradoxically one of the reasons for much of his suffering. Ariadne's superiority in terms of social rank and wealth, together with her strong personality and free agency brings on Polydor's fears of his future authority as a husband. Throughout the novel Ariadne's behaviour is presented as extravagant (in the sense of undue and outrageous), humorous (in the sense of whimsical), and cruel. Polydor is obsessed with the possibility of being cuckolded and the public scorn that this would mean. This anxiety emasculates him and plunges him into frequent moments of passivity and self-pity. It also leads him to endorse a misogynistic discourse that the ironic, intrusive narrator shares and reinforces. Therefore, the story of this

active and independent woman called Ariadne is told from a masculine perspective that puts the emphasis on the expectations of masculinity and the anxiety they produced in early modern men.

The impression that the novel caused in the “young Lady” who wrote *She Ventures and He Wins* is evident not only because she decided to adapt it to the stage, but also because she chose the heroine’s name as her own pseudonym. So she most likely identified herself with the character’s assertiveness and autonomy. In the same way that the novel’s protagonist feels the need to disguise herself in order to start “rambling all the Town over” in search of a partner (Oldys 1682: 5 [B3]), the “young Lady” writer thinks it convenient to publish her first play under a pen name. “I am very sensible of the many nice judgments I expose myself to,” she says at the beginning of the preface (1991: 105). The play was performed six years after the death of Aphra Behn, the main precedent as a woman dramatist, who had written some successful plays but whose reputation was morally dubious. After her death no other woman had had a play performed in England. Ariadne’s step was therefore not an easy one to take. Writing for the commercial stage was risky for a woman’s reputation due to the connotations of unchastity that entertaining the public for money had at the time and the frequent association between theatres and brothels (cf. Straznicky 1997: 709-710, 714). As Rubik (1998: 25, 33) has pointed out, women playwrights were viewed as eccentric (i.e. extravagant) and often as immodest (due to the supposed immorality of some scenes in their plays and some episodes in their own lives). Moreover, in the mid 1690s, the call for moral reform was too difficult to disregard. This justifies the young playwright’s decision of wearing the mask of a *nom de plume*.

In spite of that modesty and anonymity, and of resorting to a male-authored text as a source, Ariadne places herself in the short tradition of English women writers. In the preface, she claims that after the death of the “incomparable Mrs Behn,” her restrained muse “has claimed a kind of privilege; and, in spite of me, broke from her confinement” (105). And whoever wrote the verse prologue insists: “Our author hopes indeed,/ You will not think, though charming Aphra’s dead,/ All wit with her, and with Orinda’s fled” (106). Ariadne’s wit may not be as successful as Behn’s or Philips’s, but many topics and features of *She Ventures and He Wins* are also found

in the works of those and other women writers of seventeenth-century England.⁷

Actually, the first scene of the play resembles that of Behn's *The Rover* (1677) in showing the heroine willing to "ramble the town" in search of a lover, in disguise and in the company of a female relative. The main differences are that in Ariadne's play they are already cross-dressed, the setting is London, and they are the only two characters in that initial scene. This also differs slightly from the beginning of Oldys's novel, because the latter includes an ironic, intrusive narrator that gives a fairly sardonic view of the heroine. In Ariadne's play, however, the opening conversation between Charlotte and Juliana, as Pearson has rightly remarked, "introduces us to the play-world through their eyes" (1988: 139).⁸ The dialogue elaborates ideas of women's power before and after marriage, the empowering effect of cross-dressing in an oppressive patriarchal world, and men's tendency to deceive in courtship.⁹ This is how the play begins:

Juliana: Faith, Charlotte, the breeches become you so well 'tis almost pity you should ever part with'em.

Charlotte: Nor will I, till I can find one can make better use of them to bestow'em on, and then I'll resign my title to'em for ever.

Juliana: 'Tis well if you find it so easy, for a woman once vested in authority, though 'tis by no other than her own making, does not willingly part with it. [...]

Charlotte: [...] These clothes will give us greater liberty than the scandalous world will allow our petticoats, which we could not attempt this undertaking in without hazard to our modesty.

⁷ Greer (1988: 24), however, contends that the author of *She Ventures and She Wins* may not be that young (as she already wanted to be a writer when Behn was alive) or even a woman (as Mrs. Bowman speaks the prologue in man's clothes), but I do not think there is enough evidence to conclude that the author is male. The argumentation in the present study would rather point at a woman dramatist.

⁸ Pearson adds that this play is unusual in having more female characters than male and in allowing women to speak half of the lines, which contributes to reinforcing the abovementioned feminine perspective. Ballaster focuses on the opening of the play as well, and argues that it mimics "the conventional opening of the paired male co-conspirators in the comedy" (1996: 282). See also Spencer (1996: 325).

⁹ For an interesting study of the effects of cross-dressing in this play, see Pérez Vides (2002).

Besides, should I meet with the man whose outside pleased me,
'twill be impossible by any other means to discover his humour;
for they are so used to flatter and deceive our sex, that there's
nothing but the angel appears, though the devil lies lurking
within, [...]. (1991: 109)

Like Oldys's Ariadne, Charlotte has assumed both the powerlessness that women had as wives at the time and the whole set of moral values that placed modesty as a key feminine virtue. However, she is resolute in having full control of her life before marriage. She wants the freedom to find a prospective husband who will not deceive her and will not marry her for her money:

I'm not obliged to follow the world's dull maxims, nor will I wait
for the formal address of some ceremonious coxcomb, with more
land than brain, who would bargain for us as he would for his
horse [...] I'll have one who loves my person as well as gold, and
please myself, not the world, in my choice. (110)

Yet complying with patriarchal morality and intending to play an active, self-determining role is not an easy task for a woman, so she is forced to resort to disguise, faking, and stripping all the non-sexual elements from the notion of modesty, i.e. being sexually chaste but not silent or passive. As Spencer puts it, female characters of Restoration and eighteenth-century literature usually deceive as a strategy "for gaining some measure of power within a social structure that denies them power;" and Charlotte is "a very striking example of a female character who tells lies, weaves fictions around herself, and uses this to control her world. While doing this she remains a heroine, presented to us as a virtuous and sympathetic character" (1994: 320). It is precisely her commitment to chastity that justifies her acts. After all, she deceives to avoid being deceived by men, and she usurps masculine authority only temporarily, claiming to be willing to abide by it after marriage. Yet, Spencer warns us that this "may be another deception designed to conceal the desire truly to take over masculine authority" (326). In fact, none of the men in the plot of this play are representative of traditional masculinity and threatening, oppressive authority.¹⁰

¹⁰ Ballaster also argues that the wit of the female characters in this and other contemporary plays by women both surmounts the 'managerial' capacity of their male counterparts and allows them the freedom to marry the men of their choice (1996: 282).

Ariadne certainly wishes to make her heroine sympathetic to the audience, not only by reaffirming that commitment to chastity (in the novel, apart from the narrator's ironic comments, she says she is tired of her maidenhead), but also by softening her humorous nature a little so that, for instance, she never plans a duel as a test, which gives the novel's heroine a touch of cruelty and senselessness. There is an important change in the presentation of male characters too. In spite of the negative view of men that Charlotte gives in the previous quotations, she is convinced that there are some men of a different kind: "there still remains a race retains the image Heaven made them in, virtuous and just, sincere and brave." She will find one "or else lead apes in Hell" (109-110). And she does find one, aptly called Lovewell. Like Oldys's Polydor, he is the youngest son of a good family, overtrusting, honest, and constant.¹¹ When he is forsaken by Charlotte on the wedding day, Lovewell also rails against her in anger but does not indulge so often in the misogynistic discourse. Moreover, he does not use so many sexual innuendoes when talking to her, nor drink so much, nor have a group of rakish friends. This should make him more acceptable as the right husband for the heroine, particularly in the eyes of the mid-1690s audience.¹²

Another difference in characterisation is found in the only character whose name is not changed: Marwood. In Oldys's novel, he is a suitor of Ariadne's and therefore sees Polydor as a rival he must get rid of. For that reason, he eagerly accepts her request to challenge him to a duel and is very aggressive in the fight. In the play, however, Marwood is a good friend of Lovewell's, considers him the best husband for Charlotte, is very reluctant to engage in the test of the imprisonment, and is in love with Bellasira. Thus he is a much more agreeable character, who represents male friendship and is conceived in order to gain the sympathy of the contemporary public.

¹¹ As Hughes (1996: 385) points out, "Lovewell remains immovably faithful to his wife, loving the woman even when she has (apparently) been stripped of the name and station by which he initially knew her, becoming a nameless and placeless enigma."

¹² Hume (1976: 430) states that the mid-nineties witness the collapse of "hard" comedy, which is replaced by a "soft" one with increasing doses of overt didacticism. *She Ventures and He Wins* is an example of this new approach. The whole design of the play is "rigorously moral" (420). Rubik (1998: 59) also considers the piece a "reformed" comedy.

Nonetheless, the greatest alteration in the play in relation to the narrative source is the addition of a subplot. This subplot contrasts with the main plot as regards the social rank of the characters (from the middle class) and the type of comedic action (more farcical and jest-like), but it deals with similar themes of women's power and reputation, and how they have to resort to deception to preserve their honour. Here Urania, wife to a vintner called Freeman, resolves to get rid of a pestering suitor that makes advances to her, although he is also married. The *Dramatis Personae* section describes this man, called Squire Wouldbe, as "a proud pragmatistical coxcomb of poor extraction" (1991: 104) – "pragmatistical" meaning meddlesome or intrusive. This subplot is interwoven with the main plot from the second scene of Act One, and the two actions join at the end of Act Five when all the characters happen to meet at the tavern.

Initiating scene two, Urania says she does not want to be "thought dishonest, without knowing the pleasure of it" (111), and is willing to curb Squire Wouldbe's advances herself rather than remain passive and let her husband defend her -and his- honour. She resolves to do it through a series of tricks. For the first she asks him to visit her in women's clothes, then tells him to hide from her husband in a cistern and in a tub full of feathers, and then makes him fall in a trap where he is harassed by some devils who threaten to "dip him in Styx to abate his hot lust" (128). These pranks emasculate him by frustrating his sexual performance, revealing his cowardice, and ridiculing him with the wet and feathery women's dress on. The effect of his cross-dressing is therefore the opposite of Charlotte's: humiliating rather than empowering.¹³ But as he insists on seeing her, Urania arranges a meeting to which his jealous wife Dowdy is also invited so that she can witness her husband's infidelity. This happens in the last scene in which, as was said before, the characters of the main plot are also present. Their comments are actually the last words in the play and, therefore, noteworthy. In their happy day of betrothal, Bellasira casts some doubts on male fidelity by remarking: "You see what constant things you men are to your vows! I warrant this fellow swore as much faith and constancy

¹³ According to Pearson (1988: 105-106), transvestite men in plays are not as common as cross-dressed women, never central, and seldom sympathetic figures. They usually become ridiculous fools. Female writers of the time, such as Behn, Polwhele, and Centlivre, often mocked some male characters by putting them in women's clothes. Cf. also Bullough and Bullough (1993: 75-79).

as any of you can." But Charlotte asks her not to generalise: "disgrace not so the race of men, to compare him to one; such senseless wretches are only lumps of dirt, not fit for any nobler form" (159). This is related to what she said at the beginning, that she believed in the existence of honest men and she wanted to find one. Lovewell is supposed to represent that kind of man, probably Marwood and Sir Charles too. Perhaps the naïve youth of the anonymous female author made her envisage that possibility, or maybe she expected to gain the sympathy of at least part of the male audience.

Unfortunately the reception of the play was not favourable. According to Novak (1975: 51), this "may have been due to its feminist reversal of sexual roles," particularly because Charlotte humiliates Lovewell "to an uncomfortable degree" through her insistence on testing his love. And to this we can add Urania's humiliation of Squire Wouldbe, which was more justifiable morally speaking, but still a subversion of gender hierarchy and a usurpation of her husband's role. What is evident is that all the alterations in plot and characterisation in relation to the source, that Ariadne made in order to suit her own interests and the new moral expectations, were not enough to win the public's favour. No matter how sexually chaste Charlotte and Urania were, it seems that their assertiveness and autonomy were not welcome, and no matter how constant and amicable Lovewell and Marwood may be, their subordination to Charlotte's sway was not likeable. Yet we must bear in mind that the male-authored source was another failure, which only seems to have drawn the attention of a "young Lady" who was no doubt fascinated by the gender-transgressive Ariadne.

References

- 'Ariadne' 1991. "She Ventures and He Wins." Eds. Paddy Lyons and Fidelis Morgan. *Female Playwrights of the Restoration. Five Comedies*. London: Dent: 103-159.
- Baker, David E., Isaac Reed and Stephen Jones 1812. *Biographia Dramatica; or a Companion to the Playhouse*. 3 vols. London: Longman et al.
- Ballaster, Ros 1996. "The First Female Dramatists." Ed. Helen Wilcox. *Women and Literature in Britain 1500-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 267-290.

- Bullough, Vern L. and Bonnie Bullough 1993. *Cross-Dressing, Sex, and Gender*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Figueroa Dorrego, Jorge 2008. "Alexander Oldys's Comic Displacement of Romance in *The Fair Extravagant*." Ed. M. J. Lorenzo Modia. *Proceedings from the 31st AEDEAN Conference*. A Coruña: Universidade da Coruña: 433-442.
- Greer, Germaine 1988. "Introduction." Eds. Germaine Greer, Jeslyn Medoff, Melinda Sansone and Susan Hastings. *Kissing the Rod. An Anthology of Seventeenth-Century Women's Verse*. London: Virago: 1-31.
- Hinnant, Charles ed. 2007. *The London Jilt*. Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press.
- Hudson, Nicholas 2005. "Social Rank, "The Rise of the Novel," and Whig Histories of Eighteenth-Century Fiction." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 17/4: 563-598.
- Hughes, Derek 1996. *English Drama. 1660-1700*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hume, Robert 1976. *The Development of English Drama in the Late Seventeenth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Kewes, Paulina 1998. *Authorship and Appropriation: Writing for the Stage in England, 1660-1710*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Langbaine, Gerard and Charles Gildon 1699. *The Lives and Characters of the English Dramatick Poets*. London: William Turner.
- Mish, Charles 1969. "English Short Fiction in the Seventeenth Century." *Studies in Short Fiction* 6: 233-330.
- Novak, Maximilian 1975. "The Closing of Lincoln's Inn Fields Theatre in 1695." *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* 14: 51-52.
- Oldys, Alexander 1682. *The Fair Extravagant, or, The Humorous Bride. An English Novel*. London: Charles Blount.
- Pearson, Jacqueline 1988. *The Prostituted Muse. Images of Women and Women Dramatists 1642-1737*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester-Wheatsheaf.
- Pérez Vides, Auxiliadora 2002. "Gender, Disguise and the Politics of Marriage in Ariadne's *She Ventures and He Wins*." *SEDERI* 11: 271-276.
- Rayner, John L. and G.T. Crook. Eds. 1926. *The Complete Newgate Calendar*. 5 Vols. London: Navarre Society.
- Rubik, Margarete 1998. *Early Women Dramatists 1550-1800*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- 'S.A.' 1784. "Anecdote of Alexander Oldys." *Gentleman's Magazine* 54: 161.
- Spencer, Jane 1994. "Not Being a Historian: Women Telling Tales in Restoration and Eighteenth-century England." Ed. Roy Ericksen.

J. Figueroa Dorrego

Contexts of Pre-Novel Narrative: The European Tradition. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter: 318-340.

Straznicky, Marta 1997. "Restoration Women Playwrights and the Limits of Professionalism." *E.L.H.* 64/3: 703-726.

Thompson, Roger 1975. "The London Jilt." *Harvard Library Bulletin* 23/3: 289-294.

How to cite this note:

Figueroa Dorrego, Jorge. "Ariadne's adaptation of Alexander Oldys's *The Fair Extravagant* in *She Ventures and He Wins*." *SEDERI* 19 (2009): 177-188.

Author's contact: jdorrego@uvigo.es

Submission: 19/09/2008

Acceptance: 23/01/2009

Henry Constable's sonnets to Arbella Stuart

M^a Jesús Pérez Jáuregui
University of Sevilla

ABSTRACT

Although the Elizabethan poet and courtier Henry Constable is best known for his sonnet-sequence *Diana* (1592), he also wrote a series of sonnets addressed to noble personages that appear only in one manuscript (Victoria and Albert Museum, MS Dyce 44). Three of these lyrics are dedicated to Lady Arbella Stuart – cousin-german to James VI of Scotland –, who was considered a candidate to Elizabeth's succession for a long time. Two of the sonnets were probably written on the occasion of Constable and Arbella's meeting at court in 1588, and praise the thirteen-year old lady for her numerous virtues; the other one seems to have been written later on, as a conclusion to the whole book, implying that Constable at a certain moment presented it to Arbella in search for patronage and political protection. At a time when the succession seemed imminent, Constable's allegiance to the Earl of Essex, who befriended Arbella and yet sent messages to James to assure him of his circle's support, raises the question of the true motivation of these sonnets. This paper will analyze these particular works in the context of a political environment rife with courtly intrigue.

KEYWORDS: Henry Constable, Arbella Stuart, Elizabethan sonnets, Succession debate, Elizabeth I's Court.

Henry Constable (1562-1613), poet, polemicist and diplomat, is best known for his *Diana*, first published in 1592, and one of the first sonnet sequences printed in England. Besides this edition and a second, augmented quarto (1594), there are also several manuscripts containing some of his works; one of these, Victoria and Albert MS Dyce 44 –also known as the Todd manuscript– includes a group of sonnets dedicated to particular persons.¹ They are organized in four

¹ Besides the Todd there are other interesting manuscripts containing poems by Constable: the Marsh MS, at the Marsh Library, Dublin (MS z.3.5.21); the Harington

series of seven, located in the second and third sections of the book:² the first group praise the Queen of England and the King of Scotland; the second celebrate several ladies of high rank; the third were written to be presented on specific occasions; and the fourth, in which two sonnets are missing, are funeral poems. Two of the sonnets in the second subsection, plus one more placed at the end of the book as a sort of colophon, are addressed to Lady Arbella Stuart, who was considered a potential heir to Elizabeth's throne.³ Since these poems were written at a time of intense political intrigue, when different personages of the court were striving to win the favour of one of the candidates for the succession, the analysis of their meaning and political purpose can shed light on the way in which a gentleman poet like Constable, of moderate means and rank, attempted to negotiate this uncertain situation.

Lady Arbella Stuart (1575-1615) was a descendant of Margaret, Henry VIII's elder sister who was married twice, first to James IV of Scotland, from which union Mary Queen of Scots and ultimately James VI of Scotland would descend; and second to Archibald Douglas, Arbella being their great-granddaughter.⁴ Due to this distinguished ancestry, her claims to the throne were strong, and her cousin-german James was her chief rival for the succession. An important fact that favoured Arbella's aspirations was her being English in birth and upbringing, while James was regarded as a foreigner. This complicated James's position. As Paulina Croft points out, no foreigner could inherit English lands under the English statute of 1531, so inheriting the crown was theoretically out of the question (2002: 43); and Henry VIII had "explicitly debarred the Scottish line descended from his sister Margaret" in his will (2002: 44). Moreover, to the English collective mind, foreigners were

MS, at Arundel Castle; and MS Ashmole 38, at the Bodleian Library, Oxford (Grundy 1960: 86-91).

² This division follows Constable's own arrangement, explained by the author, in an address placed between the prefatory poems and the beginning of the first section (Grundy 1960: 114).

³ These three sonnets are "That worthie Marquesse pride of Italie", "Only hope of oure age that vertues dead", and "My Mistrisse worth gave wings unto my Muse."

⁴ Her parents were Charles Stuart, earl of Lennox (1555/6-1576), and Elizabeth (1554?-1582), daughter of Sir William Cavendish and his third wife, Elizabeth, née Hardwick, who would later become Countess of Shrewsbury.

suspect, not only for religious reasons –their participation in Catholic plots and wars during the 1580s and 1590s, some contemplating endangerment and invasion of the realm, rendered them threats “from within” and “from without” (Marienstras 1985: 102)– but also for economic reasons, given the natural English jealousy of their own rights and liberties, from which they did not want foreigners to benefit (1985: 103-104). The possibility that James would bring about an assimilation of Scottish people as subjects with the same status as the English was certainly viewed with suspicion.

However, her gender counted against Arbella. According to John Bruce, many people disliked the prospect of “another long female reign.” Her lack of a firm religious identity was also a source of some concern (1861: 14-15). Little by little, even though Elizabeth had forbidden her subjects to discuss the issue, people tended to assume that James would succeed. Only on one occasion had Elizabeth hinted that Arbella was a potential queen; according to her biographers, the Queen told the French ambassador: “Look to her well: she will one day be even as I am and a lady mistress” (Durant 1978: 46).

In 1587 twelve-year-old Arbella, who had lost her parents and was provided for by her grandmother Elizabeth Cavendish, best known as Bess of Hardwick, visited court for the first time. As Joan Grundy states, Constable may have spent the main part of the years 1588 and 1589 at court, taking a break from his various travels as a diplomat and champion of Protestantism.⁵ They may have first met in the summer of 1588, before the events of the Armada, and all the indications are that they liked each other well. As Grundy observes, “in a letter of 1589 he [Constable] is described as not only ‘near allied to’ but ‘in the company’ of her” (1960: 26). In addition, they both had a family connection with Gilbert and Mary Talbot, who were in charge of Arbella for some periods of time.⁶

In the first two sonnets dedicated to her, Constable decided to praise the young Arbella chiefly for her intellectual

⁵ He had already been to France, Italy, Poland and probably Germany and the Low Countries by this time (Sullivan 2004).

⁶ Gilbert Talbot was Constable’s second cousin on his father’s side. Mary was Arbella’s maternal aunt; therefore Constable and the young candidate to the throne were related.

accomplishments. Significantly, no reference is made to her physiognomy. According to Durant, “had Arbella been a court beauty, many flatterers would have told us so.” The French ambassador called her “sufficiently handsome in the face, which really was no compliment at all” (1978: 50). She probably was not physically outstanding by the standards of her age. However, all biographers agree –grounding their assessment on courtly letters and reports– that she was given the education of a queen, as her grandmother expected her to become nothing less. Arbella’s uncle, Charles Cavendish, wrote in a letter to his mother that “Lord Burghley had spoken to Sir Walter Raleigh ‘greatly in hir commendation’, saying that she could speak Italian and French, played instruments, danced and sewed beautifully, and ‘wished she weare 15 years old’” (Steen 1994: 20). Gristwood gives a more detailed account of this upbringing in her biography of Arbella, noting how “there was [...] a tradition of female learning in Arbella’s family [...]”. She was related to many of the ‘learned ladies’ of the day” (2004: 76). Lady Lennox, her grandmother, had written poetry, and her cousins, the daughters of the Talbots –Elizabeth, Mary and Alethea– became published authors (2004: 77). Other contemporaries such as Sir John Harington praised her education, her musical taste, her skill for languages and the contrasting “sobriety in her fashion of apparel and behaviour” (2004: 74).

This line of praise is condensed in the comparison Constable establishes between Arbella and Vittoria Colonna, Marchioness of Pescara (1490-1547), in the sonnet “That worthie Marquesse pride of Italie” (Grundy 1960: 148).⁷ This Italian gentlewoman wrote most of her poetry (*Rime spirituali*) after the death of her husband, and in her works she expressed her longing for a reunion with him. Pietro Bembo, Michelangelo, Baldassare Castiglione and other reputed artists of the time were among her literary friends, and she was also on intimate terms with many Italian Protestants. Numerous sonnets were written in her memory when she died.

Constable had been in Italy before 1588 and his acquaintance with this gentlewoman’s writings most likely date from that time. He emphasises the “worth”, “wit and phrase” of the Italian lady in the first half of the octave:

⁷ All quotations from Constable’s sonnets have been taken from this edition.

That worthie Marquesse pride of Italie
Whoe for all worth and for her wit and phrase
Both best deserv'd, and best desert could prayse
Immortall Ladie is reviu'd in thee. (1-4)

He then proposes that Arbella's true worth can only be assessed by comparing her with this real woman of immense talent, instead of likening her to a goddess:

But thinke not strange that thy divinitie
I by some goddesse title doe not blaze:
But through a woemans name thy glorie rayse,
For things vnlike of vnlike prayses be. (5-8)

He explains the choice of this comparison in the first half of the sestet, and finally states that, since Arbella's talents are beyond description, this sonnet can convey but an "earthly shadow" of her worth. Her qualities, he concludes, render her closer to heaven than to earth:

When we prayse men we call them gods, but when
We speake of gods we liken them to men:
Not them to prayse, but only them to knowe.
Not able thee to prayse, my drift was this:
Some earthlye shadowe of thy worth to showe,
Whose heauenly selfe aboue worlds reason is. (9-14)

In the sonnet following, "Only hope of oure age" (Grundy 1960: 149) he goes a step further and provides a more detailed account of Arbella's qualities of mind. Illustrating what the aforementioned courtiers had said or written about her, he begins by praising her fondness for learning in the first quatrain:

Only hope of oure age that vertues dead
By youre sweet breath should be reviu'd againe,
Learning discourag'd longe by rude disdaine
By youre white hands is only cherished. (1-4)

She is presented as the exception in a scenario in which learning has been long neglected, and the ambiguous placement of the word "only" helps the poet suggest both that she does not care about material things and that she is the only one truly preoccupied with learning. The motif of borrowing is then introduced in order to claim that those who want to praise her must borrow some of her own poetic genius as the only way to do it properly:

Thus others worth by yow is honoured:
But whoe shall honoure youres? poore wits in vayne
We seeke to pay the debts which yow pertayne
Till from youre self some wealth be borrowed. (5-8)

Among her many talents, the poet highlights her skill for languages –probably one of the traits that drew the attention of her contemporaries– and other intellectual gifts:

Lend some youre tongues that euery nation may
In his owne heare youre vertuose prayes blaz'd:
Lend them youre wit, youre iudgement, memorye,
Least they themselves should not knowe what to say. (9-12)

He and other wits are but debtors to Arbella: they cannot praise her properly without borrowing her talent. He concludes, likewise, that those who want to love her as well must borrow the poet's heart, which is now in Arbella's hands:

And that thow must be lou'd as much as prays'd
My hearte thow mayst lend them, which I gaue thee. (13-14)

This ending adds a courtly expression of devotion which appears to be fairly conventional, as there is certainly no evidence of any romantic attachment between them. Arthur F. Marotti notes that "for [...] courtier poets, poems were an extension of artful, polite behavior and, at the same time, ways of formulating actual or wished-for social transactions" (1995: 9). The use of the language of love, exemplified in the last lines of this poem, related to the "culturally central issues of ambition, and social status" (1982: 397). Therefore, in the same way that many courtiers used conventional expressions of love to address the Queen in a quest for service and preferment, Constable tries to present his suit for patronage by turning Arbella into his mistress.⁸

Although it cannot be proved that Arbella wrote poetry, since no texts have been preserved, Steen argues that she was a "woman of letters", and she left abundant correspondence that was praised even by contemporary readers; one of them wrote: "she hath left a very well Enameld Picture of her self drawn by her own pen,

⁸ Constable also addressed three poems to the Queen at the beginning of section two using these same conventions. In fact, he repeatedly addressed every lady of rank to whom he dedicated a sonnet as a potential mistress, seeking social promotion and financial reward in return.

wherein equal Commendation is to be given to the Easiness of stile, and the quickness of her invention and phancy" (1994: 7). That Constable should focus on Arbella's intellectual accomplishments in these two sonnets, without even alluding to her lineage or rank, is significant. It not only adds value to his praise of her education, suggesting that it is the most valuable of all her high attributes; it also helps the author to draw a subtle link between him and the young lady, emphasising the fact that they are both writers, united by their love of poetry and learning.

Before proceeding to the third poem, which is set apart from the first two, wider discussion must be given to the political manoeuvres in which Constable was involved, in order to understand the importance of his sonnets. Constable was abroad in 1587, probably serving under the Earl of Leicester in the Low Countries (Grundy 1960: 24); he even wrote a pamphlet in early 1588 in which he condemns the attitudes of some Catholics during the course of the war, and makes a favourable assessment of Leicester's actions.⁹ His loyalty to Leicester extended to his stepson, Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, and Constable soon became a member of his circle. Essex was by this time the Queen's new favourite, and his influence at court made him a central figure in the intrigues surrounding the succession. It seems reasonable to infer, therefore, that Constable's movements and bids for patronage must have been affected by Essex's position.

There is evidence of Essex and Arbella's acquaintance dating from 1588; some biographers agree that they became friends: when Arbella was in trouble after publicly showing her pride and arousing the anger of some courtiers, Essex appeared and spoke up in her support (Gristwood 2004: 105; Lovell 2006: 355-356).¹⁰ Gristwood believes that he was only interested in defending her status, as "it is

⁹ *A short view of a large examination of Cardinall Allen his trayterous justification of Sir W. Stanley and Yorck, written by Mr H. Const., and this gathered out of his own draught.* Extracts of this pamphlet are preserved in a commonplace book in the Marsh Library, Dublin (Grundy 1960: 24).

¹⁰ As all the ladies and princesses went to chapel one day, Arbella claimed first place without the consent of the master of ceremonies –even though she probably deserved it by her rank–, angering everyone, including the Queen (Gristwood 2004: 103). Lovell adds that the Earl of Essex "came to Arbella's aid by 'saluting' her publicly when people stood aghast at such arrogance" (2006: 356).

hard to envisage a man more sure to be chivalrously sympathetic towards Arbella's attempt to claim pre-eminence as a princess of the blood" (2004: 105).¹¹ Other biographers emphasise that this friendly attitude angered the Queen, who was jealous of her favourites; it even elicited rumours of a possible affair later in 1592, which according to Lovell were always angrily denied by Arbella (2006: 386). They seem to have remained friends until Essex's death (Lovell 2006: 386) and, even after that, Arbella remembered the earl with gratitude. Norrington quotes a fragment from a letter written by her in 1603:

And were I unthankfully forgetful if I should not remember my noble friend, who graced me, by her Majesty's commandment disgraced orphan, unfound ward, unproved prisoner, undeserved exile, in his greatest and happiest fortunes, to the adventure of eclipsing part of her Majesty's favours from him, which were so dear, so welcome to him? (2002: 68)

Despite his support for Arbella, Essex endorsed James of Scotland's candidature for the succession. Essex's first letters to James date from 1598, but much earlier he had assured the monarch of his loyalty. In 1589, Constable went on an errand to Scotland as part of "an intrigue to secure James VI's favour for the Earl of Essex" (Grundy 1960: 28). On October 29, Burghley's spies in Edinburgh reported that Constable had had meetings with the king, presenting to him letters and portraits of Penelope Rich, Essex's sister, and some other ladies of the Court. Grundy argues that "he had assured James that the friendship and alliance between Arbella and him did not lessen his loyalty to him" (1960: 29). It seems likely that this mission was motivated by a belief that Elizabeth would not live much longer, and the prominent men at court wanted to secure their positions in case James succeeded –and as time went by it was taken for granted he would.¹² At this moment, however, James was busy enough with the preparations for his marriage, and Fowler, Burghley's intelligencer, told his master: "the best is Victor [James's code name]

¹¹ Lovell enumerates a series of personality traits that both Arbella and Essex shared, "both seeking great store by their noble birth, both erudite, both with a streak of hysteria never far below the surface, both potentially self-destructive, both all too apt, when things went wrong, to hurl wild accusations at a third party" (2006: 386).

¹² Fowler wrote that Penelope and Essex were giving "the poor king to hope for hap shortly, and that her majesty could not live above a year or two" (Varlow 2007: 113).

regards not their offers much" (Varlow 2007: 114-115). Nevertheless, as Varlow promptly adds: "Penelope's friendly overtures paid off handsomely. Essex was James's most trusted ally for the next decade" (2007: 115).

Taking into account these complex circumstances, Essex and Constable's familiarity with Arbella might have been politically convenient, as Arbella might yet become queen or reach a position of power through a marital alliance, even while they were intriguing to further James's claim. No official heir to the throne had been named, and securing a double allegiance made sense because uncertainty surrounded the whole issue of succession. Seeking her favour was therefore far from superfluous.

It was precisely Arbella's royal blood and her potential that motivated the composition of the third sonnet, very different in subject matter from the two that have been discussed. "My Mistrisse worth gave wings unto my Muse" (Grundy 1960: 179) is the very last poem in the Todd MS; it follows a "Conclusion of the whole" that includes a brief prose text in which Constable explains that he has decided to stop writing "vayne poems" and that he wants to "employe the remnant of wit to other calmer thoughts" (Grundy 1960: 178). The title, added to the sonnet by the manuscript compiler, reads as follows: "To the divine protection of the Ladie Arbella the author commendeth both his Graces honoure and his Muses aeternitye." As the actual conclusion to the selection of Constable's works in the MS, this poem must have been composed and added somewhat later than the other two. Since those were written around 1588 and, according to Grundy, "by the end of 1590 [...] Constable's secular sonnets were probably all written, and the definitive collection represented by the Todd MS made or about to be made" (1960: 33), this last sonnet may have been written between 1589 and early 1591.

The aim of the poem, as the title in the manuscript indicates, is to dedicate the whole work to Arbella, probably in order to give her a copy as a gift. This is made clear in line 5, in which the poet mentions "this booke which heare you may peruse." The importance of presenting manuscript copies of poems to people of rank in search of patronage has been emphasised by scholars such as Marotti and Jason Scott-Warren. The presentation of a copy was a "unique", prestigious gift in the context of patronage relations, something that

could not be performed as successfully in print (Scott-Warren 2005: 56). Manuscript circulation was preferred by “genteel, aristocratic or upwardly mobile individuals” to ensure that restricted readerships received their poetical texts (Marotti 2007: 16). Circulation and repeated modification enabled Constable and his contemporaries to rededicate whole series of poems to different personages.¹³

The poet and Arbella could hardly have met in 1591: Constable left England in the summer and Arbella was not back at court (after a three-year absence) until October the same year. However, it is very likely that this final sonnet was composed at this time. During her previous visits Arbella had “been played by the queen as a diplomatic card” (Durant 1978: 54), and the third visit was not an exception. In 1591, the marriage negotiations with the Duke of Parma –concerning the match between his son Rainutio Farnese and Arbella– were resumed with renewed emphasis.¹⁴ Rainutio’s mother was descended from John of Gaunt, son of Edward III; as Durant notes, “this remote claim added to Arbella’s undoubted right would have made the marriage acceptable to England” (1978: 43). Cecil, through his spy network, offered Parma a separate principedom in the Netherlands and of course, the certainty of having his son crowned king of England. Since this moment was “the nearest that Arbella ever came to a throne” (Durant 1978: 64), it makes sense that Constable should decide to dedicate a copy of his book to her.

The title of this final sonnet, in which the poet commends his “Grace’s honour” to Arbella’s protection, gives readers an important clue: Arbella is not the “Mistrisse” (line 1) for whom Constable has suffered; the name Grace may refer to Grace Talbot, Bess of Hardwick’s daughter-in-law. Other poems in the sequence allude to this lady, and she probably was either “Diana” or a later love to whom the sonnets were rededicated. In the sonnet Arbella is regarded merely as a protector –all praise is taken for granted– given her social status and royal blood.

¹³ It is interesting to note that the collection in the Todd MS begins with the sonnet “Grace full of grace”, entitled “To his Mistrisse”, in which Constable claims to dedicate the sequence to a lady, probably Grace Talbot, and ends with this rededication to Arbella.

¹⁴ These negotiations had begun in 1587, at the time of Arbella’s first appearance at court, but were interrupted by the war with Spain (Durant 1978: 41).

The conceit of the poem revolves around the idea of flying like a bird:

My Mistrisse worth gaue wings vnto my Muse
And my Muse wings did giue vnto her name
So like twin byrds my Muse bred with her fame
Together now doe learne theyre wings to vse. (1-4)

In these first lines the poet establishes a connection between his Muse, or the inspiration that has led him to write the sonnets, and his lady, whom he has given fame; both of them are “twin birds” ready to fly. The metaphor continues:

And in this book which heare you may peruse
Abroad they fly resolu’d to try the same. (5-6)

And it is in lines 7 and 8 that Constable manifests his desire for protection:

Adventure in theyre flight, and thee sweet dame
Both she and I for oure protectoure chuse.

“She” is once again the poet’s mistress.

Line 9 has clear socio-political allusions; the speaker states why he and Grace dare ask for this support:

I by my vow and she by farther right
Vnder your Phoenix [wing] presume to flye. (9-10)

According to Tom Parker, “by my vow” indicates that “possibly he had sworn some kind of political allegiance to her, for in 1589 it had been necessary to convince King James that his loyalty was in no doubt.” He adds that “Grace’s presence under the wing is allowed by ‘farther right’ which [...] may allude to their family connection, possibly with a pun on ‘father’ –Grace’s father had married Arbella’s grandmother” (1998: 162). In the lines following, Arbella’s “wing” or protection is a shelter, a defence against the birds that feed on dead animals; this term may be referring to those people who wish –or do– Constable and his mistress harm, by tarnishing their reputation:

That from all carrion beakes in saftie might
By one same wing be shrouded she and I.
O happie if I might but flitter there
Where you and she and I should be so neare. (11-14)

Mary Lovell describes Grace's husband Henry Cavendish as a man who spent little time with his wife, travelled extensively, and did not care about perpetuating the dynasty; in fact, he fathered numerous bastards. She remarks that "he once stormed at his wife before their servants that she was a harlot, which seems extremely unlikely behaviour for this mild-mannered, thoroughly dutiful woman" (2006: 489). Therefore, Grace may have had to suffer the slanders derived from her husband's unfaithfulness. This may have prompted the poet to appeal to Arbella to defend Grace's honour.

Besides the search for patronage or protection, which was customary among poets at court, there is one issue that adds some interest to this last sonnet under discussion. Constable had converted to Catholicism by the year 1590, and in 1591 he spoke of it publicly, becoming an exile in France. Religion was obviously a central, and controversial, issue in the debate on the succession. The author of a book printed in Antwerp in 1594 entitled *A Conference about the Next Succession to the Crowne of England*, presents his views on the matter by stating that Arbella's religion was "no great motive, either against her or for her", being "tender green and flexible yet, as is her age and sex" (quoted in Gristwood 2004: 145). Arbella's family, the Lennoxes, were Catholics and, according to Handover, "it was to be a turning point of Arbella's career when she was removed, by the death of her father and paternal grandmother, from Catholic influences before she was three years old" and raised as a Protestant (1957: 59). After the execution of Mary Queen of Scots in 1587, Arbella's religion became a crucial subject indeed. Handover argues that, "had she ever declared herself a Catholic she would have attracted support from Catholics at home and abroad" (1957: 73). However, it was generally thought she inclined to Catholicism, and English Catholics preferred her to James. Constable doubtlessly knew that his conversion would get him into trouble, and seeking Arbella's protection at this time was a reasonable move. At the same time, though, he kept in touch with friends and powerful men like Essex, in an attempt to continue serving his country "as far as was consistent with his religion" (Grundy 1960: 39).

After the Farnese marriage negotiations failed in late 1592, Arbella was locked up –lest she were kidnapped or involved herself in an inconvenient marriage– and no longer considered a serious

candidate the succession;¹⁵ as Durant puts it, she “was replaced in the limbo where the queen preferred her to be” (1978: 76). However, at the time of the writing of these sonnets, Constable was a courtier with no title or high position of his own, and he did his best to secure the protection of those who were powerful. His career as Essex’s emissary and supporter could grant him not only the friendship of a considerably large faction of the court, but also the sympathies of James, the favourite candidate for succession, to whom he also addressed some sonnets. His poems to Arbella probably sprung from blood ties and friendly attachment, and evolve from literary praise into a similar plea for patronage, in the hope that her high status will ensure that she remains a powerful woman at court –if not queen.

References

- Bruce, John 1861. *Correspondence of King James VI of Scotland*. London: Camden Society.
- Croft, J. Pauline 2002. *Patronage, Culture, and Power: The Early Cecils*. New Haven, Conn.-London: Published for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art, the Yale Center for British Art [by] Yale University Press.
- Durant, David N. 1978. *Arbella Stuart*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Gristwood, Sarah 2004. *Arbella: England’s Lost Queen*. London: Bantam.
- Grundy, Joan, ed. 1960. *The Poems of Henry Constable*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Handover, Phyllis Margaret 1957. *Arbella Stuart, Royal Lady of Hardwick and Cousin to King James*. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode.
- Lovell, Mary S. 2006. *Bess of Hardwick: First Lady of Chatsworth*. London: Abacus.
- Marienstras, Richard 1985. *New Perspectives on the Shakespearean World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marotti, Arthur F. 1982. “‘Love is not Love’: Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences and the Social Order.” *ELH* 49/2: 396-428.
- Marotti, Arthur F. 1995. *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

¹⁵ Philip II started to suspect the Duke of Parma, either because he had heard rumours or because the latter’s reluctance to fight in France alarmed him, and decided that a new general must be sent to Flanders to replace him. The Duke died in December 1592 (Handover 1957: 96).

- Marotti, Arthur F. 2007. "Print, Manuscripts, and Miscellanies." Eds. Patrick Cheney, Andrey Hadfield and Garret A. Sullivan Jr. *Early Modern English Poetry. A Critical Companion*. New York: Oxford University Press: 15-26.
- Norrington, Ruth 2002. *In the Shadow of the Throne: The Lady Arbella Stuart*. London: Peter Owen.
- Parker, Tom W.N. 1998. *Proportional Form in the Sonnets of the Sidney Circle: Loving in Truth*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Scott-Warren, Jason 2005. *Early Modern English Literature*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Steen, Sara Jayne 1994. *The Letters of Lady Arbella Stuart*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sullivan, Ceri 2004. "Constable, Henry (1562-1613)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Varlow, Sally 2007. *The Lady Penelope: The Lost Tale of Love and Politics in the Court of Elizabeth I*. London: Andre Deutsch.

How to cite this note:

Pérez Jáuregui, M^a Jesús. "Henry Constable's sonnets to Arbella Stuart." *SEDERI* 19 (2009): 189-202

Author's contact: jauregui@us.es

Submission: 07/10/2008

Acceptance: 14/12/2008

Tres tragedias de venganza: teatro renacentista inglés
2006. Ed., intr. & transl. José Ramón Díaz Fernández.
Madrid: Gredos
(Biblioteca Universal Gredos, 46)

Juan Antonio Prieto Pablos
University of Sevilla

This edition, though officially published in 2006, was not available for sale until sometime later. It thus stands as an illustration of two contradictory situations: on the one hand, it must be regarded as a very worthy contribution to the spread of English Renaissance drama in the Spanish-speaking world; on the other, it evinces a certain lack of enthusiasm by the publisher –something to be particularly lamented when the publishing house is none other than Gredos. Their series “Biblioteca Clásica” and “Biblioteca Románica Hispánica” have enjoyed a long and highly respectable reputation and have been a regular reference in philological studies, and its offshoot “Biblioteca Universal” has maintained similar levels of quality since its inception in 2002. Sadly, RBA’s absorption of Gredos seems to have brought in new preferences and interests that bode not well for the continuation of Gredos’s traditional policy.

José Ramón Díaz Fernández has indeed provided a welcome addition to the still very limited catalogue of Spanish translations of English drama. In this book, he offers his own translations of Thomas Kyd’s *The Spanish Tragedy* (as *La tragedia española*), John Webster’s *The Duchess of Malfi* (*La duquesa de Amalfi*, introducing the Spanish toponym in its title) and John Ford’s *’Tis Pity She’s a Whore* (*Lástima que sea una ramera*, a rather more mellow option than the cruder *Lástima que sea una puta*, chosen by other editors). All three plays had already been translated into Spanish, but with one single exception (Antonio Ballesteros’ version of Ford’s play, published in 2001), none are readily available. And in all three cases, Díaz Fernández’s versions compare most favourably with the previous

ones. Although most of the dialogues in the original plays are in the typical iambic metre of English Renaissance drama, he has chosen prose instead of verse for his translation; nonetheless, he has managed to offer a remarkably fluent prose that sounds natural and well-suited to Spanish ears, and that could be spoken on the stage with few, if any, adjustments. He has also opted for a felicitous combination of present-day Spanish with a number of standard archaic expressions and grammatical formulas: the occasional occurrence of standard archaic terms (e.g., exclamations like “*pardiez*”; conjunction “*mas*” instead of “*pero*”; nouns like “*galeno*” alternating with “*médico*”) and of simple alterations of word order (e.g., “*Miseros tiempos son estos [...]*”: 184) contributes to anchoring the text in its Renaissance context in an unobtrusive way. Moreover, these limited liberties he has taken do not go together with any other, more tempting, options that could have led to the production of a subjective or personal version. In fact, he offers a translation that is remarkably accurate and faithful to the original, and that reveals both a sound knowledge of sixteenth and seventeenth century English and a thorough research of the specific nuances of the texts and their authors’ stylistic preferences. This can be perceived in particular in those passages requiring polysemic interpretations: in general, Díaz Fernández has managed to maintain these nuances; and on those occasions in which he could not, he refers to the other possible alternatives in footnotes.

The purpose of this edition is not limited to offering Spanish-speaking readers a suitable translation of these three plays: a 44-page Introduction and a good-sized corpus of notes gives them also the opportunity to learn about their composition and the motives that justify their incorporation to the catalogue of English drama classics. The Introduction starts with a brief reference to the place of revenge drama in the general context of Elizabethan and Jacobean drama, and then offers separate sections for each playwright and his work, in which the editor outlines what little is known about the author’s life, describes the main aspects in each plot and refers to each play’s editorial and stage history. From a strictly academic point of view, it is probably not much, and possibly not enough; but this is not meant to be an academic edition. If the kind of readers targeted is considered, the expectations should be set at clarity and accuracy, and these goals are met –as much as the authors and texts permit. Moreover, the introduction ought also to be commended for the

inclusion of references to Spanish drama and present-day popular culture (e.g., the allusion to *Shakespeare in Love* as a point of entry to the description of Webster's life and work) that can help readers better to contextualise these plays. It is only to be noted, by way of the exceptionality of this example, that the editor's eagerness to approximate texts and readers leads him to over-stretch the relationship between Spain and *The Spanish Tragedy* and assert that the play was "con toda seguridad escrita con posterioridad al intento de desembarco de la Armada Invencible, en un momento en el que todo lo relacionado con España se vivía con auténtica expectación en Inglaterra" (49).¹ Although some critics (e.g., Philip Edwards, editor of the Revels version) suggest 1590 as a date of performance, a general consensus establishes a more general segment (1582-1592) that precludes any certainty with regards to any correspondence between the play and the Armada fiasco of 1588.

Not being an academic edition, Díaz Fernández's should not be expected to cover certain other aspects that would have been otherwise requisite. This is particularly the case as regards textual features: for this matter, the editor wisely refers those who might be interested to critical editions (unfortunately for Spanish readers, these critical editions are in English), and simply points out the occurrence of significant textual cruxes, whenever they come out in the text, by means of footnotes (as, for example, when his translation goes into passages that were added in the 1602 edition of *The Spanish Tragedy*; or when he explains that the verses added after the dumb show in 3.4 of *The Duchess of Malfi* were disclaimed by Webster: 263). Nonetheless, an aspect that would have been much welcomed is a more detailed reference to earlier translations (Glantz's *La tragedia española*, Díez Canedo's *La duquesa de Malfi*, the various translations of Ford's play) particularly respecting their comparison with what this edition offers.

The Introduction is complemented with an extensive catalogue of footnotes. This is, in my opinion, an essential ingredient in editions of non-contemporary foreign texts. Díaz Fernández annotates textual variants, and comments on ambiguities, puns and other verbal games. He also adds notes that refer to the immediate

¹ That is, *The Spanish Tragedy* was "most likely written after the defeat of the Armada, at a time when all things concerning Spain aroused the interest of the people in Britain" (my translation).

context of the play's story or production, from a historical perspective (e.g., James I's selling of nobility titles: 255) or from a literary perspective (e.g., in dramatic references to women's silence: 290); points out elements of the plot that have special dramatic relevance (e.g., Andrea's scarf, which will link its first mention by Bel-Imperia to two other episodes: 66); and explains the numerous classical allusions that pepper the plays (sadly, defining the hydra (376) or Ariadne (123) has become more and more requisite in our times). These topics are to be expected, to a very great extent, in critical editions. Much less usual, and therefore the more welcome, is the addition of notes referring to Renaissance stage practice (as, for example, the first note in *La tragedia española*, where the editor notes that the Ghost of Andrea and Revenge probably enter from the stage trap; or his comment on the meaning that a character with a book in his hand would have for English audiences: 327) or to contemporary performance (319 n.81, where he observes that an ambiguous textual crux was resolved in a 2003 performance of *The Duchess of Malfi* by making her ghost appear at the end of 5.2). These notes do not only help clarify specific passages; they also contribute to enhancing the understanding of these texts as not just words on the page, but as words that combine with action on the stage.

As a whole, the notes in Díaz Fernández's edition must be regarded as constituting a thorough corpus, with very little to object to with respect to what is included. What one could find fault with is what is not found; this is a very easy kind of criticism, as there is virtually no limit to what a book like this could have –and annotation is indeed a case in point–, yet it is also too tempting to avoid, and I will indulge and mention a few instances in which I would have appreciated an explanatory note: for example, for the dance called *gallarda* (English *galliard*) (191);² for the close connection between the Geneva Bible and the Calvinists (284), which would have contributed to marking out the speaker as a Puritan sympathiser in *La duquesa de Amalfi*; or for the stage direction “Lo cuelgan del emparrado” (87: “They hang him in the arbour” in the original text of *The Spanish Tragedy*), which has aroused much critical discussion on the type of stage property used in early Elizabethan

² It might be argued that this definition can be found in the DRAE; but Díaz Fernández does add a note for another dance, the pavana (346), which has not the same potential for ambiguity as the gallarda (191).

productions. These missed notes must be regarded also as representing others of similar nature (lexical, cultural, dramatic) that could have improved the work, had they been included. But I suspect that specific editorial restrictions (namely, by the publisher, or by the editor himself) must have contributed to putting a limit to the number of notes that could be added. Still, some other omissions are not so understandable; and one fails to find a reason for the exclusion of prefatory material in *The Duchess of Malfi* and *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*, found both in the original editions and in the modern critical editions used by Díaz Fernández.

To conclude, *Tres tragedias de venganza* offers Spanish-speaking readers a very good opportunity to familiarise themselves with three classic plays and with the context which produced them. And its editor, José Ramón Díaz Fernández, facilitates this by providing a suitable amount of information alongside with the translations, a combination that proves both the extent of his abilities as a translator and the thoroughness of his research.

References

- Ford, John 2001. *Lástima que sea una puta*. Ed. and trans. Antonio Ballesteros González. Madrid: Publicaciones de la Asociación de Directores de Escena de España.
- Kyd, Thomas 1977. *The Spanish Tragedy*. Ed. Philip Edwards. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

How to cite this review:

Prieto Pablos, Juan Antonio. Review of *Tres tragedias de venganza: teatro renacentista inglés* by José Ramón Díaz Fernández. *SEDERI* 19 (2009): 205-209.

Author's contact: ppablos@us.es

Ángel-Luis Pujante and Laura Campillo eds. 2007.
Shakespeare en España: Textos 1764-1916.
Murcia-Granada: Universidad de Murcia-Universidad
de Granada

Jesús Tronch Pérez
University of Valencia

The literature on Shakespeare in Spain has a relatively long and fruitful tradition. As far back as 1874, a German article on *Hamlet* in Spain by Caroline Michaëlis was issued in *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*. In 1883, Daniel López published a nine-page documented survey with the title “Shakespeare en España”, covering up to Villalta’s 1838 translation of *Macbeth*, in *La Ilustración Española y Americana*. In 1916, the tercentenary of the death of Shakespeare and Cervantes stimulated publications on the subject. Julià Martínez included an appendix on “Shakespeare en España” in his fictionalized biography *Shakespeare y su tiempo* (1916), but he produced a more ambitious monograph for the award given by the Real Academia Española to reciprocate the commemoration of Cervantes in Britain (Pujante 2007: xlv). Julià’s work, published in 1918, focused on translations and on Shakespeare’s influence on Spanish literature. A book by Ruppert y Ujaravi with the same title followed in 1920; and in the 1930s, Alfonso Par, perhaps the most dedicated of the Spanish Shakespeareans, surpassed these preceding works with his bibliographical compilation (1930), his monumental two-volume study of Shakespeare in Spanish (and Catalan) literature (1935), and his two-volume catalogue of theatre productions up to 1900 in Madrid and Barcelona (1936 and 1940).

The topic continued to be of interest in articles and monographs after the Civil War (Entrambasaguas 1939; Thomas 1949; FitzGerald 1951), and as English Studies was consolidated as a university degree in Spain, it was taken on by academics (Pujals 1985; Serrano 1987). In 1993, J. M. González published *Shakespeare en España: crítica, traducciones y representaciones* containing (besides

personal contributions by translators, theater directors and players) survey articles on Spanish criticism on Shakespeare (Pérez Gállego, Dañoibeitia, López Roman), on Shakespeare in the Spanish university (Shaw), Shakespeare in Basque (Mendiguren), on theatre productions in Seville (Martínez Velasco), in Galicia (Alonso and González) and in Madrid and Barcelona (Mas Congost), and a Spanish bibliography on Shakespeare (Escribano and Dañoibeitia). Further reception studies of Shakespeare in Spain have increased since then, although focusing more narrowly on specific aspects or periods of the Shakespearean presence in Spain: translations (Verdaguer 1999; Zaro 2001; Campillo 2005; Pujol 2007; Buffery 2007), presence in Spanish literature (Argelli 1997), and theatre productions (Portillo and Salvador 2003; Buffery 2007, and several authors compiled in González and Klein 2002 and in González 2006), and on examining this presence in the larger European context (Portillo and Gómez-Lara 1994). This is precisely the aim of a series of research projects at the University of Murcia, directed by Ángel-Luis Pujante (<http://www.um.es/shakespeare>), one of whose outstanding fruits is the work under review.

Among the contributions to reception studies of Shakespeare in Spain summarized above, Pujante and Campillo's *Shakespeare en España: Textos 1764-1916* is unique in being an ample and well-assorted annotated anthology of 114 pieces of criticism on the Bard by Spanish (or Spain-related) writers within the indicated period. The bulk of the compilation is preceded by a preliminary note (xv-xviii), and a 37-page "Introducción" (signed by Ángel-Luis Pujante, also author of the footnotes and translations), and is followed by an appendix (423-485), a chronology of Shakespeare's works (487-441), a bibliography (493-506), and an index (507-519). Whereas Alfonso Par's 1935 precedent provided readers with a rather critical history from Par's particular viewpoint, Pujante and Campillo's compilation, by offering transcriptions of the texts themselves, accompanied by footnotes and by succinct but informative introductions, allows readers to mould their own view of the development of Spanish criticism on Shakespeare along the evolution of literary tastes in Spain. Only occasionally, and sometimes confusingly and inaccurately, did Par provide quotations from his primary material, and his critical voice prevailed throughout. In the present anthology, only footnotes and short introductions contain a critical view, as when Pujante criticizes Joan

Maragall's idealist view of Fortinbrass (364, footnote 42). The book will quickly strike the Shakespearean scholar as a Spanish counterpart of Brian Vicker's *Shakespeare: The Critical Heritage*.¹ In this respect, Pujante and Campillo's title may be a little misleading since "textos" also suggests translations, theatre adaptations or literary offshoots whereas the anthology limits itself to critical appraisals. Of course, this is clarified in the preliminary "Advertencia", which after giving due credit to Julià, Ruppert and Par, justifies the decisions on the selected material.

As for the chronological span of 1764-1916, I found it a wise decision to cover this period from the earliest recorded criticism to just before the time extended monographs on the topic of Shakespeare in Spain began to be published (Pujante and Campillo 2007: xv). In all, the book is over 500 pages long with some material necessarily left out. As for this selection, the anthology stands out for its breadth and for the rightness of its choices. Not only does it include works for their historical relevance, but also minor pieces that have a documentary value of their own. As well as critical articles or essays the collection brings together all kinds of texts that contain a piece of criticism, such as notes, observations and comments by writers (Benito Pérez Galdós, Joan Maragall), journalists (José de Armas), actors (Ernesto Rossi) and politicians (Antonio Cánovas del Castillo). The selection shows that the editors' conception of "en España" is neither restricted to Spanish nationals (they include the above-mentioned Cuban journalist José de Armas and Italian actor Rossi)² nor to Spanish-speaking texts (Blanco White's writings in English are included, as are Italian writings by Spanish Jesuits and Catalan writings such as those by Alfonso Par and Eugeni D'Ors). The latter are anthologized in Spanish translations.

Pujante and Campillo have not only limited themselves to providing full or more extended quotations of those critics Par, Julià

¹ A similar anthology, but compiling prefaces and notes of translators into Catalan, preceded by an introductory study on the reception of Shakespeare in Europe and on a historical survey of Shakespeare and Catalan translators, is Dídac Pujol's *Traduir Shakespeare: les reflexions dels traductors catalans* (2007).

² Strictly speaking, translations of non-Spanish works, such as those by Victor Hugo (1887) and Turgenev (1894), also constituted significant contributions to the dissemination and reception of Shakespeare in Spain.

and Ruppert recorded (e.g. Francisco Xavier Lampillas or Narciso Campillo y Correo) but have contributed with authors and pieces not even mentioned by their predecessors (such as José Joaquín de Escartín or Ricardo Blanco Asenjo with his articles “Hamlet y Segismundo” and “Cervantes y Shakespeare (23 de abril de 1616)”), which denotes very welcomed fresh research. As in any anthology, the specialist may miss a piece (for instance, G. Romo’s praise for Shakespeare in a comparison with Corneille published in *Memorial Literario* (1804), the leading journal of criticism at that time; see Menéndez y Pelayo (1974: 1348)), but this will not impair the readers’ image of Shakespeare in Spain through its critical heritage. If one misses the article “Reflexiones sobre el teatro inglés” by Joseph Calderón de la Barca, then editor of the journal, at least this author and the journal are represented in a pithier essay comparing Lope and Shakespeare (33-34; Calderón 1796). Although Pujante and Campillo explain their exclusion of Eduardo Benot’s “impersonal and acritical” introduction to the collected translations by Guillermo Macpherson (xvi), I particularly regret this omission since his originality has at least as much documentary value as the Voltaire-parroted comments by earlier critics. As some of the pieces are too long (such as Moratín’s edition of *Hamlet*, Blanco White’s writings, Guillermo Macpherson’s prologues or Aurelio Pereira’s *Shakespeare y Calderón*), the editors’ necessary cutting is well-chosen, some of the sections focusing on related issues (such as views of Othello, contrast with Spanish Golden Age authors) so that readers can compare different attitudes from various authors.

In the collection of texts, presented in chronological order, one can appreciate a conscientious effort to produce accurate editions (barring the modernization of spelling, the few samples I have compared have proved to be error-free except in minor “typos” that, hopefully, will be corrected in the announced online version),³ and to annotate the texts explaining references and correcting mistakes (such as when Calderón de la Barca states that Shakespeare was buried at Westminster (33)). The editors have even located and checked the originals of the quotations made by the anthologized authors. One can imagine that even a brief introduction on the author’s background or a small footnote clarifying a reference must

³ Available in Google Books with limited preview. See also “Online Publications” at <<http://www.um.es/shakespeare/eng/>>.

have needed painstaking hours of research. The footnotes and introductions are aimed at both a specialist and non-specialist readership, and are also interrelated, giving not only cohesion but also providing readers with a helpful overview. The editors' punctiliousness is also observed in an appendix offering the original texts in Italian, English and Catalan. All this denotes a remarkable work of editorship.

Ángel-Luis Pujante's "Introducción" graces the book with a well-informed and instructive survey of Shakespearean criticism in Spain, offering explanations for the way Shakespeare was introduced and received (and not only by critics but also referring to translations and performances), contrasting the situation in Spain with that in other European countries and signalling the distinctive features of the Spanish reception of Shakespeare, especially the comparison between Shakespeare and Spanish classical authors, from Lope and Calderón to Cervantes. After the texts and their appendix, the volume includes an eye-friendly table containing a chronology of Shakespeare's works, with dates basically taken from the chronology proposed by Taylor (1987), with titles both in English and translated into Spanish (some with alternative translations), and with a genre adscription.⁴ Another welcome feature is the index allowing readers to easily spot commentaries on a specific Shakespeare play or by a given author.

All this makes *Shakespeare en España: Textos 1764-1916* not only an example of the excellent research carried out by the Murcia Shakespeareans, in this case Ángel-Luis Pujante and Laura Campillo, but also an invaluable service and a "must" for those studying the presence of Shakespeare in Spain. For Spanish criticism on the Bard, Par will no longer be the main reference and the interest of his work will mainly lie in his personal appraisals of the Shakespearean critics. And many a visit to, or loan from, the Biblioteca Nacional, or the Biblioteca de Catalunya, or the library of the Institut del Teatre, or the Biblioteca Histórica Municipal de Madrid will be saved. Pujante and Campillo deserve a big "thank you".

⁴ Oddly enough, the adscription ventures to classify the lost play Cardenio as a tragicomedy, on a par with not only *The Tempest* and other late comedies but also with *Measure for Measure*, *Troilus and Cressida* and *All's Well*.

References

- Alonso, Eduardo and Mercedes González 1993. "Adaptaciones y Montajes de Shakespeare en Galicia." Ed. J. M. González Fernández de Sevilla. *Shakespeare en España: Crítica, Traducciones y Representaciones*. Alicante-Zaragoza: Universidad de Alicante-Pórtico: 379-405.
- Argelli, Annalisa 1997. *La Presencia de Shakespeare en la Literatura Española de los Siglos XVIII y XIX. Cuatro Dramas Ejemplares: Hamlet, Romeo and Juliet, Othello y Macbeth*. Diss. Universidad Autónoma de Madrid. Microfiche. Madrid: Ediciones de la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.
- Benot, Eduardo 1885. "Estudio Preliminar." Trans. Guillermo Macpherson. *Obras dramáticas de Guillermo Shakespeare*. Vol.1. Biblioteca Clásica vol. 80. Madrid: Luis Navarro.
- Buffery, Helena 2007. *Shakespeare in Catalan: Translating Imperialism*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Calderón de la Barca, Joseph 1796. "Carta Apologética en Defensa de Fr. D. Félix Lope de Vega Carpio y Otros Cómicos Españoles." *Memorial Literario* Dec: 350-410.
- Calderón de la Barca, Joseph 1797. "Reflexiones sobre el Teatro inglés. Tragedia". *Memorial Literario*.
- Campillo Arnaiz, Laura 2005. "Estudio de los Elementos Culturales en las Obras de Shakespeare y sus Traducciones al Español por Macpherson, Astrana y Valverde." Diss. University of Murcia.
- Dañobeitia, María Luisa 1993. "Una Visión Actualizada de la Crítica Shakespeariana en España." Ed. J. M. González Fernández de Sevilla. *Shakespeare en España: Crítica, Traducciones y Representaciones*. Alicante-Zaragoza: Universidad de Alicante-Pórtico: 119-136.
- Entrambasaguas, José 1939. "En Torno a Shakespeare en España." *La Determinación del Romanticismo en España*. Barcelona: Apolo: 71-82.
- Escribano, Javier Sánchez and María Luisa Dañobeitia 1993. "Bibliografía Española de William Shakespeare." Ed. J. M. González Fernández de Sevilla. *Shakespeare en España: Crítica, Traducciones y Representaciones*. Alicante-Zaragoza: Universidad de Alicante-Pórtico: 469-497.
- FitzGerald, Thomas A 1951. "Shakespeare in Spain and Spanish America." *The Modern Language Journal* 35.8: 589-594.
- González Fernández de Sevilla, José Manuel ed. 1993. *Shakespeare en España: Crítica, Traducciones y Representaciones*. Alicante-Zaragoza: Universidad de Alicante-Pórtico.
- González Fernández de Sevilla, José Manuel, and Holger Klein eds. 2002. *Shakespeare and Spain. Shakespeare Yearbook Vol. 13*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press.

- González, José Manuel ed. 2006. *Spanish Studies in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*. Newark: University of Delaware Press.
- Hugo, Victor 1887 (1864). *Guillermo Shakespeare. Obras Completas de Victor Hugo*. Vol. 4. Trans. Jacinto Labaila. Valencia: Terraza, Aliena y Compañía. Barcelona: F. Seix ed, 1906; and trans. Antonio Aura Boronat. Valencia: F. Sempere y Comp^a, [1909].
- Juliá Martínez, Eduardo 1916. *Shakespeare y su Tiempo: Historia y Fantasía*. Illus. Federico Avrial. Madrid: Imprenta Renacimiento.
- Juliá Martínez, Eduardo 1918. *Shakespeare en España: Traducciones, Imitaciones e Influencia de las Obras de Shakespeare en la Literatura Española*. Madrid: Tipografía de la Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos.
- López Roman, Blanca 1993. "Biografías Españolas de Shakespeare." Ed. J. M. González Fernández de Sevilla. *Shakespeare en España: Crítica, Traducciones y Representaciones*. Alicante-Zaragoza: Universidad de Alicante-Pórtico: 137-57.
- López, Daniel 1883. "Shakespeare en España." *La Ilustración Española y Americana* 8, 15, 22 and 30 Jul., and 8 Aug.: 10-11, 22, 46, 58, 74.
- Martínez Velasco, Julio 1993. "Representaciones del Teatro de Shakespeare en Sevilla desde 1930." Ed. J. M. González Fernández de Sevilla. *Shakespeare en España: Crítica, Traducciones y Representaciones*. Alicante-Zaragoza: Universidad de Alicante-Pórtico: 341-378.
- Mas Congost, Juan Carlos 1993. "Shakespeare en la Cartelera de Madrid y Barcelona, 1960-1992." Ed. J. M. González Fernández de Sevilla. *Shakespeare en España: Crítica, Traducciones y Representaciones*. Alicante-Zaragoza: Universidad de Alicante-Pórtico: 499-533.
- Mendiguren Bereziartu, Xabier 1993. "William Shakespeare en Euskara." Ed. J. M. González Fernández de Sevilla. *Shakespeare en España: Crítica, Traducciones y Representaciones*. Alicante-Zaragoza: Universidad de Alicante-Pórtico: 285-298.
- Menéndez y Pelayo, Marcelino 1974 (1883-1891). *Historia de las ideas estéticas en España*. Vol. 1. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- Michaëlis, Caroline 1875. "Hamlet in Spanien." *Shakespeare Jahrbuch* 10: 311-354.
- Par, Alfonso 1930. *Contribución a la Bibliografía Española de Shakespeare*. Barcelona: Instituto del Teatro Nacional.
- Par, Alfonso 1935. *Shakespeare en la Literatura Española*. 2 vols. Madrid: Librería General de Victoriano Balmes; Barcelona: Biblioteca Balmes.

- Par, Alfonso 1936 and 1940. *Representaciones Shakespearianas en España*. 2 vols. Madrid: Librería General de Victoriano Suárez; Barcelona: Biblioteca Balmes.
- Pérez Gállego, Cándido 1993. "Shakespeare en España: una análisis cultural." Ed. J. M. González Fernández de Sevilla. *Shakespeare en España: Crítica, Traducciones y Representaciones*. Alicante-Zaragoza: Universidad de Alicante-Pórtico: 39-62.
- Portillo, Rafael and Mercedes Salvador 2003. "Spanish Productions of *Hamlet* in the Twentieth Century." Ed. Ángel-Luis Pujante and Ton Hoenselaars. *Four Hundred Years of Shakespeare in Europe*. Newark and London: University of Delaware Press: 180-195.
- Portillo, Rafael, and Manuel J. Gómez Lara 1994. "Shakespeare in the New Spain; or, What You Will" *Shakespeare in the New Europe*. Ed. M. Hattaway, B. Sokolova, and D. Roper. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press: 208-228.
- Pujals Fontrodona, Esteban 1985. "Shakespeare y sus Traducciones en España: Perspectiva Histórica." *Cuadernos de Traducción e Interpretación* 5/6: 77-85.
- Pujante, Ángel-Luis 2007. "Introducción." Eds. Ángel-Luis Pujante and Laura Campillo. *Shakespeare en España: Textos 1764-1916*. Murcia-Granada: Universidad de Murcia-Universidad de Granada.
- Pujol, Dídac 2007. *Traduir Shakespeare. Les Reflexions dels Traductors Catalans*. Barcelona: Punctum & Trilcat.
- Romo, G. 1806. "Paralelo entre Shakespeare y Corneille." *Memorial Literario* 5 (20 Feb.): 221-228.
- Ruppert y Ujaravi, Ricardo 1920. *Shakespeare en España: Traducciones, Imitaciones e Influencia de las Obras de Shakespeare en la Literatura Española*. Madrid: Rev. de Archivos, Bibl. y Museos.
- Serrano, Angeles 1987. *Las Traducciones de Shakespeare en España*. Miami: Arcos.
- Shaw, Patricia 1993. "Estudio y Docencia de Shakespeare en la Universidad española." Ed. J. M. González Fernández de Sevilla. *Shakespeare en España: Crítica, Traducciones y Representaciones*. Alicante-Zaragoza: Universidad de Alicante-Pórtico: 95-118.
- Thomas, Sir Henry 1949. "Shakespeare in Spain." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 35: 3-24.
- [Turgenev] Turgueneff, Ivan S. 1894. "Hamlet y Don Quijote." *España Moderna* 68: 1-52.
- Verdaguer, Isabel 1999. "Shakespeare Translations in Spain." *Ilha do Desterro* 36: 87-110.

- Vickers, Brian ed 1995-2003 (1974-1981). *William Shakespeare: The Critical Heritage*. 6 vols. London: Routledge.
- Taylor, Gary 1987. "The Canon and Chronology of Shakespeare's Plays." Ed. Stanley Wells, and Gary Taylor, with John Jowett and William Montgomery. *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 69-144.
- Zaro, Juan Jesús 2001. "Shakespeare en España: Una Aproximación Traductológica." *Cuadernos de Filología Inglesa* 7/2: 71-91.

How to cite this review:

Tronch Pérez, Jesús. Review of *Shakespeare en España: Textos 1764-1916* by Ángel-Luis Pujante and Laura Campillo eds. *SEDERI* 19 (2009): 211-219.

Author's contact: tronch@uv.es

Abstracts and keywords in Spanish and Portuguese¹

Articles

Leticia Álvarez Recio, "Pamphlet literature against the Anglo-Spanish Match: Thomas Scott's *Vox Populi* (1620)"

RESUMEN

En 1614, el comienzo de las negociaciones para establecer un matrimonio dinástico entre el príncipe Carlos y la Infanta María de España causó una gran preocupación en el pueblo inglés, que aún conservaba fuertes prejuicios anti-católicos y anti-españoles. La decisión del rey Jacobo, en 1618, de utilizar las negociaciones matrimoniales para mediar en el conflicto religioso en Europa avivó esta preocupación. En ese momento, Inglaterra estaba dividida políticamente entre los que deseaban ayudar el yerno de Jacobo, Federico, que había aceptado la corona de Bohemia tras la rebelión de los estados protestantes contra el rey Fernando de Habsburgo, y los que apoyaban la decisión del monarca Estuardo de mantener a Inglaterra a salvo de las confrontaciones continentales.

A pesar de la censura estatal, un grupo de escritores empezó una campaña contra el Enlace español (*Spanish match*) que tuvo una gran influencia en la opinión pública. Entre las figuras más prominentes de este grupo destacaba Thomas Scott, cuya primera obra, *Vox Populi* (1620), se convirtió en uno de los tratados políticos más controvertidos del periodo. Este artículo analiza el panfleto de Scott y considera cómo el autor hizo uso del discurso contra el catolicismo y España para introducir nuevos comentarios acerca del sistema monárquico y del derecho de los ciudadanos a participar en el gobierno.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Enlace español (*Spanish match*), anti-catolicismo, discurso anti-español, literatura panfletaria, gobierno civil.

RESUMO

O início, em 1614, de negociações com vista a um casamento dinástico entre o Príncipe Carlos de Inglaterra e a Infanta Maria de Espanha provocou grande preocupação entre os ingleses que ainda mantinham fortes preconceitos anti-católicos e anti-espanhóis. Em 1618, quando o rei Jaime decidiu usar as negociações de casamento para mediar o conflito confessional existente na Europa, as preocupações avolumaram-se. A Inglaterra estava então politicamente dividida entre os que pretendiam

¹ Translations into Spanish by Tamara Pérez Fernández. Translations into Portuguese by Rui Carvalho Homem.

ajudar Frederico, o genro de Jaime que aceitara a coroa da Boémia, na sequência da revolta dos estados protestantes contra o rei Fernando de Habsburgo, e os que apoiavam o monarca Stuart na decisão de manter a Inglaterra afastada das lutas do continente.

Apesar da censura exercida pelo estado, um grupo de escritores deu início a uma campanha contra a Aliança Espanhola que veio a ter grande influência junto da opinião pública. Um dos de maior notoriedade foi Thomas Scott, cuja primeira obra, *Vox Populi* (1620), veio a tornar-se num dos textos políticos mais controversos desse período. Este artigo analisa o opúsculo de Scott e considera a forma como ele fez uso do discurso contra o catolicismo e contra a Espanha para introduzir comentários adicionais sobre o sistema monárquico e o direito dos cidadãos à participação no governo.

PALAVRAS CHAVE: Aliança espanhola, anti-catolicismo, discurso anti-espanhol, literatura panfletária, governo cívico.



M^a Carmen Gomez Galisteo, “Representing native American women in early colonial American writings: Álvaro Núñez Cabeza de Vaca, Juan Ortiz and John Smith”

RESUMEN

La mayoría de los que observaron a los nativos americanos durante el periodo de contacto entre Europa y las Américas representaron a las mujeres nativas americanas como seres monstruosos que suponían una amenaza potencial a la integridad física de los europeos. Sin embargo, el retrato más conocido de las mujeres nativas americanas es la descripción de Pocahontas hecha por John Smith, la princesa nativa americana que, según la leyenda, salvó a Smith de morir ejecutado. Transformada en cuento infantil, y popularizada por la película de Disney, y objeto de innumerables estudios históricos que cuestionan o afirman la veracidad de las aseveraciones de Smith, el hecho es que la historia de Smith y Pocahontas está en el centro de la cultura norteamericana. No obstante, la historia de John Smith, lejos de ser original, tuvo un precedente en la del español Juan Ortiz, miembro de la trágica expedición de Narváez en Florida en 1527. Ortiz, que se perdió en América y pasó el resto de su vida allí, también fue rescatado del sacrificio por una princesa nativa americana en el transcurso de un ritual nativo americano, tal y como lo cuenta el Caballero de Elvas, miembro de la expedición de Hernando de Soto. Otra visión de las mujeres nativas americanas es la de Álvaro Núñez Cabeza de Vaca, otro participante de la expedición de Narváez que durante casi una década desempeñó en las Américas varios papeles entre los nativos americanos, incluyendo algunos considerados femeninos. Estos papeles femeninos le dieron la oportunidad de evitar el cautiverio y le permitieron conocer mejor los papeles genéricos

dentro de la civilización nativa americana. Este artículo explora la descripción de las mujeres nativas americanas tal y como las describen John Smith, Juan Ortiz y Álvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca para ilustrar las diferentes imágenes de las mujeres nativas americanas durante el periodo de contacto temprano tal y como se muestran en estas obras.

PALABRAS CLAVE: mujeres nativas americanas, Álvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca, la *Relación*, *Naufraños*, Juan Ortiz, Capitán John Smith, Pocahontas.

RESUMO

A maior parte dos observadores dos povos nativos americanos durante o período de contacto entre a Europa e as Américas representou as mulheres nativas como seres monstruosos que constituiriam ameaças potenciais à integridade física dos europeus. No entanto, o retrato mais famoso de americanas nativas é a descrição que John Smith fez de Pocahontas, a princesa que, segundo a lenda, salvou Smith de ser executado. Transformada em conto infantil, popularizada pelo filme da Disney, e ainda objecto de inúmeros estudos históricos que questionam ou confirmam a veracidade das afirmações de Smith, é inegável que a história de Smith e Pocahontas está no cerne da cultura norte-americana. Contudo, longe de ser original, a história de John Smith tivera um precedente na história do espanhol Juan Ortiz, um dos membros da infausta expedição Narváez à Flórida em 1527. Ortiz, que se perdeu na América e lá passou o resto da vida, também foi socorrido por uma princesa nativa que o livrou de ser sacrificado durante um ritual, segundo o relato do Fidalgo de Elvas, membro da expedição de Hernando de Soto. Ainda outra visão das americanas nativas é dada por outro dos participantes na expedição Narváez, Álvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca, que durante quase uma década nas Américas desempenhou inúmeras funções entre os nativos, algumas das quais eram vistas como funções femininas. Estas funções femininas deram-lhe a oportunidade de evitar o cativeiro, tendo-lhe também proporcionado um melhor entendimento da importância do género na determinação de comportamentos entre os nativos. Este artigo explora as descrições das americanas nativas por John Smith, Juan Ortiz e Álvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca, ilustrando diferentes imagens da mulher durante a fase inicial do período de contacto.

PALAVRAS CHAVE: americanas nativas, Álvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca, a *Relación*, *Naufraños*, Juan Ortiz, Capitão John Smith, Pocahontas.



John J. Joughin, "Dividuated selves: on Renaissance criticism, critical finitude and the experience of ethical subjectivity"

RESUMEN

Este artículo sitúa el trabajo de la crítica renacentista como un trabajo de duelo tardío o una estética de la rememoración. En particular, me gustaría centrarme en la aparición de una supuesta forma "moderna" de subjetividad producida durante la teorización de la crítica renacentista en los años ochenta –tanto en sus aspectos distintivos como en sus occlusiones. Para este artículo, tomo la figura del crítico británico Francis Barker como representante –hasta cierto punto– de una tendencia de la crítica política que pretendía recuperar el significado perdido del cuerpo como lugar de sometimiento. Sin embargo, también alegaré que es necesario leer de nuevo el replanteamiento de la separación cuerpo-mente en la primera ola de la teorización de la crítica renacentista. Ahora se suele criticar esta *dividucción* fundacional del ser de los inicios de la crítica porque presenta al sujeto en términos reductivos de mecanicismo o funcionalismo, como producto del discurso del poder/conocimiento que lo produjo. No obstante, en una gran parte de los trabajos que consideramos materialistas culturales o neohistoricistas, la experiencia del dualismo segregaba un punto de vista ético que merece ser reevaluado. En particular, y tomando como base las ideas de Gillian Rose y de Judith Butler acerca del duelo, sugiero que la contemplación lírica de los cuerpos perdidos en la crítica radical implica nuestros vínculos con los demás, así como las relaciones con otros implícitas en cualquier sentido político de la comunidad. A su vez, esto sugiere una explicación más sofisticada de la subjetividad política así como de la reparación potencial del concepto del sujeto político para la crítica radical.

PALABRAS CLAVE: estética de la rememoración, duelo, finitud, subjetividad, Shakespeare, materialismo cultural.

RESUMO

Este artigo caracteriza a crítica que se dedica ao período renascentista como uma espécie de luto tardio, ou uma estética da memorialização. Incide em especial sobre o surgimento de uma forma supostamente "moderna" de subjetividade durante a teorização que marcou a crítica renascentista na década de 1980 –sobre as suas feições distintivas e as suas occlusões. O ensaio aponta a obra do crítico britânico Francis Barker como genericamente representativa de uma tendência na crítica política para recuperar a significação (antes, perdida) do corpo como lugar de sujeição. Contudo, defende-se também que a reconfiguração da cisão mente / corpo na primeira vaga da teorização na crítica renascentista requer uma releitura. A *dividuação* fundadora do ser, tal como vista nesses estudos iniciais, é agora criticada por propor o sujeito em termos redutoramente funcionalistas ou mecanicistas, como o produto do discurso de poder/saber que o produziu.

Porém, em muitos dos estudos a que chamamos materialistas culturais ou neo-historicistas, a experiência do dualismo também segregou uma perspectiva ética que merece uma reavaliação. Elaborando perspectivas sobre o luto antes propostas por Gillian Rose e Judith Butler, defende-se neste artigo que a contemplação, por parte da crítica radical, de corpos perdidos implica os vínculos que nos ligam a outros, assim como o quadro relacional que subjaz a qualquer sentido político de comunidade. Por seu lado, isto sugere uma caracterização mais sofisticada da subjectividade política, bem como uma reparação potencial do conceito de sujeito político para a crítica radical.

PALAVRAS CHAVE: estética da comemoração, luto, finitude, subjectividade, Shakespeare, materialismo cultural.



Lorena Laureano Domínguez, “Pericles’ “unknown travels”: the dimensions of geography in Shakespeare’s *Pericles*”

RESUMEN

El presente artículo explora la compleja noción de geografía y sus múltiples repercusiones en el primer “romance” de Shakespeare, *Pericles*. Se argumentará que el papel de la geografía y el viaje en la obra no puede reducirse a una mera estrategia formal. Esta obra entrelaza aspectos psicológicos, morales y políticos en el tratamiento y la representación de la geografía. Así pues, *Pericles* puede entenderse simultáneamente como el viaje vital de un individuo, como un viaje espiritual, e incluso como una exploración de las diferentes formas de gobierno y poder. Tomando como punto de partida el concepto de “imaginación geográfica”, acuñado por John Gillies, y la noción freudiana de “lo extraño”, me centraré en el significado psicológico y la efectividad poética y dramática del uso imaginativo de la geografía por parte del autor. El análisis de las diferentes ubicaciones demuestra que, más allá de su existencia como lugares externos específicos, son relevantes como entidades mentales que conforman la experiencia de Pericles y que adquieren significado dentro del microcosmos del héroe. Poniendo un especial énfasis en la escena del incesto, defenderé que en *Pericles* lo geográfico y lo psicológico se fusionan, y que las localizaciones geográficas funcionan como diferentes capas de la psique. Analizaré la geografía en relación con el argumento y los personajes, siempre teniendo en cuenta sus dimensiones alegóricas, psicológicas y poéticas.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Shakespeare, *Pericles*, geografía, espacio, psicoanálisis, bárbaro, lo extraño.

RESUMO

O presente artigo explora a noção complexa da geografia e as suas múltiplas implicações em *Pericles*, a primeira das peças a que a crítica shakespeariana chamou *romances*. Argumentar-se-á que o papel da geografia e das viagens na peça não pode ser reduzido a uma mera estratégia formal. Esta peça entrelaça aspectos psicológicos, morais e políticos no tratamento e na representação da geografia. Deste modo, *Pericles* pode ser interpretado em simultâneo como o percurso da vida de um indivíduo, um percurso espiritual e mesmo como uma exploração de diferentes formas de governo e de poder. Tomando como ponto de partida o conceito de “imaginação geográfica” de John Gillies e a noção de “estranho” de Freud, o ensaio centra-se no significado psicológico e na eficácia dramática do uso imaginativo da geografia por parte de Shakespeare. A análise dos diferentes locais demonstra que, para além da sua existência como espaços externos específicos, eles são relevantes como entidades mentais interiores que informam a experiência de Péricles e adquirem significado no microcosmos do herói. Argumentar-se-á, com ênfase especial na cena do incesto, que em *Pericles* o geográfico e o psicológico se fundem e que as localizações geográficas funcionam como diferentes estratos da psique. A geografia será analisada na sua relação com acção dramática e com as personagens, tendo sempre em consideração as suas dimensões alegóricas, psicológicas e poéticas.

PALAVRAS CHAVE: Shakespeare, *Pericles*, geografia, espaço, psicanálise, bárbaro, o estranho.



Sofía Muñoz Valdivielso, “‘Mine ear is much enamour'd of thy note:’ Shakespeare’s intercultural dream in the Indian subcontinent”

ABSTRACT

La producción de *Midsummer Night's Dream* hecha por Tim Supple en 2006 ha sido aclamada por algunos críticos como la sucesora de la revolucionaria versión de Peter Brook de 1970, una visión que cambió la percepción que se tenía de la obra y que se convirtió en un clásico de la historia de las representaciones de la misma. *Midsummer Night's Dream* de Tim Supple usa más o menos la mitad del texto inglés de Shakespeare, y el resto lo traduce al hindi, bengalí, marathi, malayalam, tamil, sánscrito y sinhala. Mantiene intactos el argumento y los personajes, aunque incluye elementos de tradiciones teatrales locales en la música, el baile, las artes marciales y las acrobacias. Esta producción escapa cualquier intento de clasificación, puesto que presenta rasgos de las versiones “extranjeras” de Shakespeare y sin embargo entrelaza los diálogos en lenguas indias con el original en inglés de

Shakespeare, extendiendo el efecto alienante de una producción en idioma extranjero al público de todo el mundo. Es muy significativo el éxito internacional de esta producción desde su estreno en Gran Bretaña en la temporada 2006-2007 como parte del "Complete Works Festival" de la Royal Shakespeare Company en Stratford, más allá de su valor estético y teatral. Este artículo estudia *Midsummer Night's Dream* de Tim Supple dentro del contexto de la representación shakesperiana extranjera y del teatro intercultural, y analiza en qué medida contribuye esta producción a los debates actuales sobre la importancia de Shakespeare como una figura internacional esencial.

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Midsummer Night's Dream*, teatro intercultural, estudios escénicos, Shakespeare extranjero.

RESUMO

A produção de Tim Supple de *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, em 2006, foi aclamada por alguns críticos como a sucessora da versão revolucionária de Peter Brook de 1970, uma visão que alterou as percepções da peça e se tornou um clássico na história das suas representações. A *Midsummer* de Supple usa cerca de metade do texto de Shakespeare em inglês, sendo o restante traduzido para hindi, bengali, marathi, malayalam, tamil, sânscrito e sinhala. O enredo e as personagens mantêm-se intactos, embora a peça inclua elementos de tradições teatrais locais através da música, dança, artes marciais e acrobacia. A produção desafia qualquer tentativa de classificação, pois, embora apresente características de versões "estrangeiras" de Shakespeare, entrelaça os diálogos em língua indiana com o original inglês de Shakespeare e expande o efeito de distanciamento de uma produção em língua estrangeira a públicos espalhados por todo o mundo. O sucesso internacional desta produção, desde a sua estreia na Grã-Bretanha em 2006-2007 como parte do Complete Works Festival da Royal Shakespeare Company em Stratford, é por si só significativo, transcendendo considerações de valor estético e teatral. O presente artigo discute *A Midsummer Night's Dream* de Tim Supple no contexto da representação estrangeira de Shakespeare e do teatro intercultural e analisa o contributo desta produção para os actuais debates sobre a importância de Shakespeare enquanto capital cultural internacional.

PALAVRAS CHAVE: *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, teatro intercultural, estudos de representação, Shakespeare estrangeiro.



Purificación Ribes, "Early stage history of Jules Romain's *Volpone*"

RESUMEN

Ninguna adaptación de *Volpone* ha recibido una recepción tan entusiasta como la versión libre de Jules Romain cuando se estrenó en 1928. Se mantuvo en escena durante 250 noches y continuó atrayendo a un gran número de espectadores en las giras que le siguieron en los años posteriores. El propósito de este artículo es descubrir las razones del abrumador éxito de la obra, analizando tanto los méritos teatrales del guión como las habilidades dramáticas de las compañías de Charles Dullin y de Charles Baret. La información recogida en carteles, programas teatrales y críticas arroja luz sobre el horizonte de expectativas del público. También permiten analizar el acercamiento ideológico que perseguían, así como las técnicas escénicas que preferían.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Romain, *Volpone*, texto, representación.

RESUMO

Nenhuma outra adaptação de *Volpone* jamais recebeu uma recepção tão entusiástica como a que a versão livre de Jules Romain obteve aquando da sua estreia em 1928. Manteve-se em palco durante 250 noites e continuou a atrair um elevado número de espectadores quando foi levada em *tournee* nas temporadas seguintes. O objectivo deste artigo é desvendar as razões de um sucesso tão esmagador analisando tanto os méritos teatrais do guião como as capacidades representativas dos *ensembles* de Charles Dullin e Charles Baret. A informação recolhida em cartazes, programas de teatro e artigos de crítica teatral permite perceber os horizontes de expectativas do seu público. Torna-se possível avaliar a abordagem ideológica escolhida bem como as técnicas de encenação preferidas.

PALAVRAS CHAVE: Romain, *Volpone*, texto, representação.



Javier Ruano-García, "Looking for regional words in late seventeenth-century England: Bishop White Kennett and his ignored glossary to *Parochial Antiquities* (1695)"

RESUMEN

El análisis de los dialectos regionales de Edad Moderna temprana ha quedado relegado normalmente a un segundo plano en relación con el abundante interés académico existente por la versión "autorizada" del inglés, que acabaría por convertirse en estándar. En este momento, la historia de los "ingleses" regionales permanece en gran medida olvidada,

debido principalmente a una escasez aparente de fuentes que aporten datos fiables. Las investigaciones de este campo se han centrado sobre todo en aspectos fonológicos, ortográficos y morfológicos gracias a la abundante información que dan sobre ellos los testimonios dialectales. La diversidad del léxico regional, por el contrario, no ha suscitado un especial interés ya que se plantea la incertidumbre de discernir lo que era estrictamente regional y lo que no. Este artículo se propone aportar información adicional al oscuro panorama del inglés regional en la Edad Moderna temprana. Nuestro objetivo es hacer un análisis descriptivo de las palabras dialectales recogidas en la obra *Glossary to Parochial Antiquities* del obispo White Kennett (1695). Este texto, muy poco utilizado hasta ahora, amplía la información recabada por otras listas de palabras canónicas, y además aporta datos geográficos concretos que pueden ayudarnos a completar el aún impreciso mapa de provincialismos léxicos de la época.

PALABRAS CLAVE: vocabulario regional, inglés moderno temprano (*Early Modern English*), dialectos, obispo White Kennett, lexicografía, lexicología.

RESUMO

A análise de dialectos regionais de inícios da Idade Moderna tem sido geralmente preterida em favor de um amplo interesse académico pela versão “autorizada” do inglês que acabou por vir a ser estabelecida como padrão. A história das suas variantes regionais permanece ainda, em larga medida, no esquecimento, sobretudo devido à aparente escassez de fontes que forneçam informações fidedignas. A investigação neste campo tem quase sempre focado feições fonológicas, ortográficas e morfológicas em virtude de a informação fornecida nesses domínios por testemunhos dialectais ser bastante mais abundante. A diversidade lexical regional, pelo contrário, não tem merecido especial atenção dada a incerteza quanto ao que era ou não provincialmente restrito. Este artigo tenta oferecer informação adicional sobre a obscura cena lexical do inglês regional do período proto-moderno. Tem por objectivo fazer um relato descritivo de palavras de dialecto coligidas no glossário do bispo White Kennett para *Parochial Antiquities* (1695). Este espécime pouco utilizado contribui, de facto, para alargar a informação fornecida por outras listas lexicais canónicas e disponibiliza informação geográfica concreta que nos poderá ajudar a contribuir para completar o mapa impreciso dos regionalismos lexicais da época.

PALAVRAS CHAVE: Vocabulário regional, Inglês Renascentista, dialectos, Bispo White Kennett, lexicografia, lexicologia

Notes

Jorge Figueroa Dorrego, "Ariadne's adaptation of Alexander Oldys's *The Fair Extravagant* in *She Ventures and He Wins*"

RESUMEN

En el prefacio de *She Ventures and He Wins* (1695), la joven que firma con el nombre de "Ariadne" dice que el argumento de esta obra teatral está tomado de "una pequeña novela", cuyo título no menciona. Ni los editores Lyons y Morgan (1991) ni ninguno de los pocos críticos que han comentado recientemente esta pieza han identificado el texto en el que se basa la obra. La respuesta a este enigma se encuentra en *The Lives and Characters of the English Dramatick Poets* (1699). El argumento principal de esa comedia es *The Fair Extravagant, or The Humorous Bride*, de Alexander Oldys, un texto prácticamente desconocido que no se ha vuelto a editar desde 1682. El propósito de este artículo es (re)desenterrar esa fuente y analizar el modo en que Ariadne adaptó un original de autoría masculina a sus propósitos como dramaturga, cómo lo combinó con un subargumento en clave de farsa y cómo consiguió adaptarlo a los nuevos gustos de la ciudad.

PALABRAS CLAVE: *She Ventures and He Wins*, adaptación, *The Fair Extravagant*, dramaturga, drama de la Restauración.

RESUMO

No prefácio de *She Ventures and He Wins* (1695), a jovem que assina "Ariadne" diz que o enredo desta peça é retirado de "a small novel," cujo título não menciona. Nem os editores literários Lyons e Morgan (1991) nem qualquer dos raros críticos que recentemente se debruçaram sobre esta obra identificaram o texto em que a peça se baseia. A resposta a este enigma pode ser encontrada em *The Lives and Characters of the English Dramatick Poets* (1699). O enredo principal dessa comédia é *The Fair Extravagant, or The Humorous Bride* de Alexander Oldys, um texto praticamente desconhecido que não voltou a ser publicado desde 1682. O objectivo deste artigo é (re)desenterrar essa fonte e analisar a forma como Ariadne adaptou o original de um autor masculino para os seus próprios intentos enquanto dramaturga, como o combinou com um enredo secundário com características de farsa e como conseguiu moldá-lo de acordo com os novos gostos da cidade.

PALAVRAS CHAVE: *She Ventures and He Wins*, adaptação, *The Fair Extravagant*, dramaturga, drama da Restauração.



M^a Jesús Pérez Jáuregui, “Henry Constable’s sonnets to Arbella Stuart”

RESUMEN

Aunque al poeta y cortesano isabelino Henry Constable se le conoce sobre todo por su secuencia de sonetos *Diana* (1592), también escribió una serie de sonetos dedicados a personajes nobles que aparecen solamente en un manuscrito (Victoria and Albert Museum, MS Dyce 44). Tres de estos poemas están dedicados a Lady Arbella Stuart, prima-hermana de Jacobo VI de Escocia, considerada durante mucho tiempo candidata a suceder a la reina Isabel. Dos de los sonetos se escribieron probablemente para celebrar el encuentro de Constable y Arbella en la corte en 1588, y alaban las muchas virtudes de la dama de trece años; parece que el otro se escribió más tarde, como conclusión a todo el libro, lo que implica que en un determinado momento Constable se lo presentó a Arbella buscando mecenazgo y protección política. En un momento en el que la sucesión parecía inminente, el apoyo de Constable al conde de Essex, que se hizo amigo de Arbella pero a la vez enviaba mensajes a Jacobo asegurándole el apoyo de su círculo, suscita la pregunta de la verdadera motivación de estos sonetos. El presente artículo analizará estas obras dentro de un contexto político mezclado con la intriga palaciega.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Henry Constable, Arbella Stuart, sonetos isabelinos, debate de sucesión, la corte de Isabel I.

RESUMO

Apesar de ser mais conhecido pela sua sequência de sonetos *Diana* (1592), o poeta e cortesão isabelino Henry Constable também escreveu uma série de sonetos dirigidos a figuras nobres que apenas aparecem num manuscrito (Victoria and Albert Museum, MS Dyce 44). Três desses sonetos são dedicados a Lady Arbella Stuart –prima direita de Jaime VI da Escócia, que durante muito tempo foi considerada candidata a sucessora de Isabel I. Provavelmente escritos por altura do encontro na corte de Constable e Arbella em 1588, dois dos sonetos elogiam a dama de treze anos de idade pelas suas inúmeras virtudes; o outro soneto parece ter sido escrito numa data posterior, como conclusão para o livro, o que implicaria que Constable o tenha apresentado a Arbella em determinado momento, em busca de patrocínio e protecção política. Numa altura em que a sucessão parecia iminente, a lealdade de Constable ao Conde de Essex, que apesar de se mostrar amigo de Arbella enviava mensagens a Jaime para lhe assegurar o apoio do seu círculo, levanta a questão da verdadeira motivação destes sonetos. Este artigo analisará estas obras num contexto político fortemente marcado por intrigas de corte.

PALAVRAS CHAVE: Henry Constable, Arbella Stuart, sonetos isabelinos, debate de sucessão, corte de Isabel I.