

# **S E D E R I I V**

**Journal of the Spanish Society  
for English Renaissance Studies**

**1 9 9 3**



**Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria**  
**SERVICIO DE PUBLICACIONES**

# SEDERI

## SOCIEDAD ESPAÑOLA DE ESTUDIOS RENACENTISTAS INGLESES

The specific aim of the Spanish Society for English Renaissance Studies is to promote, stimulate and give impulse in Spain to the study and research of 16th and 17th century literature and history, and their relationship with their Spanish counterparts, in all aspects: linguistic, literary and cultural.

### Executive Committee:

#### *President:*

Javier Sánchez, Zaragoza.

#### *Secretary:*

Jackeline Hurlley, Barcelona (Central).

#### *Treasurer:*

Andrew Monnickendam, Barcelona (Autónoma).

#### *Other Committee Members:*

Dionisia Tejera, Deusto; Clara Calvo, Granada;

Miguel Martínez-López (S), Granada; Patricia Shaw (H), Oviedo.

### Editorial Committee:

J. M. González, Alicante; Andrew Monnickendam, Barcelona (Autónoma); Socorro Suárez, Oviedo; Macario Olivera, Huesca; J. R. Fernández, Valladolid.

### Editor of this number:

Teresa Guerra Bosch,  
Las Palmas de Gran Canaria.

### Advisory Board:

Patricia Shaw, Alexander Lackett, Terence Hawks, P. Ahrens, Simon Shepherd, Gustav Ungerer, M. Keefer, Alan Sinfield, Thomas Healy, Claus Uhlig, Gordon Campbell, Fernando Galván.

Issue number IV of **SEDERI** contains a selection of articles and essays presented in the 4th Conference of the Spanish Society for English Renaissance Studies held at the University of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria in the Canary Islands, Spain, in March 1993.

Copies of this number can be obtained by writing to the following address:

Dr. Teresa Guerra, Dpto. de Filología Moderna, Edificio de Humanidades,  
C/ Pérez del Toro, nº 1. 35003 - LAS PALMAS DE GRAN CANARIA, Spain.

© ULPGC. Servicio de Publicaciones, 1994. Las Palmas G.C.  
Depósito Legal: G.C. 1.327-1994 - ISBN: 84-88412-02-9.  
Realización: Filmarte. Las Palmas de G.C. Printed in Spain

# CONTENTS

Repetition, Metaphor and Conceit in the Renaissance <i>Manuel Aguirre</i> .....	5
Milton and the Languages of the Renaissance <i>Gordon Campbell</i> .....	11
In and Out of the Bird-Cage: The Language of Confinement in the Duchess of Malfi <i>María Ángeles Conejo Fort</i> .....	23
Relativization and Register: A Seventeenth Century Survey <i>María de la Cruz Expósito González</i> .....	31
"I am not I, Pitie the Tale of Me": Reading and Writing (in) <i>Astrophil and Stella</i> <i>Fernando Galván Reula</i> .....	41
The Place of Man in the Chain of Beings According to Sidney's <i>Defense of Poesie</i> <i>Pilar Garcés García</i> .....	63
Narrative and Its Representation in <i>Othello</i> <i>Keith Gregor</i> .....	69
Some Analogies in <i>La Celestina</i> and <i>Troilus and Cressida</i> <i>Teresa Guerra Bosch</i> .....	77
Marlowe and the Drama of Protestant Sexuality <i>Thomas Healy</i> .....	87
Tragedy and Shared-Guilt: A Comparative Approach to <i>Othello</i> and <i>El pintor de su deshonra</i> <i>Jesús López-Peláez</i> .....	103
El laúd en el Renacimiento inglés <i>Mª Paz López-Peláez</i> .....	111
Renaissance Visions of Paradise: Ancient Religious Sources of Thomas More's <i>The Best State of a Commonwealth and the New Island of Utopia</i> <i>Miguel Martínez López</i> .....	121
"More's <i>Utopia</i> " or "Utopia's <i>Utopia</i> ?: How to Handle Textual and Generic Doubling <i>Joaquín Martínez Lorente</i> .....	133
Cony-Catchers and cazadores de gatos: An Examination of the Lexis Related to Thieves and Swindlers in England and Spain in the 16th and 17th Centuries <i>Margarita Mele Marrero</i> .....	143

The Poet and the Bard Andrew Monickendam.....	155
Northrop Frye's Critical Approach to Shakespeare's Last Plays Sofía Muñoz Valdivieso .....	165
Redefining Characters in Translation: A Case Ana M <sup>a</sup> Murillo Murillo .....	173
<i>The Book of Common Prayer</i> : Its Making and Language Macario Olivera Villacampa.....	181
Masks and Characters in <i>The Merchant of Venice</i> and <i>Los intereses creados</i> Rosa Sáez González.....	191
Tamburlaine, the Scourge of God: Mexia, Marlowe and Vélez de Guevara F. Javier Sánchez Escribano .....	203
The Romance in Shakespeare: <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> and <i>The Tempest</i> Concha Sastre Colino.....	217
Criseyde / Cresseid / Cressida: What's in a name? Robert K. Shepherd.....	229
<i>Dissident Reading</i> : Summary Alan Sinfield.....	237
Dr. Faustus and Don Juan: Two Baroque Heroes Dionisia Tejera LLano .....	243
Remarks on the Chronography of Transition: Renaissance - Mannerism - Baroque Claus Uhlig .....	251
Problems in Translating <i>Guzmán de Alfarache</i> into English Isabel Verdaguer .....	273
Who's who in SEDERI F. Javier Sánchez Escribano .....	281

## REPETITION, METAPHOR AND CONCEIT IN THE RENAISSANCE

Manuel Aguirre  
Universidad de Alcalá de Henares

There is a rhetorical technique systematically used by the medievals to intensify the significance, truth and reality of an object, whether thing or person, text or event<sup>1</sup>. It consists in *expanding* the object, typically by means of repetition, duplication, multiplication, unfolding, mirroring. The allegorical mode so dominant in the Middle Ages relied for its effectiveness on the conception of the world as twofold, in the sense that every object had a significance which related it, as a mirror-image, to some object in the spiritual domain. The use of the figure of the 'companion' of the hero (Bran's three foster-brothers in the Irish *Voyage of Bran*, Roland's Olivier in *La Chanson de Roland*), or of the figure of his 'double' (Roland's Ganelon, Sir Gawain's Green Knight) exemplifies the same effort to unfold and thereby to emphasize and intensify, through repetition or through contrast, heroic behaviours and values. The exegetical technique similarly allowed commentators to present texts as twofold constructs, endowed with, beside their literal meaning, a second, spiritual level of interpretation.

The technique was known as *amplificatio*, and according to Quintilian it offered four main strategies: augmentation, comparison, reasoning, and accumulation (Preminger 1990:32). Any device which, from the simplest exclamation to hyperbole, division, comparison, or repetition tends to intensify the object, falls under the general label of *amplificatio* (Lanham 1991:8).

The technique is not alien to the Renaissance; 16th century writers used *amplificatio* lavishly as part of their rhetoric of intensification in poetry or drama; let me offer some examples from both Spanish and English texts. In Fernando de Rojas' *La Celestina* (*The Spanish Bawd*, 1499), Calixto, madly in love with Melibea, compares the fire of his passion to that of Purgatory;

<sup>1</sup> See Aguirre (X), where I discuss the uses of repetition in medieval literature and its value in the context of the medieval theory of truth and reality. A more extended treatment of Richard II's soliloquy from the point of view of the medieval definitions of being, truth, reality and meaning is the subject of an article in preparation.

remonstrated by his servant, "Are you not a Christian?", he replies: "I am a Melibean, I adore Melibea, I believe in Melibea, and I love Melibea" (Mabbe's translation, Act I). In unfolding his experience into four categories (being, worship, faith, and love), Calixto simply seeks to enhance his devotion.

In Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, when Claudius reproaches the prince for his immoderate grief he pronounces: " 'tis a fault to Heaven, / A fault against the dead, a fault to nature, / To reason most absurd" (I.ii.101 ff.). The fourfold description of the object tends to enhance it, this time stressing its negative value, its excess. The technique is no different from that used by Thomas Aquinas to argue, e.g., the existence of God through not one but five different proofs<sup>2</sup>. Never mind that the specific categories resorted to by Calixto or Claudius have no direct counterparts in scholastic philosophy—that they are, in a sense, arbitrary, that their rhetorical nature is shown up by the facility with which the two sequences could be extended, perhaps indefinitely: why could Calixto not say "I hope in Melibea", "I serve Melibea", and so on? Why could Hamlet's grief not be labelled a fault against Denmark, or against the self, or against his mother? The point is rather the technique of multiplication itself, the fact itself of a three-or four-or fivefold categorization, the use of 'scholastic' classifications of experience which, by unfolding it, intensify its significance.

In *Richard II*, the king intensifies in just this way the presentation of his grief at the loss of some of his followers:

*Of comfort no man speak.  
Let's talk of graves, of worms, and epitaphs,  
Make dust our paper, and with rainy eyes  
Write sorrow on the bosom of the earth.  
Let's choose executors and talk of wills  
(III.ii:144 ff.)*

These five lines reveal to us an immature man wallowing in an excess of grief which he intensifies by practicing *divisio* of his subject-death: "let's talk of death," the king is saying; but, put like this, it would sound somewhat paltry, so he divides the concept of death into some of its aspects —worms, graves, epitaphs, wills—. In effect, he uses multiple metonymy<sup>3</sup>.

2 "[...] in thirteenth-century theology each *summa* supplied a variety of ways in which divine truth could be apprehended [...] The idea that to multiply the foundations of faith is to strengthen it [...] was widely accepted" (Vinaver 1971: 00 f.).

3 We might equally consider Shylock's speech in *The Merchant of Venice* (III.i.) as a question ('Am I not human too?') rhetorically amplified into a series of metonymic references to the experience of being human ('If you prick us, do we not bleed? If you tickle us, do we not laugh?').

I want briefly to introduce here the concept of *congruence*. In the case of Calixto, it will be observed that the four categories into which he divides his devotion to Melibea —being, faith, worship and love— are all of the same order of abstraction and share the common quality of human experience. The same can be said of Claudius' breakdown of Hamlet's grief into four different but similar kinds of offence. Much the same goes for Richard II when he 'amplifies' death into a series of metonymies. What I am trying to say is that we have to do with one single object which is then expanded or unfolded into several aspects of itself and that, therefore, these aspects are all congruent with one another: it makes sense to speak in one breath of worms, graves, epitaphs, dust and so on in the context of death. The point is almost trivial, but acquires a special importance when we move into one Renaissance version of *amplificatio*.

We recall that one of Quintilian's four kinds of amplification was comparison; by establishing the resemblance of A to B we enhance some of A's attributes or discover in it some quality which only the simile may bring out. Now, a simile is a weaker form of metaphor, and it is reasonable to assert that metaphor, too, is a figure of amplification. Where the simile establishes likeness between A and B, metaphor goes further and *identifies* the one with the other, thereby lending A the attributes of B and allowing A thus to enjoy a *double* essence for the duration.

The use of metaphor, like that of simile, intensifies the nature of its object. Now, metaphor consists of, basically, two terms, which I. A. Richards labeled "tenor" and "vehicle". In the expression "the road of life", the tenor is life, what we want to talk about; the vehicle, "road", is the means we employ to discuss the tenor, what we say about it: we want to say that life is like a road, or, better, that life is a road or that it shares some basic attributes of roads.

Now, as in other cases of amplification, *congruence* must be found in metaphor: the vehicle must display a certain appropriateness to its tenor. It is all right to speak of "the road of life", but in the expression "the dictionary of life" it is not quite obvious what is meant. True, there is a context for nearly everything, and in a certain context "the dictionary of life" might make perfect sense; but the difference resides in that the expression "the road of life" makes sense (to our Western culture) in *most* contexts, whereas "the dictionary of life" will be found to make sense in few.



Though amplification as a rhetorical strategy persists into the Modern age<sup>4</sup>, the Renaissance tends to construe its own versions of it. The rhetoric of the 16th and 17th centuries builds on, and exploits, a discrepancy between appearance and reality: *is* is not the *same* as *seems*; the comedy of errors, misunderstandings and *double-entendres*, like the tragedy of honour, builds on a dissociation between the two terms of all metaphor: expression and meaning; what is said is no longer necessarily a reflection or expansion of what is meant<sup>5</sup>. This, one of the grand Renaissance themes, shapes a world of dissembling and enquiry, of uncertainty and reflection, of pretence and paranoia; or, as Hamlet finds out, a world in which "One may smile, and smile, and be a villain": the face one puts on does not necessarily correspond any longer to the sentiments beneath.

If expression and meaning are at variance, it makes sense that a new type of metaphor should arise in the Renaissance to convey this rift between tenor and vehicle: this is the conceit. "A conceit", Helen Gardner tells us, "is a comparison whose ingenuity is more striking than its justness". "A conceit", she goes on, "is like a spark made by striking two stones together. After the flash the stones are just two stones" (Gardner 1957:19).

For my example, I turn to the first 9 lines of Richard's monologue in *Richard II* (V, v), where the deposed king sits alone in his prison-cell at Pomfret Castle, expecting the worst:

*I have been studying how I may compare  
This prison where I live unto the world;  
And, for because the world is populous  
And here is not a creature but myself,  
I cannot do it. Yet I'll hammer it out.  
My brain I'll prove the female to my soul,  
My soul the father, and these two beget  
A generation of still-breeding thoughts,  
And these same thoughts people this little world [...].*

4 Other examples of Renaissance use of *amplificatio* would be found in the *contrafactum* which turned a secular lyric into a religious one; or the time-honoured technique of redaction which made it possible for Calderón de la Barca to write an *Alcalde de Zalamea* after Lope de Vega's, or for Shakespeare to compose a *Hamlet* after Thomas Kyd's (hypothetical) play on the same subject (see Aguirre 1993). Indeed, it is debatable whether our Modernity has really eschewed the rhetoric of amplification: Joseph Campbell (1968) persuasively argues that Realism and Modernism merely insist on a *repetition of uniqueness*.

5 Rüdiger Ahrens reminded us in this same forum a year ago (see the coming *Proceedings of SEDERI III*) that one characteristic of the poetics of the Renaissance is a discrepancy between what is said and what is meant. See also Aguirre 1990, chapter 3.

The purpose of comparing cell to world is obvious: Richard seeks to justify his condition by making it into a mere example of the human condition in general. We recall that Hamlet, feeling similarly shackled in Elsinore, concludes that 'Denmark's a prison', 'the whole world is one'; and we recall that Calderón de la Barca's drama *La Vida Es Sueño* ("Life Is a Dream", 1635) resorts to a literalization of this metaphor in its central character Segismundo, imprisoned from birth in his tower - a fitting image for a widespread Baroque view of human life. But unlike Hamlet or Segismundo, Richard cannot discern in his experience that universal quality that would redeem it: because it remains intrinsically private, his is a senseless condition. And then, he hits (if you'll pardon the expression) upon the hammer: he will force a sense where none was to be had. To this purpose he begins by redefining two human faculties in gender-terms: his brain tells him the comparison is not possible; his soul will effect it anyway. The brain is the seat of the intellect, reason, advising him as to the rationality of his endeavour; his soul, on the other hand, stands for the will, and the conflict between these two is described as a violent sexual encounter: the male Will shall overpower the female Intellect; in other words: only by sheer *force of will* can Richard make possible his unlikely metaphor.

But of course, the image thus obtained is unwieldy, and is sustained only through two metaleptic strategies. *Metalepsis* is a rhetorical device which essentially consists in the bridging of a distance between two terms, either by omitting intermediate steps ('The ship is sinking: damn the forest where the mast grew'), or by violating ontological borders. Richard uses an *rebour*s metalepsis in so far as he requires the *construction*, rather than the omission, of several intermediate steps - the gendering of mental faculties, the sexual encounter of these, the subsequent begetting of thoughts - for his image to make sense; secondly, he posits his thoughts as inhabitants of his cell; now, the 'thoughts' Richard's comparison begets do not really people his prison but his mind; the image therefore takes a step from the conceptual to the real which is not warranted by the means employed; of course it makes great sense, but it is inappropriate from the logical point of view. In other words, what Richard has constructed is not a traditional 'comparison', a metaphor or simile, but a Renaissance conceit, and one which reveals, and reflects, the tragic gap between his private experience and the universal condition.

The conceit represents a breach in the basic structure of metaphor in so far as it forces a tenor-vehicle relationship on things which the language of the Renaissance sees as incongruous. Its effect is one of intensity, and one which, I dare to add, is probably much more powerful than that obtained by means of traditional metaphor; but this intensity is full of poignancy, there is something

almost pathetic about it: it arises not so much from an *amplification* of A into B as from a *tension* between A and B. It is as appropriate to say of the late Renaissance and Baroque period as it will be of Modernism that, in the words of W.B. Yeats, "things fall apart, the centre cannot hold". What is falling apart in Richard's world is meaningfulness. A whole semantic and cultural system is collapsing around 1600; and it is no coincidence that the modern (as distinct from the Petrarchan) conceit should emerge in this period.

#### WORKS CITED

- AGUIRRE, Manuel. *The Closed Space: Horror Literature and Western Symbolism*. Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1990.
- . "A Literature of Reflection", to appear in *Forum for Modern Language Studies* xxix:3, July 1993.
- . (X) "On the Function of "Gloss" and "Significance" in Medieval English Texts", to appear in the *Proceedings of the 5th SELIM Conference* held at the University of León, September 1992.
- CAMPBELL, Joseph. *The Masks of God*, vol. IV: *Creative Mythology*. 1968. London: Penguin Books, 1976.
- GARDNER, Helen, ed. *The Metaphysical Poets*. 1957. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1980.
- LANHAM, Richard. *A Handful of Rhetorical Terms*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
- PREMINGER, Alex, ed. *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*. 1965. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- ROJAS, Fernando de. *Celestina*. 1499. Trans. James Mabbe, in *Six Spanish Plays* (ed. Eric Bentley). New York: Doubleday, Anchor Books, 1959.
- VINAVER, Eugene. *The Rise of Romance*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

## MILTON AND THE LANGUAGES OF THE RENAISSANCE

Gordon Campbell  
University of Leicester

The central obstacle facing anyone who wishes to undertake a serious study of Milton is a massive linguistic hurdle: Milton could read in nine or ten languages other than his native English. If St Epiphanius was, as Jerome dubbed him, *πεντάγλωσσος* –he knew Hebrew, Greek, Syriac, Latin and Egyptian (by which Jerome must have meant Christian Coptic)– Milton was *δεκάγλωσσος*. In the poem *Ad Patrem* Milton thanks his father for paying for lessons in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, French and Italian in the years before he went to St Paul's at the age of twelve:

*tuo pater optime sumptu  
Cum mihi Romuleae patuit facundia linguae  
Et Latii veneres, et quae Jovis ora decebant  
Grandia magniloquis elata vocabula Graiis,  
Addere suasisti quos jactat Gallia flores,  
Et quam degeneri novus Italus ore loquelam  
Fundit, barbaricos testatus voce tumultus,  
Quaeque Palaestinus loquitur mysteria vates.*

[When at your expense, excellent father, I had become fluent in the language of Romulus, the charms of Latin, and the lofty words of the eloquent Greeks, fit for the mighty lips of Jove himself, you urged me to add the flowers that France boasts and the language the modern Italian pours from his degenerate mouth –testifying in his speech to the Barbarian invasions– and the mysteries uttered by the Palestinian prophet].

By the time that Milton travelled to Italy in 1638 he had composed a considerable body of poems in Latin, and a smaller number in Greek and Italian, and at some point had acquired enough Spanish to merit its inclusion in Antonio Francini's ode in praise of Milton:

*Ch'ode oltr'all Anglia il suo più degno Idioma  
Spagna, Francia, Toscana, et Grecia e Roma.*

[For not only England hears you speak her worthy language, but also Spain, France, Tuscany, Greece and Rome]

After he returned from Italy Milton became a schoolmaster, and his nephew Edward Phillips, who was one of his pupils, recalled fifty-four years later that as a ten-year-old he was 'studiously employed in conquering the Greek and Latin tongues' and mastering the literatures in those languages, but that this study did not 'hinder the attaining to the chief oriental languages, viz the Hebrew, Chaldee and Syriac, so far as to go through the Pentateuch... in Hebrew, to make a good entrance into the Targum or Chaldee Paraphrase, and to understand several chapters of St Matthew in the Syriac Testament'. Milton had clearly acquired a command of Chaldee, which we would now call Aramaic, and Syriac, which he seems to have regarded as a separate language. At some point in 1652, the year in which Milton went totally blind, he began to take lessons in Dutch from Roger Williams. In a letter to John Winthrop dated 12 July 1654 Williams explained that 'it pleased the Lord to call me for some time, and with some persons, to practise the Hebrew, the Greek, Latin, French, and Dutch. The Secretary of the Council, Mr Milton, for my Dutch I read him, read me many more languages'. Claims for Milton's knowledge of a tenth language, Anglo-Saxon, are based on the putative influence of the Old English Genesis and Milton's friendship with its editor, Francis Junius; the argument is complicated by the relationship between the Old English Genesis and the Old Saxon fragment in the Vatican library, and the problem still awaits serious examination. Claims for other languages might be made, but Milton's quotations from Samaritan and Ethiopic (the predecessor of Amharic), for example, are taken from printed Latin translations, and there is no evidence for first-hand knowledge of such languages.

Milton's command of this formidable range of languages means that the range of sources available to him is greater than that on which ordinary mortals can draw, and his lifelong study of the literatures written in those languages gives his poems a distinctly literary cast. Milton was able to continue his study of various literatures after he went blind by enlisting his daughters, who were (in the words of Edward Phillips)

...condemned to the performance of reading and exactly pronouncing of all the languages of whatever book he should at one time or another see fit to peruse, viz the Hebrew (and I think the Syriac), the Greek, the Latin, the Italian, Spanish and French. All ...without understanding one word.

Each of the languages that Milton read produced sources for *Paradise Lost*. In the modern languages, to name only one in each, Milton is said to have drawn on the French of Du Bartas' poem *La Semaine*, the Italian of Giambattista Andreini's play *L'Adamo*, the Dutch of Vondel's play *Adam in Ballingschap* and the Spanish of Alonso de Acevedo's poem *Creación del mundo*.

I cannot, in the compass of one paper, consider all four of these modern languages, so I propose to select one, namely Spanish, in which Milton's competence may have been as slight as mine. I should like to begin by disposing of Alonso de Acevedo. The fact that he appears speaking Italian in Cervantes' *Viaje del Parnaso* is indicative of the problem of identifying the *Creación del mundo* as a source for *Paradise Lost*, because Acevedo's epic draws so heavily on Tasso's *Il mondo creato* and Du Bartas' *La Semaine* that it would seem impossible to detect any specifically Spanish strain in Milton's poem. But how much Spanish literature did Milton know? The only allusion to Spanish literature seems to be the note on 'the verse' which Milton drafted in 1668 for the fourth issue of the first edition of *Paradise Lost*. The printer, Samuel Simmons, had asked Milton to explain 'that which stumbled many...: why the poem rhymes not'. The tone of Milton's note suggests that he was irritated by the request:

The measure is English heroic verse without rhyme, as that of Homer in Greek and of Virgil in Latin – rhyme being no necessary adjunct or true ornament of poem or good verse, in longer works especially, but the invention of a barbarous age, to set off wretched matter and lame metre... Not without cause therefore some both Italian and Spanish poets of prime note have rejected rhyme both in longer and shorter works, as have also long since our best English tragedies, as a thing of itself, to all judicious ears, trivial and of no true musical delight; which consists only in apt numbers, fit quantity of syllables, and the sense variously drawn out from one verse into another, not in the jingling sound of like endings – a fault avoided by the learned ancients both in poetry and in all good oratory.

Who, one wonders, are the 'Spanish poets of prime note' who have repudiated 'the jingling sound of like endings'? Spanish Golden Age poetry is of course rhymed. Indeed, the only great Spanish poem in blank verse known to me is Miguel de Unamuno's *El Cristo de Velázquez* (1920), which, like his *nívolas*, is written in his usual spirit of literary rebellion; he was, after all, an academic. *Versos sueltos* was introduced into Spain by Joan Boscà, who was in 1526 invited by the Venetian ambassador Andrea Navagero to introduce Italian metres into Spain. This was not an impossible task for a Catalan for whom the Provençal hendecasyllabic line deeply embedded in Catalan lyric poetry led

easily to the *octavas reales* that quickly became the dominant metre of Spanish Renaissance epic. The products of Boscà's Italian period, if it may be so termed, included his *Leandro* (1543), which took the *versi sciolti* form from Trissino. *Versos sueltos* was subsequently used by Boscà's friend Garcilaso de la Vega and Cervantes' friend Francisco de Figueroa. Are these, one wonders, 'Spanish poets of prime note'? Certainly the use of blank verse excited animosity: Cristóbal de Castillejo's *Contra los que dejan los metros castellanos y siguen los italianos* (c. 1540) characterises those who use blank verse as *usan de cierta prosa / Medida sin consonantes*.

Where else might we look? There are irretrievably minor blank verse poems scattered thinly in the *Varias poesías* (1591) of the soldier-poet Hernando de Acuña, who had served in Italy and read deeply in Petrarch, in the *loas* of Agustín Rojas Villandrando, who had also travelled in Italy, and in Fray Luis de León's *Poesías* (1631), which contain many imitations of Italian poems, as one might expect from the translator of Bembo and La Casa. Imitations are, perhaps unexpectedly, the chief source of blank verse poems. Frai Jerónimo Bermúdez's *Nise lastimosa* and *Nise laureada* (1577) are Greek in structure and Portuguese in subject (the legend of Inés de Castro), but resolutely Italian in metrical form. Cervantes used blank verse for *El rufián viudo*, one of his *entremeses*, but this example poses the same problem as the tetrameter masque verse in late Shakespeare: is the explanation for its general awfulness incompetence or parody? I tend to the former view in the case of Shakespeare, and to the latter in the case of Cervantes' interlude, but it is difficult to be confident about either judgement.

Thus the rejection of rhyme in 'shorter works' by Spanish poets of prime note'. A consideration of 'longer works' produces an even shorter list of candidates. Of the hundreds –literally hundreds– of heroic epics, only four, we are assured by one Carl W. Cobb, who scoured the list compiled by Cayetano Rosell (*Philological Quarterly* 42, 1963, p. 265), are cast in blank verse. One can be eliminated immediately, because the *Historia del Nuevo Reino de Granada*, the fourth and final part of Juan de Castellanos' 119,000 line *Elegías de varones ilustres de Indias*, seems not to have been printed until modern times. That leaves three possibilities: Jermyno Corte Real's *Felicissima victoria concedida del cielo al señor don Juan de Austria* (1578), Gaspar Pérez de Villagrà's *Historia de la Neuva México* (1610) and perhaps most apposite for our conference in Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Antonio de Viana's *Antigüedades de las Islas Afortunadas de la Gran Canaria* (1604), which celebrates in a mixture of unrhymed verse and octavas reales that which led to present-day Las Palmas, the marriage of the Guanche and Castilian peoples. Milton does mention Tenerife in *Paradise Lost* (IV. 987), as the mountain was then thought to be the

highest in the world –about 60 miles high, according to one traveller's report– but I regret to report that he is not known to have read Viana's epic, and indeed all four of these historical epics would seem to be unlikely candidates for Milton's longer poems in blank verse. Of the Spanish religious epics that might seem to provide the closest analogies to *Paradise Lost*, all are written in *octava real*, the Spanish version (sometimes called *octava heróica*) of *ottava rima*. Acevedo's epic, which offers the closest analogy to Milton, is modelled so closely on Tasso that Acevedo felt obliged to defend his use of the *octava real*; *no me contenté con referir esta universal obra en verso suelto, como he visto lo han hecho algunos famosos poetas en otras lenguas, sino antes, por hacer más gustosa la lección della, me quise atar al trabajo de la octava rima*.

There is, one may say in summary, a host of minor Spanish writers who have occasionally used blank verse, even though most of their output is rhymed, but there are no 'Spanish poets of prime note' who can be said to 'have rejected rhyme both in longer and shorter works' – unless, that is, we extend our sense of the term 'poet' to include verse translators. That leads us (and again I am indebted to Carl Cobb for pointing the way) to two translations that Milton may well have known. The first is mentioned by Roger Ascham: 'Gonzalo Pérez, that excellent learned man, and secretary to King Philip of Spain, [who] in translating the Ulysses of Homer out of Greek into Spanish... by good judgement avoided the fault of rhyming, [even though he did not] hit perfect and true versifying'. I must confess immediately to never having heard of Gonzalo Pérez or his *De la Ulyxea de Homero XII libros, traduzidos de Griego en Romance Castellano* (1550), but no less a scholar than Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo assures us that this is the first translation of Homer into any European language. If Ascham knew of it, then Milton could have known of it, and could even have thought Pérez a poet 'of prime note'.

The second translator arguably has a better profile and certainly has a longer name: Juan Martínez de Jáuregui y Hurtado de la Sal, the artist who painted a portrait of Cervantes in old age. Jáuregui studied art in Rome, and while he was there translated Tasso's pastoral drama *Aminta*. Milton is known to have read the *Aminta*, though his allusions are usually glossed by reference to Tasso's Italian original (1573) or Thomas Watson's Latin version (1585) or (with less likelihood) Henry Reynolds' English version (1627). Jáuregui's Spanish translation, which he published in Rome in 1607, attempts to render Tasso's *versi sciolti* into Spanish *versos sueltos*. Milton was interested in the *Aminta*, and may well have known this translation, which, like *Paradise Lost*, begins with an explanation of 'why the poem rhymes not':

*Bien creo que algunos se agradarán poco de los versos libres y desiguales, y sé que hay orejas que, si non sienten a ciertas distancias el porrazo del consonante, pierdan la paciencia... como si en aquello consistiese la sustancia de la poesía (cit. Cobb, 267)*

Thus Milton's Spanish. The ancient languages present an even more daunting prospect. Hebrew was one of the languages that Milton learned as a child. The transliterations that he used in his Hebrew annotations to his translations of the Psalms suggest that he pronounced Hebrew with a Sephardic accent: *taw* is transliterated *th*, and *ayin* is rendered as a quasi-consonantal *gn* (See Leo Miller, *Milton Quarterly* 18, 1984, 41). As that pronunciation derives ultimately from Spain, we might therefore regard Milton's Hebrew as another Spanish language. Milton seems to have been reasonably competent in Hebrew, but it is not clear, to me at least, how he interpreted the unadorned Hebrew text of the Old Testament. It is often casually assumed that he was guided by the Massoretic vocalisation, and this is at least a partial truth, but there is also evidence that on occasion he preferred the Greek of the Septuagint to the meaning implied by the pointing supplied by the Massoretes. In *Samson Agonistes*, for example, Milton introduces the "giant Harapha of Gath" (1068). In the 1611 translation of II Samuel xxi the Hebrew *harapha* is simply rendered "the giant"; the Septuagint text, however, treats Rapha as a proper name, in the which case the Philistine champions should be called the "sons of Rapha", which is how Milton describes Goliath and his brothers (1248-9). Milton's use of Harapha as a proper name draws on the Greek reading while still preserving the Hebrew sense of moral enervation.

In the seventeenth century the Old Testament was often read with the assistance of Aramaic commentaries, the Targumim. Students of Milton do not always recognise a Targum when they encounter one in the darkness of another language. Thus the two standard translations of Milton's theological treatise *De Doctrina Christiana* record Milton's reference to "the three most ancient Jewish commentators, Onkelos, Jonathan and Hierosolymitanus"; neither translator recognised the Jerusalem Targum lurking behind the mysterious commentator Hierosolymitanus.

In Greek, in addition to the Septuagint and the corpus of ancient Greek poetry, Milton could draw on the Greek fathers, for whom he had unusual sympathies: in the case of his depiction of Eden, for example, he drew heavily on the works of the Cappadocian fathers: the περί κόσμος of Gregory Nazianzus which (like the *Carmen de Deo* of Dracontius) reflects its hexameral subject in its choice of metre, and of course Basil the Great, whose *Hexaemeron* lit a torch which passed to his brother Gregory of Nyssa and thence to Greek hexameral

writers such as George of Pisidia, whose *Hexamaeron*, with its strong colouring of classical cosmological accounts, was often printed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The largest tradition on which Milton could draw was of course the vast succession of Latin works, not only those of classical antiquity, but also those in the Christian patristic and hexameral traditions, the latter of which begins with St Ambrose, whose various hexameral works were much loved by the humanists of the Renaissance; his *De Paradiso* (like *Paradise Lost*) set Paradise on a mountain. It should be remembered that this Latin tradition, which includes scores of hexameral works, extends continuously to Milton's own time, to works such as Grotius' tragedy *Adamus Exul*, on which Milton drew.

The last of the ancient languages on which Milton drew was Syriac, a language made unnecessarily difficult by the fact that it is written in three different consonantal scripts. I am not going to discuss Milton's competence here, because I have written on the subject elsewhere (*Milton Quarterly*, May 1993); suffice it to say that Milton certainly consulted the Peshitta, and may have had some knowledge of Syriac fathers such as Aphraates and St Ephrem Syrus.

Milton was a competent linguist, and he knew it. He could on occasion be something of a linguistic terrorist: he was fond, for example, of giving Greek titles to his English works – hence *Tetrachordon*, *Colasterion* and *Areopagitica*. Sometimes he would deploy his learning as a weapon. The publisher of Milton's 1645 *Poems* commissioned a portrait for the frontispiece. The engraver, William Marshall, seems to have shown the portrait to Milton, who asked him to engrave a few lines of Greek verse beneath it. The hapless (and Greekless) Marshall complied, carefully engraving Milton's four lines of Greek, and the volume was in due course published, probably on 2 January 1646. And what does the Greek say? 'Looking at its original, you would perhaps say that an ignorant hand had drawn this image. Since you do not recognise the person, my friends, laugh at this bad imitation by a worthless artist'.

I am a student of literature rather than language, so I should like to conclude with a consideration of the effect that this multilingualism had on Milton's poetry. Sometimes the issue is one of translingual ambiguities; sometimes it is a case of the meaning of a phrase in one language only being apparent by reference to another; sometimes the problem is one of allusion or imitation.

Let us begin with ambiguities, some of which are rooted in Milton's habit of thinking in one language while composing in another. In the Marshall epigram, for example, the ambiguity lies in the genitive φαύλου ζωγράφου, which might

mean that the portrait was 'of a worthless artist' or 'by a worthless artist'; Milton was thinking in English of one or the other, and in Greek has created an ambiguity. Similarly, in *In Obitum Procancellarii Medici*, a poem in which the seventeen-year-old Milton commemorated John Gostlin, the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge, he refers to Gostlin as *alumno major Apolline*; did he mean "greater than your pupil Apollo", as in classical Latin, or "greater than your tutor Apollo", as in late Latin?

Comparable problems of ambiguity arise when Milton translates the Psalms. Translating Psalm 88, for example, he covers himself by translating one phrase twice:

Thou break'st upon me all thy waves,  
And all thy waves break me.

Milton covers himself by adding in the margin 'The Hebrew bears both'; in this instance Milton has detected an ambiguity where none exists, because only the first line is a correct translation. Translating Psalm 83, however, he grapples with a problem that is real rather than imagined:

By right now shall we seize  
God's houses, and will now invade  
Their stately palaces.

What are they? God's houses or stately palaces? Milton's marginal note says "Neoth Elohim bears both". He is half right. *Elohim* means "God", but it can also be used as a superlative, so "God's" and "stately" are in fact both possible translations. The problem which Milton seems not to have noticed is the other word, which in his Sephardic transliteration comes out as *neoth*. It means "pastures" (as in Psalm 23: "he maketh me to lie down in green pastures"), and hence "dwelling places", but hardly "palaces".

Sometimes Milton tries to resolve such ambiguities by recourse to another language. In *Areopagitica*, for example, he looks at the Greek text of Acts xix.19, which refers evasively to the "curious arts" (τὰ περίεργα) of Paul's converts, and immediately checks it against the Syriac text, in which the word *harrāshē* makes it clear that the practitioners of these arts were necromancers. Such problems are built into the Bible and thence into Milton's Christian faith, because the holy books are multilingual. Thus when the translators of the Old Testament into Greek read in Isaiah that an *almah* would conceive and bear a son, they had to decide, because of the choices forced on them by Greek, whether or not she was a παρθένος. They decided that she was indeed a virgin,

and thus planted the seeds of the doctrine of the virgin birth. The same is true of such post-Biblical doctrines as original sin, which originated in Augustine's infelicitous translation of ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον (Romans v.12) as *in quo omnes peccaverunt*, a howler that located the origins of sin in Adam.

The second effect of multilingualism that I should like to consider is the case of words and phrases in one language that can only be understood by reference to another. One of the most fertile examples of such phrases occurs in Book IX of *Paradise Lost* (792), at the moment when Eve eats the apple:

Greedily she engorged without constraint  
And knew not eating death.

Milton is imitating a Greek construction in which the verb "to know" is followed by a nominative participle without repetition of the subject. At one level, then, the line means "not knowing that she was eating death". The purpose of the Hellenism is of course to introduce a Latinism, *mors edax*, death that devours. The same thing happens in *Samson Agonistes* (840): "knowing, as needs I must, by thee betrayed", which means both "knowing that I was betrayed by thee" and "knowing myself to be betrayed". Similarly, a phrase such as "who slewest them many a slain" (439) seems opaque in English, but once one realises that 'them' is a Latin dative of disadvantage, the sense of "to their loss" readily becomes apparent. Or again in *Samson Agonistes*, "unless there be who think not God at all" (295) becomes fruitfully ambiguous when one recognises the Greek construction, common in negative clauses, in which "think" (νομίζω) is followed by an accusative without an infinitive. On occasion Milton implies a specific phrase rather than a simple construction: thus in *Paradise Lost* the sun and moon are said to be conveyed "down to this habitable" (VIII.157). Habitable what? The phrase imitates ἡ οἰκουμένη (*scilicet* γῆ), the inhabited (world), and thus introduces the Greek distinction between Greece and the world beyond its borders, between civilisation and barbarity.

These are examples of the constructions of one language impinging on another. There are comparable examples in which the pivot is lexical. In *Paradise Lost*, Adam's eyes are anointed "with euphrasy and rue" (XI. 414). Both are plants, but they are also puns: "rue", Shakespeare's "herb of grace", means "pity", and "euphrasy", Greek εὐφροσύνη, means "good cheer". Or in *Paradise Regained*, Satan offers to show Jesus "regal mysteries" (III. 249). For Milton the word "mystery" retained the senses of two different Latin roots: *ministerium* ("skill" or "occupation") and *mysterium* ("secret"). Another

bifurcating etymology occurs in the description of the touchpaper of the cannons in *Paradise Lost* as "pernicious with one touch to fire" (VI. 520): "pernicious" means both "rapid" (from *pernix*) and "destructive" (from *pernicius*). This sort of multilingual playfulness can also be seen in Milton's prose. In his *Defensio pro populo Anglicano*, for example, the learned men of Trent (*doctores Tridentinos*) are said to be *tridentinae* ("three-toothed"), and a mounted grammarian is said to be a horse-critic –*hippocriticus*– a splendid three-way pun that fires off in Greek, Latin and English.

I should like to conclude by raising briefly the related issues of imitation and allusion, an issue that I have explored elsewhere (*Milton Studies* 19, 1984, 165-177). According to an anecdote in the elder Seneca, Ovid borrowed phrases from Virgil "not stealing them, but borrowing openly with the intention of being recognised" (*non supripiendi causa sed palam mutuandi, hoc animo ut vellet agnosci: Suasoriae* III. 7). The most famous example in antiquity is Virgil's appropriation of a line from Catullus (who was in turn translating Callimachus, but I do not propose to consider that complication). In *Aeneid* VI. 460, Aeneas descends to the underworld, meets Dido, and pleads that he did not leave her shores voluntarily (*invitus, regina, tuo de litore cessi*). The problem is that the line imitates Catullus, who makes the lock of Berenice's hair say '*invita o regina tuo de vertice cessi*' ("I did not leave your head voluntarily"). Virgil has transformed mock heroic into heroic, and the sheer daring of the transference has left generations of admirers astonished that Virgil could contaminate such a poignant moment by imitating a line in a court elegy. It seems to me a remarkable moment: any second-rate poet can mock the heroic, but it takes a great poet to do it the other way round, to transfer a clever line from a mocking poem into a pained and hesitant expression of anguish.

One could explore this phenomenon in Milton's English poems by reference to examples such as the echo of Virgil's *templum* for Caesar in the phrase "before all temples" at the outset of *Paradise Lost*, but it is easier to understand the issues if one doesn't shift languages. I shall therefore take my two examples from Milton's Latin poems. One of these imitations is an early fumble, and the other, to pursue my sporting analogy, a completed pass. Milton's *Elegia tertia*, written when he was an undergraduate, commemorates Lancelot Andrewes, that most celibate of English churchmen. Milton's dream-vision of Andrewes ends with the line *talia contingant somnia saepe mihi* ("may such dreams often befall me"). The problem is that the phrase irresistably recalls its original in Ovid's *Amores* (I. 5): *proveniant medii sic mihi saepe dies* ("May it often be my good fortune to have middays like this one"). Ovid is recalling a lunchtime romp with Corinna, and the reader's recollection of this line skews Milton's

poem. At the age of 17 Milton was not yet the master of his craft. By the time he wrote *Epitaphium Damonis*, at the age of 31, he was a faultless Latin poet in total control of his material. The refrain of Milton's lament for his friend Charles Diodati is *ite domum impasti, domino jam non vacat agni* ("go home unfed, my lambs, your master has not time for you now"). The line imitates Virgil's *Eclogue* VII. 44: *ite domum pasti, si quis pudor, ite juvenci* ("go home well fed, my heifers, go, for shame"). Virgil's shepherd is dismissing his herd either because he cannot make love and watch animals at the same time, or because he does not want the animals to be voyeuristic onlookers. Milton has skilfully used the echo of Virgil to convey through the *frisson* that it creates a decorous hint of the passion that he felt for Diodati, who may have been the only person that Milton ever loved unreservedly. Like Virgil, Milton has transformed coarseness into passionate and poignant solemnity.

# IN AND OUT OF THE BIRD-CAGE: THE LANGUAGE OF CONFINEMENT IN THE DUCHESS OF MALFI

**María Ángeles Conejo Fort**  
Universidad de Málaga

Professor Bradbrook has written that Webster's most famous plays, *The White Devil* and *The Duchess of Malfi*, could both be subtitled "A Woman at Bay". The similarities in dramatic structure, however, should not hide the differences, as Vittoria's "heroic action" serves her worldly ambition, while the courage of the Duchess gives her fortitude to endure the consequences of her bid for feminine happiness and fulfilment<sup>1</sup>.

This paper will focus on the Duchess of Malfi who is certainly cornered and kept at bay by her powerful, repressive brothers through confinement and death. Her "bid for feminine happiness", her assertion of female independence with complete disregard for her brothers' coercive advice represents an instance of women's disruptive behaviour and a reversal of her expected role in the family and in society. Oppression and subordination were the context in which women lived at the time. The fact that the Duchess is a member of the nobility and as such she is entitled to some social power does not seem to make any difference as far as her brothers are concerned: she is totally powerless in the family circle.

Before analysing Webster's treatment of the figure of the Duchess both from a moral and social point of view, I would like to trace the story back to its original source. It was based on a real event: the secret marriage between the young widowed Duchess and the steward of her household, their love and happiness during five years, their attempt to escape the revenge of the Duchess's brothers and the eventual murder of Antonio Bologna in October of 1513.

The story survived because it had been recounted by a contemporary, Matheo Bandello, who may have been the Delio of the play, as he seems to have known Antonio personally. He stressed Antonio's role in the story and transmitted it as Antonio's tragedy.

---

<sup>1</sup> M.C. Bradbrook, *John Webster. Citizen and Dramatist*. (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1980) 142.



One hundred years elapsed between the actual event and Webster's play, which is thought to have been first performed between 1512 and 1514. His narrative source was William Painter's *The Palace of Pleasure* (1567). The story had become almost a tragic legend when through the French it reached Painter, who added some of the events which had no historical support: the Duchess's imprisonment and death by strangling, together with her maid and children.

Webster in a way updated the legend by including some contemporary issues. On the one hand, as M.C. Bradbrook has pointed out the Spanish rulers of the kingdom of Naples could be interpreted in the light of contemporary Spanish honour and Spanish pride (Lope de Vega used this very source for one of his plays some years later). Webster's contemporaries were also aware of the end of Penelope Rich and Charles Blount's love affair, or the story of Antonio López and the Princess of Eboli. These two ladies shared a similar fate with the Duchess of Malfi who ended her life as a prisoner in her palace<sup>2</sup>. On the other hand "the court of Amalfi presents in miniature the court of Whitehall, with its adventurers, its feverish pulling of strings for office and promotion, its heedless and heartless pursuit of privilege"<sup>3</sup>.

The narrative sources of *The Duchess of Malfi* have already been studied in depth by Dr. Gunnar Bocklund<sup>4</sup>. On giving this brief account of them, my interest lies in analysing the different moral approaches to the figure of the Duchess from its original source to Webster's play.

Bandello's narrative records his extreme shock at the events and blames everybody: Antonio for his presumption, the Duchess for her lust and the brothers for their cruelty. As for Painter's account, the arguments of critics on his attitude towards the Duchess are contradictory. Some argue that Painter disapproves of the young widow remarrying in secret, beneath her rank and against her brothers' wishes and that he stresses these blemishes on her conduct<sup>5</sup>; while others claim that Painter explicitly defends remarriage on grounds both of morality and common sense. They also quote Painter's characters as their own convincing apologists for the violation of "degree"<sup>6</sup>.

2 Ibid. 142.

3 J.M. Lever "The Tragedy of State" in R.V. Holdsworth (ed.) *Webster: The White Devil and The Duchess of Malfi* (London: Macmillan, 1975) 200. See also J.R. Brown (ed.) *The Duchess of Malfi* (London, 1964).

4 Gunnar Bocklund, *The Duchess of Malfi: Sources, Themes, Characters* (Cambridge, Mass., 1962).

5 L.G. Salingar "Toumeur and the Tragedy of Revenge" in Boris Ford (ed.) *The Pelican Guide to English Literature*, Vol. II (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1979) 351.

6 J.M. Lever. 204.

Critical responses to the figure of the Duchess in Webster's play are also contradictory. Clifford Leech pointed out that the remarriage of widows, though quite lawful was viewed with scepticism or disapproval<sup>7</sup>; Inga-Stina Ekeblad went further to say that the Duchess was presented as "an exemplum horrendum to all women contemplating a second marriage"<sup>8</sup>; finally, according to James L. Calderwood, the Duchess is punished for her "uninhibited passion", her "violation of degree" and her "disrespect for external realities"<sup>9</sup>.

Opposite views are supported, for example, by L.G. Salingar<sup>10</sup> and J.M. Lever who describe the Duchess in terms of her dignity and moral strength<sup>11</sup>. These baffling differences could be accounted for by the contradictions which arise in the presentation of the Duchess within the play itself: the way in which the heroine is seen by the different characters and, in particular, by the language and imagery related to her<sup>12</sup>.

It is in this context where I want to discuss the language of confinement related to the heroine. At the beginning of the play, she is figuratively confined by the language, by enclosing male definitions of womanhood; later she will be literally confined, first in a prison and then in the ultimate confinement: her coffin.

By language of confinement, therefore, I mean not only the explicit images of seclusion or imprisonment, but also those images which confine her to female archetypal roles as defined by men: from the virtuous lady and mother to the whore. This ambivalence (women are either good or wicked, angels or devils) is found here in one single character by combining these two contrasting images. It is this pattern of imagery and the denouement of the play which elicit the negative critical approach, as they seem to punish the Duchess's disruptive behaviour and her reversal of expected roles.

The first instance of this type of language in the play comes from Antonio himself who describes his future lover and wife in the language of exemplary virtuous womanhood, an image of a saint in a stained-glass window which "stains the time past; lights the time to come" (I.ii. 132).

7 Clifford Leech, *John Webster* (London, 1951) 68-77.

8 Inga-Stina Ekeblad "The 'Impure Art' of John Webster" in R.J. Kaufmann (ed.), *Elizabethan Drama: Modern Essays in Criticism* (New York, 1961) 257-8.7.

9 James L. Calderwood "The Duchess of Malfi: Styles of Ceremony" in G.K. and S.K. Hunter (eds.) *John Webster: A Critical Anthology*, (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1969) 266-280.

10 L.G. Salingar. 351.

11 J.M. Lever. 205.

12 see Hereward T. Price "The Function of Imagery in Webster" in G.K. and S.K. Hunter, opus cit 176-202.

This vision is opposed later by the enclosing image of the lasciviousness of remarrying widows, represented in the brothers' warning:

Ferdinand: And those joys  
Those lustful pleasures, are like heavy sleeps  
Which do forerun man's mischief.

Cardinal: Fare you well.  
Wisdom begins at the end: remember it.

Duchess: I think this speech between you both was studied,  
It came so roundly off.

Ferdinand: You are my sister;  
This was my father's poniard, do you see?  
I'd be loth to see't look rusty, 'cause 'twas his.  
I would have you to give o'er these chargeable revels:  
A visor and a mask are whispering-rooms  
That were never built for goodness –fare you well–  
And women like that part which, like the lamprey,  
Hath never a bone in 't.

Duchess: Fie, Sir!

Ferdinand: Nay,  
I mean the tongue; variety of courtship.  
What cannot a neat knave with a smooth tale  
Make a woman believe? Farewell, lusty widow.  
(I.ii. 32-48)

Later in the play, this pattern of imagery related to her morality and reputation will confine her within the archetype of the prostitute, the "fallen woman". In a way, she is partly responsible for this for failing to make her marriage public. Her reputation is destroyed, as Antonio himself will acknowledge: "the common rabble do directly say she is a strumpet". (III.i. 25-26).

Ferdinand also believes that she is promiscuous and "a notorious strumpet" and he claims in violent anger that he is not going to be appeased by her maternity, but only by her death:

'Tis not your whore's milk that shall quench my wild fire,  
But your whore's blood"  
(II.v. 48-49)

The Duchess tries to escape by refusing to accept or oppose the versions of womanhood provided by either her brothers or Antonio. Her reply to her brothers' warning or threat quoted above is ambiguous and compromising, as if

reconciling these extremes within female nature. She presents herself, not as Antonio's virtuous woman (the bawdy joke denies that possibility) nor as her brothers' lascivious widow:

Ferdinand: Marry! They are most luxurious  
Will wed twice

Cardinal: Oh, fie!

Ferdinand: Their lives are more spotted  
Than Laban's sheep.

Duchess: Diamonds are of most value,  
They say, that have passed through most jeweler's hands.

Ferdinand: Whores by that rule are precious.  
(I.ii. 5-11)

She struggles throughout the play to be not an angel or a devil, but a woman, a free human being. It is only in her final scene, when she is about to die, that Webster frees her from the archetypal extremes and invokes an image of caring, unselfish motherhood. However, it is difficult to tell whether that image is intended to present a "real" woman and mother, with dramatic life outside the fiction in which she appears; or whether it is just a dramatic device to heighten the pathos and sense of loss in this crucial scene<sup>13</sup>.

The Duchess tries to escape again from these two versions of womanhood in the wooing scene. There is a clear reversal of the conventional structure and roles in a seduction scene. Antonio's role is passive, indeed feminine, while the Duchess is given the attributes and the dramatic behaviour traditionally associated with a man, and it is precisely a woman, Cariola, who is aware of this, as she seems to hint at in her epilogue to the scene:

Cariola: Whether the spirit of greatness or of woman  
Reign most in her, I know not; but it shows  
a fearful madness: I owe her much of pity.  
(I.ii. 204-6)

These lines, however, can also be interpreted as the opposition or struggle between "her spirit of greatness", her rank or public role imaged as "her figure cut in alabaster", and "her spirit of woman", her womanhood or private role, "her flesh and blood".

13 Kathleen McLuskie, *Renaissance Dramatists* (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1989) 144.

Rank is also a confining factor which also involves isolation and misery. Before Antonio, she is happy to reveal her own vision of womanhood: a free, independent woman who boldly asserts her right to choose a husband without regard to her family or to her social class:

Duchess: The misery of us that are born great!  
We are forced to woo, because none dare woo us;  
....  
          You do tremble:  
Make not your heart so dead a piece of flesh,  
To fear more than to love me. Sir, be confident:  
What is 't distracts you? This is flesh and blood, sir;  
'Tis not the figure cut in alabaster  
Kneels at my husband's tomb. Awake, awake, man!  
I do here put off all vain ceremony,  
And only appear to you a young widow  
That claims you for her husband, and, like a widow,  
I use but half a blush in 't.  
(I.ii. 154-163)

This pattern of imagery is further developed in Act III, when she rebels against the fate that her brother wants to impose on her:

Duchess: Why should only I  
Of all the other princes of the world  
Be cased up, like a holy relic? I have youth  
and a little beauty.  
(III.ii. 135-138)

This opposition between woman and monument, life and death "is given a visual force by the image of the Duchess, kneeling before her own tomb, forced by her brother into a symbolic submission"<sup>14</sup>.

The language of confinement is also closely linked to the imagery of animals, which is not only associated with the Duchess, but with most of the characters. Webster's use of these clusters of images is very consistent. The Duchess only uses images related either to fish or birds, animals which are netted or caught by hunters (men), as she is by her brothers. It is therefore appropriate that Antonio should accurately describe Bosola as "an impudent snake" and Ferdinand as "a tiger". The Cardinal is "an old fox".

Ferdinand is generally associated with wild, predatory animals, especially with the wolf, as we can see in this macabre image after the Duchess's death:

Ferdinand: Oh, I'll tell thee;  
The wolf shall find her grave, and scrape it up,  
Not to devour the corpse, but to discover  
The horrid murder.  
(IV.ii. 296-299)

This image is also an omen of Ferdinand's fatal destiny at the end of the play, when he becomes a werewolf and these lines are echoed by a doctor describing the symptoms of Ferdinand's disease.

The Cardinal uses an image from falconry. He is imaged as the falconer/hunter and Julia, his married mistress, as the falcon:

Cardinal: You may thank me, lady,  
I have taken you off your melancholy perch,  
Bore you upon my fist, and showed you game,  
And let you fly at it. I pray thee, kiss me.  
(II.iv. 27-30)

Although Julia is associated with a bird, a falcon, it should be noted that there are some clear differences between this and the ones associated with the Duchess. Julia is married and therefore is committing adultery as the Cardinal's mistress. The Cardinal is then the hunter who has taken her off from the "melancholy perch" of her marital home, but she very aptly has to be "a falcon", a wild bird, which is caught and tamed by "the falconer" and allowed a limited freedom to fly from his lover's "fist" to her marital "perch" and back.

The Duchess's bird images are, on the other hand, associated with little, wild birds. She envies their freedom. They are free to choose their mates, because they are not subject to family, society and rank. She regrets and resents the fact that she is denied the right which is available to one of the smallest and humblest creatures. There are also images of little, helpless birds kept in captivity, where an ominous sense of approaching death can be perceived:

Duchess: The robin-redbreast and the nightingale  
never live long in cages.  
(IV.ii. 13-14)

Marriage, the event which triggers off the tragedy, is also presented in confining and dangerous terms, as a trap. For Ferdinand courtship is "a kind of honey-dew that's deadly", which will eventually poison her fame. It is also dangerous and "subtler than Vulcan's engine", the net in which Vulcan, Venus's husband caught her unbehaving with Mars. This indirect mythological reference to illicit sex links this image to his vision of the Duchess as "a whore".

14 Kathleen McLuskie.144.

Courtship eventually leads to "weddings" which are only the first step to death by "execution". The figurative threat eventually becomes literal revenge:

Ferdinand: Such weddings may more properly be said  
To be executed than celebrated.  
(I.ii. 31-32)

The Cardinal also introduces his own threatening allusion to her likely fate, should she dare to defy their warning:

Cardinal: The marriage night is the entrance into some prison.  
(I.ii. 33-34)

The Duchess is aware of the danger involved. She sees her projected marriage as "a dangerous venture". She is, nevertheless, firm on her resolution, defies her brothers and marries Antonio.

The image of marriage in the wooing scene is associated with the image of a circle. It is first introduced by the wedding ring as a symbol of marriage and is immediately imaged as a conjuring circle associated with witchcraft when Antonio says:

Antonio: There is a saucy and ambitious devil  
is dancing in this circle.  
(I.ii. 116-117)

The wedding ring thus becomes the charmed circle which the necromancer first draws on the ground to conjure up the devil. The sexual connotations of "saucy" seem to be alluding the Duchess, while the "ambitious devil" is referred to what Antonio feels to be a dangerous temptation, ambition, if he marries the Duchess. Finally, the figurative "Gordian knot" of marriage not to be "untied by violence" becomes ironically by violent death the literal noose/cord of the Duchess's strangling, a deadly trap for the couple and their children.

Webster seems to be exploring new possibilities for a female character in this play. He is, nevertheless, constrained by the dramatic traditions of archetypes of women. There seems to be a gap between the enclosing male definitions of women and the Duchess's dramatic behaviour, a contrast between language and action. As Kathleen McLuskie puts it, "women characters can step out of the enclosing misogyny of other characters' view of them but are ultimately controlled by the power of the men who control the world in which they live"<sup>15</sup>.

<sup>15</sup> Kathleen McLuskie, *opus cit.* 145.

## RELATIVIZATION AND REGISTER: A SEVENTEENTH CENTURY SURVEY

María de la Cruz Expósito González  
University of La Laguna

The syntactic function of the relative in its clause is important in as much as it can be correlated with the stylistic complexity of the text in which it is inserted. In this sense I will be following S. Romaine (1984) and X. Dekeyser (1984 y 1988), who have already completed studies in which they tried to confirm this premise. In their analysis, they have attempted to show which syntactic functions are more easily relativizable and which less, following Keenan and Comrie's (1977) theory of the Accessibility Hierarchy. This hierarchy positions the syntactic functions performed by relative pronouns and adverbs in an implicative scale. The order of functions in this scale is as follows:

SU > DO > O > OBLI > GEN > OBJ.COMP

The adverbial function is placed, according to Dekeyser's conclusions, between oblique and genitive. From this hypothesis it emanates that a text or discourse will be the more complex the further down the use and frequency of relative constructions reach in this implicational scale of relativization. In this sense a text that contains relatives functioning as direct or indirect objects will be more complex than a text in which relativizations perform more frequently the subject function and so forth.

The choice of one or other level in this order of relativization might be a reflection of the register to which a text is ascribed. Similarly, register is important in determining the restrictive or non-restrictive nature of the relative construction, since this distinction seems to be characterised, among other variables, by the syntactic complexity of the discourse (Dekeyser 32).

The correlation between the choice and use of relativizers with the syntactic complexity and the stylistic level of the register employed in a given text or discourse has been examined so far for P.D.E. (Present-Day English) informants. X. Dekeyser and M. Ingels, S. Romaine and others have also analyzed texts from other periods to explore the possible application of this theory to stages of the English language when the uses of the relatives were not

as firmly established as in present day English.

The present study has been devised as a complement to the previous ones, since I will be trying to apply further these criteria to another stage of the English language, namely the seventeenth century. The second half of this century is the stage in which, according to several scholars, the contemporary use of the relative pronouns is established. To this respect T. Saito states:

It is worth noting again that as far as the comparative degrees of popularity of the relatives are concerned, there has been no great shift since the end of the seventeenth century.

(76)

The Earl of Rochester will be the seventeenth century informant from whose language I will try to extrapolate the uses of the relatives in this period. The selection of John Wilmot for this purpose is not only due to the fact that he is an educated speaker of the period, but also because his production is not too extensive, and it can be classified in just two genres: poetry and epistolary prose.

Three have been then the hypotheses contemplated in this case, as has been mentioned before:

1. Relativizations introduced by **WH** are commoner in more formal styles than those introduced by **TH** and **zero**. Romaine explains it as follows:

**WH**-forms occur more frequently in more formal styles, whether written or spoken, while **that** and **0** (absence of a relative marker) occur in the less formal styles of speaking and writing.

(104)

It is to be noted, in this sense, that **WH**-pronouns have been historically equated with the Latin forms in **QU**-, and this seems to evidence a higher stylistic formality in their use. Suzanne Romaine implements the linguistic intuitions of the speaker/reader of the language to determine the degrees of formality/informality of the texts she uses as a primary source. Other authors, like Biber (1989), propose a whole series of objective criteria to gradate the formality of a text, among which he includes the selection of relativization techniques.

2. The degree of formality of a text is reflected normally in the higher or lesser degree of syntactic complexity. In this sense, and in accordance with the Accessibility Hierarchy proposed by Keenan and Comrie, it is considered that the presence of relative pronouns in functions other than subject is an index of a

syntactically more elaborated text<sup>1</sup>. On the contrary, following Dekeyser, a passage/discourse is felt to be syntactically less complex if more than 50% of its relative constructions function as subject.

3. Non-restrictive relative sentences usually confer a higher syntactic complexity and indicate, therefore, a higher degree of formality of the text, since, as Dekeyser postulates:

Given the fact that non-restrictive clauses only provide additional information about the antecedent NP, and that less complex language, such as spontaneous speech, tends to present this in a paratactic or non-embedded structure, we expect -R to be a mark of the more complex registers.

# 1. STYLISTIC FORMALITY

Up to the moment, some of the studies carried out in this field show a gradation of the different literary genres in relation to the linguistic register they exhibit. In general this gradations usually contemplate a wide range that consists of different styles. Suzanne Romaine divided them in

theatre in verse  
vernacular verse  
epistolary prose  
narrative prose  
official prose

They are ordered in relation to the impressions of their complexity obtained from their reading from the least complex to the most complex text (official prose). These impressions frequently coincided with the register they were ascribed to attending to their use of the relatives. As might be observed, this stylistic gradation shows that poetry and verse theatre are nearer to the least complex styles, and they are followed by the epistolary prose. Narrative and official prose represent the most formal registers.

Xavier Dekeyser, using associations based on impressions as well, classifies the texts he analyzed in three groups ordered in a decreasing scale of formality:

informative prose  
tragedy  
comedy

<sup>1</sup> The works by Romaine (1984) and Dekeyser (1984) and (1988) are issued in this line.

If I was to indicate which one of Rochester's books is the most complex I would choose the *Poems*, since the *Letters*, being addressed to relatives and friends, would logically represent simpler syntactic constructions. No doubt, the topics Rochester deals with in his letters are familiar enough, both when he writes to his wife as when he corresponds to his friend Henry Saville. In the letters addressed to the latter, more or less veiled references can be found, occasionally, to parties and orgies, economical and political problems, the fall in disgrace of one or the other in court or even to their sexual relations and interchange of lovers (both male and female). In consequence, it seems highly unlikely that letters in which some so very intimate matters were treated and discussed could be written in a formal style of language. Nevertheless, certain characteristics of the epistolary genre in the Restoration period should be considered.

Epistolary prose in English has always been characterised by a simple and plain language despite the trends marked by fashion and manuals for their composition. Even though the English Restoration brought about a strengthening of the taste for a language that was not too elaborate and embellished, however, the fashion in relation to the epistolary prose was approaching a more formalist tendency, which was not followed by the majority of letter writers, but which had a very strong influence in certain circles (Pepys is one of the authors mentioned by J.A. Prieto Pablos (1989: 249)). It is also necessary to keep in mind that epistolary prose was characterised by the presence of formulaic structures that, in many cases, were introduced by the **WH**-pronouns<sup>2</sup>. On the other hand, the linguistic tendencies of a speaker also depend, to a great extent, on his/her cultural level and background; thus, it is frequent that an educated speaker exhibits a more complex use of the relatives than an uneducated one.

The poetry selected by doctor Romaine (Scottish Vernacular Verse) displays some thematic and linguistic features that distinguish it. On the contrary, the great majority of Rochester's poems are inserted in a satirical context (this author was reputed in the seventeenth century for his spiteful lampoons), and there are, naturally, linguistic differences between Rochesterian poetry and Scottish Vernacular verse, marked by the cultural background of the author himself and his idiosyncratic use of the language. Consequently, both the verse and prose of Rochester's should be very similar in style, both formal, even though the *Letters* due to their theme and addressees should be assigned to a less formal register than the *Poems*.

<sup>2</sup> The introduction of **who** in the relative paradigm is also related to certain formulae. See Rydén (126-34).

The table below shows which relativization techniques are used more and which less in John Wilmot's work. In this respect I have included **WH** relative adverbs in the general frequencies of this elements, following Dekeyser. **TH** represents both **that** and **zero**, whose level of implication in relation to syntactic complexity seems to be very similar (Romaine 104).

<i>LETTERS</i>	<b>WH</b>	<b>TH</b>	Total
	194	143	337
	57.56%	42.43%	100%
<i>POEMS</i>	254	128	382
	66.49%	33.50%	100%

The frequency of **WH** surpasses 50% of the examples of relativization in both books, even though in the *Poems* it exceeds substantially the yield obtained for the *Letters*. Therefore, although both works display a majority of relativizations in **WH**, they are more profuse in verse, which results the most formal register of Rochester's production.

Dekeyser includes poetry and epistolary prose in his study of the first half of the seventeenth century. His results reflect that verse and epistolary prose also show a significant frequency of relativizations introduced by **WH**.

<i>EPISTOLARY P.</i>	<b>WH</b>	<b>TH</b>	Total
	260	104	364
	71.42%	28.57%	100%
<i>VERSE</i>	236	188	424
	55.66%	44.33%	100%

As opposed to the yield in Rochester's works, in the epistolary prose studied by Dekeyser, **WH**-relatives reveal a higher percentage than in verse, which is also above 50%. The difference with Rochester's *Letters* is due to the fact that the letters analyzed by Dekeyser exhibit "a more or less official character" (Dekeyser 1984:62).

In the preceding paragraphs, the degree of stylistic formality used to study the selection of relative forms in accordance with register has been determined attending to extralinguistic considerations in an impressionistic way. To avoid the danger of argumentative circularity it is, nevertheless, essential that stylistic formality be established with an unbiased method by means of linguistic

correlations. In this sense, some researchers (Romaine or Dekeyser) have recently included Keenan and Comrie's Accessibility Hierarchy as a criterion, whose effectiveness in Rochester's production is dealt with below.

## 2. SYNTACTIC FUNCTION AND STYLISTIC COMPLEXITY

The insertion of relativization techniques in the different syntactic functions is, as has been mentioned before, another variable to be taken into account in the study both of the selection of relative forms and of the stylistic implications beckoned by its use. To this respect the following table offers a detailed distribution of the syntactic functions in Rochester's books.

	Subj.	D-IO	Obliq.	Adv.	Gen.
<b>LETTERS</b>	142	106	60	24	6
	42.01%	31.36%	17.75%	7.10%	1.77%
<b>POEMS</b>	195	87	22	38	39
	51.18%	22.83%	5.77%	9.97%	10.23%

As stated before, a text is considered syntactically less complex if more than a 50% of its relative constructions function as subject. In the *Poems* this function exceeds that number, in detriment of the object function, which decreases 9 points approximately in comparison with the *Letters*. The uses of the oblique function also decrease considerably, while the genitive and adverbial functions increase. This seems to grade the complexity of the *Poems* slightly above that of the *Letters*, despite the fact that the subject function yields a smaller percentage in the latter.

The table that follows shows the distribution of WH and TH in each of the works according to the different functions:

	Subj.	D-I. O.	Obliq.	Adv.	Gen.
<b>LETTERS</b>					
<b>WH</b>	99	30	42	18	6
	50.76%	15.38%	21.53%	9.23%	3.07%
<b>TH</b>	43	76	18	6	0
	29.45%	53.14%	12.58%	4.19%	0%

## RELATIVIZATION AND REGISTER: A SEVENTEENTH CENTURY SURVEY

<b>POEMS</b>	Subj.	D-I. O.	Oblig.	Adv.	Gen.
<b>WH</b>	124	33	21	36	39
	49.01%	13.04%	8.30%	14.22%	15.41%
<b>TH</b>	71	54	1	2	0
	55.46%	42.18%	0.78%	1.56%	0%

It is clear that the percentages for WH surpass TH in the most complex functions. In the *Poems* the oblique function decreases for both relativization techniques. In the genitive and adverbial functions WH is a long way above TH; the margin of difference is wider in the *Poems*.

The greater stylistic complexity of the *Poems*, and the higher formality of the register implied by the use of WH, will be more easily observed if the percentages are examined taking the functions as the axis.

	Subj.	Obj.	Obliq.	Gen.	Adv.
<b>LETTERS</b>					
<b>WH</b>	69.71%	28.30%	70%	100%	75%
<b>TH</b>	30.28%	71.69%	30%	0%	25%
<b>POEMS</b>					
<b>WH</b>	63.58%	37.93%	95.45%	100%	94.73%
<b>TH</b>	36.41%	62.06%	4.54%	0%	5.25%

Thus, WH-pronouns outnumber TH forms in practically all functions and increase as they approach the most complex levels (the genitive function is exclusively WH). Only in the role of object does TH dominate, due probably to the specialization of zero in that function. The frequency of TH in the complex positions is modest, mainly in the *Poems*.

The conclusions obtained by Dekeyser and Ingels (1988) for informative prose, comedy and tragedy of the later years of the sixteenth century are:

<b>INF. PROSE</b>	Subj.	Obj.	Obliq.	Gen.
<b>WH</b>	60.9%	79.2%	91.25%	100%
<b>TH</b>	39.1%	20.8%	8.75%	0%
<b>TRAGEDY</b>				
<b>WH</b>	26.4%	61.4%	100%	100%
<b>TH</b>	73.6%	38.6%	0%	0%

COMEDY	Subj.	Obj.	Obliq.	Gen.
WH	29.4%	62.5%	88.9%	100%
TH	70.6%	37.5%	11.1%	0%

The results accomplished for Rochester's poetry are quite similar to the outcome for the informative prose of the second half of the sixteenth century. The epistolary prose of this author of the English Restoration also coincides more with the informative prose than with comedy and tragedy as regards their use of relative forms. The only divergence observed is localised in the object function, which in Rochester is more frequently performed by **TH** than by **WH**. This might be explained, as I mentioned before, by the restriction of **zero** in certain functions and its confinement to others.

As opposed to what happens in informative prose, the yield of comedy and tragedy shows a predomination of **TH** in the simplest function: subject.

Indeed, it can be thought that Rochester's work is, in general, much closer to the most formal register of the language as far as the syntactic complexity of its relative constructions is concerned.

### 3. ABSENCE OF RESTRICTION AND STYLISTIC LEVEL

The restrictive or non-restrictive use of the relative clauses correlates to a certain extent with the syntactic complexity of the text. A high percentage of non-restrictive clauses is frequently considered, at least by Dekeyser, as an index or sign of complex registers. Romaine (1984:120-21, note 11) also claims that non-restrictive clauses are syntactically more complex than restrictive ones:

It could also be the case that non-restrictive clauses are in some way more syntactically complex than restrictive ones. The fact that a different ordering of syntactic positions obtains in the case of non-restrictive relative clauses and the non-restrictive system uses a predominantly **WH** strategy might be taken as evidence to support this hypothesis.

It could be therefore expected that differences emerged in the use of these variables exhibited by Rochester's works. In general, restriction is more frequent than non-restriction, although, as compared with the immediately preceding stage of the language, the percentage of non-restrictive clauses is quite high in this author. The uses observed in Rochester's texts might be compared with those studied by Dekeyser and Ingels for the registers of the first half of the seventeenth century.

	+R	-R
Inf. Prose	55.5%	44.5%
Tragedy	62.2%	37.8%
Comedy	63.2%	36.8%
Rochester	53.2%	46.7%

It is obviously in Rochester's work where a higher percentage of non-restrictive clauses results, even higher than in the informative prose analyzed by Dekeyser, whereas the less complex genres (comedy and tragedy in this case) show a notably smaller proportion.

The restriction or non-restriction of relative clauses depending on the type of text display the following comprehensive results, without taking the category of the subordinator into account.

	+R	-R	TOTAL
LETTERS	191 56.67%	146 43.32%	337 100%
POEMS	192 50.26%	190 49.73%	382 100%

The highest proportion of non-restrictive clauses is found in the *Poems*, and this is even more significant if the overall number of restrictive and non-restrictive clauses (383 and 336 respectively) is taken as the axis for the percentage. If this is done, the *Poems* surpass 50% of the non-restrictive examples, as might be observed in the following table.

	+R	-R
LETTERS	49.86%	43.45%
POEMS	50.13%	56.54%
TOTAL	100%	100%

Consequently, from the three perspectives contemplated in this study, the correlation between the use of the relatives and register as it is encountered in Rochester's works concurs with the three hypotheses submitted at the beginning. The *Poems* seem to belong to a slightly more formal and complex register than the *Letters*. In relation to the technique employed to introduce relative clauses, in the *Poems* **WH** is above 66%, whereas in the *Letters* it stands for 58% of the occurrences, approximately. A certain incoherence is



observed in relation to function. The subject function is slightly above 50% of the total in the *Poems*. This is nevertheless restrained by the higher frequency of **WH** in the most complex functions (genitive and adverbial). In relation to the third criterion, a slightly higher complexity might be noticed as well in the *Poems*, in which non-restrictive clauses outnumber in more than 13 points the constructions of this type registered for the *Letters*.

In conclusion, it seems more adequate that in the future the distribution of relative forms should be studied paying attention to register in more detail and in such a way that the linguistic criteria for the selection of each form of this syntactic variable could be examined objectively. Even though the choice of specific items of a variable on the part of speakers/writers might be unconscious, this does not mean that they are isolated, but they are part of an ampler movement in the evolution of the language that takes place as a result of a gradual and cumulative drift. In this sense, the dimensions proposed by Biber and Finegan (1989), for example, with which they try to offer a wider perspective on the evolution of English written styles, deserve being correlated with the use of the different relatives, if less impressionistic and more reliable conclusions are to be obtained as a useful tool for the interpretation of contextual meaning, on the one hand, and for the disclosure of the possible direction of linguistic change in a more general framework.

#### WORKS CITED

- BIBER, D. and E. FINEGAN. "Drift and the Evolution of English Style: A History of Three Genres." *Language* 65, 3 (1989).
- DEKEYSER, Xavier. "Relativizers (sic) in Early Modern English: A Dynamic Quantitative Study". *Historical Syntax*, ed. Jacek Fisiak, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1984: 61-87.
- DEKEYSER, X. and Mia INGELS. "Socio-Historical Aspects of Relativization in Late 16th Century English: CA. 1550- 1600\*." *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* XXI (1988): 25-39.
- KEENAN, E. and B. COMRIE. "Noun Phrase Accessibility and Universal Grammar." (the version used in this article has been the one included in Edward L. Keenan *Universal Grammar*. London: Croom Helm, 1987.
- ROCHESTER, John Wilmot, Earl of. *Letters*, edited by Jeremy Treglown. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1980.
- . *Poems*, edited by Keith Walker. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984.
- ROMAINE, Suzanne. "Some Historical and Social Dimensions of Syntactic Change in Middle Scots Relative Clauses," in *English Historical Linguistics: Studies in Development*, edited by N.F. Blake and Charles Jones. Cectal Conference Papers Series, 3. University of Sheffield, 1984: 101-122.
- RYDEN, Mats. "The Emergence of **who** as Relativizer." *Studia Linguistica*, vol. 37, 2 (1983): 126-134.
- SAITO, Toshio. "The Development of Relative Pronouns in Modern Colloquial English. A Statistical Survey of the Development of their Usage Seen in British Prose Plays from the 16th Century to the Present Time." *The Scientific Reports of Mukogawa Women's University* 8 (1961): 67-89.

## "I AM NOT I, PITIE THE TALE OF ME": READING AND WRITING (IN) ASTROPHIL AND STELLA

Fernando Galván  
Universidad de La Laguna, Tenerife

Twentieth-century criticism on Sidney, and particularly on *Astrophil and Stella*, has mainly emphasized the rhetorical elements and the important debt with the Petrarchan tradition present in his poems. Seminal studies in this field published in the fifties and sixties proved the large extent to which Sidney was not merely or primarily expressing his life in this sonnet sequence. I cannot mention all of them, of course, but I wish to recall, at least, Richard B. Young's long essay "English Petrarche: A Study of Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella*" (1958), which insisted so much on the presence of the opposition between Art and Nature<sup>1</sup>, and the chapter on Sidney in J.W. Lever's essential book *The Elizabethan Love Sonnet* (1956)<sup>2</sup>, that also traced the Petrarchan heritage in the poems. In the sixties the scholarly production on this line was really impressive; we started then to talk about *persona*, plot, structure, and dramatic conflict in this sequence due to several books of excellence, such as Robert L. Montgomery Jr. in 1961 (*Symmetry and Sense*), David Kalstone in 1965 (*Sidney's Poetry: Contexts and Interpretation*) and Neil L. Rudenstein in 1967 (*Sidney's Poetic Development*)<sup>3</sup>. These books were accompanied by essays which broke new ground in the field: in 1960 Jack Stillinger showed how difficult and unsound it was to interpret the sonnet sequence as the biographical expression of Sir Philip Sidney<sup>4</sup>; and throughout the decade more studies continued the anti-biographical vein, culminating –so to speak– with three essays published in

1 Richard B. Young, "English Petrarche: A Study of Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella*", in *Three Studies in the Renaissance: Sidney, Jonson, Milton*. Yale University Press, New Haven, 1958 (reprinted by Archon Books, 1969).

2 J.W. Lever, *The Elizabethan Love Sonnet*, Methuen, London, 1966.

3 Robert L. Montgomery, *Symmetry and Sense: The Poetry of Sir Philip Sidney*, University of Texas, Austin, 1961; David Kalstone, *Sidney's Poetry: Contexts and Interpretations*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1965; and Neil L. Rudenstein, *Sidney's Poetic Development*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1967.

4 Jack Stillinger, "The Biographical Problem of *Astrophil and Stella*", *Journal of English and German Philology*, LIX (1960), pp. 617-639.

1969: one by A.C. Hamilton<sup>5</sup>, a second one by Leonora Leet Brodwin<sup>6</sup>, both of which dealt with the tripartite division of the sequence; and the third one by B.P. Harfst<sup>7</sup>, which defended a seven-part division on the basis of the structure of the *Apologie for Poetrie*.

Naturally, this tendency goes back in time to the end of the nineteenth century, when the biographical bias was being turned over to studies in literary tradition. The pioneering essay by Emil Koeppel in 1890, or Sidney Lee's work in 1904<sup>8</sup>, helped decisively in creating a new atmosphere more akin to textual studies, which has steadily developed from Kenneth Myrick's book *Sir Philip Sidney as a Literary Craftsman* (1935) onwards<sup>9</sup>. The evolution of literary theory after the Second World War, and particularly in the last twenty-five years, has not been alien to this and has obviously exerted a great influence on the way Sidney has been read and interpreted, introducing new approaches.

During the seventies we had, certainly, important studies in formalist criticism; critics like Ernst Häublein, Frank J. Fabry, Derek Attridge and William Cherubini dealt with rhetorics and metrics<sup>10</sup>; Ruth Stevenson and Andrew Weiner continued the discussion on the structure of the sequence<sup>11</sup>; Richard A. Lanham and Leonard Barkan studied rhetorical devices and

5 A.C. Hamilton, "Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella* as a Sonnet Sequence", *English Literary History*, XXXVI, (1969), pp. 59-87.

6 Leonora Leet Brodwin, "The Structure of Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella*", *Modern Philology*, LXVII (1969), pp. 25-40.

7 B.P. Harfst, "Astrophil and Stella: Precept and Example", *Papers on Language and Literature*, V (1969), pp. 397-414.

8 Emil Koeppel, "Studien zur Geschichte des englischen Petrarkismus in sechzehnten Jahrhundert", *Romanische Forschungen*, V (1890), pp. 65-98; and Sidney Lee, *Elizabethan Sonnets Newly Arranged and Indexed*, with an Introduction by Sidney Lee, 2 vols., 1904.

9 Kenneth Myrick, *Sir Philip Sidney as a Literary Craftsman*, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, 1965 (2nd ed.).

10 Ernst Häublein, *Strophe und Struktur in der Lyrik Sir Philip Sidneys*, Herbert Lang, Bern, & Peter Lang, Frankfurt, 1971; Frank J. Fabry, "Sidney's Poetry and Italian Song-Form", *English Literary Renaissance*, 3 (1973), pp. 232-248; Derek Attridge, *Well-weighed Syllables: Elizabethan Verse in Classical Metres*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1974; William Cherubini, "The 'Goldenness' of Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella*: Test of a Quantitative-Stylistics Routine", *Language and Style*, 8 (1975), pp. 47-59 (for a more complete account cf. A.J. Colaianne & W.L. Godshalk, "Recent Studies in Sidney (1970-77)", in Arthur F. Kinney, ed., *Sidney in Retrospect. Selections from "English Literary Renaissance"*, The University of Massachusetts Press, Amherst, 1988, pp. 220-241).

11 Ruth Stevenson, "The Influence of Astrophil's Star", *Tennessee Studies in Literature*, 17 (1972), pp. 45-57, and Andrew Weiner, "Structure and 'Fore Conceit' in *Astrophil and Stella*", *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 16 (1974-75), pp. 1-25.

metaphors<sup>12</sup>, and some others, in short, tried to shed light on many formal details of the sequence, either on the language of *double entendre* used by Sidney to talk about love and passion, as Alan Sinfield showed in his article "Sexual Puns in *Astrophil and Stella*", or on the poems in praise of the kiss, as James Finn Cotter did in 1970-71, etc.<sup>13</sup>

But we cannot forget that this was also the period when scholars tended to pay more attention to Sidney's ideology: both to his Protestant ethos and to his Platonism. Just a couple of names such as those of Alan Sinfield and Gary F. Waller, early in the seventies, must be enough for those familiar with Sidney criticism<sup>14</sup>. This new preoccupation, exemplified here with Sidney, is—as we know—a mere reflection of that "preparation of the way" for the fascinating explosion of studies on the ideology of the Renaissance in the eighties. It would be very difficult to summarize here the wealth and diversity of approaches that the eighties (as well as the second half of the seventies) have produced; reader-response criticism, deconstruction, new historicism, cultural materialism, and feminism and gender studies have widened and enriched our knowledge and perception of the Renaissance. Thomas Healy has explained all this brilliantly in his recent *New Latitudes*, and Janet H. MacArthur offered in 1989 a splendid synthesis of contemporary criticism in the case of *Astrophil and Stella* and *Amoretti* in her book *Critical Contexts of Sidney's "Astrophil and Stella" and Spenser's "Amoretti"*<sup>15</sup>. Formalist and rhetorical analyses of this poetry were also written in this period, of course, and further contributed to ascertain the subtleties and artistry of Sidney's poems, but new and fresh insights came out of these unusual visions of the contexts in which poems were then produced and read, and of our processes of reading them now. Healy has depicted this situation very clearly in the aforementioned book: "Recent literary and cultural theory has helped us to explore Renaissance texts in the historicity of their own

12 Richard A. Lanham, "Astrophil and Stella: Pure and Impure Persuasion", *English Literary Renaissance*, 2 (1972), pp. 100-115; and Leonard Barkan, *Nature's Work of Art: The Human Body as Image of the World*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1975.

13 Alan Sinfield, "Sexual Puns in *Astrophil and Stella*", *Essays in Criticism*, 24 (1974), pp. 341-355; and James Finn Cotter, "The 'Baiser' Group in Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella*", *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 12 (1970-71), pp. 381-403.

14 E.K. Gregory Jr., "Du Bartas, Sidney, and Spenser", *Comparative Literature Studies*, 7 (1970), pp. 437-449; Alan Sinfield, "Sidney and Du Bartas", *Comparative Literature*, 27 (1975), pp. 8-20; and Gary F. Waller, "This Matching of Contraries: Bruno, Calvin and the Sidney Circle", *Neophilologus*, 56 (1972), pp. 331-343.

15 Thomas Healy, *New Latitudes. Theory and English Renaissance Literature*, Edward Arnold, London, 1992; and Janet H. MacArthur, *Critical Contexts of Sidney's "Astrophil and Stella" and Spenser's "Amoretti"*, University of Victoria, B.C., Canada, 1989.

moments of production and in the negotiated moments of their cultural reception until the present" (p. 4). We shall see later how some of these new approaches have helped in the reading of *Astrophil and Stella*.

My main purpose today is to try to combine the formalist method, dealing with some prevailing images in the sequence, and some of the new approaches about the process of production of meaning. I must confess beforehand that I am not sure at all that I can say anything new –which is so difficult with works of this kind, on which so much, and so good, has already been written–, but let me attempt, at least, to reread the sonnet sequence from the perspective of the images of writing and reading along with the lessons that poststructuralist theory have taught us about writing and reading.

Images of writing and reading are in the Renaissance images directly connected to the book, the book as an object that acquired a tremendous importance with the invention and expansion of the printing press. Although these images are as old as writing itself, they had received almost no systematic and comprehensive research until 1948, when the German scholar Ernst Robert Curtius published his seminal work *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter*<sup>16</sup>. Curtius asserts in this book that almost all civilizations have tried to explain the world in terms of writing and reading, so that for the old Babylonians, for instance, the stars were *the writing of the sky*. The book as the object of reading and writing has condensed in itself the metaphors associated with these two activities; the book has become thus a hypermetaphor for the whole world, because writing symbolizes all that exists, *reality*, so that what exists is written and is to be found in the book. Let us remember the French poet Mallarmé, who said that "the world exists to become a beautiful book". And let's recall that in the Middle Ages the images of the world, or of Nature, as a book were constantly recurring. The medieval French author Alain de Lille, who lived in the 12th century, wrote for instance: "Omnis mundi creatura / quasi liber et pictura / nobis est et speculum".

This image was certainly very popular in the Renaissance, as we shall see later, and has reached our times, probably because it involves the idea that in the book you find the diversity, the multiplicity, or the infinite nature of the world, because the *author* of the book is not merely a single author but a multiplicity of authors, whose words, whose debts and influences, appear in the

<sup>16</sup> Ernst Robert Curtius, *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter* (1948); there is an English translation: *European Literature and Latin Middle Ages*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1973.

book. This is also (or rather, seems) an extraordinarily contemporary conception, if I may say so. Think of Roland Barthes and his idea of "the death of the author", of Harold Bloom and his principle of the "anxiety of influence", or of Gérard Genette and his classification of transtextuality. All texts are the results of processes of rewriting, these critics tell us. The metaphor of the book represents the diversity of the world, because the book is authored by many: it is a *collective creation*. Consider the ways this metaphor advances through times and literary periods: in Cervantes's *Don Quijote*, in Sterne's *Tristram Shandy*, or in Calvino's *If on a Winter's Night a Traveller...* Notice that images of the book, of the fictions that books tell, appear themselves in the fictional world depicted in these books. The book is the BOOK with capital letters, it is the continuous process of writing and rewriting; it is, finally, an *actualization of the world*. One of the authors who have treated this issue with particular depth thought and wrote in Spanish: the Argentinian Jorge Luis Borges. He wrote a fascinating story, "La Biblioteca de Babel", where he equated the whole universe with a library, because the different aspects of the world are contained in different books. The library and the world are really one. He says that the Library exists *ab aeterno*, since it is God's work, while man is simply the librarian, the imperfect librarian, who cannot reach the beauty and perfection of books. He compares the beauty of the words printed on the pages of books with the trembling symbols of man's hand scribbling on them:

Para percibir la distancia que hay entre lo divino y lo humano, basta comparar estos rudos símbolos trémulos que mi falible mano garabatea en la tapa de un libro, con las letras orgánicas del interior: puntuales, delicadas, negrísimas, inimitablemente simétricas<sup>17</sup>.

These are images we cannot easily forget: man is imperfect; only the universe, shaped as the Library, is God's work. Unlike this, the image of handwriting, by the author's hand, is weak, trembling, failing, in comparison with the strong, beautiful, delicate, and black symmetrical images of the words on the pages of books. I will be returning to this later when we look at Sidney's poems.

In short, then, there is a long tradition that links diverse aspects of reality and the world with the image of the book, so that we can find different kinds of books in poetic language: the book of nature, the book of memory, the book of the heart, the book of spirit, the book of reason, the book of experience... Man writes and reads in all these books, and that is how we live our lives upon the Earth.

<sup>17</sup> Jorge Luis Borges, "La Biblioteca de Babel", in *Ficciones*, Alianza Editorial, Madrid, 1971, p. 91.

In England the tradition was very strong in the Renaissance, and many examples, with interesting variations, can be found in Shakespeare, in Donne, in Milton, in Vaughan, in Herbert, in Crashaw, etc. during the 17th century. Francis Quarles, for instance, writes in his *Emblems* (1635):

The world's book in folio, printed all  
With God's great works in letters capital:  
Each creature is a page; and each effect  
A fair character, void of all defect.

Here we see the primary metaphorical equation between book and nature expanded to man; now the printed pages are one with human beings. But let us return to Sidney. Although not the first case, surely some of the earliest and most interesting uses of these images in the Renaissance are those by Sidney in his *Astrophil and Stella* sequence, that was so influential in contemporary poetry. Herbert S. Donow's work *A Concordance to the Poems of Sir Philip Sidney* may help as a guide in checking and corroborating this impression; some terms such as "book", "read", "write", "words", "pen", "leaves", "ink", etc. appear very frequently not only in *Astrophil and Stella* but also in the *Arcadia* and in the *Eclogues*<sup>18</sup>. This is obviously an indication of Sidney's conscious effort to draw the attention on this topic. Sidney, as we shall see later, is an extraordinarily self-conscious artist, well aware of what he is doing with his pen. That is why I think it is worthwhile to look closely at some of the poems, trying to read in them "what is written" and what underlies that which is written.

Let us see then how the poet's voice, how Astrophil –the persona Sidney uses to express himself, or rather, perhaps, to disguise himself– writes, and reads, where and how he learns to write and read because this is one way to understand his world view. The first poem has been widely discussed and I think I cannot add anything substantial to what has already been said. It is very interesting to notice, however, that from the very beginning of the sequence we find several images connected with the techniques of writing: *painting*, *writing*, *reading*, *words* and *pen*, on the one hand; and on the other synecdoches such as leaves for "book" and *feet* for "rhythm", along with other references to the literary art (*Invention*, *step-dame Studie's blowes*). We know that this is the justification for the whole book: how *writing* would favour her *reading*, and this would lead her to *knowledge*, and from it to *pity*, so that ultimately she

18 Herbert S. Donow, *A Concordance to the Poems of Sir Philip Sidney*, with programming by Trevor J. Swanson, Cornell University Press, Ithaca & London, 1975.

would give him *grace*. This process of getting the lady's love is described in the poem through these images of writing and reading, although paradoxically the conclusion that the poet reaches here, and repeats in many other sonnets of the sequence, is that all the techniques that Rhetorics teaches are useless, because the only way to get Stella's love is by avoiding Invention (that is, technique), and by going directly to his own heart, probably representing here the image of the poet's mistress, that is, "the source of his powers of invention", as Kalstone has remarked in his splendid examination of this sonnet<sup>19</sup>. It is the heart, then, the true code of happiness, the centre of the universe for Astrophil, the only source of meaning for the world, the salvation for the lover. Astrophil says that certainly writing requires reading ("I sought fit words to paint the blackest face of woe, / Studying inventions fine, her wits to entertaine..."), but adds that what one should read is not others' books. One should read the Book with capital letters, that is: the book of the Heart where his mistress dwells, and from which his powers of invention are nurtured. This principle governs the whole sequence, and more examples appear later.

Notice also Sonnet 3, where the Book of Nature is represented in Stella:

How then? even thus: in Stella's face I reed,  
What Love and Beautie be, then all my deed  
But Copying is, what in her Nature writes.  
(ll. 12-14)

Or Sonnet 6, where we contemplate how some lovers try to express themselves through the Muses or Mythology, using all the tools of writing:

[...] *strange tales* attires,  
broadred with buls and swans, powdered with golden raine:  
Another humbler wit to shepherd's *pipe* retires,  
Yet hiding royall bloud full oft in rurall vaine.  
To some a sweetest plaint, a sweetest *stile* afords,  
While teares powre out his *inke*, and sighs breathe out his *words*:  
His *paper*, pale dispaire, and paine his *pen* doth move.  
(ll. 5-11)

But all this to no avail, at least for Astrophil, who insists on expressing himself in a "natural" way: notice the adjective ("When *trembling* voice brings forth that I do *Stella* love", l. 14), which is the same adjective as the one we encountered

19 David Kalstone, *Sidney's Poetry: Contexts and Interpretations*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1965, pp. 124-129.

earlier, in Borges's description of the difference between the divine and the human. Borges said the human was imperfect, and was represented by those "rough, *trembling* symbols that his failing hand was scribbling on the cover of a book", in comparison with the perfection of the symmetrical, delicate, black, characters inside the book. It is true that Sidney does not set an opposition here between the black ink of the rhetorical style (the language of books, the language of beautiful mythological stories) and the trembling hand scribbling the lover's complaints, but he certainly places that absent ink, represented by books, by rhetorics, in opposition to his *trembling* voice. I think there is no great distance between his *trembling* voice and Borges's *trembling* hand; both reveal the same spirit: human imperfection in front of the divine power, here symbolized by the rhetorics of books. The great paradox, as we know, is that Astrophil, despite all these claims to natural language and rejection of rhetorics, is highly rhetorical in his expression. As Kalstone has also said, "we are bound to be puzzled if we take Astrophel's poems on style as a program of reform rather than as a series of rather troubled and self-conscious gestures"<sup>20</sup>. But there's no real contradiction, if we understand the sequence and the opposition between Invention (Art) and Nature as the manifestation of conflict, of disruption, that is so common in Renaissance love poetry. Sidney, according to Kalstone, shares this feature with his contemporaries, but emphasizes even more strongly "the *discovery* of conflict, the frequent emphasis on disruption itself"<sup>21</sup>.

The images of the book, of reading and writing, that we are examining help to understand better the self-conscious nature of this *persona* represented by Astrophil, the *persona* of "the questioning critic", using again Kalstone's words<sup>22</sup>. Notice also how Sonnet 7 insists upon this conception; Nature created Stella, the poet says using the equation with painting to allude to that act of creation: ll. 1-8. And then he calls upon the reader to observe the opposition between beauty and the colour *black*:

Or would she her miraculous power show,  
That whereas blacke seemes Beautie's contrary,  
She even in blacke doth make all beauties flow?  
(ll. 9-11)

This phrase *in blacke* is an allusion to the colour of *ink*, of *printing*, but also to the colour of *mourning*; and so the poet concludes with this pun, telling us that

20 David Kalstone, p. 130.

21 David Kalstone, p. 131.

22 David Kalstone, p. 132.

*black* is necessary in order to place Love in Stella, because this is the only way firstly that "Love should be / Placed *ever* there" (the eternity of the printed word), and secondly, "To honor all their deaths, who for her bleed", that is, all the lovers who die for her. The black colour of Stella's eyes is metaphorically the guarantee of the eternity of art, through the black ink of printing, and through the eternal memory of the lovers who have died unrewarded.

Sonnet 11 constitutes a beautiful adaptation of this topic: Love is now a boy who approaches *reading* for the first time; the book he uses is *faire*, with *gilded leaves*; it is a *coloured velume*, with pictures. This is probably, as Patricia Fumerton has so accurately described it, an allusion to the beautiful miniatures by Hilliard that were so popular in the court<sup>23</sup>. The boy can only look at the book, but cannot read, so that he only *sees* Stella in *Nature's cabinet*. Thus, unable to read, he remains in *each outward part*, he does not go beyond the surface. That is why the poet finally addresses Love with a tone of scorn: "But, foole, seekst not to get into her hart". We learn, then, that *reading* is deciphering, decoding messages, entering the heart of the matter, the heart of the text (that is, Stella's heart, because she is really the text of the Book of Nature: "Nature's cabinet"). This little boy, Love, is still very young and cannot do so, cannot reach Stella's heart; he is a fool, and that's why he receives the poet's contempt.

Sonnet 15 is simply a reaffirmation of Sonnets 1 and 3, that is, of the necessity to escape from the books of Rhetorics and to advocate a return to the Book of Nature; in this case the message is similar to Sonnet 3: read Stella and find inspiration in her. And Sonnet 28 collaborates further in emphasizing this idea: the rhetorical devices are not necessary, the only thing needed is Love, which is the only creature capable of "reading unto me this art", *reading* being used here, notice, with the value of *dictating*, of *teaching*.

One of the key pieces in the sequence is Sonnet 45, from which I have taken the last line for the title of this speech today. The sonnet starts with the image of *painting* (writing on the body): "Stella oft sees the verie face of wo / *Painted* in my beclouded stormie face", but this does not make her react with pity towards him. Astrophil discovers that Stella is only moved by Art, not by Reality. His "beclouded stormie face" produces no reaction in her;

23 Cf. Patricia Fumerton, "'Secret' Arts: Elizabethan Miniatures and Sonnets", in Stephen Greenblatt, ed., *Representing the English Renaissance*, University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles & London, 1988, pp. 93-133, especially pp. 111-122.

Yet hearing late a *fable*, which did show  
Of Lovers never knowne, a grievous case,  
Pitie thereof gate in her brest such place  
(ll. 5-7)

So look! it is Invention, rather than Nature, that provokes her pity. *The power of the written word*, of Imagination, is stronger with Stella than the lover's reality:

Alas, if *Fancy drawne* by imag'd things,  
Though false, yet with free scope more grace doth breed  
Then servant's wracke, where new doubts honor brings;  
(ll. 9-11)

What can the poet do, then? There's a very simple solution: the poet demands an effort from the lady's side, so that she *reads* also *tales in him*, not only the traces left on his face by woe:

Then thinke my deare, that you in me do *reed*  
Of Lover's ruine some sad *Tragedie*:  
I am not I, pitie the tale of me.  
(ll. 12-14)

This is a strange conclusion indeed, highly paradoxical. Notice that Astrophil has been telling us all the time that the only way to win Stella's love is through reading and learning the Book of Nature, or the Book of the Heart (where Stella dwells), avoiding the books of rhetorics; and now, all of a sudden, he discovers, and we are told, that Stella's attention cannot be drawn to him unless Stella looks at him *as if he were a tale*, as if his life were a tragedy, like the ones she reads in mythological tales and books. A great paradox of course: *his writings* are not based on other writings but on Love, on the Heart, on Nature. But, for her, Nature is not enough: *Reality must be shaped by writing*, at least for her; otherwise she wouldn't notice it.

Many interpretations have been given of this surprising line; for some this enigmatic "I am not I" points to the autobiography that the sequence really is; Young, for instance, comments on the question whether Astrophil is "real" or a "tale":

Critical evaluation of the sonnets seems more often than not to have been dictated by the answer to this question, and Sidney's critics have divided widely upon it. Those, like Lee, who emphasize the literary provenance of the sequence conclude that it is simply an exercise in the

Petrarchan manner, with no real matter at all; those who emphasize the allusions to Sidney's own life and times conclude that it is the material record of biographical fact, which the manner serves less to express than to disguise<sup>24</sup>.

This same author later says that, for him, this reference to Astrophil being a "tale" is a parody of the character's previous behaviour, that all his suffering, his "grievous case", is now seen as a tale<sup>25</sup>. Kalstone, on the other hand, sees it as an ironical remark on the dangers of the Petrarchan tradition, that is, the risk of encouraging "satisfaction with a literary passion and draw attention from the experience on which the original poems were based"<sup>26</sup>. For Thomas P. Roche, Jr., in a completely different mood, this poem shows "the phallic impudence of Astrophil's erected wit"<sup>27</sup>, and particularly the last line is a proof of the confusion that dominates Astrophil, who cannot distinguish "between a response to literature and a response to life"<sup>28</sup>. Following a line of interpretation similar to Sinfield's in his article "Sexual Puns in *Astrophil and Stella*"<sup>29</sup>, Roche argues that although Astrophil's defeat here is a logical consequence of his rhetorical confusion, his

unremitting passion surmounts even such logical defeat by blatantly punning on the word 'tale', for which he would willingly substitute 'tail', a word that he has become in the course of these sonnets, an object that he has elevated in his thoughts to be the principal definition of his being<sup>30</sup>.

That is certainly a witty comment, and one which –although minor and marginal, in my opinion– helps in enriching the interpretation of the sequence, one which contributes to "make the poetry better" and to transform radically "the traditional image of the elegant but naive courtier" we have of the poet (Sinfield's words at the end of the article I have just quoted, p. 355).

24 Richard B. Young, "English Petrarche: A Study of Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella*", in *Three Studies in the Renaissance: Sidney, Jonson, Milton*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1958 (reprinted by Archon Books, 1969), p. 9.

25 Richard B. Young, 56.

26 David Kalstone, *Sidney's Poetry*, p. 158.

27 Thomas P. Roche, Jr., "*Astrophil and Stella*: A Radical Reading", in *Spenser Studies. A Renaissance Poetry Annual*, III, ed. by Patrick Cullen & Thomas P. Roche, Jr., University of Pittsburgh Press, 1982, p. 158.

28 Thomas P. Roche, p. 159.

29 Alan Sinfield, "Sexual Puns in *Astrophil and Stella*", *Essays in Criticism*, 24 (1974), pp. 341-355.

30 Thomas P. Roche, p. 159.

Other critics offer equally suggestive interpretations that do not question the more traditional image of the poet, that of an elegant courtier and a sophisticated man of letters. One of the most interesting is Rosalie L. Colie's reading in her book *Paradoxia Epidemica. The Renaissance Tradition of Paradox*. She associates this "I am not I, pitie the tale of me" with Petrarch's first sonnet in the *Canzoniere*; the Italian poet, in fact, confesses from the very beginning that he is writing of his "real" self:

Voi ch'ascoltate in rime sparse il suono  
di quei sospiri ond'io nudriva 'l core  
in sul mio primo giovenile errore  
quand'era in parte altr'uom da quel ch'io sono  
(ll. 1-4)

Nevertheless he has a fear, a fear of being misunderstood by his readers; in the first tercet of this first sonnet he puts it very clearly:

Ma ben veggio or sí come al popol tutto  
favola fui gran tempo, onde sovente  
di me medesmo meco mi vergogno;

This shame, this fear of being seen as a "fable", as a "fiction", is obviously a false fear, because this is precisely what he was and what he wanted to be. Colie says that as he pretended to record the "real" Petrarch, growing old, "he made an ideal Petrarca, a poet fabulous in his fidelity and endurance, remarkable even for his very reality, a poet whose life took on the air -'l'aura', as he said himself- of the laureateship of love"<sup>31</sup>. So when Sidney makes Astrophil say this "I am not I, pitie the tale of me", he is ironically recalling these Petrarchan lines, reversing their meaning and making fun of them. He is thus manipulating language and tradition. Colie concludes her argument with a statement I find extremely illuminating:

The paradoxical "I am not I" can be taken as the motto for the whole sequence, perhaps for any such set of poems where the writer is both subject and creator: Sidney is, but also he is not the "I" that is Astrophil-although, of course, Astrophil's words must come from Sidney's mouth as Pantagruel's do from Rabelais'; words which create the truth and can therefore uncreate it, since they made it in the beginning; words which can at once, in triumph, assert and deny the truth of what they say<sup>32</sup>.

31 Rosalie L. Colie, *Paradoxia Epidemica. The Renaissance Tradition of Paradox*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1966, p. 87.

32 Rosalie L. Colie, p. 95.

Also J.G. Nichols has contributed to the clarification of this poem. Although he says he can accept the presence in it of the love situation and the possible disguise under which the poet hides, he prefers to regard this sonnet as a way of talking about literature. He says: "the literary theory involved is that poetry may move us when reality does not"<sup>33</sup>. And obviously, this sophisticated reading shouldn't surprise us in the context of Renaissance Petrarchan tradition, and particularly within the context of the sequence. Nichols also adds:

Astrophil's sophistication (a reflection of course of the sophistication of his creator) must be matched by a sophisticated reading. A sophisticated reading demands a constant awareness of the poems as artefacts, human fabrications which could have been different. One of the greatest pleasures of Sidney's poetic masterpiece is missed if we are not always alive, not only to the effects created, but also to the ways in which they are created<sup>34</sup>.

I do agree with Nichols, of course, and my purpose here is precisely to illustrate this kind of reading, Sidney's complete awareness as a poet and his attitude of self-consciousness. The metaphors of writing and reading we see in the sequence are undoubtedly the product of this sophistication. Sonnet 45 is, then, exemplary in this respect, but neither the only example, nor one out of a few. Another critic who has also noticed this kind of thing, although she does not develop it sufficiently, in my opinion, is Anne Ferry in her book *The "Inward" Language. Sonnets of Wyatt, Sidney, Shakespeare, Donne*. Talking about this sonnet, she remarks the use Sidney makes of the terms *tale* and *fable* in the sequence and in *An Apologie for Poetrie*, where both share the meaning of "fiction". She goes a bit further, and notices that in the first two lines of this sonnet "Astrophil's face is itself a poem, in which he (or woe, or Nature, or perhaps even Love) has depicted an image of a visage other than his own"<sup>35</sup>. This makes Astrophil not a direct representation of a reality, at least in this grievous mood in which he is depicted here, but a contrived image ingeniously devised to attract Stella's pity; for Ferry, this interpretation explains the last line of the poem like this: "'I am not I' lays claim to what it wittily denies: that behind the pitiable 'tale of me', admittedly false and calculated to move Stella,

33 J.G. Nichols, *The Poetry of Sir Philip Sidney. An Interpretation in the Context of His Life and Times*, Liverpool University Press, Liverpool, 1974, p. 152.

34 J.G. Nichols, p. 153.

35 Anne Ferry *The "Inward" Language. Sonnets of Wyatt, Sidney, Shakespeare, Donne*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago & London, 1983, p. 134.



is an 'I' with an identity distinct but unexpressed, held in reserve"<sup>36</sup>. I find this very interesting because it implies a high degree of awareness and reflection (self-reflection) on the act of writing itself: Astrophil knows he is a product of Sidney's imagination and Invention, and as such, "false", merely an image. His "own identity" –so to speak– is denied to us, because all his being is vehicled, mediated, through the language of rhetorics. Ferry discusses this from the perspective of the opposition between "inward" and "outward" expressions, that is the main concern of her book. She says:

Unlike the lover in Wyatt's song in which the lover bids farewell to cruelty, Astrophil does not easily identify himself with a representative "one" or "he". On the contrary, he playfully assumes such an identification only in order to set himself apart from it. Beyond even these distinctions is Astrophil's sense of himself as separate from what can be shown through direct outward expression of inward states. For his troubled countenance makes visible only a portrait –and here such artistic images are "false"– of suffering. Undefined but implied by contrast with the verbal representations of "fable", "Tragedie", "tale", is something unspoken; by contrast with the vocabulary of painting and showing, something unseen but true to Astrophil's sense of being who "I am"<sup>37</sup>.

The reflection on the construction of one's own identity which underlies this line in Sidney's sonnet is surely a fascinating topic, one with which Stephen Greenblatt has also dealt brilliantly in his book *Renaissance Self-Fashioning. From More to Shakespeare*. When he discusses the character of Othello, Greenblatt quotes Astrophil's line, and comments that although it is Iago who says in the play "I am not what I am" ("the motto of the improviser, the manipulator of signs that bear no resemblance to what they profess to signify"), "it is Othello himself who is fully implicated in the situation of the Sidney sonnet: that one can win pity for oneself only by becoming a tale of oneself, and hence by ceasing to be oneself"<sup>38</sup>. This fictionalization of life is –as we know very well– a common theme of Renaissance art and literature. Sidney is perhaps one of the first artists to fully develop it and he does it so successfully that some of his achievements are later the source of quotations by others, such as Shakespeare in this case.

Gary F. Waller has also tackled this issue of the identity from an ideological point of view in two important essays: "Acts of Reading: The Production of

Meaning in *Astrophil and Stella*" and "The Rewriting of Petrarch: Sidney and the Languages of Sixteenth-Century Poetry"<sup>39</sup>. In the first essay Waller discusses the role played by readers in the reception and interpretation of texts, following particularly Barthes's poststructuralist position in *S/Z*, and Derrida's notions of "textuality"; for Waller, then, there are no texts by themselves (as the formalists conceived it), but a combination of "the author (as scriptor as well as reader), the poems' readers, and the history of their readings"<sup>40</sup>. The elucidation of these multiple aspects of textuality leads Waller to treat the Petrarchan and Protestant ideologies that produced certain types of texts in the Renaissance, which were vehicled through the figure of the author. This proposal is certainly fascinating, and extremely demanding, I must add, so that Waller naturally cannot exhaust its potentialities (he doesn't have that intention, on the other hand). He is perfectly aware of this, when he writes about Sidney's poetic sequence being a *scriptible* text in Barthes's sense. That means, as he clearly explains, following Barthes's proposals in *S/Z* very closely:

Sidney's texts are not lines of words realizing a single message; they are "multi-dimensional" spaces in which "a variety of writings", including those of his readers, "blend and clash". We can enter the texts by any of several routes, none of which we are forced to accept as the authentic one –however strongly Astrophil, or even Sidney, may try to persuade us. As Barthes puts it, we enter "a galaxy of signifiers, not a structure of signifieds". We play within a ludic space, and the codes thereby mobilized will "extend as far as the eye can reach, they are interminable", or at least will extend through the work's history<sup>41</sup>.

This is, to my mind, fundamental in our contemporary reading of Sidney, as our reading of the images of reading and writing show in this case. What is the meaning, in fact, of those recurrent signifiers in the text? How can we ascribe to them a structure of signifieds?

In his second essay Waller pursues a more concrete goal, to show how the Protestant poet that Sidney was tried to negotiate the Petrarchan ethos with

39 Gary F. Waller, "Acts of Reading: The Production of Meaning in *Astrophil and Stella*" (in *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, XV, 1, Spring 1982, pp. 23-35) and "The Rewriting of Petrarch: Sidney and the Languages of Sixteenth-Century Poetry" (in Gary F. Waller & Michael D. Moore, eds. *Sir Philip Sidney and the Interpretation of Renaissance Culture. The Poet in His Time and in Ours. A Collection of Critical and Scholarly Essays*, Croom Helm, London & Sidney, and Barnes & Noble Books, Totowa, N.J., 1984, pp. 69-83).

40 Gary F. Waller, "Acts of Reading: The Production of Meaning in *Astrophil and Stella*" (in *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, XV, 1, Spring 1982, p. 24).

41 Gary F. Waller, *ibid.*, p. 28.

36 Anne Ferry, p. 135.

37 Anne Ferry, p. 135.

38 Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning. From More to Shakespeare*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago & London, 1980, p. 238.



Protestantism, taking as a starting assumption the conviction that "any 'literary' movement is always (indeed, always already) overdetermined, the product of a complex, perhaps infinite, network of codes which continually write and rewrite one another"<sup>42</sup>. He discusses the presence of the 'I' in Petrarchanism and Protestantism, showing how the desiring subject speaks without being free. For him, the 'I' is allowed to speak under the control of an "Other" (a mistress in Petrarchanism and God in Protestantism); this mediation is what makes speaking possible, welling up "as a seemingly obligatory truth-bearing act and which asserts or desires to reveal a stable, given, pre-existent, autonomous and originating self"<sup>43</sup>. This fighting among multiple discourses is perhaps best summarized in sonnet 45, because the assertion of unity, consistency and selfhood that appears in other poems (in the first sonnet, for instance) is here disrupted in the final line: "I am not I, pitie the tale of me". Waller says that in this sonnet we find that the "radically decentered self that the Petrarchan situation unfolds as an attempt is made to write itself into the world"<sup>44</sup>. This writing leads to unravelling the lack of stability, the anxiety underlying the identity of the poet himself as well as of his contemporary courtly audience.

What does all this mean?—some of you will very likely be wondering, perhaps in desperation, by now—; the answer is very simple: that the enigmatic sentence, whose diverse interpretations I have tried to summarize up to this point, is just a token of the multiplicity of voices and ideologies living and fighting, as in a palimpsest, under the beauty and apparent neutrality of these love poems. Astrophil says that he is not himself, perhaps alluding to his creator, who is indirectly speaking through his voice, but also perhaps referring to his own condition of fiction ("fable", "tale"), his anxious condition of being an empty or floating "signifier" in the midst of a tradition so replenished with beautiful words and *topoi*. As Jacqueline T. Miller writes in an article entitled "'What May Words Say': The Limits of Language in *Astrophil and Stella*", referring to Murray Krieger's formulation, "Renaissance poets, among them Sidney in particular, confront 'the emptiness of words as signifiers—their distance from their signifieds' and 'can accept words as insubstantial entities existing on their own, not to be confounded with their signifieds'"<sup>45</sup>. But what interests me today is not so much

42 Gary F. Waller, "The Rewriting of Petrarch: Sidney and the Languages of Sixteenth-Century Poetry", op. cit., p. 69.

43 Gary F. Waller, *ibid.*, p. 70.

44 Gary F. Waller, *ibid.*, p. 74.

45 Jacqueline T. Miller, "'What May Words Say': The Limits of Language in *Astrophil and Stella*" (in Gary F. Waller & Michael D. Moore, eds., *Sir Philip Sidney and the Interpretation of Renaissance Culture. The Poet in His Time and in Ours. A Collection of Critical and Scholarly Essays*, Croom Helm, London & Sidney, and Barnes & Noble Books, Totowa, N.J., 1984, p. 95.

talking about the struggling ideologies behind this evanescent identity of the 'I' (something already done brilliantly by critics such as Waller, Greenblatt, Sinfield, Jones and Stallybrass, or Miller, among others)<sup>46</sup>, but rather to emphasize the rhetorical elements used by Sidney to draw the reader's attention to all these gaps in the text. Through all these images of writing and reading we can see how Sidney is consciously reflecting on his own process of writing, on his own mechanisms to disguise and to produce his own ideological discourse.

If we go on reading the sequence we shall undoubtedly encounter more examples of these images. In what is normally considered by critics as a second part, or phase, in the sequence, we see basically the same images, the same insistence upon the necessity to pay attention to the book of Nature, to the single book represented by Stella herself, forgetting about all the other books. What is perhaps distinctive in this second group is a slight difference of tone: we notice a more vigorous resolution, we see how Astrophil now shows a higher degree of audacity and decision. In sonnet 55, for instance, he rejects the Muses with strength, and declares the value of a single word, her name:

But now I meane no more your helpe to trie,  
Nor other sugring of my speech to prove,  
But on her *name* incessantly to crie:  
For let me but *name* her whom I do love,  
So *sweete sounds straight mine eare and heart do hit*,  
That I well find no *eloquence* like it.

(II. 9-14)

The substance of the message remains much the same as in the other sonnets of the first phase; what is different here is probably—as I have just said—the tone, which is much more assertive. We can even say that the rejection of the Muses represents the rejection of the written word (since the Muses are reflected on the writings of other poets), while the defence of Stella's name as his only salvation enacts the privileging of speech over writing. Derrida would have much to say on this, and perhaps what we learn from sonnet 45 could fruitfully be applied here, but this is a complex question, that I prefer to put aside for the time being.

46 The full bibliographical reference to Jones and Stallybrass is: Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass, "The Politics of *Astrophil and Stella*", *Studies in English Literature*, 24 (1984), pp. 53-68.

Robert L. Montgomery has examined this sonnet from another interesting perspective, justifying this insistence on the rejection of the rhetorics of others in the construction, by Astrophil, of a deliberate policy of persuasion in order to win Stella: "Astrophil's various styles and repeated claims of poetic simplicity and authenticity are really at bottom strategies of desire"<sup>47</sup>; Montgomery goes further, arguing that all these sonnets dealing with the process of writing are merely the expression of "the ethos of the hopeful but frustrated lover, not Sidney's own critical stance or the general rightness of a kind of style"<sup>48</sup>. We have, then, more arguments for the consideration of Astrophil as "fiction", as "fable".

Sonnet 67 offers a beautiful image of writing and reading, particularly of reading, of interpretation, and one that I find especially appealing today, because it seems as if it were one of our usual contemporary images, an image of the postmodern period. A few years ago Nona Fienberg read this poem from a feminist point of view, commenting on how Stella's silence acquires a powerful significance in this context. For this critic, this silence, this "marginalized discourse to which her femininity relegates her" exerts a dominating position, to the extent that she "translates her deprivation into a mode of domination"<sup>49</sup>. In her final conclusion she says that Astrophil (or Sidney) in this sonnet "thematizes the difficulty of writing and of understanding the gaps, those alternative discourses through which culturally marginalized groups communicate"<sup>50</sup>. I think this point is crucial in the interpretation of this sonnet, and to a large extent of the whole sequence, but perhaps not because we are dealing with a marginalized group, such as women, but simply because of the intrinsic difficulty of any text, no matter whether it is produced by a marginalized group or not. This is one of the dominating elements of *Astrophil and Stella*: the difficulty of reading and interpreting texts. Notice that Hope, here personified, *reads* Stella's heart and *interprets* her feelings; the result is that the *language of her eyes is translated* by Hope. And here we have a problem, Astrophil faces a problem: can Hope really understand the text she is reading? is not that text (Stella's heart, remember I referred to that image in connection with Sonnet 11) very difficult to interpret? can we trust Hope's interpretation? has Hope read the whole text,

47 Robert L. Montgomery, "Astrophil's Stella and Stella's Astrophil", in Gary F. Waller & Michael D. Moore, eds., *Sir Philip Sidney and the Interpretation of Renaissance Culture. The Poet in His Time and in Ours. A Collection of Critical and Scholarly Essays*, Croom Helm, London & Sidney, and Barnes & Noble Books, Totowa, N.J., 1984, p. 52.

48 Robert L. Montgomery, *ibid.*, p. 53.

49 Nona Fienberg, "The Emergence of Stella in *Astrophil and Stella*", *Studies in English Literature*, 25 (1985), p. 12.

50 Nona Fienberg, *ibid.*, pp. 12-13.

or only some parts, and so misinterprets the totality? All these questions are condensed in the following lines:

But failst thou not in phrase so heav'nly hie?  
Looke on againe, the faire text better trie:  
What blushing notes doest thou in margine see?  
What sighes stolne out, or kild before full borne?  
Hast thou found such and such like arguments?  
Or art thou else to comfort me forsworne?

(ll. 6-11)

Astrophil uses the language of textual commentary (*speech, translated, phrase, text, notes, margine, arguments, interpret, contents*) to refer to Stella's body, to Stella's face, and implies, as you can see, that the text should be read in its totality, including the margins, not only the centre. He tells us that what at first sight seems accidental, marginal, may become substantial; this is why Hope fails in her reading: she doesn't perceive the *blushing notes in the margin*, and all the other elements that accompany them. This makes her interpretation dubious, uncertain. But Astrophil, in this phase of fighting, prefers this *misreading* (this partial reading) to crude reality, to the naked truth:

Well, how so thou interpret the contents,  
I am resolv'd thy error to maintaine,  
Rather then by more truth to get more paine.

(ll. 12-14)

The text is then not only Stella's eyes, but Stella's whole body. If we read only her eyes, as Hope has done, we get a partial information about her heart: eyes are not the mirror of the soul, the poet seems to be telling us; we must also read other things, in order to get a more complete appreciation of the text. Appearances might induce to error.

This tone of problematizing interpretation, which paradoxically tackles the necessity to secure interpretation, is increased in Sonnet 71, one of the undisputable central pieces in the whole sequence, although in this case reading seems simpler, and Astrophil's assertion is clearer:

Who will in fairest booke of Nature know,  
How Vertue may best lodg'd in beautie be,  
Let him but learne of Love to reade in thee...

(ll. 1-3)

This gives certainty, security, to a reading, because it is a direct reflection of Nature, this being, again, the spirit of the whole sequence, in its opposition between *Nature* (positive) and *Invention* (= Literature, negative). But the contradictions, the struggles that Astrophil suffers are not absent here either. Compare Sonnet 71 with Sonnet 70. Notice the sharp contrast: in Sonnet 70 the poet is trying to *describe* Love and particularly Joy, and is suspicious of the possibilities offered by his Muse to him:

My Muse may well grudge at my heav'nly joy,  
If still I force her in sad rimes to creepe...  
(ll. 1-2)

so that, being afraid of his inability to *paint his joy*, even in black and white, he feels defeated, and yields. He prefers to keep silent, not to write. This feeling of disappointment, despondency even –being an anticipation of the third phase–, is expressed at the end of the sonnet with a great power:

Cease eager Muse, *peace pen*, for my sake stay,  
I give you here my hand for truth of this,  
Wise silence is best musicke unto blisse.  
(ll. 12-14)

It is important to remark again that Sidney was consciously working with these images of the book and of writing and reading, even when he was adapting a previous text; notice in this respect that Sonnet 71 is a well-known version of Petrarch's sonnet 248, "Chi vuol veder quantunque pò Natura", that contains no reference at all to the image of the book of Nature. It is Sidney who introduces the metaphor in Sonnet 71, because he obviously needs it for making his purpose more explicit. As Kalstone has written:

Sidney's poem develops the metaphor of the book and concerns itself, almost systematically, with the process of learning from Stella. The observer will 'know', will 'read'. Petrarch asks us to see, to admire [...] A sense of illumination is implicit in the tone and dramatic situation, but is not conveyed as explicitly as it is in Sidney's sonnet<sup>51</sup>.

This aspect of *learning* that Kalstone associates with *reading* is, no doubt, a substantial point in the interpretation of the sequence.

51 David Kalstone, *Sidney's Poetry: Contexts and Interpretations*, op. cit., p. 120.

In the third phase, finally, we can also see how disappointment, anxiety, and even desperation, are reflected in the Book he is writing and reading. Illustrations of this appear, among others, in Sonnets 90, 93 and 102. The feeling of despondency and abandonment is revealed, with an extraordinary power, in Sonnet 90; he says he is no great poet, he insists on repeating that nothing comes from his wit or his will, but that all that he has written has been dictated to him by love, so that he is a mere copyist. This is obviously an idea we have already seen in the first part of the sequence (Sonnets 1, 3, 6, 15...). But notice the richness of metaphors of writing here:

In truth I sweare, I wish not there should be  
*Graved* in mine Epitaph a *Poet's name*:  
Ne if I would, could I just *title* make,  
That any *laud* to me thereof should grow,  
Without my *plumes* from other's *wings* I take.  
For nothing from my wit or will doth flow,  
Since all my *words* thy beauty doth *endite*,  
And love doth hold *my hand*, and makes me *write*.  
(ll. 7-14)

Sonnet 93, on the other hand, deals with writing about his own woe; we see the return of the image of black ink, an ideal colour to paint his woe. The tone is clearly one of pessimism and frustration, but the images are the same ones we found earlier:

What sobs can give words grace my griefe to show?  
What inke is blacke enough to paint my wo?  
.....  
That all thy hurts in my hart's wracke I reede;  
I cry thy sighs; my deere, thy teares I bleede.  
(ll. 2-3; 13-14)

This final reference to bleeding, that we also found in Sonnet 7 associated to ink, is recurrent near the end again. Notice Sonnet 102. Ink is no longer black, now it is *red*, the colour of blood, which in the tradition was normally Christ's blood, but also, by extension, the lover's or Love's blood. Here the red ink is used to describe the beauty and delight of the love story that has been told. After many questions about where the red colour of roses, of cheeks, of shame... has gone, Astrophil finally says that it has been given to ink in order to depict Venus, that is, Love. The power of the images is extraordinary:

Where be those Roses gone, which sweetned so our eyes?  
Where those red cheeks, which oft with faire encrease did frame  
The height of honor in the kindly badge of shame?  
Who hath the crimson weeds stolne from my morning skies?  
.....

It is but love, which makes his *paper perfit white*  
 To write therein more fresh the story of delight,  
 While *beautie's reddest inke* Venus for him doth sturre.

(ll. 1-4; 12-14)

White is the colour of the paper on which the love story is written, and white is certainly Stella's face on which this story is represented. But this simple explanation does not suffice; we would like to know more. As a matter of fact, the whole collection can be seen as forming –in Patricia Fumerton's words– "an ornamental pattern encircling and pointing to the 'space', the white parchment, that is the ground of the poet's love"<sup>52</sup>. In my opinion, this is a subject for a fascinating research that could render interesting results about the uses and significance of the rhetorical devices Sidney employed in writing *Astrophil and Stella*. Today, four centuries after the publication of the sonnets, we are, methodologically, much better equipped than the preceding generations to unravel some of the mysteries that are still buried in the text. A methodology that would proceed on the lines sketched in this speech, taking into account the dominating role played by the images discussed here, and considering *Astrophil and Stella* as a *scriptible* text, would probably make a decisive contribution to the knowledge of the rhetorical and ideological devices of the Renaissance.

A full-length monograph is really required to give an adequate treatment of the immense richness of *Astrophil and Stella* in this aspect, something that, of course, I have not been able to do in this speech today. The intricacies of the text are many, multiple, and extremely suggestive. I have only dealt superficially with a small group of sonnets, with the purpose of showing how much we ignore still about the enigmas of the sequence. But more sonnets are awaiting scholarly treatment on this line. In addition to the sonnets which I have commented on or simply alluded to, my final words are an invitation to you to go on pursuing these images of writing and reading in many other poems, both sonnets and songs, of *Astrophil and Stella*<sup>53</sup>. I admit that the task is not a minor one, but I am also persuaded that it is important, and surely a very exciting challenge. So, if you accept it, good luck! Thank you very much!

<sup>52</sup> Patricia Fumerton, "'Secret' Arts: Elizabethan Miniatures and Sonnets", in Stephen Greenblatt, ed., *Representing the English Renaissance*, University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles & London, 1988, pp. 120-121.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Sonnets 14, 19, 21, 31, 34, 35, 37, 38, 40, 44, 50, 51, 54, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 63, 69, 74, 77, 80, 81, 84, 92, 94, 98, 100 and 104, as well as Songs 2, 5 and 8.

## THE PLACE OF MAN IN THE CHAIN OF BEING ACCORDING TO SIDNEY'S *DEFENCE OF POESIE*

Pilar Garcés García

Universidad de Valladolid

According to the Renaissance, the Medieval world had been an age of obscurantism, theocentrism and order that was going to be annihilated by the brightness, homocentrism and ordered chaos of the new era. But this period was not a spontaneous outburst of light that gave birth to the Magnanimous Man, dweller of a world ruled by disorder as portrayed by the Elizabethan drama. In fact, the greatness of the Elizabethan age was to plant its roots in the Medieval world where a primum-mobile mastered all the actions of the universe in a fixed order, thus showing that the Elizabethan world was not "out of order".

E.M.W. Tillyard elucidates in his *Elizabethan World Picture* the conception the Elizabethans had of their own age<sup>1</sup>. Given the difficulty of staying outside the mainstream current of criticism established by the Renaissance, Tillyard's attempt to shed light on the Elizabethan world enables us to overcome some of the stereotypes.

One of the authors mentioned in Tillyard's book is Sir Philip Sidney for he represents the bulwark of these commonplace concepts among the Elizabethans that, paradoxically, are not always obvious in the creative literature. His *Defense of Poesie*<sup>2</sup> clearly delineates the image of a universe ranged in an unalterable order and wrapped in a direct and fresh style, similar to the overall tone that permeates the portrait expounded by Tillyard.

One of the most important principles governing the lives of the Elizabethans was that of hierarchical order, a medieval conception that was evident from the stratification of social classes and the cosmological understanding of the

1 All the quotations are taken from Tillyard, *The Elizabethan World Picture*, 1972. In this book the author aims to "extract and expound the most ordinary beliefs about the constitution of the world as pictured in the Elizabethan age" (8). In his book he includes a collection of quotations from different authors of this period, but I have concentrated on Sidney's *Defense of Poesie*.

2 The quotations are taken from the prose works of the Feuillerat edition that follows the edition of William Ponsoby, *The Defense of Poesie*, and not the edition by Henry Olney, *An Apology for Poetry*. Both editions see the light some years after his author's death in 1595.

universe. Thus, Queen Elizabeth is compared in several instances, to the primum-mobile, the master-sphere of the physical universe in control of the rest of the chain of being. To be awarded the first place in any classification meant power and control over the rest of the elements. That is precisely the argument Sidney is going to use in his defence of creative literature, namely, poesie, to ward off the attacks of the puritans who argued that poetry was harmful because the world pictured in it was deceitful.

And first truly to all them that professing learning envey against Poetrie, may justly and first be objected, that they go very neare to ungratefulnesse, to seeke to deface that which in the noblest nations and languages that are knowne hath bene the first light giver to ignorance and first nurse whose milk litle & litle enabled them to feed afterwards of tougher knowledge. (5)

The structure of the hierarchy is organized in such a way that all the elements of the chain excel in a single particular and are arranged in a tripartite division<sup>3</sup>. Sidney places Philosophy and History directly after Poetry and, although he emphasizes the excelling qualities of Philosophy because "the philosopher teacheth" (18), and those of History because it brings "images of true matters" (18) he, nevertheless, concedes primacy to Poesie because it "tells facts not as they are but as they should be" (18), adding that "neither Philosopher nor Historiographer, could at the first have entered into the gates of popular judgements, if they had not taken a great pasport of Poetrie" (5).

The triple division of elements has the Holy Trinity as a frame of reference and the whole creation is branches into three categories. The classification begins with the division of God-Angels-Man, followed by the division of the world in Angels-Man-Beasts, etc. displaying a set of correspondences between elements of the Macrocosm, the Body Politic and the Microcosm. The correspondences found in the Middle Ages were more intellectual, rather as if they were a mathematical formula in a rigid and immobile order. On the contrary, the Elizabethans used the correspondences with flexibility assuming the disorder provoked by the imperfection of man. As examples of correspondences in the Renaissance we come across such as the correspondence between the Macrocosm

3 Tillyard also acknowledges the importance awarded to the particular excellencies of each element of the chain. "... stones may be lowly but they exceed the class above them, plants, in strength and durability. Plants, though without sense, excel in the faculty of assimilating nourishment. The beasts are stronger than man in physical energy and desires. Man excels the angels in his power of learning" (34).

and the Body Politic when Queen Elizabeth is compared to the primum-mobile, or between the Macrocosm and the Microcosm comparing the storms with the stormy passions of man, or between the Body Politic and the Microcosm when Erasmus compares reason in the mind to the king in the state.

As mentioned before, the place of man in the chain of being is after the angels, but before the animals, excelling, not so much in magnanimity, but in his capacity to overcome his internal conflict reaching towards perfection<sup>4</sup>. He is close to the angels because they share the same particular quality; that of *understanding*, although they are qualitatively different for the angels understand intuitively while man has to use his reason. At the same time man is closed to the beasts because of his passions although they are under his control owing to his capacity for learning,

since our erected wit maketh us know what perfectiō is, and yet our infected wit keepeth us frō reaching unto it. (9)

It is the *wit* that permits man to become the nodal point in the chain of being discerning between right and wrong enabling him to make order out of chaos, and to rise from an imperfect state<sup>5</sup>. The human capacity to transform limitations into qualities must be seen in the light of the fact that the "infected wit" is not so much the cause of the fall but supposes man's capacity to rise. Sidney tries to reconcile both aspects of man as other writers of the Renaissance do, such as Erasmus in his *Praise of Folie*<sup>6</sup>. This reconciliation of opposites

4 Tillyard comments that the place man occupies in the chain is found on a Neo-Platonic attitude that is not only evident in the *Defence* but also in his verses. Cf. *Astrophil y Stella* (bilingual edition by Fernando Galván):

More fundamental than any Aristotelian belief that poetry was more instructive than history or philosophy was the Neo-Platonic doctrine that poetry was man's effort to rise above his fallen self and to reach out towards perfection. (30).

5 It is interesting to note that a Spanish critic, Alfonso García de Matamoros, also points at the *entendimiento* (*wit*) as a human characteristic that makes man more divine. Matamoros' essay appears in 1553 with the title *De adserenda eruditione sive de viris hispaniae doctis narratio apologetica*. In this passage he describes Marcial's struggles to become an orator:

El entendimiento humano no puede avanzar más allá de los límites impuestos por la naturaleza, pues es ley natural que exista esta predeterminación y aptitud para las cosas en cada hombre, y sus cualidades están circunscritas por ciertos límites de expresión.

For more information on Matamoros see P. Sainz Rodríguez, *Historia de la Crítica Literaria en España* (38).

6 D. Connell comments in his book *Sir Philip Sidney. The Maker's Mind*, this symbiosis of paradoxical terms:

Erasmus as a man of reason, exposes and censures human folly. But in the involuted and paradoxical plan of his work, he also gives Folly herself the power to reason (5).

drains an optimistic *energeia* that pictures man not as the poor creature expelled from paradise for ever, but as the poor creature expelled from paradise for ever, but as the creature working his way back to Eden<sup>7</sup>.

Among men, the poet has the inalienable mission of using the wit to help man rise from the fall. Sidney describes the poet not as someone special, a prophet foreseeing chaos, but as an ordinary man who has been endowed *with the force of divine breath* (8). What the author is trying to emphasize is the power any man has to create, to use the *wit* as a means to reach for divinity, for it is the Maker of all makers, the first in the chain of being, who confers this power to man. However, he also acknowledges that the world he creates is merely a fleeting vision of the real one:

... believe themselves, when they tell you they will make you immortal  
by their verses. (45)

Sidney is overtly stating that the poet can only create an ephemeral world doomed to disappear. But the question of mortality is not a cause for anguish because man is a product of nature and like the rest of the natural world he is perishable. Therefore, the poet's mission is to *make the too much loved earth more lovely* because he goes *hand in hand* (8) with nature. The poet joins mortality and immortality in his verses when he sings to death and love<sup>8</sup>, a binomial that is inherent to the human condition asserting the place man takes in the chain:

... that while you live, you live in love, and get favour, for lacking skill  
of a sonet, and when you die, your memory die from the earth for want  
of an Epitaphe. (46)

<sup>7</sup> This optimistic portrait of man is humourously expressed in Lope de Vega's poem "Huerto Deshecho":

Eva y Adán, finalmente  
iban desnudos por donde,  
aunque oitros ojos los vieran,  
no les salieran colores (281-284).

<sup>8</sup> The common belief shared in the Renaissance is that love and death made people equal. With this combination, the opposite qualities of immortality and mortality are justified and are considered as basic human characteristics, such as Cervantes states in Don Quixote's words:

Advierte, Sancho -dijo Don Quijote-, que el amor ni mira respetos ni guarda términos de razón en sus discursos, y tiene la misma condición que la muerte, que así acomete los altos alcázares de los reyes como humildes chozas de los pastores (Part II, chapter LVIII).

For a better understanding of the beliefs and disbeliefs on this age see C.S. Lewis, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century* and also M. Roston, *Sixteenth Century English Literature*.

But Sidney is a writer who offers solutions and he does not only lecture on the mortal condition of man, he also gives a reason why this condition is not to be considered negatively. Man is the only element in the chain who is capable of learning, and he aspires to a self-knowledge which begins with an appreciation and estimation of what he does. Consequently, his life becomes part of that learning as he expresses it at the beginning of the *Defence*:

... that selflove is better than any guiding to make  
that seem gorgious wherein our selves be parties. (3)

As Pugliano has mastered the art of horsemanship in Sidney's argumentation, so he masters the art of poetry, and this self-knowledge is worked upon from the basis of his *wit*, that excellence that once strengthened permits the enabling of judgement and the profound and inner knowledge of the self. The divorce between knowledge and the art of living has not taken place yet, on the contrary the marriage results in a well-balanced couple that allows man to reconcile *man's erected wit and man's infected wil* perfecting the latter by self-knowledge that leads to self-love. Thus, man becomes aware of his limitations and acts accordingly without despairing.

In order to entwine the eternal characteristic of the soul and the perishable condition of the body, both the spiritual and the material components of man are treated evenly, as essential features of human condition. In the process of learning, man needs to feed both the soul and the body, and Sidney is aware of the fact that in order to perfect man's self-knowledge, he has to find something kind for him to digest. He, thus, considers Plato's doctrine as the epitome of the means to help man achieve a better self-knowledge, because Plato moralizes in philosophy with the skin of poetry. He states that teaching must be followed and preceded by delight and Sidney put this theory into practice and his works can be considered in the modern linguistic term as the *performance* of his theory. His *Defence* is full of concepts taken from other critics such as Scaligero, Minturno, Aristotle and Plato but his work does not result in a dull heavy essay of didacticism but in an enjoyable and ironic look upon human conceit. His style so fresh and direct gives praise to poesis through the *wit*<sup>9</sup>.

<sup>9</sup> The above mentioned Spanish critic, Matamoros, also coincides with Sidney in the maxima of teaching with delight:

hay que enseñar no con estudio árido y triste, sino con la desenvoltura y alegría de las fiestas populares (37).

It is his irony that is what makes possible the final coupling of self-knowledge and learning in delight, combining his gift as orator in a perfect structure of rhetoric, organizing a work of art in which all human capacities are acknowledge and embroidered in a piece of a logician who re-creates a world that mirrors the ordered but flexible Elizabethan chain of being.

#### WORKS CITED

- CONNELL, D. *Sir Philip Sidney The Maker's Mind*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.
- GILBERT, A.H. *Plato to Dryden*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1962.
- HUME, M. *Spanish Influences on English Literature*. London: Eveleigh Nash, 1905.
- LEWIS, C.S. *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1944.
- LOZANO, M. "La Modernidad del discurso poético de Philip Sidney", *Epos, Vol III* (1987): 231-261.
- ONEGA, S. (ed) *Estudios Literarios Ingleses: Renacimiento y Barroco*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1986.
- ROSTON, M. *Sixteenth Century English Literature*. Farnborough: MacMillan Press, 1982.
- SAINZ RODRÍGUEZ, P. *Historia de la Crítica Literaria en España*, Madrid: Taurus Humanidades, 1989.
- SIDNEY, P. *The Defence of Poesie*. Cambridge: CUP, 1968.
- . (trad.) *Deffensa de la Poesía*. Chapel Hill: North Carolina Studies, 1977. (Ms. 3908 in the Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid, contains 60 folios and measures 22.5 + 15.5, each folio with approximately 22 lines.)
- . *Astrophil y Stella*. (bilingual edition by Fernando Galván), Madrid: Cátedra, 1991.
- TILLYARD, E.M.W. *The Elizabeth World Picture*, London: Penguin Books, 1972.

## NARRATIVE AND ITS REPRESENTATION IN *OTHELLO*

Keith Gregor  
Universidad de Murcia

The Clown appears only twice in *Othello*; both appearances are brief but pulsing with proleptic energy. The first is at the start of the third act. Cassio has instructed the musicians to play something to wake Othello, who has spent his first night with Desdemona in Cyprus. The Clown asks if their instruments are wind instruments, and when they say they are, he quips: "O, thereby hangs a tale"<sup>1</sup>. Not "hearing" the pun, the first musician asks: "Whereby hangs a tale, sir?". He expects a story and all he gets is an allusion to flatulence<sup>2</sup>. Cassio then offers the Clown some gold to arrange a meeting with Desdemona. The Clown pretends to misunderstand him,

Cassio: Dost thou hear, mine honest friend?

Clown: No, I hear not your honest friend: I hear you.

(III.1.21-22)

Iago is invoked without being named. As the Clown leaves, it is the newly reinstated Lieutenant who enters.

The Clown's second appearance (three scenes later) is just as fleeting and no less gratuitous. This time it is Desdemona who asks for Cassio. Once again the Clown's response is punning: "I know not where he lodges, and for me to devise a lodging, and say he lies here, or he lies there, were to lie in my own throat." (III.4.11-13) The pun is a bad one but cruelly anticipatory of Othello's grim play on the word in Act IV:

Iago: Lie—

Othello: With Her?

1 This and future references to the text are to the Kenneth Muir edition (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1987). In both Q1 and F1, no orthographic distinction is made between the two terms, though the pun is obviously intended.

2 Touchstone, in *As You Like It*, uses the same expression, but this time referring to the passing of time: "And so, from hour to hour we ripe and ripe, / And the from hour to hour we rot and rot, / And thereby hangs a tale". Jaques, who quotes these words, thinks he has found a kindred spirit, though the Fool's words might equally be interpreted as an allusion to impotence.



Iago With her, on her, what you will.  
Othello: Lie with her? Lie on her? We say lie on her when  
they belie her. Lie with her! Zounds, that's fulsome!

(IV.1.35-40)

The Clown gets away with it because he is not yet aware –no one is– of the true relevance of the word "lie". He makes a joke because he is paid to be witty. At the same time, however, his *affected* literal-mindedness, a grotesque parody of Othello's *real* gullibility, comically highlights what appears as an obsessive concern of the tragedy: storytelling, its purposes and effects; the demand for narrative and the "credit" given to it, as well as the function of the tale in a dramatic context.

Stories abound in the play and their function is clearly rhetorical. As Alan Sinfield has recently observed, "all the characters in *Othello* are telling stories, and to convince others even more than themselves". (1992, 29) But this is not to forget that both the nature and the effect of the narratives told are radically different. Othello's stories are, as we shall see, predominantly about the past and about his own exploits. But what they reveal is less, as Leavis and scores of subsequent critics have claimed, the character's love of himself than an urgent desire to outvoice his detractors and so convince his auditors. Thus to Iago's warning in Act I that Brabantio is out to denounce him, Othello calmly responds: "Let him do his spite: / My services, which I have done the signory, / Shall out-tongue his complaints". (I.2.17-19) This is no doubt vanity, but as the play never ceases to remind us, deeds are more eloquent than rumour, though as the last quotation reveals, those deeds must first be put into words, given a "voice", if they are to convince. Commenting on Othello's "traveller's history", Stephen Greenblatt writes that we are

on the brink of a Borges-like narrative that is forever constituting itself out of the materials of the present instant, a narrative in which the storyteller is constantly swallowed up by the story. That is, Othello is pressing up against the *condition* of all discursive representations of identity. He comes dangerously close to recognizing his own status as a text, and it is precisely this recognition that the play as a whole will reveal to be insupportable.

(1980: 238)

But this is to ignore the supremely *oral* nature of narrative in the play. Besides, Greenblatt overlooks both the fact that the words are intended for an audience (here the Duke and the Senators as well as the "real" audience viewing the play) and what Robert Weimann has called the "wounding, healing, affectional" (1985: 275) power of the *performed* word. In this respect, Othello is in complete

command of his discourse: it is not his self-recognition as a text so much as the revelation of his failure as an auditor which the play makes insupportable. Determining this failure, as I shall argue, is what the play presents as a maladjustment to present conditions, highlighted by the fact that Othello's narratives are in the past, not the present, tense. I shall return to this later.

For the moment, I would like to reexamine Brabantio's claims that the Moor had bewitched his daughter, entangling her in "chains of magic". For both Brabantio, Desdemona and the Senate are in turn entranced by the tale which is recounted: the Duke's response, "I think this tale would win my daughter too" (I.3.171) is a tribute not to Othello, though his valour and "value" is not in doubt, but to the incantatory effect of his story. Iago's later remark to Roderigo, "Mark me with what violence she first loved the Moor, but for bragging and telling her fantastical lies" (II.1.216-17), is from a man who also knows the rhetorical force of fiction.

The "magical" effect of narrative is reaffirmed in the "story" of the handkerchief. Responding to Rymer's critique, Kenneth Burke understood the importance of this object, standing as it does as a combination of the public and the intimate, and thus a "perfect materialisation of the tension which the play is to exploit". (1951, 198-99) But the handkerchief is representative on another level. Desdemona's concern here is with reinstating Cassio and her response to Othello's "magic in the web" tale is, for Othello, a flat "Is't possible?" and "Indeed! Is't true?" (III.4.68,76). Emilia, who has picked up the handkerchief, keeps it, "I'll have the work ta'en out, / And give't Iago" (III.3.293-4), while Cassio, fatally, gives it to Bianca to "have it copied" (III.4.187). The spell has begun to wear off and as the object is passed from hand to hand, or rather from (Othello's) head to (Cassio's) bed, new and less romanticised signifieds accrue to it: for Bianca the handkerchief is simply a sign of Cassio's deceitfulness; Iago uses it as a sign of Desdemona's "infidelity" and as the ocular proof needed for his revenge. Like stories which circulate from mouth to mouth, the token drifts inexorably from its original meaning. When Iago informs Othello of Cassio's manly boasts and makes him "tell the tale anew", the magic is already gone –the work has been taken out of it.

Othello's final recourse to narrative is of course his suicide speech, and it is here that the warlike Othello of the opening scenes returns. The self-identification with the "malignant and turbaned Turk" has been presented as a sign of the Moor's forced acceptance of his true place in Venetian society –that is, no place–, though it may also seen as a last-ditched attempt to replace language with heroic deed and so re-woo his listeners in extremis. As if to



underline the fact, Othello stabs himself in the throat, the source of speech and (as the Clown reminds us) of lies. If the speech is rhetorical, it is not in the "inflationary," self-deluding sense of the term which would seem to govern the Leavisite attitude to the character; rather, it is an instance of what Eliot called the "rhetoric of substance", a rhetoric peculiar to situations "where a character *sees himself* in a dramatic light". (1951, 39) Othello, that is, is more conscious than ever of his role as actor in a tragedy which has been scripted by another, as well as the uses and limitations of speech as an affective mechanism. Lodovico's punning response ("O bloody period!"), alluding both to the events that have just taken place and to the spilling of blood which the end of Othello's speech occasions, is qualified by Gratiano's: "All that's spoke is marred!". The statement carries a kind of retrospective consciousness of tragic waste as well as an aphoristic quality: speech deceives, only actions convince.

The paradox is that, even as he cuts his throat, Othello clings to his favoured past tense. For though Othello has been presented as a kind of parvenu, artificially ennobled by his love for a wealthy grandee's daughter, it is equally true that, in his own imagination, he has all the hallmarks of the epic hero, a figure which finds its degraded counterpart in Iago. According to Mikhail Bakhtin, the "world" of such heroes is

a world projected into the past, on to the distanced plane of memory, but not into a real, relative past tied to the present by uninterrupted temporal transitions; it [is] projected rather into a valorized past of beginnings and peak times. This past is distanced, finished and closed like a circle. [...] Within this time, completed and locked into a circle, all points are equidistant from the real, dynamic time of the present; insofar as this time is whole, it is not localized in an actual historical sequence; it is not relative to the present or to the future; it contains within itself, as it were, the entire fullness of time.

(1990: 19)

It would not, I think, be stretching the point to say that the world of Othello's stories is equally closed, equally distanced from the "present" of the play, and that when, under Iago's malevolent guidance, the Moor crosses the divide between past and present, he is incapable of adapting, the present threatens to engulf him and he must murder it (Desdemona) and then himself.

By contrast, Iago is perfectly adapted to the world of "modern" seeming; it is his natural habitat. His being cashiered from epic nobility next to Othello is his cue to commence a new life amongst those who throw "but shows of service on their lords" and thrive by them. If, in Bakhtin's terms, the epic and tragic

hero is "nothing" outside his destiny, Iago resembles the characters of a popular mask, "heroes of free improvisation and not heroes of tradition, heroes of a life process that is imperishable and forever renewing itself, forever contemporary". (36) As critics never cease to observe, he is an extemporiser, a spontaneous inventor of fictions, and audiences can even extract enjoyment from watching his plot mature and his skill in capitalising on coincidence. In short, he is the product of a consciousness whose ultimate expression will be what Bakhtin defines as the novel, and as such he takes his place next to the Clown.

In contrast to the Clown, however, he is not content with his servitude, has ideas above his station, and for this reason is cunningly represented as the "demi-devil". From the very start, we are made aware of the economic efforts of the demoted and so déclassé soldier to regain the position "usurped" from him by the parvenu Cassio, and of a system in which "Preferment goes by letter and affection, / And not by old gradation, where each second / Stood heir to th'first". (I.1.36-38) Iago here excuses himself by representing his fall as one from the ideal epic world of heroic deed to mercenary, mercantile Renaissance Venice:

But he, sir, had th'election:  
And I, of whom his eyes had seen the proof  
At Rhodes, at Cyprus, and on other grounds  
Christian and heathen, must be leed and calmed  
By debtor and creditor.

(I.1.27-31)

His first action in his new role is to take hold of Roderigo's purse strings. Moreover, the language Iago speaks from now on will be the language of the market, not just as a means of gulling his rich friend out of a fortune, but of establishing the "value" of the stories he hears and constructs. Thus, that Desdemona loves Cassio is considered "apt and of great credit" (II.1.278), while her repeated overtures to Othello concerning Cassio only succeed in undoing her "credit" with the Moor (II.3.349). To the "example" of Othello's cuckoldom his response is: "To be direct and honest is not safe. / I thank you for this profit...". (III.3.376-77). The humiliating ring to the term "honest" is surely, as Empson observes, a powerful incentive to revenge, but it is equally the profits to be gained through dishonesty which make Iago such a fervent tale-teller.

In *The Death of Tragedy*, George Steiner argued that Shakespeare's tragic characters are largely unaffected by the money motive, that only "base" creatures, such as Roderigo, are shown putting gold in their purse; furthermore, the only "poetry of money is prose", and more specifically the modern novel. (1961, 263-4) Prose indeed plays a comparatively small part in this particular

work, but this is not to overlook the fact that every one in the play is in the business of either constructing, contesting, crediting or discrediting narratives. If Iago, whose baseness has been insisted on again and again, comes closest to embodying the novelistic hero, this is not to say that other, nobler characters are tainted with the mercantile spirit. Thus even before Othello entrances the Senate with his story of how he bewitched both Brabantio and his daughter, the Duke and Senators are shown disputing the "credit" of the news of the Turkish invasion. Perhaps on his guard, the Duke meets Brabantio's story with a distinctly lukewarm:

To vouch this is no proof,  
Without more wider and more overt test  
Than these thin habits and poor likelihoods  
Of modern seeming do prefer against him.  
(I.3.107-10)

Amidst the clamour of report and counterreport of the Turkish invasion, Brabantio's tale (fed to him in part by Iago) fails to incriminate the crypto-Turk Othello, who has already proved his "value". The taunt of "modern" has a sanctimonious ring, specially as "seeming" has been the whole substance of the discussion preceding Brabantio's entrance.

But *Othello* is not just about the nature of truth and its delicate balance with falsehood. What the play puts on trial is not just the veracity or credulity of its protagonists, but their whole credibility as social actors. On stage are two quite distinct social orders, two "world pictures." The clash of narratives represented is nothing less than a clash between the old and the new. Iago, the demoted lieutenant, seeking retribution by means of "modern seeming", is found out and sent off for ignominious torture; Othello, the outsider, regains his place in the heart of the society which has adopted him by becoming their scapegoat and dying by his own hand. In the final scene, new "stories" are in the offing – Iago's confession to his torturers, and Lodovico's relation of the "heavy act" of Othello's suicide to the state, though the play ends, as it must, in silence. Iago's "victory" – in Jonathan Goldberg's words, his refusal to answer the accusations represents his self-mastery as a character, a condition he "takes control over by relinquishing – by withholding – his voice" (1985, 132) – is a pyrrhic one. Othello's muteness, coinciding with his "self-discovery" as the Venetian's "other," the turbaned Turk, is more powerful and ennobling: the drawing of the curtain on the object which "poisons sight", at the same time as it preserves the image of the death embrace as the dumb show of love's immortal triumph over jealousy, re-encloses the Moor in his epic circle.

Is this a sign of Shakespeare's basic conservatism? Do we sense here the dramatist's resistance to the more discursive mode of fiction? As the play approximates the actional extreme of wordless pantomime, so the "truth" emerges in its painful intensity. Othello's final gesture is far more eloquent than words, and more ennobling, while Iago, who is denied the dignity of a "clean" death, confirms his baseness by refusing to talk. Yet the demand for narrative is a powerful one, as Lodovico's last words, and indeed the whole play, have shown. As Paul Hernadi has argued, "every passage of imaginative literature contains at least a modicum of both action and vision." (1971, 25) Such a merger is implicit in Lodovico's invocation of the object which poisons sight: *Othello* is a striking instance of the aptness of the paradox which makes sight the recipient of a substance administered only through ear and mouth. To Brabantio's earlier objection: "But words are words; I never yet did hear / That the bruised heart was piercèd through the ear" (I.3.216-7), it is as if Shakespeare the storyteller had wanted to supply his own ironic rejoinder: "Thereby hangs a tale".

#### WORKS CITED

- BAKHTIN, Mikhail. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: U. of Texas P., 1990.
- BURKE, Kenneth. "Othello: An Essay to Illustrate a Method". *The Hudson Review* 4 (1951): 165-203.
- ELIOT, T. S. 1951. "'Rhetoric' and Poetic Drama". *Selected Essays*. London: Faber & Faber.
- GOLDBERG, Jonathan. "Shakespearean Inscriptions: The Voicing of Power". *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*. Eds. Patricia Parker and Geoffrey Hartman. London: Methuen, 1985: 116-137.
- GREENBLATT, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning from More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: U. of Chicago P., 1980.
- HERNADI, Paul. "Verbal Worlds Between Action and Vision: A Theory of the Modes of Poetic Discourse". *College English* 33, 1 (1971): 18-31.
- SINFELD, Alan. *Faultlines: Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading*. Oxford: Oxford U.P., 1992.
- STEINER, George. *The Death of Tragedy*. London: Faber & Faber, 1961.
- WEIMANN, Robert. "Mimesis in Hamlet". *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*. (1985): 275-291.

## SOME ANALOGIES IN *LA CELESTINA* AND *TROILUS AND CRESSIDA*

Teresa Guerra Bosch

Universidad de Las Palmas de G.C.

The object of this essay is to analyze some of the analogies that appear in *La Celestina* and *Troilus and Cressida* in order to draw certain conclusions about a possible influence from the Spanish work on the English one. This comparison is not unfounded as both works present a similar trio of characters, combine the tragic and the comic and exhibit a cynical, bitter and partially obscene language to refer to love.

Julio César Santoyo in his opening lecture to the II Conference S.E.D.E.R.I. mentions *La Celestina* among the Spanish books known to Shakespeare (261). However, we cannot properly assume an influence from *Celestina* on *Troilus and Cressida*, because, as we all know, Shakespeare had enough sources other than *La Celestina* from which to draw his love story.

In Spain there are two different versions of *La Celestina*, one with 14 acts and a later version with 21. The first extant copy is from 1499 and was published in Burgos and followed by printings in Toledo (1500) and Seville (1501). The longer version appeared in 1502 in Salamanca, Toledo and Seville and was entitled *Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea* while the shorter versions had been entitled *Comedia de Calisto y Melibea*. Eventually, because of the importance of the character of the procurer in the whole work, it became known as *La Celestina* (Alborg 533-35).

According to Guadalupe Martínez Lacalle *La Celestina* was introduced in England at the time of Catherine of Aragon's journey to England to marry the Prince of Wales<sup>1</sup>. Apparently the noble Spaniards of her entourage brought copies of the work. The first complete translation dates back to 1631 and was done by James Mabbe. Shakespeare could not have known that one. However, according to Lacalle, before that date, in 1530, there appeared in English an adaptation of the first four acts of *La Celestina* that included some lines from

---

<sup>1</sup> Pedro Guardia Masó gives 1501 as the arrival of Catherine to England (131).

the fifth and sixth acts and ended differently<sup>2</sup>. At the end of the 16th century we have two entries –february 24, 1591 and October 5, 1598– in the *Stationer's Register* (Lacalle 5). Any of these could have been read by Shakespeare<sup>3</sup>.

*Troilus and Cressida* was probably written in 1601 or 1602 because it was entered in the *Stationer's Register* on february 7, 1603 and was published in quarto in 1609 and later on in the *FI* (Riverside 29-30, 54).

In the case of *La Celestina* what has puzzled the critics is not the fact of having been called first a comedy and later on a tragicomedy, but whether it is fiction or drama. *La Celestina* is divided into acts, written in its totality in dialogue form, a dialogue that is characteristic of drama of the time because it shows in every moment where the action is taking place. However, because of its length the work is unfitted for the stage. Stephen Gilman reaches the conclusion that it is a work without a genre because it was written at a time when the genre of the novel and the drama had not yet acquired a specific form. M. Rosa Lida considers it to be a "comedia humanística", a genre that appears in Italy in the first half of the XIV c., and whose initiator was Petrarch. It is interesting to point out that this type of comedy develops the personal independence of the heroine. In the poems added to the *Celestina* in the later copies, its author alludes to his "terenciana obra", a reason why some critics have seen certain similarities with the comedy of Terencius, a prototype of the comedy of love. Other critics point out that the Terencian comedy looks primarily to the complications in the plot<sup>4</sup>, while it leaves out very important aspects of the *Celestina* (Alborg 554-59). Finally, Dorothy Sherman Severin calls it "a generic hybrid: neither humanistic comedy nor sentimental romance" (2), and the first work in world literature that can be considered a novel (5).

The genre of *TC* has puzzled the critics since its appearance. The title-page of the 1609 quarto describes it as a "history" but in the preface the word

2 It had a lengthy title that began *A New Comedy in English in Manner of an Interlude ...* and ended *"with a Moral Conclusion and Exhortation to Virtue"*.

3 Lacalle believes that one of these translations mentioned in the entries was Mabbe's. However, she does not think that they are the same as the Alnwick manuscript, written by Mabbe between 1603 and 1611, different and shorter than the 1631 published translation (Lacalle, 5-34). Because of his knowledge of Spanish, Mabbe had been officially appointed to Madrid from 1611 to 1616 (Guardia 132).

4 Besides looking primarily to the complications in the plot, the Terencian comedy is more interested in the tricks to procure love than in love itself, it is excessively prodigal in comic scenes while neglecting the painting of characters, that is, it does not stress the important aspects of *La Celestina* (Alborg 560).

"comical" is mentioned twice. However in the *FI TC* was originally going to be included in the Tragedies after *Romeo and Juliet*<sup>5</sup>, to be finally placed between the histories and the tragedies.

So far three categories, –comedy, history and tragedy– have been mentioned with respect to *TC*. At the end of the 19th c. F.S. Boas came up with the name "problem play" (Cf Boas 345; Lawrence 3-4) and in the 20th c. O.J. Campbell decided that *TC* was a satire, a genre that was in fashion in the last years of Elizabeth's reign, a work dedicated to the service of moral education, ridiculing Trojan sensuality and Greek individualism<sup>6</sup>. A term with which Anne Barton does not agree because there is no well-balanced moral character to guide the judgement of the audience (Riverside 445).

As is the case with *TC* there exists a polemic with respect to the existence or not of a moral intention in *Celestina*. Many critics insist that *La Celestina* is a didactic work against the excesses of love and its tragic consequences, and consider the most important achievement of the work the study of passion with its logical and fatal result. It was a crazy love and for that reason Calisto is careless and dies (Alborg 578-613). With respect to *TC* some critics lament that Cressida is not punished<sup>7</sup>, but nobody considered that Troilus should be punished<sup>8</sup>. Love is destroyed not as a punishment to the lovers but because it is another casualty in a senseless war<sup>9</sup>.

Another term that has been proposed for *TC* is that of Tragicomedy. In "Shakespearean Tragicomedy" Barbara A. Mowat, presents Giovanni Battista Guarini's concept of tragicomedy:

He who makes a tragicomedy... does not intend to compose separately either a tragedy or a comedy, but from the two a third thing that will be perfect of its kind, and may take from the others the parts that with most verisimilitude can stand together.

(82)

5 This can be seen by comparing the three different versions that exist of the first edition of the *FI*. It is very clearly explained in Peter Blayney's study of the *FI* as Blayney presents in pictures the pages that make up the different versions (17-24).

6 Cf *Comickall Satyre and Shakespeares Troilus and Cressida*. Huntington Lib. Pub, 1938: 185-234; rpt. in SC III: 574-78.

7 Cf. Dryden or Lennox (*Shakespearean Criticism* III, 536-38) and especially Muriel Bradbrook's total condemnation of Cressida.

8 Not all critics praise Troilus's behaviour. Sir Edmund Chambers calls him "a poltroon" (*Encyclopaedia Britannica* 446; quoted also by Lawrence 32), Bryant blames him for Cressida's treason (193-98), and Barton considers that both Troilus and Cressida are equally flawed (Riverside 446).

9 Cf Kott and Yoder (*Shakespearean Criticism* III: 609-13; 626-30).

Mowat believes that *TC* has not been associated with Guarinian tragicomedy because it lacks a happy ending (85). However, we do not find that an unhappy ending contradicts the term tragicomedy as we are used to the *Celestina's* tragic ending.

It is not known if *TC* was ever staged in Shakespeare's times as we find two contradictory statements about it. The 1609 Quarto has two different title pages. The first describes *TC* as a play "acted by the King's Majesty's servants at the Globe" (Riverside 443). This claim accords with the specific mention of professional performances in the 1603 *Stationer's Register* entry. During the course of printing, however, this title-page was replaced by another, in which the reference to actors and theatres was suppressed. Instead, an address to the reader was inserted which hailed *TC* as "a new play never stal'd with the stage, never clapper-claw'd with the palms of the vulgar" (Riverside 443). Could this mean that *TC* like *Celestina* was meant to be read? Most critics do not accept that Shakespeare would write a play not to be staged. Some critics believe that *TC* was presented once; or that it was rehearsed, but because of the difficulties it involved, never put on stage; while others, because of the puns on legal terms that appear on the preface, think that it was presented at the Inn's Court (Riverside 444). Finally other critics interpret the statement "never clapper-claw'd with the palms of the vulgar" to mean that it is a witty play fit for a sophisticated audience<sup>10</sup>. It is not certain that it was staged in Shakespeare's time. In the centuries that followed, *TC* was never performed. Today, however, some critics claim it is the most staged of Shakespeare's plays. With respect to the characters, both works present a somewhat similar trio. The critics of each work have wondered why the young man has never thought of marrying his lady, and in both they have reached the conclusion that this is so because it is courtly love<sup>11</sup>. Other critics have wondered about the lack of self-confidence on the part of the young man who needs the help of a wooer. In the case of Calisto it has been pointed out that perhaps he was of Jewish descent, a reason that would make his marriage to Melibea impossible. Other critics have seen in the manifestations of humility on Calisto's part proof of their different social class<sup>12</sup>, while most critics think that that humility on the part of the lover is one of the conventions of courtly love (Martin 2).

10 "Introduction" to *Troilus and Cressida*, Folger's edition, p. xvii.

11 Gaston Paris considered that illegitimacy was an essential feature of courtly love (Martin 2).

12 There must not be any difference in social class as Melibea before committing suicide tells Pleberio: "Muchos dias son passados, padre mio, que penava por mi amor vn caballero que se llamava Calisto, el qual tu bien conociste. Conociste assimesmo a sus padres y claro linaje..." (310).

With regard to the moment the lovers first set eyes on each other, in the case of Calisto and Melibea we know it takes place in a garden<sup>13</sup>, a garden to which Calisto seems to have had easy access. But, in the following encounters he needs a ladder to scale the high wall and he will die as a consequence of falling from it. With respect to Troilus and Cressida we do not know when or where they meet. As the play opens Troilus is in love with Cressida, and she seems to know him already (I.ii.228). The garden will come later on and it will be the place of their swearing and exchanging of vows. Their love, however, will be consummated in a chamber behind the stage. Troilus does not need to climb walls as Pandarus, Cressida's uncle, will not only push him into the affair but give him free entry and even present Troilus' excuses for his absence at King Priamo's dinner table.

At the beginning of their works both heroes are love-sick. Troilus unarms himself and Calisto wants to lie in bed. But neither one behaves like the typical courtly lover<sup>14</sup>. As June Martin has observed Calisto is not tamed, does not obey his lady and hits and swears at his servants, all of which as Martin observes constitute unfit behaviour for a courtly lover (110). In the case of Troilus he is not careful enough about hiding his affair. Everybody seems to know he has spent the night at Cressida's. He is so indiscreet as to choose his lady's guardian as his messenger to the king. Most criticism –male in the main– insists that Troilus does not deserve his fate. Calisto, on the other hand, shocks most readers with his lack of sensitivity towards Melibea's modesty. He is too rough with her. In the lovers' last encounter, the scene that precedes Calisto's death, his possession of Melibea seems like rape<sup>15</sup>. In the first consummation of their love, when in her modesty Melibea asks her maid to go away, he tells her to stay and witness his glory. Troilus also shows some insensitivity towards Cressida's feelings, as he allows Pandarus's nasty kidding (IV.ii.31-34), but this is nothing comparable to Calisto's behaviour. We could say that Calisto in the first part resembles Troilus in the second Diomedes.

There are also some differences in the way each lover courts his lady. Calisto spends his money in *Celestina* up to the point of being recriminated by his servant Parmeno, who advises him to send gifts to Melibea, instead of spending his money on the old woman. While Cressida, through Pandarus, seems to receive presents from Troilus (I.ii.284).

13 According to Martin: "The courtly world... adopted as its setting a garden world..." (10).

14 For a concise study of courtly love beliefs and practices see June Martin's *Love's Fools*.

15 Melibea tells Calisto: "no me destroces ni maltrates como sueles" and he answers: "Señora, el que quiere comer el ave quita primero las plumas" (301). However, she does not seem to hate it really.

In the case of the young ladies, the critics wonder at the speed with which Melibea changes her ire towards Calisto<sup>16</sup>. However, I do not see such speed because Melibea tells Lucrecia: "aquel señor, cuya vista me catiue" (209)<sup>17</sup>. Cressida also recognizes she "was won... / with the first glance" (III.ii.116). Four centuries before the Women's Liberation Movement Melibea ends up by lamenting women's fate: "¡O genero femenino, encogido y fragile! ¿Por que no fue tambien a las hembras concedido poder descubrir su congoxoso y ardiente amor, como a los varones?" (209). Cressida also laments the inequality of the sexes: "I wished myself a man, / Or that we women had men's privilege / Of speaking first". (III.ii.126-7). They both use strong images to describe their passion. For Melibea her passion feels like serpents inside her body which are eating her heart, for Cressida her thoughts are, "like unbridled children" (III.ii.120). The last point we want to stress is that both ladies are extremely careful to hide their affair. Melibea, in spite of her overwhelming passion<sup>18</sup>, prepares very carefully the encounters, keeps an eye on the street and lies to hide her passion<sup>19</sup>. And they both experience doubts towards the enjoyment of their passion, as they both want and do not want at the same time. Melibea is afraid to lose her chastity and so she grants a meeting to her suitor but she asks him to content himself with her sight. Cressida does not yield right away to her passion because she believes that men lose interest once they have enjoyed what they wanted. And it is for that reason that it takes months before she grants her favors while Melibea is won in one day<sup>20</sup>. Cressida will always lament having yielded because she thinks she has lost her power over her lover, while Melibea, once she has yielded to her passion she will not experience any regrets whatsoever. The last feature relating to both heroines concerns the short time of the affair. In the short version of *Celestina* the lovers meet only once in

16 June Martin in *Love's Fools* –following Andreas Capellanus' *De Amore*– finds the reason of Melibea's ire in the fact that Calisto approaches her as he would approach his mistress (75).

17 This statement contradicts what Melibea tells Celestina a few pages later: "Muchos y muchos dias son passados que esse nobile cauallero me hablo en amor. Tanto me fue su habla enojosa quanto, despues que tu me le tornaste a nombrar, alegre." (215). However this could be an indication that Melibea tries to blame Celestina for the passion she now feels.

18 As Melibea says, "Agora toque en mi honrra, agora dañe mi fama..." (212).

19 As Juan Luis Alborg comments: "Tras las primeras zozobras, Melibea cede resueltamente a su pasión sin atormentarse con imaginaciones y escrúpulos; y una vez gustado su amor se rinde a su deleite" (574).

20 In the case of Diomedes, however, Cressida, rather than losing him is willing to yield right away, but Cressida, as I tried to explained in *III Conference S.E.D.E.R.I.* has been stripped of all her pride and this Cressida is no longer the former Cressida as Troilus says in front of Ulysses. In "Representation and Performance: Authority in Shakespeare's Theater", Robert Weimann studies the crisis in authority in this scene and so does Barbarta Hodgdon in "He Do Cressida in Different Voices," *English Literary Renaissance* 20, 2 (Spring 1990): 254-86.

the longer twice, while in *TC* they spend only one night together. However, both ladies react very differently at the end of their affair, while Cressida after being let go can find a substitute<sup>21</sup>, Melibea prefers to stop living<sup>22</sup>.

While there is no negative criticism towards Melibea, it abounds with respect to Cressida. Most critics insist Cressida is a coquette, because she loves Troilus and pretends she does not<sup>23</sup>. In the 18th c. there is an insistence on the fact that the play is deficient in poetical justice, because Cressida is not punished. In the last years of the 19th c. and beginnings of the 20th the critics wonder why Cressida is so odious and why Shakespeare was so bitter toward women. In the fifties during this century some critics started seeing her as a very contemporary girl and also as a victim of her circumstances<sup>24</sup>. For me, Cressida seems to embody the *carpe diem* philosophy: "Seize the day", a time to love a time to die, while Melibea does not settle for seconds<sup>25</sup>.

The last analogy concerns the role of the procurer. And while Celestina eventually usurps the place of the lovers in the eyes of the reader up to the point of renaming the work, there is not much written about Pandarus. Most critics insist on the decline of the character from Chaucer to Shakespeare. Many of the critics see Celestina as a sorceress, a kind of diabolical figure who is able to change Melibea's attitude and mind in a few minutes. Pandarus, however, needs time to convince Cressida to yield to Troilus' desire. He is not a diabolical figure but a mild fool. His motivation seems to be different from that of Celestina. While hers is money and she will be punished for her greediness, we do not know the reason

21 In Meredith's *The Tragic Comedians*, the lover also lets his lady go, and at the end she marries his executor. Apparently some women hate rationality and civilized behaviour on the part of their lovers.

22 Alborg points out that Pleberio's praise of virginity could have contributed to Melibea's decision to commit suicide.

23 In the 18th c. Charlotte Lennox complained that by escaping justice Cressida leaves the play deficient in poetical justice. Dryden also insists on the point that Cressida is false and is not punished. In 1849 G.G. Gervinus criticizes what he considers Cressida's coquetry and betrayal. George Brandes in the last years of the 19th c. wonders why Cressida becomes so odious and why Shakespeare was so bitter about her. And finds the reason on Shakespeare's rejection of women which had started with his drawing of Cleopatra. Frederick Boas calls Cressida a "scheming cold-blooded profligate", while Chambers sees Cressida as a creation of a disillusioned Shakespeare who meant to square the general sex by her. In the 20th c. critics like Tucker Brooke see her somewhat soiled from the beginning and predestined to become more polluted. De Almeida sees her as a wanton but also as a victim of circumstances—because the point of honour is the adulteress Helen, her uncle suggests her that her hopes lie in a liaison in Troy, and the same occurs in the Greek camp. Jan Kott sees Cressida as a young girl, very twentieth century, who has imagined love and gets it through a procurer.

24 For a reprint of part of the criticism on *TC* before 1984 see *SC* III 532-648.

25 For a *carpe diem* philosophy in *Celestina* see Hartunian's work.

behind Pandarus's interest in getting both lovers together. With the exception of his confession in the last act, scene x, —a scene that according to some critics is not Shakespeare's (Lawrence 134)—in the rest of the play we do not see any indication that Pandarus was a procurer for the general public but a person interested in getting a good settlement for his niece, a role that later on in the play and with respect to Diomedes will be taken by Calchas. Pandarus seems to have free entrance to the palace, but nobody as is the case of Celestina, seems to regard him as a procurer. However, he is called Pandarus, and that name characterizes him. There is something puzzling in Pandarus's behaviour with respect to the lovers' forced separation. Pandarus shows his concern about Troilus's suffering while he ignores Cressida's. Perhaps he knows her better than we do. Or perhaps his real motivation in the affair from the start has been his affection for Troilus.

Both works are thematically different. With respect to the *Celestina* Lida believes that its author meant to paint an uncontrollable tragic passion (Alborg 564). In *TC* what is tragic is not the passion, but Hector's death that will eventually bring about the destruction of Troy.

Comparing both works we realize that though Shakespeare could have known *La Celestina* and though at a first glance we see a correlation between the three main characters of both works, after a careful analysis we realize that—with the exception of some similar reactions on the part of the ladies—the characters of one work are totally independent from those of the previous one and also that there are more analogies concerning the bewilderment of the critics with respect to the genre of each of the two works, than similarities between their respective genres. We observe, however, some similarities in the mood. Instead of the mild irony of Chaucer's work we find that the mood in *Troilus and Cressida* is as cynical and bitter as that of *La Celestina*. Courtly love, free of pedestals and mixed with street language is no longer an elevating experience, but a debasing one as is described in obscene language by the witnesses to the affair. To summarize, both works rely on a similar kind of bitter humour and recur to obscene language to describe love, because the affair in the fable is not only seen through the eyes of the lovers but also through the unredeeming eyes of servants and slaves, and in this aspect of the work it may be possible that Shakespeare was inspired by the mood in the *Tragicomedy of Calisto and Melibea*. At the moment, we can only say that the tone in the interlude is not the same, and that Shakespeare could not have read the Alnwick ms. (composed between 1603-1611) before writing *TC* (entered in the *SR* on February 7, 1603) nor the 1631 Mabbe's translation. What is left to us is to guess about the tone adopted in the XVI c. abridged translations and adaptations the entries in the *SR* refer to that Shakespeare could have had access to. But this is a point that I do not believe should be researched further.

# WORKS CITED

- ALBORG, Juan Luis. *Edad Media y Renacimiento. Vol. I of Historia de la literatura española*. 3 vols. 2nd. ed. Madrid: Gredos, 1979.
- ALLEN, H. Warner, ed. *Celestina, and An Interlude of Calisto and Melebea*. London: Routledge, 1908.
- ALMEIDA, Barbara Heliodora C. de M.F. de. "Troilus and Cressida: Romantic Love Revisited". *Shakespeare Quarterly*, XV, 4 (Fall 1964): 327-32.
- BLAYNEY, Pater W.M. *The First Folio of Shakespeare*. Washington, D.C.: Folger Library Publications, 1991.
- BLUMNSTEIN, Andree Kahn. *Misogyny and Idealization in the Courtly Romance*. Bonn: Bouvier, 1977.
- BOAS, Frederick S. "The Problem Plays". *Shakspeare and His Predecessors*. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896. pp. 344-408.
- DRADBROOK, M.C. *Muriel Bradbrook on Shakespeare*. Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1984.
- BRANDES, George. "Contempt of Women--Troilus and Cressida". *William Shakespeare*. Trans. Diana White and Mary Morison. William Heinemann, 1920. pp. 501-507.
- BROCKBANK, Philip. "Troilus and Cressida: Character and Value 1200 B.C. to A.D. 1985", in *On Shakespeare: Jesus, Shakespeare and Karl Marx, and Other Essays*. Basil Blackwell, 1989: 30-59.
- BROOKE, Tucker. "Shakespeare's Study in Culture and Anarchy". *Essays on Shakespeare and Other Elizabethans*. Hamden, CT.: Archon, 1969. pp. 71-7.
- BRYANT, J.A., Jr. *Shakespeare and the Uses of Comedy*. Lexington, Ky.: The U P of Kentucky, 1986.
- CHAMBERS, E.K. "Troilus and Cressida". *Shakespeare: A Survey*. Reprint. OUP, 1926. pp. 191-99.
- DRYDEN, John. Preface. "Troilus & Cressida; or, Truth Found too Late, a Tragedy". Vol. V of *Dryden: The Dramatic Works*. Ed. Montague Summers, 1932. Reprint by Gordian Press, 1968. pp.11-28.
- FERNÁNDEZ-CORUGEDO, S.G., ED. *Proceedings of the II Conference of the Spanish Society for English Renaissance Studies*. Universidad de Oviedo, 1992.
- GERVINUS, G.G. "Third Period of Shakespeare's Dramatic Poetry: 'Troilus and Cressida.'" *Shakespeare Commentaries*. Trans. F.E. Bunnétt, rev. ed. 1877. Reprint, AMS: 1971. pp. 679-97.
- GRUDIN, Robert. *Mighty Opposites: Shakespeare and Renaissance Contrariety*. Berkeley: U of C P, 1979.
- GUARDIA MASÓ, Pedro. "The Spanish Bawd: Londres, 1631", in Santoyo, Julio César and Isabel Verdaguer, eds. *Versiones inglesas de clásicos españoles (ss. XVI-XVII). Estudios de Literatura Española y Comparada*. Barcelona: PPU, 1987.
- HARRIS, Laurie Lanzen and Mark W. Scott, eds. *Shakespearean Criticism III*. Detroit: Gale, 1986.
- HARTUNIAN, Diane. *La Celestina: A Feminist Reading of the Carpe Diem*. The Catholic University of America: Scripta Humanistica, 1992.
- HILLMAN, Richard. *Intertextuality and Romance in Renaissance Drama: The Staging of Nostalgia*. N Y: St. Martin's Press, 1992.
- HODGDON, Barbara. "He Do Cressida in Different Voices", in *Shakespearean Criticism XVI*: 70-83 (From *English Literary Renaissance*, Vol. 20, 2 (Spring 1990): 254-86.

- KOTT, Jan. "Troilus and Cressida: Amazing and Modern". *Shakespeare Our Contemporary*. Trans. Boleslaw Taborski, 1964. Reprint. Norton, 1974, pp. 75-83.
- LENNOX, Charlotte. "The Fable of 'Troilus and Cressida'". *Shakespeare Illustrated; or, The Novels and Histories, on Which the Plays of Shakespeare Are Founded*. Vol. III, 1754. Reprint by AMS Press Inc., 1973, pp. 89-100.
- MAGUIRE, Nancy Klein. *Renaissance Tragicomedy: Explorations in Genre and Politics*. N Y: AMS, 1987.
- MAHOOD, M.M. *Bit Parts in Shakespeare's Plays*. Cambridge UP; 1992.
- MARTIN, June Hall. *Love's Fools: Aucassin, Calisto and the Parody of the Courtly Lover*. London: Tamesis, 1972.
- MARTÍNEZ LACALLE, Guadalupe, ed. *Celestine or the Tragick-Comedie of Calisto and Melibea*. London: Tamesis, 1972.
- MOWAT, Barbara A. "Shakespearean Tragicomedy", in Maguire
- O'DONOGHUE, Bernard. *The Courtly Love Tradition*. Manchester UP, 1982.
- RIEHLE, Wolfgang. *Shakespeare, Plautus and the Humanist Tradition*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1990.
- ROJAS, Fernando de. *La Celestina*. Ed. M. Criado de Val y G.D. Trotter. 9th ed. Barcelona: Bruguera, 1979.
- ROUGEMONT, Denis de. *El amor y occidente*. 2nd ed. Barcelona: Kairos, 1981.
- SANTOYO, J.C. "Lewkenor/Lucanor (1555?-1627?): Fragmentos biobibliográficos de un traductor olvidado". In Fernández-Corugedo: 261-287.
- SEVERIN, Dorothy Sherman. *Tragicomedy and Novelistic Discourse in Celestina*. Cambridge UP, 1989.
- SHAKESPEARE, William. *The Riverside Edition: The Complete Works*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.
- . *Troilus and Cressida*. Washington: The Folger Shakespeare Library, 1966.
- WEIMANN, Robert. "Representation and Performance: The Uses of Authority in Shakespeare's Theater". *PMLA* 107, 3 (May 1992): 497-510.

## MARLOWE AND THE DRAMA OF PROTESTANT SOCIETY

Thomas Healy  
Birkbeck College, London

At first glance my title may appear oxymoronic and inappropriate. Sex and protestantism seem unlikely bedfellows, as strangely heterogeneous as the yoking together of England and summer or Britain and Europe! It might also appear that I wish to import a Calvinist dampness into our proceedings in Las Palmas de Gran Canaria—some might assume Protestantism's relation with sex is in denying its place and propriety. I assure you I wish to bring no such spirit into our proceedings.

We have recognised, since Foucault, that sexuality is a human construct, a cultural artefact which changes with time. Because of its popular character, the collaborative circumstances of its agency, and the scope of its concerns, Renaissance drama is an important repository of information for our understanding of early modern sexualities. Yet, it must also be remembered that dramatic representations were not seeking to record the cultural meanings of sexuality in unmediated and authentic manners, as though anticipating the needs of current historians for an archive of information on gender and its effects. How the drama represented sexuality reflects many things, including generic choice, specific historic circumstances, ideological choices in a world culturally far less hegemonic than we have often imagined, and the desires of audiences to witness exaggerations and differences from the everyday in plays whose representations they selectively chose to subscribe to. Further, we should also recall that the Renaissance plays which most interest us are not necessarily the plays which seem to have most interested contemporary audiences and that many Renaissance plays, including some of the most popular, are lost to us.

Representations of sexualities in Renaissance drama are various, particularly dependent of the generic contexts in which sexuality is displayed. Sexuality can be presented in plays in symbolic manner, frequently representing an uncertainty of proper government (domestic or the state). Sexuality is often associated with uncontrolled emotionalism, the dominance of figures by sensual appetites, usually seen as effeminate, against the controlled reasonableness of patriarchal order. In other plays, sexuality seems suggestively displayed in



order to arouse, indicating sexual availability under the guise of warnings against excess. In others again, it functions as satirical bawdy, often directed at the authorities who were seeking to regulate sexual behaviour. In still others, it marks out a compelling attraction to the marvellous (think of Theridamas in *Tamburlaine*), or indicates dangerous dispositions (for example Mother Sawyer and the devil as the dog Tom in *The Witch of Edmonton*). Only rarely does sexuality direct us towards interior psychology, a means of delineating individual identity among a play's characters.

The type of sexuality I term Protestant, which I wish to explore with Marlowe, can be illustrated through considering the ending of a later play, Middleton's and Rowley's *The Changeling*. At the conclusion, in Alsemero's uncovering of the activities of DeFlores and Beatrice-Joanna, we witness the convergence of a number of concepts- predestination, moral corruption, death, and sexual appetite. The scene climaxes with a reversal of a wedding ceremony- a compact, already sexually consummated, which has diabolical possibilities. It neatly counters Alsemero's meeting and musings on Beatrice as the image of purity in the temple at the play's opening, operating to reveal her and DeFlores as images of tainted infection. Their types are instantly recognisable to any reader of *The Faerie Queene* or Renaissance moral tracts. Apparently a figure of religious integrity, Beatrice is actually a deceiver, a white devil whose image conceals her destructive nature. DeFlores is the seemingly dutiful servant who is actually traitorous. Both are threats to stability in more righteous individuals, the family and even the state. Their resistance to order and government and their refusal to accept their assigned places in society encourage their unrestrained sexual desires. Murder leads to sex and sex to murder. What is interesting with *The Changeling*, though, is that these revelations culminate in a final display of sex and death which complicates the reversal of Beatrice from pure virgin to sexually active murderess as much as it heightens the dramatic intensity of Beatrice and DeFlores uncovering.

Having been accused of infidelity by Alsemero, Beatrice-Joanna tries to defend herself by revealing her arrangement with DeFlores in the murder of her betrothed, Alonzo de Piracquo, so she could wed Alsemero. She was forced to 'kiss poison and strok a serpent', ostensibly for Alsemero. He is outraged and orders her into his closet as his prisoner. DeFlores arrives, is confronted and confesses to Alsemero, revealing Beatrice's infidelities:

Alsemero: It could not choose but follow, oh cunning devils!  
 How should blind men know you from fair-fac'd saints?  
 Take your prey to you, get you in to her, sir  
 I'll be your pander now; rehearse again

Your scene of lust, that you may be perfect  
 When you shall come to act it to the black audience  
 Where howls and gnashings shall be music to you.  
 Clip your adult'ress freely,

The imagery obviously connects illicit sex with damnation. What is less usual is that Beatrice and DeFlores take up Alsemero's offer to rehearse this performance, a play within a play, which they will offer to the assembly. Using the privacy of the closet, Beatrice and DeFlores combine sex with death, the consuming nature of their passion leads to actual self-consumption.

Alsemero attempts to explain to Beatrice's father and the brother of the murdered Piracquo his discovery. Piracquo's brother is in his own high state of consuming passion.

Piracquo: Give me a brother alive or dead:  
 Alive, a wife with him, if dead, for both  
 a recompense, for murder and adultery.  
 Beatrice: Oh, Oh, Oh!  
 Alsemero: Hark 'tis coming to you.  
 De Flores: Nay, I'll along for company.  
 Beatrice: Oh, Oh!  
 Vermandero: What horrid sounds are these?

What horrid sounds are they? Given Alsemero's arrangements, the initial possibility must be that they are the sounds of Beatrice and De Flores fucking. These orgiastic sounds are the literal equation of that Renaissance literary commonplace, death and orgasm. In coming out of the privacy of the closet, DeFlores and Beatrice reveal themselves mortally wounded by self-inflicted stabbings, a source of amazement to the witnesses. As she bleeds on the stage, Beatrice implores her father to keep his distance or she shall defile him. (It is worth recalling that women were formally re-introduced to the Church of England after supposedly being made unclean through childbirth- a woman's blood was a sign of sin). Beatrice develops this infected blood imagery, claiming that she is bad blood being purged from her father for his better health. She then muses on her fate:

Beneath the stars, upon yon meteor  
 Ever hung my fate, 'mongst things corruptible;  
 I ne'er could pluck it from him: my loathing  
 Was prophet to the rest, but ne'er believ'd;  
 Mine honour fell with him, and now my life.

Alsemero, I am a stranger to your bed,  
Your bed was cozen'd on the nuptial night,  
For which you false bride died...

DeFlores: Yes, and the while I coupled with your mate  
At barley-brake; now we are left in hell.

Vermandero: We are all there, it circumscribes here.

DeFlores: I lov'd this woman in spite of her heart;  
Her love I earn'd out of Piracquo's murder  
...and her honour's prize  
Was my reward; I thank life for nothing  
But that pleasure: it was so sweet to me  
That I have drunk it up all, left none behind  
For any man to pledge me....

Make haste Joanna, by that token to thee:  
Canst not forget, so lately put in mind,  
I would not go to leave thee far behind.

Beatrice: Forgive me Alsemero, all forgive;  
'Tis time to die, when 'tis a shame to live.

Calvin speaks of theatres of the world where humanity may be stunned, dazzled and blinded by the world's allurements which falsely promise grace and sweetness, an argument echoed in Alsemero's condemnation of devils who appear fair-faced saints to blind men. *The Changeling* is a play which demonstrates that appearances are deceptive and the world unknowable, but it also indicates a fatalism about destiny which hints at inevitabilities in humanity's fallen condition. The 'meteor' Beatrice sees her fate hung on concludes a series of images which suggest DeFlores as Satan, the fallen star Lucifer. Yet, DeFlores appears as much a victim of his sexual passions as he does the satanic exploiter of Beatrice. His remark that we are all left in hell, recalls another commonplace identification of hell with a woman's genitalia. The men can present themselves as victims of Beatrice's deceptions. Yet, rather than attribute culpability to the female, *The Changeling* proposes an inescapable quality about sexuality. Beatrice and DeFlores self-consumption provides, in its own terrible manner, a proper consummation of their relation, a fulfilment of their ungovernable longings. This is what particularly complicates the ending of *The Changeling*—the bloodiness, the destructiveness, the physicality of DeFlores and Beatrice's sexuality is satisfying to them. Just as the horror of Dante's *Inferno* is the recognition that the

places inhabited by the damned are the fulfilment of their desires, passions which are *contra natura* but desires all the same, so the deaths of DeFlores and Beatrice enact the true consummation of their passion. They discover their identities in their sexuality but those identities are apparently wholly outside their control. Rather than subjectivity, their self-discoveries confirm them as destined victims of the Fall. "I can exact no more" announces Piracquo after the deaths, "Unless my soul were loose, and could o'ertake / These black fugitives that are fled from thence, / To take a second vengeance; but there are wraths / Deeper than mine, 'tis to be fear'd, about 'em". A world governed by "deeper wraths" works its just vengeance on fallen humanity. Certainly, *The Changeling* offers nothing in the way of a cosy moral message to guard against emotional excess.

The idea of a Protestant drama is one which we are becoming ever more familiar with after the important work of the late Margot Heinemann on Middleton or, more recently, Julia Gaspar on Dekker. It is not a drama of easily observed theology, of course; nor is it the logical development of the Protestant morality plays which found favour with the early English reformers. A supernatural organisation of the world which saw constant attempts by the forces of the Antichrist to challenge the godly and the majority of humanity necessarily damned, however, found cultural expression in plays which explore the implications of these conditions. The nature of Protestant tragedy is perhaps neatly summarised by Beatrice: "my loathing / Was prophet to the rest, but ne'er believ'd". Even those who count themselves among the godly may find themselves damned, their apparent revulsion against the illicit no more than an indication of the desires proper to their condition which they refuse to credit.

## II

I do not have the space, nor frankly the inclination, to present a lengthy case for viewing Christopher Marlowe as a Protestant dramatist. The old charge of Marlowe being an atheist, which largely arises from statements made by Richard Baines and Thomas Kyd against him, or from the discovery of supposedly heretical books in Marlowe's rooms, is effectively libel based on innuendos. There is far too much which is coerced about all this supposed evidence, both in its Elizabethan origins and in its later interpretations by modern critics anxious to find an exciting subject for their biographies. Kyd's and Baines's charges occurred after Marlowe's death and there was apparently a wish by some of the authorities to discredit Marlowe. The English Church was pursuing heretical opinions (mostly extreme Protestant ones) and was no lover of the theatre in the 1590s. A chance to attack a popular but conveniently

deceased playwright may have seemed a good idea, but this is only speculation. We do know that Marlowe was involved in activities directed against Catholics and worked for the ultra-Protestant secret service. Whether from conviction or not is again a matter of speculation.

In many respects, however, the shadowy biography of Marlowe is not pressing when we turn to the question of Marlowe's authorship of the plays which bear his name. Certainly, he was behind them all at some stage but most, if not all, have been substantially altered in printed versions. I view Marlowe's drama as more accurately representing a collection of plays which reflect collaborative constructions not the product of a single author, even though Christopher Marlowe was the first agent in their creation. Looking at the plays, it is possible to see distinctive Protestant endeavours in their ideological visions. At least one of them, *The Massacre at Paris*, is a piece of pure Protestant propaganda.

*The Changeling's* suggestion that we are in hell, seems to echo Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*. I would like to consider another Marlowe play, though, *Edward II*, which also reaches a dramatic culmination in a death which combines sex and violence. Like *The Changeling*, Marlowe's play is a study in deceptions intimately combined with sexuality, and like Middleton and Rowley's piece it offers no easy resolution to the dilemmas it poses. It, too, posits a determined pattern to events which are inescapable and it is a pattern which offers no ready solace to its audiences. Far more than *The Changeling*, *Edward II* demonstrates an unknowable world where all forms of relationships are insecure and uncertain, a drama which questions the audience's ability to determine what is lawful, moral, natural. Importantly, it represents its designs through sexuality.

The death of Edward is a reversal of the play's opening with its polarisation between Gaveston's promises of sensual excess as his means of maintaining Edward's affection and the barons disgust at Gaveston's rising position within the court. Our first encounter with Gaveston is suspicious. He makes it clear he uses a language of flattery and is a dissembler. He offers us a vision of how he:

May draw the pliant king which way I please:  
Music and poetry is his delight;  
Therefore I'll have Italian masques by night  
Sweet speeches, comedies and pleasing shows;  
And in the day, when he shall walk abroad;  
Like sylvan nymphs my pages shall be clad;  
My men, like satyrs grazing on the lawns,  
Shall with their goat-feet dance an antic hay;

Sometimes a lovely boy in Dian's shape  
With hair that gilds the water as it glides,  
Crowns of pear about his naked arms,  
And in his sportful hands an olive-tree,  
To hide those parts which men delight to see,  
Shall bathe him in a spring; and there, hard by,  
One like Actaeon, peeping through the grove  
Shall by the angry goddess be transform'd  
And running in the likeness of an hart,  
By yelping hounds pull'd down and seem to die:  
Such things as these best please his majesty.

The transformation of Diana into a boy is a sexual transformation and also a convolution of Elizabeth's adoption of Diana imagery to emphasise her chastity. Diana, as the virgin goddess of hunt, punishes Acteon for accidentally glimpsing her naked. In Gaveston's vision, the boyish Diana plays at titillating his viewers, and he translates an episode of pathos and human tragedy in Ovid into a voyeuristic fantasy of sex and death.

Gaveston's speech, with its echoes of Suetonius's descriptions of Tiberius's sexual adventures on Capri, appears to support two of the issues the barons bitterly denounce in his relationship with the king. First, that in their love of diversions and pageantry, Edward and Gaveston drain the exchequer. Second, that Gaveston promotes a foreign and decadent aesthetic in the English court. The barons' other, and most significant, accusation is that Gaveston is basely born and has no right to gain high office. In an exchange between the Mortimers after Gaveston, Edward and the nobles have been momentarily reconciled, it is proposed that it is not the sexual frolics between Edward and Gaveston which are troublesome. Mortimer Senior argues that the king is by nature "mild and calm" and should be allowed to dote on Gaveston as his minion, citing a number of classical precedents:

Then let his grace, whose youth is flexible,  
And promiseth as much as we can wish,  
Freely enjoy that vain light-headed earl,  
For ripper years will wean him from such toys.

The senior Mortimer marks out a socially acceptable way of viewing Gaveston and Edward's relation, one in which sexuality is not a corrupting influence but an amusement. Edward's actions, which might be viewed as revealing effeminate indecision and emotional dotage in other contexts, are ascribed to his youth. The promise of Edward which Mortimer indicates is ambiguous, but it suggests

Mortimer Senior does not view Gaveston's and Edward's relation to Elizabethan understanding, as unmanning, and, corrupting Edward.

Mortimer junior agrees that Edward's "wanton humour" is not troublesome. His dismay at Gaveston and Edward, he claims, is motivated by national needs mixed with a repulsion at Gaveston's importation of foreign courtly behaviour, particularly because Gaveston is of lowly origins. Mortimer's difficulty with Gaveston is a fear that the state's structures of power are being re-arranged. Gaveston's use of shows and foreign manners to gain control of the king is against a courtliness based on landed might and inherited privilege promoted by the nobles. Gaveston's imported courtliness is one Mortimer has no tolerance of:

I scorn, that one so basely born  
Should by his sovereign's favours grow so pert,  
And riot it with the treasure of the realm,  
While soldiers mutiny for want of pay.  
He wears a lord's revenue on his back,  
And, Midas-like, he jets it in the court  
With base outlandish cullions at his heels,  
Whose proud fantastic liveries make such show  
As if that Proteus, god of shapes, appear'd.  
I have not seen a dapper Jack so brisk.  
He wears a short Italian hooded cloak,  
Larded with pearl, and in his Tuscan cap  
A jewel of more value than the crown.  
Whiles other walk below, the king and he  
From out a window laugh at such as we,  
And flout our train, and jest at our attire  
Uncle, 'tis this that makes me impatient.

One of the principle preoccupations of Protestant drama was its representations of abroad. While a playwright such as Dekker argued for a pan-European Protestant movement, a more common characteristic of Protestant polemic at this time is distinguishing between a morally and religiously corrupted southern Europe and a godly England. As Patrick Collinson has demonstrated, the belief that God was English and that the English were an elect nation was a common theme in Elizabethan pulpit oratory. Despite some gesturing at Protestant universalism, the exclusive nature of the Calvinist covenant and principles of election tended to restrict the divine plan of salvation to the English in popular Protestant tracts.

Commentators have largely tended to interpret Renaissance drama as though the foreign merely stands in for England, a disguise in order to address

subjects it would be difficult politically to broach in an English setting. It is not clear that this was how contemporaries interpreted the foreign in plays. John Reynold's *God's Revenge Against Murder* which is a main source for *The Changeling* has various asides against Roman Catholic practices in his account of Alsemero and Beatrice which pointedly suggests that the corruptions exhibited are not surprising given the characters' religion. The courting of Beatrice in a church by Alsemero turns the temple into a stew, a: "sinfull custom... especially in Italy and Spaine, where, for the most part, men love their courtizans better then their God". George Whetstone's *The English Myrror* which was Marlowe's main source of information on Tamburlaine, is an unashamed piece of Protestant religio-nationalism, contrasting an England ostensibly free from the ravages of envy with foreign instances of destructive vices. Such contrasts can be mere conveniences in such texts, which devote their energies to detailed description of how wonderfully and excitingly vicious foreign things are—elaborations which clearly found favour with their readers given the number of editions of these texts and the widespread use of the convention. The exaggerated exoticism of foreign practices was popular and these accounts seem to have been enjoyed for their otherness. Similar conventions apply to the popular theatre but this appears rarely recognised critically. *The Jew of Malta* seem to provoke a bizarre ecumenicalism among many critics who consider 'the Christians' in the play, apparently so that an English audience can be somehow included in its moral culpabilities. In fact, *The Jew of Malta* quite clearly singles out the commonly imagined excesses and hypocrisies of Roman Catholic practices, with a predictable swipe at Spain, along with its depictions of Turk and Jew. *Doctor Faustus* is, in many respects, a travel play and shares similarities with imaginary voyage narratives. I doubt whether audiences imagined they were witnessing themselves.

As we have seen, the question of foreignness is important to *Edward II* and certainly helps illuminate the play's Protestant sympathies. The play opens with Gaveston dismissing a poor soldier to the hospitals he claims exist for such as him. Mortimer's anger that soldiers mutiny for lack of pay while Gaveston lives extravagantly re-directs our attention to this idea. The problem of former soldiers in the London of the early 1590s was an acute one in a period of high unemployment. There was the fear of them as masterless and often criminal but also scandal that they were so badly treated, particularly because most had fought in Protestant causes against Spain. At the same time, the late 1580s and early 1590s had produced huge tensions over immigration in London, where aliens were frequently blamed for economic difficulties and the apprentices constantly threatened violence against foreigners as a means of having the

authorities address their grievances. The London in which *Edward II* was first acted was going through one of its periodic bouts of xenophobia. It is worth recalling that Thomas Kyd was arrested on suspicion of writing a public libel against foreigners which had been signed Tamerlane. Thus, Gaveston's and Edward's desire for foreign manifestations of sensuality and their extravagances which leads to the reported economic wants in the country would not have been calculated to endear them to a London audience of the mid 1590s. Mortimer's defence of native plainness appears patriotic in this context.

Sexuality plays an important part in the construction of the foreign because illicit sexuality, particularly homosexuality, was commonly perceived as more prevalent in ungodly places. In law, sodomy was an unnatural practice punishable by death. Yet sodomy does not seem to have been viewed as widespread or culturally subversive when it was clearly only associated with a sexual act. As Bruce Smith observes, in the forty-five years of Elizabeth's and James's reigns there are records of only six men being indicted only on the charge of sodomy in the home counties and only one conviction. In contrast, sodomy was a common accompanying charge for Roman Catholics or others arrested and condemned for anti-state activities. The Henrican convention of seeing sodomy in terms of heresy seems to have remained largely in place. In this context, sodomy was feared because it indicated the intrusion of diabolical treachery into the midst of the godly.

Importantly, therefore, sodomy does not appear to have been automatically equated with other forms of homosocial and even homosexual behaviour. Categories for defining sexualities were organised in importantly different ways from the modern. Where we commonly classify all forms of same-sex activities as registering sexual desires, this does not appear to have been the case with the early modern period. Sharing a bed with another man to gain privacy for study and conversation could be presented as indicating a healthy manly friendship. Ascham's well known account of reading through Cicero's tract on friendship, *De Amicitia*, while in bed with a young man named John Witney is a telling example. As Alan Stewart has demonstrated, part of Ascham's strategy in relating this episode is to absolve him of complicity in the treason of his patron Thomas Seymour. Ascham develops a motif of seclusion from the world for master and pupil, their privacy signalling their innocence from worldly vice.

In contrast, where accusations of sodomy were made against those involved in political or religious treasons, the intimacies of the accused indicate his corruption of all social norms. It was felt to be necessary to display condemned traitors as thoroughly infectious to the state in every aspect of their life-styles. As

a result, sexual practices were readily equated with religious questions and, significantly, evidence of illicit sexual practice did not need to be actually proved among those found guilty of treachery or heresy. Establishing guilt in political actions confirmed illicit sexuality and allowed the popular imagination to develop an expectation of treachery being accompanied by sexual corruptions. The drama's representations of proscribed sexual practices as signifying ungodly activities against the state were well supported in pulpit and law court. Edward dies in the play through a terrible parody of sodomy. A red-hot spit is pushed up his rectum while he is pressed between a feather bed and a table, the actions being devised so that no marks will appear on his body. Given Edward's relation with Gaveston, there might be a temptation to witness this terrible death as having a type of biblical propriety about it, like Beatrice and DeFlores a consummation of unnatural desires. This is, however, to ignore the reversals which take place in the play. By Edward's death, the entire weight of illicit sexuality has shifted from the king and his minions to Mortimer and Isabella. In our discovery of Mortimer's and Isabella's rebellious adultery against husband, monarchy and state there is the revelation of their deceptiveness. The positions of honour, of loyalty, of social order they claimed to uphold at the play's start are revealed to have been false, part of their attempts to gain control and power of the realm. At the point of Edward's death, it is Mortimer and Isabella who have demonstrated themselves as the usurpers of the kingdom, the true abusers of social, political and moral orders.

It is, of course, Mortimer who commands the death of Edward and it is he who is ultimately responsible for the murderous act of sodomy against him. There is a wonderful and yet unsettling irony here. Mortimer does not know how Edward will die. His actions are done by the hired murderer Lightborn who reveals that his devious methods of killing people were learned in Naples, showing Mortimer as an importer of ugly foreign practices into the realm. When Mortimer asks him what his method in killing Edward will be, Lightborn refuses to divulge his trade secrets. Yet, Mortimer's unknown and grisly sodomy of Edward culminates his unnatural usurpations upon the kingdom. The ostensibly native patriot, fiercely desirous to maintain the status quo and dismissive of Gaveston's baseness and foreignness, becomes the figure, far more than any other in the play, who assumes a role above his station and does so through embracing both unnatural sex and foreignness. Although unplanned, the act of murderous ritualised sodomy against Edward is the logical conclusion of Mortimer's designs. Mortimer, the fiercest opponent of Gaveston is revealed as perpetrating the deceptions, corruptions and sodomies he claimed to be passionately opposing. Like Beatrice in *The Changeling*, his loathing is shown to be prophet to the rest.

Mortimer's position in seeking power would be untenable without Isabella. As the sister to the king of France, Isabella is a foreigner, though she appears to attempt reconciliation among the English in the early part of the play. She constantly claims accusations of infidelities made against her are false and the early scenes appear to support her eloquent testimony of love for Edward. By the play's conclusion, Isabella's word has been wholly discredited, considerable energy being expended in demonstrating her capacities for deception. In the last act, in the space of a hundred lines, Isabella offers a variety of different faces to different figures. She swears her affection for Mortimer and proposes he should do against Edward 'what thou wilt, and I myself will willingly subscribe', she then publicly grieves over Edward's condition, next she rejoices at the news of Edward's resignation of the crown, then she expresses her desire to have Edward dead, she then goes on to announce that she is labouring to ease Edward's grief and gain his freedom, and finally she states her sorrow at the news of Edward's resignation. In case the audience misses the duplicity in her protean dispositions, Mortimer and Edmund have asides which point out her dissembling. As Edmund the duped brother of Edward realises, 'Mortimer / and Isabel do kiss, while they conspire. / And yet she bearr a face of love'.

Isabella's capacity for deception creates an important link with Marlowe's most obvious Protestant play, the propagandist *The Massacre at Paris*. The central scenes of this play depict in bloody detail the St. Bartholmew's day massacre of Huguenot Protestants by the Catholic faction led by the Duke of Guise. Guise has been the character accorded most critical attention, but I would like to briefly consider the part of the Duke of Anjou, afterwards Henry III. We witness Anjou joyfully taking part in the Protestant murders, himself killing Ramus. Yet within a few lines he is protesting his innocence to Henry of Navarre: 'I have done what I have done to stay this broil'. By the play's end we apparently have another reversal. Henry, mortally wounded by a friar from the Guise faction, concludes his life with a strongly anti-papist speech addressed to Henry of Navarre and the English agent who will carry word to Elizabeth:

Navarre, give me thy hand: I here do swear,  
To rinate that wicked Church of Rome,  
That hatcheth up such bloody practices;  
And here protest eternal love to thee,  
And to the Queen of England specially,  
What God hath bless'd for hating papistry.

Stirring language, but given Anjou's actions earlier in the play how far to be believed? It should be remembered that the closest Elizabeth came to marriage was with the brother of Henry III, François, who had become Duke of Anjou- a

marriage much opposed by more militant Protestant in England because of their fears of Catholic influence. The marriage arrangements had long been cancelled by the time of Marlowe's play, but his Protestantism appears to have held a particular mistrust of France and Isabella's capacity for deception fits a national characteristic exhibited in *The Massacre at Paris*.

Isabella's attempt to deceive through feigning love for Edward re-appears even in the play's closing moments as she attempts to save herself. Given this ability to assume false roles and present herself as dutiful wife when in fact adulterously involved with Mortimer, Edward's early dismissals of Isabella during the play must be open to reappraisal by its end. What seemed unwarranted and hostile rejections gain political credibility.

*Edward the Second*, therefore, is calculated to frustrate attempts to categorise it as a play about the ruler's need to keep a tight check on his appetites if proper balances in the nation's orders are to be maintained. Actions and language, and the gap between them reveal deception and counter-deceptions. Edward's passionate espousal of Gaveston as the man who 'loves me more than all the world' which at first appears based simply on emotional attraction increasingly takes on political overtones. Gaveston and his replacements Spencer and Baldock remain loyal to Edward, even though their loyalties have been in some way purchased. The appearance on the stage of Old Spencer marks a significant shift in the play. Old Spencer and his band of quintessential English soldiery—bowmen, pikes, brown bills and targetters—'Sworn to defend King Edward' royal right 'undermines the barons' claims to represent the nation. Old Spencer's and his men's loyalties to Edward come from the king's advancement of his son. They are 'bound to your highness everlastingly / For favours done, in him, unto us all'. This is precisely the traditional organisation of power vested in the monarch's granting of licenses and favours which the barons claim exclusively for themselves. The play increasingly recasts Edward's actions so as to make them seem designs to assert his own power by re-figuring existing orders and less the consequences of uncontrollable emotions. Interesting, the social historian Mervyn James has shown that it was just such traditional constructions of duties and allegiances which were under pressure in late sixteenth-century England, while Alan Bray has recently shown how the rhetoric of friendship points to 'that network of influential patrons, of their clients and suitors and friends at court which were [the] subtle bonds of early modern society'. With the arrival of Old Spencer, Edward's faction becomes popularist, native and decisive in action while the Queen and the barons now appear usurpatious, self-seeking, and deceptive.

Sexuality in the play is, thus, intimately tied to political manoeuvring and the uncovering of deception against the nation. It indicates an important feature about Marlowe's drama of Protestant sexuality, its representations are organised to reveal social and political conditions, not psychologies. To view these depictions of sexualities as demonstrations of individual subjectivities is to miss their dramatic use, this organisation of sexuality does not propose the illusion of realism. To suggest Edward is fickle or has some pathological dependency on his minions because he seems to forget Gaveston immediately and transfers his affections to the younger Spencer is to seek for a psychological causation alien to these characters. They are emblematic figures, not in some simple and crude sense, rather in keeping with the idea that identity is linked to determined roles, partly socially formed, but also resulting from a belief that set patterns of actions are necessarily imposed on a fallen humanity by the justice of our creator.

It is crucial to the play's revelation of Mortimer that he is the source of murderous sodomy, but it is also important that he is unaware of the ritualised buggery he is responsible for. The action eschews attempts to imagine Mortimer as homophobic because of his own repressed homosexuality. Rather it demonstrates a fatalistic irony in his perpetration of what he ostensibly stands opposed to, a telling representation of Mortimer's unnatural rebellion against his sovereign. *Edward II* manoeuvres its audience initially to imagine deviance where it was not and then finally exposes it to be located among those who claim to seek to repress it.

We have to be careful, therefore, in assessing sexuality in the play. To call *Edward II* specifically misogynist because of its dealings with Isabella may be to accord Isabella a greater sense of realism than she possesses. As I have argued, Isabella's infidelities signal her deceptive and dangerous qualities as a foreigner in the English state subtly working for its overthrow. Her sexual unfaithfulness to Edward is the telling indication of her lack of loyalty and obedience, a sign of her treachery whose political manifestation is finally revealed. I do not read her actions as demonstrating the emotionally ungovernable woman of Renaissance domestic tragedy who, like Anne Frankford in *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, is happy to jump into bed at the first seductive offer. Isabella's organised dissembling is much more careful and diabolical. The play, however, may be seen as sharing a widespread cultural misogyny in its proposal that a woman may be the most dangerous corrupter because the most able dissembler. Even in this context, though, I think Isabella foreignness is as significant as her gender. In a play where Gaveston, initially the apparent seducer of the state through his exotic enticements of Edward, dies more innocent of treachery than others, it is

dramatically balanced that Isabella, initially the apparent victim, should end the play's greatest criminal.

Through our critical desires to indicate continuities in early modern writing with our own cultural environment, we have too frequently allowed teleologies to exhibit themselves. While, of course, we recognise early modern differences, there is a frequent critical slippage in which current cultural frameworks are too readily used to make sense of Renaissance writing or other artefacts. The twentieth century has largely taken sexual desire as a point of departure for a discovery of personal identity and there has been a tendency to seek out earlier texts which offer some early stirrings of sexuality as subjectivity.

I have argued with *Edward II* that a different dramatic manifestation of sexuality is exhibited. *Edward II* is a difficult play because it resolves so little. The structure through which it reveals deceptions at all levels and among virtually all characters is carefully calculated to undermine an audience's capacity to interpret actions, leaving confusion- an insecurity with existing categories, including literary generic patterns, through which events are normally understood. The play certainly does not present cases of villains becoming heroes and heroes villains. In revealing Mortimer's and Isabella's usurpation and illicit sex, Gaveston's manipulations of Edward's emotions may appear far less treacherous but they are not celebrated. Instead, the play seems concerned to demonstrate the capacity for deceit and corruption, one which I see tied to Protestant anxieties about deceptions both abroad and at home, and which also reflects the potentials for self-delusion apparent in a cultural framework which asserted predestination. In this respect, Marlowe's play seems interestingly linked to Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, another text where sexuality and Protestantism significantly figure together. Like Spenser, Marlowe's characters reveal a world filled with traps and deceptions, which all seem to be constantly prey to. If *Edward II* has a message, it is clearly not to accept appearances and words at face value. But the play, like *The Changeling*, presents a dark vision of human ability to know, or control, self and the world. Mortimer's final speech proposes fate linked to a secular wheel of fortune. I would suggest the play hints at a determinism which stems from a Protestant version of struggle between the old foe and the godly and the deeper wraths which govern the world. In *The Changeling's* assertion that we are all in hell, there is, as we have seen, a proposal that sex confirms this fallen state. Alsemero sends Beatrice and DeFlores into his closet so they can rehearse their lust before they 'act it to the black audience', by which Alsemero means the damned. He then finds, in their unexpected performance, that he is part of that audience. As the audience of *Edward II* witness a ritual sodomy in the murder



of an English king in the mire of a dungeon and the apparent triumph of the two arch-deceivers, it is hard to resist the sense that England, too, has become hell.

## TRAGEDY AND SHARED-GUILT: A COMPARATIVE APPROACH TO *OTHELLO* AND *EL PINTOR DE SU DESHONRA*

Jesús López-Peláez Casellas  
Colegio Universitario de Jaén

The existence of a clear-cut definition of what we should understand by "tragedy" has traditionally convinced many readers and scholars of the inadequacy of considering Calderón's plays, especially his **dramas de honor**, as tragedies. "Honour" has been taken to be, up to the sixties, an especially inappropriate subject for a tragedy, and thus, by virtue of the confusion between *theme and meaning*, plays such as *El pintor de su deshonra* have been denied the status of tragedy. Following Alexander Parker in *La imaginación y el arte de Calderón*<sup>1</sup>, when I speak of Calderón's concept of tragedy, I don't refer to "una serie de normas formales, sino a la perspicacia en cuanto a los problemas del sufrimiento y el mal que un gran dramaturgo aporta en su exploración de la experiencia humana"<sup>2</sup>. Parker states the main structural elements that we can find in Calderón's **comedias** and, among others, he comments upon the unreality of the characters and the tragic components in the theme and the form. My point here is that, through an analysis of Calderón's *El pintor de su deshonra*<sup>3</sup> and Shakespeare's well known tragedy *Othello*<sup>4</sup>, regardless of formal norms, we can find elements that invite us to admit that there is a coincidence between both plays. If, in *Othello*, being a tragedy according to the traditional standards, we discover a common element with Calderón's play, and this element is among those so relevant to the definition of tragedy as *guilt*, then we have both an unexpected similarity (a starting point for a fuller comparative study) and an interesting criterion for the study of both texts. Modern theory has already established that the tragic hero doesn't have to cause his own downfall: we accept the existence of a primal injustice "in the heart of the Universe" (as Parker put it); the sense of injustice that we can find in Calderonian tragedy has more to do with some sort of *shared-guilt* than with the classical focusing on the hero.

1 Parker, Alexander A. *La imaginación y el arte de Calderón*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1991.

2 Cf. A. Parker, p. 247.

3 Calderón, Pedro. *El pintor de su deshonra en Obras completas*. Vol. ii. Madrid: Aguilar, 1991. All references to this edition.

4 Shakespeare, William, *Othello*. London: Penguin, 1968 (1st ed.). All references to this edition.



All the characters (or the most relevant ones, at least), are somehow guilty, and take part in the final tragic catastrophe. This doesn't seem very difficult to prove in some of Calderón's plays, but we do find some resistance when we want to apply it to *Othello*; Shakespeare's play has been a "tragedy of love and hate" for Elliott, a "tragedy of jealousy" for Campbell, a "tragedy of honour" for Wilson, a "tragedy of self-justification" for Heilman, and racism, metamorphosis, honesty and sheer evil have also been studied in connection with the play by countless others. In this context, I attempt a combination of many of these elements applied to most of the characters of the play, to show that they are, as in Calderón's *El pintor de su deshonra*, guilty in one way or other.

The marriage between D. Juan and Serafina in *El pintor de su deshonra* has an obvious flaw; it is a doomed union from the beginning, and D. Juan Roca himself, in the first ninety lines of the first *jornada*, makes it clear. A convinced bachelor, there are two main reasons behind his sudden decision to get married:

Pues siendo todo eso así,  
ya rendido a la atención  
de mis deudos, o a que fuera  
lástima que se perdiera,  
faltándome sucesión,  
un mayorazgo que creo  
que es ilustre y principal  
y no de poco caudal,  
correspondí a su deseo<sup>5</sup>.

His other reason is no less superficial: Serafina's beauty, that will make three men in the play lose control over their actions, and, significantly, will be an unsurpassable difficulty for D. Juan as a painter: "(mi pecho ingrato...) después que vio a Serafina, / tan del todo se rindió, / que aún yo no sé si soy yo." (I, 81-3). This, however, doesn't mean that D. Juan won't love Serafina eventually, but the marriage is unfortunate from the beginning. For Parker, the marriage is unreal because Serafina doesn't love D. Juan<sup>6</sup>, and he links this with the significance of painting as a substitute for reality; I could add that it is doubly unreal, for it links two persons with very different ages and motives for the marriage. The dramatic implications of Juanete's stories are enormous; they anticipate many of the problems that the play develops, and act as a kind of verbal and logic connector that goes through the text. Thus, his story of the "chicken and wine" points at the essential disequilibrium in this actual marriage:

Lo mismo me ha sucedido  
en la boda, pues me han dado  
moza novia y desposado  
no mozo: con que habrá sido  
fuerza juntarlos al fiel,  
porque él con ella doncella,  
o él la refresque a ella,  
o ella le caliente a él.

(I, 229-36)

And most important of all, the main flaw of this marriage lies on the fact that Serafina doesn't love D. Juan, and has married him only when she has known that her real love, D. Alvaro, has died ("Viuda de ti me he casado" (I, 604)).

There are many elements here to support our point about shared-guilt; to begin with, we have D. Juan's prejudices to marriage, and his arguable reasons to get married; but more dangerous is Serafina's attitude: she loves another man, but since she has tried to maintain this relation in secret, nobody knows it and, consequently, she has to accept D. Juan. The apparition of Alvaro will create a "divided duty" (not very different to that of Desdemona in *Othello*): to his legal husband, and to the man to whom she promised her eternal loyalty. And Alvaro is also guilty for not letting Serafina free: he won't accept the new situation. So, an excess of prudence on the part of Serafina, selfishness on D. Juan's, and lack of prudence and selfishness also on Alvaro's part, will initiate the chain of errors that will create the tragedy.

Regardless of what many authors have said, it seems arguable to consider that Othello and Desdemona are not deeply in love. Of their relation we only have the account they make, and this only proves that, in spite of being so culturally different, they loved each other. In fact, we know that Desdemona loves and trusts Othello till the end, and that, furthermore, she was "half the wooer" (in Othello's terms) since she realized he could not do it. I cannot agree with Elliott when he claims that Othello's love was not so deep as to give the first step<sup>7</sup>; and to claim that their union was an ill-fated one because of some sort of "disproportion" or rashness (a sedentary woman momentarily attracted by a "wheeling stranger"), seems to me an excess in interpretation. Iago's attack on Othello achieves its maximum effect when it uses the social difference as a weapon, especially his references to the customs of the "Venetian ladies" ("I know our country disposition well, etc..." -III,iii,199-202), and his allusions to the racial (and, consequently here, social) aspects of such a marriage ("One may smell in such a will most rank, / Foul disproportion, thoughts unnatural"

<sup>5</sup> *El pintor de su deshonra*, (I, 56-64).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. A. Parker, p. 259.

<sup>7</sup> Elliott, G.R. *Flaming Minister*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1953; pp. 28 et ff.

(III.iii.230-1)). Social difference constitutes the essence of Iago's plan to divide Desdemona and Othello, and so, by using it, he gives us a clue to where the weakest point of their marriage may be. Eldred Jones, in *Othello's Countrymen*, seems to have hit the nail on the head when he states that Othello, "being a Moor... starts off in a position of social disadvantage in relation to her"<sup>8</sup>. He was socially her inferior, despite his "services" to the State, and this fact was painfully evident for Othello in the constant allusions to his colour<sup>9</sup>. The marriage could have been successful if both, Othello and Desdemona (but especially he), had known each other better, and if Othello had had a correct notion of his honour; if they had been more aware of their difference, and if Othello had acted with more prudence, and Desdemona with more perspicacity.

Difficulty stems from this, and stays as a latent danger, ignored but existent, till it appears with all its dramatic potential to bring about the tragedy. This doesn't mean that, as it happens in *El pintor de su deshonra*, this one is a marriage that should have never taken place. But, as it happens in Calderón's play, an unfortunate marriage, carrying the seed of its own destruction, lies at the heart of the tragedy. The two cases, and the reasons of the failure of both marriages, are different, but the way they condition the action of the plays is very similar; and, more interesting, these failures are a direct consequence of certain faults committed by different characters who, in some way, and as we have seen with relation to both plays, can be said to be "guilty".

I mentioned above Othello's incorrect notion of honour as one of the reasons for the failure of his marriage. Obviously, and as E. M. Wilson, among some others, has pointed out, honour is relevant for many other reasons in *Othello*. For Wilson, the sense of honour is the foundation of the play, and "Othello acts in the same way as Calderón's savage husbands"<sup>10</sup>. All the important characters in the play have some sort of relation with honour, and a great part of the action of the play (perhaps all of it) can only be correctly understood if we analyse this concept<sup>11</sup>. Cassio exemplifies the subjection to the code of honour, or to the

strict rules of an honourable life in (II, iii, 255-7). Iago plays with the concept, showing a different view depending on who he is speaking to, and ignoring it in his relation with all the characters, as his monologues show. He neither believes in honour, nor can understand why others respect it to the extreme of risking their lives; paradoxically he is considered as an honourable man by almost everyone in the play, and this will be one of the reasons of his partial success: a man unconcerned with this topic and consequently free to perform the most dishonourable actions. Brabantio is worried by what Kenneth Muir has called "parental honour"<sup>12</sup> (I, i, 161-3) and Desdemona refers to her "honesty" (IV, ii, 64). Finally, Othello acts to recover the honour he thinks he has lost. Thus, he is afraid of being a "...fixed figure for the time of scorn / To point his slow unmoving finger at!" (IV, ii, 53), and explains his deed as an obligation imposed on him by his condition of man of honour:

An honourable murderer, if you will:  
For naught did I in hate, but all in honour.  
(V, ii, 291-2)

*El pintor de su deshonra* does also contain an enormous amount of references to this topic, by different characters and applied to situations similar to those that we find in *Othello*. There are general allusions to conventional behaviour: greetings, obligations and courtesies, between D. Juan (who is thus characterized as a Spanish nobleman, with all the connotations that this has) and other characters (namely, D. Luis, D. Pedro, and the Prince of Ursino) (I 1-5; 108-12 and 296-9). Serafina, D. Alvaro and D. Juan seem especially concerned with the concept, and their actions will be conditioned in different ways by the pressure that public opinion makes on them. Serafina equates Honour with Existence and Life, as the loss of the first implies the loss of the other two (I, 1001-4); she explains the battle that takes place within her between honour and pain, and her obligation to hide her feelings in the name of her reputation (I, 1039-48). D. Alvaro ignores the constraints that this concept imposes, or is meant to impose, on him, and thus he will bring about the tragedy; like in the case of Iago, here a lack of respect for honour is the cause of part of the tragedy. He is reproached by Serafina:

.... Tú mismo sabes  
mi honor, mi altivez, mi brío;  
y pues nadie como tú  
examinó en los principios  
lo ilustre de mis respetos,

8 Jones, Eldred. *Othello's Countrymen: the African in English Renaissance Drama*. London: Oxford University Press, 1965; p. 94.

9 See *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*. Vol. 7. (G. Bullough ed.). New York: Columbia University Press, 1973; es. pp. 207-18.

10 See Wilson, Edward M. "A Hispanist Looks at *Othello*" in *Spanish and English Literature of the 16th and 17th Centuries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980; esp. pp. 204-6; see also Watson, C.B. *Shakespeare and the Renaissance Concept of Honour* (1954).

11 "I only refer here to the most relevant examples connected with honour and related to the most important characters. I do not mention, for example, Iago's "honesty", Bianca's virtue/lack of virtue, Emilia's digressions on these topics or the many allusions to Othello's military reputation, his so-called "services" to the state.

12 Muir, Kenneth. "Introduction" to *Othello*; pp. 7-44.

lo honrado de mis desvíos,  
lo atento de mis decoros,  
lo noble de mis designios,  
a ti mismo te examina  
en mi favor por testigo,  
porque [si] a ti mismo tú  
no te vences, será indicio  
**que de ti mismo olvidado,  
no te acuerdas de ti mismo.**

(II, 1391-1404)

Obviously, the concept of honour that Serafina is handling here has a lot to do with the honour that Othello and Cassio value most, the one that Cassio referred to as: "the immortal part of myself" (II; iii, 256); this concept was frequently studied by moral essayists in the XVI and XVII centuries, and Ashley in *Of honour*, among others, characterized it (following Aristotle) as "the reward of virtue", which is the most typical expression used to imply that this concept of honour is related to an honest and virtuous life<sup>13</sup>. This honour was considered as a positive quality by philosophers, and consequently it was appreciated by all kind of moralists both in England and Spain, in direct opposition to other meanings of this same term. Dishonour, then, from this view, means that virtue has been lost, with the obvious consequences of the loss of social consideration, and, consequently, of identity (D. Juan's "pues no soy mientras vengado / no esté;" -III, 2643-4-) (14). The lack of adherence to a behaviour socially considered as "honourable" or "virtuous" is common for D. Alvaro and Iago; Alvaro ignores the fact that Serafina is married now, and first compromises her fame and later destroys it by his impulsive actions. Iago doesn't ignore reality, but "creates it out of his discourse" (as Sinfield puts it), and equally destroys Desdemona's reputation, if only in her husband's eyes. Thus, both characters are, although for different reasons, equally dangerous and responsible for the tragedy: they are active or passive agents of enormous consequences in the play.

Quite a different matter is the honour that we find when we study Othello's and D. Juan's discourse. If Cassio, Serafina or Desdemona use this "honour as virtue" notion, these two characters (from many points of view, the most

important in their respective plays), although being also aware of this concept of honour, show a special concern for honour as "reputation", connected with the sexual behaviour of the women directly dependant on them (in this case, their wives). This second notion of honour is derived from the classical one we have just analysed briefly, but departs from it since it stresses public opinion and ignores a man's deep trust in his own merits (virtue, braveness, magnanimity etc...). This is the honour that obliges a man to defend his wife's chastity and good name at all costs, that imposes the duel, and private and public revenge to restore reputation, and that places dignity not in one person's actions but in the concept that the community has of that person (as Peristiany and Caro Baroja have explained). This savage rule is not willingly accepted by Juan Roca or Othello, but they must conform to it. D. Juan protests bitterly against this obligation:

¡Mal haya el primero, amén,  
que hizo ley tan rigurosa!  
Poco del honor sabía  
el legislador tirano,  
que puso en ajena mano  
mi opinión y no en la mía.

(II, 84-89)

D. Juan refers, quite appropriately, to a law, and this is exactly the image that Shakespeare gives and the role that Othello assumes: he sees himself as Justice, being at the same time Defence, Prosecutor, Judge and Executioner in the "It is the cause" speech (V, ii, 1-22). For Othello, "A hornèd man's a monster and a beast" (IV, i, 62); and the argument that finally makes him forget the difficulty of killing someone he loves so much ("the pity of it" -IV, i, 194-) is Iago's "...if it touch you not, it comes near nobody". (IV, i, 197-8). D. Juan also sees clearly that he won't have honour until he kills his wife and her lover (whoever he may be), being this something that only affects him: "Dadme, / ¡cielos!, o muerte o venganza." (II, 2090-1). Here, then, we have total adherence to honour, in direct contrast to what we saw in relation to Alvaro and Iago, but in this case it is adherence to a wrong concept of honour; it is this acceptance of the obligations that a certain notion of honour imposes on them that completes the tragedy in both plays. Paradoxically, but logically also if we accept a certain reading of these plays, lack, and an excess, of adherence to honour (although to different kinds of honour), makes different characters share the guilt of the tragic events: Alvaro and Iago, Othello and Juan Roca, and also Desdemona, Serafina or Brabantio, allow the tragedy to happen through their different and complementary attitudes towards honour.

13 Ashley, Robert. *Of Honour* (San Marino (Ca.): The Huntingdon Library, 1947); p. 38. For a brief introduction to this topic the following readings are aessential: Aristóteles, *Ética a Nicómaco* in *Obras completas* (Madrid: Aguilar, 1968); Cicerón, *Sobre los deberes (De officiis)* (Madrid: Gredos, 1987); Thomas Elyot, *The Boke Named the Gouvernour* (London: Everyman's Library, 1937); Fray Antonio de Guevara, *Menosprecio de corte y alabanza de aldea* (Madrid: Clásicos Castellanos, 1928); and Lodowicke Bryskett, *A Discourse of Civill Life* (London: 1944).

E.M. Wilson stated in "Towards an appreciation of *El pintor de su deshonra*"<sup>14</sup> that **prudence** was the main concern of Calderón in this play. Certainly, a great part of what I have presented above can be reduced to the opposition prudence vs. lack of prudence in the behaviour of the most relevant characters, not only in Calderón's tragedy but also in *Othello*. In "A Hispanist looks at *Othello*" Wilson introduces this idea in Shakespeare's play: **As long as Iago acts cautiously, acts with worldly prudence, his schemes succeed;... When he has to stake all on a single throw -the death of Cassio- he comes to grief**<sup>15</sup>. It doesn't seem difficult to state that Cassio acts without prudence in his unorthodox petition to Desdemona to intercede for him with Othello, and she does the same accepting to act as an intermediary. Othello obviously acts imprudently when he kills his wife, although according to the code of honour the imprudence lies on the fact that he killed her without proof of her guilt. Alvaro gives, as I tried to prove above, the best example of an imprudent behaviour; as a consequence of this, a married woman is wooed and later abducted. The prince's sudden passion, D. Juan and Serafina's unfortunate marriage, plus secrecy, self-deception and a certain degree of selfishness, are other elements that should be analysed in full detail, for they help to have a clear idea of the way guilt in the tragedy is shared between different characters.

I have presented a certain reading of these two plays trying to highlight different elements connected with their tragic structure. Unlike in classical or traditional tragedy, we have seen how guilt is not within the nature of one single tragic hero, but rather we can find a whole series of main and secondary characters sharing different degrees of responsibility for the tragic resolution. *Honour and prudence* seem to be two common topics, which, while presenting some differences in Shakespeare's and Calderón's plays, seem to fulfill similar functions and lead to the same end: the production of a very specific type of tragedy. Comparison, then, is possible on these premises, as a starting point that allows a fuller study in common of plays by these two authors.

## EL LAÚD EN EL RENACIMIENTO INGLÉS

M<sup>a</sup> Paz López-Peláez Casellas  
Conservatorio de Música de Jaén

Gracias a la posición históricamente predominante de la religión podemos conocer con bastante exactitud la música sagrada del pasado. No ocurre así con la música popular coetánea de la que poco se conoce. Distintas fuentes nos hacen referencias a este tipo de música o a los instrumentos que intervenían en su ejecución, pero de una manera un tanto vaga e imprecisa. El estudio de los instrumentos antiguos que aparecen en códices, esculpidos o en manuscritos desde la Edad Media hasta entrado el Renacimiento es un tema complejo. Habrá que tener en cuenta que, más que de instrumentos aislados se trata de familias de instrumentos unidos entre sí por características definitorias.

En las líneas siguientes procederé a analizar la música Renacentista en general y la inglesa en particular, girando, principalmente, en torno al laúd, instrumento que relacionaré con otros dos de la época, la guitarra y la vihuela.

Durante el Renacimiento se producirá principalmente un cambio en la concepción de la música, motivado sobre todo por la aparición de un nuevo concepto de público. En la Edad Media no había separación entre *quién* ejecutaba la música y a *quién* iba dirigida, al ser integrados ambas funciones en la liturgia. Con el desarrollo progresivo de las formas profanas, y con la laicización de la música se origina esta escisión. La consecuencia fundamental de todo esto será una nueva exigencia en los compositores: agrandar al público, satisfacer sus gustos pero sin perder en ningún momento el equilibrio, la serenidad y la mesura renacentista.

Se pondrá especial interés en las palabras a las que ponen música y los compositores empezarán a fijarse en la prosodia del lenguaje hablado a la hora de musicarlo. Se puede encontrar en esta tendencia un intento de representar las emociones por medio de la música, de conmover al alma que nos recuerda las doctrinas damonianas y aristotélicas del *ethos*.

El compositor se ve obligado a buscar melodías que atraigan al oyente ya que ahora no les mueve el fervor religioso que antes aseguraba su presencia. Los instrumentos se vuelven cada vez más complicados y perfectos, lo que obliga al ejecutante a una mayor instrucción para conseguir un perfecto dominio.

14 Cf. E. Wilson, pp. 65-90.

15 Cf. E. Wilson, p. 218.

Por esta razón se empieza a tomar en consideración a los instrumentistas, que con anterioridad eran definidos como bestias; como dice Guido de Arezzo:

Musicorum et cantorum magna est distantia, isti dicunt, illi sciunt quae componit musica. Nam qui facit, quod non sapit, diffinitur bestia.

("Es inmensa la distancia que hay entre músicos y cantores; éstos cantan, aquellos conocen cuanto constituye la música. Aquel que hace lo que no sabe se le puede definir como bestia" –mi traducción–)<sup>1</sup>.

Como consecuencia del desarrollo de la música instrumental que tendrá lugar en el Renacimiento se producirá:

- \* una acordialidad propiciada por instrumentos como el laúd.
- \* el nacimiento de la armonía vertical y funcional.
- \* una distinción de colores y timbres.

El laúd será el instrumento para el que se compongan las más bellas obras en el Renacimiento inglés, e influirá sobre todo en la música cortesana y de cámara. La primera noticia que se posee de la estructura del laúd procede de un manuscrito de la Biblioteca Nacional de París fechado a comienzos del s. xv. En esta misma fecha hay citas en galés (con su consiguiente traducción al inglés en el poema Houlate) de los instrumentos usados en Inglaterra por los bardos, pudiéndose citar entre ellos guiternas, salterios, monocordios, rotas etc, algunos de los cuales, como dice el poema *Reson and sensualite*, del s. xv, procedían de España. En la rota y la guiterna podemos encontrar antecedentes del laúd. Hay noticias de que una rota de cinco cuerdas era conocida en Inglaterra ya en el s. viii. La guiterna que aparece esculpida en la catedral de Exeter (antes de 1370) consta de cuatro cuerdas, apreciándose en ella un considerable adelanto técnico con respecto a la rota. También en literatura podemos encontrar frecuentes alusiones a las prácticas instrumentales de la época, y las obras de Chaucer y Wycliff resultan bastante reveladoras a este respecto.

Aunque no se encuentran verdaderos tañedores de laúd antes de la primera mitad del s. xiv, a finales de siglo el instrumento ya había llegado a un notable grado de virtuosismo, lo que nos recuerda una vez más el cambio en la concepción musical. Ya Aristóteles en el libro viii de la *Política* se mostraba contrario al virtuosismo. En estos primeros años todavía es visible la persistencia de costumbres orientales tales como la tendencia del laúd al canto melismático.

1 Guido de Arezzo, *Regulae Rhythmicæ* (Vol. II). (Roma: 1959); p. 25.

El s. xvi es, por su parte, el siglo del laúd. En él se revela como un instrumento capaz de grandes agilitades, de entonación precisa y de grandes posibilidades sobre todo en la ejecución de música polifónica y posteriormente como acompañante de una melodía. Este laúd, según describe Tranchefort en su libro *Los instrumentos musicales en el mundo* presentaba,

...una caja de resonancia piriforme de fondo convexo construida por el ensamblaje de numerosas costillas... La tapa armónica ovalada y de madera resinosa llevaba una abertura en forma de rosetón. De mástil corto y ancho, con una clavija doblada en ángulo recto y un diapason de madera dura dividido en casillas (o "tonos"). Las cuatro o cinco cuerdas eran dobles afinadas al unísono o a la octava, a las cuales se añadía una cuerda en el registro agudo: la cantarela o prima...<sup>2</sup>.

Este instrumento era pequeño y ligero por lo que la tensión que podían soportar sus cuerdas no era grande. Hay que señalar que la afinación del laúd durante el Renacimiento no permaneció inalterable, y no sólo variaba con los años sino también según el país del que se tratara.

A partir de 1600 se observan nuevos cambios en la estructura del instrumento, originados en gran medida por las transformaciones armónicas del momento. El laúd aumenta su número de cuerdas motivado por las exigencias de la melodía acompañada. Estas cuerdas eran añadidas en el registro grave, debido a que el laúd pasó a encargarse de las voces inferiores de las obras, y originó nuevos tipos de instrumentos: los llamados tiorbis, chitarrones y archilaúdes.

Una costumbre típicamente renacentista que data de principios del s. xvi y se extiende a todos los instrumentos de cuerda punteada es la de escribir la música utilizando un sistema de notación simplificada llamado Tablatura o Tabletura. Con este sistema el hombre renacentista demostró ser mucho más práctico que nosotros. Esta manera de escribir música consistía en anotar las posiciones de la mano que eran necesarias para la ejecución de la obra, es decir, el punto exacto en el que el intérprete debía pisar la cuerda para producir el sonido deseado. Este sistema fue adoptado por todos los países de Europa, aunque con distintas variantes.

Aunque los ss. xv y xvi fueron el apogeo de la polifonía vocal, también, como ya he mencionado con anterioridad, supusieron un desarrollo creciente en la música instrumental; música influida en gran medida por la de los trovadores.

2 Françoise-René Tranchefort, *Los instrumentos musicales en el mundo* (Madrid: Alianza Música, 1991); p. 131.

Si bien es cierto que los instrumentos ya intervenían activamente en la ejecución de la música durante la Edad Media, en el Renacimiento, motivado por los cambios a los que ya he hecho mención, conocerán un desarrollo importante. Sin embargo, no se compondrán obras pensando exclusivamente en ellos, sino que serán, principalmente, adaptaciones de obras vocales. Es significativo de una mayor atención a la figura del ejecutante el hecho de que empezaran a publicarse tratados sobre los instrumentos y sobre la forma de ejecutarlos [Música Getutschut und Ausgezagen de S. Virdung (Basilia 1511), Sintagma Musicum de M. Praetorius (Wolfenbüttel 1615-20)].

Con respecto a la música escrita para laúd a principios del Renacimiento hay que decir que ésta giraba en torno a tres puntos principalmente:

- música en la que el laúd sólo desempeña el papel de acompañante. Dentro de este punto hay que incluir el air o aire en el que descollan los ingleses.
- música influída por los instrumentos de tecla.
- música en la que el laúd aspira a solista, y en la que los españoles irán a la cabeza.

Estas primeras obras para laúd serán formas prafanas, menores y destinadas a ser danzadas. Hay que tener en cuenta que durante el Renacimiento la danza cortesana era uno de los entretenimientos más comunes entre los hombres y mujeres educadas. La danza formaba parte del juego del amor cortesano (como se señala en una obra tan significativa como El cortesano de Castiglione).

Esta música, fiel a su objetivo, tenía un esquema rítmico fijo y una melodía muy ornamentada. Eran obras muy simples que con el tiempo fueron ganando en complejidad. Aunque todas estas danzas era individuales se tocaban seguidas, lo que con el tiempo daría lugar a las suites de danzas. También fueron adoptadas para el laúd obras vocales eminentemente imitativas como el motete y la chansón que daría lugar al ricercar y la canzona.

Por otro lado, es importante diferenciar el laúd de la guitarra y la vihuela y asimismo es necesario, al hablar del laúd, hacer referencia a su doble procedencia, tanto septentrional como meridional.

El término laúd procede del árabe *ud*, *al'ud*, con artículo, origen de la denominación de este instrumento en las lenguas europeas. El laúd llegó al mundo árabe procedente de oriente y se introdujo en España tras las invasiones árabes, hecho que está detallado por multitud de historiadores.

El laúd siguió en su expansión un segundo camino, y así atravesó el Norte de Europa y se extendió por Francia en tiempos de S. Luis (organizador de la segunda cruzada). El camino que siguió es detallado en *Frónimo*, obra de Vicencio Galilei, tal y como comenta Adolfo Salazar en *La música en la sociedad europea*<sup>3</sup>.

La variedad de laúd que encontramos en España bajo la invasión árabe fue muy utilizado en la zona invadida e impulsada, en gran medida, por la actitud de los soberanos. A Ziryab músico de Abderramán II y discípulo en Bagdad de Ishac el Mosulí, se le debe el haber añadido, durante su permanencia en Andalucía, una quinta cuerda al instrumento e igualmente la invención de un plectro de pluma que sustituyó al de madera usado hasta entonces.

Será, sin embargo, el laúd europeo el que acapará toda la atención de la sociedad renacentista. El número de cuerdas de este laúd será en un principio cuatro, número que fue aumentado para responder mejor a las exigencias musicales hasta alcanzar once cuerdas, cinco de ellas dobladas.

Cuando este instrumento llega a España gracias a la intervención de Felipe el Hermoso, los españoles no le dan el nombre de "laúd" al no asemejarse al instrumento que ellos denominaban como tal, por lo que sustituyeron su nombre por el de vihuela (españolización del vocablo italiano viola) al que añadieron "de Flandes" aludiendo a su procedencia.

El laúd será utilizado ampliamente en casi toda Europa no así en España, donde las obras escritas para laúd no se ejecutarán sobre él sino sobre la guitarra, a la que previamente se le había añadido cuerdas nuevas. Las causas de esta sustitución pueden ser varias: Salazar en su libro *La Música en la Sociedad Europea* arguye la posibilidad de un cierto recelo en la España de los Austrias al laúd debido a su origen musulmán. Lo cierto es que el arte del laúd tocado en la guitarra era de más fácil ejecución debido a su menor número de cuerdas, posibilitando un más rápido encadenamiento de acordes, lo que la hacía más apta para acompañar armónicamente la voz. Las diferencias existentes entre ambas eran referentes al número de cuerdas y a la afinación. Cuando la guitarra adaptaba a su estructura seis o siete cuerdas recibía el nombre de vihuela. El tema de la afinación es ampliamente tratado por un teórico de la época: Bermudo, quien nos dice que en la afinación de la vihuela se empleaba la "scotadura", es decir, se dejaba al gusto del tañedor. Esto, unido a que no había un tamaño estipulado para el instrumento nos afianza aún más en la idea de que el término vihuela no se refería a un solo instrumento sino a toda una familia de ellos.

3 Adolfo Salazar, *La música en la sociedad europea* (Vol. I: *Desde los primeros tiempos cristianos*) (Madrid: Alianza Música, 1989); p. 364.

Al hablar de guitarra se suele aludir siempre a su procedencia oriental y a la importancia que tuvieron las teorías griegas en su evolución. Según la teoría más ampliamente difundida el instrumento siguió una trayectoria similar a la del laúd; por un lado llegó a Europa atravesando el continente y por otro llegó a España por vía árabe. Estudios posteriores descartan esta posibilidad. Es cierto que los árabes utilizaron un instrumento que fue denominado en la época como guitarra morisca, pero esta denominación no fue exacta. Siguiendo esta teoría la guitarra morisca no tenía parentesco con la guitarra latina que se usaba en Europa tiempo atrás. Son muchas las fuentes que con esta errónea denominación crearon la confusión. El arcipreste de Hita, arabista y erudito de su tiempo, desmiente que los árabes utilizaran la guitarra, opinión a tener en cuenta. Así, cuando se habla de guitarra morisca en fuentes de la época, quizá se aluda a un instrumento usado por los árabes y parecido a la guitarra.

Veamos ahora, de una manera un tanto generalizada, cual era el desarrollo de la música en la Inglaterra renacentista. Durante el Renacimiento la música inglesa tuvo un periodo de gran esplendor, impulsado, en gran medida por la actitud de los reyes ante la música. Así, Enrique VIII, gran amante del arte y tañedor de laúd, hizo florecer la música bajo su reinado, hecho que continuaría con Eduardo VI y María Tudor, hasta alcanzar en el reinado de Isabel un desarrollo que no volvería a conocer. Pero no sólo fue una Edad de Oro para la música, también la literatura se vio impulsada y dio figuras como Shakespeare, Sidney o Bacon. Una característica de la época en Inglaterra será la influencia que ejerció lo italiano y que no sólo se manifestó en la música.

Dentro de la gran masa de instrumentos de la época, el laúd se presenta como uno de los más emblemáticos... Aunque es cierto que tuvo tan sólo una breve época de esplendor (entre 1590-1160), este tiempo fue suficiente para crear obras como "Flow, my tears" o "In darkness let meddwell", canciones de tal belleza que no han tenido parangón en la literatura posterior escrita para este instrumento.

Hacia 1590 llega a Inglaterra una tendencia que ya se había extendido por gran parte de Europa y que supone la presencia del laúd, y en menor medida de la viola, como acompañantes de canciones monódicas. Será sin embargo, a finales de siglo y comienzos del siguiente cuando alcance su mayor gloria. Las obras escritas para laúd serán en su mayoría danzas, sobre todo pavanas y gallardas (aunque también allemandes, gigas, correntes...), adaptaciones de obras vocales, variaciones sobre temas populares... y superarán en número a las escritas para cualquier otro instrumento.

En 1588, Byrd, en el prefacio de *Psalmes, Sonets and Songs of Sadnes and Pitie* indica que ya en esta fecha se componían canciones para voz y laúd (o

ayres) en Inglaterra. Estos eran herederos de una tradición musical del país: la de la canción para diversas partes, pudiéndose encontrar entre ambas características comunes tales como el hecho de que sea la parte más aguda (o sopra) la principal, su melodiosidad, o que abarquen una amplia gama de expresión (desde el drama hasta la comicidad). Estos efectos expresivos no sólo se lograban con la letra de las obras; la armonía o la selección de un ritmo y un aire adecuado eran también de la mayor importancia.

El *ayre*, como género, podía aparecer tanto como acompañamiento de canción monódica como acompañamiento de canción polifónica, pudiendo además elegir los ejecutantes entre cantar todas las voces o solo las más agudas. Estas versiones alternativas, al igual que ocurría en los madrigales, diferían rara vez entre sí.

La exacta determinación de los instrumentos que debían intervenir en las obras no era común en el Renacimiento sino que se dejaba a gusto del intérprete. Sin embargo, sabemos que el laúd era un instrumento fijo en el acompañamiento, como escribe Thomas Campion en el prefacio de su *Primer Libro de Ayres*:

Casi todos estos ayres fueron concebidos en un principio para una voz con laúd o viola, pero en determinadas ocasiones se les han añadido más partes, las que puede usar al que le plazca y abandonarlas aquel al que le disgusten<sup>4</sup>.

Los acompañamientos para laúd, totalmente desarrollados por el compositor, poseían a veces, una cierta independencia rítmica y melódica. Las partes para voz y laúd aparecían en una misma página colocadas verticalmente con el propósito de que el cantante pudiese acompañarse a sí mismo. En algunas antologías, como el tercer libro de Ayres de Y. Dowland, (1603), las canciones aparecen con los pentagramas dispuestos de tal forma en la página que los instrumentistas y cantantes podían utilizar un mismo libro al ejecutar la pieza.

El bajo, aunque desarrolla un papel principalmente armónico, era la parte más interesante del acompañamiento. Las voces interiores carecían de interés en la mayoría de compositores a no ser que la obra fuera de carácter imitativo.

El periodo de florecimiento del *ayre* coincide en Inglaterra con la decadencia del madrigal, viéndose éste perjudicado por la monodia más natural de aquel. Sin embargo y a pesar de ser formas distintas, se produjo cierta confusión en algunos compositores de esta época. Cito a continuación algunas carac-

4 Thomas Campion, *First Book of Aires* (1925 -1613 prim. pub.); p. 56; citado por Gustave Reese en *La música en el renacimiento* (vol II) (Madrid: Alianza Música, Madrid, 1988); p. 122.



terísticas que a grandes rasgos, sirven para diferenciar el ayre del madrigal en esta última etapa.

En el ayre, a diferencia del madrigal, se repite la misma música para cada una de las estrofas que componen el poema, lo que le da cierta regularidad tanto en su estructura rítmica como en la melodía, igualmente la progresión rítmica de acordes suele ser mas rápida. Predomina el estilo silábico, apareciendo melismas sólo en casos aislados y para realzar determinadas palabras.

Entre las características comunes se puede resaltar que tanto en el ayre, como en el madrigal es común una íntima unión entre la letra y la música conseguida mediante cambios de ritmo, choques cromáticos, (es decir, falsa relación, tan común en la música inglesa del periodo) etc... Se puede decir que nunca ha habido tal fusión en un nivel tan elevado como en el arte de los laudistas del renacimiento en Inglaterra, ya que en épocas posteriores los poemas musicalizados eran de muy inferior calidad.

El más importante de los laudistas ingleses del Renacimiento es John Dowland, que nace en Dublín en 1562 y muere en Londres en 1626. Ocupó en distintas épocas el cargo de laudista de la corte del rey de Dinamarca y fue uno de los funcionarios de esa clase empleados por Carlos I de Inglaterra. Poco apreciado en la corte fue aclamadísimo por los nobles por la intensa y penetrante melodía de sus obras. La fama de su arte lo llevó muy lejos y se jactaba de que sus obras estaban impresas en ocho de las más famosas ciudades de más allá de los mares, es decir, París, Amberes, Colonia, Nuremberg, Francfort, Leipzig, Hamburgo y Amsterdam [prólogo de "A pilgrims solace" (Londres 1692)]. Parece que en los últimos años de su vida cayó en el olvido y murió pobre y amargado.

Las obras de Dowland tienen más fuerza y los sentimientos que describen son más apasionados que los de las obras de sus coetáneos. Entre sus obras publicadas hay que destacar los tres libros para voz y laúd (*The first (second-third) Booke of Songs or Ayres... with Tableture for the lute or Orpherion with the violl de gambo...*, (Londres: 1597, 1600, 1603)). La colección considerada como la más famosa es *Lacrimae or seven Tears in seven passionate Pavans, with divers others pavansi galiards and almands set forth for the lute, viols or violons in five parts* (Londres: 1604), algunas de cuyas pavanas son extremadamente melancólicas, plasmando las amarguras que el compositor sufrió en vida. Cabe destacar de entre todas ellas "Flow, my tears" (Corred lágrimas mías), obra que fue tomada como modelo en otras de Byrd ("Pavana Lachrymae") Farnaby ("Lacrimae Pavan") y Sweelenick ("Pavana Lachrymae"). Cabe igualmente destacar por su belleza el ayre "In darkness let meddwell, que consta además de algunos compases realmente sorprendentes e innovadores.

Junto a Dowland hay que destacar a todo un grupo de compositores que, aunque es cierto que en algunas de sus obras logran igualarle en el aspecto técnico, no conmueven tanto como él. Robert Jones es un autor muy fecundo, siendo las más logradas las obras más breves. Publicó *The first booke of songs and ayres of four parts with tableture for the lute...*, (Londres: 1600); *The second booke* (Londres: 1601) y *Vltinum vale* (Londres: 1605). Philip Rosseter (1575-1623) fue laudista al servicio de la capilla real de Londres. Es muy diestro en la elaboración de los motivos rítmicos de sus canciones. Fue amigo y colaborador de Campion y publicó con él una obra titulada *A booke of ayres, set foorth to be songs of the lute, treble-violl, Bandora, Citterne and the flutte* (1609).

Thomas Campion (1567-1620) médico y laudista, creaba también las letras de las canciones que componía, aunque en esta faceta no alcanzó los resultados esperados. Escribió cuatro volúmenes de aires, publicados entre 1613 y 1617. Entre sus mejores composiciones se encuentran sus piezas ligeras y algunas de sus composiciones severas (como *Author of Light*). Escribió además dos libros de *Masques* (mascaradas o cantos carnalescos) publicados en 1607 y 1614 respectivamente para canto y laúd o bajo de viola.

El hijo de John Dowland, Robert, (1584-1641) fue también un destacado laudista. En 1610 publicó 2 libros "Varietie of lute-lessons" (recopilación de canciones para laúd, fantasías, pavanas...) y *A musical Banquet furnished with varieties of delicious Ayres, collected out of the authours in English, French, Spanish and Italian*, obra en la que reúne algunas de las creaciones de su padre.

Thomas Morley (1557-1603) también escribió obras para laúd entre las que hay que destacar *The first Booke of Ayres of little short songs to sing and to play to the lute with the bass-viol* y *The first booke of consort lessons*. Junto a estos habría que mencionar también a Thomas Greaves, John Bartlet, Alfonso Ferrabosco II, William Corkain, Thomas Ford, Robert Jones y un largo etcétera.

En definitiva, todo esto no hace sino subrayar la importancia del renacimiento inglés dentro de la historia musical de este país, hasta el extremo de poder ser considerado un siglo de oro. Mi intención en las líneas precedentes no ha sido sino resaltar el papel que ocupa el laúd dentro de la producción musical de estos siglos, lo que sin duda, y a la vista de autores y obras, lo convierte en un objeto de estudio fundamental dentro del renacimiento inglés.



# RENAISSANCE VISIONS OF PARADISE: ANCIENT RELIGIOUS SOURCES OF THOMAS MORE'S *THE BEST STATE OF A COMMONWEALTH AND THE NEW ISLAND OF UTOPIA*

Miguel Martínez López  
University of Granada

Utopian literature is largely the result of the crash of several intellectual trends of the European Renaissance: exaltation of the individual conscience vs. the omniscient guide of the mediaeval Catholic Church, the rise of the spirit of religious and scientific enquiry, the shift of the viewpoint from the otherworldly to the worldly, the glad acceptance of the great challenges of geographical discoveries..., summarily the self-emancipation of the individual from the bondage of institutions.

The kind of utopian thought that gave way to some of the great literary monuments of the Renaissance<sup>1</sup> essentially consists in a form of *anamnesis*: it attempts the recovery of buried and/or latent memories, both individual and collective. The tool that the utopian writer best uses in this operation is his own fantasy and his ability to anticipate and partake, through literary formulae, in those dreams of his generation that are, in essence, shared –at least in the realm of hypothesis and in the collective unconscious– by all times and all generations<sup>2</sup>;

1 Some utopian texts written during the Renaissance were widely read by their authors' contemporaries and exercised great influence on later literature; among these, see: Thomas More, *Libellus vere aureus nec minus salutaris quam festivus de optimo reipublicae statu, deque noua Insula Utopia*, (Louvain, Belgium: Arte Theodorice Martini, 1516). Sir Philip Sidney, *The Countesse of Pembrokes Arcadia*, (London: William Ponsonbie, 1590). Joseph Hall, *Mundus Alter et Idem*, (London: H. Lownes, 1605). William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, 1611. Ben Jonson, *The Fortunate Isles and Their Union*, (N.p., 1624). Francis Bacon, *New Atlantis, A Worke Unfinished*, (London: J.H. for W. Lee, 1627). Francis Godwin, *The Man in the Moone*, (printed 1808-1813; London: White & Cochrane, 1638). Campanella's *Civitas Solis* (c. 1630), Hobbes's *Leviathan* (1651) and Harrington's *Oceana* (1656) are three more titles that depart from More's most famous utopian tract.

2 About the definition of utopian literature I will be working with, see my paper "Towards a definition of English utopian literature", delivered at the *I Congreso de Lengua y Literatura Anglo-Norteamericana*, Ciudad Real, University of Castilla-La Mancha, 1993 (In press): "In order to be, utopia must always keep itself encapsulated within the dialectics good place/no place ("eutopia"/"ou-topia"), beginning and end, already and not yet. Utopia and History, in short, must forever fight" (p. 6).

these dreams often call back to a primordial time 'when mankind dwelt in this world without strife'; and they often anticipate a better future which cannot come into being without man's appropriate intervention in the concrete building of his own history (anti-Providentialism). Never before or after the Renaissance did the myth of Paradise take such a precise, rational and, at the same time, complex shape.

In this paper, I intend to briefly trace some of the antecedents, memories and models Thomas More worked on in his vision of the ideal commonwealth. More's *Utopia* remains the text against which all works that claim to be utopian are judged; he invented the term and created the rhetoric, linguistic and cultural framework of what would eventually become a literary genre importance of which, for any correct understanding of the history of English literature, cannot be overestimated.

#### **The Judaeo-Christian tradition: Paradise, The Messianic Kingdom, The Millennium and The Apocalypse**

The philological revolution of renaissance humanism affected pagan and religious sources alike. This is the age of the great scripture translations and commentaries of More's best friend, Desiderius Erasmus. From its very outset, Humanism was concerned with Christianity as much as with classical learning. More's description of his imaginary commonwealth in terms approximating perfection, according to the canons of his time, was as Christian and as "classic" as it could reasonably be, without spoiling the narrative consistency of the text. The search for the earthly Paradise –and, consequently, for the blissful isles where it was supposed to be located– was by no means merely symbolic for the explorers of the Renaissance. The utopian writers, on their part, were exploring the possibility of establishing a paradise-like state in this world, through the correct use of reason. The following pages succinctly explore the genesis of this myth; in the light of the cultural history of the earthly paradise, its possible influence on More's design of the ideal commonwealth constitutes more than a plausible hypothesis<sup>3</sup>.

The Judaeo-Christian visions of Paradise, the Messianic Kingdom, the Millennium and the Apocalypse constitute a fundamental layer on which utopian thinkers worked their narratives and the readers of utopias have probably

<sup>3</sup> Paradise had also been an influence on St. Augustine's *De Civitate Dei*, which is in turn another source of More's *Utopia*. I have explored the relationship of Augustine's *De Civitate Dei* to More's *Utopia* in a paper entitled "The medieval background of Th. More's *Utopia*", delivered at the 1992 International Conference of SELIM (León: University of León, in press).

unconsciously relied on them in their interpretations and feelings about utopian literature. Whereas the Greek influence on utopian narratives ("Arcadia", "The Golden Age of Chronos", "Elysium"... and especially Plato's Republic) is no doubt obvious and of primary importance for the study of its major texts, that kind of imagination has not had the type of solid, continuing, evolving presence in western culture that the above myths have<sup>4</sup>.

Probably the first Golden Age of mankind that we know of –an age classically depicted as one full of happiness when man lived in this world in harmony– has to be traced back to Sumerian literature of the fourth millennium B.C. It is contained in an epic poem entitled "Enmerkar and the Land of Aratta", and describes "a once-upon-a-time state of peace and security and ends with man's fall from this blissful state"<sup>5</sup>.

The biblical story of Paradise was first written some time during the ninth century B.C. Together with the nostalgia for the lost paradise, the Jews built up

<sup>4</sup> Cfr. S.B. Liljegren, *Studies on the Origin and Early Tradition of English Utopian Fiction*, (Uppsala-Copenhagen: Uppsala University-English Institute, 1961), p. 71: "[...] what has been earlier written about the influence of, e.g., Plato on More, is not satisfactory. In my opinion, we must, in the case of More, distinguish between definite influence, and the inspiration occasioned by the existence of events and books and ideas obvious to More and his contemporaries. [...] That More devotes some space to Greek studies in his *Utopia* is [...] no surprise. But a particularized influence is not involved, in my opinion".

About Paradise, the Messianic Kingdom, the Millennium and the Apocalypse, see: Frank E. Manuel and Fritzie P. Manuel, *Utopian Thought in the Western World*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979), p. 33-63. See also Mircea Eliade, "Paradise and Utopia: Mythical Geography and Eschatology", in Frank E. Manuel (ed.), *Utopias and Utopian Thought* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965), p. 260-280. Richard Heinberg, *Memories and Visions of Paradise*, (Los Angeles: Jeremy P. Tarcher, 1989), p. 3-256. Isaac J. Pardo, *Fuegos bajo el Agua. (La invención de utopía)*, (Caracas: Fundación "La Casa de Bello", 1983), 802 p.

<sup>5</sup> Cfr. Samuel Noah Kramer, *History Begins in Sumer*, (Rpt. 1959; New York: Doubleday, 1956), p. 222. "Once upon a time, there was no snake, there was no scorpion, / There was no hyena, there was no lion, / There was no wild dog, no wolf, / There was no fear, no terror, / Man had no rival [...]". See also: E.N. Genovese, "Paradise and Golden Age: Ancient Origins of the Heavenly Utopia", in *The Utopian Vision. Seven Essays on the Quincentennial of St. Thomas More*, ed. by E.D.S. Sullivan, (San Diego: San Diego State U.P., 1983), p. 9-28. Departing from the study of the Sumerian tablet quoted above, this author attempts "to trace a confluence of traditions of the first, eternal and ultimate utopia-paradise. The evidence will show that neither is our Judaized concept of Paradise unique, nor is our Christianized concept merely eschatological. In sum, we shall see how our paradise tradition arises in Mesopotamia and combines with the Indo-European cyclic golden age myth to produce a prevalent belief in heavenly reward after death, all of which forms the basis for man's centuries of utopian dreams". Cfr. *Op. cit.*, p. 10. However, more recent research –including the Manuels– emphasizes the uniqueness and originality of the Biblical history of Paradise, or The Garden of Eden with respect to the descriptions of a Golden Age in epic literatures of the cultures of the Tigris-Euphrates valley between the fourth and second millennium B.C.

the first doctrinal corpus that included the hope –expressed, of course, in a metaphorical way– that the day would come when human afflictions and hardships would turn into abundance, peace and prosperity. This hope slowly materialized, within the span of a few centuries, in a complex process that can be thought to present at least three distinctive phases:

1. From the Fall, and subsequent expulsion from Paradise, until David, through Moses –who leads the Jewish people out of the Egyptian slavery towards the Promised Land, flowing with milk and honey, which neither he nor we, as readers, are allowed to enter at the end of *Exodus*; hope during this period is based upon the symbol of the serpent in *Genesis* whose head is crushed by the heel of its victim.
2. Three hundred years of prophecies, since Amos, shape the Jewish Messianic hope, a hope that included the idea of a Redeptor. This supernatural being was conceived with ever increasing precision as a ruler, a legislator and spiritual guide very much like Moses –and like King Utopos– depicted as a just and victorious king. The emphasis at this stage is on a kingdom of equity and justice, without tyrants, without hardships, and without wars (*Isa.* 55:13; *Jer.* 33:6, 33:16; *Ezek.* 28:24; *Ps.* 85:11-14). Jerusalem is a jewel-city, undoubtedly a model for Francis Bacon's *New Atlantis*, (*Ezek.* 28:25-26, 36:35; *Jer.* 33:9; *Isa.* 54:11-12, etc.), and famine will disappear, (*Isa.* 51:3, *Ezek.* 36:35, etc.). Thus, the triumph of the redeemed people would definitely start as a political and economic one<sup>6</sup>.
3. What I will call the third phase brings about a radical metamorphosis of both the concept of Messiah and the Messianic expectation in general. Emphasis is diverted –after the Babylonian captivity– from the material welfare of the Messianic Kingdom towards more spiritual matters, and a surprising image arises from the previous ones which presents a humble king, riding on an ass, but who will, however, dictate his law to the nations, (*Zech.* 9:9; *Ps.* 45:9-10; *II Isa.* 42:1-4, 49:1-2, 50:5-6 and 52). Actually, the figure of a humiliated redeptor had already been formed in the East well before Christ's birth, though Jewish and Christian exegesis obviously differ in their interpretations of this figure as respectively referring to Israel and Christ, or to both.

<sup>6</sup> For an accurate and suggestive summary of utopian trends in this phase, see Ann Hughes, "Jewish utopian visions from the Canonical, the Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha", Paper delivered at the 1990 Meeting of the American Society for Utopian Studies, Lexington, KE., University of Louisville, 1990; (unpublished paper kindly sent to me by its author), 5 p.

After the final messianic messages of the prophetic literature, (Malachi), these topics seem to disappear from the Scriptures and they will be absent from them for about three centuries; the Jews seemed to have given up their hope of a new paradise on earth that never seemed to come. Daniel will begin a trend within the prophetic literature (around 160 B.C.): the Apocalypse or Revelation. These Revelations are not the subtle result of divine inspiration, but rather derive from violent raptures in which the visionary is taken to Heaven so that he may learn about occult secrets, about the past and, above all, about the future, with special attention paid to the description of the end of the world. This is the way in which the Messianic hope and the end-of-times came to be one single theme.

The apocalyptic genre –which, as Frank Kermode suggests<sup>7</sup>, is the model for all fictions– uses a technique of prophecy a posteriori, usually beginning with a dream, and with a result that is full of obscure symbols, excruciating metaphors, and plenty of ambiguity that becomes well the nature of the dream vision that produces it<sup>8</sup>.

Millenarianism, as we conceive it today –the most pervasive element in utopian literature and science fiction of all times–, is definitely a development of the messianic expectation of a human being, the Deliverer<sup>9</sup>. Of course, there is a Jewish and a Christian Millennium, the former being essentially the same as the Messianic Kingdom; and, of course, it exercises different degrees of influence on western literatures in the different periods. It is generally agreed

<sup>7</sup> Frank Kermode, *The Sense of an Ending. Studies in the Theory of Fiction*, (Oxford: O.U.P., 1968).

<sup>8</sup> The largest part of the summary on the apocalyptic imagination, in the longer version of this paper is taken from the following two sources: -John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination. (An introduction to the Jewish matrix of Christianity)*, (New York: Crossroad, 1984), 280 p. - H.H. Rowley, *The Rlevance of Apocalyptic. A Study of Jewish and Christian Apocalypses from Daniel to the Revelation*, 2nd ed., (Rpt. 1963; London: Lutterworth Press, 1947), 240 p.

<sup>9</sup> See Gershom Scholem, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays in Jewish Spirituality*, (London: Allen & Unwin, 1971), p. 1-36. See also Milton Steinberg, *Basic Judaism*, (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1947). Since there is so little dogma and no Thomas Aquinas in Judaism, it is impossible to categorically deepen in a general account of what the Jews were supposed to believe about these questions from Daniel onwards. Thus, the above is formulated in a strictly speculative way. For an account –as close as we can get to a 'dogma' in Jewish thought of the Middle Ages– see Maimonides' *Thirteen Principles, his Ethical Writings and Mishneh Torah*, where we can find a fairly detailed account of the Jewish concept of ideal society and good, that is, holy life. See also, among a myriad of secondary sources, Menachem Kellner, *Dogma in Medieval Jewish Thought. From Maimonides to Abravanel*, (Oxford: O.U.P., 1986), 310 p., especially its bibliographical chapter, p. 287-302.

that in English and American literature, the period which saw the vastest sway was c. 1750-1850; but, whatever their influence, all millennialists of all times are supposed to share a belief in the fact that the world is going to be transformed by the (second/first) coming of the Messiah, which will result in the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth; this state will last a thousand years, after which the Last Judgement will take place; whether the (Second) Coming of the Messiah will precede or follow that thousand years of happiness and just rule on earth is not agreed on. There is wide support in the Bible for a Millenarian belief, particularly in Daniel, in the Apocalypse of John or *Revelation*, (20:4), and in several Sibylline Oracles. The images of peace and happiness therein contained move us back to the paradisiacal imagery of *Genesis* in what is surely more than an inescapable analogy<sup>10</sup>. Obviously, Millenarianism soon developed a peculiar kind of eschatology, and there came in the believers a mixed feeling of terror and hope before an oncoming end, feared and, at the same time, desired, but anyway expected, and in the short run. These complex feelings were poured into a language which put together apocalyptic features and dreams of a happy land, of a paradise that was first supposed to be somewhere Eastward, then Eastward but accessible through a Western route, and finally, somewhere in the Newfound Land; and there they went: some only dreamed about it, but others decidedly sailed the seas in search of paradise. *IV Esdras*, added as an appendix to the *Vulgate*, provided two lines that fired a prolific fantastic geography that sent, among others, Christopher Columbus to discover and regain the paradise lost<sup>11</sup>. For him, the search for the earthly paradise was no chimera, and the discovery itself – as it happens in all utopian texts – had eschatological consequences of its own:

<sup>10</sup> "The Age or Reign of the Messiah is hence on this earth: it is a public and political State of goodness and freedom, not a matter of personal or individual salvation, or of life in the hereafter". This idea is kept very much alive in Christian millenarianism. The Council of Ephesus pronounced millenarianism a heresy in 431, and the orthodox view throughout the Middle Ages was Augustinian: which meant a denial of a new earthly millennium following the Second Coming of Christ, [...]. But we know impossible the Church found it to prevent alternative interpretations arising, mainly in the form of commentaries on the *Book of Daniel* and *The Revelation of St. John the Divine*. *Revelation* in particular gave rise to the standard pattern of millenarian belief. Christ's Second Coming would be accompanied by the emergence of the Antichrist and by his victory over him. There would be a first Resurrection and a first Judgement. Then would ensue Christ's thousand-year reign of peace, joy and freedom on earth. That would be followed by a second Resurrection and a second and Last Judgement, and the final end of earthly existence. But up to the final point, Christian millenarianism shared with Jewish messianism the belief that the new providential dispensation would take place on earth". Cfr. K. Kumar, *Religion and Utopia* (Canterbury: The University of Kent at Canterbury, 1988), p. 3.

<sup>11</sup> See Mircea Eliade, "Paradise and utopia: mythical geography and eschatology", in Frank E. Manuel, (ed.), *Utopias and Utopian Thought*, Op. cit., p. 262 ff. See also Pardo, *Op. cit.*, p. 246.

The great navigator accorded an eschatological significance to these geographic discoveries. The new world represented more than a new continent open to the propagation of the Gospel. The very fact of its discovery had an eschatological implication. Indeed, Columbus was persuaded that the prophecy concerning the diffusion of the Gospel throughout the world had to be realized before the end of the world – which was not far off. In his *Book of Prophecies*, Columbus affirmed that these events, namely the end of the world, would be preceded by the conquest of the new continent, the conversion of the heathen and the destruction of the Antichrist. And he assumed a capital role in this grandiose drama, at once historical and cosmic. In addressing Prince John, he exclaimed: "God made me the messenger of the new Heaven and the new Earth, of which He spoke in the Apocalypse by St. John, after having spoken of it by the mouth of Isaiah; and He showed me the spot where to find it". It was in this messianic and apocalyptic atmosphere that the transoceanic expeditions and the geographic discoveries that radically shook and transformed Western Europe took place. Throughout Europe, people believed in an imminent regeneration of the world, even though the causes and reasons for this regeneration were multiple and often contradictory<sup>12</sup>.

Both the subject-matter and the audience were ready for the accounts of the utopian writers about more perfect societies and about the necessity of imagining first and 'enforcing' later a more perfect world, so that 'the time' might be fulfilled.

#### Judeo-Christian Scripture and More's vision of the ideal commonwealth. A comparative analysis

I now intend to propose a reading of Thomas More's *The Best State of a Commonwealth and the New Island of Utopia*<sup>13</sup> in the light of Scriptural teaching about one of the major issues on which the utopian society must be built, according to More: the idea of a commonwealth and the related questions such as wealth, poverty, work, and the consequences of an eventual elimination of private property<sup>14</sup>.

<sup>12</sup> Mircea Eliade, *Op. cit.*, p. 262.

<sup>13</sup> All quotations, when it is not stated to the contrary, are taken from *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More*, Vol. IV, ed. by Edward Surtz, S.J. & J.H. Hexter, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965), p. vii-cxciv, 1-629.

<sup>14</sup> In a forthcoming chapter, entitled "The idea of a commonwealth according to the Essenes and Thomas More's *Utopia*", (New York: Fordham U.P., in press), I analyze in detail Josephus', Philo's and Pliny's description of the commonwealth of the Judaic sect of the Essenes (c. 150 B.C. -66-70 A.D.) and its possible influence as a source for More's *Utopia*. For more information about Thomas More's *Utopia* and the Essenes, see my article "The life of the Essenes and Thomas More's *Utopia*", submitted to *Moreana* for its forthcoming special issue on *Utopia* (1994).

First, of course, poverty, less indigence, do not exist in More's vision. Food is plentiful and the hardships in its obtention inexistent:

Though they are more than sure how much food the city with its adjacent territory consumes, they produce far more grain and cattle than they require for their own use: they distribute the surplus among their neighbours.

(p. 117)

The Utopians devote, thanks to the effectiveness of cooperative labor, very little time to manual work, and society itself is designed so that, most of the time, most of the people may be free from any type of manual work; in this way, they can devote themselves to increase their knowledge and pleasure, which are the true sources of happiness. As in the OT visions of Paradise and the Days of the Messiah, the Utopians, under the rule delivered by their founder King Utopus<sup>15</sup>, live in a land and age of bounty, whereas their enemies suffer famine and thirst: "And people will say: This land, so recently a waste, is now like a garden of Eden, and the ruined cities once abandoned and levelled to the ground are now strongholds with people living in them" (*Ezek.* 36:35)<sup>16</sup>. Utopia had also been a waste until King Utopos separated it from the mainland and turned it an isle.

Through the description of the essential otherness of the Utopian society, More consistently builds upon the tension that exists between the contingency of the present situation, of the society he lives in, (the England of the early sixteenth century), and the superior plenitude of 'the other', (the commonwealth of Utopia); the structure of the book in two parts helps to provide that sense of estrangement that forces the reader to realize the extent of the commitment of the so-called English Christians to the principles of their religion when compared to the supposedly heathen that inhabits Utopia; the latter –through reason alone– have been capable of enacting a much more Christian ethics. The subtle qualifications of the author's conceptual positions will come along with the complex network of personalities and voices through which More speaks (Raphael Hythlodæus, the Thomas at the table in Antwerp, the third person narrator, etc.).

<sup>15</sup> There is no utopia without history, and there is no history without messianic expectation; King Utopus is, in *Utopia*, the Deliverer of the Law, the one that separated the land and turned it into an island to protect his people from evil influences from the other world. Though a symbol of man's capacity of progress, always beyond *Utopia* we have a law-giver king or legislator who set the basis for the commonwealth the traveller finally finds in his search.

<sup>16</sup> All Biblical quotations, when not stated to the contrary, are taken from *The New Jerusalem Bible. Reader's Edition*, (Rpt. 1990; New York: Doubleday, 1990).

There is no money in *Utopia*, nor do they need it, and gold is ridiculed by assigning it the humblest use of all, (chamber-pots and children toys). More's exaltation of communal life –beginning with the family–, certain rather stoic touches in his consideration of the superfluous, and social justice at large in his utopia, clearly derives from the Scriptures as he saw them finally enacted in the monacal life, towards which he felt so much inclined at certain points of his life<sup>17</sup>.

On the intricate question of private property More seems to deviate from the traditional concept of ownership within the Scriptures, where possession of goods and real property is taken for granted and theft is severely condemned, (*I Macc.* 15:33; *Sir.* 34:20, 46-19); personal possessions should be used for the help of those in need. However, this deviation is more apparent than substantial. The evolution of this concept departs from wealth symbolizing God's blessing, (as in *Gen.* 24:35 and 13:2; *II Chron.* 32:27-29, etc.), to communal abundance in *Exodus* and in the prophetic literature, towards increasing concerns about the negative effect of riches in the sphere of salvation. The Fathers –following Christ's hard remarks about riches in *Luke*, 19-45 & 18:24-27– had a hard time trying to explain that the human being had been created as *homo socialis*, a being designed to communicate with others and that riches were to be included in this sharing. Gold –very much like in *Utopia*– is to be equated to dirt, according to Clement of Alexandria and Tertulian, who remind us of some pagan tribes' custom of chaining their prisoners in gold. Of course, the situation was by no means simple. The Church Fathers, admiring, like More, the communal life as the theoretically more perfect state, were trying to reach a compromise that would not deprive the Church from the new members of the high middle classes that were converting in large numbers to Catholicism after Constantin's reform, while still condemning the terrible social inequalities of their time. As we shall see, More was not alien to this sense of compromise, in his complex approach to the question of wealth and private property in his *Utopia*.

Critics have suggested that More made himself defend 'private property' against Hythlodæus' opinion in Book I; but the thing is that he did not do that in his original text written in the Netherlands, (Book II); as J.H. Hexter<sup>18</sup> suggests, on his way back to England More might have had second thoughts about that matter. However, apparently, that was not the case. Actually More talks twice within the first book in defense of personal property –against Hythlodæus' account of the perfect communism of the Utopians–, but, as Hexter rightly suggests, quite surprisingly, his arguments are inappropriately weak for a mind

<sup>17</sup> More followed the regime of the Carthusian monks from 1499 to 1503.

<sup>18</sup> Hexter, *Op. cit.*, p. 35.

of his class<sup>19</sup>; his biography –which tells us of his intimate repulsion against pomp and riches in general– makes us think that his arguments could only be purposely weak, so as to trick the reader into hating even more the effects of private property: "This juxtaposition [Hythloday's magnificent invective against private property and More's silly reply in its defense] at the very end, leaves the reader with a feeling of disgust against the evils of private property"<sup>20</sup>.

In his controversial account of private property, More is heir to a religious tradition of thought that has brought about the positive view about communal, shared goods as the most perfect religious state for mankind only through a complex mutation in his dialectical relationship with the world that surrounds him. In fact, the common set of Messianic expectations, and the Millenarian belief turned the first Christians communities<sup>21</sup> into entities almost completely irresponsive to the social issues. According to the *Didaché*, the Church was the only society Christians should feel themselves members of; virtually, the *civitas terrena* did not exist for those who were waiting for the Day of the Apocalypse, for the Millennium or, in general, for the end of the world, which was wrongly supposed to be at hand. By the end of the second century A.D., the average Christian still believed that the imminent future was not in an earthly city, but in the celestial one and thus continued to enforce his detachment from every attempt at a worldly structural change. From the third until the eighth century, this belief gradually changed, and then, having the supposed immediacy of the end been questioned, the Christian began to dream of building a universal empire under the name of Christ. It is in this manner that the *civitas Dei* and the *civitas terrena* are bonded. Although the ideal continued to be the monastery, that radical separation between the Christian and his society, upon claims of a most harmful contamination (as Hythloday suggests) if he intervened in the business and institutions of power of this world, was –to say the least– far less radical. More's contribution to a new sense of compromise between hyper-providentialism and hyper-secularism, finds in *Utopia* its most accomplished formulation.

More, then, is inheritor of the Latin Fathers' tradition according to which personal riches are tolerable only when they are used for the common good<sup>22</sup>, a

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., p. 36-39.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., p. 39.

<sup>21</sup> More had widely read the Latin Fathers and knew about the way of life of the early Christian groups and especially about the prescriptions of the Benedictine rule. Cf. Hexter, *Op. cit.*, p. 62.

<sup>22</sup> St. Augustine, On the Epistle to the Parthians. For a complete survey of the Fathers' teachings in this respect, see Pardo, *Op. cit.*, p. 337-392.

tradition regarding God's property of all things, including the lives and souls of his people, that goes back to the *Exodus*, when the Lord proclaimed:

"So now, if you are really prepared to obey me and keep my covenant, you, out of all peoples, shall be my personal possession, for *the whole world is mine*" (Ex., 19:5) <sup>23</sup>.

and went through Luke, who contends, in "The parable of the rich man and Lazarus", that the Christian concept of justice and the moral gravity of man's insensibility towards poverty –exemplified in the condemnation of the rich man– had changed nothing from "Moses and the prophets"<sup>24</sup>; and the supposedly 'utopian' vision of Augustine tells us, in his *Civitas Dei*, of God dispensing all people to share food, clothes, cures, etc.

## Conclusion

The all-embracing myth of paradise –as I have tried to outline in the above pages– epitomizes well the ideological substratum and the conceptual identity of More's utopia. His dream of a better –though not yet perfect– society implies a vision of the world and of the human soul that moves back along history to a prelapsarian humanity. In terms of formative causation, utopian literature –according to More's definition– suggests that his subtle, even subliminal, use of the myth of paradise reflects, as R.W. Wescott<sup>25</sup> rightly suggests, in terms of Platonic gnoseology, our collective memories of a former existence in Paradise as well as an often silent hope that we shall some day return to a paradisaal state, where there will no longer be pain or hunger, sorrow or violence, where even the memories and recollections of past hardships, even of coeternal pain and punishment will be erased in an eternal present. More's imagination, like anyone else's cannot invent *ex nihilo*; thus, Utopia springs from memory and essentially requires re-creation, re-view, re-enactment of a past that will join the future, when there no longer be past but only sempiternal present. But man's wordly existence is in time and space and it is in this world that he must prepare and try to anticipate the world that is to come.

This kind of discourse had to be born in the Renaissance. Its look back to the classics, in search of a philosophy of man and of history on man's own

<sup>23</sup> See also, in this line of thought: Ex. 22:21; Job. 24:2-12; Ps. 22:26; Prov. 6:11; Am. 4:1.

<sup>24</sup> Luk. 16:19-31.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. R.W. Wescott's foreword to R. Heinberg's *Memories and Visions of Paradise. Exploring the Universal Myth of a Lost Golden Age*, (Los Angeles: Jeremy P. Tarcher, Inc., 1989), p. xxi-xxiii.

terms, from the standpoint of man's own abilities, was bound to produce a radical desire of transformation. Thomas More's *Utopia*, with its subliminal version of the myth of paradise, perfectly joined together the viewpoint of history and the viewpoint of metaphor, the allegory and the satire, the irrational outopia of perfection on this earth and the eutopia that must guide human behavior in this world.

## "MORE'S *UTOPIA*" OR "UTOPIA'S *UTOPIA*?": HOW TO HANDLE TEXTUAL AND GENERIC DOUBLING

Joaquín Martínez Lorente  
Universidad de Murcia

This is about differences between interpretations of a book and interpretations of the same book when read from the perspective of the genre it "belongs" to. Of course this is not unusual: texts belong to different genres, and genres themselves are explained in many different, even contradictory, ways. However, some ingredients make More's *Utopia* a special case:

- First, there should be a stronger connection between text and kind: not only because More wrote the foundational work, "the real thing" in utopias, but also because the literary kind has inherited the name of the text.
- Second, *the name of the genre* seems to give some extra information about the contents of its members, and emphasize some of its dimensions.
- Third, *the place of this class of books in literature* (or as literature) is special. These texts have been typically placed far from the centre of literature, as 'boundary works' (Morson; 1981;75), as exotic as the countries they portray.

Some major theoretical problems are involved here, such as the articulation of 'extraliterary' and 'literary' knowledge, and also the articulation of critical and generic information. It is precisely by addressing these very big issues that I will deal with the interpretive doubling of More's *Utopia*, in the conviction that explicit examination of the particular interpreting and classifying interests of critics (and thus of the limits of their observations) has been insufficient<sup>1</sup>.

Let us start with the interpretive history of More's *Utopia*. George Logan made the point economically when he described *Utopia* as "designedly enigmatic" (1983,3). He went on by specifying the quality of the difficulty of the book, and by distinguishing two causes of uncertainty:

<sup>1</sup> See Dan Ben-Amos, "Analytical Categories and Ethnic Genres" (1969). Morson follows him when he insists that "genre does not belong to texts alone, but to the interaction between texts and a classifier" (1981, viii).



*Utopia* has proved to be too sophisticated for its readers, both in substance and in literary method.

It is difficult to disagree with this. When confronted with the sophistication of *Utopia*, a typical reaction for many years has been to look again through the text, to examine it even more carefully than before, in order to secure a meaning for it. In other words, to draw a map of the text in which new key regions are 'discovered' from time to time. So we have now at least nine major (and by no means simple) sections to consider<sup>2</sup>:

PARERGA	BOOK 1	BOOK 2
-----/-----/-----		
Parerga/Giles/Intro/Morton/counsel/commun/Utopia/Pride/More		
---- / ---- / ---- / ---- / ---- / ---- / ---- / ---- / ----		

In all these cases a typical pattern has been followed: the political or moral message is serious; comic factors are associated with the literariness of the work. A simple revision of the critical history of *Utopia* has to look like a mockery of Hegel's triad, with two famous traditions in the roles of thesis and antithesis, and the best tradition in the position of synthesis: they are the 'Catholic', the 'satiric', and the 'polyphonic' (Blaim, 1982) stances.

I will concentrate on the roles assigned to political analysis and narrative frame:

A - In the Catholic tradition the Utopian way of life is justified: it is true that not always every detail, but the rationale of this society is good<sup>3</sup>. Thomas More is sometimes critical (against England, or Europe, particularly in Book I), and there is much room for irony (eg, Greek names suggest non-existence); however, we can tell the point More is making, and the formal structure of *Utopia* should be interpreted as a protective device, or 'machinery of disguise' (Ames, 1949:84).

<sup>2</sup> Consider this sequence of titles of contributions; they make a short script of the recent interpretative history of *Utopia*:

"Missing the Point in More's *Utopia*?", Merrit Abrash, *Extrapolation* 19 (1977): 27-38.

"More's Raphael Hythloday: Missing the Point in *Utopia* Once More?", Wolfgang Rudat, *Moreana* 18 (1981): 41-64.

"Irresolution as Solution. Rhetoric and the Unresolved: Debate in Book I of More's *Utopia*"; John M. Perlette, *Texas Studies in Language and Literature* 29 (1987): 28-53.

<sup>3</sup> For our purposes traditional socialist-communist readings are included here, the main difference with the catholic ones being that in general the former are more literal, and the latter more interested in the problem of Revelation. Furthermore, the communist emphasise the analysis of European economy of Book I.

B - Discussion has been pushed in the direction of *satire*, humour or irony, by means of two basic operations: i) by *reversing* traditional designations of what is good and bad, serious and comic, and 'here' and 'there'. Heiserman (1963) started this tradition by showing that the society of Utopia was a clumsy project, made of famously ridiculous solutions; ii) by giving a more specific, 'literary', function to the narrative frame of Book I. The persona Morus is not conventional and indifferent, but as wise as Cardinal Morton, by following the principle 'RESPONDE STULTUM SECUNDUM STULTITIAM EIUS' ('answer a fool according to his folly'. Kinney; 1986)<sup>4</sup>.

C - For the third stage the key concept is *polyphony*: in the light of historical probability it is assumed that More did not want to relinquish any of the two political perspectives. To this interpretive decision follows a different articulation of the political and literary discourses: *textual sophistication communicates the complexity of social issues*; the ambiguity of his 'method' is a faithful reflection of his personal stance<sup>5</sup>.

How is this achieved? The text communicates the political dimension of utopianism by reproducing at the level of verisimilar fiction the debate that should take place outside, a debate that has already taken place in the mind of the utopist. Three movements are involved in this third phase: from the fantastic to the realistic, from the political to the narrative and from the collective to the individual. These movements make supplementary interpretive demands on the reader: to put it in a single formula, political ideas are shown in a context, and individuals are involved in these ideas.

This operation I have sketched has important critical consequences: in many of the most stimulating studies *the island of Utopia has moved to the periphery*

<sup>4</sup> C.S. Lewis (1954) had attacked the model, but it was on the grounds of its totalitarianism. H.W. Donner (1945) had also shown the satiric element of the book, but not so much through the weaknesses of Utopian institutions. The novelty of Heiserman's approach is that the drawbacks of More's design are seen as part of More's joke.

So utopia is 'impossible', or 'false', or bad, in at least four different ways: people will not agree to establish it, it is undesirable, it will not work, and it does not exist.

This tradition was improved and proposed by Robert C. Elliott (1970).

<sup>5</sup> A. Blaim (1982, 1983), R. Helgerson (1982), Frederic Jameson (1981), E. McCutcheon (1971), and others using *Utopia* for the description of their versions of utopian writing, express this 'dialectical' taste, sometimes emphasising the painful element. M. Lasky (1976) and P. Ruppert (1986) are radical in this interest for the logic of contradictions. Some contributions (Logan; 1983, Skinner; 1987) have correctly directed attention to the fact that when these critical writings go too far, they may do not do justice to the sense of personal *commitment* the book of *Utopia* still communicates.



of the text of *Utopia*. The urge to scrutinise utopian customs in search for references to their European counterparts is replaced by new centres. I will mention four approaches:

a) First, there is a real *blend of fantasy and realism* in *Utopia*, not a mechanical juxtaposition: the realistic fictional world of Antwerp is important, and it contains other imaginary places (utopian or not), and other (utopian) historical places<sup>6</sup>.

b) Second, Hythloday's final invective against Pride and selfishness can make a very convincing justification of the book (both political and literary), making the rest its context<sup>7</sup>.

c) Third, the figure of the traveller, his 'foolish wisdom' can be a useful pattern: instead of being a function of realism, utopia becomes a function of his imaginary personal experience<sup>8</sup>.

d) Of course, this figure is a metaphor of the anguish of the utopian writer himself, who has 'seen' utopia mentally, but cannot get it implemented. Expanding this idea S. Greenblatt's (1980) analysis of the social institutions of *Utopia* is almost a function in the analysis of More's political career.

In order to justify my preference for this model I do not have to claim in a naive way that there is no personal political or moral taste involved; I can say more cynically that this model is aesthetically satisfactory because it combines static harmony, and dynamic tension, balance and conflict, naivety and cynicism, intensity and detachment, etc.

How can we describe this last stage in generic terms? I would say these critics have found a new source of aesthetic interest in *Utopia* by describing it in a 'novelistic' fashion. Even a superficial acquaintance with utopias suffices to acknowledge that 'realistic frame' and 'individuals' are not elements we expect in the formula of Utopian literature, and that a 'fictional frame' is conceded mainly in an ontological sense<sup>9</sup>.

6 See P. Kuon (1985; 79ff) for a chart of the worlds of *Utopia* and the contexts in which they appear.

7 J. Mezciems (1982, 1983) makes this point central in her commentaries. For Mezciems it clearly links More's text and Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*. Note that Swift makes his book end with a similar diatribe by Gulliver against pride.

8 See J. Traugott (1961): the deep connection between More's *Utopia* and *Gulliver's Travels* is also established. Baker-Smith (1987) also focuses on the experience of the voyager.

9 See the chapter entitled 'The Aesthetics of Utopia', in R. Elliott's *The Shape of Utopia* (1970), and also Vita Fortunati's approach to the narrative structure of utopias (1979).

Differences are obvious, and the range of reasons is wide:

A. The first kind of reasons is typical of the functions we assign to genres: loss of information in the passage from text to genre is expected because many times in any literary kind what matters is what makes its members similar, what makes the class different from other classes: as the difference 'is' the 'creation' or depiction of that particular community, *the aspect to preserve in the texts is the community*<sup>10</sup>. Some classic virtues of critical description (analysis of tone, subtleties of meaning and interaction between different layers) have no place.

B. But we would be too indulgent if we conceded that there must be a breach between textual and generic studies. To explain how utopias function as literature has also proved a difficult task. We should be able to distinguish between different academic uses of utopianism, where 'utopian ideology' (Morson, 1981:69) is only one of them. The narrative and fictional dimension of utopias has been neglected in many studies (mainly in the fields of Political Philosophy and History of Ideas) because doing so has been considered a trait of 'scientific precision' (Morson, 1985:72)<sup>11</sup>.

C. Even as forms of didactic literature, utopias have been affected by their association with other forms: in the 1970s and 1980s utopias were used as relatively 'respectable' forerunners of fashionable forms, such as Science-Fiction, Dystopia and Fantasy, but more often than not it was implied that these new forms were respectable, not that a vindication of the aesthetic values of classical utopias was advanced. Here, what Morson calls 'progressive theory of generic evolution' (1981:73) seems to apply and work against utopias—the last works are the best ones, both in social attitudes and literary form. We only have to compare the fame of dystopias (*1984 or Brave New World*) with utopias (naively optimistic, totalitarian)<sup>12</sup>.

10 D. Suvin (1979) makes a long analysis of criteria involved in definitions of utopias. Other discussions of the same problem are available in L.T. Sargent (1979) and P. Sawada (1971).

11 J.C. Davis (1981; 17), K. Kumar (1987; ix) and Paul Ricoeur (1986; 269) show explicitly their disinterest in any literary factor for their analyses: for the first 'fiction... is an emotive concept'; the third declares that literary considerations are an obstacle for a political approach; the second, Kumar, that 'not much is going to be gained' by treating dystopias as literary, and also:

More... invented, more or less single handedly, a new literary genre. But the literary form of utopia is not an important concern in this study; nor perhaps should it be in any serious treatment of utopia (1987; 25);

Gary Morson's revision of generic contributions shows that this approach is not so far from the practices of many 'literary scholars; not far from these consequences, though for different causes, are the approaches of Raymond Williams (1979) or F. Jameson (1981).

12 Mark Hillegas (1967) illustrates the birth, or rebirth of dystopianism as a reaction against H.G. Wells, who is made to represent the latest utopianism.

D. The same situation works against More's *Utopia* even within classical utopianism: both in literary design and in ideological stance *New Atlantis* has been taken to represent an improvement on *Utopia*: Bacon represents a modern, scientific approach, while More's model recalls primitive monastic communities<sup>13</sup>; concerning the literary method, *New Atlantis* has been described as a consequential step towards 'formal realism', and the novel (Powers; 1978: Albanese; 1990); while More's 'tractarian' approach seems less attractive.

So utopia's *Utopia* has come to be a dogmatic, 'unliterary' work in a dogmatic 'unliterary' genre, while More's *Utopia* was polyphonic and literary (where, as always, 'literary' is taken as a synonym of artistic).

There is a historical explanation for this doubling (i.e., not only an abstract, theoretical textual-generic gap); however, how we deal with the multiplicity of meanings may have new theoretical effects. In these two respects Gary Morson (1981) and James Holstun (1985) have done something. However, while the historical account they produce is satisfactory and precise, the handling of generic distinctions tends to reproduce the same old problems at a different level:

1) As Morson (1981:75) describes *Utopia* as 'designed to be read in a tradition of deeply ambiguous works... intended to offer only a qualified endorsement to Hythloday's views', and as Morson thinks that many of the weaknesses of former attempts to characterise utopian literature are due to incapacity to handle the political and literary components of these 'boundary works', we are invited to think that a genre that is more like the original design of More's *Utopia* is to be proposed.

However, more important than More's design is a generically responsible characterization of utopias: the social-historical dimension of genre, its 'ethnic' existence, prevails over critical interests: his definition matches established views on this class of texts<sup>14</sup>, and so do the interpretive rules Morson generates: there is an authoritative voice –the 'delineator'– whose ideas cannot be taken as those of any character of any piece of fiction: 'novelistic' phenomena, such as 'a plausible sequence of events', 'personality', and 'irony of origins' (1981:77) are ruled out.

13 This view is held by many: Hansot (1974), Manuel-Manuel (1979), B. de Jouvenel (1966), Willey (1934), Weinberger (1985), Martin Pares (1967) and Nell Eurich (1967). However, their readings seem to have been more superficial than that of J. Bierman (1963), who shows how ineffectual that institution is.

14 This is the definition Morson proposes:

A work is a literary utopia if and only if it satisfies each of the following criteria: (1) it was written (or presumed to have been written) in the tradition of previous utopian literary works; (2) it depicts (or is taken to depict) an ideal society; and (3) regarded as a whole, it advocates (or is taken to advocate) the realization of that society (74).

Morson has been able to see that this case is similar to that described by Claudio Guillen in *Literature as System* (1971:142) on how the picaresque came to be acknowledged in society only when the second work was published, how it inherited the mood of the second work, and how the first work was reinterpreted. In Morson's words, 'the original text is, in effect, re-created by its own progeny'<sup>15</sup>. *Utopia*, in a strange chronological twist, 'imitates' those texts that imitated it– the more assertive, dogmatic Campanella's *The City of the Sun*, Andreae's *Christianopolis* and Bacon's *New Atlantis*<sup>16</sup>.

James Holstun's (1987) subject and solution are different, but the elements are the same: 17th-century Puritans were literal and pragmatic, and did not see how literary form changes meaning:

So far as they read More (which is unfrequently), the Puritan utopists seem to misread him, ignoring the literary textures that put More's political programs into context (1987:4).

Accordingly, Holstun's reading of *Utopia* and utopian writing follows the logic of Puritans, overlooking all the literary subtleties he acknowledged at the beginning.

2) Later operations show, however, that these two scholars are not completely happy with the historical frame they have used to fix one meaning, one interpretation, for utopias:

Gary Morson still wants to rescue *Utopia* from its descendants, and in the last chapter of his book (107ff) he incorporates a Bakhtinian 'theory of parody', which reproduces at the level of genre the triad I proposed to describe the history of the text: anti-utopias are members of an anti-genre, in a parodic relationship to utopias, and there is also *meta-utopia*, a *meta-genre*, a *meta-parody* –'In texts of this type, each voice may be taken to be parodic of the other' (1981:142)– to which *Utopia* is said to belong, on the basis of, precisely, the *irony of origins* we can detect.

15 The works are *Lazarillo de Tormes* and *Guzman de Alfarache*. Moreover, the genre retained some ideological and functional qualities of the second ('didactic and dogmatic'), rather than of the first ('compassionate and pluralistic'). Morson's full commentary reads as follows:

History makes the exemplar; and tradition, insofar as it directs readers to take the exemplar as a member of the genre that it fathers, changes its semiotic nature: the original text is, in effect, re-created by its own progeny (...) In a important sense, it is really the *second* works of a genre that creates the genre by defining conventions and *topoi* for the class.

16 It does not mean that the genre's interpretative rules cannot be very easily applied to More's text: Hythloday is the delineator, the island represents More's dream, Hythloday is dogmatic, showing the commitment of revealed truth...

James Holstun adds to his literal social analysis an explicit and paradoxical vindication of an articulated description of the spheres of 'form' and 'politics', and ends up by describing the 'literariness' of all utopias on the basis of an indeterminate 'central utopian imperative' (1985:10, 13), which is at the same time a metaphor of fictionality, a metaphor of the act of mentally representing the State, an eternal human impulse and a cultural fantasy<sup>17</sup>.

I will start the conclusion with a short evaluation of these two procedures:

A) To define utopian literature on the shaky basis of More's *Utopia* is a danger Morson wants to avoid; so he makes one version of this text help him in his characterization of this *socio-historical institution*. But later he *doubles* the genre by moving to a *home-made critical-theoretical category*. My impression is that Morson has simplified one thing to complicate it later, because the social evidence available for the genre of meta-utopias is poor, and the critical evidence for some antiutopias is arguable<sup>18</sup>.

B) Holstun's procedure (apart from playing fast and loose with the concept of the literary status of *Utopia*) is to avoid many problems by selecting a very particular *historical genre* (i.e. with less urgently needed decisions on voices, individual involvement, and frames of reference), and then claim a *trans-historical concept of genre* in which the real essence is psychological or perhaps anthropological.

Both Morson and Holstun seem to suggest an apparently homogeneous generic ground as a retreat from textual diversity, only to let different generic categories collide. This makes me think that solutions cannot be looked for in a unified genre theory, which is unrealistic, but in other parts:

First, in a more productive combination of ideological and 'formal' information, based on how not to make any element a residue in the analysis:

17 Holstun claims that the source of his selection of material is historical, not theoretical: he is not 'making' any concept. However, the qualities he identifies to develop the utopian imperative are a 'rational ordering' (p. 13), and an 'imaginative ability to envision a population as an utopian blank page' (p. 10). For utopia as a human impulse or vocation, see Manuel-Manuel (1979); for the cultural fantasy explanation, D. Bleich (1984).

18 For instance, some of his 'dogmatic' anti-utopias (such as *Brave New World* and Zamyatin's *We*) can be shown to be as polyphonic as his meta-utopian *Utopia*. There is another problem involved here: his decision to put *Utopia* in the group of meta-utopias is grounded on one of the most superficial factors of this book – the textological history and how the parerga modifies the interpretation.

Utopian writing cannot be subsumed under political theory. The decision to operate through a fiction may suggest the inadequacy of the political concepts available, and a consequent desire to extend and refine those concepts by means of an imaginative exploration. (Baker-Smith, 1987:8)

Second, if we have to keep the social institution of utopian literature in literary history let us complement it with a distinct *generic criticism*, one looking for the aesthetic assessment of generic texts.

Third, it would be perhaps desirable to have less respect for the institution of utopian literature: some of the best analyses of More's *Utopia* are those in which critics have moved more freely within the text, and from text to text, without having to rely too much on the interpretive rules generic descriptions invoke. These readings do not have to make a novel out of More's *Utopia* but at least a more coherent piece of narrative.

#### WORKS CITED

- ALBANESE, D. "The *New Atlantis* and the Uses of Utopia". *English Literary History* 57 (1990): 503-28.
- AMES, R. *Citizen Thomas More and His Utopia*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1949.
- BAKER-SMITH, D. "The Escape from the Cave: Thomas More and the Vision of *Utopia*". *Between Dream and Nature. Essays on Utopia and Dystopia*. Ed. D. Baker-Smith. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1987.
- BEN-AMOS, D. "Analytical Categories and Ethnic Genres". *Genre* 2 (1969): 275-301.
- BIERMAN, J. "Science and Society in the *New Atlantis* and other Renaissance Utopias", *PMLA* 78 (1963): 492-500.
- BLAIM, A. "More's *Utopia*: Persuasion or Polyphony?" *Moreana* 19 (1982): 5-20.
- . "The Genre Structure of More's *Utopia* and the Tradition of Carnivalized Literature". *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* 6 (1983): 1-14.
- BLEICH, D. *Utopia: The Psychology of a Cultural Fantasy*. Ann Arbor: UMI Research P, 1984.
- DAVIS, J.C. *Utopia and The Ideal Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1981.
- DONNER, H.W. *Introduction to Utopia*. London: Goddard & Jackson, 1948.
- ELLIOTT, R.C. *The Shape of Utopia. Studies in a Literary Genre*. Chicago/London: Chicago UP, 1970.
- EURICH, N. *Science in Utopia*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard UP, 1967.
- FORTUNATI, V. *La letteratura utopica inglese: morfologia e grammatica di un genere letterario*. Ravenna: Longo, 1979.
- GREENBLATT, S. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1980.
- GUILLEN, C. *Literature as System*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1970.
- HEISERMAN, A. "Satire in the *Utopia*". *PMLA*, 78 (1963): 163-74.
- HELGERSON, R. "Inventing No-place, or the Power of Negative Thinking". *Genre* 15 (1982): 101-21.

- HILLEGAS, M. *The Future as Nightmare: H.G. Wells and the Anti-Utopians*. New York: Oxford UP, 1967.
- HOLSTUN, J. A *Rational Millenium. Puritan Utopias of Seventeenth-Century England and America*. Oxford/New York: Oxford UP, 1987.
- JAMESON, F. *The Political Unconscious*. London: Methuen, 1981.
- JOUVENEL, B. (1966) "La utopía para propósitos prácticos". *Utopias and Utopian Thought*. Ed. F. Manuel. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co, 1966. Spanish translation Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1982. 268-86.
- KINNEY, A.E. *Humanist Poetics. Thought, Rhetoric and Fiction in Sixteenth-Century England*. Amherst, Mass: Massachussets UP, 1986.
- KUMAR, K. *Utopia and Antiutopia in Modern Times*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1987.
- KUON, P. *Utopischer Entwurf und Fiktionale Vermittlung*. Heidelberg: Carlwinter Universitätsverlag, 1985.
- LASKY, M. *Utopia and Revolution*. London: MacMillan, 1976.
- LEWIS, C.S. *English Literature in the Sixteenth-Century Excluding Drama*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1954.
- LOGAN, G. *The Meaning of More's Utopia*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1983.
- MANUEL, F.E. and F.P. MANUEL *Utopian Thought in The Western World*, Cambridge, Mass: Belknap P, 1979.
- MCCUTCHEON, E. "Denying the Contrary: More's Use of Litotes in the *Utopia*". *Moreana* 16 (1979): 107-21.
- MEZCIEMS, J. "Utopia and the Thing which is not: More, Swift, and other Lying Idealists". *University of Toronto Quarterly*, 52 (1982): 40-62.
- "Swift's Praise of Gulliver: Some Renaissance Background to the *Travels*". *The Character of Swift's Satire*. Ed. C. Rawson. Newark: Delaware UP, 1983. 245-81.
- MORSON, G.S. *The Boundaries of Genre. Dostoevsky's 'Diary of a Writer' and the Traditions of Literary Utopia*. Austin: Texas UP, 1981.
- PARES, M. "Francis Bacon and the Utopias". *Baconiana* 50 (1967): 13-31.
- POWERS, D.C. "Formal Realism and the Seventeenth-Century English Utopian Novel". *Genre* 11 (1978): 15-27.
- RICOEUR, P. *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia*. New York: Columbia UP, 1986.
- RUPPERT, P. *Reader in a Strange Land. The Activity of Reading Literary Utopias*. Athens, Ge/London: Georgia UP, 1986.
- SARGENT, L.T. *British and American Utopian Literature. 1516-1975*. Boston: G.K. Hall, 1979.
- SAWADA, P.A. "Towards the Definition of *Utopia*". *Moreana* 8 (1971): 135-156.
- SKINNER, Q. (1987) "Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* and the Language of Renaissance Humanism". *The Languages of Political Theory in Early Modern Europe*: Ed. A.R. Pagden. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987. 123-57.
- SUVIN, D. *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction. On the Poetics and History of a Literary Genre*. London: Yale UP, 1979.
- TRAUGOTT, J. "A Voyage to Nowhere with Thomas More and Jonathan Swift: *Utopia* and 'The Voyage to the Houyhnhnmland'". *The Sewanee Review* 69 (1961): 534-65.
- WEINBERGER, J. *Science, Faith, and Politics: Francis Bacon and the Utopian Roots of the Modern Age*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1985.
- WILLEY, B. *The Seventeenth-Century Background*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1934.
- WILLIAMS, R. "Utopia and Science-Fiction". *Science-Fiction. A Critical Guide*. Ed. P. Parrinder. New York: Longman, 1979. 52-66.

## CONY-CATCHERS AND CAZADORES DE GATOS: AN EXAMINATION OF THE LEXIS RELATED TO THIEVES AND SWINDLERS IN ENGLAND AND SPAIN IN THE 16th AND 17th CENTURIES

Margarita Mele Marrero  
Universidad de La Laguna

Vagabonds "working" as *cony-catchers*, *pilfereres*, *cazadores de gatos*, *rateros*, etc., have always been with us; but the fact that in England and Spain in the 16th and 17th centuries many writers made them the object of their work, testifies to their importance during that period. The English Rogue Pamphlets and the Spanish picaresque writings are examples of such sources.

This paper examines the vocabulary related to thieves and swindlers in English and Spanish in the 16th and 17th centuries, using primary and secondary sources from the two languages. The lexis of and about these marginal groups, will be compared to determine later on if Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) concept of structural metaphor does operate in the creation of the analysed terms. It will thus be shown that these two underworlds do not lie so far apart as linguistic links can be established between them.

Crime and vagrancy are social phenomena usually considered to be closely tied to poverty. As the number of people lacking adequate means of living increases, the groups of thieves, swindlers, beggars and prostitutes also swell, and when they get organized in hierarchical bands, they are perceived as a social threat. Extant records show that crime and vagrancy became a serious worry in Elizabethan England. Paul Slack, analysing the English Poor Law, states that: "The legislation of 1598 and 1601 was passed at a time when the problem of poverty was unusually severe" (11). Previous years had not been any better and the number of criminals and vagrants was not a low one. In his book *Los Pícaros en la Literatura*, A. Parker tells us that the social and economic situation in the rest of Europe was somewhat similar, and Spain was no exception to this (46-48). But here we are not concerned with the reasons that drew people to a life of crime; our interest is mainly the vocabulary they produced as a result of their way of life, narrowing our scope further to that related to thieves and swindlers.

In English as well as in Spanish during the 16th and 17th centuries we find vocabularies "used" by marginal groups of people who were vagrants, beggars,

thieves, swindlers and prostitutes. The words in these lexical sets differ in the degree to which they were opaque to outsiders depending on the evolution of their use. In English the term applied to that vocabulary is **cant**, from Latin *cantare*, canting, the singing of beggars when asking for money (*OED*); in Spanish we have the **germanía**, from Latin *germanus*, brother, brotherhood (*DRAE*). The short life of these jargons (at least short life in terms of secrecy) makes it difficult sometimes to state with certainty that a word was included or excluded in any of them. Nevertheless, even the terms adopted by common people, outside these groups, to designate those who were a menace for them are worthy of consideration.

In English, the sources that testify to the existence of this underworld and its vocabulary are the Rogue Pamphlets, a series of treatises written by several authors during the second half of the 16th century and first decades of the 17th century, whose main topic is **cant** and its speakers, the **canting-crew**. Awdeley can be considered as the first compiler of this jargon, his *The Fraternity of Vagabonds* (1575) served as a model for Harman's *A Caveat of Common Cursitors* (1568) and gave way to other pamphlets like those by Greene, Hutton, Middleton, Dekker or Rid, included in the list of references. The Spanish counterparts to the Rogue Pamphlets are the picaresque and "germanesque" writings whose vocabulary has been studied by J.L. Alonso in *El Lenguaje de los Maleantes Españoles de los Siglos XVI y XVII: La Germanía*. This author has used literary texts, (picaresque novels, poetry, plays,...) containing **germanías** as well as other types of marginal lexis. The English texts are less "literary", since writers like John Awdeley or Thomas Harman only offered lists of **cant** words obtained from the criminals themselves, in an attempt to discover their tricks and prevent innocent citizens from falling into their traps. Though other writers like Robert Greene may use stories to illustrate the vocabulary, they also claim to have used the information provided by people from the underworld, and it is even possible, according to Aydelotte (1913:123) and Salgado (17) that Greene himself was for some time an active participant in that underworld. Apart from the pamphlets, dictionaries of the period as well as those of the present day are also of help in the analysis of these specific English and Spanish vocabularies.

Two great groups, thieves and swindlers, within their marginal worlds in England and Spain will be our main interest here. Their activities will be described briefly to compare their metaphorical implications later on.

Stealing was one of the options that people from the very low classes had as a means of earning a livelihood, sometimes combining it with other "jobs":

begging, cheating, prostitution, etc. The words with which they designated themselves or were designated by others are usually related to how and what they would steal or who they would rob.

Among those thieves that use hooks to steal, we find in English: **HOOKERS**, **ANGLERS**, **CURBERS** and **FILCHERS** (**FILCHING MORT/ COVE**)<sup>1</sup>. All are variants of a thief who "with a curb as they term it, or hook, doth pull out of a window any loose linen cloth apparel, or else any household apparel whatsoever" (Greene 1592a:222). It is noticeable that all these terms are derived (through the usual means of the English grammar) from the instrument employed, a curved piece of metal: **HOOK**, **ANGLE**, **CURB**, or **FILCH**, "a short staff (...) having in the nab, or head of it a ferme, (that is to say a hole) into which (...) when he goes a filching he putteth a hook of iron". (Dekker 1612:380). There are also variants of the modality of theft itself, such is the case of the **FIGGING BOY** in which a little boy was placed at a window and he performed the part of the hook.

Their Spanish equivalents are the **GANCHO**, **GANZÚA**, **PESCADOR** and **GARABERO** (Alonso 77). In the first and second no derivation is used, the thief is directly identified with the instrument, whereas **GARABERO** is formed from **GARABO**, a hook, and **PESCADOR** is taken from the relation of this with the fishing rod hook, or **PESCADA**. According to Alonso these people would use their hooks to open locked doors, and therefore they can be differentiated from their English counterparts in the methods and object of their work, but sometimes definitions are so general ("ladrón que hurta con ganzúa") that they could simply correspond to the English rogues mentioned before. This assertion can also be backed by the fact that in Spanish there are clearer designations for picklocks: **LLAVERO DE CERRADURAS** and **SAN PEDRO**. In English we find **CHARM** applied specifically to this latter type of thief. "House works" were also done by the **COMADREJA** "ladrón que entra en cualquier casa" (Alonso 79).

A comparable version to the **FIGGING BOY** is the **MALETA** (Alonso 80): a man was left in a sack in a house or shop during the day, and at night he would come out to open the door to his partners or to throw the stolen goods through the window.

Among those involved in stealing money we have in English the **CUTPURSE** and **BUNG NIPPER**; in Spanish: **CORTABOLSAS**, **CORTA-**

<sup>1</sup> **MORT** probably from Fr. 'mot' = 'word' and used as a euphemism for 'cunt' (Allan & Burridge 1991:95), appears in **cant** as an indicator of female sex, whereas **COVE**, from Romanic 'kova' = 'thing', 'person' (J. Ayto 1990) implies male sex.

DOR SOBRE PERCHA, BARAHUSTADORES, CAZADORES DE GATOS, and RATEROS. The last two make reference not to the robbing instrument, but to the purse itself made of the skin of a cat, or similar in appearance to a rat (Alonso 82-83). The ARAÑA is another thief of purses; according to Alonso, it was common to call the money MOSCA and that is why the one who went after it was compared to the spider.

Other small-scale pilferers are the FOISTS / GARRAs, their similarity having its origins in the main instrument used, the hand. GARRA (Alonso 79) has to do metaphorically with the animal clutch, and FOIST comes from the Dutch *vuistan*, take in the hand (*OED*). The more general LIFT, still in use, and LEVADOR (Alonso 75) are also curiously connected through the use, in both languages, of verbs which imply moving something by raising it.

Most of the characters mentioned worked in town, but the roads and countryside were not free of theft. In England there were HIGH LAWYERS, PADs or PADDERS: "...such as rob on horseback were called high lawyers, and those who robbed on foot, he called padders" (Rid 415), and in Spain DESVALIADORES, LOBOs DE VERDON, and SATIROs (Alonso 81), who would rob travellers and also steal cattle in the cases of the last two. Important hauls were also those obtained by the PRIGMAN or PRIGGER OF PRANCERS and the CUATRO MAYOR, both horse stealers.

With regard to the group of tricksters, it must be said that in Spanish they do not form a group as such, while in English we have to distinguish between thieves and swindlers for two reasons, firstly because the pamphleteers do so, and secondly because, though both types have the same goal (to get other people's money), their methods are different. The common thief uses various instruments to open doors, cut purses, steal through windows, etc., whereas the swindler uses his loquacity and intelligence to cheat "simple people" who do not realize they are being robbed until it is too late. To this group belong the CONY-CATCHERS, a term first applied to card players (Greene 1591:158) and later extended to all sorts of swindlers. Alonso does not make reference to this distinction, though he mentions some specially cunning thieves.

The variety of tricks that those who caught innocent conies developed, gave rise to several designations. Very often the whole trick was the work of a group or pair; such is that of the prostitute or TRAFFIC and her "man", the CROSBITTER. According to Grose CROSBITTING is "entrapping a man so as to obtain money, in which the wife, real or supposed, conspires with the husband".

The RABBIT SUCKER would obtain goods, on credit he would never pay back, and sell them again even to their original owner. His assistants were the TUMBLER and the WARREN, and the person who sold them the merchandise was called FERRET.

The FALCONER pretended to be a writer looking for a Maecenas to whom he had dedicated a pamphlet. In exchange for a nobleman's or any wealthy person's money he would offer immortality with his writings that were never published or even written. The conned person was called TERCEL GENTLE, the false pamphlet LURE, and the money obtained BIRD. The FALCONER also had an assistant, the MONGREL. Another type of conman was the SNAFFLER who introduced himself as a nobleman or ex-soldier, and would get some farmer or innkeeper to lend him money or horses that this PROVENDER would never see again.

The JACK-IN-A-BOX or SHEEP SHEARER used a very complex and clever trick to change money of less or no value for silver, the victim was the poor BLEATER. Similar to this were the Spanish CAMBIADOR and MAREADOR who got "el real y el trueko" (Correas, in Alonso 84-85). Alonso mentions other cunning characters like the ÁGUILA/AGUILUCHO, "ladrones astutos", and the FULLERO, "especializado en hacer trampas a base de hablar mucho, hacer chanzas y decir bromas para despistar al contrario y hacerle perder" (94).

Alonso does not refer to the possible names of the victims, while in English they are also recorded. Most of them took their name from a defenceless animal or from animals that are easily captured and domesticated. Apart from CONY we find in the pamphlets others like: BIRD, BLEATER, FISH, FLOUNDER, GULL and SIMPLER. Nevertheless, we do find in Spanish designations for assistants of the thief, but they do not have specific equivalents in English; some are more general like those related to acting as watchmen (PUNTERO) or helping the thief with the robbed merchandise (e.g.: ALIVIADOR, AZORERO, CESTA), others refer to those that informed the thief about places worthy of their attention (ABISPON, CALETA, HONDEADOR, PILOTO).

The equivalent activities and terms of the English and Spanish underworlds that have been compared so far are summarized in table I.

TABLE I  
EQUIVALENT TERMS FOR THIEVES AND SWINDLERS

ENGLISH	SPANISH
HOOKER, ANGLER, CURBER, FILCHING MORT/COVE	GANCHÓ, GANZÚA, PESCADOR GARABERO
CHARM	LLAVERO DE CERRADURAS, S. PEDRO, COMADREJA
FIGGING BOY	MALETA
CUTPURSE, BUNG NIPPER	CORTABOLSAS, CORTADOR SOBRE PERCHA, BARAHUSTADOR, CAZADOR DE GATOS, RATERO, ARAÑA
FOIST	GARRA
LIFT	LEVADOR
HIGH LAWYER, HIGH PAD/PADDER	LOBO DE GARO, LOBO DE VERDON, DESVALIJADOR
PRIGMAN/PRIGGER OF PRANCERS	CUATRO MAYOR, SÁTIRO
CONY-CATCHER <sup>2</sup>	ÁGUILA, AGUILUCHO, FULLERO
SHEEP-SHEARER/JACK IN A BOX	CAMBIADOR, MAREADOR

It is worth noting that correspondences between the two worlds appear not only in the terms that describe the way in which the robbery is committed. The words used to designate the criminal, and even the theft itself, may be different, but there is a deeper equivalence in the way in which they are conceived metaphorically and metonymically. According to Lakoff and Johnson "the way we think, what we experience, and what we do every day is very much a matter of metaphor"<sup>3</sup>. Metaphors are not only a literary resource, they also help us to

understand our daily experiences and to highlight those aspects we consider relevant, leaving aside others not so important, or even those we do not want to show. Within these metaphors we find **structural metaphors and metonymies**, that are able to structure our actions, our thoughts, and conceptualize the external world, and other "idiosyncratic, unsystematic and isolated" metaphors and metonymies (Lakoff and Johnson 51-55), where the equivalence stated is only between two terms and not between upper concepts from which further "comparisons" can be derived. Our marginal vocabularies, more complex than what they may seem, do not only give evidence of this second type of metaphor. In the lexis dealt with, we find both structural and idiosyncratic metaphors/metonymies. To this latter group belong words like: GANCHÓ, GANZÚA, GARABERO; LLAVERO DE CERRADURAS, SAN PEDRO; MALETA; CORTABOLSAS, CORTADOR SOBRE PERCHA, BARAHUSTADOR; LEVADOR; DESVALIJADOR; CUATRO MAYOR; SÁTIRO; FULLERO; CAMBIADOR, MAREADOR; PUNTERO, ALIVIA-DOR, CESTA, PALANQUÍN, HONDEADOR, PILOTO;

HOOKER, ANGLER, CURBER, FILCHING MORT/COVE; CHARM; FIGGING BOY; CUTPURSE, BUNG NIPPER; LIFT; HIGH LAWYER, HIGH PAD; PRIGGER OF PRANCERS.

Some instances can exemplify this type of equivalence:

– GANCHÓ, GANZÚA and FOIST are metonymies in which the part selected to stand for the whole is the instrument which distinguishes one type of thief from the other.

– SAN PEDRO, LLAVERO DE CERRADURAS, SÁTIRO, the identification is of one to one, through the particular characteristics these individuals share with the designated thieves: St. Peter's keys, or just a key ring, with those of the picklock, and the bucolic settings where satyres appear with the man who steals cattle in the countryside.

– PRIGGER OF PRANCERS and CUATRO MAYOR are more complex forms of metonymy. The first takes the vb. PRIG which meant "ride", and PRANCER, horse (both words have an uncertain origin) to transpose the idea of a simple horseman to a person who steals horses. This metonymy became so deeply-rooted that later Grose in his dictionary would register other terms like "PRIGGER OF CACKLERS, robbers of hens". In the case of CUATRO MAYOR, according to Alonso (273) originally a horse (versus CUATRO MENOR, a donkey), the stolen animal, which is itself named by means of a metonymy taking its four legs, is identified with its thief.

<sup>2</sup> The English term CONY-CATCHER could designate as a generic the specific activities of the TRAFFIC, CROSBITTER, RABBIT SUCKER, FALCONER, SNAFFLER, their respective assistants, and also the JACK IN A BOX or SHEEP SHEARER.

<sup>3</sup> As in Lakoff and Johnson, metonymy here will include the traditional concept of synecdoche, where the part stands for the whole (36).



These are so to speak more "simple" equivalences, in which we find, culturally bound independent metaphors/metonymies as well as some correspondences of images between the two languages; but the structural metaphor is also present. It appears that these marginal groups used systematic metaphors to conceptualize their worlds and at the same time render them impenetrable to others in the societies in which they lived.

If we think about most of the terms mentioned, it can be seen that there is a relation among them; they can be grouped under a main idea or metaphorical concept: STEALING-SWINDLING IS HUNTING. The image of the robber trying to find a victim or a good haul, surrounding it and finally stealing it, can be understood by means of the hunter looking for an important prey, pursuing it and catching it. In Spanish many thieves are named after hunting animals: AGUILUCHO, ARAÑA, COMADREJA, LECHUZA, LOBO,... In English, when talking about swindlers, we usually find a human hunter assisted by an animal, as in falconry or FERRET HUNTING (this was in fact the name the RABBIT SUCKER deceit received), an animal which could be the victim itself: CONY-CATCHER, RABBIT SUCKER/FERRET, FALCONER/TERCEL GENTLE, SHEEP-SHEARER. The idea of representing theft through hunting is very descriptive while at the same time rather concealing, since not knowing exactly what the trick consists of, one is not able to identify the trickster just by the name he is given.

It is interesting to see how the animal hunter is more important in Spanish than in English; in the latter the human hunter is preferred to designate the swindler; only two Spanish terms are similar to the English ones in this respect, the RATERO and CAZADOR DE GATOS. The difference shown by the rest can be justified through the use of dysphemism in Spanish. In this language there is no clear division between stealing and swindling; this lack of distinction implies another way of perceiving the act of stealing. While in Spanish the animal side of the thief is highlighted, in English, at least in what comes to swindlers, what matters is their "human" side, the rationality of the hunter, the form in which he prepares the attack to chase his prey. Therefore, though the main image is the same, each language chooses from among the aspects it offers those that best suit each culture and each experience. This can be illustrated with a pair like FERRET and COMADREJA, they are basically the same image, both animals belong to the species of polecat, but there is an important difference: while the ferret can be half-tamed to drive rabbits from burrows, the *comadreja* or weasel is a wild animal that hunts for its own survival. In cant the FERRET is the cheated person, the one that brings out the prey to be contained in the PURSE NETS (the bag where the rabbit was

trapped), but he does not keep anything for himself. In the case of the COMADREJA, the thief that breaks into houses does it with the same ability as the animal and the booty obtained is for the thief alone. Very similar cases are those of the FALCONER and the AZORERO; in English the most important in the whole con is the hunter, the one who holds the falcon and prepares the lure to attract him. In Spanish the AZORERO is a secondary character, the assistant of the thief, the one who "acompaña y lleva lo que hurta el ladrón" (Alonso 91); whereas the ÁGUILA and AGUILUCHO are described as thieves themselves. The only exception is the CAZADOR DE GATOS, which could be understood as a human hunter; the same is possible with RATERO, though it could be simply a cat. It is also relevant that the dimensions and reputation as a hunter of the animal selected for the metaphor increases according to the booty obtained; the ARAÑA, RATERO, CAZADOR DE GATOS, are cutpurses, the COMADREJA enters houses, the ÁGUILAS and AGUILUCHOS are birds of prey and are, therefore, terms aptly applied to tricksters, while the LOBO looks for travellers and cattle.

The names given to the victims are also meaningful in the English **hunting metaphor**, the CONY, BIRD, PURSE NET, and the BLEATER (the complaining sheep of the SHEEP-SHEARER), are all related to the preys of a hunt.

In table II are summarized the idiosyncratic metaphors and metonymies, and in table III we can see that there are not only lexically equivalent activities in the two underworlds, but also metaphoric and metonymic equivalences in the way their reality was conceptualized.

TABLE II  
METAPHORIC EQUIVALENCES  
ONE TO ONE (IDIOSYNCRATIC) METAPHORS/METONYMIES

- HOOKER,.../ GANZÚA,... > hook --> thief who uses a hook.
- LIFT/LEVADOR > raise, take from a place --> steal.
- FIGGING BOY > pick figs in a tree --> steal from a window.
- MALETA > suitcase --> thief left in a house in a suitcase
- FOIST > hand, take in the hand --> rob, thief.
- GARRA > clutch, to clutch --> thief
- CUTPURSE,..., CORTABOLSAS,... > cutting the purse --> robbing the purse.
- HIGH PAD > highway --> thief who works there.
- PRIGGER > prig --> ride --> thief who steals horses.
- CUATRO MAYOR, MENOR > four legs of a horse, donkey --> thief of horses or donkeys.
- PILOTO > to guide --> assistant that tells the thief where to rob.
- ALIVIADOR, CESTA > help with the weight, container --> assistant of the thief.
- HONDEADOR > to test depth (hondear) --> assistant that sounds places to be robbed.
- PALANQUÍN > stick used to carry weight --> assistant of the thief.
- PUNTERO > to point out danger --> watchman.



TABLE III  
STRUCTURAL METAPHOR:  
*stealing & cheating = hunting*

Human hunter thieves/swindlers	Animal hunter assistants/providers	Animal hunter thieves/swindlers	Prey
CONY CATCHER	—	—	CONY
RABBIT SUCKER	FERRET	—	PURSE NET
SHEEP SHEARER	—	—	BLEATER
FALCONER	TERCEL GENTLE	—	BIRD
CAZADOR DE GATOS	—	—	GATO
RATERO	—	—	RATA
—	—	ÁGUILA, AGUILUCHO	—
—	—	ARAÑA	MOSCA
—	MONGREL	—	—
—	—	COMADREJA	—
—	—	LECHUZA	—
—	—	LOBO	—
—	AZORERO	—	—
—	ABISPÓN	—	—

It is important to realize that the structural metaphor STEALING-SWINDLING = HUNTING does not originate from the marginal vocabularies analysed. In the everyday language of the period, and even today, the pamphleteers use metaphors from this concept in other registers: "GENTLE READER: (...)avoid the damage thereof by knowing their mischievous and most subtle practice in getting a prey to spoil the same" (Walker 1552:29). What the **cant** and **germanías** users did was to enlarge the metaphor making use of its possible entailments, being more specific and less general to achieve the secrecy they were looking for; they brought out what Lakoff and Johnson (1980:53) mention as those subspecies which lie "outside the used part of a metaphorical concept that structures our normal conceptual system". A further enlargement of the conceptual metaphor here dealt with, is that registered by Grose (1811): CATCHING HARVEST, a period of fairs, celebration when robberies were more frequent.

The introduced novelties in **germanías** and **cant** protected their speakers from public knowledge of their actions, and when these "novel metaphors" came from their possible victims they were a means of understanding the unknown. It can thus be seen how the English and Spanish underworlds were a distorted reflexion of that upper world that made the rules they were breaking.

## WORKS CITED

- ALLAN, Keith & Kate Burridge. *Euphemism and Dysphemism: Language Used as Shield and Weapon*. New York: Oxford UP, 1991.
- ALONSO HERNÁNDEZ, José Luis. *El lenguaje de los maleantes españoles de los siglos XVI y XVII: La Germanía*. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 1979.
- AWDELEY, John. *The Fraternity of Vagabonds*. 1561. In Salgado, 59-79.
- AYTO, John. *Bloomsbury Dictionary of Word Origins*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 1990.
- CONY-CATCHER, CUTHBERT (R. Greene?). 1592. *The Defence of Cony-Catching*. In Salgado, 339-379.
- COPLAND, Robert. *The Highway to the Spital-House*. 1535. In Judges, 1-26.
- DEKKER, Thomas. *The Bellman of London*. 1608a. In Judges, 303-312.
- . *Lantern and Candlelight*. 1608b. In Judges, 312-366.
- . *O per se O*. 1612. In Judges, 366-383.
- GREENE, Robert. *A Notable Discovery of Cozenage*. 1591. In Salgado, 155-193.
- . *The Second Part of Cony-Catching*. 1592a. In Salgado, 193-231.
- . *The Third and Last Part of Cony-Catching*. 1592b. In Salgado, 231-265.
- . *A Disputation*. 1592c. In Salgado, 265-371.
- . *The Black Book's Messenger*. 1592d. In Salgado, 317-265.
- GROSE, Francis. *A Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue*. (reprint) Australia: Bibliophile Books, 1811.
- HARMAN, Thomas. *A Caveat for Common Cursitors*. 1566. In Salgado, 79-155.
- HUTTON, Luke. *The Black Dog of Newgate*. 1596. In Judges, 265-292.
- JUDGES, A.V., ed. *The Elizabethan Underworld*. London: George Routledge & Sons, 1930.
- LAKOFF, George and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- MIDDLETON, Thomas. *The Testament of Lawrence Lucifer*. 1604. In Judges, 296-303.
- PARKER, Alexander A. *Los pícaros en la literatura. La novela picaresca en España y Europa*. (1599-1753). Trad. Rodolfo Arévalo Mackny. Madrid: Gredos, 1971.
- RID, Samuel. *Martin Markall, Beadle of Bridewell*. 1610. In Judges, 383-423.
- SALGADO, Gamini, ed. *Cony-Catchers and Bawdy-Baskets*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972.
- SLACK, Paul. *The English Poor Law*. London: MacMillan, 1990.
- WALKER, Gilbert. *A Manifest Detection of Dice-Play*. 1592. In Salgado, 27-59.

# THE POET AND THE BARD

Andrew Monnickendam

Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona

The aim of this paper is to analyze and discuss the impact and importance of Ted Hughes' *Shakespeare and the Goddess of Complete Being*, published in 1992. The book has its own intrinsic interest, the Poet Laureate has decided to write a lengthy study—over five hundred pages—of another national institution: no less than the bard himself. Hughes has decided to be openly anti-academic, by opposing many current theories of culture, as represented by various forms of poststructuralism, and by not bothering to include a bibliography or an index. Hughes's proposal is to trace the formulation and application of a basic mythic pattern which is present in all Shakespeare's work. Biographically, this must strike the reader as somewhat odd, in complete contrast with the voice of *Crow*, for example, which is the voice of dismemberment and separation, most memorably in such poems as *A Childish Prank*, in which the worm is cut up and divided between man and woman<sup>1</sup>. Personally, attempts to find the key to an author's mind remind me of a cartoon I saw as a child. Yogi Bear (or it might have been Huckleberry Finn) wants to join the army. Candidates are given different shaped blocks, circular, rectangular or oval, and have to place them in a board with correspondingly shaped holes. The exercise is completed successfully. However, a rather brutish character, who cannot distinguish the matching shapes and holes, has to force the blocks in. Needless to say, it is the latter who is chosen for the army. In other words, there is inevitably, in such

---

<sup>1</sup> Crow laughed,  
He bit the Worm, God's only son,  
Into two writhing halves.

He stuffed into man the tail half  
With the wounded end hanging out.

He stuffen the head half headfirst into woman  
And it crept in deeper and up  
to peer out through her eyes  
Calling its tail-half to join up quickly, quickly  
Because O it was painful. (Ted Hughes, *Crow*, London: Faber & Faber, 1972).

studies as Hughes's, the odd bit which does not fit in, or does so in a most peculiar way. Hughes, it must be stated, does not believe that Shakespeare's mythic pattern is necessarily premeditated, it is more a case of the pattern asserting itself throughout the length and breadth of Shakespeare's oeuvre. Hughes's insistence on the importance of the mythic plane, he leans heavily on Robert Graves and Northrop Frye, puts to one side several areas of research that have dominated Shakespearean studies for many years. The study of tragic heroes, heroines and their predicament is displaced by the mythic plane; the study of the subversive nature of drama and language suffers the same fate; the source of transgression is now that of mythic patterns establishing their presence. Furthermore, Hughes's approach presupposes a development that culminates in the tragicomedies, particularly in *The Tempest*. In other words, the "Complete Works" are not only complete in the sense of being the high point of English culture, but they are also completed, in the sense of being rounded off. The "Complete Works" possess their own internal logic, which is, Hughes argues, mythologically defined.

Hughes's thesis is based upon an explicit relationship between the poems and the plays. What is identifiable as being problematic in the poems is also present, though in a much more complex and often convoluted form, in the plays. As a methodological strategy, this is highly questionable, but at this point, it is extremely important to say that it is not my intention to adopt a non-committal standpoint. To say that Hughes's hypothesis is leaky but he makes many incisive observations not only is condescending but also irrelevant and ultimately belittling, as if a hypothesis is put forward, it is to be judged as a hypothesis, not as a hotchpotch of comments of varying validity. Hughes argues that Shakespeare's works have a template, the tragic equation, on one side of which we have *Venus and Adonis* and on the other *The Rape of Lucrece*. *Venus and Adonis*, in any version, is a tale of desire which culminates in the death of the male and the sorrow of the female. Initially, Shakespeare follows an erotic pattern:

...she cannot choose but love;  
And by her fair immortal hand she swears  
From his soft bosom never to remove  
Till he take truce with her contending tears...  
(79-82)

However, this particular Adonis is plain hard to get, and the more Venus desires him, the less he responds. Consequently, he is accused by Venus of being Narcissus (157-162). Adonis is killed the next day by the wound in his thigh

caused by the raging boar, leaving Venus to weep over his body and carry off in her bosom the metamorphosed flower. Hughes points out that this is the only version of the myth in which love is not culminated: Venus weeps over the body of a virgin, not a lover. Such a situation makes the identification of the boar futile: there is no way of determining whether it follows one mythic pattern, the boar is the jealous lover Mars, or whether it follows the other, it is Persephone, come from the underworld. Adonis had rejected Venus' advances on the grounds of morality.

Call it not love, for Love to heaven is fled  
Since sweating lust on earth usurp'd his name...  
(792-793)

Love comforteth like sunshine after the rain,  
But Lust's effect is tempest after sun;  
Love's gentle spring doth always fresh remain,  
Lust's winter comes ere summer half be done.  
Love surfeits not: Lust like a glutton dies.  
Love is all truth: Lust full of forged lies.  
(799-804)

Adonis sought some kind of perfection which the pleasures of the body alone cannot satisfy, as these are simply "Lust". Adonis rejects the female and strives after an ideal which sanctifies pleasure within an institution, which presumably is another way of saying marriage, an institution which is not subject to the fate which Venus foresees, "Sorrow on love hereafter shall attend/ It shall be waited on with jealousy", etc.

The second element of the equation can be found in *The Rape of Lucrece* (the poem was called *Lucrece* until the Q6 version, which, coincidentally, is the first time that Shakespeare's name appears on the title-page). The story is simple. Some Roman generals wonder what their wives are up to when they are away on campaign. They make a lightening visit to the city where only Lucrece is virtuously spinning with her maids. The sight of the virtuous Lucrece serves only to excite the lust of Tarquin, who will rape her. She in turn, exposes his crimes to the generals, before committing suicide. Hughes illustrates the extraordinary symmetry between the two poems, in their language, plot, moral, in almost everything, which makes their dedication to the Earl of Southampton even more perplexing. Lucrece is indeed a model, she is "This earthly saint, adored by this devil". (85) Adonis's predictions about the consequences of lust are fulfilled:

For with the nightly linen that she wears  
 He pens her piteous clamours in her head,  
 Cooling his hot face in the chastest tears  
 That ever modest eyes with sorrow shed.  
 O, that prone lust should stain so pure a bed!  
 The spots thereof could weeping purify,  
 Her tears should drop on them perpetually.  
 But she hath lost a dearer thing than life,  
 And he hath won what he would lose again.  
 This forced league doth force a further strife,  
 This momentary joy breeds months of pain,  
 This hot desire converts to cold disdain;  
 Pure chastity is rifled of her store,  
 And Lust, the thief, far poorer than before.

(680-693)

Although the moralistic tone of this extract, with its wonderfully evocative detail of "the nightly linen" and its domestic setting of the bedchamber seem a world apart from the mythical world of Venus, it is clear that both Adonis and Lucrece (and the poem's narrative voice) base their respective defence on the same concept: chastity, whether it is inside or outside marriage. In other words, what really matters is marriage. I would argue that what Hughes identifies are precisely those concerns which Milton takes up both in *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* and *Paradise Lost*: what consumes Adam and Eve is lust, whereas fully satisfying physical pleasure can only be obtained, or perhaps glimpsed, in marriage. Tarquin succeeds where Satan fails.

However much chastity is of prime importance in both poems, Hughes defines *Venus and Adonis* as the myth of Catholicism, and *The Rape of Lucrece* as the myth of Protestantism/Puritanism<sup>2</sup>. The end of the former, the mother holding the body of the youth is very much that of a *pietà*, that of the *mater dolorosa*. On the other hand, in the latter, the consequence of the act leads to a tremendous feeling of guilt in the mind of the victim herself, who comes to believe that as she has dishonoured her husband and her marriage; she must die, for "she hath lost a dearer thing than life". We have encountered the language and ideas of *Leviticus* as taken up by Calvinism.

Lucrece verbally assaults Tarquin (as if from the pulpit) with a list of his sins: he is guilty not just of "murder ... theft ... perjury ... subornation ... treason ... forgery ... shift ... incest ..." but also of "... all sins past and all that are to

<sup>2</sup> The distinction is not always made that clear.

come" (923). The destiny, primarily of the tragic hero, but finally, one presumes, that of all men, is to have to face the terrible proposition either of constructing an image of woman as "the Puritan Lucrece figure, idealized, moralized and chaste" (Hughes 161) with the inevitable result that such a person exists only in the imagination and never in the flesh, as Adonis's death demonstrates, or as a result of this fruitless search man becomes a Tarquin, burning with rage, fury and frustration. There really is little hope for man as the construct(s) which he has to live with provide no "home sweet home" or even basic shelter. The only remaining possibility is to reject woman altogether; something which is impracticable for most men and will lead to the extinction of the human race. Therefore even though the two sides of the equation contain different constituents, Adonis is not Tarquin, Hughes argues that the tragic hero often switches between these irreconcilable figures. In other words it is as crucial to understand how the equation works as it is to realise that there is no other alternative to it.

The consequences of Hughes's analysis are far-reaching. Perhaps what most immediately springs to mind is that his hypothesis explains the misogyny that is most striking in the Sonnets, woman is dark, devilish, from the underworld, but pervades the tragedies: Goneril and Regan accompany Lady Macbeth, but Desdemona and Cordelia die, somewhat silently. Yet, we must go farther than Hughes does here. If he emphasises the centrality of Shakespeare, possibly the only untouchable canonical writer, it must ineluctably follow that cultural history, as exemplified by both literature and criticism, has reworked the Shakespearean model, the tragic equation, relentlessly. Thus, to take up the link with Milton, perhaps the association of madwomen in the attic and the Brontë's, which originates in readings of Milton, his daughters and *Paradise Lost*, stops short, as Milton reworks those very same problems that lie at the centre of *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece*. Consequently, if we accept Jonathan Bates's thesis that the Romantics are haunted both by the presence of Shakespeare and Milton, then surely we have to go beyond the idea that this influence is primarily aesthetic.

In this section of my paper, I will not enter into a detailed analysis of how we can apply the tragic equation to Shakespearean drama. One reason is practical: it would take too long. Another relates to my earlier remark, that is to say that in pinning down areas where the hypothesis is more or less convincing, we run the risk of saying there are insights, but little else. I will set the process in motion, and allow the reader to see and judge how far the application of the tragic equation is useful. The equation comes into effect after *All's Well that Ends Well*, "...the last play that is free from sexual disgust and it immediately

precedes plays that are overwhelmed with a horror of sexual disease" (Hughes 121) Most conspicuous of these is *Measure of Measure* where this "horror" infects all sectors of society, whether we direct our attention to the court or the stews of Mistress Overdone. This play clearly shows how the tragic equation functions. Angelo's strictures on morality lead him to punish those who do not share his vision of the "Puritan, Lucrece figure, idealized, moralized and chaste" (Hughes 161) with the death penalty, but when he sees his Lucrece he goes berserk with desire. It is just one of life's little ironies that the woman he possesses is not Isabella after all. Othello is another case of a rapid change from Adonis to Tarquin. His goddess, Desdemona is at first chaste, but the only whiteness she retains is the monumental alabaster of death, as Iago rapidly, and easily, converts him into Tarquin. Hamlet's preoccupations stem from his having an Adonis complex, making the question of whether or not he has had carnal knowledge of Ophelia secondary. If he has, she no longer forms part of his idealized vision, if he hasn't, they are a result of his seeing all women as corrupt and irredeemable as he would like us to believe his mother is.

If the poems, tragedies and bitter comedies demonstrate the validity of the tragic equation, then that leaves us with the problem of dealing with the tragicomedies. There is a critical consensus that there is something different about them, something which distinguishes them from the previous plays. Within Hughes's analysis, this difference stems from the foregrounding of the mythic plane at the expense of the human, or tragic plane. Hughes points out there are several indications in the tragedies themselves that this is going to happen. The first of them, questionable in my opinion, is the image of "pity, the new-born babe" in the first act of *Macbeth*, the second, at the end of *Coriolanus*, where a woman, Volumnia, survives, and finally, most significantly of all, is the healing nature of Cleopatra's love, contrasted with the arid lifestyle of imperial Rome.

At the end of *Venus and Adonis*, Venus picks up "A purple flow'r, check'ed with white" (1168) and places it on her bosom<sup>3</sup>; the myth will now transform itself into that of miraculous growth, rebirth or resurrection. On the tragic plane, the interaction of both sides of the equation prohibits not only rebirth, but its prerequisite: the presence of women. In other words, what we are now seeing is that Cordelia, or more precisely her disciples, the healers, the women of the heart, will now play a significant role that previously their immanent death precluded. Hughes evaluates the presence of flowers and flower imagery before tackling *The Tempest* at great length. This situation is just as foreseeable as it is logical. Not only has Hughes articulated a theory of the complete works, which

<sup>3</sup> It also appear on Imogen's breast, Hughes asserts.

includes an assessment of Prospero's magic, but also *The Tempest*, in its masque, has recreated, through magic, a new world. Hughes insists on the importance of the vision in spite of the irony of Miranda's placement of "the brave new world" and the fact the masque is interrupted by those very elements that Prospero wants to exclude. Hughes characterises Prospero's insistence on chastity as the putting into practice of the Lucrece ideal, possible only on the island, where Miranda has seen or met no other woman. The scenario is perfect, the music is perfect, Prospero is in complete control until Caliban, boar-like [sic], and his followers interrupt the ceremony. This, coupled to Prospero's abjuration of his magic, seems to make a mockery of his vision, that is to say accentuating its baselessness. In other words, the Puritan vision cannot even work in an abstract form or impose its symbolic order on the mythical island. Hughes claims that while it is true that Prospero recognises "this thing of darkness", at the same time it is certain that darkness is externalised and thus separated in the form of Caliban. Hughes suggests something that to me is crystal clear, which is that Caliban is black, perhaps both metaphorically and physically, and is thus a descendant not just of Sycorax but also of Othello, and more significantly, of that pure black thoroughbred Aaron. It is exactly at this point, that Hughes's hypothesis could be taken that one step farther. That is to say, Prospero's vision of purity reveals its inbred inconsistency in this attempt at externalisation. In other words, however much the physical presence of Caliban is left behind on the island, its semiotic power as a sign of violence, blackness, night, all that which Lucrece describes as an abomination, remains inside the Puritan psyche. Hughes also argues that the mythic plane, as it is a paradigm of male resurrection brought about through the medium of the healing quality of women, demonstrates reconciliation and completeness:

In fact it seems obvious that he deliberately turns the flame off from the source, from Adonis's agonized death-rebirth into Tarquin, and subjects the burnt, suffering hero to the healing light from the other source, the death-rebirth illumination of the Female who is also the soul.

(Hughes 487)

Perhaps we are going round in circles, but however much this interpretation can be successfully applied to *Pericles* and *The Winter's Tale*, it has little to do with *The Tempest*, which, it could be maintained, casts doubt upon the "elimination of the Female", a sex, it has to be admitted, practically absent from *The Tempest*.

At this point, after this appraisal of Hughes's work, I would like now to describe what I consider its achievements before moving on to its shortcomings. Whether or not there is any correspondence between Prospero and Ted Hughes,

after all, he was born in 1930, is academic. What I find particularly interesting is this return to the religious and political conflicts of the early seventeenth century, which goes some way towards confirmation of the thesis that the events of that period form the basis of British culture and consciousness, both as regards the concept of the individual and of nationality. Hughes makes many perceptive points about the religious conflicts within and outside Shakespeare's drama, but I simply do not feel that he takes his conclusions far enough. For example, in the earlier chapters he emphasises the importance of Neo-Platonism, of the Hermetic mystery, but drops the subject. I would like to take up the Catholic/Protestant confrontation which forms the basis of the two complementary myths. Hughes contextualises the situation by pointing out Shakespeare's apparent allegiance for a strong central state, a circumstance which, to a certain extent, turns the Roman plays into a continuation of the history plays, by placing the Virgin Queen at the centre of action as the only force that is strong enough to hold the warring factions apart. The succession of James to the throne would therefore account for the reiteration of this "strong government" in the closing lines of *Macbeth*. Hughes goes on to highlight a most obvious, though often neglected point: that Rome, in the time and climate of the Reformation is primarily the Rome of corrupt Catholicism. However intriguing this makes the Roman plays, it also makes Shakespeare's own beliefs even more inaccessible than before. What are we to make, for example, of Coriolanus' defeat at the hands of his mother? What are the implications of the assassination of dictatorial Julius Caesar? How would an audience react to the civil war caused by his death? If we accept the seminal/germinal nature of *The Rape of Lucrece*, what does her rape imply? Lurking behind all these questions, one certainty can be encountered, the fear of civil war brought about by religious strife.

I would like now to combine these considerations with a series of observations made by Eagleton, Michael Bristol and myself: they all concern *Hamlet*. Now the strangest thing about the play is its undying popularity. What makes five hour drama so enthralling for a modern audience? Eagleton believes that the answer can be found in the nature of Hamlet's alienation, which is somehow modern(ist).

...the resultant 'decentring' of his identity satirically questions the violent closure of bourgeois individualism as much as that of Claudius' court... the individualist conception of the self will itself enter into crisis. This is why many commentators have discerned something peculiarly 'modernist' in Hamlet... he stands at the tentative beginnings of a history which may now... be drawing to a close.

(Eagleton 75)

Hamlet is thus the first modern hero, or perhaps more momentously, the first anti-hero, unable to fit in anywhere. From a different tack, Michael Bristol defines Claudius and his court as medieval. They disclose a Carnavalesque zest for excess, for the body, for eating, drinking and fornicating, especially during a period of mourning. Claudius, as Lord of Misrule, cannot understand Hamlet's reticence and so scolds him for behaving like a spoilt child. It is perfectly feasible to draw together Hughes, Eagleton and Bristol if we return to the question of religion. Laertes, it should be remembered, is educated in Paris, Hamlet in Wittenburg. Wittenburg lies at the centre of the Reformation, and not for nothing is it still called Lutherstadt. Paris, might not be Rome, but for many Europeans it was the city of decadence and licence, the Babylon of northern Europe. The conflict between Hamlet and his uncle can be seen as generational, the medieval Claudius unable to maintain power in the Reformation age, it can be interpreted as a fable of the struggle that would become the Thirty Years War, yet it can escape no one's attention that the day finally belongs to the aptly named Fortinbras, who, will appear, if we use our imagination, just a few years later in the figure of Gustavus Adolphus. Thus, in line with Hughes' analysis, the individualism Eagleton identifies is Protestantism, which explains succinctly why Hamlet cannot accept Ophelia as a woman: she does not match up to his vision of the perfect woman that the Protestant Adonis-cum-Tarquin constructs. If we regard Hamlet as a hero, then he is not of the type that we can find in epic poems of national glorification, but closer to that more contemporary phenomenon, the novel.

If there is one major theme that Hughes has left virtually untouched, it is that of sexual difference. The fact that Hughes uses the poems as the basis of his hypothesis combined with the fact that he himself is a poet might be nothing more than a coincidence, but clearly one of the major achievements of modern criticism is a reaction against the heavily Romantic emphasis on Shakespeare as primarily a poet. Prospero, from this angle, says goodbye to poetry in the most highly poetical of styles. Keats' reading of *King Lear* is just that, a reading, after all, the poem is called *On Sitting Down to Read "King Lear" Once Again*; it is the poet talking to the poet. Whether Hughes is more inclined towards Shakespeare the poet than Shakespeare the dramatist is open to question, but the fact remains that Hughes insists that what is described in the poems, and particularly in the *Sonnets* is then transferred to the plays; this is an attempt at defining a hierarchical relationship. Furthermore, Hughes's analysis of the *Sonnets* contains one fatal flaw. Hughes comments that "a modern reader... will naturally ask how far this extravagant declaration of love is a literary convention" (Hughes 58). He replies that it is not just a convention, adding that

the Shakespeare's declarations are "total, unconditional, self-sacrificial..." (Hughes 60). However much "private pain" (Hughes 60) there is, Hughes then goes on to analyze the Dark Lady sonnets. In a way, this predicts his strategy of interpreting the role of the Goddess in the plays, yet we cannot fail to see that there is considerable inconsistency here. There is an Adonis figure in the poems, there is a dark Venus here, but the affections that are painful are not solely heterosexual but homosexual. This is the subject that Hughes does not develop, yet, he has given himself plenty of scope to do so. Right at the beginning of his study he states categorically:

In the Adonis myth, this fatal double emerged as Mars, Aphrodite's jealous lover, who took on the form of a wild boar and killed Adonis. So it comes about that the two versions of Adonis's death exist side by side. In the first, he is killed by Persephone in the form of a boar. In the second, he is killed by the one who will replace him - in the form of a boar. In other words, the boar is simultaneously the Queen of the Underworld in her enraged animal form, and Adonis's usurping double, a murderous martial warrior in enraged animal form.

(Hughes 8)

A radical change is brought about if the question of the double identity is analyzed. It sheds light on the problem of interpreting the sonnets as well as the plays, where sexual ambiguity plays a prominent part, for example, in the various amorous relationships, whether factual or imagined, in *Othello*. Neither should it be forgotten that women's roles were not played by women until Restoration times. Two years ago, Vita Fortunati gave us a very informative and stimulation lecture on the subject. Finally, Hughes himself stresses that Shakespeare's source for *Venus and Adonis* was presumably Ovid. *The Metamorphoses* is undeniably the epitome of ambivalence.

In reaching a conclusion in a paper of this sort, it is difficult to avoid a schoolmasterish attitude by saying "satisfactory, but could have done better", but that lies in the nature of any assessment.

#### WORKS CITED

- BATE, Jonathan. *Shakespeare and English Romantic Imagination*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- BRISTOL, Michael. *Carnival and Theater: Plebeian Culture and the Structure of Authority in Renaissance England*. London: Routledge, 1989.
- EAGLETON, Terry. *William Shakespeare*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1986.
- HUGHES, Ted. *Shakespeare and the Goddess of Complete Being*. London: Faber & Faber, 1992.

## NORTHROP FRYE'S CRITICAL APPROACH TO SHAKESPEARE'S LAST PLAYS

Sofía Muñoz Valdivieso  
Universidad de Málaga

... We are such stuff  
As dreams are made on

Northrop Frye's analysis of Shakespeare's last plays, the so-called romances, must be seen in the context of his theory of comedy as it is presented in "The Argument of Comedy" (1949), *Anatomy of Criticism* (1957), and, most importantly, in *A Natural Perspective. The Development of Shakespearean Comedy and Romance* (1965)<sup>1</sup>. Frye's critical thought is inherently schematic, and his approach to literary works is fundamentally a search for patterns and overall structures. Thus, although he knows that "each play of Shakespeare is a world in itself, so complete and satisfying a world that it is easy, delightful, and profitable to get lost in it" (Frye 1965a: viii), Frye chooses to view the comedies, as he himself indicates in the preface to *A Natural Perspective*, "from a middle distance, considering [them] as a single group unified by recurring images and structural devices" (Frye 1965a: viii). He approaches the individual plays as unified structures which relate to other similar structures and constitute what he calls the *mythos* of comedy. His purpose, then, is to lead the reader

from the characteristics of the individual play, the vividness of the characterization, the texture of imagery and the like, to consider what kind of a form comedy is, and what its place is in literature.

(Frye 1965a: viii)

The rationale behind Frye's critical approach to Shakespeare's comedies and romances is as usual articulated in the spatial metaphor of distance. In a crucial passage of *Anatomy of Criticism* (1957) he had justified his method in a famous extended simile, in which he compared the task of criticism to the contemplation of a painting: the minute rhetorical analysis of the New Critics would be like

<sup>1</sup> References to Shakespearean romance, especially *The Tempst*, can be found in other work by Frye. See in particular, *Northrop Frye on Shakespeare, The Secular Scripture* and "Romance as Masque".

standing close to the canvas to "analyse the details of brush work and palette knife" (Frye 1957:140), while his own approach would be like "standing back" from the painting in order to see its overall design. In *A Natural Perspective* (1965) Frye looks at Shakespeare's plays from a "middle distance", and thus envisions the main thesis of the book, his belief that "the four romances are the inevitable and genuine culmination of the poet's achievement" (Frye 1965a: viii). The same spatial metaphor of "middle distance" guides my argument in discussing his approach to Shakespearean romance. Thus what he claims to be true for literary works is also true of his own critical works: when we read them, when we look at them "the further back we go, the more conscious we are of the organizing design" (Frye 1957:140). Therefore, if we "stand back" from Frye's analysis of Shakespeare's romances, if we leave the details of brush work and palette knife aside, its design becomes visible, and it clearly emerges as one more particular instance of the central *mythos* of his criticism. Echoing Frye's own words, I could say that my purpose in discussing his approach to Shakespearean romance is to lead the reader from the characteristics of the individual critical comments, the vividness of the characterization, the texture of imagery and the like, to consider what kind of a form Frye's criticism of Shakespearean romance is, and what its place is in his overall critical theory.

Northrop Frye is best known as the author of *Anatomy of Criticism* (1957), a book in which he made an important attempt to present a comprehensive and systematic theory of literature, and insisted that criticism was a structure of thought and knowledge existing on its own right. *Anatomy of Criticism* put Northrop Frye at the center of crucial critical discussions for over a decade, and still remains for some readers the most comprehensive theoretical work in criticism since Aristotle<sup>2</sup>. In it Frye envisions four types of imaginative experience which articulate themselves in literature in four major genres: comedy, romance, tragedy and irony. For Frye, "the mythical backbone of all literature is the cycle of nature, which rolls from birth to death and back again to rebirth" (Frye 1965a:119), and he conceives of the genres as forming a cycle that reproduces the natural rhythm of the seasons. Those which dramatize a downward movement towards winter and death are tragic or ironic; those that represent an upward movement towards spring and rebirth are comic. In Frye's view, "tragedy is really implicit or uncompleted comedy [given that] comedy

2 Like all major figures in the world of criticism, Frye has provoked varied reactions among colleagues, and the responses run the whole gamut from those who see him as "the most influential critic writing in English since the 1950s" (Grady 21), to those who dismiss his criticism as irrelevant or even pernicious.

contains a potential tragedy within itself". He manages thus to make comedy the more capacious form, "because it points beyond death to intimate the cycle's fullness" (Danson 232).

Frye's concept of comedy has been so influential that some Shakespearean critics speak of pre- and post-Frye criticism of the comedies. Indeed, Lawrence Danson refers to Frye's theory of comedy as "the single most important impetus" in the attempt by twentieth-century critics to "invent or rediscover a point of view that can take Shakespeare's comedy seriously but on its own, not tragedy's terms." Frye's work is thus seen as the most important attempt "to rediscover the genre of comedy itself" (Danson 231). Although not all critics would agree with Graham Hough that "Frye's brilliant theory of comedy does what the *Poetics* did for tragedy at the beginning of our literary history" (Hough 85), Frye's postulates must be reckoned with even by those who explicitly claim they are of no use. Writing a review of Shakespearean criticism of the comedies in the seventies, Wayne A. Rebhorn entitled his essay "After Frye", for he found that "Frye's approach to the comedies is the inevitable starting point for all subsequent criticism which amounts to anything at all" (Rebhorn 555). Around the same time, another article reviewing Shakespearean critics of comedy and romance from 1957 indicated that "they all respond to Frye's theories about comedy" (Merrill 475). In fact, we could say of his theory of comedy what has been said of his work as a whole, ie, that "to posit Frye's influence on any English-speaking critic or work of criticism that postdates him is to hazard little" (Polansky 228).

Frye's concept of comedy centers around the idea of identity; for him, the basic impulse in comedy is "a drive toward identity" (Frye 118) in one of its three forms:

There is plural or social identity, when a new social group crystallizes around the marriage of the hero and the heroine in the final moments of the comedy. There is dual or erotic identity, when the hero and heroine get married. And there is individual identity, when a character comes to know himself in a way that he did not before.

(Frye 1967:15-16)

The structure of the Elizabethan comedy typically derives from Greek New Comedy, in which the main theme is a love story: a young man falls in love with a young woman, and has to overcome various blocking characters to finally possess the object of his desire. Shakespeare's comedy, Frye indicates, begins in a normal world, but moves into a "green" world, and before returning



to the normal world, it goes into a metamorphosis in which the comic resolution is achieved.

In the opening lines of *A Natural Perspective*, Frye classifies critics in two groups depending on their instinctive preference for tragedy and irony, or for comedy and romance. He calls them *Iliad* and *Odyssean* critics, respectively, and immediately remarks that he has "always been temperamentally an *Odyssean* critic... attracted to comedy and romance" (Frye 1965a:2). He is aware that he is in a minority, "in a somewhat furtive and anonymous group who have not much of a theory, implicit or explicit to hold it together" (Frye 1965a: 2). In fact, in the history of criticism "there has prevailed a more or less tacit assumption that dictates that the "serious" critic should work primarily on texts partaking of what Matthew Arnold called high seriousness" (Hamilton 52). Implicitly in *Anatomy of Criticism*, in which tragedy and comedy were given equal importance, and explicitly in *A Natural Perspective*, "Frye defends the serious value of comedy because of its particular closeness to myth" (Rebhorn 553), although he is fully aware that we live in an ironic age.

The Elizabethans never used the term "romance" to refer to any of Shakespeare's plays, and the editors of the first Folio classified *Cymbeline* as a tragedy and *The Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest* as comedies – *Pericles* was not even included in it. Modern critics have labelled these plays romances, given the thematic and episodic similarities between them and medieval and Renaissance romance. Shakespearean romance often includes

the separation and disruption of families, followed by their eventual reunion and reconciliation; scenes of apparent resurrection; the love of a virtuous young hero and heroine; and the recovery of lost royal children.  
(Wells 1971)

In *A Natural Perspective* Frye sees Shakespeare's romances within the same general movement as the comedies, and views them as the logical consequence of Shakespeare's technical interest in the structure of drama. The romances give us "drama within drama, a kind of ultimate confrontation of a human community with an artistic realization of itself... [In them] the action cannot be lifelike: it can only be archetypal" (Frye 1965a:32). Frye finds a tendency toward romance in the movement from early to late Shakespeare, and concludes that "the turn to romance in Shakespeare's last phase represents a genuine culmination". He is not suggesting, he insists, that "the romances are better or greater plays than the tragedies"; he simply means that "there is a logical evolution toward romance in Shakespeare's work, and consequently no anticlimax, whether technical or

spiritual, in passing from *King Lear* to *Pericles* to *The Tempest*" (Frye 1965a:7). Frye's view of the romances fits in with his own interest in myth, archetype, ritual and dream. For Frye, literary works are displaced myths, and the simple, more conventionalized works are closer to the original myths. It is not surprising therefore that Frye should see in Shakespeare's romances the culmination of his career, because in them the poet is "trying to capture the primitive and popular basis of drama", and this attempt leads to "a close affinity between romances and the most primitive (and therefore most enduring) forms of drama, like the puppet show" (Frye 1986:154-55).

We must see this view of Shakespeare's last plays, then, in the context of Frye's recovery of the romance as a serious literary genre. When *Anatomy of Criticism* appeared, the critical scene was for the most part dominated by the close readings of the New Critics, always in search of ambiguity and paradox. The simplicity of a naive genre like romance was not appreciated in that ironic age. Frye rescued the endangered genre of romance in the best romantic manner, using the sharp edge of his rhetoric and the involving mantle of his all-embracing visionary system. In the first essay of *Anatomy of Criticism*, Frye envisions the history of Western literature as descending from "myth" through "romance" to "high mimetic", "low mimetic" and "irony", which roughly correspond in conventional historical periods to the classical, medieval, Renaissance, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and modern period. Frye's idiosyncratic chronology seems to present literary history as "a process of disintegration or displacement away from the natural integrity and univocality of myth toward the self-conscious distancing and discontinuity of irony" (Felperin 62). As a genre, romance is, in its neglect of realism, close to the wish-fulfillment sphere in which literature, in Frye's view, most genuinely belongs; romance furthermore articulates itself around the quest-myth which Frye sees at the core of human nature. At one point in his career, Frye even suggested that part of the critic's business was "to show how all literary genres are derived from the quest-myth" (Frye 1963b:17).

With the possible exception of *The Tempest*, the romances are among the least frequently performed plays of Shakespeare. (When *Pericles*, for instance, was recently staged in Great Britain in 1990, this was its first performance in thirty years.) For Frye, however, the romances are the plays in which the dramatic experience itself is at its strongest, precisely because the dramatic construct has been reduced to great simplicity and directness. Even though the stories are governed by desire rather than by logic or reference to the real, "we surrender ourselves to the story and accept its conventions" (Frye 1965a:10). We resemble Miranda in *The Tempest*; we are like "a child listening to a story,

too spellbound to question the narrative logic" (Frye 1976a:51). While comedy remains within the cycle of nature, romance transcends it as the hero and heroine transcend tragedy and death:

The romance differs from comedy in that the concluding scene of a comedy is intensely social. The emphasis is thrown on the reintegrated community; there are multiple marriages, and the blocking characters are reconciled or have been, like Shylock previously excluded. In the four comic romances there are glimpses of something beyond this, something closer to the imagery of pastoral, a vision of a reconciliation of man with nature, in which the characters are individualized against nature, like Adam and Eve in the solitary society of Eden.

(Frye 1976b:177)

In his approach to Shakespeare's romances, Frye has been called "visionary" (an adjective which is really most appropriate to define his criticism), because for him the romances take us from reality to illusion, but the kind of illusion embodied in art, which is in fact more genuinely "real" than the physical world that surrounds us. As he significantly says in *The Educated Imagination*, "the ideal world that our imaginations develop inside us looks like a dream... but it isn't. It is the real world, the real form of human society hidden behind the one we see" (Frye 1964:152)<sup>3</sup>.

Comedy for Frye deals with what we want and has much to do with the world of dreams and hopes and wishes. The more romantic the comedy, the more closely the society reached at the end approximates the upper level of nature. We could say that for Frye a romance is a comic structure taken one step further, because the integration of the characters at the end implies transplantation to a higher sphere. The romances offer at the end a paradise where spring and autumn exist together, and we emerge from them

into a recognition of a transcendental nature that we could not know other than by the symbols of art... The romances can take us... beyond tragedy and into the participation in a higher order of reality that all men desire.

(Sanders, 9)

3 Frye's conviction that only this ideal world deserves to be called real was poignantly stressed at the time he was writing *A Natural Perspective*. This study was in its original version a series of lectures he delivered at Columbia University in November, 1963, exactly the same week that President Kennedy was assassinated. In the published version of the lectures there is no reference to the assassination, but it affected him deeply. As he reflected a few weeks later, "A world in which the Presidency of the United States can be changed by one psychotic with a rifle is not real enough for an intelligent person to want to live in". (Ayre, 295).

Literature for Frye gives us an experience that stretches us vertically to the heights and depths of what the human mind can conceive. In the case of Shakespeare's work, "the world of higher nature which romance approaches is... a world not of time but of fulfillment of time, the kind of fulfillment traditionally symbolised by the perpetual spring of paradise" (Frye 1965b:57). For Frye, the framework of all literature is the story of the loss and regaining of identity embodied in the "divine comedy" of the Bible, in which man loses the tree and water of life at the beginning of Genesis and recovers them at the end of Revelation. The stories presented in romance are secular versions of the history of man's salvation; they represent our quest as human beings for individual and social fulfillment. Given thus the central role played by romance in Frye's visionary critical system, it is only appropriate that he should have considered Shakespeare's romances as the culmination of the poet's career.

#### WORKS CITED

- AYRE, John. *Northrop Frye. A Biography*. Toronto: Random House, 1989.
- DANSON, Lawrence. "Twentieth-Century Shakespeare Criticism: The Comedies". *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare Studies*. Ed. Stanley Wells (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).
- FELPERIN, Howard. "Romance and Romanticism: Some Reflections on *The Tempest* and *Heart of Darkness*, Or when is Romance No Longer Romance?" *Shakespeare's Romances Reconsidered*. Eds. Carol McGinnis Kay and Henry E. Jacobs. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1978.
- FRYE, Northrop. "The Argument of Comedy" *English Institute Essays: 1949*. Ed. D.A. Robertson, Jr. New York: Columbia University Press, 1949.
- . *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1957.
- . *The Educated Imagination*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1963a.
- . *Fables of Identity. Studies in Poetic Mythology*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1963b.
- . *A Natural Perspective. The Development of Shakespearean Comedy and Romance* New York: Columbia University Press, 1965a.
- . "Nature and Nothing". *Essays on Shakespeare* ed G.W. Chapman. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1965b.
- . *Fools of Time: Studies in Shakespearean Tragedy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967.
- . *The Secular Scripture. A Study of the Structure of Romance* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1976a).
- . *Spiritus Mundi: Essays on Literature, Myth and Society*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1976b.

- . "Romance as Masque". *Shakespeare's Romances Reconsidered*. Eds. Carol McGinnis Kay and Henry E. Jacobs. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1978.
- . *Northrop Frye on Shakespeare*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.
- GRADY, Wayne. "The Educated Imagination of Northrop Frye". *Saturday Night* 96 (October 1981): 19-24.
- HAMILTON, A.C. *Northrop Frye. Anatomy of his Criticism*. University of Toronto Press, 1990.
- HOUGH, Graham. *An Essay on Criticism*. London: Duckworth, 1966.
- MERRILL, Robert. "The Generic Approach in Recent Criticism of Shakespeare's Comedies and Romances: A Review Essay" *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 20 (Fall 1978): 474-87.
- POLANSKY, Steve. "A Family Romance-Northrop Frye and Harold Bloom: A Study of Critical Influence", *Boundary* 2, 9 (Winter 1981): 226-45.
- REBHORN, Wayne A. "After Frye: A Review-Article on the Interpretation of Shakespearean Comedy and Romance" *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 21 (Winter 1979): 553-82.
- SANDERS, Norman. "An Overview of Critical Approaches to the Romances". *Shakespeare's Romances Reconsidered*. Eds. Carol McGinnis Kay and Henry E. Jacobs. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1978.
- WELLS, Stanley. "Shakespeare and Romance". *Shakespeare's Later Comedies*. Ed. D.J. Palmer. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971.

## REDEFINING CHARACTERS IN TRANSLATION: A CASE

Ana M<sup>a</sup> Murillo Murillo  
Zaragoza

This paper focuses on the process of translation of the characters in *The Spanish Jilt*, the English translation carried out by Captain John Stevens of the Spanish novel *La Pícaro Justina* in 1707. Captain Stevens' accomplished his translation by suppressing and changing many elements of this Spanish novel, and by adding others; as a consequence of this, *The Spanish Jilt* turns out to be rather different from its original.

As A. Lefevere asserts,

translation is, of course, a rewriting of an original text. All rewritings, whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and a poetics and as such manipulate literature to function in a given society in a given way. Rewriting is manipulation<sup>1</sup>.

and Captain Stevens' translation of *La Pícaro Justina* certainly is, as he clearly states in the preface to the book:

The Country Jilt, in Spanish, call'd La Picara Justina, is not a Translation, but rather an Extract of all that is Diverting and good in the original, which is swell'd up with so much Cant and Reflection...<sup>2</sup>

The treatment the characters undergo is not very different from that of the translated text. The most outstanding features as far as characters are concerned are reduction, simplification and forwardness. On one hand we shall study the giving of a collective identity to individual members of a group, the blending and the suppression of characters; and on the other, the free rendering of the names, nicknames and epithets that characterize them, which have different connotations in English that suggest a certain kind of behaviour, and then

1 Lefevere, A., *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London: Routledge, 1992. Preface, p. 7.

2 J. Stevens, *The Spanish Jilt*, in *The Spanish Libertines: The Spanish Jilt, The Bawd of Madrid, Estevanillo Gonzales and An Evenings Intrigue*. (London: Printed for Samuel Bunchley, 1707) 1-65. Preface, p. 3

finally we will put these approaches in the general context of other Spanish books in English translation.

Due to the translator's desire for conciseness and simplification already expressed in the preface to the book, there is a systematic simplification of the number and name of the characters, who are called, as we shall see, by their profession. Picaresque novels, because of their variety of incidents and general idea of travel, were populated with a large number of characters, some of them being totally irrelevant to the general outline of the novel in question. The rogue meets a great many people in the course of his or her outings and an easy way to simplify the novel would consist of either blending or suppressing characters, as is shown in the examples of the scholar Pintado and the barber Bertol Araujo. Both of them are from Mansilla, Justina's village, and each of them is Justina's counterpart in a different adventure. She is on a pilgrimage and a young man—Pintado—approaches her. To get rid of him, Justina asks Pintado to go to the inn which she had left without having paid the bill in order to fetch a honey-pot that she had supposedly forgotten there. Here we have the fragments of the blending:

... *un bachillerejo* algo mi pariente que aunque me pesó, se me pegó al tornarme de la romería a León<sup>3</sup>.

A Barber of our Town... would needs bear me Company, and I was not sorry for it because he took care of my Ass.

(Stevens 43)

after the expostulation with the honey:

*El estudiante* despachado salió como una vira a buscarme, pero por ahora no te daré cuenta del suceso del encuentro, porque tengo que despachar otros mejores cuentos...

(p. 518)

*The Barber* thus sham'd flew away like Lightning to find me out; but before I tell you our Greeting, I must inform you what I did in the mean while.

(p. 46)

Just after the incident of the honey and the scholar comes the episode with the barber, and Stevens, consequently, makes an addition (underlined) to link both incidents coherently:

*I now met again with my Cousin the Barber, who, after some Expostulation about the Honey, was glad to put up the wrong; and ask'd me if I would not see the King's Garden?*

(p. 47)

3 F. López de Úbeda, *La Pícara Justina*. Madrid: Editora Nacional (Ed. Antonio Rey Hazas), 1977, p. 508.

There is a passage in the Spanish novel in which Justina meets both the Barber Bertol and the scholar Pintado; this passage (belonging to Número 2 "Del desenojo astuto" of chapter IV of the third part of Book 2 of "La pícara romera") is left out in the translation. At other times, Stevens suppresses many of the characters, as in the case of the soldier that Justina meets in la huerta del rey (the King's Gardens) in León, but this passage is not relevant to the novel *stricto sensu*, since it is intended to show Justina's ability and ingeniousness to retort once more; therefore, it is left out of the translation, and, with it, the character of the "soldadillo". What happens to the characters of Bárbara Sánchez and Brígida Román in the incident wherein they compliment Justina's face is a different case, because although this episode is present in the translation, the two characters have been suppressed and the whole episode is summarized in the following way:

Fui en compañía de una Bárbara Sánchez, gran amiga mía, y aún no quería yo tanta amistad como ella me ofrecía. Iban también conmigo otras mozueltas que alababan poco por mirarme mucho... me dijo:

— Señora Justina, muy sonrosada vas...

— Señora Brígida Román, no es lo que piensa.

(pp. 363-364)

Some Country Wenches, my Companions, began to Rally me, upon the Plaistering of my Face, which I endeavour'd to defend as if it had been natural.

(p. 35)

Conciseness is also achieved by giving a collective identity to a group of characters where the Spanish original introduces them one by one through their nicknames, as in the episode of "la Bigornia":

Eran siete de camarada, famosos bellacos que por excelencia se intitulaban la Bigornia, y por ese nombre eran conocidos en todo Campos, y por eso solían también nombrarse los Campeones. Estos traían por capitán a un mozo alto y seco, a quien ellos llamaban el obispo don Pero Grullo... Este venía en hábito de obispo de la Pícaranzona. Traía al lado otro estudiante vestido de pícarona piltrafa a quien ellos llamaban la Boneta, y cuadraba bien el nombre con el traje, porque venía toda vestida de bonetes viejos, que parecía pelota de cuarterones. Los otros cinco venían disfrazados de canónigos y arcedianos, a lo pícaral. El uno se llamaba el arcediano Mameluco, el otro Alacrán, el otro Birlo, otro Pulpo, el otro el Draque, y las posturas y talles decían bien con sus nombres.

(p. 286)

The translation simplifies it by saying:

...a Gang of seven Scholars in a Ridiculous Disguise, Dancing and Singing. They were known all the Country about for a parcel of the Rankest Knaves, within many Miles of them, and therefore call'd themselves the Champions. The Chief of them was a long thin Fellow, whom they call'd the Bishop, and his Dress represented it in a Comical manner, as the others did, those of Arch-Deacons and Prebends. By the Bishops side was another Scholar clad like a Scoundrel Strumpet.

(p. 28)

As we can see, the nicknames which define the other five scholars disappear from the translation, and all of them are given a collective identity as members of the Bishop's group. These nicknames are highly representative in Spanish since they connote the kind of person they refer to: 'mameluco' is an idiot, 'alacrán' is a scorpion, dangerous because of its sting, 'birlo' comes from the verb 'birlar', the Spanish slang for to steal; 'pulpo' –octopus– also has the same connotation in Spanish, as it is the case of the privateer Drake, well known in Spain because of his assaults on the Spanish vessels which returned from the Indies in order to steal the gold. All these nicknames define the five scholars, Drake being a sort of English devil, and the worst one of all for a Spanish reader.

The chief of the scholars is named Obispo don Pero Grullo, a legendary character from the fifteenth or sixteenth century, well known for his silly proverbs called methonymically "perogrulladas". Stevens omits the real name and only retains the first part: Bishop. Up to this point, we can say that the scholars have two characteristics in common: their lack of intelligence and their desire to rob; but both of them are absent in the English translation, which simply shows a group of scholars in disguise led by a chief whom they call 'bishop', because he acts as the "spiritual guide" of the group. Both characteristics constitute the basis of the episode in which Justina is abducted: the scholars not only take Justina with them in the cart, but they also go to the village to grasp everything they can for their celebration. In the end, Justina outdoes them all thanks to her ingeniousness and the scholars prove to be as silly as thieves.

This passage also reveals the changing of the conception of the names, for the only scholar who gets a name in the English translation is called 'la Boneta' in the Spanish original, because he wears a dress made of "bonetes" (the hat used by the seminarists or the clergy); but Stevens changes this name and chooses another one belonging to the sexual semantic field: 'Scoundrel Strumpet', the old word for "whore". One may wonder why the translator acted in such a way, since he was sure to know what the Spanish word meant, as his *A New*

*Dictionary*<sup>4</sup> proves. The fact is that this changing of the name has nothing to do with the scholar in question but with Justina, since the 'scoundrel strumpet' was to represent her in her abduction.

There is a change in the conception of the main female character in the novel: Justina. Whereas the Spanish writer, López de Úbeda, keeps her honour in ambiguity and never says explicitly that she is a whore, as is the case of other female rogues such as Lozana Andaluza (by Francisco Delicado), who becomes the most renowned prostitute in Italy, or la hija de Celestina (by Alonso de Salas Barbadillo), Stevens changes the Spanish text in an attempt to attract the readers' attention and turns Justina into a whore not only in the book title: *The Spanish Jilt* –another old word for 'whore'– but also in several passages, as we shall see.

First of all, when Justina as the narrator of her own adventures 'gives an account of her pedigree', she writes that her father's great grandmother was

a Tumbler and a Vaulter, a Woman Excelently Skill'd in all sorts of Vaulting, and would play her part with any Man.

(p. 3)

The underlined addition in the above quotation clearly shows the condition of Justina's ancestor, which was ambiguously outlined in the original. Blood heritage determines and shapes the rogue's character; therefore, just as Justina's great grand-mother behaves in a certain way, so will the great grand-daughter. In this respect, Justina writes:

My Father would not open his Inn till his Daughters were grown up Lusty Wenches and fit for service.

(p. 7)

But the original simply says 'buenas mozas y recias para servir' (p. 193), meaning grown and stark. Captain Stevens continues this tendency and translates 'Del robo de Justina' (p. 285) as 'the rape committed on Justina by the scholars' (p. 26) in the general title of chapter IV, but such a rape does not take place and the word 'robo' should have been translated as "abduction". Nevertheless, Stevens keeps the pretence of a rape throughout the chapter therefore changing the original. Moreover, the scholars get everything ready to celebrate the union of Justina and their Bishop, or, as they say, "the Nuptials of a Whore and a Rogue" (p. 31), as a translation of "era boda de pícaro y pícaro". The Spanish original equals Justina and the false bishop in rank, since both are rogues and play tricks; but this is not the case in the English translation.

4 J. Stevens, *A New Dictionary, English and Spanish, Spanish and English...* (London: J. Darby, 1726).

As far as the translation of the characters' names is concerned, we can say that the Spanish names usually disappear in the translation, owing to the fact that they mean nothing to an English reader and would make the translation more difficult for them to understand. Accordingly, Stevens renders them by calling them by their profession, thus: El tocinero Juan Pancorvo becomes 'a fellow that sold bacon'; Sancha Gómez, the innkeeper of León, is never called by her own name, and she is always referred to as 'the hostess'; Martín Pavón, el ermitaño hipócrita, becomes 'the hypocritical hermit'; Marcos Méndez Pavón, the scholar whom Justina tricked with the 'agnus' is always called 'sharper' as a translation of 'fullero'; 'The Barber' blends A. Pintado and Bertol Araujo, as we have already seen.

Regarding Justina's suitors and husband, we can say that they are never called by their name: the first of them is Maximino de Umenos and the Spanish writer makes puns with this name, but Maximino is a turner by trade, and in the translation he is always called 'Turner'. The second suitor's name is Machín, but since he presents himself before Justina dressed and dancing like a 'Morrice-Dancer', he is always referred to by this name. The last suitor and future husband is Lozano, meaning vigorous and lively in Spanish, which leads the narrator Justina to make puns with his name. Lozano is referred to as 'he', 'bridegroom', 'spouse', and 'husband'. Even the main character Justina is never called by her surname, as the following instance shows:

Mis hermanos, cuando vieron nombrar Justina Díez, hija de Fulano Díez, con Fulano Lozano, embarazaron: mirábanse unos a otros, y luego todos me miraban a mí.

(p. 727)

We all went to Church on Sunday, where the Bans were bid, and my Brothers fix'd their Eyes on me, as if they would have star'd me thro'.

(p. 62)

As we can see, characters, instead of being called by their own name, are called according to their trade or profession. Thus, there is a 'fellow that sold bacon', a 'hermit', a 'barber', a 'hostess', a 'turner', a 'sharper', a 'bishop', a 'morrice dancer', a 'spouse', as a translation of 'el tocinero Juan Pancorvo, A. A. Pavón el ermitaño, Bertol Araujo and A. Pintado, Sancha Gómez, Maximino de Umenos, Marcos Méndez Pavón, Pero Grullo, Machado el disciplinante, and Lozano'; only Justina, the main character, keeps her Spanish name throughout the translation. Characters are thus individualized by their trade, like in folk tales, for it is easier to remember them than their Spanish names, and this is in line with the general outline of the translation, for Captain Stevens intends to make

an English Tale out of the Spanish novel, as he writes in one of his manuscripts:

Of the first (La Pícaro Justina) I have made an English Tale, call'd, The Spanish country Jilt, & printed in the Book Entitl'd, The Spanish Libertines<sup>5</sup>.

This way of rendering the name of the characters is peculiar to Stevens in this translation. Other Stevens' translations such as *The Bawd of Madrid*<sup>6</sup> keep the Spanish names of all the characters and none of them is omitted. In his rendering of *El Buscón as Paul, the Spanish Sharper*<sup>7</sup>, Stevens also keeps the names of the characters, thus we have Pontio de Aguirre, Don Diego, Don Alonso Coronel de Zunniga or Cabra, whereas other translations of this Spanish work, for instance John Davis' of 1657, change them, and for example, Pablos' uncle, the executioner Alonso Ramplón, is called Uncle Grimpant, and the schoolmaster Dómine Cabra, Ragot. Moreover, the name of Pablos' father is Ysidore, and his mother is called Roguille, instead of the Spanish Clemente Pablo (Clement Paul, as Stevens renders it) or Aldonza Saturno de Rebollo<sup>8</sup>.

A striking case is Stevens' translation of *Estevanillo Gonzales*, in which he retains the names of a large amount of characters, most of whom are military officers, constables or governors such as 'Prince Emanuel Philibert of Savoy, our Generalissimo', 'the Constable Colonna', 'Juana de Austria, daughter to the famous Don Juan de Austria, who gain'd the great victory at Lepanto', 'Don Pedro de Caravajal, his Lieutenant Colonel', 'Colonel Don Melchor de Bracamonte' etc., present in the original to confer an impression of historicism and veracity to the novel, and being therefore completely different from the conception of the names of the characters in *The Spanish Jilt*, which are full of allusions and susceptible to witty linguistic puns intended to have special connotations for a Spanish reader. Stevens, aware of this fact, simplifies them in an attempt to make his translation more understandable and enjoyable for his readers.

5 J. Stevens, MSS 3093, Sloane Collection of the British Museum Library, fol. 9.

6 Vid. J. Stevens, *The Bawd of Madrid* and *Estevanillo Gonzales* in *The Spanish Libertines*, op. cit., 67-160 and 255-528 respectively.

7 *The Life of Paul, The Spanish Sharper*, in *The Comical Works of Don Francisco de Quevedo...* 2nd ed. London: Printed for J. Woodward, in St. Christopher's Church-Yard, Threadneedle Street, 1709.

8 Stevens follows the first edition of this Spanish masterpiece: *Historia de la vida del Buscón, llamado Don Pablos...* En Zaragoza, por Pedro Verges, 1626. The Spanish text changed in other editions and the name of Aldonza Saturno de Rebollo, intended to give Pablos' mother a Roman triumphal filiation, changes to Aldonza de San Pedro, which has a connotation of newly converted christians.

## **THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER: ITS MAKING AND LANGUAGE**

**Macario Olivera Villacampa**

Universidad de Zaragoza

Colegio Universitario de Huesca

Any reformation is a quest for better things. But the Reformation is the specific movement for reform that took place in the Roman Catholic Church in the 16th century, gave birth to the Protestantism and resulted in the establishment of the Reformed or Protestant Churches. *The Book of Common Prayer* cannot properly be understood unless it is studied within the whole context of the Reformation, as it is a product of the circumstances peculiar to the English Reformation. It is the Book of the English Liturgy. In its origin it was rather treated as an instrument of ecclesiastical policy, whether by the government or by the episcopate; but, in virtue of its enormous merits, after so many years of being in use, it is securely lodged in the affection of the English speaking peoples.

For centuries, and more notoriously in the late Middle Ages, from which the 16th century reformers emerged, the church, particularly in the office of the papacy and its surroundings, had been deeply involved in politics and less worried about God's kingdom than about the kingdom of money. Inasmuch as money is said to be the root of all evil, the church's increasing power and wealth contributed to the bankruptcy of its spiritual force and message of salvation. Everything in the church, said the critics, was sold for money: indulgences, pardons, masses, candles, ceremonies, curacies, benefices, bishoprics, the papacy itself. Too many scandals, too many inconveniences, too many injustices, too much ignorance (Chadwick, 1986).

Everywhere there appeared to be not only a need of reform but a cry for reformation. In the course of history there have always been some dominating figures emerging now and then to take the lead on the way to new times. What they pursue may well be the same end, but the different aspects of reality are interpreted successively and complementary so that what the one does can only be properly understood in the light of what the other has done or is about to do. Erasmus of Rotterdam, a great humanist scholar, was one of the first proponents of Catholic Reform. He wrote the *Enchiridion militis Christiani*, still in Latin, where he explained the lines of a new theology, which should be simpler and more Biblical than that of the Scholasticism. He also published an edition of the

Greek New Testament and a fresh Latin translation of it. Being such a competent humanist, he was somehow compelled to deal with the classical languages, and he did so in order to lay the appropriate bases for future translations into vernaculars. Indeed, Erasmus wanted everyone to have direct access to the Bible and, therefore, to be able to read it in the vernacular. All the rest, all those superstitions, devotions, cults of statues, credulities, indulgencies... he termed as ridiculous. There was a celebrated saying in the 16th century: "Erasmus laid the egg and Luther hatched it" (Chadwick 39). If not the same egg, another was certainly hatched by Henry VIII.

Luther wanted to go to the theological root of the problem, that is, the perversion of the church's doctrine of redemption and grace, "sola scriptura, sola fide", not that complex system of indulgencies and good works. While in England the origin of Reformation was not a theological doctrine, but a domestic affair, and then a question of discipline and politics. Henry VIII established the Anglican Church as a consequence of Pope's refusal to grant him the divorce. He proclaimed himself as the Supreme Head of the Church, and was concerned with the organizing of the new church detached from Rome (Olivera). Together with the translation of the Bible into English, one thing was essential: the preparation of a liturgy in English, which gave birth to *The Booke of Common Prayer and administracion of Sacramentes, and other Rites and Ceremonies after the Use of the Church of England*.

Thomas Cranmer had been in favour of king's divorce, and was appointed Archbishop of Canterbury. He was the favourite ecclesiastic in the cause of the reform of worship. He became acquainted with the liturgical reform in several Lutheran centres in Germany, which determined his mind for vernacular services. There were also many others who wanted English to replace Latin as the language of the liturgy, because "the divine service was ordained to be said in the church for the edifying of the people, that they, hearing the words of the Gospel and the examples of the holy saints, might be stirred and moved to follow their steps" (Starkey 129).

The work of compiling the First Prayer Book, 1549, is attributed by the *Act of Uniformity* to "the Archbishop of Canterbury and certain of the most learned and discreet bishops and other learned men of the realm" (Ratcliff 13). Prior to the *Act of Uniformity* a considerable number of books was required for the performance of liturgical services, but now all the prayers, ceremonies and sacraments were gathered in the Book, ranging from The Order of the Morning Prayer, through The Order of the Holy Communion, or The Catechism, to Forms and Prayer on Accession of Sovereign. The Sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion are

held to be the most important in the Anglican Communion. Dealing with every section of *The Prayer Book* would exceed the limits of any article or chapter of a book. As I think that one of the centres of interest, from a theological as well as philological point of view, lay and still lies in the Eucharist or Holy Communion, that is the section I have chosen as a reference in this paper.

The traditional doctrine about transubstantiation, as explained by St Thomas Aquinas, distinguished between the substance and the accidents. The mystery of the Eucharist lies in the change of the substance of the bread into the substance of the Body of Christ, while the accidents, namely, the colour and taste and shape, remain those of bread. Many philosophers, nominalist theologians and reformers, among whom several Oxford and Cambridge scholars, thought this doctrine irrational, because they could only conceive a change of substance to mean a change of accidents at the same time. They might believe in the doctrine of transubstantiation as a question of faith only, for in such mysteries the reason is helpless. Faith and reason are lodged upon different planes. It is wastepaper to seek a concord between them (Chadwick).

As it is known, the guiding principle in Luther's doctrine is justification by faith, which implies a shift from metaphysical reason and external acts of religion to mind and heart. As far as the Eucharist, Lutheran teaching is that transubstantiation is not warranted by Scripture, which only demands a belief in the Real Presence so that the bread and wine are the Body and Blood of the Lord, but no further definitions of the mystery are given. Probably, the Real Presence could be preserved by means of substituting one preposition for another, so that instead of saying that the divine gift is *under* or *in* the accidents of bread and wine, we might say that it is *with* them, which does not imply a change of substance. The new word then would be *consubstantiation*, that is, the two substances together, one of them apparent to the senses and the other to be known by faith only.

Before the publication of the first Prayer Book, 1549, Cranmer, who was one of the authors of The Order of the Communion, had abandoned the Catholic belief that the bread and the wine become the Body and Blood of Christ. Nevertheless, the traditional words in the Prayer of Consecration are kept: "This is my Body which is given for you", "This is my Blood which is shed for you". And so is the sentence at the receiving of the Holy Communion: "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul into everlasting life" (the same for the Blood). The second sentence of the formula, which adds a step forward, was introduced at the time of the second version of the Book, as we shall see. All that means, first, that



different ways of interpreting or explaining the Real Presence are available without changing the words, and, second, that the whole work is an English supplement to the Catholic Mass in order to fulfil what was required about the administering of the Holy Communion to the people "under both kinds, that is to say, of bread and wine" (Brook 23).

From the day of its publication, the 1549 Book did not please any sides: the conservatives thought it was too radical and the reformers too conservative. In other words, "the mixture of retention of the old and introduction of the new in the first Book of Common Prayer brought down upon it the censure of both convinced Romanists and convinced Reformers" (Brook 28). Therefore, before it came into general use, the Book was destined for amendment. The final words of the Rubric placed before the second Exhortation hint by themselves at further changes to come: "vntill other order shalbe prouided". A strong impulse on the same direction was given by the Eucharistic doctrine taught by the Swiss Reformers, to whom Cranmer was sympathetic. Zwingli considered the Sacraments as symbols or signs of the Covenant between God and man. The Lord's Supper, in particular, is a memorial of the Lord's death for man's salvation and a thanksgiving for it. The doctrine of the Real Presence is not sanctioned in the Bible. A spiritual gift, as it is the grace of salvation, cannot be received physically but only by faith. When he was told that in the text of the Bible Jesus said "This is my Body", he replied that it was the metaphorical way of speaking Jesus had, much in the same way as when he said "I am the door" it does not follow that he was a real door; that is, these statements cannot be understood literally. "This is my Body" means "This is a sign of my Body", i.e., to remind you of Christ's presence by faith (Chadwick).

The second Book of Common Prayer was issued in 1552. According to the new interpretation of the Real Presence by some of the influential continental Reformers, who had come over to England as refugees, the most important changes from a doctrinal point of view, were made in The Holy Communion. Everything was rearranged so that the likeness to the Roman Mass was diminished, but, above all, a new sentence was introduced at the receiving of the Holy Communion so as to declare that the Eucharist was a memorial of Christ's sacrifice and that it was a spiritual gift received by faith: "Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving". So serious the matter was that a discussion arose about kneeling to receive the Sacrament. Eventually, a compromise was reached by inserting the so-called Black Rubric: "in requiring communicants to kneel it is not meant thereby that any adoration is done, or ought to be done unto any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood" (Chadwick 122).

The second Prayer Book was abolished before a year of use. In 1553 Edward VI died, and his Roman Catholic half-sister Mary succeeded to the throne. Consequently, *The Book of Common Prayer* was prohibited and the previous service books returned with the restoration of the Catholic worship.

Soon after the accession of Queen Elizabeth in 1558, procedures began to restore the 1552 Prayer Book, which was done by the *Act of Uniformity* of April, 1559. There were a few changes made, among which it is worth remarking the following: 1) The removal from the Litany of the petition for deliverance "from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome, and all his detestable enormities". 2) The suppression of the Black Rubric to justify the practice of kneeling, as explained above. 3) The prefixing of the sentence of 1549 Book at receiving the Holy Communion to that of 1552, as we have them today making up the whole formula. All that was not useless, for it meant not as bitter a separation from Rome as it had been, on one hand, and, on the other, a door open towards the acceptance and adoration of the Real Presence.

With the accession of James I in 1603 the Puritans hoped for a revision of the Prayer Book so as to replace the Anglican with the Genevan system, but, even if a few alterations were introduced, nothing significant was changed. There was the so-called Cromwellian interregnum during which *The Book of Common Prayer* was prohibited, but its use was restored when the monarchy was re-established. Charles II made it revised in 1661 and published in 1662. A few distinguishing features of this version, as compared to the previous ones, are the inclusion of the Psalter, the substitution of the text of the *Authorised Version* for the text of the *Great Bible*, and some corrections of language for "the more proper expressing of some words or phrases of ancient usage" (Brook 34). For Anglican Englishmen the 1662 Prayer Book remains, by habit as well as by law, the normal vehicle of public worship.

The language of *The Book of Common Prayer* belongs to the period known in the development of English as *Early Modern English*, as it does the language of the *King James Bible* or *Authorised Version*, to which it is closely related (Strang). The study of its language can be dealt with from different points of view. For the time being, it is my purpose to limit myself to remarking a few lexicological features, especially those connected to the characteristics of the Renaissance movement.

The revival of the classical learning had a notorious influence on the shaping of English vocabulary. At the time of the Norman Conquest there was a flood of French loan words making their way into English, so that most of the words said to be of French origin come from the French speaking ruling classes

and French culture in England after the Conquest. Eventually, as French is a Romance language, that is, a language that has developed out of the spoken Latin of the late Roman Empire, all those words coming into English from French can be said to be of Latin origin. However, the Renaissance period is remarkable for the quantity of its direct borrowings from Latin. Classical literature became a fruitful source of information and inspiration. No wonder that hundreds of words should be adopted together with the ideas they stood for and should seem indispensable means of enriching a language which appeared rather poor as compared to the richness of Latin and Greek. The most numerous words are Latin; other words from Greek entered into English through Latin or were latinized, and quite a number of French words were remodelled into closer resemblance with their Latin originals (Jespersen, 1985). At other stages in the course of history there had already been other influences of Latin on English, namely, when the Angles, Saxons and Jutes were in contact with the Roman Empire on the Continent before going to England; when England itself was invaded by the Romans under the Emperors Julius Caesar and Claudius; and when the Christianity was preached and introduced into England by the end of 6th century (Strang).

Considering that French words are ultimately Latin in origin, and that it is ever so difficult to determine the time when a particular word was incorporated into English, it is safer to use the term Latin origin to cover both French and all the periods of direct Latin influence, unless it happens to be a special reason to distinguish between them. The thing is that, by the 16th century, English language shows a vocabulary in which the dominant place is held by words of Latin origin, at least as far as full words are concerned from a semantic point of view.

*The Book of Common Prayer* was produced in the heart of the Renaissance period, and, on top of that, the language of worship has always been a learned language. No wonder, then, the words of Latin origin have special frequency and significance in it. Sometimes words of Latin origin are chosen instead of native words, and they appear redundantly, two or three or even more, with no apparent addition of meaning; other times words of both origins appear side by side, frequently in pairs, with approximately the same meaning. It could be questioned whether synonyms exist or not. Firth said that a word when used in a new context is a new word; but he said nothing about two or more words, closely related to one another, and in the same context. All that can easily be proved by going through the Prayer Book; if we peruse, for example, not even the whole rite of Communion, but the three Exhortations and the Prayer of Consecration only, we find the following cases:

Religiously and devoutly disposed  
Food and sustenance in that holy Sacrament  
Search and examine your own consciences  
Holy and clean to such a heavenly Feast  
The way and means thereto  
To make restitution and satisfaction  
Injuries and wrongs done by you to one another  
Scruple and doubtfulness  
Called and bidden by God  
Grievous and unkind thing  
Injury and wrong done unto him  
Accepted and allowed before God  
wherefore then do ye not repent and amend?  
To try and examine themselves  
Lively and stedfast faith  
Humble and hearty thanks to God  
Darkness and shadow of death  
Instituted and ordained holy mysteries  
True holiness and righteousness  
A full, perfect, and sufficient  
sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction.

The least that can be said is that such striking organization of the vocabulary cannot be considered a random result, but it must obey the authors' purposes, apart from reflecting the hospitality of the Renaissance period to Latin origin words. There can be several reasons for that, among which I thought it worthy pointing out the following:

1. The authors intended to produce a learned language, and Latin was the most learned of all. But such words were mainly familiar to the upper classes, and, on the other hand, the Book was meant to be understood by ordinary people; that is why, in contrast to the Roman Church, they had changed from Latin to English, and the effect should not be, by any means, writing Latin in English. The solution to make both ends meet was writing side by side native words and words of Latin origin, whenever possible, even if nothing substantial was added to the meaning, but thus the high prestige of worship language was preserved to the contentedness of learned people or upper classes, and the ordinary people or lower classes would be able to understand.
2. Religious language is, by its own nature, a language of persuasion, which is very much favoured by conveying the same idea as many times as it is suitable, the more the better, provided that neither nuisance nor fatigue are caused.

3. Repetition is the golden rule of memory, that is, the way of helping it to keep the contents taught. The association of words gives further strength, as two or more associated words expressing the same idea in the same context are a better guarantee for a given idea to be rooted deeper and remain longer in mind, and so lead our behaviour more permanently.

After so many years in existence, the new words, or words of Latin origin, cannot be said to be new any more; they are fully incorporated into the English vocabulary and may well be supposed to be known by all English speakers. But, even so, they do continue to present a considerable degree of difficulty to the modern reader, which, in my view, may be said to be of two types:

1. If not all, many of those words have never, and, most probably, will never be understood by anybody that has not got a classical education, because, most commonly, there are not associations of ideas between them and the ordinary stock of words used in conversation; there is not, either, any likeness in root or in the formative elements to assist the understanding. Curiously enough, this assesment should mainly be applied to native speakers, as they are much more familiar with words of Anglo-Saxon origin as used in their ordinary conversation; while words of Latin origin seem more familiar in their form to Romance languages speakers, although the ideas or the message transmitted may be as strange to the latter as to the former, and, therefore, a classical education may be needed in any case. Consequently, it might be right to conclude that the large number of learned words used in a given language is apt to form or to accentuate social class divisions rather than to send messages to everybody, so that a man's culture is largely judged by the extent to which he is able to handle correctly those hard words in speech and in writing (Jespersen).
2. The second type of difficulty is more concrete and specific, and lies in the fact that words of Latin origin in *The Book of Common Prayer* bear a meaning which is different from the one we have come to attach to them in present day English. Sixteenth century Englishmen were more aware of the Latin sources where the new words came from, and such words, being then new, had not yet been changed with use. Therefore, in the *Book of Common Prayer* Latin words frequently carry the basic etymological meaning of their originals, whereas in present day English the etymological meaning either has become obscured, or has been lost, or it is not known any more. This does not necessarily mean that the present meaning did not exist at the time of Prayer Book publication, because such meaning may have existed side by side with the

etymological meaning and been used in other contexts outside the Prayer Book. Which is illustrated by the following significant examples:

We find the verb *prevent* in the Collect for the 17th Sunday after Trinity: "Lord, we pray thee that thy grace may always *prevent* and follow us, and make us continually to be given to all good works"; or in the Collect for Easter day: "Almighty God... we humbly beseech thee that, as by the special grace *preventing* us thou dost put into our minds good desires, so by thy continual help we may bring the same to good effect. In these, and other instances alike, *prevent* carries the etymological meaning, i.e., go before so that other works may come to good effect Which is specifically aplyed to the doctrine of grace: the *preventing* grace, as the theologians call it, goes before to move human hearts, or inspire good desires, so that good works may follow and, for that, the *helping* grace is needed as well; that is why we pray for it to follow us too. It is clear that the present meaning of *prevent* is misleading in the sense that we would be unable to understand either the word itself or the whole literary context, or even the whole doctrine of grace as explained by the theologians of all ages. For, in the present meaning of *prevent*, something goes before to hinder the following action from happening.

The etymological meaning of *invention* is to discover, to come upon; it is about something that exists, is hidden, but is found. This sense is preserved in the Calendar of *The Book of Common Prayer* in the feast of the Invention of the Cross, May 3rd, with the reference to the finding of the True Cross by St Helen. The present meaning is displaced from the etymological one in the sense that it does not imply the previous existence of something, but, on the contrary, it is the discovery of something new, a form of creation, or how to make or devise something new. In this way, it is known the saying "necessity is the mother of invention". Also, in present English, *invention* is used as opposed to something that is true, such as in "newspapers are full of inventions", which implies as well a displacement from the etymological meaning.

Many other examples would lead us to complete the subject of another essay.

Such essential work in the history of English literature and of English people as *The Book of Common Prayer* is still used by those who go to Church for public services, or stay at home and say prayers in private. The different stages in its making are but a sign of its significance in the origin and development of the Anglican Church; and its language reflects the culture of the Renaissance period and is an incentive to keep working for further insights into cultural and linguistic studies.

WORKS CITED

- BROOK, S. *The Language of the Book of Common Prayer*. London: A. Deutsch, 1965.
- BRUCE, F.F. *History of the Bible in English*. London: Lutterworth, 1979.
- CHADWICK, O. *The Reformation*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986.
- FIRTH, J.R. "Modes of Meaning", *Papers in Linguistics 1934-1951*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- JESPERSEN, O. *Growth and Structure of the English Language*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1985.
- OLIVERA, M. "Your Majesty, the Head of the Church of England", *Proceedings of the II Conference of the Spanish Society for English Renaissance Studies*, Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Oviedo, 1992.
- RATCLIFF, E.C. *The Booke of Common Prayer of the Church of England*. London: SPCK, 1949.
- STARKEY, Th. *Dialogue between Reginald Pole and Thomas Lupset*. London: Burton, 1948.
- STRANG, B. *A History of English*. London: Methuen, 1979
- The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church according to the Use of The Church of England together with The Psalter or Psalms of David Pointed as they are to be sung or said in Churches, and the Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining and Consecrating of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, London: SPCK, 1662.*

# MASKS AND CHARACTERS IN THE MERCHANT OF VENICE AND LOS INTERESES CREADOS

Rosa Sáez González  
Mérida, Badajoz

The many allusions to Shakespeare and some similarities between *Los intereses creados* and *The Merchant of Venice*, such as the garden and law scenes, led me to explore in *Los intereses creados* a possible deep indebtedness to *The Merchant of Venice*. The two plays share themes and formal elements.

In a sense, Benavente's adaptation of the *commedia dell'arte* masks for his characters in *Los intereses creados* reveals the latent *commedia dell'arte* figures beneath Shakespeare's characters. *The Merchant of Venice*, in turn, may be read as a play about concealed "bonds of interest" among "masked" characters. I propose that Benavente recognized this undercurrent of *The Merchant of Venice* and set about writing a kind of picaresque version of Shakespeare's play, a version in which idealism proves so strong that it can redeem even the less noble characters Benavente portrays.

In *Los intereses creados*, Benavente brings to the foreground the mercantile principles ruling society in *The Merchant of Venice* and emphasizes how they can corrupt society as well as its leaders. The question is: how can society be redeemed? In both *Los intereses creados* and *The Merchant of Venice*, love and the Christian ideal are claimed to be enough to save society from such corruption, despite Benavente's obvious skepticism. *La ciudad alegre y confiada*, sequel to *Los intereses creados* first staged nine years later, completes Benavente's response to this view, intimated in his previous scepticism: society can only be redeemed by love for one's country.

As announced in the prologue to *Los intereses creados*, the staging of the play follows the tradition of the Italian *commedia dell'arte* with its "immutable masks", and the conception of the "traditional puppet shows whose characters are worked by coarse threads" not even hidden from the audience, as Walter Starkie notes<sup>1</sup>. Crispín describes the play the audience is about to see as

<sup>1</sup> Walter Starkie, *Jacinto Benavente* (London: Oxford University Press, 1924), p. 151.

una farsa guiñolesca, de asunto disparatado, sin realidad alguna. Pronto veréis como cuanto en ella sucede no pudo suceder nunca; que sus personajes no son ni semejan hombres y mujeres, sino muñecos o fantoches de cartón y trapo, con groseros hilos visibles a poca luz y al más corto de vista. Son las mismas groseras máscaras de aquella comedia del arte italiano, no tan regocijadas como solían, porque han meditado mucho en tanto tiempo<sup>2</sup>.

To Starkie, "Benavente has made his characters don masks because the masks immobilize the action of the play", and the audience derives the comic from this stiff mechanism deprived of spontaneity<sup>3</sup>. It seems to me, however, that the masks have the opposite effect: they encourage a certain spontaneity of action and dialogue, as evidenced in the fact that the Italian *commedia dell'arte* relied on improvisation to a great extent. But they immobilize character development, because the mask reveals exactly the character's personality, and it establishes what we should expect of that character. In any case, I believe, like Starkie, that Benavente succeeds in bringing these puppets to life while, paradoxically, still keeping them within their masked rigidity.

One of the effects of the use of flat, stiff characters, appears to be the recollection of the old view of the world as a stage where men and women perform their parts<sup>4</sup>. This idea is further insisted upon by the masks the characters don, which cast each character in the role the mask encodes. This perception of the world as a stage appears in *The Merchant of Venice* when, charged by Gratiano with worrying excessively about worldly matters, Antonio pleads innocent by declaring: "I hold the world but as the world, Gratiano,/A stage where every man must play a part,/and mine a sad one"<sup>5</sup>. While Gratiano admits that he enjoys playing the part of a fool, with its gaiety and laughter, Antonio seems resigned to his joyless, to his grave part.

2 Jacinto Benavente, *Los intereses creados, La ciudad alegre y confiada. Cartas de mujer*. 4th ed. Crisol, 22 (Madrid: Aguilar, 1950), p. 23. All subsequent references will be to this edition and will appear in the text, preceded by LI for *Los intereses creados* and LC for *La ciudad alegre y confiada*.

3 Starkie, p. 151.

4 Pedro Calderón de la Barca (1600-1681) fully devotes his *auto sacramental* entitled *El gran teatro del mundo* to this idea: life is a play, cast by God, staged by the World and acted out by human beings, who improvise the roles they have been assigned. Upon conclusion, the World collects everything he issued for the performance, leaving the actors with only their job at the performance—their good deeds—to show for themselves when facing God's judgment of how well they played their roles. Their responsibility lies in how well they play their roles, not in the part itself. Francisco Ruiz Ramón, *Historia del teatro español, I desde sus orígenes hasta 1900*. 2nd ed. El libro de bolsillo, 66, Vol. I (Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1967), p. 409.

5 William Shakespeare, *The Merchant of Venice*, ed. John Russell Brown, 7th ed. The New Arden Shakespeare (1955; 2nd rpt. London: Methuen, 1961), Act I, Scene i, 77-79. All subsequent references to *The Merchant of Venice*, unless otherwise indicated, will be to this edition and will appear in the text, preceded by MV.

The explanation of the other effect of the use of these stiff characters, their lack of individuality, requires a close look at the characters and, in the case of the leads, their development. Starkie compares Leandro to the Innamorato of the *commedia dell'arte*, who, resourceless, always needs the aid of a witty servant<sup>6</sup>. Indeed, Leandro turns for help to Colombina in *La ciudad alegre y confiada*, since Crispín absolutely disapproves of his passion for Girasol. In *Los intereses creados*, Crispín not only supports Leandro and Silvia's love but is "the artificer of the whole fabric", as Starkie describes him<sup>7</sup>. Bassanio's part in *The Merchant of Venice* is similar to Leandro's in both plays. For both Leandro and Bassanio, winning the lady becomes a priority, although they use very different means. The difference between the two authors lies in their adaptation of the role of the servant of the *commedia dell'arte*. Shakespeare turns him into a friend, Antonio, financially able to respond to his friend's needs. Benavente mixes both servant and friend in Crispín, who, in public, naturally assumes the role of the servant typical of the *commedia dell'arte* and of the Spanish picaresque tradition. He, too, is witty and penniless. But Benavente also incorporates Shakespeare's idea of a friend helping the young man in love. Both Antonio and Crispín are older men, beyond the urgency of young love, but able to understand it and ready to help. The relationship between Portia and Nerissa seems the feminine counterpart. Nerissa, too, acts as both a servant and a friend to Portia, with two important differences: Portia does not need financial help and she certainly shows enough wit to understand the situations she finds herself in and to plan a suitable course of action. Thus, Nerissa does not need to display the wit essential to the servant of the *commedia dell'arte* or the rogue.

As has been noted repeatedly, Crispín is descended from the rogue of the picaresque novel tradition springing from *El Lazarillo de Tormes*. He points it out himself when, commenting on the city he and Leandro have just reached while escaping justice, Leandro sees it as a good place to stay for some time. Crispín argues that he would rather not settle there, on the grounds that "es condición de los naturales, como yo, del libre reino de Picardía no hacer asiento en parte alguna, si no es forzado y en galeras, que es duro asiento" (LI p. 25). Starkie reminds his readers of another important fact: nature gave the rogue nothing for survival but his wits, which, to cut out for himself a more comfortable situation, he sharpens against "the stupidity of the rest of

6 Starkie, p. 162.

7 Starkie, p. 157.

humanity"<sup>8</sup>. Undoubtedly, like Lázaro de Tormes, Crispín has to use his wits so that he can "[l]legar a buen puerto" (LI p. 79)<sup>9</sup>.

The perspective of the complementary nature of the characters of Crispín and Leandro brings up another interesting question: its relation to Cervantes and his idea of dividing two opposing aspects of human disposition between his characters don Quijote and Sancho Panza. Marcelino Peñuelas acknowledges that Crispín's description of Leandro and himself as being one because each complements the other and supports the interpretation of the pair as "two, apparently paradoxical, aspects of human personality"<sup>10</sup>. Peñuelas also notes the recurrent parallel interpretation of don Quijote and Sancho to deny any similarity between the characters and the works. Personally, I find a tight connection. Like Cervantes, Benavente sought to forge a new synthesis of the ideal and the real by showing their mutual effect: reality is not utterly despicable because the ideal ennobles it, and the ideal is tempered by the flint of reality. The characterization of don Quijote and Sancho, as compared to that of Leandro and Crispín, seems to illustrate this idea.

Starkie describes Leandro as the aristocrat, raised on lofty thoughts. Crispín is described as "a modern Sancho Panza who has lost many of his blithe and debonair qualities in the rough-and-tumble of present-day civilization"<sup>11</sup>.

Such a blend of reality and ideals in Benavente's plays is best explained through the effect Leandro and Crispín's friendship has on them. In *Los intereses creados*, Crispín resorts to unethical means to facilitate the pair's advancement in society. His machinations, however, are to some extent ennobled because, though initially not so intended, they ensure that Leandro and Silvia's love is allowed to grow. In *La ciudad alegre y confiada*, Crispín completes his redemption by both willingly accepting the sacrifice he is expected to make and leading Leandro out of his apathy.

<sup>8</sup> Starkie, p. 162.

<sup>9</sup> This perceptibly echoes the words with which Lázaro describes the respectability he has achieved after he left the last of his masters. He has now settled in Toledo, taking up the responsibility of a steady job and, in his own eyes, the best wife in town. Ironically, he has been appointed town-crier socially regarded as a contemptible occupation, which involves announcing the crimes of those who, convicted, are about to be executed. In addition, he is fortunately married to a good wife, so he overlooks her unfaithfulness with her former master, a clergyman, because of its profitability.

<sup>10</sup> Marcelino Peñuelas, *Jacinto Benavente*, trans. Kay Engler. TWAS, 57. (New York: Twayne, 1968), p. 111.

<sup>11</sup> Starkie, pp. 163-64.

In *La ciudad alegre y confiada*, as Starkie puts it, Crispín ceases to be the eager-witted rogue he was in the first play and turns into the conscience of its inhabitants by becoming the ruler of the city-state. He now incarnates Crispín who "rises from the Crispín all men have in their souls" to become the object of their fear and hatred"<sup>12</sup>. In Crispín's words:

Sí. Soy el Magnífico... Imagen visible de los que me elevaron... Los Crispines cobardes necesitan un Crispín valeroso que autorice sus picardías; ellos solos no se atreverían a cometerlas. El sello del Magnífico es su absolución. Como en mis tiempos de criado era yo una parte de mi señor y suyas eran las grandezas y más las ruindades, así ahora la Ciudad me necesita para descargo de sus culpas... Y soy yo el elegido. Siempre Crispín, el criado siempre... Pero los pueblos, para mayor sarcasmo, o para engañar mejor su conciencia, a los criados nos llaman señores, nos dan una apariencia de gobierno... y ya es nuestra toda la culpa de las culpas de todos.

(LI pp. 233-34)

Leandro, too, has changed, Starkie remarks. He is no longer "the ideal part of man" he once symbolized, because, "[t]he wealth of his father-in-law has made him flabby and cynical". He neglects his wife, Silvia, and instead, he tries to win the love of the attractive dancer Girasol, for which he would readily "risk ruin and cheat his father-in-law"<sup>13</sup>.

Silvia's change is also worth noticing as well. In *La ciudad alegre y confiada*, Silvia, helpless and disillusioned, watches how Leandro keeps courting the beautiful Girasol. She has nothing left of that Silvia who fled from her father's house to be married to Leandro, contrary to her father's wishes, because, as she had stated earlier: "Yo haré lo que mi padre ordene, si a mi madre no le contraría y a mí no me disgusta" (LI p. 73). What ennobles her is that, in spite of her disappointment about Leandro, she still loves him. Her sorrow after Leandro's death is also ennobled, as Arlequín remarks, by the poetic speech with which Crispín avoids the natural hostility between the two women. Silvia and Girasol have met on their way to offer flowers to Leandro, who has been taken to Crispín's residence to be honoured before his burial. After stating that it would be inappropriate for Girasol to accompany Silvia and himself to pay homage to Leandro, Crispín asks both women to kiss one of the roses that Girasol is going to offer the hero. The rose would then symbolize the complementary nature of the two aspects of love Leandro found in the two women: the pure, ideal love of Silvia and the worldly, sophisticated love of Girasol.

<sup>12</sup> Starkie, p. 169.

<sup>13</sup> Starkie, p. 169.

The character development of the protagonists just described is part of the paradox already mentioned. They change, but they still appear almost as rigid as the minor characters, who do not develop in both plays. Peñuelas points out that, as an effect of their rigidity and flatness, the characters lack individuality, as Benavente's characters often do. In *Los intereses creados*, to me, the masks the characters wear contribute to their lack of individuality, thus turning their human quality into a conceptual rather than a vital reflection, as Peñuelas points out. He writes:

The characters are generic types, symbols. All, in their complex coexistence with others, wear the mask which circumstances impose on them. In other words, each plays his part in the comedy of life, which in this case is the dual farce of the play: Leandro and Crispín, penniless adventurers fleeing from the law, pass themselves off as a powerful gentleman and his servant, and when Leandro wants to appear as he really is, he cannot; the Captain and Arlequín are the incarnation of the ambiguous and sad roles of the unsuccessful hero and poet; Sirena, bankrupt, who gives grand balls to maintain her position, sees herself forced to act with the shamelessness of a Celestina; Colombina, the former servant, passes herself off as Sirena's niece; Polichinela, once a thief, murderer and galley prisoner, is now rich and respected in the city. Silvia, who represents innocence, candor and ingenuousness, is the only important character who appears without disguise<sup>14</sup>.

In *La ciudad alegre y confiada*, Benavente drops the device of the masks. Paradoxically, the characters are no longer alive, even though they develop to a certain extent. Instead, they seem to have become symbols for the author's political ideas, as Starkie rightly observes. It seems to me that the regeneration brought about by the character's defeat and death shows the mutual effect of the ideal and the real at work. Crispín, like Sancho, has moved towards the ideal, but he still perceives reality as it is. He understands that his city, like any other city, cyclically needs a scapegoat to cleanse itself. He willingly accepts the part. On the other hand, Leandro has disappointed him by betraying the only faith, hope and ideal Crispín had found: Leandro's love for Silvia. Crispín succeeds in leading Leandro to his regeneration by condemning the vain apathy in which Leandro had indulged. Leandro then becomes the first hero, when he dies fighting dutifully and courageously for the city.

Benavente, then, incorporates to the *commedia dell'arte* masks the picaresque tradition and elements from *Don Quijote* in his response to

Shakespeare, who also brings about the clash of reality and ideals throughout *The Merchant of Venice*. Shakespeare's presentation is more complex, partly due to the religious confrontation Benavente does not dramatize. Benavente more openly demonstrates skepticism about the influence of the Christian ideal of love already implicit in Shakespeare's message: the bonds of love, however selfish, "of interest", are the only way to achieve the synthesis of reality and ideals which both ennoble the real and tempers the ideal. The values fostered in Belmont result from such a compromise between ideals and reality. Portia takes immediate action to save Antonio because she understands that his death would pose an unsurmountable strain on her marriage, on her ideal love. The lottery Portia's father devised to test her suitors is based on the same philosophy. Unworthy candidates to Portia's hand would not satisfy the demand made by the legend written on the lead casket. In other words, they would refuse to give and risk everything for the apparent plain baseness of lead, which seems too unpromising and even threatening to offer anything worth the hazard. In Venice, the mercantilism governing life jeopardizes the ideal, almost lost in the world of usury, trading, loss and profit. It seems perfectly natural to Salerio that Antonio should be concerned about his material well-being, gained by trading, even at church. Shylock is hated by the members of a Christian community—who believe in love—because he lends money for interest. Evidently, the Christians view trading as completely different from and more morally acceptable than usury.

In *The Merchant of Venice* Shakespeare also includes the picaresque element in his characterization of both Launcelot Gobbo and his old father. I see in Bassanio's portrait, which in this sense is compared to Leandro's, at least one picaresque brush-stroke: he considers his marriage to Portia as a means to pay off his debts. Furthermore, the tradition of the *commedia dell'arte* is also present in the play. John Russell Brown refers to J.R. Moore's remark that Shylock, even though his name does not indicate so, has a few characteristics in common with the "Pantaloon of the *commedia dell'arte*: he is a widower, the head of a household and avaricious, but he is not the ridiculous lover, nor a Magnifico of Venice (such as Antonio)"<sup>15</sup>. Benavente did not make his Pantalón the "ridiculous lover" either but kept him more strictly within the tradition of the *commedia dell'arte*, whereas Shakespeare borrowed from other sources to characterize Shylock as a Jew to make him the yardstick with which to measure the Christians.

14 Peñuelas, pp. 110-11.

15 Russell Brown, ed. *The Merchant*, p. xli.



Gratiano's name suggests Graziano, the traditional name for the comic doctor in the *commedia dell'arte*<sup>16</sup>. While the role of the doctor devolves upon Portia in the trial scene, Gratiano also follows the *commedia dell'arte* tradition. He resembles the gracioso of the Spanish *comedia* of the Golden Age, who is either a lackey or a rustic servant. In either characterization, the gracioso shares with Gratiano a broad, at times obscene, humour. The rustic type of the *gracioso* can be traced to the *commedia dell'arte*<sup>17</sup>. Once again, Shakespeare turns the servant into a friend. Gobbo, according to John Florio's Italian dictionary *A World of Words*, published in 1598, means "croop-backt". I believe, like Moelwyn Merchant, that the name "seems to have intended a family of comic hump-backs, from the Italian *gobba*, a hump, and *gobbo*, a hunchbacked"<sup>18</sup>.

Shakespeare's use of the *commedia dell'arte* elements, following the Italian fashion, adds some consistency to the Italian setting chosen for the play. It seems as if Benavente had paid very close attention to even these vague reminders of the *commedia dell'arte* in Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice* and used it for his own purpose. As has already been pointed out, Benavente establishes how he wishes *Los intereses creados* to be read. In Silvia's closing speech, Benavente explains the philosophic meaning of the play. Silvia "translates" the play for the audience when she builds up a comparison between what has just been performed and "las farsas de la vida" (LI p. 148). According to Silvia, the strings that work the puppets are, for human beings, "los intereses, las pasioncillas, los engaños y todas las miserias de su condición" (LI p. 148).

In *Los intereses creados*, Crispín appears as the puppeteer who controls the strings that work the puppets. Crispín manages to create enough bonds of interest with all the other characters so that they find themselves forced to act in a certain way and make the decisions Crispín wishes them to make so that he and Leandro can achieve their aim. For Leandro and Bassanio, the goal is similar: their marriage will provide their security. The means they use are completely different. Bassanio asks for a loan he intends to repay, even though with Portia's money. Leandro just allows Crispín's machinations, which eventually enable him to gain his objective, despite his protestations.

Although the question in *Los intereses creados* apparently is not very clear, it can be argued that the characters take turns to play the role of the puppet

master. However, they are not completely aware of it. The idea of the puppets works precisely in the reverse order in the plays. Crispín consciously works the strings that engage everybody in his own –thus Leandro's– salvation in *Los intereses creados* and in the city's salvation in *La ciudad alegre y confiada*. In the latter play, Crispín knows he is going to die, so he brings Polichinela with him, for the city's good. After trying, he lets Pantalón go. Crispín had previously had a conversation with Leandro, after which Leandro leaves for the battlefield and gives his life for the city. In *The Merchant of Venice*, everybody contributes to the dramatic situation but it is Portia who works out Antonio's delivery, which brings the situation back to normal.

The idea of human duality also appears in *The Merchant of Venice*, where the characters are not what they seem to be. Shylock is not portrayed just as a cruel infidel but as driven to cruelty by the way the Christians treat him, which, in turn, presents the Christians as less merciful, charitable and loving than they believe themselves to be. Nevertheless, it is Shylock's cruelty that provides the tragic elements leading to the climax of the trial scene. Shylock is clearly human and, through him, Shakespeare depicts rather unchristian attitudes towards material well-being, the Jews and one another. Even though they believe they are actually saving Shylock by having him convert, the Christians have earned nothing but the Jew's hatred for their hypocritical behaviour, which they also observe among themselves<sup>19</sup>. Shylock accuses the Christians of mistreating their slaves. He resents the way the Christians spurn the Jews. Bassanio's offer to sacrifice everything, even his wife, for Antonio, causes Shylock to wish his daughter had married "any of the stock of Barrabas... rather than a Christian" (MVIV.i. 292-93).

Through Shylock's perception of the Christians, and his interaction with them, Shakespeare can venture the compromising part of the thesis of his play: the imperfections of the Christians, like those of the Jew, stem from their identical humanity. Through Shylock's enforced conversion, the playwright seems to question the belief behind that imposed conversion: despite their imperfections, the Christians can be redeemed by the grace of God, whereas "infidels" are irremediably doomed. Even Jessica believes she can be saved because Lorenzo has made her a Christian.

16 W. Moelwyn Merchant, ed. *The Merchant of Venice*, by William Shakespeare, New Penguin Shakespeare (1967; 11th rpt. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin, 1980), p. 179.

17 Margaret Wilson, *Spanish Drama of the Golden Age* (London: Pergamon Press, 1969), p. 52.

18 Merchant, p. 179.

19 P.N. Siegel makes the point that, through Shylock, Shakespeare attacks the Puritans for their hypocrisy. Siegel argues that an Elizabethan audience would hardly need any direct references to perceive the similarity between Shylock and the Puritan usurers. According to Siegel, usury was largely practiced by the Puritans, since the Jews did not amount to a high percentage of the population in England at the time. P.N. Siegel, *Shakespeare in His Time and Ours* (London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968), pp. 237-54.



However, not even Portia conforms to the Christian ideal. She does take some pitiless satisfaction not only in turning the bond against the Jew, but also in delaying his undoing. This does not exactly correspond to her plea for mercy. Moreover, she is demanding a sacrifice from Shylock when she is not in the least inclined to sacrifice Bassanio. Shylock is censured for the fault he shares with all the other characters: he is unable to be generous, to give without demanding repayment for what he gives, Jeanne Heifetz asserts. The Christians, then, do not conform to their ideals, and a compromise is needed. In Heifetz's words:

...the ideals of Belmont are compromised even in Belmont, and dangerously compromised in Venice. The play's final motion resists the pattern: it is a return to Belmont with the lessons of Venice. *The Merchant of Venice* ends in Belmont, in a compromise of ideals with human reality that forces the audience to question both<sup>20</sup>.

Essentially, *Los intereses creados* presents the same idea with a picaresque outlook. Leandro and Crispín arrive in a new city with the knowledge gained from wandering and determined to use it for survival. This struggle for material benefit becomes the strife for spiritual regeneration found in *La ciudad alegre y confiada*.

Benavente, then, through the use of the *commedia dell'arte* masks in both plays, highlights his intention of exposing how the passing of time has changed society. *Los intereses creados* and its sequel convey Benavente's attitude towards his sources by showing how Benavente drew from them to state that society, basically the same, has now reached such a degree of corruption that a blood sacrifice, never allowed in *The Merchant of Venice*, is necessary for its regeneration. This is seen from the very opening of *La ciudad alegre y confiada*. Benavente, once again, sets the tone and the purpose of the play in a prologue, recited by Desterrado, whose tone is already far graver than that of Crispín's opening speech in *Los intereses creados*. The reason: "hoy sabe la farándula que es todo el mundo un lugar de miseria, todos los días tristes" (LC p. 155). Moreover, the world "es teatro de tragedia, y si el Arte mismo no puede ser hoy serenidad, si no quiere parecer inhumano, ¿cómo puede ser bufonada sin parecernos un insulto al dolor y a la muerte?" (LC p. 156).

In other words, the prologue to *La ciudad alegre y confiada* already establishes that Benavente's philosophy has taken one step forward since the writing of *Los intereses creados*, where he ends approximately at the same

20 Jeanne Heifetz *Love Calls Us to the Things of This World: The Return to Belmont in The Merchant of Venice* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1981), pp. 45-6.

point as Shakespeare finishes his *The Merchant of Venice*: love is the only way society has to redeem itself. Redemption has to start individually before it can reach society as a whole, and it does so through the Christian ideals of mercy and charity. These are necessary both to counteract a person's innate selfishness and to temper justice. Benavente, Starkie notes, also summarizes his philosophy in Silvia's final words to expose the true sense of the farce: despite "his perpetual pessimism, he [Benavente] always looks ahead to the ideal of Christianity"<sup>21</sup>. I think this is suggested in Silvia's speech by her mention of love, evoking its related concepts of mercy and charity and, more obviously, the idea of the divine share men enjoy, which rescues them from their baseness. Silvia says:

Y en ella visteis, como en las farsas de la vida, que a estos muñecos, como a los humanos, muévenlos cordelillos groseros, que son los intereses, las pasioncillas, los engaños y todas las miserias de su condición; tiran unos de sus pies y los llevan a tristes andanzas; tiran otros de sus manos, que trabajan con pena, luchan con rabia, hurtan con astucia, matan con violencia. Pero entre todos ellos descende a veces del cielo al corazón un hilo sutil, como tejido con luz de sol y con luz de luna: el hilo del amor, que a los humanos, como a estos muñecos que semejan humanos, los hace parecer divinos, y trae a nuestra frente resplandores de aurora, y pone alas en nuestro corazón y nos dice que no todo es farsa en la farsa, que hay algo divino en nuestra vida que es verdad y es eterno y no puede acabar cuando la farsa acaba.

(LI p. 148)

*La ciudad alegre y confiada* turns to patriotism to fulfill the same redeeming function.

21 Starkie, p. 161.

# WORKS CITED

- BENAVENTE, Jacinto. *Los intereses creados. La ciudad alegre y onfiada. Cartas de mujeres*. 4th ed. Crisol, 22. Madrid: Aguilar, 1950.
- HEIFETZ, Jeanne *Love Calls Us to the Things of This World: The Return to Belmont*. Cambridge, Mass. Harvard University Press, 1981.
- PEÑUELAS, Marcelino. *Jacinto Benavente*. Trans. Kay Engler. TWAS, 57. New York: Twayne, 1968.
- SHAKESPEARE, William. *The Merchant of Venice* Ed. John Russell Brown. 7th ed. The New Arden Shakespeare. 1955; 3rd rpt. London: Methuen, 1961.
- . *The Merchant of Venice*. Ed. Moelwyn Merchant. New Penguin Shakespeare. 1967; 11th rpt. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin, 1980.
- SIEGEL, P.N. *Shakespeare in His Time and Ours*. London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968.
- STARKIE, Walter. *Jacinto Benavente* London: Oxford University Press, 1924.
- WILSON, Margaret. *Spanish Drama of the Golden Age*. London: Pergamon Press, 1969.

## TAMBURLAINE, THE SCOURGE OF GOD: MEXÍA, MARLOWE AND VÉLEZ DE GUEVARA

F. Javier Sánchez Escribano  
University of Zaragoza

Tamburlaine (or Timur Lang, 1336-1405) is one of those historical characters who have become a legend and a myth<sup>1</sup>. History and literature unite in the formation (deformation?) of these characters. This is also the case of Richard II of England, his contemporary, and many others. In this paper I want to show how the figure of Tamburlaine as Scourge of God was used by three different writers.

Pedro Mexia published his *Silva de Varia Lección* in 1540 (43?). Chapter XXVIII of Part I is dedicated to Tamburlaine and has the title: "Del excelentísimo capitán y muy poderoso rey el Gran Tamorlán. De los reinos y provincias que conquistó; y su disciplina y arte militar"<sup>2</sup>. The *Silva* was very well known in the Renaissance, and it was first translated into English in 1571 under the title: *The foreste or collection of histories, no less profitable then pleasant...* Dooen out of French into Englishe, by Thomas Fortescue. London, I. Kyngston for W. Jones, 1571<sup>3</sup>.

As we can see in the title, the Chapter dedicated to Tamburlaine is a description of his conquests and personality. He was often a *libertador* of oppressed peoples, an "excelente capitán que fue tan sabio y diestro en gobernar su gente que nunca hubo en ella motín ni rebelión notable"<sup>4</sup>. But he was also cruel. A merchant from Genoa who travelled with the army of Tamburlaine dared to ask him why he showed so much cruelty with those who humbly implored his mercy. There comes a short reference to the Scourge of God. It is reported that

1 The relevance of this medieval king is shown by the numerous embassies that visited him. See F. López Estrada: "La relation de l'ambassade d' Henry II au Grand Tamerlan". *Etudes de Lettres*, Revue de la Faculté des Lettres, Université de Lausanne. Recilts et voyages hispaniques. Juillet-Septembre, 1992. 28 pgs.

2 *Silva de varia lección*. Madrid: Sociedad de Bibliófilos Españoles, 1933. Tomo I, pp. 413-421.

3 An extract of it was translated and published in 1565-7. The 1571 edition was followed by others in 1576, 1613-19, 1651 and 1656. See A.F. Allison: *English Translations from the Spanish and Portuguese to the Year 1700*. London: Dawsons of Pall Mall, 1974. Entry: Mexía.

4 *Silva*, op. cit. p. 415.

Tamburlaine, with much anger and alteration, his face as burning and his eyes full of fire, answered: "Tú debes de pensar que yo soy hombre como los otros. Muy engañado estás en ello, que no soy sino ira de Dios y destrucción del mundo; y no parezcas más ante mí si no quieres llevar el pago que merescé tu atrevimiento". The merchant, who knew him well, changed his route and he was not seen again<sup>5</sup>.

It is admitted by the critics that the *Silva* was one of the sources Marlowe used for his *Tamburlaine*. Infinite ambition, inordinate lust of dominion, and unbounded belief in his own victorious destiny are outstanding qualities in the sixteenth century conception of Tamburlaine, not products of Marlowe's invention. This is not to say that Marlowe used everything in the histories without selecting for his purpose. It is obvious that he was more interested in the spiritual consequences of this power lust, as Leslie Spence says<sup>6</sup>.

The title page of Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* (1590) presents "two Tragical Discourses" concerning a mighty monarch who "(for his tyranny, and terrour in Warre) was termed, THE SCOURGE OF GOD". It is not only a mere phrase repeated more than a dozen times in the play; it is a definitive concept which signifies a pattern of human behaviour and of divine destiny. This concept is used in different ways by Catholics and Protestants, the latter exploiting the idea more than the former. Roy W. Battenhouse wrote an extraordinary study of the concept<sup>7</sup>.

In the Renaissance orthodox doctrine taught that God punishes the wicked in two ways: internally, by sending maladies of the mind and perturbations of the passions; externally, by permitting the ravages of tyrants, who are thus made to serve God as his scourges. In using the second of these two means of punishment, God permits evil agents to rage for a time, to be used simply as a means of punishing the wickedness of other men. "Scourge of God", then is a concept employed in accounting for historical calamities such as wars and tyrannies, which are interpreted as social punishments inflicted under God's providence by wicked men who will quite probably suffer the same type of "scourge" themselves in the course of time.

Although an ancient notion, it was frequently invoked by Renaissance moralists who wished to make it clear that retributive justice is not confined to an after-world.

Plutarch, among the pagan philosophers, says Battenhouse, is the first to point towards the theory of the employment of scourges by divine providence<sup>8</sup>. God abandons the wicked to tyrants, whom he uses as rods for punishing sin. A century and a half later, Plotinus says that bad men hold sway because of the feebleness, folly, and sloth of their victims, that Providence permits great wrong-doers to receive ultimately an appropriate punishment. Plutarch and Plotinus were very popular with educated readers of Elizabethan England.

Battenhouse points out that the more authoritative origin of this concept, the "Scourge of God", is to be found, however, in the Old Testament prophecy of Isaiah (X: 5-16), where Assyria is described as the rod of God's anger raised against the sins of Israel. Calvin in his commentary on this passage<sup>9</sup>, makes much of the point that the Assyrian, though at heart ambitious, lustful, and avaricious, is nevertheless made to serve God's purpose. The Assyrian is described as furious, proud, and blasphemous. He treads his enemies under foot, "which is the uttermost of all rage, for what can men do more then with shame and contempt to stamp them *under feete* whom they haue vanquished?"<sup>10</sup>. He recites his conquests, boasts of the ease of his victories, and finally vaunts himself against God. But the Assyrian's boastings, says Calvin, are "so many belowes (as it were) to kindle the wrath of God." God's flame shall utterly consume the Assyrian's glory. And the burning shall be a light to God's faithful, exhibiting to them God's revenge. Calvin at one point applies Isaiah's doctrine to the interpretation of Renaissance history. He remarks:

So at this day there are diuers diseases in the Church which the Lord will purge and heale... Wherefore wee must not maruell if he lets loose the bridle to tyrants, and suffreth them still to exercise their crueltie against his Church: for the consolation is readie, to wit, hauing used them as his vassals to correct his people, he will visit their pride and arrogancie<sup>11</sup>.

8 See also Seneca's *De ira*, and among the christians Lactancius's *De Ira Dei*.

9 *A Commentary Vpon the Prophecie of Isaiah* (1609), pp. 115-122. It appeared in Latin in 1551, in French in 1552, both editions dedicated to Edward VI. Later Latin editions appeared in 1559, 1570, and 1583; and a 1572 French translation of the 1570 Latin edition was the basis of C. Cotton's English translation, entered to Harrison and Bishop as early as 21 Jan 1577, then on 26 Jan. 1608 to Kingston, and printed by him 1609.

10 It is therefore a particularly appropriate sign of Tamburlain's rage when he treads Bajazet under foot, and when he orders his horsemen to charge (and thus to trample under foot) the virgins of Damascus. (*Tamburlaine*, 11. 1458, 1898).

11 *Commentary*, pp. 119-120.

5 Idem. p. 420. See also Perondinus' *Vita Magni Tamerlanis*. Florence, 1551.

6 Leslie Spence: "Tamburlaine and Marlowe". *PMLA*, XLII, 1927. pp. 605-6.

7 Roy W. Battenhouse: "Tamburlaine, The 'Scourge of God'". *PMLA*, XX, 1941. pp. 337-348.

The "Scourge of God" concept helped explain history to many others besides Calvin, continues Battenhouse. The concept was useful, for example, in accounting for the miseries suffered by Christendom at the hands of the Turks. God "sufferethe the wicked and cursed seed of Hismael to be a scourge and whip us for our synnes", wrote Peter Ashton in a preface to his *Shorte Treatise Upon the Turkes Chronicles* (1546). And Richard Knolles in "The Preface to the Reader" of his *The Generall Historie of the Turkes* (1603) gives the same explanation of Christendom's suffering. The Turkish empire has had scandalous successes. One cause for this domination is "the vncertainetie of worldly things", which must be forever rising and falling. But "the first and greatest" cause, Knolles says,

is the iust and secret iudgement of the Almightye, who in iustice deliuereth into the hands of these mercilesse miscreants, nation after nation, and kingdome vpon kingdome, as vnto the most terrible executioners of his dreadful wrath, to be punished for their sinnes<sup>12</sup>.

Philip Mornay, says Battenhouse, whose popular work of Huguenot apologetics was translated by Sidney and Golding<sup>13</sup>, interpreted some of the greatest heroes of history as unwitting instruments of Divine Providence. For example, Cyrus was led by his ambition to make war upon the Assyrians. But God adapted Cyrus' design to an historical purpose of His own: the deliverance of the Israelites. Titus was led by his own passion to attack Jerusalem: but God thus made Titus the executor of justice against the Jews who crucified Christ. When Judas betrayed Christ, the devil himself served God's providence. Mornay's most significant example, however, is Attila, the great robber-conqueror, much famed as God's scourge<sup>14</sup>. Mornay's Attila is like Isaiah's Assyrian and like Marlowe's Tamburlaine:

Likewise when *Attila* entered euen into the bowelles of Europe, all the Preachers of Christendom did nothing els but bewayle the wretchednesse of that tyme. Ye must thinke that when this great Robber cast lots in his Countrie of Scythia, whether he should leade the third part of that land, he had another meaning then to reforme the world. Yet not withstanding, all men acknowledge him to be a necessary scourge of GOD, and to haue come in due season. Yea, and he himselfe considering that he had

conquered much more of the Countrie, than euer he hoped at the first to haue seene, insomuch that he had ouercome euen those which were counted the strength of the World: as barbarous as he was, he fell to thinke of himself, that he was the Scurge whereby God chastised the World. Not that God is not able to chastise vs himselfe whensoever he listeth... but that as a Maister of a howshold holdeth skorne to whippe his Slaues himselfe... but causeth (peradventure) the groome of his stable to doe it, to the intent to show them the iustnesse of his displeasure: Euen so doth God punish the wicked one by another<sup>15</sup>.

As Battenhouse points out, Marlowe as a divinity student at Cambridge very probably read Protestant theologians such as Mornay. This would provide us with ample justification for examining quite precisely this theory which makes histories of warfare so piously educational. A fundamental aspect to the "Scourge of God" concept, of course, is that provides a solid justification for the existence of wars: they are paradoxically justified (they scourge sinners) and at the same time are condemned (by God, who will eventually see to it that the wager of war is in his turn punished).

Thus, as Battenhouse shows, Elizabethan authors commonly define war as "a scourge of the wrath of God"<sup>16</sup>. Greville condemns war as "the perfect type of Hell", but also justifies war as, by Heaven's overruling power, "The sword of Justice, and of Sinne the terror". He explains that war is a form of tyranny grounded in man's sin, arising when man gives rein to the rebellion that lives in his nature. Thus, when man repeats the original sin and strives to become God, he becomes merely the Scourge of God. Greville points to Nimrod and to the Turkish empire as two notable examples of highly prosperous tyranny founded on war. He explains that Mahomet's religion is, essentially, a Religion-of-War: it prepares men for danger only; it considers virtues of peace effeminate; its discipline is not how to use but how to get; its Church is "mere collusion and deceit"<sup>17</sup>. So Mahomet's followers, boldly "climbing vp vnited staires" of diligent wickedness, have prevailed over the Christians, because the Christians are split between a doctrine of peace and a pope who stirs them up to war. The wicked Turks punish the impious Christians. War is of the devil, but the devil is under the providence of God.

<sup>12</sup> Quoted by Battenhouse, p. 339.

<sup>13</sup> Mornay's *De la Vérité de la Religion Chrestienne* (Antwerp, 1581) is in the S.R. licensed for translation on 13 Oct., 1581, and on 7 Nov., 1586, Thomas Cadman was paid for printing the translation.

<sup>14</sup> Vélez de Guevara has also a play called *Atila, azote de Dios*.

<sup>15</sup> Mornay, op. cit., p. 209.

<sup>16</sup> The quoted phrase is Nicholas Breton's in *Characters Upon Essays Moral and Divine* (1615). Note also in *The Good and the Bad* (1616) Breton's character of "An Unworthy King": he is "the scourge of sin... he knows no God, but makes an idol of nature..." (Cf. *Tamburlaine*, 1. 869).

<sup>17</sup> Note that Tamburlaine in Marlowe's play exhibits just such religion as is here described.

Nimrod, whom Greville has cited as type-example of the Scourge, was a hero known to Renaissance readers in Du Bartas' popular story. The story is noteworthy, because the pattern of Nimrod's career parallels Tamburlaine's. At an early age Nimrod tyrannizes, like Tamburlaine, over shepherds.

Battenhouse goes on to show that the "Scourge of God" notion often contains within it its own undoing. The tyrant Cæsar, so Philip Mornay said, was slain miserably "To shewe vnto Tyrannes that the highest step of their greatnesse is tyed to a halter, and that they be but Gods scourges which he will cast into the fyre when he hath done with them"<sup>18</sup>. And La Primaudaye affirmed that for tyrants God has His own secret but sure stroke of revenge – "God will returne into their bosom the euill which they haue done"<sup>19</sup>. This faith sustained the important Elizabethan doctrine that men should not for private reasons take God's revenge into their own hands.

The concept of the "Scourge of God" has, therefore, two complementary pedagogical aspects: it goes someway to explaining the difficult "problem of evil": calamities are just chastisements permitted by God and tyrants should take note that their excesses will not go unpunished: they in their turn will be chastised.

There is, certainly, says Battenhouse, good reason for supposing that Marlowe was not ignorant of the meaning of the concept. The Scythian Tamburlaine is, like the Scythian Attila and like all Turks and Titans, a Scourge of God. In terms of Isaiah's philosophy of history, his rise can be seen as having a providential purpose because of the wickedness of the Persians, the Turks, and the Babylonians. He is a rod for their chastisement. The scourging which he administers is, except in the case of the virgins of Damascus, more or less deserved: Mycetes is a vain and foolish king; Cosroe is a usurper; Bajazet is proud and cruel. Tamburlaine is perhaps more wicked than they; but God uses the wicked to punish the wicked. The destruction and slaughter which Tamburlaine wreaks in his lust for power but under the mask of piety are a scandal permitted under God's providential justice.

The conqueror's religion is a Religion of War. Throughout the play Tamburlaine fulfills the action demanded by his rôle as Scourge of God. Until such time as Heaven decides to cast its Scourge into the fire, he is permitted to continue in a crescendo of pride and conquest.

Finally, we have the catastrophic spectacle of Tamburlaine's blasphemy and death. This is the point which Tamburlaine's history reaches with the Triumphal Entry into Babylon. Drawn in his chariot by slave-kings, Tamburlaine likens himself appropriately to Belus, the son of Nimrod, to Ninus, legendary Assyrian conqueror, and to Alexander. These earliest of kings (the accent on primitivism may be significant) were, for Elizabethan readers, stock examples of pride, ambition, and impiety.

The overthrow of Babylon has symbolic importance, because Babylon in Christian tradition is, as we know, the epitome of wickedness<sup>20</sup>. The moment therefore is a significant one. Tamburlaine, calling himself God's scourge, has, like the Assyrian of Isaiah's prophecy, punished the world's wickedness symbolized by Babylon. His usefulness as Scourge may now be regarded as at an end. We may expect him, like the Assyrian, to vaunt himself against God. Even while his soldiers are still about the work of the destruction of Babylon, Tamburlaine calls out:

Now *Casane*, wher's the Turkish *Alcaron*  
And all the heapes of supersticiousbookes,  
Found in the Temples of that *Mahomet*,  
Whom I haue thought a God? they shal be burnt.

.....

In vaine I see men worship Mahomet.  
My sword hath sent millions of Turks to hell,  
Slew all his Priests, his kinsmen, and his friends,  
And yet liue vntoucht by *Mahomet*.

(II.4284-4297)<sup>21</sup>.

Then, as the books are burning<sup>22</sup>, Tamburlaine reveals to us that he has reached the moral stand which Greene called "atheist", and which is, to speak accurately and according to Calvin's interpretation, the epitome of blasphemy. He dares God out of heaven in a manner which recalls certain bystanders at Calvary addressing Christ. He repudiates God's laws and openly questions the existence of God. His words are:

Now *Mahomet*, if thou haue any power,  
Come down thy selfe and worke a miracle,  
Thou art not worthy to be worshipped,  
That suffers flames of fire to burne the writ  
Wherein the sum of thy religion rests.

18 Mornay, op. cit., p. 196.

19 The Second Part of *The French Academie* (1594), p. 326.

20 Tamburlaine coincides in time with the schism of Avignon, "the Babylonian captivity".

21 C.F. Tucker Brooke (Ed.): *The works of Christopher Marlowe*. O.U.P., 1969 (1910).

22 This is not historical: he was reported to be a devout Muslim and a man of letters.

Why send'st thou not a furious whyrlwind downe,  
 To blow thy Alcaron vp to thy throne,  
 Where men report, thou sitt'st by God himselfe,  
 Orvengeance on the head of *Tamburlain*,  
 That shakes his sword against thy maiesty,  
 And spurns the Abstracts of thy foolish laws.  
 Wel souldiers, *Mahomet* remains in hell,  
 He cannot heare the voice of *Tamburlain*,  
 Seeke out another Godhead to adore,  
 The God that sits in heauen, if any God,  
 For he is God alone, and none but he.

(ll. 4298-4313)

Less than twenty lines later Tamburlaine cries: "But stay, I feele my selfe distempered sudainly" (l. 4329). The average Elizabethan could be relied upon to draw the right conclusion in terms of the moral teaching of the day: "it is often said of the wicked in the Scripture, that God will return into their bosom the euill which they haue done" (La Primaudaye). God has cast his Scourge into the fire – a fire in Tamburlaine's own blood, kindled by the conqueror himself.

I do not know a Catholic equivalent of the Protestant concept of "Scourge of God" as seen in Marlowe's play. In Spanish drama we only have Guevara's play, where that concept is used in a different way and Tamburlaine becomes God's arm to avenge a love affair, as we will see.

Luis Vélez de Guevara (Ecija, 1570 - Madrid, 1644) was one of the few playwrights of the Spanish Golden Century who didn't care about the printing of his works. That's why they are distributed in different collections, although a lot of them appeared first as *sueeltas*, and today are an authentic rarity. An example is his play

*Comedia Famosa, la Nueva Ira de Dios, y Gran Tamerlan de Persia...*  
 En Valladolid: En la Imprenta de Alonso del Riego, en donde se hallará  
 con otros distintos, Historias, Comedias, Autos, Libros, Coplas, Entre-  
 meses, y Estampas. (without date)<sup>23</sup>.

His plays, says Mesonero Romanos, "pertenecen al drama apellidado entonces de *ruido ó de cuerpo*<sup>24</sup>; tratan argumentos é intervienen en ellos

23 The volume I have been using includes *the Entremès del Hijo de Vezino*. The pagination is mine.

24 "Dos caminos tendréis por donde enderezar los pasos cómicos en materia de trazas. Al uno llaman comedias de cuerpo, al otro de ingenio ó de capa y espada. En las de cuerpo, que sin las de reyes de Hungría ó de príncipes de Transilvania, suelen ser de vidas de santos, intervienen varias tramoyas y apariencias". (Suárez de Figueroa, *El Pasajero*).

personajes históricos y elevados, vidas y hechos esforzados de los héroes y de los santos, y expresado todo con el mayor lujo de entonación y accesorios de efecto en la escena, especialmente codiciados por el público de aquella época"<sup>25</sup>. I have been talking about history and histories in this paper, but we must take care when we apply it to Guevara's works. Cotarelo, a specialist on Guevara, said that "más de la mitad de sus comedias son históricas, legendarias o genealógicas"<sup>26</sup>. We must not take "históricas" in a literal sense.

Alberto Lista, protagonist of the revival of the Sevillian renaissance poetry of the eighteenth century, criticized Guevara in the most absolute terms and gives an accurate description of some of his heroes:

Pocos vestigios se ven en GUEVARA de las mejoras que hizo Lope en el arte dramático. Mas bien parece imitador de las comedias de Virués, Cervantes y otros antecesores del padre de nuestro teatro, que de la gracia y fiel representación de las pasiones humanas, que, à pesar de sus defectos, admiramos en los dramas de este. Casi todas sus fábulas son ó se fingen tomadas de la historia. Figuran en ellas Tamorlan, Escanderbech, el rey Desiderio, Atila, Roldan, Bernardo del Carpio, cuyos caracteres desfigura, dando á estos héroes el lenguaje de los rufianes y baladrones. Gusta mucho de la bambolla y del aparato teatral, como Virués, é introduce, como él, personajes alegóricos<sup>27</sup>.

A comentary that was retaken by Alborg in our days:

Vélez se tomaba con los hechos y personajes históricos –lo mismo nacionales que extranjeros– idénticas libertades que todos los dramaturgos de su tiempo: la Historia era sólo un depósito generosamente colmado de acontecimientos y tipos de excepción, en donde proveer para urdir conflictos de comedia. Y esta condición es todavía más notoria en el teatro del ecijano, hasta el punto de constituir una de sus más acusadas características. Ningún otro dramaturgo llevó a las tablas, en la misma medida que Vélez, tantos reyes y reinas, apasionadas damas y audaces caballeros, siempre trazados a escala heroica. No faltan entre sus obras las piezas de más sencillo y natural enredo, pero la mayor parte de las suyas están repletas de románticos sucesos, violencias y crímenes, virtudes conducidas hasta imposible perfección o pasiones de anormal y bárbaro primitivismo<sup>28</sup>.

25 R. Mesonero Romanos: *Dramáticos Contemporáneos de Lope de Vega*, Tomo Segundo. En Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, Tomo 45. Madrid: M. Rivadencira, 1858. p. xii.

26 Emilio Cotarelo y Mori: "Luis Vélez de Guevara y sus obras dramáticas". En *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Lengua*, III, 1916. p. 622.

27 Quoted by Mesonero Romanos, op. cit. pp. xii-xiii.

28 Juan Luis Alborg: *Historia de la Literatura Española*, II. Madrid: Gredos, 1977 (1967). p. 389.

As we are going to see, the idea of Tamburlaine as Scourge of God has been transformed. The influence of Mexia and Perondinus is clear, especially in the description of our hero:

Hõbre es de mediano cuerpo,  
de cuya espantosa cara,  
aun aqui la carne tiembla,  
rizada, y negra la barva,  
los ojosdesencaxados,  
la nariz abierta, y ancha,  
con una señalde herida:  
es la mitad de su cara  
de la color de la rosa,  
y la otra mitad morada:  
los labios gruessos, y roxos:  
y la nerbiosa garganta,  
como de un fiero novillo  
con las venas señaladas.  
Largo, y negro es el cabello,  
fornido el Pecho, y la espalda,  
travado de braço, y ombro,  
y la mano corta, y ancha;  
las piernas largas, y recias,  
calçada una tosca abarca:  
es coxo de la una pierna,  
por esto en la lengua Persiana,  
por llamarle el hierro coxo,  
el gran Tamorlàn le llaman.

(p. 8-9)

In this play, Vélez de Guevara transforms the story into a love affair interrupted by Tamburlain. Bayaceto, Emperor of the Turks, is captured when he was escaping with a ladder from the rooms of Aurelia, daughter of the Emperor of Greece. Eventually, the latter agrees to the wedding of the Turk and his daughter. The erotic triangle is completed by Eleazara, former Bayaceto's mistress, who curses this mestiza union in a long speech:

Ya no puedo ser tu esposa,  
quedate con tu Christiana,  
y Alà os dê mestizos hijos,  
de las dos leyes contrarias,  
Mahoma permita, aleve,  
en la primera batalla,  
que tu cavallo te arrastre,  
pues tu Alcoran arrastras.

(p. 5)

This is the atmosphere. Tamburlain becomes God's arm to avenge a love affair of a Christian princess and the Turk. And he is introduced with the idea that he was elected by God:

Christianos ay en Balaquia,  
pero aunque Christianos son  
à trueco de verse libres,  
seguiran nuestra opinion.  
El Tamorlàn me llamais,  
que en vestra Persiana voz  
quiere dezir, Hierro coxo,  
porque coxo, y fuerte soy.  
Esta rosa, que en mi cara  
demuestra un grande arrebol  
dize, que en mi nacimiento  
fuí señalado de Dios.

(p. 3)

although from the beginning we have him as his scourge, the avenger against the Turk:

Tenèos, villanos honrados,  
dexad vivos à estos dos,  
que de en medio desta afrenta,  
quedan para dârle cuenta  
deste castigode Dios,  
al Exercito de Turcos.

(p. 6)

"Tamorlan" against God: "la nueva ira de Dios", as he is addressed by different characters:

Yo, que soy el Tameràn,  
yo soy el que fui pastor  
vil, de baxo nacimiento,  
y he de ascender al assiento,  
y estado superior.  
Yo soy quien con tardo buelo  
la tierra pienso ganar,  
y si lo llegoà intentar,  
he de alçarme con el Cielo.

Bay.: .....

Tam.: Ni Alà quiero q me ayude,  
ni mahoma, ni la Luna,  
y quiero, que la fortuna  
sea contraria, y no se mude;

ni quiero favor del Cielo,  
mientras durare la guerra,  
sea en mi contra la tierra,  
tengame por fuerza el suelo,  
juntese todo el poder  
del mundo oy en contra mia,  
que antes, que se acabe el día,  
te he de matar, ò prender.

(p. 10)

Tamburlain, after vaunting heaven and earth, directs his conquests towards the deep. Remember the medieval and renaissance idea of the four levels of the Universe:

Yo, q os ofreci en mi tierra?  
yá sè que prometí un día,  
que â todos os premiaria  
en acabando la guerar;  
acabese, que es temprano;  
la pada no me pidais,  
hasta que el cetro veais  
de todo el mundo en mi mano,  
y luego con pecho fiel,  
que aya conquistado el mundo,  
irè â ganar el profundo,  
por daros Reynos en èl.

(p. 22)

As happens in Marlowe's *Tamburlain, Part II*, there is an unnatural coalition of Christians and Muslims against Tamburlain. He dies, not in peace as Mexía says, but poisoned by Aurelia:

Mas ay Alà, què es aquesto?  
què fuego en el alma se entra,  
que las entrañas me abrasa?  
ay Cielos! mi muerte es cierta.  
O Alâ cruel, y embidioso,  
que por està en tu esfera  
seguro de mis hazañas,  
oy a morir me condenas.  
Aguardame Bayaceto,  
que en las infernales penas,  
dixiste, que me aguardabas,  
y ya està mi alma en ellas.

(p. 28-29)

Velez follows Mexia in the description of the huge tomb built for Tamerlan:

Llebad esse fiero monstruo;  
y en essas asperas sierras,  
que dividen los confines  
de la Rufia, y de la Grecia,  
le hazed un bello sepulcro,  
por dexar memoria eterna  
de su vida, y de su muerte,  
y en él enterrado sea.

(p. 29)

As we have seen, very little of Battenhouse's exposition of the "Scourge of God" theory in the Renaissance is kept in Guevara's play. Only the idea is left. The figure of Tamburlaine is transformed, exaggerated, suitable for the theatrical apparatus of the Spanish drama of the 17th century. The Spanish conquistador Aguirre was also termed "la cólera de Dios", but this is another theme.

Y aquí acaba la Comedia / de la Nueva Ira de Dios / y Gran Tamorlàn de Persia.



## **THE ROMANCE IN SHAKESPEARE: *ROMEO AND JULIET AND THE TEMPEST***

**Concha Sastre Colino**  
Universidad de Valladolid

Shakespeare did not write any philosophical treatise on drama but he understood the deep interaction between laughter and tears in dramatic art. Shakespeare delights in portraying human life with the specific circumstances and peculiarities involved in it. In Shakespeare, life includes good and evil. Therefore he gives a vision of life and characters interlaced with comedy and tragedy.

The happy end which characterizes comedy is transcended in romance given that romance contemplates a wider spectrum: in romance, we find a mixture of content. It is a story with a happy ending without the logical aspect: cause and effect. In Romance, the characters in the end have reached the impossible: they find themselves transcending time and space; reconciliation takes place; virtue and joy, common to man's happiness, become real. This achievement is only possible when man is in harmony with Divinity and Nature, in which the idealistic landscape is a reflection of supernatural light.

Doctor Samuel Johnson says that Shakespeare's literary production cannot be classified simply as tragedy or comedy, but should be considered in its own right. The "comic relief" acquires magnificence in relation to the tragedy, the emphasis in Romance lies in happening. With regard to the subject under discussion, Samuel Johnson says that the dialogue emerges from the event. Romance has so much lightness and simplicity that it seems to have life, to be real. These dialogues seem to be taken from common events in life.

The features mentioned above fit the comprehension and flexibility that Shakespeare tries to give to the expression. The language is ductile and fluent, being at the service of a metaphorically spiritual conception. Although the language becomes precise, it does not refer specifically to particular events of every day life. Rhythm is deliberately slow and beauty prevails in his works.

The effect of music is another important aspect worthy of consideration. In *The Tempest* we can appreciate that spirituality is represented through music: it is the music of heavenly spheres which suggests purely mystical joy, captivates

the senses and enchants the critical faculty of mind. Music awakens conscience: it is the filter of spiritual experience. In *The Tempest*, Act III, sc.iii, there is a strange vision in which spirits dance to the music of intense melody. Here is the introduction to this scene:

Solemn and strange music; and Prosper on the top (invisible). Enter several strange shapes, bringing in a banquet; and dance about it with gentle action of salutations; and inviting the King, & c., to eat, they depart<sup>1</sup>.

Alonso and Gonzalo, while listening to the strangely solemn music, exclaim:

Alon.: What harmony is this? My good friends, hark!

Gon.: Marvellous sweet music!

(III.iii.18-19)

In Act V. sc.i., Alonso, who remained motionlessly bewitched by the spell Prospero had cast upon him, is greeted by the latter:

A solemn air, and the best comforter.  
To an unsettled fancy, cure the brains,  
Now useless, boil'd within thy skull! there stand,  
For you are spell-stopped.

(V.i.58-61)

The Shakespearean Romance is mainly influenced by two important literary genres:

In the first place, The Medieval Romance (Knight Romance). The Romance has certain typical features: it generally concerns young Knights and involves a large amount of fighting as well as a number of miscellaneous adventures; the hero is often involved in romantic love with an inaccessible lady; The hero or the heroine, in the romance, is the representative of virtue and spiritual transcendentalism. The romance makes liberal use of the improbable and often of the supernatural. The plots generally consist of a great number of events, and the same event is apt to occur several times within the same romance.

Shakespeare adopts the style of the romance featuring the overtones of the code of chivalry: love at first sight, courtesy, commitment, adventure and intrigues. The writer takes over the religious, moral and social system of the Middle Ages, based on the ideal qualities expected of a knight, such as courage, honour, courtesy and concern for the weak and helpless.

In the second place, The Pastoral Romance: ranging from *Daphne and Chloe* to Edmund Spenser's *The Fairie Queene*, Sir Philip Sidney's *The Arcadia*, John Lyly's *Galathea and La Diana* by the Spanish writer, Jorge de Montemayor.

The Pastoral setting shows the idealism reflected in the romance. It is the story of unlucky lovers or shepherds of noble birth. This is made evident by divine intervention, which always helps young lovers in an environment of a supernatural and wonderfully idyllic atmosphere.

The romance idealizes love, irrespective of the realities of life. Nevertheless, Shakespeare, while accepting idealized love, imbues it with temporal elements, vis-à-vis every day life.

Shakespeare creates harmony between the romantic and the comic effect. This is highly visible in the subject of our study: The plays of *Romeo and Juliet* and *The Tempest*. These plays feature the most representative imagery of both The Knight and The Pastoral Romance. Let us analyse these aspects:

Both couples, Romeo and Juliet and Ferdinand and Miranda, fall in love the instant they meet and love immediately blossoms. They express their love for each other passionately.

The first time that Romeo sees Juliet (a Capulet), with whom his own family (the Montagues) are at feud, expels all childish sentimentalism, and he asks himself: "Did my heart love till now? Forswear it, sight. // For I ne'er saw true beauty till this night" (I.v.51-52).

Romeo, bewitched by Juliet's beauty, does not hesitate to speak in a loud voice in the house of his enemy, singing the praises of his lady:

Romeo: O, she doth teach the torches to burn bright,  
It seems she hangs upon the cheek of night  
As a rich jewel in an Ethiop's ear  
Beauty too rich for use, for earth too dear.  
So shows a snowy dove trooping with crows  
As yonder lady o'er her fellows shows.  
The measure done, I'll watch her place of stand,  
And touching hers, make blessed my rude hand.  
*Did my heart love till now?* Forswear it, sight.  
For I ne'er saw true beauty till this night.

(I.v.43-52)

As Juliet, in the balcony scene reveals, her love for Romeo with sweet, tender words:

<sup>1</sup> Shakespeare, William: *The Tempest*.

Juliet: Thou knowest the mask of night is on my face,  
Else would a maiden blush bepaint my cheek  
For that which thou hast heard me speak tonight.  
Fain would I dwell on form; fain, fain deny  
What I have spoke. But farewell, compliment.  
Dost thou love me? I know thou wilt say 'Ay',  
And I will take thy word. Yet, if thou swear'st,  
Thou mayst prove false. At lovers' perjuries,  
They say, Jove laughs. O gentle Romeo,  
If thou dost love, pronounce it faithfully.

(II.ii.85-94)

The commitment, avowals of love and loyalty from the lovers occur in their second encounter, in Capulets' garden, the night they saw each other for the first time. Let us look at this little fragment:

Romeo: Lady, by yonder blessed moon I vow,  
That tips with silver all these fruit-tree tops-

Juliet: O swear not by the moon, th'inconstant moon,  
That monthly changes in her circled orb,  
Lest that thy love prove likewise variable.

Romeo: What shall I swear by?

Juliet: Do not swear at all.  
Or if thou wilt, swear by thy gracious self,  
Which is the god of my idolatry,  
And I'll believe thee.

Romeo: If my heart's dear love-

(II.ii.107-115)

Some similarities are found between the scene mentioned above and the final part of scene i, in Act III, 67-90 in *The Tempest*. In this scene Miranda y Ferdinand declare their mutual love for each other and seal it with vows of marriage, swearing to be loyal and true. Aside, Prospero takes great delight in gazing at the young couple together. He watches them cautiously, avoiding being seen.

We can appreciate the beauty of this scene in the following lines:

Mir.: Do you love me?

Fer.: O heaven, O earth, bear witness to this sound,  
And crown what I profess with kind event,  
If I speak true! if hollowly, invert  
What best is boded me to mischief! I,  
Beyond all limit of what else i' th' world,  
Do love, prize, honour you.

Mir.: I am a fool  
To weep at what I am glad of.

Pros.: Fair encounter  
Of two most rare affections! Heavens rain grace  
On that which breeds between 'em!

Fer.: Wherefore weep you?

Mir.: At mine unworthiness, that dare not offer  
What I desire to give; and much less take  
What I shall die to want. But this is trifling;  
And all the more it seeks to hide itself,  
The bigger bulk it shows. Hence, bashful cunning!  
And prompt me plain and holy innocence!  
I am your wife if you will marry me;  
If not, I'll die your maid: to be your fellow  
You may deny me; but I'll be your servant,  
Whether you will or no.

(III.i.67-85)

Here again we may think of the analogy between Ferdinand and Romeo. Such emotional power and authentic voice emerge in Ferdinand's language in his first encounter with Miranda. He is so impressed by Miranda's charm and beauty that he, at first, thinks that she is a supernatural being: a goddess.

Fer.: Most sure the goddess  
On whom these airs attend! Vouchsafe my prayer  
May know if you remain upon this island;  
And that you will some good instruction give  
How I may bear me here: my prime request,  
Which I do last pronounce, is, O you wonder!  
If you be maid or no?

(I.ii.424-430)

As has been mentioned above, one of the features of the romance is that the human element makes an incursion into the supernatural world. Heroes and heroines are taken for gods and goddesses. This theme is prominent in *The Tempest*. Yet Ferdinand takes Miranda for a goddess and, in the same way, Miranda thinks that Ferdinand is a spirit.

The interaction between the supernatural and the human world is a theme widely used in literature: Christopher Marlowe makes use of the theme in his tragedy *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, in a rewording of the Aeneid by Virgil. A

very similar situation to that happening in *The Tempest* is found in the play *The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune* and Edmund Spenser, in *The Fairie Queene*, also introduces the supernatural element into the human world through the heroine whose specially efficacious virtue transforms her into a splendid apparition which can be scarcely accepted as human.

Miranda, impressed by the appearance of Ferdinand (a handsome, sensitive, affectionate young man), exclaims in front of her father, Prospero:

Mir.: What is 't? a spirit?  
Lord, how it looks about! Believe me, sir,  
It carries a brave form. But 'tis a spirit.  
(I.ii.412-413)

She, bewitched by the attractiveness of Ferdinand, can not believe her eyes and, in spite of her father's words assuring her that Ferdinand is human, Miranda can not help thinking that he must be "A thing divine", from the supernatural world:

I might call him  
A thing divine; for nothing natural  
I ever saw so noble.  
(I.ii.420-421)

Miranda is unique in that her father and the uncouth Caliban (the offspring of the witch Sycorax, a "man-monster" reduced by Prospero to the servitude in which he appears at the beginning of the play) are the only two beings she has known. Therefore, she shows an innocent admiration for the strangers she meets on the island: "How many goodly creatures are there here! / How beauteous mankind is! O brave new world, / That has such people in't!".

Ferdinand, fascinated by Miranda's grace, virtue and beauty, offers his love to her the instant they meet:

O, if a Virgin,  
And your affection not gone forth, I'll make you  
The Queen of Naples.  
(I.ii.450-452)

There is mutual attraction and, as Prospero says: "They are both in either's pow'rs" (I.ii. 53). Prospero's own comments, as he watches the young couple together, express the sense of their fitness for each other: "Fair encounter/ of two more rare affections".

Miranda says to herself that Ferdinand "is the third man she has ever seen and the first she has ever sighed for". And asks:

... Why speaks my father so ungently? This  
Is the third man that e'er I saw; the first  
That e'er I sigh'd for: Pity move my father  
To be inclin'd my way!  
(I.ii.446-449)

Nevertheless, Prospero, who sees the young couple's growing love, is determined to strengthen the bond by making the path of true love anything but smooth. He is severe with his daughter and is to Ferdinand at first "compos'd of harshness". However, his treatment of Ferdinand and Miranda is calculated to increase their love for one another:

Pros. (Aside): They are both in either's pow'rs: but this Swift business  
I must uneasy make, lest too light winning  
[Make the prize light.  
(I.ii.453-454)

We may say that the love between Ferdinand and Miranda –and Romeo and Juliet– recreates similar situations in both plays. However, we may also admit that the difficulties which the lovers overcome to reach their definite love is placed farther apart.

In *Romeo and Juliet*, the disapproval of their love arises from their own families (The Montagues and Capulets) who are deadly enemies. The speech, in the *Sonnet prologue*, spoken by *Chorus*, briefly introduces the plot, telling us that in Verona there exists a long standing feud between two families, the Montagues and Capulets. This feud is to be ended only by the sad fate of Romeo, a Montague, and Juliet, a Capulet, whose love for each other surpasses their families' hatred. This hatred, however, is to bring about the tragic death of the "star-cross'd lovers". The conflict in *Romeo and Juliet* is painfully unhappy. The sudden or violent changes occurring in the play bring ill fortune and catastrophe. Tybalt's death, caused by Romeo in a street duel, gives rise to a series of unfortunate events.

Shakespeare imposes a marked rhythm which brings out the interplay of conflicting time scales. The hero and heroine scarcely escape from one dangerous situation only to find themselves in trouble once again. The swift changes which the characters are forced to endure oblige the reader to think, from the beginning, that this deplorable lack of time entraps the characters in a spiral of misfortune. There is no way out for them as long as their spirits are imprisoned and, given the sword of Damocles which hangs over them, the only possible route to liberty and liberation is that to be found as a result of their own death.

The tragic fate of Romeo and Juliet contrasts with the happy ending of *The Tempest*. In the latter, Miranda and Ferdinand make arrangements for their wedding in Naples once Prospero has approved their betrothal. Prospero's wish to see his daughter Queen of Naples does come true. The happy event takes place in Act IV.sc.i.1-23, outside Prospero's Cell.

In this scene, the atmosphere of tender intimacy is created in candidly pure diction; tiny details of sensation, sound and image suggest a tender love for Miranda, and enliven the speech:

Fer.: As I hope  
For quiet days, fair issue and long life,  
With such love as 'tis now, the murkiest den,  
The most opportune place, the strong'st suggestion  
Our worser genius can, shall never melt  
Mine honour into lust, to take away  
The edge of that day's celebration  
When I shall think, or Phoebus' steeds are founder'd,  
Or Night kept chain'd below.

Pros.: Fairly spoke  
Sit, then, and talk with her; she is thine own.  
(IV.i.24-33)

Romeo would certainly like to have spoken Ferdinand's words:

As I hope  
For quiet days, fair issue and long life,  
With such love as 'tis now,...  
(24-25)

As far as one can tell, that happy ending reflects the antithesis of the sad end of Romeo and Juliet. However, we may ask ourselves: did the young couple succeed in finding true love? Is happiness qualitative or quantitative? Does not, in fact, Romeo and Juliet's love transcend time, space, and even death? Are these aspects not likely to exist beyond the happy end?

From the point of view of style, one of the relevant elements of romance is to transcend time and space. In other words, to surmount earthy hindrances. Romeo and Juliet have overcome death due to the intensity of their love which does not die with their human body but remains in their spirits throughout eternity.

Shakespeare describes Romeo and Juliet's death as a sacrifice. If, finally, peace between Montagues and Capulets is restored, it is as a result of the tragic fate which has befallen "the star-crossed lovers".

In Act IV. sc.iii, Juliet endures a most painful experience. She is face to face with the terrifying task of carrying out the Friar's instructions: to drink the potion. She acts her "dismal scene" alone. She is tormented by doubts and misgivings: what if she awakens from her death-like trance before Romeo arrives at the tomb? What horrors will beset her in this gruesome place of death? At last with a cry of "Romeo I come! This do I drink to thee", she swallows the potion.

The last scene of the play (V.iii.88-120) once more demands of her an act of lonely courage and faith in love: Juliet awaking to the sight of Romeo dead beside her. She turns to the lifeless figure, resolved to follow him into death! The lovers are truly at last united in death. Romeo and Juliet lie together, immune to will, confusion and death. As Romeo had wished a moment before at the sight of Juliet, whom he thought to be dead: "...Here, here, will I remain / ...O here will I set up my everlasting rest".

The moral realm which Shakespeare describes in *Romeo and Juliet* is intended to be "qualitative" not "quantitative". Previously, in Act II, we were able to appreciate the great value of "psychological" time (the lovers' private time) and the powerful emotion of the instance. In Romeo's words:

But come what sorrow can,  
It cannot counterveil the exchange of joy  
That one short minute gives me in her sight.  
(II.vi.3-5)

Echoing these sentiments, Juliet also expresses the same feeling by prolonging the moment:

Juliet: Art thou gone so? Love, lord, ay husband, friend,  
I must hear from thee every day in the hour,  
For in a minute there are many days.  
O, by this count I shall be much in years  
Ere I again behold my Romeo.  
(III.v.)

As the play develops, Shakespeare sustains emphasis on the continuous counterpoint between ordinary time (an exactly stipulated day, hour or moment) and unreal time. The lovers withdraw into a private world of intimacy, suspending the world's ordinary time and replacing it with the rival time of the imagination. In this way, we can see at the close of the play two different realities. The physical reality: sad and sorrowful; and the psychic reality which, for Romeo and Juliet, is the authentic one. The strength and depth of their passion go beyond the mere dimensions of time. Thus, their love survives after death and achieves a spiritually eternal alliance.

"Reconciliation" is *Romeo and Juliet* and *The Tempest*'s conclusion. However, In *Romeo and Juliet* reconciliation is achieved at a high price. Friar Laurence, an important character in the play, sees that in *Romeo and Juliet*'s marriage there lies a chance of reconciling the Montagues and Capulets. Thus, he agrees to assist Romeo. The Friar's hopes come true through the sacrifice of the lovers: "Poor sacrifices of our enmity", exclaims old Capulet. Capulet takes Montague's hand as the play ends in front of the lifeless young lovers, sealing the bond of marriage between the two families in a dowry of love:

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

(V.iii.295-296)

In *The Tempest*, Prospero also aims at reconciliation. He says that he will offer his enemies forgiveness rather than revenge: "Though with their wrongs I am struck to th' quick, / Yet with my nobler reason 'gainst my fury / Do I take part: the rarer action is virtue than in vengeance". (V.i.24-32)

The climax is reached, in Act V.sc.i. 71-79, when Prospero says to his enemies, as they are arraigned for judgment in a circle: "Behold, Sir King, the wronged Duke of Milan, Prospero". However, so completely has he adopted the policy of forgiveness that he follows this immediately with: "To thee and thy Company I bid a hearty welcome". Then follows general restitution: his Dukedom to Prospero; Ferdinand to his father; his island to Caliban and freedom to Ariel. In this scene, Prospero offers forgiveness to his brother Antonio and King Alonso through whose conspiracy he had lost the Dukedom of Milan. Prospero achieves reconciliation with his enemies by means of his magic (his Art), assisted everytime by Ariel, the spirit of air, and other supernatural beings.

Repentance, forgiveness and reconciliation is the great triptych we find at the close of the play. Living in harmony with men and nature is ultimately a characteristic of romance. In *Romeo and Juliet*, the character who symbolises the union between man and nature is Friar Laurence: philosopher and scientist, an expert in herbs who manufactures drugs, medicines and the like. In *The Tempest*, Prospero is the symbol of harmony and wisdom. In direct contrast to Prospero, who also personifies good and evil, there arises the figure of Caliban, who represents evil. Nevertheless, this "horrid" character is aware of Prospero's powerful "art". Caliban knows that Prospero's magic is irresistible to evil. Thus, when being threatened by Prospero, Caliban answers:

No, pray thee.  
(Aside) I must obey: his Art is of such pow'r,  
It would control my dam's god, Setebos,  
And make a vassal of him".

(I.ii.373-376)

In the tragic romance of *Romeo and Juliet* the supernatural world is less evident as the result of the lovers' certain death which acts against the wonders of the supernatural world and forces it to remain in the background, as Northop Fry describes in *Anatomy of Criticism*<sup>2</sup>.

In *Romeo and Juliet* (I.iv. 53-94) the supernatural world is introduced in the "Queen Mab" speech spoken by Mercutio. The Queen Mab speech is a burlesque, mocking an assembly of folk-tale figures, proverbial rural superstitions, old wives' tales and ancient myths.

Northop Frye remarks that *Romeo and Juliet* "is nearer romance than the later tragedies due to the mitigatory influences which act in opposite direction to catharsis, absorbing the irony of the leading characters" (p. 59)<sup>3</sup>.

Besides the Queen Mab speech, we can also appreciate that supernatural powers are present throughout *Romeo and Juliet* in the omens and auspices which emerge from the characters and fill them with horror.

Thus, Friar Laurence, or the nurse, are constantly in fear because of the conflicting situation between love and hatred, misfortune and death, and the ambiguous environment which causes events to move at high speed.

The omen is an important aspect in tragedy. It holds the threads of the plot entwined, as regards both action and suspense. This is precisely the facet in which we find the analogy with the supernatural world featured in romance. In conclusion, we maintain that *Romeo and Juliet* is endowed with the characteristics of romance, although ultimately it is a *tragic* romance.

2 FRYE, Northop: *Anatomy of Criticism, Four Essays*, New York, Princeton University (1957), 1967, pág. 59.

3 FRYE, Northop: *Op. cit.*, pág. 59.

WORKS CITED

- AGUILAR, M., ed. *William Shakespeare. Obras Completas* (Translated and annotated by Luis Astrana Marín), Madrid, Aguilar S.L., 1947.
- ARNOLD, Edward, ed. *Later Shakespeare*. London: Stratford-Upon-Avon Studies, 1966.
- BULLOUGH, Geoffrey. *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.
- FELPERIN, Howard. *Shakespearean Romance*. New York: Princeton University Press, 1972.
- FRYE, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism*. 1957. New York: Princeton University Press, 1967.
- . *On Shakespeare*. Ontario (Canada): Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data, 1986.
- JOHNSON, Samuel. *The plays of William Shakespeare*. [1765].
- KNIGHT, G. Wilson. *The Crown of Life*. Great Britain: Methuen & Co., 1982.
- SHAKESPEARE, William. *Romeo and Juliet*, (edited by Brian Gibbons). The Arden Shakespeare. London: Methuen & Co., 1986.
- . *The Tempest* (edited by Frank Kermode). The Arden Shakespeare. London: Methuen and Co., 1986.

# CRISEYDE / CRESSEID / CRESSIDA: WHAT'S IN A NAME?

Robert K. Sepherd

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

Shakespeare's main source for *Troilus and Cressida* (1601/2) was, most probably, the 1599 Francis Thynne edition of *Troilus and Criseyde* in which *The Testament of Cresseid*, composed towards the end of the fifteenth century by the Dunfermline makir Robert Henryson, was appended to Chaucer's text. It is my opinion that the dramatist set out to blend the two very different treatments of the "heroine" that he found in these works into a coherent whole, and my aim in this paper is to show how he performed such a delicate literary graft. In so doing I wish to prove that the "operation" was successful in that it produced not the stock figure of a "shallow coquette"<sup>1</sup> whose metamorphosis from Troilus' lover to Diomedes' whore is too swift to be believable, but a well-rounded character whose reasons for doing what she did are, if not morally spotless, at least understandable.

When stating that Shakespeare set out to fuse Chaucer's and Henryson's treatments of Criseyde / Cresseid, I do not wish to suggest that he was attempting to reconcile polar opposites. His task was much more difficult - that of combining the ambivalent with the forthright.

Chaucer's interpretation of the lady's character and actions - particularly as regarded her motivations for deserting Troilus - was ever anything less than open-ended; here he took his cue from French and Italian sources. As C. David Benson points out, although Benoît de Saint-Maure (*Roman de Troie*, c. 1160) "draws a conventional lesson from the affair about the untrustworthiness of women"<sup>2</sup> he gives the "heroine" a long final speech in which "Briseida", although condemning herself as an opportunist, also pleads self preservation as an excuse. Alone and friendless in the Greek camp, she needed a protector, to be bought at any price. In *Il Filostrato* (c. 1338), while Boccaccio plays lip-service to Guido delle Colonne's harshly anti-feminist approach (*Historia Destructionis Troiae*, 1287) he seems rather to lose interest in than actively wish to condemn "Criseida"

1 W.W. Lawrence, *Shakespeare's Problem Comedies* (London and New York: The Macmillan Company, 1931) p. 197.

2 C. David Benson, *Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1990), p. 2.

after she leaves Troy. Boccaccio and Benoît have one thing in common: they never say exactly why the object of female affection changes overnight.

Chaucer takes this tendency to extremes. Not only are we left in ignorance as Criseyde's feelings for Diomedes, it is not even really certain that she committed herself to Troilus in the first place. In her soliloquy of Book II (ll. 708-805) the question of whether or not she is stricken isn't even mentioned; such pitfalls as the loss of honour and freedom resulting from such a match are uppermost in her mind. In the chamber scene of Book III she is cool-headed enough to know exactly how to deal with her lover's trumped-up charges of infidelity. The "few bright tears" she sheds when her loyalty is called into question are most certainly of the crocodile variety, since she knows very well that "a full misty morrow" is often followed by a merry summer's day<sup>3</sup>. Having realized that Troilus has a seemingly infinite capacity for self-chastisement (which generally leads to unstinting self-sacrifice, most important in the bedroom context!) she exploits him to the maximum. While the consummation itself is accompanied by exquisitely poetic declarations of love, nocturnal ecstasy must always give way to the cold light of morning. One should note that it is Troilus who feels obliged to propose a repetition of the happy event while Criseyde will only go so far as to assure her lover that she has him "fast in minde"<sup>4</sup> –implying, I believe "Whether the relationship continues or not" It goes without saying that there exists a multitude of interpretations for her reactions in these and other scenes, but this is the whole point. Ambiguity is her watchword, and the fact that she becomes an unreliable and somewhat incoherent penpal in Book V should hardly come as a surprise to anyone.

In contrast, Henryson's Cresseid is frankness personified. She may well have proved "fickill and frivolous" with Troilus and whored with Diomeid (all this by her own confession) but she is given very good reasons for so doing. Allowing her Trojan lover to survive his despair-fuelled suicidal urges on the battlefield (thus cleansing Cresseid of blood-guilt) may well be a striking innovation, but the Scotsman's real masterstroke was to make Calchas undergo religious conversion. Whereas in previous accounts he had been the priest of Apollo (emphasis being placed upon the god's oracular functions) here he presides over the temple of Venus and Cupid. While his daughter is not an actual priestess like Hero, she has dedicated herself to the goddess and her son in the Marlovian, carnal sense. Unlike Chaucer's creation she is wholly committed to love-considers herself a

3 Geoffrey Chaucer, *Troilus and Criseyde* ed. John Warrington (1953; rept. London; J.M. Dent & Son Ltd. 1991) Bk. III ll. 1058-1664.

4 Ibid. I 1486.

living (self) sacrifice to her tutelary divinities. This does beg the question as to what the relationship between sex and steadfastness is, yet in the fatally blasphemous prayer to her two supposed "protectors", Cresseid makes it abundantly clear that she would have remained faithful to the men in her life if perverse (served by blind) fate had not decreed otherwise:

O fals Cupide, is nane to wyte bot trow  
And thy Mother, of lufe the blind Goddes!  
Ye causit me alwayis understand and Erow  
The seid of lufe was sawin in my face,  
And ay grew grene throw your supplie and grace.  
Bot now allace that seid with froist is slane,  
And I fra luifferis left and all forlane<sup>5</sup>.

Her cry of loss and longing for the men whose society she has been torn from:

Quha sall me gyde? quha sall me now convoy  
Sen I fra Diomeid and Nobill Troylus  
Am clene excludit...?<sup>6</sup>

is indicative of that kind of helpless dependence which, while hardly amounting to love in the highest sense, certainly represents much more than Criseyde's notion of it as "politic allegiance". Henryson is almost completely sympathetic towards his heroine, despite her lapse:

Yit nevertheles quhat ever men deme or say  
In scornfull langage of thy brukkilnes,  
I sall excuse, als far furth as I may,  
Thy womanheid, thy wisdome and fairnes.  
(Henryson 108)

How, then, was Shakespeare to fuse wilful ambiguity and cool calculation with a pathetically hotblooded eagerness to be loved? When it came to judging the character, how might Henrysonian forthrightness be balanced against Chaucerian coyness?

Let us tackle the second question first. It was relatively easy for Shakespeare to let Criseyde off the hook upon which Guido delle Colonne (and his English translator John Lydgate) had hung her. He did so by playing the detractors at their own game. While Chaucer and Boccaccio only touched upon the setting for the love affair when it affected the two parties concerned, both *Historia*

5 Robert Henryson, *Poems and Fables* ed. H. Harvey Wood (1933; rpt. Edinburgh: The Mercant Press, 1978) p. 109.

6 Ibid.



*Destructionis Troiae* and *The Troy Book* were chronicles of the war as a whole, the giant backdrop against which Troilus and Criseyde play out their relatively minor rôles. In the play less attention is paid to the courting couple than to the social environment of martial strife and political intrigue they are forced to inhabit. The reader/spectator is therefore obliged to weigh Cressida's treachery against the pervading morality of the times, and here, "morality" means "rotteness".

Thersites, the "deformed and scurrilous Greek" who acts as commentator/one-man chorus throughout, treats corruption as a way of life. He is so accustomed to witnessing it that he is incapable of believing that anyone would think twice before prostituting their own highflown ideals and boasts. Ulysses pontificates upon the Greeks' failure to acknowledge respect for one's superiors (the speech on "degree", I.ii.75-186) before attempting to pit Ajax (whom he regards as a mere bumpkin) against the great Achilles. Achilles brags to Hector's face that he will say him easily in single combat (IV.v) before failing miserably to do so and ordering a whole troop of Myrmidons to act as hired assassins (V.vii, IV.viii). Even the noble Hector, despite his objections to spilling blood on Helen's behalf in II.ii, is not above killing a man (whom he refers to, for no apparent reason, as a "beast") for his armour (V.vi). Helen is a whore, Menelaus a cuckold and an idiot to boot (V.i.54-58) and the strife that marital infidelity has engendered may be described in the same terms, given that it only amounts to an excuse for the Greek commanders to theorize about the noble –and lost– virtue of chivalry on the battlefield while sending thousands to their deaths, more often than not (as in Ajax's case, although he defies expectations by neither fighting Hector nor dying by his hand) for purely political reasons. Thersites sees right through them;

All the argument is a whore and a cuckold, a good quarrel to draw  
emulous factions to death upon<sup>7</sup>.

In a world where false promises and empty aspirations are ten-a-penny, why should anyone expect Cressida to be faithful to Troilus, to transform such vows of eternal dedication as the following into palpable act?

Time, force and death  
Do to this body what extremes you can;  
But the strong base and building of my love  
Is as the very centre of the earth...

(IV.ii.103-6)

7 William Shakespeare, *Troilus and Cressida* ed. Daniel Seltzer (New York: The Signet Classic Shakespeare, 1963) II.iii.74-76. All quotations taken from the play refer to this edition and will appear bracketed in the main body of the text.

Thersites certainly doesn't; he has her marked down as a "drab" (V.ii, 101), a Trojan counterpart to Helen, before even clapping eyes on her; as the type of individual who will not think twice before giving the lie to the heartfelt declarations of eternal fidelity he imagines (as usual, quite correctly) that she has uttered. Nevertheless we the audience/readership know that Thersites is a typical case of professional deformation –that constant exposure to self-betrayal has encouraged him to revel in it, to take sado-masochistic pleasure in condemning a sin he knows he himself is not free of. Should we not simply ameliorate his judgement and content ourselves by saying that Cressida, even if she is no better than her male contemporaries, is certainly no worse?

I myself regard this as far too easy an option: easy in the sense that it ignores Shakespeare's debt to Henryson; to the idea that Cresseid/Cressida, however fickle, is a woman capable of total self-sacrifice to the man she happens to be with at the time. Whereas a Ulysses proves so willing to betray his own professed values that he is no more than a bombastic oratorical shell, we know that Cressida was, at one point at least, passionately in love with Troilus. She says so herself, in the speech that ends I.ii. We must believe her because said speech is, in fact, a soliloquy. While Ulysses chooses to expound highflown moral values before a listening public, she awaits a moment of privacy (the only one Shakespeare gives her) in which to declare her true feelings. She has to; being the Criseyde type (a woman who does not wish her inner secrets to be made public) she fears her ever-present uncle's loose tongue;

But more in Troilus thousand fold I see  
Than in the glass of Pandar's praise may be  
(I.ii.296-7)

Here, then, Shakespeare has applied Marlowe to Chaucer: Cressida, like Hero, needed no persuasion on Pandarus' (Leander's) part to fall in love; beguiling words are superfluous. He presents us with an impulsive woman –a Cresseid, in fact. However, this is a Cresseid with a cool Criseydean head on her shoulders, –here the Trojan war background, as well as Chaucer, comes into play.

Cressida knows what men are like. Unlike Criseyde, who shuts herself up in her chamber for most of the action and seems to believe that the vaguest conception of history being made outdoors is the price she has to pay for keeping herself –and the workings of her mind– from the public eye, she is out and about. There is no danger of her having to ask, like her Chaucerian counterpart "For Goddess Love, is the siege away?"<sup>8</sup>. On the contrary, she is aware that her best

8 Geoffrey Chaucer, *Troilus and Criseyde* Bk II.1.123.

defense against the (Trojan) male of the species is an up-to-date knowledge of what each and every one of them is up to. Her judgements upon the passing cavalcade of heroes which precedes the soliloquy of II i are strikingly perceptive. Living with the Trojan war for so long has shown her that reneging upon highflown promises is the order of the day, and Troilus' ardent declarations may prove to be no exception to the rule. Once he knows that he has an easy conquest it might be prove all too simple to leave her on the shelf, and it is better to keep him guessing;

Women are angels, wooing;  
Things won are done, joy's soul lies in the doing  
(I.ii.298-9)

This strikes the ideal balance between Chaucer and Henryson; a woman who is deeply in love, yet has the good common sense to keep her mouth shut about it. Under the joint influence of Troilus and Pandarus she lapses for what is to prove a fatal moment, but it is not long before head takes over from heart again with the realization that she had been right to believe that the intensity of his passion will soon lessen. After the consummation he wishes to absent himself as quickly as possible—to smoke the proverbial cigarette, no doubt, and gloat upon his sexual prowess. Cressida has ceased to be so terribly important, and Troilus' song of farewell (the aubade) takes up exactly four lines (IV ii 12-15) The woman who has given herself to him despite her better judgement knows exactly what is going on in his mind: she bitterly regrets allowing a mixture of softheartedness, love and lust to place her at the mercy of a potentially disinterested male. Shakespeare has steered her too close to Henryson for her own comfort:

Prithee, tarry;  
You men will never tarry.  
O foolish Cresseid! I might have still held off  
And then you would have tarried.  
(IV.ii.15-18)

Small wonder, then, that the last words she speaks to Troilus in the play are "My lord, will you be true?" (IV.iv.101) The fact that he sheds bitter tears and virtually demands her to be "true of heart" (IV.iv.58) is neither here nor there; Prince Charming will only ever profess to adore the unobtainable. Love him though she still does, the fact that she now doubts the wisdom of considering Troilus as a partner for life goes some way to explaining her decision to ditch him.

Not the whole way, however, and perhaps Shakespeare intended to take yet another leaf out of Chaucer's book by refusing to let us see exactly why

Diomedes is able to seduce her so easily, even if he does go directly against the grain of *Troilus and Criseyde* by allowing us to witness the seduction scene itself (V.ii). My theory, however, is that our heroine, in committing herself to Troilus, has let the mask of Criseydean aloofness slip so far down that she finds it impossible to set it in place again. The passionate woman—the Cresseid—that always struggled beneath surface sophistication, has now asserted herself for good; the distinction between appearance and reality has been blasted away.

And, ironically, it is Greek hypocrisy and cynicism—particularly that of Ulysses—which forces her to realize that, in present company, any attempt on her part to stage a show of aloofness to affairs of heart will be a waste of time. When she first enters the Greek camp Cressida is still capable of acting out the rôle of icy coyness—that of the worldlywise *femme fatale* who knows enough about men to keep them at a distance. She feels that she owes at least this much to Troilus who, after all, is still only a suspect when it comes to betraying vows.

However, she is a little too worldly for her own good. The (apparently) shy and retiring Criseyde might have passed muster before Ulysses and his impromptu welcoming committee. Cressida does not: by attempting to use coyness as a means of building the Greek hero up for, quite literally, a "kiss off", she plays right into his hands. The consummate actor and double talker treats the notion that anyone—especially a Trojan—should attempt to play him at his own game by reversing the rules with disbelieving contempt. He refuses to entertain the notion that playful ambiguity might be used as a disguise for, first, heartfelt affection for another man, second, contempt for profferings of false friendship. By implying that he should grovel for her favours, Cressida is only attempting to give him a verbal slap in the face—one which he returns, with interest;

Ulysses:	May I, sweet lady, beg a kiss of you?
Cressida:	You may.
Ulysses:	I do desire it.
Cressida:	Why, beg then
Ulysses:	Why, then for Venus's sake give me a kiss, When Helen is a maid again...
	(IV.v.47-50)

All Trojans are whores, in one way or another. It is in Ulysses' interest to bombard the listening Ajax with this message. Although the latter is not the brightest of souls, he **had** just about worked this out for himself but, in attempting to egg him on to face Hector, "Polumetis Odysseus" refuses to desist from the use of a spade where a spatula will do. Here comes Cressida/Cresseid—the daughter of Calchas. Why should it not be the case that turncoat begets whore—

Thersites' Helen counterpart? Our heroine has very definitely turned up at the wrong place at the wrong time.

And she never bounces back from the "blow" that Ulysses has dealt her—never recovers her old composure. She now knows that, to the Greeks, superficial appearance is a substitute for the spiritual cleanliness that no-one is expected to possess. She has let herself down in her host nation's eyes; has paraded an ambiguous attitude towards vice and virtue by substituting the white (artificial purity) that should overpaint the black (corruption) with a Criseydean grey area which, to the Greeks, is closer to black than white. In a world where virtue amounts to keeping vice well hidden, Cressida has branded herself—quite unwittingly—as being hopelessly shallow. Should she now perform a *volte-face* and make a declaration of her affections she will only be regarded as a hypocrite as well as a whore.

She chooses, then, to play the game by the Greek rules—to do what everyone expects of her, she adopts Cresseid—the wanton sexual animal—as her new mask, a defence against obvious Greek hostility towards intelligent women.

Her new protector, however, is just like all men—especially Troilus. He wants a reward for his attentions—in the shape of sex—immediately, and Cressida is by now too hopelessly confused and frightened by her hostile reception to refuse. The new mask very quickly becomes a way of life and, before she knows it, she is in love with the new man in her life. She is the type of person who needs someone to adore and Diomedes may well prove to be no worse than Troilus who, remember, she has already seen through. In point of fact Henryson reveals him to be no better than his rival; he will eventually throw her over.

Criseyde / Cressida / Cresseid—what's in a name? In Shakespeare's case, nothing. He demonstrates that self-sacrifice to passion and the self-preservation instinct—the felt necessity both to feign aloofness for and indulge oneself in lust with the object of affection need not be mutually exclusive; that, placed in the right social setting (provided by the Trojan War chroniclers) there is no reason that Chaucer's and Henryson's character should not cohabit the one body. His play is a perfectly constructed bridge between its two major sources.

## DISSIDENT READING: SUMMARY

Alan Sinfield  
University of Sussex

Once it was possible to assert that anti-Semitism is irrelevant to *The Merchant of Venice*. Lillian S. Robinson says she was persuaded of this; one should set it aside and address "the real point of the work"<sup>1</sup>. The usual liberal-conservative way to retrieve the play nowadays is encapsulated in Helen Vendler's remark, which Christopher Ricks (in the course of a discussion of T.S. Eliot's anti-Semitism) endorses: "Shylock, in Shakespeare's imagination, grows in interest and stature so greatly that he incriminates the anti-Semitism of Belmont"<sup>2</sup>. So, in a paradoxical sense, Shylock wins—not in the world, of course, but in Shakespeare's imagination. From the left, Terry Eagleton also finds Shylock the paradoxical victor: he "is triumphantly vindicated even though he loses the case: he has forced the Christians into outdoing his own "inhuman" legalism"; he unmasks "Christian justice as a mockery"<sup>3</sup>. It is Shylock who has respect for the spirit of the law, Portia who discredits the law through hyper-ingenuous quibbling. Allen Bloom offers a staunchly right-wing interpretation. He says Shylock asks for trouble, for he has "the soul of a man who has refused to assimilate. He is consequently distrusted and hated. He reciprocates, and his soul is poisoned"<sup>4</sup>. It is all Shylock's fault, for not abandoning his own culture and adopting "western values".

So it is possible to get diverse readings from *The Merchant*, not all of them offensive. But what about ordinary readers and audiences who are situated partly or wholly in subordinate cultures—Jews, women, Blacks, lesbians and gay men, lower-class people? Should we expect them to unravel such intricately divergent readings in order to find a cultural space in which they may recognize themselves?

1 Lillian S. Robinson, *Sex, Class, and Culture* (New York and London: Methuen, 1986), p. 35.

2 Christopher Ricks, *T.S. Eliot and Prejudice* (London: Faber, 1988), p. 118. On reading *The Merchant*, see Alan Sinfield, *Faultlines: Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading* (Berkeley: California U.P. and Oxford: Oxford U.P., 1992), pp. 299-302.

3 Terry Eagleton, *William Shakespeare* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986), pp. 37-8, 41.

4 Allan Bloom with Harry V. Jaffa, *Shakespeare's Politics* (New York and London: Basic Books, 1964; Chicago U.P., Midway Reprint, 1986), p. 21.

School students, for instance. "When someone with the authority of a teacher", Adrienne Rich says, "describes the world and you are not in it, there is a moment of psychic disequilibrium, as if you looked into a mirror and saw nothing... It takes some strength of soul –and not just individual strength, but collective understanding– to resist this void, this nonbeing, into which you are thrust, and to stand up, demanding to be seen and heard"<sup>5</sup>. If we accept any responsibility for the way our prized texts circulate beyond the academy, the routine classroom humiliation of ordinary readers from subordinated groups is our concern.

\*\*\*

Traditionally, the ostensible project of literary criticism has been to seek the right answer to disputed readings. But in fact the essay that purports to settle such questions always provokes another. This is because both literary writing and Englit are involved in the processes through which our cultures elaborate themselves. The texts we call 'literary' characteristically address contested aspects of our ideological formation. When a part of our worldview threatens disruption by manifestly failing to cohere with the rest, then we reorganise and retell its story, trying to get it into shape –back into the old shape if we are conservative-minded, or into a new shape if we are more adventurous. There is nothing mysterious about this. Authors and readers want writing to be interesting, and these 'faultline' stories are the most promising for that. Further, in such contests, Shakespeare is a powerful cultural token. He is already where meaning is produced, and people therefore want to get him on their side. For there is no disinterested reading; Shakespeare is deployed in diverse ways –for instance in those readings of *The Merchant*, and now by me– as part of an ongoing cultural contest. We all know this, but it has been the historic project of Englit to efface it<sup>6</sup>.

The implications of these arguments for Englit are substantial, for it follows that meaning is not adequately deducible from the-text-on-the-page, or even from the-text-plus-suitably-selected-context. It is a key proposition of cultural materialism that the specific historical conditions in which cultural institutions and formations organise and are organised by textualities must be addressed. Within such a perspective, the relations between mainstream readings and those from subordinated groups becomes a proper and a necessary focus of attention.

5 Adrienne Rich, *Bood, Bread and Poetry* (New York: Norton, 1986), p. 199.

6 See Alan Sinfield, *Faultlines: Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading* (Berkeley: California U.P. and Oxford: Oxford U.P., 1992), ch. 2 et passim; Sinfield, *Literature, Politics and Culture in Postwar Britain* (Oxford: Blackwells and Berkeley, California U.P., 1989), ch. 3.

\*\*\*

John Addington Symonds, the Victorian man of letters, read Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* before he was ten, and it changed his life. Hitherto, what Symonds calls his 'reveries' had generally 'reverted' to 'naked sailors'. But then he read Shakespeare's poem:

It gave form, ideality and beauty to my previous erotic visions. Those adult males, the shaggy and brawny sailors, without entirely disappearing, began to be superseded in my fancy by an adolescent Adonis. The emotion they symbolized blent with a new kind of feeling. In some confused way I identified myself with Adonis; but at the same time I yearned after him as an adorable object of passionate love<sup>7</sup>.

Suppose, Symonds wonders, his predisposition had been heterosexual? –"Boys of more normal sexuality might have preferred the 'Rape of Lucrece'", he says (rather a chilling thought). Or, in *Venus and Adonis* "they might have responded to the attraction of the female– condemning Adonis for a simpleton, and wishing themselves for ten minutes in his place" (p. 63). Gay boys, it seems, read differently from other boys. And women, surely, might want to make of the poem something different again.

But could Shakespeare have been gay? The Sonnets have caused most anxiety, and not only in our self-conscious times. Quite a lot may be sacrificed in order to dispel the spectre of bardic queerness. Eric Partridge, in his study *Shakespeare's Bawdy* (1947), supported the idea that "most of the Sonnets may be read as literary exercises". It seemed safer to abandon the integrity of the poetry than to admit that Shakespeare might have been like that<sup>8</sup>. Here again, Shakespeare is a powerful cultural token: Partridge is trying to secure Shakespeare for heterosexuality. A recent biographer of Shakespeare, Garry O'Connor, contains the danger by pigeon-holing the Earl of Southampton (principal candidate for the beautiful young man of the Sonnets and *Venus and Adonis*), Shakespeare and Christopher Marlowe in modern stereotypes. The earl had an "intensely feminised" nature, O'Connor says, and "played up to his admirers... with a dark and neurotic mixture of arrogance and bashfulness" (treacherous queer). Marlowe, who had a "dark taste", fell for it: he conceived a "passion for Southampton"– though it

7 Phyllis Grosskurth, ed., *The Memoirs of John Addington Symonds* (London: Hutchinson, 1984), pp. 62-3.

8 Eric Partridge, *Shakespeare's Bawdy* (New York: Dutton, 1948), pp. 13-8. Other critical evasions are amusingly displayed by Simon Shepherd, 'Shakespeare's Private Drawer: Shakespeare and Homosexuality', in Graham Holderness, ed., *The Shakespeare Myth* (Manchester U.P., 1988).

was "pure wish-fulfilment" on Marlowe's part (silly queen)<sup>9</sup>. But Shakespeare, O'Connor asserts, was interested only in Southampton's patronage; he was "far too mindful of his own skin to write sonnets of homosexual love" (closet case?, p. 143). Integrity is a price worth paying to secure heterosexuality.

Recent scholarship on homosexuality in Shakespeare's time has mostly started from Michel Foucault's thesis in *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*: early-modern England did not have a concept of 'the homosexual'. The big shift occurs in the nineteenth century, when the person who engages in same-sex activity gets to be perceived as a personality type. So far from the Victorians repressing sex, Foucault brilliantly observes, they went on about it all the time; it became a principal mode of social regulation. As part of this process, the

homosexual became a personage, a past, a case history, and a childhood, in addition to being a type of life, a life form, and a morphology, with an indiscreet anatomy and possibly a mysterious physiology... The sodomite had been a temporary aberration; the homosexual was now a species.

Alan Bray in his book *Homosexuality in Renaissance England* substantiates much of Foucault's case, showing how acts of sodomy were scapegoated, within a general category of debauchery, in legal discourses<sup>10</sup>.

However, this should not lead us to assume that it was altogether impossible to self-identify as a sodomite in Shakespearean times. Bruce R. Smith proposes in *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England* that we recognize different kinds of discourse: moral, legal, medical, and poetic. Same-sex practices were valued distinctively in poetic writing, largely contradicting moral and legal discourses, because of the huge prestige of ancient Greek and Roman texts. Smith discovers, not a homosexual identity in any modern sense, but six "cultural scenarios" for same-sex relations, founded in classical sources. Within such a network of possibilities, individuals might negotiate quite diverse sexual alignments<sup>11</sup>. Also, it is not necessary to assume, with Foucault, that history falls into epochs, characterized by distinct modes of thought, with change occurring through a sequence of large-scale epistemological shifts. We should

9 Garry O'Connor, *William Shakespeare a Life* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1991), pp. 95-6.

10 Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage Books), p. 43. Alan Bray, *Homosexuality in Renaissance England* (London: Gay Men's Press, 1982).

11 Bruce R. Smith, *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England* (Chicago U.P., 1991), pp. 13-4, 74-6. See further Alan Bray, 'Homosexuality and the Signs of Male Friendship in Elizabethan England', *History Workshop*, 29 (1990), 1-19; Jonathan Goldberg, *Sodomities* (Stanford U.P., 1992).

not expect an even development, whereby one model characterizes an epoch and then is superseded by another. There may have been in early-modern Europe, especially in highly privileged circles, coterie where something like our concept of the homosexual individual occurred. That concept need not have been generally known, and need not have been coherent with, or even have affected, wider patterns of sexuality and gender. Ideology is never tidy, though ideologues present it as though it were. So even if certain figures were recognizably continuous with our idea of "a homosexual", a gay identity might still be inaccessible –incomprehensible– to almost everyone. I have a strong suspicion that the quest for the moment at which the modern homosexual subject is constituted is misguided. I suspect that what we call gay identity has, for a long time, been always in the process of getting constituted –as the middle classes have been always rising; or, more pertinently, as the modern bourgeois subject has for a long time been in the process of getting constituted.

The key point is that early-modern Britons drew the boundaries of sexualities in different places from ourselves. In particular, they did not associate male same-sex practices specifically with "effeminacy". Up to the time of the Oscar Wilde trials, I think –far later than is generally supposed– it is unsafe to interpret effeminacy as defining of, or as a signal of, same-sex passion. Mostly, it meant being emotional and spending too much time with women. Thus it often involved excessive cross-sexual attachment. To be manly was of course to go with women, but in a way that did not forfeit mastery. In Milton's *Samson Agonistes*, Samson's explanation of his subjection to Dalila is: "foul effeminacy held me yoked / Her bondslave"<sup>12</sup>.

One model of same-sex passion involved the lord and his minion, the catamite, the Ganymede. Only the latter was considered effeminate –because he occupied the subordinate position of the woman. In the opening scene of Marlowe's *Dido Queen of Carthage* the problem is not that Jupiter is playing with Ganymede, but that he is not attending to imperial business. Aeneas is said to be effeminate when he neglects his imperial destiny– distracted by Dido. The relationship between Achilles and Patroclus in *Troilus and Cressida* does not make Achilles effeminate; his love for Polyxena does that, keeping him from the war.

More surprisingly, to us, two warriors may proclaim mutual affection comparable to that between man and woman. So long as they are being very

12 *Samson Agonistes*, lines 410-11, in John Milton, *Poetical Works*, ed. Douglas Bush (Oxford U.P., 1969).

warrior-like, there is no embarrassment. Coriolanus, in Shakespeare's play, compares his embrace of his comrade Cominius to his honeymoon night; Aufidius' greeting to Coriolanus is in the same vein. Coriolanus is said to usurp the place of the maid Aufidius married, but he does not become feminine<sup>13</sup>. It is submitting to the Citizens that risks that, and to his mother. "Thou boy of tears", Aufidius accuses (V.vi.101). The taunt means not that Coriolanus has become a homosexual, but that he has submitted to his mother. This shifts his relations with men out of the heroic friendship model and into the Ganymede model.

\*\*\*

Engaging in same-sex practices, then, didn't make you either a homosexual or effeminate; in certain circumstances it made you specially masculine. The early-modern organisation of sex and gender boundaries, simply, was different from ours. And therefore Shakespeare couldn't have been gay. However, that need not stem the panic, because, by the same token, he couldn't have been straight either. In practice, the plays are pervaded with erotic interactions that strike chords for lesbians and gay men today, as they did for Symonds. Friendships are conducted with a passion that would now be considered suspicious; language of sexual flirtation is used in circumstances where we would find it embarrassing; and all the women's parts may, legitimately, be played by young men (I grant that this may not, immediately, be good news for women). It is not, necessarily, that Shakespeare was a sexual radical; rather, the ordinary currency of his theatre and society is sexy for us. Shakespeare may work with distinct force for gay men and lesbians, simply because he didn't think he had to sort out sexuality in modern terms. For approximately the same reasons, these plays may incite radical ideas about gender, class, race and nation.

So perhaps neither *Venus and Adonis*, nor Symonds' response to it, are as strange and remote as they may seem. Perhaps Symonds' reading is and was valid –not as the one, true reading, but as a haunting possibility that may be ignored or repudiated, but will not go away.

These arguments are developed in Alan Sinfield, *Cultural Politics – Queer Reading* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, and London: Routledge, 1994).

<sup>13</sup> Shakespeare, *Coriolanus*, ed. Philip Broackbank, New Arden edn (London: Methuen, 1976), I.vi. 29-32, IV.v. 114-19.

## DR. FAUSTUS AND DON JUAN, TWO BAROQUE HEROES

Dionisia Tejera Llano  
Universidad de Deusto

Renaissance had a different echo in the different countries of Europe. In France, for example, the continuous contacts with Italy, owing to the wars against Charles V on Italian soil, were to be the cause of the quick break with Medieval thought and forms; but, on the other hand, the wars of Religion were a handicap for the full development of Renaissance splendour, and, literally speaking, the country did not reach the highest point of Renaissance mood until the time of Louis XIV.

In England, the development of economic activity was to be accompanied by a parallel process in the artistic and intellectual fields. Perhaps owing to the natural, insular isolation, the Renaissance entered the country much later than on the continent, as a result, it could profit fully from French, Italian and Spanish influences. In fact when the new mood made its way into England it was more Baroque than pure Renaissance. By universal agreement no writer has ever been able to portray all kinds of passions in the human heart better than Shakespeare: faith, love and happiness, but also revenge, violence, hate and pain. He is not just the writer of the Renaissance but of the exaggeration of passions which would be the most outstanding characteristic of the Baroque, but all these ingredients were already present in his most important forerunner: Christopher Marlowe, himself a flamboyant, baroque character.

Like in England, in Spain the period between the 16th Century and the beginning of the 17th Century is, without doubt, the most important period of Spanish culture, both for the quantity and quality of scientific and literary works and the influence that Spanish thought had in all literary genres, expressing Spanish originality and depth of thought.

The Religious revolution which stirred the Europe of the Renaissance followed different paths in the two countries which, nevertheless, continued having a kind of love-hate relationship. The first part of the 17th century is perhaps the time in which England and Spain reached, on the one hand, the greatest degree of understanding while, at the same time, an antagonism was developing between them that would not end for a long time.

In England, the Religious revolution –which ended with the separation from the Church of Rome– had been more related to State. This resulted in a good political and economic solution for the impoverished crown, which was fortified by the "injection" of wealth from monasteries and bishoprics. The result was a very thankful aristocracy who shared with the crown the ownership of the states belonging to the church: abbeys, monasteries and the lands annexed to them, as well as the property of the recusants. Most of the religious controversies of this part of the Renaissance aimed at justifying this despoiling of Church property.

In Spain the Revolution had been more purely religious. Monastic reformers had been visiting convents trying to purify them of secular, deprived ways. St. Theresa's reformation added to that of Cisneros's. Important divines were bringing up theological topics for discussion, the philosophers took part in controversies which obliged the supreme authority of the Church at Rome to take them into consideration. The most influential orders of the church; the Jesuits and the Dominicans were Spanish-born and, from this country, they controlled the purity of the Catholic faith, which made many writers and politicians of the times accuse them of being spies for the House of Austria. Dominican friars and Jesuits were being condemned to death in England not only on religious but political grounds as well<sup>1</sup>. Juan Reglá writes:

Pero las tentativas del Emperador y del humanismo Erasmista fracasaron con la radicalización de posiciones. El protestantismo fue adaptado a la mentalidad capitalista y burguesa por el francés Calvino, mientras el catolicismo sintetizaba la tradición cristiana y las conquistas del humanismo por obra del español S. Ignacio de Loyola<sup>2</sup>.

At the end of the 16th Century the so-called "controversy of Auxiliis" started the theological debate about the salvation or damnation of human souls all over Europe. To the basic tenets of Protestantism: the exclusive authority of the Bible and the sanctity of the individual conscience, Calvin had added the doctrine of predestination.

In Spain, the controversy was held between the Molinists (the supporters of the Dominican Pedro Molina) and the Suarezists (from the Jesuit philosopher Suarez). On the other hand Neoplatonism, which had had its origins in Italy, influenced all Europe. At the end of the 16th Century and all through the 17th Century, Ovid's *Metamorphosis* replaced the Petrarchan tradition in more than one aspect. Otis H. Green writes:

...germinan promiscuamente los elevados conceptos neoplatónicos del amor con los conceptos del amor puramente terrenos<sup>3</sup>.

The same could be applied to England at the same time.

Fire (in the shape of a flame that reaches for higher regions), and earth, could be the key words to describe Baroque plasticity. I cannot think of better painters than El Greco on the one hand and Rubens on the other to depict through painting the idea of the time about Man; flesh –earthy flesh– that wants to soar above itself to higher regions where the spirit has its abode, "polvo enamorado" in the words of Quevedo or "so death does touch Resurrection" in Donne's Hymne.

Both heroes, Dr. Faustus and Don Juan, are the literary answer to the philosophical and religious concerns of their age. Both plays deal with the situation of man upon this earth with relation to the other creatures and to God. The two heroes defy the power of God, and in doing so, bring about their downfall; they are condemned for eternity. The Great Doctor and The Great Don are aware that they have a soul capable of salvation or condemnation: life in the next world depends on their lives upon this earth, but they are more concerned with the life of the body, than of the consequences upon their souls.

Faustus claims: "This word damnation terrifies not him"<sup>4</sup>, and in comparison with his worldly interests, Dr. Faustus speaks of his soul as: "Those vain trifles of men's soul" (I.iii.62). Faustus believes in the Neoplatonic unity of body and Soul, to Mephistophelis reminder: "Thou hast given thy soul to Lucifer" (I.i.133), he answers: "Ay, and body too, but what of that?" (II.i.134). But his interests, after all, are more the life of pleasure than the acquisition of deeper knowledge as could only be expected from the Great Doctor. Faustus exchanges his soul for the acquisition of wordly matters. His first wishes are "I will have them fly to India for gold" (I.i.83) "for pleasant fruits and princely delicates" (I.87) "the secret of foreign kings" (I.88) "wall all Germany with brass" (I.89) "fill the public schools with silk" (not with wisdom) (I.91). And in the actual compact he stresses on the wish to be given "twenty and four years" (I.iii.62) upon this world after which he is not interested any longer. So he is ready to give "body and soul, flesh, blood or goods into their habitation whatsoever" (II.i.110-111).

Faustus is very conscious of the passing of time, which causes him to want to live more intensely:

1 See Folley *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*. ed. by Rochampton. London 1877.

2 Juan Reglá, *Introducción a la Historia de España: Edad Moderna*. Editorial Teide, 1965.

3 Otis H. Green. *España y la Tradición Occidental*. Editorial Teide, 1965.

4 See *Dr. Faustus a 1604 –version edition*, ed. by Michael Keefer, Canada 1991. Act I, scene iii, line 59.

Faustus: Now Mephistophelis the restless course  
That time doth run with calm and silent froth...  
Therefore, sweet Mephistophelis  
Let us make haste....  
(V.ii.1-6)

He realises the vanity of his wishes when he is taking leave of his fellow scholars: "For the vain pleasure of four and twenty years hath Faustus lost eternal joy and felicity" (V.ii.36). For a doctor this seems really base and shallow, only in the context of the baroque concern for the passionate life of the senses is he to be understood. The great scholar, in fact, very soon forgets that he has not received any answers to his intellectual demands:

Faustus: First will I question with thee about Hell  
Tell me, where is the place that men call hell?  
(II.i.1-6)

Mephistophelis: Under the Heavens.  
(II.i.118)

This could be a very good example of one of the other non-answers he receives from Mephistophelis.

Don Juan is reminded time and again, by several characters, that he will be punished for his evil ways. The spirit, the eternity, is placed before Don Juan in opposition to that longing to possess reality, to live in the present. Every time the "Burlador" (the mocker) hastens upon reality, he is reminded that the present and reality are not the only things for man, that the soul is eternal and he is gambling in a game he is going to lose. Tragedy comes forth (in both plays) from this contrast between transience and eternity. Don Juan received admonitions from his father, Catalinon, and Tisbea, but he disregards their warnings. For instance Catalinon, tells him:

Los que fingís y engañáis  
las mujeres de esta suerte  
lo pagaréis con la muerte<sup>5</sup>

and Tisbea:

Advierte mi bien, que hay Dios y que hay muerte<sup>6</sup>

Don Juan's philosophy of life and death is perfectly portrayed in his famous verse "que largo me lo fiais" which he repeats five times throughout the play.

5 Alfredo Rodríguez López-Vázquez, *Andrés de Claramonte: El Burlador de Sevilla atribuido tradicionalmente a Tirso de Molina*. Kassel Edition Reichenberger 1987. p. 182, vs 901-3.  
6 Ibid. p. 184, vs 943-44.

Their interest in the life of the flesh is so outstanding that they seem quite unconcerned with the consequences of their acts, but in fact they are also preoccupied with the life to come. Thus, all Faustus's soliloquies are not just "flashes" which illuminate his character, but the natural outbursts of a complicated character, who is both the good angel and the bad angel, but that transcends them both and is *A Man*. Faustus generally speaks of himself in the second person: "Now Faustus, must thou needs be damn'd" (II.i.1). What ensues after this monologue does not change in mood so it can naturally be taken as a development of the idea inside Faustus's mind:

Good Angel:	Sweet Faustus, leave that execrable art"
Faustus:	Contrition, prayer, repentance: what of these?
Good angel	O, they are means to bring thee unto heaven
Evil angel:	Rather illusions, fruits of lunacy That makes men foolish that do trust them (II.i.15-20)

And Don Juan, the Great Don, who is completely unconcerned with the results of his actions upon this earth (what happens to all the women which he debauches?) is nevertheless worried about how a dead man can hurt him: his visits to the church where Don Gonzalo's tomb is and his invitation to "El Convidado de Piedra" are proof that he is aware of the parallelism of life in this world and in the next. The Ghost of Don Gonzalo de Ulloa moves freely from one world to the other, thus reminding Don Juan that the separation of body and soul is but a surmise of our limited earthly minds.

Faustus and Don Juan are condemned, they do not have a chance because they have committed the sin of the Holy Ghost that is the greatest offence of their age. Faustus first wish had been "to become a spirit" and Don Juan is equated with the devil himself: "Pienso que el demonio en él tomó forma humana"<sup>7</sup>, says Catalinon who plays the role of D. Juan's conscience throughout the play.

Don Juan as a fallen angel is given the qualities of a noble man: he perverts the ranks to which he belongs. Américo Castro in his famous Prologue in 1952 states:

"El invento de Tirso (he believes there is no doubt that Tirso was the author of the play) consiste en haber personalizado en un alma audaz la oposición a los principios morales y sociales y haberlo hecho con tanta intensidad que los reyes se estremecen al contacto del protervo galán y la Justicia Eterna tiene que recurrir a sus más eficaces rayos. Para un "debouche" habría bastado con un alguacil y varios corchetes"<sup>8</sup>.

7 *Andrés de Claramonte: El Burlador...* vs 299-301.  
8 Ibid. Prólogo: p. XXIII.



The same could be said about Dr. Faustus. There is no question of the belief in God of the two heroes. Neither in England nor in Spain could there be any possibility of questioning this. So the rebely and audacity of the heroes questioning this are more outstanding and intense. In spite of their awareness that they are receiving warnings from another world they remain unconcerned, their beliefs are determined by their tremendous vital impulse. This is the tragic aspect of "el burlador" or of "the Doctor" who turns into a magician; they are both heroes of the moral transgression. Their redeeming feature is in the human relationship with their friends: Don Juan puts his life in danger to save that of his servant who later on will say about him:

Como no lo entreguéis vos  
moza o cosa que lo valga  
bien podéis fiaros del:  
que en cuanto en esto es cruel  
tiene condición hidalga<sup>9</sup>

and in the case of the Doctor, his concern for his friends when he is reaching the end of this life proves that he is still capable of some moral values. Their condemnation at the end is the results of their baroque characterization, their exuberant transgression. Faustus cannot be saved because he despairs, not of the possibilities of the human soul, but of the merits of Christ, which cannot help him. Mephistophelis himself stresses Faustus's faith "His faith is great" (V.i.79).

Don Juan is an individualist in his morals, that is his sin; he has no doubt that his problem is not that of faith. He believes he will always have time for repentance. His problem is not of faith but of moral choice, and his salvation does not depend on his faith or the merits of Christ: he obviously believes in Grace so deeply that, in his mind, he has always had it clear that he would be given time for repentance. He believes in the sacrament of penance but finds out too late that he had overlooked the gospel advice to beware because we know neither the place nor the time.

Don Juan's weakness is obviously indiscriminate lust, this flaw is not in itself the cause of his ultimate downfall. He, in fact, dies and is condemned to hell because he dares to defy the world of the spirit from the tirany of the flesh. Of course the superiority is so obvious that Don Juan must, out of necessity, lose the battle. There is another very interesting angle to Don Juan's sin; it is a social offence and therefore he has debased his whole rank in society:

<sup>9</sup> Ibid. Jornada 2 p. 161-6.

La desvergüenza en España  
se ha hecho caballería<sup>10</sup>.

This social sin is to be understood in the light of Catholicism which does not believe in the supremacy of the individual conscience separated from the social one and has always considered the communion of the Saints as one of the dogmas of faith. The cause of Don Juan's downfall therefore must be related to a being that is a symbol of reconciliation between Don Juan's rank in society and the world of the spirit: the Ghost of a "caballero". Thus Don Juan's death is both a sacrifice and a purgation.

But it is my belief that ultimately the Great Doctor condemns his body and soul for eternity, for the sin which should, more naturally, be the Great Don's: lust. We cannot overlook the fact that Faustus speaks about himself in several scenes of the play; but the only definition he gives of himself, the only time he uses the first person, is when he entreats Mephistophelis to give him a woman:

...for I am wanton and lascivious, and cannot live without a wife.  
(II.i.141-43)

Helen's second appearance is the cause of Faustus's death: the separation of his soul from his body. After his encounter with her, Faustus's soul departs from this world and he dies. One must remember that the verb "die" has, in the Baroque, a sexual meaning also, so Faustus's address to Helen (besides being one of the most beautiful pieces of poetry ever put on the English stage) has a very profound and, I believe, literal meaning.

Her lips suck forth my soul, see where it flies!  
Come Helen, come, give me my soul back.  
(V.i)

So Faustus has, after all, given his soul because he is wanton and exchanged it for a moment of sexual pleasure.

Both plays are about two characters who had the aspirations of free spirits. These aspirations are checked by law —by moral and social laws in the case of Don Juan, and by divine in the case of Dr. Faustus<sup>11</sup>. They are rebels who despise established rules and morals and break them consciously by using their free will. In their daring bravery they defy divine justice but they are ultimately powerless to confront God's designs. They are very far from the serenity of the

<sup>10</sup> *El Burlador*... p. 222.

<sup>11</sup> *El Burlador*... p. 13.

classical heroes. It is their Baroque concern with the human body which is as essential a part of man as is the human spirit, but with that imbalance that had made the ascetics of the time mistrust the Neoplatonic concept of human love as much as they distrusted Spanish Illuminism.

#### WORKS CITED

- Dr. Faustus a 1604-version edition*. Ed. by Michael Keefer. Canada: Broadview press, 1991.  
 GREEN, Otis H.: *España y La Tradicion Occidental*. Madrid: Gredos, 1969.  
 RIERA FORTIANA, Enric. *Las claves de la Hegemonía Española*. Ed. Planeta, 1993.  
 RODRÍGUEZ LÓPEZ-VÁZQUEZ, Alfredo. *Andrés de Claramonte: El Burlador de Sevilla atribuido tradicionalmente a Tirso de Molina*. Reichenberger: Kassel Edition, 1987.

## REMARKS ON THE CHRONOGRAPHY OF TRANSITION:

### Renaissance - Mannerism - Baroque

Claus Uhlig  
University of Marburg, Germany

It happens most naturally of course that those who undergo the shock of spiritual or intellectual change sometimes fail to recognise their debt to the deserted cause: -How much of their heroism, or other high quality, of their rejection has really been the product of what they reject?

Walter Pater, *Gaston de Latour* (1896)

For quite a while now the human mind has been trying to stem the unbounded tide of becoming in time through principles of order designed to stop time, as it were, and to divide it into readily surveyable epochs. This endeavour is not so much a product of short-lived scholarly fashions as of the temporality of human existence itself, which in passing through its various stages experiences its own history subdivided as it is into epochs<sup>1</sup>. In the same way our understanding seeks insight into history as such, seeing that every individual is imbedded in it. Therefore it would seem necessary and legitimate in every generation to question again our epochal concepts and to re-examine their validity in scholarly discourse<sup>2</sup>. In the following this will be attempted with special regard to the time-honoured discussion of the transition from the Renaissance to the Baroque. What has been achieved so far will have to be presented briefly and with a view to pointing up possible alternatives.

#### I

Surveying the scholarly literature in the field according to the style of argumentation and the methods employed, one cannot but notice quite disparate results. While older art historians like Alois Riegl<sup>3</sup> and Heinrich Wölfflin<sup>4</sup>, for instance, used to describe the epochal transition in question as one between two

1 Cf. Hans-Georg Gadamer, "Die Zeitanschauung des Abendlandes" (1977), in H.-G.C., *Kleine Schriften*, vol. IV (Tübingen, 1977), pp. 17-33, esp. p. 28.

2 Cf. August Buck (ed.), *Renaissance und Barock*, vol. I; *Neues Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft*, vol. IX (Frankfurt/Main, 1972), p. 2; Alastair Fowler, "Periodization and Interart Analogies", *New Literary History*, 3 (1972), 487-509, esp. pp. 487ff.; and Ulrich Weisstein, *Comparative Literature and Literary Theory: Survey and Introduction* (Bloomington-London, 1973), pp. 66-98, esp. p. 67.

3 Alois Riegl, *Historische Grammatik der bildenden Künste* (1897/98), edd. K.M. Swoboda and O. Pächt (Graz-Köln, 1966), p. 58.

4 Heinrich Wölfflin, *Renaissance und Barock* (1888), ed. H. Rose (München, 1926), pp. 74-88.

more or less monolithically conceived ages, a marked change has taken place in this respect since the twenties and especially the fifties of our century, initiated above all by the introduction of the term Mannerism<sup>5</sup>. This term, generally applied to the age of transition from about 1530 to 1600 –although for England a time-lag stretching the period to the age of Milton and Marvell must of course be taken into account<sup>6</sup>–, has meanwhile been widely accepted in scholarship and criticism, in spite of the fact that the differentiations effected by it for two thirds of the 16th century should neither make the Renaissance appear more uniform than it was<sup>7</sup> nor try to usurp the terrain previously occupied by the Baroque<sup>8</sup>. Apart from this, the term Mannerism itself is problematic in both theoretical and methodological respects.

From the point of view of theory, more precisely the theory of history, we must first of all note that Mannerism is more often than not defined in a privative sense, that is to say, as decline or even crisis of the Renaissance whose inevitable Indian summer it would thus indicate. Such an interpretation, although by no means always grounded in a sufficiently thought out notion of crisis, is not only brought forward by students of sociology or social history –whose precursors are older than Marx, by the way<sup>9</sup>– but also by aesthetes<sup>10</sup> or proponents of

5 Dagobert Frey, "Probleme einer Geschichte der Kunstwissenschaft" (1958), in D.F., *Bausteine zu einer Philosophie der Kunst*, ed. G. Frey (Darmstadt, 1976), pp. 35-82, esp. p. 72; and A. Buck, *Forschungen zur romanischen Barock-literatur* (Darmstadt, 1980), p. 23.

6 Cf. Wylie Sypher, *Four Stages of Renaissance Style* (Garden City, N.Y., 1955), pp. 104f.; Franzsepp Würtenberger, *Der Manierismus* (Wien-München, 1962), p. 6; and Roy Daniells, *Milton, Mannerism and Baroque* (Toronto, 1963), p. 6.

7 Cf. Johan Huizinga, "Das Problem der Renaissance" (1920), in J.H., *Das Problem der Renaissance - Renaissance und Realismus* (Darmstadt, 1952), pp. 5-64, esp. p. 60; and Thomas M. Greene, "The Flexibility of the Self in Renaissance Literature", in P. Demetz et al. (edd.), *The Disciplines of Criticism* (New Haven-London, 1968), pp. 241-264.

8 Conservative in this sense are scholars who remain unimpressed by the boom of the concept of Mannerism. Cf. Jean Rousset, *La littérature de l'âge baroque en France: Circé et le paon* (Paris, 1953), pp. 161ff., 183-228; as well as Frank J. Warnke, *Versions of Baroque: European Literature in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven-London, 1972), pp. 1-20, esp. p. 13.

9 Cf. in this context Herbert Weisinger, "The English Origins of the Sociological Interpretation of the Renaissance", *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 11 (1950), 321-338; as well as, with regard to actual interpretation, Arnold Hauser, *Sozialgeschichte der Kunst und Literatur* (München, 1953; repr. 1967), pp. 377-387; idem, *Der Manierismus: Die Krise der Renaissance und der Ursprung der modernen Kunst* (München, 1964), pp. 6-16; Walter Dietze, "Raum, Zeit und Klasseninhalt der Renaissance", in W. Bahner (ed.), *Renaissance, Barock, Aufklärung: Epochen- und Periodisierungsfragen* (Kronberg / Ts., 1976), pp. 72-128; Tibor Klaniczay, *Renaissance und Manierismus: Zum Verhältnis von Gesellschaftsstruktur, Poetik und Stil* (Berlin, 1977), pp. 79-211; and A. Buck, "Der Epochenwandel von der Renaissance zum Barock in den romanischen Literaturen" (1984), in A.B., *Studien zu Humanismus und Renaissance: Gesammelte Aufsätze aus den Jahren 1981-1990*, ed. Bodo Guthmüller et al. (Wiesbaden, 1991), pp. 429-450.

10 Cf. e.g., John Buxton, *Elizabethan Taste* (New York, 1966), pp. 1-38.

biologistic life cycle theories<sup>11</sup>. As for the method in evidence, Mannerism by and large owes its modern physiognomy to the so-called "mutual illumination of the arts", a procedure which, in the wake of Heinrich Wölfflin's *Principles of Art History* (1915), seeks to explore the analogies supposed to exist between works of art and architecture on the one hand and those of literature on the other<sup>12</sup>. The many unresolved tensions ensuing from this approach might well have enriched the very concept of Mannerism in that they structurally stress tendencies towards decentralization and polyperspectivism<sup>13</sup>, but certainly do appear speculative to those who, out of a sound scepticism towards the rhetoric of the humanities, regard mannerism as a mere characteristic of style rather than an epochal phenomenon<sup>14</sup>. Closely related to this view, which would of course ultimately result in historiographic defeatism, is finally the typological interpretation of mannerism as put forward by Ernst Robert Curtius and his pupil Gustav René Hocke, according to whom mannerism is an historical constant by definition transcending any epoch whatever<sup>15</sup>. As if intending to save the term for the discussion of epochs, Arnold Hauser, next to Franzsepp Würtenberger an authority on our subject, uneasily vacillates between the two approaches to mannerism, the epochal and the typological one<sup>16</sup>, for it should be clear how detrimental to the history of art and literature must be an understanding of history which –and already Heinrich Wölfflin's "periodicity of development"<sup>17</sup> creates a contradiction in

11 Cf. only Robert S. Lopez, *The Three Ages of the Italian Renaissance* (Charlottesville, Va., 1970), pp. 62f. and 64f.

12 Cf. W. Sypher, *Four Stages of Renaissance Style*, pp. 1-35, 100-179; R. Daniells, *Milton, Mannerism and Baroque*, pp. 6-50; Mario Praz, *Mnemosyne: The Parallel between Literature and the Visual Arts* (Princeton, N.J., 1970), pp. 90-108; Jost Hermand, *Literaturwissenschaft und Kunstwissenschaft* (Stuttgart, 1971), pp. 16-20; and U. Weisstein, *Comparative Literature and Literary Theory*, pp. 150-166, esp. pp. 155ff. –Critical of this approach are A. Fowler, "Periodization and Interart Analogies", pp. 489-493; and W.K. Wimsatt, *Day of the Leopards: Essays in Defense of Poems* (New Haven-London, 1976), pp. 40-56.

13 Cf. Wolfgang Drost, *Strukturen des Manierismus in Literatur und bildender Kunst: Eine Studie zu den Trauerspielen Vincenzo Giustis (1532-1619)* (Heidelberg, 1977), pp. 27-40, esp. pp. 32ff.

14 Cf. Hugo Friedrich, *Epochen der italienischen Lyrik* (Frankfurt/Main, 1964), pp. 593-615; Davy A. Carozza, "For a Definition of Mannerism: The Hatzfeldian Thesis", *Colloquia Germanica*, 1 (1967), 66-77; Blake Lee Spahr, "Baroque and Mannerism: Epoch and Style", *ibid.*, pp. 78-100; and Friedrich Gaede, *Humanismus, Barock, Aufklärung* (Bern-München, 1971), pp. 177f.

15 Cf. Ernst Robert Curtius, *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter* (Bern, 1919), p. 277; as well as Gustav René Hocke, *Die Welt als Labyrinth* (Hamburg, 1957); and idem, *Manierismus in der Literatur* (Hamburg, 1959).

16 Cf. A. Hauser, *Sozialgeschichte der Kunst und Literatur*, pp. 384, 408; as well as idem, *Der Manierismus*, pp. 355-358.

17 Cf. H. Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe* (Basel-Stuttgart, 1919), pp. 268-271.

terms here— sets greater store by recurrent cyclicity than by irreversible linearity, the very basis of historiography<sup>18</sup>.

If what has been said appears to aim at a metahistorical level of discussion, then for two reasons. First, to remain in keeping with our postmodern age of Neohistoricism<sup>19</sup>; second, to be able to look at the results of previous research in the fields of the Renaissance, Mannerism and the Baroque from a certain distance. To put it differently, what we learn about the mentality and world picture of Mannerism in particular is just as much a projection of the approaches and methods described as it is the signature of an epoch of transition having largely exchanged the stability assumed to prevail during the high Renaissance for ubiquitous lability<sup>20</sup>. More specifically, changes in the general outlook on life are in this context mentioned time and again, changes which are said to be tantamount to a renunciation of Renaissance anthropocentrism without having as yet reached the theocratic order of the Baroque<sup>21</sup>. The doubtful state, nay "metaphysical incompleteness of everything human"<sup>22</sup> that is thus diagnosed is then considered to correspond to a view of life characterized by insecurity, especially manifesting itself in an awareness of the passing of time, the process of ageing, and the oncoming of death, while the transcendental security associated with the age of the Baroque still bides its time<sup>23</sup>.

Among the authors whose texts serve to corroborate these and similar points we have first of all to number Montaigne<sup>24</sup>; furthermore —if it is permitted to restrict oneself to English literature for the moment— Shakespeare, Donne, Milton and Marvell. In this respect it is especially the Shakespeare of the great tragedies and problem plays who is most often laid under contribution<sup>25</sup>, whereas Milton, and that in marked contrast to the arch-mannerist Donne<sup>26</sup>, is

said to have attained, after a youthful mannerist phase, a vision of baroque grandeur in *Paradise Lost* (1667 and 1674)<sup>27</sup>.

We shall later have to return to Shakespeare and Milton. Yet what the above survey already suggests as a desideratum now is the need for terminological clarification<sup>28</sup>. On the whole, Renaissance scholarship is quite clear about this<sup>29</sup>, although it still seems to rely too much on analogy, a most precarious mode of argument at the best of times. Already back in 1736 Bishop Joseph Butler, using the method in question for theological purposes in his *Analogy of Religion*, could not but acknowledge that analogical evidence, grounded in verisimilitude as it is, only led to probability, i.e., "an imperfect kind of information", even if he had to depend upon it in his reasoning<sup>30</sup>. Kant and Goethe, on their part, likewise condoned analogy for its open and empirical quality, provided it was used with care and circumspection<sup>31</sup>. By and large, this can be averred for eighteenth-century literary critics working within the tradition of *ut pictura poesis* whose possibilities and limitations they recognized in the study of texts<sup>32</sup>. Thus it would appear that mainly our century has sinned through excess in this respect. If, however, the study of historical epochs wants to advance, at least in the field of literature, beyond the discussion of questions of mere chronology which tend to associate Mannerism at times with the late Renaissance, at times with the early Baroque, it will perhaps have to change its point of view fundamentally. That is to say, spatial categories as applied under the methodological domination of art history might well have to be replaced by temporal categories as would be fitting for the analysis of texts, the primary objects of literary history after all. It

18 Cf. U. Weisstein, *Comparative Literature and Literary Theory*, p. 69.

19 Cf. Arnaldo Momigliano, *Historicism Revisited* (Amsterdam-London, 1974), p. 10.

20 Cf. only A. Hauser, *Sozialgeschichte*, p. 381; *Der Manierismus*, pp. 145-150; and F. Württenberger, *Der Manierismus*, p. 218.

21 Cf. Hiram Haydn, *The Counter-Renaissance* (New York, 1950), pp. 461-551; W. Sypher, *Four Stages of Renaissance Style*, pp. 17-130; A. Hauser, *Der Manierismus*, pp. 44-46, 50-52; and F. Württenberger, *Der Manierismus*, pp. 218ff.

22 Cf. Rudolf Stamm, "Englischer Literaturbarock?", in R.S. (ed.), *Die Kunstformen des Barockzeitalters* (München, 1956), pp. 383-412, esp. p. 404.

23 Cf. instead of many, F. Württenberger, *Der Manierismus*, pp. 222f.

24 Cf. A. Hauser, *Der Manierismus*, pp. 48-50.

25 Cf. R. Stamm, "Englischer Literaturbarock?", pp. 403ff.; as well as A. Hauser, *Sozialgeschichte*, pp. 453-455; *Der Manierismus*, pp. 340-346.

26 Cf. M. Praz, *Mnemosyne*, pp. 97-101; and Murray Roston, *The Soul of Wit: A Study of John Donne* (Oxford, 1974).

27 Cf. W. Sypher, *Four Stages of Renaissance Style*, p. 106; R. Daniells, *Milton, Mannerism and Baroque*, pp. 19-50, 87-99, 170-193; and M. Roston, *Milton and the Baroque* (Pittsburgh, Pa., 1980). —However, there is no lack of sceptical opinion in this respect; cf. especially Roland Mushat Frye, *Milton's Imagery and the Visual Arts: Iconographic Tradition in the Epic Poems* (Princeton, N.J., 1978), pp. 6 and 17f.

28 Cf. also Ludwig Borinski, *Das Problem der Begriffsbildung in den Geisteswissenschaften*, *Berichte aus den Sitzungen der Joachim Jungius-Ges. der Wiss. e.V.*, Hamburg, Jg. 2, H.1 (Göttingen, 1984), pp. 13 and 20.

29 Cf. e.g., R. Daniells, *Milton, Mannerism and Baroque*, p. 62; John M. Steadman, *The Lamb and the Elephant: Ideal Imitation and the Context of Renaissance Allegory* (San Marino, Calif., 1974), pp. 8f., as well as A. Buck, *Forschungen zur romanischen Barockliteratur*, p. 29.

30 Cf. Joseph Butler, *The Analogy of Religion to the Constitution and Course of Nature*, ed. Joseph Angus (London, n.d.), pp. 1-12, esp. p. 5.

31 Cf. Johannes Hoffmeister (ed.), *Wörterbuch der philosophischen Begriffe* (Hamburg, 1955), pp. 34f., s.v. "Analogie".

32 See on this, with special reference to a single poem of central historical importance, Ralph Cohen, *The Art of Discrimination: Thomsons's "The Seasons" and the Language of Criticism* (London, 1964), pp. 188-193, also p. 521 of the "Index of Subjects", s.v. "analogy".

is along these lines, at any rate, that I wish to move in submitting an alternative to the customary approaches to Mannerism, while concurrently entering a plea for a temporalization of the argument.

## II

The replacement of spatially determined modes of thought which tend to enter scholarly discourse via metaphors –and talking of "transitions" or "ages of transition" inevitably is speaking metaphorically<sup>33</sup>– by temporalized concepts can only succeed if, with Martin Heidegger, one realizes that the mode of thought in question is itself a product of history, i.e., derived from the modern concept of the world as picture, as "world picture" in the interest of subjective disposability<sup>34</sup>. In order therefore to avoid being caught up in an historiographic vicious circle with regard to the epochal transition from Renaissance to Mannerism and Baroque, we should call to mind the structure of time itself. This is all the more necessary since the historical understanding of literary texts we are primarily discussing here and in the following does not only remain subject to time and change on its part<sup>35</sup>, but in view of its objects also presupposes, as we have known since Lessing's *Laokoön* (1766), a relation to time entirely different from that of artworks<sup>36</sup>.

What is more, the actual experience of time to be encountered in literature itself calls for our attention in the present context. Time as the medium of history and thus the foundation of historiography, too, is indeed very much in evidence in literature, both ancient and modern, and that in a variety of shapes. Taking for example one of the oldest literary genres, the epic, one will find there an almost metahistorical conception of time, making it stretch from past to future and thereby overarch any present with significations pointing beyond the passing moment. Such a temporal wholeness, however, was no longer conceivable by the period of the Renaissance, when fragmentation set in and the representation of reality had to allow for the eternal vicissitude of things, mutability constantly threatening to become chaos. As essentially chaotic in character, time then appeared in the experimental novel, above all in Laurence Sterne's *Tristram Shandy* (1759-67), a text that relished juggling with time, establishing a sort of

33 Cf. Alexander Demandt, *Metaphern für Geschichte: Sprachbilder und Gleichnisse im historisch-politischen Denken* (München, 1978), pp. 218-220.

34 Cf. Martin Heidegger, "Die Zeit des Weltbildes" (1938), in M.H., *Holzwege* (Frankfurt/Main, 31957), pp. 69-104, esp. pp. 81ff.

35 Cf. A. Momigliano, *Historicism Revisited*, pp. 4ff.

36 Cf. D. Frey, "Das Zeitproblem in der Bildkunst" (1955), in D.F., *Bausteine zu einer Philosophie der Kunst*, pp. 212-235.

time dialectic between the author, his characters and his readers in order to point not only, in the manner of Locke, to the subjectivity of time and duration but also to the simultaneous co-presence of past and future in the present instant of narration. To elaborate these Shandyan manipulations could, in a way, be considered the purpose of all those later novelists fascinated, like Sterne, by the riddle of time. Here Virginia Woolf with her fictive biography *Orlando* (1928) readily comes to mind. Yet, mingling subjective with objective conceptions of time quite generally is the hallmark of all fiction that, continuing the experimental strain right to our so-called 'postmodern' age, exhibits a polytemporal structure whereby it juxtaposes past, present and future, with no concern for causality and sequence –or, to put it in terms of Vladimir Nabokov's ingenious but necessarily inconclusive "chronographical" speculations about his narrator's projected *Texture of Time*, simultaneously blends memory and expectation into a composite textual medium that defies "chronography and charting"<sup>37</sup>.

Time, then, is anything but uniform. Apart from literature, as indicated, everyday experience also confirms this observation already, while the theory of history, our main concern from now on, accepts a phenomenon like the non-contemporaneity of the contemporaneous –or *vice versa*– without much questioning<sup>38</sup>. Therefore it comes as no surprise to notice that all fields of knowledge confronting the problem of time include multiple temporality among their central axioms. Very much to the point here is Krzysztof Pomian's inquiry into the nature of both "chronographie" as related to the present and "chronosophie" as related to the future, encompassing as it is quite a few areas of thought and resulting in an affirmation of time's plurality<sup>39</sup>. Hence one will likewise have to reckon with a fair number of dualities which are operative in organizing the various branches of knowledge; and in isolating one or two of these oppositions, the structure of time might perhaps become just as clear to us as the problem of literary historiography in the face of epochal change.

37 Cf. Vladimir Nabokov, *Ada or Ardor: A Family Chronicle* (New York-Toronto, 1969), pp. 535-563, esp. pp. 536, 540; idem, *Look at the Harlequins!* (London, 1975), p. 168; also Claus Uhlig, "Current Models and Theories of Literary Historiography", *Arcadia*, 22 (1987), 1-17, esp. pp. 13f.

38 Cf. only Erwin Panofsky, "Zum Problem der historischen Zeit" (1927), in E.P., *Aufsätze zu Grundfragen der Kunstwissenschaft*, edd. H. Oberer and E. Verheyen (Berlin, 1964), pp. 77-83, esp. p. 82; and Siegfried Kracauer, *History: The Last Things Before the Last* (New York, 1969), pp. 139-163, esp. pp. 147ff.

39 Cf. Krzysztof Pomian, *L'ordre du temps* (Paris, 1984), pp. V and 354: "Il existe une pluralité de temps".

As time in literature and the arts cannot be organized either chronologically or annalistically, we might, by way of hypothesis and in the wake of Niklas Luhmann, deem it useful to differentiate from the outset between the time of nature or the world on the one hand and those structures or systems which obey their own temporal logic on the other. World-time, to start with the more general notion, may then be said to exhibit homogeneity, reversibility, chronological determinateness, and transitivity for the sake of comparison between different extensions of time<sup>40</sup>. It is thus independent of tempi of change and, most debilitating from the point of view of history, by no means structured according to caesuras of sense. And no matter which kind of relationship obtains between the past, the present, and the future in world-time, it can only be governed by contingency. Systems, by contrast, possess, with regard to their temporal structuration, exactly those features found missing in world-time. That is to say, they have not forgotten their respective pasts, they have internalized them instead, thus tending of their own accord, whether by expectation or extrapolation, to reach into the future. In short, systems are historical, albeit in a rigorously selective manner<sup>41</sup>.

All this being the case, isochrony should not be expected between world-time and the time of systems; anachrony<sup>42</sup>, rather, is the normal state of affairs, marking the various types of discordance between two differing timetables. In this respect systems ultimately resist history, so long at least as history is conceived in purely chronological terms. Still, however appealing the analysis of systems might appear to the student of genuine history, it must be admitted that systems theory itself has yet to produce evidence of having mastered the theoretical problem of how systems, through generalizing of structures, may create possibilities for, say, change and innovation<sup>43</sup>. If in this context one were to ask about the contribution of Heinrich Wölfflin's heirs Henri Focillon and George Kubler who, as we may recall, agree in stressing the "systematic age" of art forms, the answer would be that they still leave us in the dark with regard to the principles of selection which not only determine the status of prime objects and replicas but also the shape of historical curves from ascent to decline<sup>44</sup>.

40 Cf. Niklas Luhmann, "Weltzeit und Systemgeschichte" (1973), in N.L., *Soziologische Aufklärung*, vol. II (Opladen, 21982), pp. 103-133, esp. p. 111.

41 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 107.

42 For the use of this term, although in a more restricted sense, cf. Gérard Genette, *Narrative Discourse*, trans. J.E. Lewin (Oxford, 1980), pp. 35f.

43 Cf. N. Luhmann, *Soziologische Aufklärung*, vol. II, 114f.

44 Cf. Henri Focillon, *Vie des formes* (Paris, 41955), pp. 80-95; and George Kubler, *The Shape of Time: Remarks on the History of Things* (New Haven, 1962), esp. pp. 39-45 on the "diagnostic difficulties" to be expected in this area of study.

Ascent and decline: add to these progress, decadence acceleration, or retardation, and you have seized upon further phenomena to be observed in the study of any social, political, cultural, or literary system. Ill discriminated they were encountered by us above all in the discussion of Mannerism as crisis. But what can be observed and described on the phenomenological level is not necessarily understood in conceptual terms. For it is important now that the phenomena mentioned should, in the sphere of cognition, be viewed as temporal modes of experience with a history of their own. And it would be the particular task of an historical semantics to elucidate the meaning of these modes of experience for the benefit of scholarly discourse<sup>45</sup>. And such an historical semantics could in turn serve as the basis for a theory of historical times which from the present point of view would appear to be the real desideratum. Its domain, however, as is clear from the above distinction between world-time and systematic time, will not be chronology but chronography.

To illustrate very briefly what is meant here, one of the prime tasks of a theory of historical times conceived along chronographic lines would certainly consist in making intelligible the transformation of the temporal modes of experience mentioned into formal categories of chronography such as irreversibility or asynchrony within apparent simultaneity<sup>46</sup>. It is equally clear that any such attempt could not dispense with the example set by the French *Annales* historians who, by methodically dividing up time into *longue durée*, *moyenne durée*, *temps court* as well as *conjoncture*, have more than once brought out the complications of temporal multi-dimensionality in terms of both theory and practice<sup>47</sup>.

Still, all of this is not yet the last word for the literary historian. For he immediately takes for granted that the system of literature, characterized as it is among other things by recurrent themes and long-lived genres, quite regularly tends to follow its own timetable, thus often coming into conflict with the calendric time of the world surrounding it<sup>48</sup>. In addition to that, he further realizes that texts as smallest units of this selfsame literary system do in fact have a temporal structure of their own.

45 Cf. in this context G.W. Trompf, *The Idea of Historical Recurrence in Western Thought: From Antiquity to the Reformation* (Berkeley-Los Angeles-London, 1979); Reinhart Koselleck (ed.), *Historische Semantik und Begriffsgeschichte* (Stuttgart, 1979); as well as R. Koselleck and Paul Widmer (edd.), *Niedergang: Studien zu einem geschichtlichen Thema* (Stuttgart, 1980).

46 Cf. R. Koselleck, *Vergangene Zukunft: Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten* (Frankfurt/Main, 1979), pp. 130-143, esp. p. 132.

47 Cf. in this context only Traian Stoianovich, *French Historical Method: The "Annales" Paradigm* (Ithaca-London, 1976), esp. pp. 106-112 on Fernand Braudel's notion of *longue durée*.

48 Cf. Claudio Guillén, *Literature as System: Essays Toward the Theory of Literary History* (Princeton, N.J., 1971), pp. 375-469.

Put more precisely, any present text is embedded in time in a fourfold manner even, since both past and future inform a given text's present in a double sense. Thus the past may first of all surface intertextually in the present through quotation or allusion, whereby a stratum of residual meaning is pointed to. A somewhat more complicated mode of the past's presence in new texts is secondly that of latency which bears upon a future actualization of the past as opposed to the present past just mentioned. Walter Pater seems to have this in mind when in describing his ideal type of character he writes: "A magnificent intellectual force is latent within it" –a force which is then said to operate through reminiscence and anticipation<sup>49</sup>. As for the future in a present text, its most immediate mode of existence would be virtuality. Especially utopian thinkers concern themselves with this form of the future's presence in the present; witness next to Ernst Bloch's well-known "anticipatory vision" ("Vor-Schein")<sup>50</sup> also Mikhail M. Bakhtin's concept of "historical inversion". "Historical inversion", according to Bakhtin, enriches the bygone at the expense of the future by transferring everything desirable into a more authentic past, which on account of its presence in the present must thus add to the latter's fullness of time, i.e., future time<sup>51</sup>. Still regarding the future we may finally point to the potential layer of meaning in texts, a layer which, though often hidden to contemporary readers, will eventually be discovered<sup>52</sup>, so that the future not yet come will one day be in a position to change its mode of existence from potentiality to actuality.

The described fourfold temporality of literary texts in their specific present now does not only throw light on a most complex interaction of past and present to form a multi-layered textual presence but also on the fact that any text's actuality must be regarded as a direct result of its historicity. The textual model introduced may further help us to perceive the difference between the history of literature and the history of events, inasmuch as the latter, provided we can trust the historian J.H. Plumb, is neither interested in the future nor in

49 Walter Pater, "Diaphaneité" (1864), in W.P., *Miscellaneous Studies*, New Library Edition (London, 1910), pp. 247-254, esp. p. 250. As to latent possibilities in literary texts, see also I.A. Richards, *Coleridge on Imagination* (London, 1934), p. 90.

50 Cf. Ernst Bloch, *Das Prinzip Hoffnung*, 3 vols. (Frankfurt/Main, 1978), I, 242-258. For a critique of the utopian concept of "Vor-Schein" as depriving any given present of its own right of existence, see Hans Jonas, *Das Prinzip Verantwortung: Versuch einer Ethik für die technologische Zivilisation* (Frankfurt/Main, 1979), pp. 376-387.

51 Cf. Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, ed. M. Holquist, trans. C. Emerson and M. Holquist (Austin-London, 1981), p. 147.

52 Cf. Arthur C. Danto, *The Transfiguration of the Commonplace: A Philosophy of Art* (Cambridge, Mass., 1981), p. 43; as well as M.M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, p. 257.

the past properly speaking<sup>53</sup>. If this obviously does not apply to the literary historian, his task does not become any easier for that matter –especially with regard to the problem of epochal change. Seeing, moreover, that *Annales*-historiography has so far been more eloquent on continuity than on change and that systems theory as such has not yet been able to come up with definite results either, we are sharply confronted with the question of how that which is so multi-layered in itself, that is, texts in their full temporality, can possibly become a vehicle or even indicator of such complex historical processes as epochal transitions must be considered to be. More or less thrown back on its own resources the chronographic approach will thus have to prove, albeit in conjunction with the textual model described in the foregoing, whether it can cope with the problem of change.

### III

It is customary to regard change as a dynamic notion and to contrast it with static concepts. But let us from the outset guard against simplistic oppositions such as we still find, for example, in the association of Mannerism with hecticness, supposedly in contrast to the statics of the Renaissance and the dynamics of the Baroque<sup>54</sup>. For in reality change occurs in a great variety of ways since we may, to mention the extremes only, experience it both as formless "continuity-in-mutability"<sup>55</sup> and as catastrophe which all of a sudden reveals life as discontinuous and acts as the caesura dear to historians wanting to give an ordered shape to time.

But does this explain change? "The knowledge of the mechanics of historical change is far more profound than it was two generations ago", affirms J.H. Plumb<sup>56</sup>. Here doubts are warranted. If Wölfflin, for instance, in trying to come to terms with the problem of stylistic change did not succeed during his entire life in reconciling periodic and cyclical with teleological and linear motifs of thought<sup>57</sup>, then it is not surprising to encounter a similar position still held today, especially with those who staunchly believe in a wholly "intra-

53 Cf. J.H. Plumb, *The Death of the Past* (London, 1969), pp. 102-145, esp. p. 144.

54 Cf. W. Drost, *Strukturen des Manierismus in Literatur und bildender Kunst*, p. 173.

55 C.S. Lewis, "De Descriptione Temporum" (1955), in C.S.L., *Selected Literary Essays*, ed. W. Hooper (Cambridge, 1969), pp. 1-14, esp. p. 2.

56 J.H. Plumb, *The Death of the Past*, p. 144.

57 Cf. H. Wölfflin, *Renaissance und Barock*, pp. 74-88; idem, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, pp. 266-272; as well as, critical of Wölfflin, Michael Podro, *The Critical Historians of Art* (New Haven-London, 1982), pp. 98-151.



artistic" notion of change<sup>58</sup>. As against this, it is of course not sufficient to emphatically stress external conditions which Hauser invokes to counter Wölfflin<sup>59</sup>; for it is important to see that what is new in any development is not absolutely determined by what went before, but enjoys, by way of addition, evocation or variation, quite a degree of freedom in the face of the past<sup>60</sup>. Nor shall we become any the wiser by conceiving of change in terms of deprivation and decline, for, if anything, this conception betrays –and this ultimately also holds good for Bakhtin's generically employed *chronotope*– nothing but a nostalgia for a lost "spatial and temporal material wholeness of the world" which, as such, probably never existed<sup>61</sup>. Finally, as regards Michel Foucault's much-quoted *épistémè*, it must be said that this methodological concept might well have served its purpose in registering epochal differences –such as, for example, between Renaissance analogizing and baroque as well as classicist representation–, but has so far been unable to explain change<sup>62</sup>.

Thus there seems to be no alternative to description in dealing with the problem of change<sup>63</sup>. Let us take consolation from a statement of Michael Oakeshott's, to the effect that "history accounts for change by means of a full account of change". True enough, but hardly satisfactory for chronographic purposes. And Michael Stanford does not appear to be more helpful either when, writing on change as history's most characteristic attribute, he singles out physical nature, human nature, and rational intention, although not overlooking "the logic of their interactions", as sufficient to explain the processes of change in the historical field<sup>64</sup>. Yet he is nearer the mark when, somewhat later, he comments upon the opposition between the "horizontal world" we live in and the "verticalities of time" that hide the secret of change, not to be uncovered by the traditional narrative of historians, though<sup>65</sup>. Under these circumstances, then, we would perhaps be well advised to go back to Aristotle and remember his

insight into the nature of change, whereby an analysis of the phenomenon is said to involve three terms: namely, a subject remaining unspecified, a field, time, and a final term, the result of the process<sup>66</sup>. Since therefore, according to him, "all that changes changes in time"<sup>67</sup> –one of the reasons, by the way, why a temporalization of the argument is called for in our present context–, conceptions of time itself must inevitably enter any discussion of change.

To be sure, in our day and age complex temporal entities are no longer studied by means of holistic approaches but, to use a phrase of Karl R. Popper's, through "piecemeal" ones<sup>68</sup>. This is clearly in harmony with our well-grounded mistrust of monistic views. Thus, wherever we look –and this holds good for the humanities as well as for the natural sciences–, we find pluralistic approaches<sup>69</sup>. Methodologically this often involves the breaking down of complex entities into their constituent parts, whence the investigation proceeds to study the various interrelationships between particularized items. This way new though different and as a rule smaller entities are built up. As for the problem of epochal change, it follows that convincing mediation between the structures of long duration on the one hand, and the events of shorter duration on the other, although envisaged by *Annales* historians already, remains of crucial importance. Now the mediating notion we stand in need of is that of "series"; and since change is never free-wheeling, everything depends on how we define "series". In other words, it is only through the notion of a series of events that, to condense a long and mainly French debate on the exact relationship between structure or system and event<sup>70</sup>, world-time could ultimately become amenable to systematic time, or *vice versa*, so that *longue durée* and *temps court*, by interacting with each other, could simultaneously be said to generate change. At any rate, such a conception is tantamount to transforming a chronological impasse into a well-defined chronographic problem.

58 Cf. H. Friedrich, *Epochen der italienischen Lyrik*, p. 613.

59 Cf. A. Hauser, *Sozialgeschichte der Kunst und Literatur*, pp. 462f; as well as, in a more differentiating way, idem, *Der Manierismus*, pp. 147f.

60 Cf. M. Podro, *The Critical Historians of Art*, pp. 136-140.

61 Cf. M.M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, pp. 84-258, esp. pp. 84f., 166, 206-224.

62 Cf. Michel Foucault, *Les mots et les choses* (Paris, 1966), p. 13; idem, *Die Ordnung der Dinge*, trans. U. Köppen (Frankfurt/Main, 1974), esp. pp. 13f. on the problem of causality in the sense indicated; as well as idem, *L'archéologie du savoir* (Paris, 1969), pp. 248-251.

63 Michael Oakeshott, *Experience and Its Modes* (Cambridge, 1933), p. 143; quoted and criticized by Maurice Mandelbaum, *The Anatomy of Historical Knowledge* (Baltimore-London, 1977), p. 110.

64 Cf. Michael Stanford, *The Nature of Historical Knowledge* (Oxford, 1986; repr. 1990), pp. 37-41, esp. p. 41.

65 Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 124f.

66 Cf. Aristotle, *Physics*, VI, 236b5. For this and the subsequent reference, see C. Guillén, "Literary Change and Multiple Duration", *Comparative Literature Studies*, 6 (1977), 100-118, esp. p. 112.

67 Aristotle, *Physics*, VI, 236b20.

68 Cf. Karl R. Popper, *The Poverty of Historicism* (London, 1957; repr. 1974), pp. 64-70.

69 Apart from C. Guillén, as cited above, n. 66, cf. also Julian H. Steward, *Theory of Culture Change: The Methodology of Multilinear Evolution* (Urbana, Ill., 1955; repr. 1976), pp. 11-29; and H. Kalmus, "The Measurement of Biological and Social Changes", in J.T. Fraser et al. (edd.), *The Study of Time*, vol. III (New York-Heidelberg-Berlin, 1978), pp. 237-264.

70 For more detail regarding the debate in question, see T. Stoianovich, *French Historical Method*, pp. 204-231; M. Mandelbaum, *The Anatomy of Historical Knowledge*, pp. 137-142; and R. Koselleck, *Vergangene Zukunft*, pp. 144-157.



For a problem it remains, at least as long as series, justly considered to be temporal systems in their own right, are studied in isolation from the world's larger time scheme still surrounding them. Over against this, it is, I submit, precisely the chronographic approach which should make us see how two or even more segments of different temporal systems intersect with each other. This assertion might perhaps seem less abstract when compared to the process of alloying metals. For, investigating the nature of material structure and structural change, the metallurgist and theoretician of the arts Cyril Stanley Smith has been stressing interaction and compatibility in describing the "mechanics of change". He writes:

One cannot overemphasize the fact that *everything* –meaning and value as well as appropriateness of individual human conduct or the energy state of an atom –depends upon the interaction of the thing itself and its environment. The drive for both stability and change is the minimization of free energy in a physical system and, in a social system, something like unhappiness or dissatisfaction –both summed, not averaged or individually measured. The mechanism of change is by transfer across the interface, each atom making its own choice, and quickly being brought back if not supported by compatible choices on the part of its neighbors<sup>71</sup>.

The precise location of change would thus always be the "interface", which in terms of chronography can only mean the point of intersection between world-time and the time of systems. Yet utmost care has to be taken that the extension or point of time chosen to unite the two for a while does not comprise loosely correlated components but only strictly compatible ones. As a consequence of this, the use of the concept of "crisis" in historiographic discourse above all would have to answer the principle of compatibility which this way could act as a necessary corrective to premature theories of interaction<sup>72</sup>. Similarly, "interart analogies" should be employed with the greatest care seeing that, paradoxically, the more specific they appear to be, the sooner they lead to global constructs like

71 Cf. C.S. Smith, *A Search for Structure: Selected Essays on Science, Art, and History* (Cambridge, Mass., 1981), pp. 358-390, esp. p. 381. For the necessary stress on "interaction", see also T. Stoianovich, *French Historical Method*, p. 222 (quoting Paul Veyne and Arthur C. Danto); as well as M. Stanford, *The Nature of Historical Knowledge*, p. 186.

72 Cf. in this context the differentiations brought to the discussion of the concept of crisis by Rudolf Vierhaus, "Geschichtswissenschaft: Situation - Funktion - Aufgabe", *Wirtschaft und Wissenschaft*, 3 (1975), 17-20. Cf. further Ricuad Wollheim, *Art and Its Objects* (Cambridge, 1980), pp. 150f.

"time-spirit", "epochal mentality", or even, most ambitiously, "architexture" of an era<sup>73</sup>, without transforming analogic juxtaposition into functional correlation.

To give an example: Milton scholarship has tried, and that not only since Murray Roston, to work out parallels between the poet's art and that of the Baroque, referring especially to specific churches in Rome to explain the cosmic vision of *Paradise Lost*<sup>74</sup>. In this context, the problem of how to define the Baroque has been raised again –one of the results being not to rely so much on either monarchic absolutism or Counter-Reformation impulses as on the new cosmology to account for the oncoming of the epoch. Though far from being alone with this thesis<sup>75</sup>, Roston surely has gone further than anybody else when he seeks, for instance, to establish a direct historical relationship between the elliptical paths of the planets as discovered by Kepler and the architecture of Borromini's S. Carlo alle quattro Fontane as well as Bernini's S. Andrea al Quirinale, likewise based on the ellipse<sup>76</sup>. If thus an event in the history of natural science were really to interact with medium-range developments in architecture and the long tradition of the epic which finally culminates in *Paradise Lost*, then change would indeed not only be indicated factually but also understood chronographically. But unfortunately Roston's thesis is not tenable. Quite apart from chronological discrepancies –Vignola's oval dome over an oblong groundplan in S. Andrea in via Flaminia (1552), for instance, antedates Kepler's discovery as published in the *Astronomia nova* (1609) by more than half a century<sup>77</sup>–, any talk of "baroque" or "mannerist infinity" respectively must on the one hand take into account Kepler's metaphysical conservatism<sup>78</sup> and on the other not be oblivious of the fact that Bernini and Borromini were not of one mind with regard to the oval form<sup>79</sup>. What's more, mannerist art theory itself, when dealing with church architecture, either still adheres to the circle of the Renaissance or, particularly with Lomazzo and Zuccari, at least continues to construe the new hybrid of the oval so rich in

73 As to the last term, cf. Mary Ann Caws, *The Eye in the Text: Essays on Perception, Mannerist to Modern* (Princeton, N.J., 1981), pp. 358-390, esp. p. 381. For the necessary stress on "interaction", see also T. Stoianovich, *French Historical Method*, p. 222 (quoting Paul Veyne and Arthur C. Danto); as well as M. Stanford, *The Nature of Historical Knowledge*, p. 186.

74 Cf. above all R. Daniells, *Milton, Mannerism and Baroque*, pp. 170-193; and M. Roston, *Milton and the Baroque*, pp. 23-25 as well as 29-34.

75 Cf. already W. Sypher, *Four Stages of Renaissance Style*, pp. 134f.; and A. Hauser, *Der Manierismus*, pp. 44-48.

76 Cf. M. Roston, *Milton and the Baroque*, pp. 22-25.

77 Cf. H. Wölfflin, *Renaissance und Barock*, p. 91.

78 Cf. Alexandre Koyré, *From the Closed World to the Infinite Universe* (Baltimore-London, 1957; repr. 1970), pp. 58-87.

79 Cf. M. Praz, *Mnemopsyne*, pp. 136f.

tensions along anthropometric lines in the sense of the preceding epoch<sup>80</sup>. Seeing that it is therefore impossible to associate oval groundplans with Keplerian ellipses, it should be mentioned in the end that Milton on his part vacillates between the old and the new astronomy in *Paradise Lost*, undecidedly speaking of both "centric" and "eccentric" with reference to the movement of the heavenly bodies<sup>81</sup>. Again this does not encourage attempts at monocausal explanations of his universe which is as eclectic as it is spacious.

So much for the refutation of a most stimulating thesis which precisely on account of its questionable nature makes clear that the chronographic compatibility it is necessary to insist upon is defined by the convergence of different segments of time. That is, only through the interaction of systematic time's linearity with world-time's cyclicity will an adequate understanding of epochal changes or transitions be guaranteed.

#### IV

In closing, it seems indicated to look at the textual model introduced above in the light of our temporalization of the argument with a view to commenting upon its heuristic value for literary history.

As we have seen, literary texts possess a rather complex temporal structure. Besides, they are vulnerable, and that on account of four basic conditions of language itself: "its historicity, its dialogic function, its referential function, and its dependence on figuration"<sup>82</sup>. Furthermore, while struggling to stand the test of time, they are liable to suffer from opinion and prejudice, two forces that may either admit them to, or exclude them from, the canon<sup>83</sup>, let alone the basic fact that what is made of them depends to a large extent upon "the skill and

80 Cf. Anthony Blunt, *Artistic Theory in Italy 1450-1660* (Oxford, 1940; repr. 1980), pp. 129f.; and F. Württemberg, *Der Manierismus*, p. 84.

81 Cf. John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, III, 575; V, 623; VIII, 83f.; X, 671. Cf. further the relevant commentary in J. Milton, *Complete Poems and Major Prose*, ed. Merritt y Hughes (New York, 1957), pp. 272, 317, 364, 422; as well as in *The Poems of John Milton*, edd. John Carey and A. Fowler (London, 1968), pp. 596, 715, 818, 961. Cf., additionally, Kester Svendsen, *Milton and Science* (Cambridge, Mass., 1956; repr. New York, 1969), pp. 61-79; Marjorie H. Nicolson, *The Breaking of the Circle*, rev. ed. (New York, 1960), pp. 172f.; 182-188; and M. Roston, *Milton and the Baroque*, pp. 29-40.

82 Cf. T.M. Greene, *The Vulnerable Text: Essays on Renaissance Literature* (New York, 1986), pp. 99-115, esp. p. 100.

83 For the issues involved here, see Anthony Savile, *The Test of Time: An Essay in Philosophical Aesthetics* (Oxford, 1982), pp. 60-85, esp. p. 60; as well as Frank Kermode, *Forms of Attention* (Chicago-London, 1985), pp. 65-93, esp. p. 74.

prepossessions of the reader"<sup>84</sup>. If, then, it goes without saying that these circumstances, in addition to their complex temporality, complicate their role as vehicles for epochal characteristics, it might still not be quite clear where exactly, in terms of the chronographic mode of argument, the methodological problem encountered here lies. Provided we are not deceived entirely, the obstacle seems to lie primarily in the fact that literary texts have preserved the stages of their becoming in the form of present strata of being. In order therefore to inquire into their epochal quality yet another transformation is called for, although it will have to differ completely from the "despatialization" of our thought as postulated in the beginning. For what is at issue now has been well put by Roland Barthes when, in writing on the discourse of history, he suggested that we "dechronologize" the linear "thread" of history and restore to time its "spatial depth":

To sum up, the presence in historical narration of explicit signs of uttering would represent an attempt to 'dechronologize' the 'thread' of history and to restore, even though it may merely be a matter of reminiscence or nostalgia, a form of time that is complex, parametric and not in the least linear: a form of time whose spatial depths recall the mythic time of the ancient cosmogonies, which was also linked in its essence to the words of the poet and the soothsayer<sup>85</sup>.

Discarding for the time being Barthes's interest in mythological depth structures, his suggestion cannot, in our present context, but amount to transforming the chronography of historical times into the stratigraphy of texts which comprise the various layers of time in simultaneous presence. For the sake of clarity it should be added, however, that this procedure is sharply to be distinguished from the old Neo-critical concept of "spatial form" as first propounded by Joseph Frank and subsequently criticized on existential, aesthetic, and historical grounds by other scholars more concerned about the temporality of texts than the basically ahistorical modernists whose works had lent support to the concept in the first place<sup>86</sup>. Contrary to this view, it is now precisely time

84 Cf. I.A. Richards, *Coleridge on Imagination*, p. 84.

85 R. Barthes, "Le discours de l'histoire", *Social Science Information*, 6 (1967), 65-75; cited to "The Discourse of History", trans. S. Bann, in *Comparative Criticism: A Yearbook*, 3 (1981), 3-20, esp. p. 10.

86 Cf. Joseph Frank, "Spatial Form in Modern Literature" (1945), in J.F. *The Widening Gyre: Crisis and Mastery in Modern Literature* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1963), pp. 3-62, esp. pp. 54-60. For a critique in the former sense, see William V. Spanos, "Modern Literary Criticism and the Spatialization of Time: An Existential Critique", *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 29 (1970), 87-104; and, for objections on the latter score, see W. Wolfgang Holdheim, "Aesthetics and History: Convergence and Paradox" (1973), in W.W.H., *The Hermeneutic Mode: Essays on Time in Literature and Literary Theory* (Ithaca-London, 1984), pp. 161-172, esp. p. 171.

that is made visible, so to speak, in any given text under scrutiny, albeit in a structurally transformed guise. And to synchronize diachrony in the manner indicated would not only mean replacing the horizontal perspective by the vertical one but further entitle us to view texts as palimpsests<sup>87</sup> to be studied microscopically, decipherable only by what has been aptly called "thick description"<sup>88</sup>.

What this method of "thick description" might be capable of bringing to light could well be a realization that literary texts, in view of their fourfold temporality as outlined above, do indeed, chronographically speaking, not only mark the points of intersection of different systems or segments of time but also stand the tension ensuing from this. Thus, depending on the mode of temporality which is important now, they are to be regarded as stable when in their respective present they comprise the past as only residually present and the future as only virtually so. They tend to become metastable as soon as they, in contrast to these relatively unproblematic modes of presence, lapse into those of latency or potentiality as their dominant temporal form. At this point they also become prone to interact with either adjacent texts within their immediate system or related evidence in compatible systems. In this respect textual change is comparable to linguistic change, insofar as the latter has been accounted for by polysemy<sup>89</sup>. For where there is cumulative meaning or, for that matter, multi-layered temporality, a shift in the direction of metastability becomes inevitable, even if, as a rule, structures or systems will immediately strive for equilibrium again. Should this be slow in coming, we are bound to speak of arrested change which is to be distinguished from completed change like "no more" from "not yet". With all this we have prepared the way –and you have been in the know all the time –for the definition of a mannerist text, seeing that such a text, in view of its temporality, is characterized above all by its dependence upon the immediately preceding past, clinging to it even to the point of missing its own present, without as yet reaching into the future. Since under a temporal perspective latency takes pride of place over potentiality in mannerist texts, they inhabit a space in between which cannot be called arrival but must remain transition instead. What has been said so far might, despite terminological scepticism in

87 Cf. in this context C. Uhlig, *Theorie der Literaturhistorie: Prinzipien und Paradigmen* (Heidelberg, 1982), pp. 87-99.

88 For the notion of "thick description", see Gilbert Ryle, *Collected Papers*, vol. II (London, 1971), pp. 465-496; as well as Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York, 1973), p. 6; and Geoffrey H. Hartman, *Criticism in the Wilderness: The Study of Literature Today* (New Haven-London, 1980), pp. 300ff.

89 Cf. Paul Ricoeur, *The Rule of Metaphor*, trans. R. Czerny (London, 1978), pp. 116f.

some quarters, be buttressed and rendered more plausible by the academic theories of mannerism itself, especially when, as in the writings of Lomazzo and Armenini, discussing the concept of *maniera* which to all intents and purposes was held to fulfil a retrospective function<sup>90</sup>. Yet true legitimation is, of course, only to be had through renewed exemplification, be it ever so fragmentary for the moment.

Suffice it therefore to glance, by way of conclusion, at Shakespeare and Milton in order to cull from their work some of the features characteristic of texts situated at points of epochal transition. Caught up in the temporal modes of latency and potentiality, such texts tend, as is evident throughout, to more or less refined variations of bygone literary conventions without, however, being the new already. Take for instance Shakespeare's *Hamlet* (ca. 1600), a play indebted both to the tradition of Elizabethan revenge tragedy and the widespread pessimism of the sixteenth century at its close, and you will notice that the dramatist did not make revenge his theme but its absence or delay instead. That way and by an additional mannerist device such as the play-within-the-play of the third act he achieved a spiritualization of the action<sup>91</sup> which on account of the extreme literary awareness it betrays constitutes a manner in the highest sense<sup>92</sup>. Yet another convention drawn upon manneristically by Shakespeare during his career would be pastoral poetry. Having summed up, in *As You Like It* (ca. 1600), the possibilities of this popular Renaissance genre, establishing above all its thematic structure as the contrast between expulsion and reconciliation, he varies it in the tragedy *King Lear* (ca. 1605) by negation, thence proceeding, in romances like *The Winter's Tale* (ca. 1610) or *The Tempest* (ca. 1611), to a final use of a form worn-out through excessive stylization by the time of his last plays<sup>93</sup>.

90 Cf. A. Blunt, *Artistic Theory in Italy 1450-1660*, pp. 154-157, and, for the reluctance to identify *maniera* with Mannerism, see John Shearman, *Mannerism* (Baltimore, 1967), as quoted by David Rosand, "Art History and Criticism: The Past as Present", *New Literary History*, 5 (1974), 435-445, esp. p. 436, n. 3.

91 Cf. here, instead of many, C. Uhlig, *Traditionelle Denkformen in Shakespeares tragischer Kunst* (Hamburg, 1967), pp. 28-36; as well as A. Fowler, *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes* (Oxford, 1982), p. 180; and on the subject of sixteenth-century pessimism, cf., besides H. Haydn, *The Counter-Renaissance*, esp. pp. 619-636 on *Hamlet*, quite generally Robert S. Kinsman (ed.), *The Darker Vision of the Renaissance* (Berkeley-Los Angeles-London, 1974).

92 Cf. R. Stamm, "Englischer Literaturbarock?", p. 404.

93 Cf. David Young, *The Heart's Forest: A Study of Shakespeare's Pastoral Plays* (New Haven-London, 1972).

While Shakespeare stays within the boundaries of the Renaissance and of Mannerism, Milton's work, in its earlier stages still harking back to the Renaissance and equally exhibiting obvious mannerist traits, later reaches into the Baroque. This fact, further complicated through Milton's active involvement in the Puritan Revolution, made it difficult for criticism, especially when relying on purely stylistic or chronological criteria, to situate the poet properly in time. Thus one of the best Milton scholars, in discussing the early masque *Comus* (1634), vacillates inconclusively between terms like "pastoral" or "operatic" and "recital" or "mannerist display"<sup>94</sup>. Now, since none of these designations is actually wrong, we are once more forcefully reminded not only to differentiate clearly between generic and epochal denotations but, especially with Milton's *chef-d'oeuvre* *Paradise Lost* (1667 and 1674) in mind, also to accept generic complexity as a feature of mannerist texts, which ostentatiously refer back to the latent possibilities of the literary past by either concentrating or amplifying imitation<sup>95</sup>. Moreover, seeing that they mostly remain, as it were anachronistically, in this retrospective attitude, they at the same time give evidence – although this applies much less to Milton's late poem *Paradise Regained* (1671) than to *Paradise Lost*, this critical dialogue with the epic tradition at large – of their being prime witnesses of transition whose precarious presence may be regarded as the chronographic product of the many ambiguous tensions between the times.

Toward the end of his learned complaint about "The Fall of Literary History", René Wellek wrote: "What is needed is a modern concept of time, modeled on an interpenetration of the causal order in experience and memory"<sup>96</sup>. Now, *pace* Nabokov, I am not certain whether I have heeded this injunction sufficiently in pondering the problem of epochal transition. Too persistently our ways of thinking about time still follow spatial concepts in the old "interart" sense, thus permitting them to enter, by way of metaphor, into scholarly discourse even if it strives to emancipate itself from chronology in order to practise chronography. What's more, those who like their epochal demarcations nice and neat might find the textual model employed here too open, applicable in fact to any transition in time. To be sure, considering the life of texts along the line of a

wider historical trajectory, the latent qualities of Shakespeare's plays, for instance, have over the centuries been brought out by ever renewed efforts of interpretation, most provocatively so perhaps in Jan Kott's actualizing readings of them in the light of modern drama<sup>97</sup>. But also Milton, although in a less conspicuous and controversial way, could be shown to have had a beneficial influence already a century after his own, for the major poets of the period realized "that one had to rethink Milton, sometimes in a new mode, in order to discover the creative possibilities latent in his work"<sup>98</sup>. Now, while this openness undoubtedly enhances the model's theoretical status, it would seem to invalidate its heuristic use in characterizing the specific epochal transition at issue here. Yet this is clearly not the case, for what we actually encounter in the period between, say, 1530 and 1600 is an unusually great number of metastable and retrospective texts in the sense defined, so that we are therefore all the same justified in speaking of Mannerism, even though, from the geographical point of view alone, England cannot be compared to Italy in this respect. More important, however, than to note once again England's relative belatedness should be the attempt to formulate, as I have been trying to do, the conditions of the chronographic mode of inquiry. In other words, to point to the methodological requirements necessary in talking of epochal transition and to temporalize an argument vitiated through unrestrained analogizing for too long perhaps might not have been a move in the wrong direction after all.

94 Cf. Louis L. Martz, *Poet of Exile: A Study of Milton's Poetry* (New Haven-London, 1980), pp. 7, 23, 28, 29, 30. As for Milton's early mannerism, see L. Borinski, "John Milton", in K.H. Göller (ed.), *Die englische Lyrik*, vol. I (Düsseldorf, 1968), pp. 194-208, esp. pp. 204f.

95 As for the generic richness of *Paradise Lost*, see Rosalie L. Colie, *The Resources of Kind: Genre-Theory in the Renaissance*, ed. B.K. Lewalski (Berkeley-Los Angeles-London, 1973), pp. 121f.

96 R. Wellek, "The Fall of Literary History" (1973), in R.W., *The Attack on Literature and Other Essays* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1982), pp. 64-77, esp. p. 75.

97 Cf. Jan Kott, *Shakespeare Our Contemporary*, trans. B. Taborski, rev. ed. (London, 1967), esp. pp. 100-133 ("King Lear, or Endgame"); as well as, for a critical tribute to the author, John Elsom (ed.), *Is Shakespeare Still Our Contemporary* (London-New York, 1989).

98 Cf. Dustin Griffin, *Regaining Paradise: Milton and the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1986), p. 42.

## PROBLEMS IN TRANSLATING *GUZMÁN DE ALFARACHE* INTO ENGLISH

Isabel Verdaguer  
Universidad de Barcelona

The earliest English translation of Mateo Alemán's picaresque novel *Guzmán de Alfarache*, which was entitled *The Rogue: or the life of Guzman de Alfarache*, was first published in 1622, twenty-three years after the publication of the first Spanish edition. *The Rogue* was translated by James Mabbe, a Magdalen scholar who had lived in Spain for several years. It went into five editions in the seventeenth century (London, 1622; London, 1623; Oxford, 1630; London, 1634; London, 1656) and it has been reprinted again in our century (London and New York, 1924 and 1967).

*The Rogue* is not the only English translation of *Guzmán de Alfarache*. Other translations were published in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, but all of them deviate substantially from the original. They derive from French adaptations, and have omitted most moralisations, which are considered "superfluous". Whereas these adaptations are interesting only in so far as they reflect the aesthetic canons and the concept of translation of the age in which they were published, the reprint of Mabbe's translation indicates that it is perfectly satisfactory to twentieth century readers. Obviously, it is not so popular now as it was in the seventeenth century because the readers' interests are different, but had it been a deficient translation, it would not have been reprinted. This paper will analyse some of the problems that *Guzmán* presents to the translator and how Mabbe solved them.

Translating *Guzmán de Alfarache* into English is indeed a difficult task. Mateo Alemán was a great master of the Spanish language. His pithy prose and extremely rich vocabulary, his use of proverbs and idioms, puns, metaphors, alliterations, and other sound-effects pose many problems to the translator. Mabbe wrote in his dedication to John Strangways: "En algunos lugares hallo mi *Guzmanico* oscuro como la noche. Pero, yo he hecho algunos *Escolios* para quitar los *Escollos*. Espero buen puerto".

*Guzmán de Alfarache* became immediately popular when it was published in 1599. The number of editions *The Rogue* went into and the fact that it is found in the catalogues of many private libraries show that Mabbe's translation

was also a success among English readers. Moreover, it was highly praised by Mabbe's contemporaries. John Florio, Ben Jonson and Leo Diggs wrote commendatory verses for it. John Florio wrote his laudatory verse "To the exact Translator of the famous History of infamous Guzman". Leo Diggs emphasized the fact that whereas Alemán's language was dark and difficult to understand, Mabbe "now makes him [Guzmán] speake English plaine" ("To Don Diego Puede-Ser, and his Translation of Guzman"). Ben Jonson also refers to Mabbe's recreation of *Guzmán* and considers it even better than the original: "hee's [the English Rogue] too well suted, in a cloth,/ Finer than was his Spanish" ("On the Author, Worke, and Translator"). Mabbe was, then, an "exact", a faithful translator, but, as we will see, he was also creative; his translation reflects his personality and his own style.

Mabbe was a contemporary of Alemán's and fully understood the spirit of the original. He respected Alemán's intention and the content, structure and stylistic devices of the novel. Alemán combined Guzman's adventures with long moralisations to instruct his readers. Mabbe was the only English translator who realized the importance of the moral passages and did not omit them, as later translators did, mutilating the content and changing the structure of the novel.

The form of a literary work is as important as its content. Alemán made frequent use of metaphors, puns, sound effects, proverbs and popular expressions. Mabbe wrote his dedication in Spanish, probably to show that he had an excellent command of the source language, and in it he used a style very similar to that of Alemán, as if he wanted to show us from the beginning that he would respect the author's stylistic devices. Indeed, he respected and retained them, but he also imprinted his own personal style in the translation, showing his fondness for amplification and figurative language. Mabbe expanded Alemán's pithy passages and clarified them.

As it is mistakes in translation rather than successful solutions that critics normally pay attention to, I would like to focus on Mabbe's effective renderings. In his dedication Mabbe wrote: "El que buelue las palabras y conceptos de vna lengua en otra à menester tener fidelidad, prudencia, y sagacidad, y yqual noticia de ambas Lenguas, y lo que en ellas se dize por alusiones, y términos metafóricos, y mirar lo, que en esta otra lengua se puede corresponder". A translator must then be faithful to the original and sensitive to language. He has to use the resources of the target language to produce on his readers the effect that the author intended. Mabbe's concept of a faithful translation was not a literal translation, but one which attempted to carry over into English the sense and the stylistic devices of the original.

The search for the adequate equivalences from one language to another often requires a great deal of imagination and ingenuity, in addition to a mastery of the two languages. I will consider now how Mabbe used the resources of English to solve some of the main problems he was faced with in translating *Guzmán de Alfarache*.

Alemán often used metaphors to define and exemplify concepts. Whereas most modern translators feel uneasy in the presence of metaphors –the term "metarophobia" has been coined to refer to this feeling– Mabbe was fond of figurative language and reproduced Alemán's metaphors accurately:

Es amor una prision de locura, nacida del ocio, criada con voluntad y dineros<sup>1</sup>.

Love is the prison of Folly, borne of Idleness, bred vp by Selfe-will and Money<sup>2</sup>.

Not only does Mabbe keep Alemán's figures of speech but he also makes up metaphors and similes which do not exist in the original. The following example illustrates the translator's exuberant style; Mabbe expands the original text considerably, by adding a series of metaphors:

Todo se me hacía tarde.

(GA, 1, II, 8, p. 324)

I thought euery houre a thousand yeere, till I might come to see her againe; Time (me thought) was too slow of wing, his Glasse did not runne fast enough, his Scythe did not sweepe away the loytring houres half so speedely, as I could have wished.

(TR, 1, II, 8, p. 160)

Mabbe does not feel uneasy either in the presence of sound-effects. Alliteration is a frequent device in Elizabethan literature, and Mabbe has no difficulties in keeping Alemán's alliterative passages:

Es fiera, fea, fantástica, furiosa, fastidiosa, floja, fácil, flaca, falsa, que sólo le falta ser Francisca.

(GA, 1, III, 2, p. 362)

It is fierce, foule, fantasticke, furious, fastidious, faint, facile, feeble, false: only she failes of being a Franciscan.

(TR 1, III, 2, p. 190)

1 Mateo Alemán, *Guzmán de Alfarache*, F. Rico, ed. *La novela picaresca española* (Barcelona, 1967) 103-922, GA 2, III, 5, p. 823.

2 Mateo Alemán, *The Rogue: or the life of Guzman de Alfarache*. Trans. James Mabbe (London, 1622), TR, 2, III, 5, p. 287.

More difficult to keep are the rhymes which normally produce a comic effect and are so characteristic of Alemán's style:

El hombre tenía poder, el juez buenas ganas de hacerle placer.  
(GA 2, II, 2, p. 606)

He was a powerfull man in that Citie, and the Iudge (it seemed) was very willing to pleasure him.

(TR, 2, II, 2, p. 106)

Mabbe, however, tries to compensate for this loss, by using the same sound effect in other passages:

La bolsa apurada y con ella la paciencia.  
(GA, 1, II, 1, p. 247)

My purse pennillesse, and my patience remedillesse.  
(TR, 1, II, 1, p. 103)

Another problem that Mabbe had to face was the rendering of Alemán's frequent puns. The translation of puns, of word-play, generally requires a great deal of ingenuity. Mabbe, an Elizabethan translator, was also very fond of puns and tried to reproduce them. Alemán often used words which had the same sound but different senses. Mabbe looked for an analogous wordplay in English, and in many cases he succeeded, since English has many monosyllabic words, and puns are easily made with them:

En la posada no hay cosa posada.  
(GA, 2, II, 8, p. 669)

Into an Inne bring nothing in.  
(TR, 2, II, 9, p. 184)

Mabbe also succeeded in retaining Alemán's paronomasia -his plays on words which have a similar sound:

Yo mandé que te hartases; mas que no hurtases.  
(GA, 1, III, 9, p. 248)

I will'd thee, that thou shouldst fill thy selfe, and not filch.  
(TR, 1, III, 9, p. 244)

Alemán's misogynous explanation of the etymology of the word "mujer", "Su nombre trae consigo: *mujer de mole*, por ser blanda" (GA, 2, III, 1, p. 739) is replaced by a similarly misogynous but ingenious comment: "And therefore their name sutes well with her nature, being for this cause, called *Woman*, because she is a *woe* to *man*" (TR, 1, III, 9, p. 244).

However, in some cases Alemán's puns have to be sacrificed, since it is impossible to reproduce them in English, especially when the two meanings are not semantically related, as in the polysemic pun, but when the identity of sound is purely arbitrary. When the translator can only capture one of the two meanings, he usually explains the Spanish wordplay in a footnote.

Mabbe's fondness for wordplay is evident throughout his translation and he sometimes adds his own puns. Mabbe even plays on his name, which is translated as "Don Diego Puede Ser".

*Guzmán de Alfarache* is full of proverbial expressions, which are not only a stylistic device but a way of expressing concise statements regarding human nature. Mabbe, who lived in an age when there was a literary interest in proverbs, realized the importance they have in a didactic work and tried to preserve and, if necessary, explain them. Whenever possible, Mabbe uses an English equivalent:

Por saltar de la sartén caí en la brasa.  
(GA, 1, I, 5, p. 169)

When I leapt out of the Frying-pan into the fire.  
(TR, 1, I, 5, p. 45)

The comments that Mabbe writes in his footnotes show his tendency to use English idioms and proverbs. "Los pies de la perdiz" (GA, 2, I, 1, p. 487), for example, is translated as "the legge of a Larke" (TR, 2, I, 1, p. 6) and a footnote explains: "The Spanish word is *pie de perdiz*, but the other fits better with our phrase or speech". When there is no English equivalent, Mabbe translates the proverb absorbing it in the text and explaining its meaning,

Y así viene quien menos culpa tiene a lavar lana.  
(GA, 2, III, 2, p. 761)

Whence, it oftentimes comes to pass, that he that is least in fault, smart's most.

(TR, 2, III, 2, p. 232)

Mabbe also translates a number of proverbs and idioms literally, always noting *Proverb* in the margin, so that the reader knows that there is a proverb in the original. The Spanish proverb "echar la soga tras el caldero" (GA, 2, III, 2, p. 700), for example, is translated literally as "to cast the cord after the cauldron" (TR, 2, II, 3, p. 123) on one occasion, whereas he gives the English equivalent on another "to throw the halve after the hatchet" (TR, 2, II, 3, p. 123).

Proverbs also show Mabbe's tendency to enlarge and clarify the text. He sometimes adds the Spanish proverb:

De muchos pocos hiciera mucho.

(GA, 1, I, 5, p. 176)

*De muchos pocos hiziera mucho*; Many a little makes a mickle.

(TR, 1, I, 5, p. 50)

resorts to Latin:

Mi amigo es Platón, pero mucho más la verdad.

(GA, 1, I, 1, p. 115)

*Amicus Plato, sed magis amicus Veritas*: Plato is my friend, but the Truth more.

(TR, 1, I, 1, p. 7)

or uses two or more similar proverbs:

Una pequeña piedra suele trastornar un carro grande.

(GA, 2, II, 8, p. 689)

A little hayre in a Pen, makes a great blot; and a little stone in the way, overturnes a great Waine.

(TR, 2, II, 9, p. 176)

Mabbe translated not only the proverbs that he found in the original, but he added some of his own, thus reflecting the literary value that proverbs had during the Elizabethan age. In short, he succeeded in conveying one of the most characteristic features of the *Guzmán*.

The consummate craft with which Alemán handled Spanish, and his masterful use of vocabulary obviously posed some problems even to a translator who had an excellent command of this language. Mabbe had difficulty in understanding some expressions, but his mistakes and deviations are not very important. Alemán alludes in one passage to the custom that some inn-keepers had of giving horse meat to poor guests. Guzmán says: "ninguno entrara en la venta a pie que dejara de salir a caballo" (GA, 1, II, 1, p. 256) the expression "a caballo" meaning that they had eaten horse meat. Mabbe misunderstood it and translated the sentence as "That no man that had come into the Inne afoot, would haue stayed to goe out a horse-back" (TR, 1, II, 1, p. 110).

How to translate dialectal features is a problem which has been the subject of endless discussions. Unfortunately, there is no ideal solution. When faced with this problem, Mabbe decided to render the dialectal expressions into Standard English, sometimes indicating the speaker's peculiar speech:

Dijo: "Hernán Sanz, dádmelo a mí, que, par diez, nunca hu ñamurado"

(GA, 2, I, 2, p. 5)

In his Clownish kinde of language, said unto him; Brother Sanz, giue mee the Pig: for by these ten bones I vow vnto you, that I was neuer yet in loue.

(TR, 2, I, 2, p. 604)

In the same way, the thieves' slang becomes standard English:

No hay neguilla.

(GA, 2, II, 2, p. 604)

He cannot possibly deny it.

(TR, 2, II, 2, p. 105)

Nobody has yet written an ideal or perfect translation; all translations can be improved. A modern translator would no doubt omit all the amplifications which are characteristic of Mabbe's style, but I wonder whether s/he would render Alemán's metaphors, sound-effects, puns and proverbs better than Mabbe and would find more effective expressions than those used by him.

#### ABBREVIATIONS

GA: *Guzmán de Alfarache*, ed. F. Rico (*La novela picaresca española*, pp. 103-922), Barcelona, 1967.

TR: *The Rogue: or the life of Guzman de Alfarache* Trans. by James Mabbe, London, 1622.



## WHO'S WHO IN SEDERI (1993)

F. Javier Sánchez Escribano  
University of Zaragoza

### Aguado Giménez, Pilar

Dpto. de Filología Inglesa, Facultad de Letras. C/ Santo Cristo, nº 1.  
30071-Murcia. Tlf. 968-363188. Profesor Ayudante, Universidad de Murcia.

A. I.: Teatro isabelino, W. Shakespeare.

### Aguilera Linde, Mauricio Damián

C/ Faisán 20, Bl. 1, 4º M. 18014-Granada. Tlf. 958-282570. Becario de Investigación, Universidad de Granada.

A.I.: Poesía Victoriana.

#### *Publicaciones:*

-"From Fire to Water: A symbolic analysis of the "elements" in the Elizabethan erotic discourse". En S.G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed.): *Preceedings of SEDERI*, II. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992. pp. 9-22.

### Aguirre, Manuel

Dpto. de Filología II, Universidad de Alcalá (UAH), C/ Colegios 2, 28801-Alcalá de Henares. Tlf. 91-8855009. Profesor Titular Universidad, Alcalá.

A.I.: Literaturas Celtas; simbolismo medieval y renacentista; literaturas marginales; postmodernismo.

*Docencia:* Cursos sobre *Shakespeare* (1981-2), *The Hamlet Theme* (1983-4) en la Universidad de Amberes; *The Sources of Hamlet* (Tercer Ciclo) en la Universidad de Alcalá, 1991. Conferencias: "Woman and Witchcraft in Renaissance England", Universidad de Alcalá, 1990; "Shakespeare and the Renaissance Poetics", Universidad de Amberes, 1991; "Myth and Renaissance: Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and Calderón's *Life Is a Dream*", Universidad de Amsterdam, 1992.

*Tesina (Director):* "Faust-like Characters in Contemporary Horror Fiction". Universidad de Amberes, 1985-6.

#### *Publicaciones:*

-*The closed space. Horror literature and Western symbolism.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990.

—"The Dream of Evil: medieval Symbolism in *Hamlet*". En S.G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, II. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992. pp. 23-28.

**Alcaraz Sintes, Alejandro**

Avda. de Madrid 19, 6º C. 230001-Jaén. Tlf. 953-273068. Sección Filología Inglesa, Campus Universitario de Jaén, U. de Granada.  
A.I.: Análisis del discurso; historia del inglés; didáctica.  
Tesis doctoral en curso, sobre Webster.

**Bardavío Gracia, José María**

Dpto. de Filología Inglesa y Alemana, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras. 50009-Zaragoza. Profesor Titular de Universidad.  
A.I.: Psicoanálisis  
*Publicaciones:*  
—"Las dos madres de Julieta Capuleto". *Miscelánea*, 1, 1980. pp. 63-74.  
—"La tensión edípica en *Richard II* de Shakespeare". *Miscelánea*, 2, 1982. pp. 15-32.  
—"La estructura síquica de Tito Andrónico (Primera Parte)". *Miscelánea*, 3, 1984. pp. 27-52.  
—"La estructura síquica de Tito Andrónico (Segunda Parte)". *Miscelánea*, 5, 1985. pp. 21-40.  
—"La estructura síquica de Romeo Montesco". *Miscelánea*, 6, 1985. pp. 57-70.

**Bozman, Timothy**

Dpto. de Filología Inglesa y Alemana, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras. 50009-Zaragoza. Profesor Contratado, Universidad de Zaragoza.

**Bravo García, Antonio**

Pto. de Palo 2, 3º C. Gijón. Tlf. 98-5153506. Profesor Titular de Universidad, Oviedo.  
A.I.: Lengua y Literatura del Inglés Antiguo y Medio; paleografía de los textos literarios.  
*Publicaciones:*  
—"La influencia del teatro de Calderón en la comedia inglesa de la Restauración". *Nueva Conciencia*, 22-23. Mieres del Camino: Instituto "Bernaldo de Quirós", 1981. pp. 139-150.  
—"A Commentary on four Courtier Poets' Autographs". En S.G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, II. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992. pp. 29-38.

**Bregazzi, Josephine**

C/ Antonia Ruiz Soro 2, Bajo iz. Esc. D. 28028-Madrid. Tlf. 91-3660892.  
Titular de Universidad, UCM, Madrid.  
A.I.: Estilística; lingüística del texto; teatro jacobeo.

**Calvo López, Clara**

Dpto. de Filología Inglesa, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Campus de Cartuja. 18071-Granada. Tlf. 958-243669.  
A.I.: Shakespeare, teatro inglés s. XVI y XVII, estilística.  
*Tesina:* "Voices Imprisoned in Comic Discourse: the Speech of Domestic Jesters in the Plays of Shakespeare". Madrid, Universidad Complutense, 1986.  
*Tesis Doctoral:* "Power Relations and Fool-Master Discourse in Shakespeare: A Discourse Stylistics Approach to Dramatic Dialogue". Universidad de Nottingham, 1990.  
*Publicaciones:*  
—"El germen de una tanática websteriana: *The White Devil*, Act. V, Sc. vi". *RCEI*, 10, 1985. pp. 157-173.  
—"A Chev'rill Glove: on the distinction between two 'corrupted' words". *RCEI*, 1987. pp. 35-52.  
—"Power Relations and Fool-master Discourse in Shakespeare: A Discourse Stylistic Approach to Dramatic Dialogue". Monographs in Systemic Linguistics, 3. University of Nottingham: Department of English Studies, 1991.  
—"Authorial Revision and Authoritative Texts: A Case for Discourse Stylistics and the Pied Bull Quarto". En S.G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, II. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992. pp. 39-56.

**Castillo Martín, Francisco Javier**

C/ Fermín Morín, 11, 5º B. 38007-Santa Cruz de Tenerife. Tlf. 922-211914.  
Licenciado en Filología Inglesa (Doctor) y en Filología Hispánica. Profesor Titular, Dpto. de Filología Moderna, La Laguna.  
A.I.: Narrativa norteamericana del XIX; literatura inglesa medieval y renacentista.  
*Docencia:* Literatura Inglesa Medieval y Renacentista.  
*Publicaciones:*  
—"The English Renaissance and the Canary Islands: Thomas Nichols and Edmund Scory". En S.G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, II. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992. pp. 57-70.

**Chamosa González, José Luis**

Dpto. de Filología Inglesa y Francesa, Facultad de Filología, Campus de Vegazana. 24007-León. Tlf. 987-291093. Profesor Titular de Universidad, León.

A.I.: Traducción y crítica de la traducción, siglo XVI.

*Tesis Doctoral*: "La primera traducción inglesa de las *Dianas* de Montemayor, Gil Polo y Alonso Pérez: estudio crítico". Universidad de León, 1985.

*Publicaciones*:

-"Sobre la traducción española de *Amoretti & Epithalamion* de Edmund Spenser". *Contextos*, III, 5, 1984.

-"Difusión de un poema español del siglo XVI: '¡Cabellos, cuánta mudanza!'" *Actas del IX Congreso de AEDEAN*. Universidad de Murcia, 1986. pp. 41-54.

-"Bartholomew Yong: la traducción inglesa de las *Dianas* (1598)". En J.C. Santoyo & I. Verdager (eds.): *De clásicos y traducciones. Versiones inglesas de clásicos españoles (ss. XVI y XVII)*. Barcelona: PPU, 1987. pp. 59-81.

-"Traducciones de clásicos españoles: una aproximación crítica a su estudio". *Estudios Humanísticos. Filología*, 9, 1987. pp. 19-30.

-"Robert Southy, traductor de poesía española". En J.C. Santoyo & al. (eds.): *Fidus Interpres*, 1. Universidad de León: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1987. pp. 340-349.

-"La versión de la Historia de *Félix y Felismena* que Shakespeare utilizó en *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*". *Actas del X Congreso de AEDEAN*. Universidad de Zaragoza, 1988. pp. 257-268.

-"Barnabe Googe: creador, adaptador, traductor". En J.C. Santoyo (ed.): *Translation across cultures*. Universidad de León: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1989. pp. 65-73.

-"Poetry translated from the Spanish: the case of England's *Helicon*". En Javier Sánchez (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, I. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1990. pp. 71-83.

-"The strange fate of the English *Arnalte y Lucenda* by Diego de San Pedro". En S.G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, II. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992. pp. 71-82.

**Conejo Fort, María Angeles**

Avda. Molière, 25, Esc. 2, 2º 3 (Edificio Nilo). 29004-Málaga. Tlf. 952-235838. Licenciada/prof. asociada. Universidad de Málaga.

A.I.: Literatura Inglesa (Novela del siglo XIX).

*Docencia*: Poesía Inglesa (siglos XV, XVI y XVII).

**Dañoibeitia Fernández, Mª Luisa**

C/ de Alfacar, nº 9-45-46. Torre A 3º C. 18011-Granada. Tlf. 958-153890. BA y MA por la Universidad de Toronto; Profesor Titular de Universidad, Granada.

A.I.: Edad Media y Renacimiento, novela del siglo XX.

*Publicaciones*:

-"Cleopatra's Role Taking: A Study of *Antony and Cleopatra*". *RCEI*, 12, 1986. pp. 55-74.

-"You have some cause: a study of *King Lear*". *Miscelánea*, 10, 1989. pp. 17-45.

-"A forgotten play and a dated hero: a study of Chapman's *The Conspiracy and Tragedy of Charles Duke of Byron*". *AAFVTL*, nº 5, 1989. pp. 273-300.

-"Role-playing and role-taking: a study of *Coriolanus*". *Atlantis*, XII, 1990. pp. 25-50.

-"Duplication and emulation in *King Lear*". En Javier Sánchez (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, I. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1990. pp. 123-138.

-"The Inevitable Death of Desdemona: Shakespeare and the Mediterranean Tradition". En S.G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, II. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992. pp. 83-94.

-"Una visión actualizada de la crítica shakespeariana en España". En J.M. González (ed.): *Shakespeare en España*. Zaragoza: Pórtico, 1993. pp. 119-135.

-"Bibliografía española de William Shakespeare". (Con F.J. Sánchez). *Idem*, pp. 469-497.

**Díaz Fernández, José Ramón**

Dpto. de Filología Inglesa y Francesa, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras. 29071-Málaga. Tlf. 952-131789 / 131682 / 131681. Profesor Asociado de Literatura Inglesa, Málaga.

A.I.: Historia del Teatro y Crítica Literaria.

*Docencia*: Historia del Teatro Inglés, Teatro Isabelino y Jacobeo.

**Expósito González, María de la Cruz**

Dpto. de Filología Moderna-Inglés, Facultad de Filología (Campus de Guajara). 38200-La Laguna, Tenerife. Tlf. 922-639505. Profesor Asociado, Universidad de La Laguna.

A.I.: Lengua Inglesa.

*Tesina*: "El uso de los relativos en la obra del Conde de Rochester".

*Tesis doctoral en curso*: "Noun Phrase Constructions in Fifteenth Century London English".

M.Ph.: "Historical English Language". U. de Glasgow. Dissertation: "Trinity College (Cambridge) 323: a dialectological study".

*Docencia:* Historia de la lengua inglesa.

**Falces Sierra, Marta**

Dpto. de Filología Inglesa, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Campus de Cartuja. 18017-Granada. Tlf. 958-243668. Profesor Ayudante LRU, Granada.

A.I.: Lingüística, Estilística y Didáctica de la Lengua Inglesa.

**Fernández Suárez, José Ramón**

Dpto. de Filología Inglesa, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras. 47002-Valladolid. Tlf. 983-423000, Ext. 4267. Profesor Titular Universidad, Valladolid.

A.I.: Cultura e instituciones británicas (políticas, jurídicas, religión, arte,...), relaciones históricas y culturales entre España y Gran Bretaña, cultura británica vista por españoles.

*Tesis doctoral:* "Influjo de Fray Luis de Granada en John Donne". Universidad de Valladolid, 1974.

*Publicaciones:*

-"Fray Luis de Granada en Inglaterra: Repercusiones en los Sermones de John Donne". *ES*, 4, 1974. pp. 111-131.

-"La primera actuación del Conde de Gondomar en Inglaterra: La *Defensio Fidei* de Suárez, 1613-1614". *ES*, 5, 1975. pp. 43-69.

-"La embajada inglesa en Madrid y la Española en Londres, 1607-1614". *ES*, 6, 1976. pp. 83-139.

-"Francis Cottington: su correspondencia inédita con el Conde de Gondomar, 1616-1619". *ES*, 7, 1977. pp. 71-116.

-"Joseph Creswell: al servicio de Dios y de su Majestad Católica, 1598-1613". *ES*, 8, 1978. pp. 47-83.

-"Relaciones diplomáticas españolas con la República inglesa de O. Cromwell, 1650-1658". *ES*, 9, 1979. pp. 33-74.

-"España ante la boda de Carlos II Estuardo y la Independencia de Portugal: la Diplomacia española, 1660-1666". *ES*, 10, 1980. pp. 3-80.

-"La persecución religiosa de Carlos II de Inglaterra a través de los embajadores españoles, 1666-1685". *ES*, 12, 1982. pp. 3-60.

-"Política y religión durante el reinado de Jacobo II a través de los Embajadores españoles, 1685-1688". *ES*, 13, 1983. pp. 3-62.

-"Por Valladolid ni al cielo quisiera ir..." *El Norte de Castilla*, 1, XI, 1988.

-"El Colegio de los Ingleses en Valladolid, tan cercano". *ES*, 14, 1990. pp. 45-61.

-"Popularidad de Fray Luis de Granada en Inglaterra: valoración de su persona y de sus escritos". *Actas del Congreso sobre Fray Luis de Granada* (en prensa), 1991.

**Florén Serrano, Celia**

Cesáreo Alierta 6. 50008-Zaragoza. Tlf. 976-239820. Catedrática de Escuela Universitaria, E.U. del Profesorado de EGB de Zaragoza.

*Publicaciones:*

-"Some aspects of rhyme and suffixation in *The Rape of Lucrece*". En Javier Sánchez (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, I. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1990. pp. 83-94.

-*A Concordance of Paradise Lost*. Hildesheim: OLMS, 1991.

**Garcés García, Pilar**

Pl. San Juan, 14, 7º C. 47002-Valladolid. Tlf. 983-397546. Ayudante, Dpto. de Filología Inglesa, Valladolid.

A. I.: Lingüística Aplicada, Lingüística y Crítica Literaria.

**García García, Luciano**

C/ Martínez Molina 7, 2º D. 23004-Jaén. Tlf. 953-274619. Profesor Asociado, Facultad de Humanidades, Jaén.

A.I.: Literatura Isabelina y Jacobea.

**García González, Francisco**

Rector Leopoldo Alas Hijo 11, 6º A. 33006-Oviedo. Tlf. 98-5273900. Profesor Escuela Oficial de Idiomas, Oviedo.

A.I.: Relaciones España-Irlanda-Inglaterra a finales del siglo XVI.

*Publicaciones:*

-"Mateo de Oviedo, perhaps Ireland's greatest Spanish friend of all time". En S.G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, II. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992. pp. 113-122.

**García Herrera, Antonio**

C/ Eva Cervantes 35, 2A. 41006-Sevilla. Tlf. 94-4920589. Licenciado en Filología Inglesa, Profesor de bachillerato.

A.I.: Medieval; renacimiento; humanismo. Traducción al español de los poemas latinos de Milton.

**Gleeson de Biel, Mary**

C/ Cuesta del Caidero 15. 18009-Granada. Tlf. 958-229420.

A.I.: medieval y renacimiento.

*Publicaciones:*

-"Celtic Undertones in *Macbeth*". En S.G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed.):

*Proceedings of SEDERI*, II. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992. pp. 123-134.

**Gómez Soliño, José**

Dpto. de Filología Moderna-Inglés, Facultad de Filología (Campus de Guajara). 38071- La Laguna. Tenerife. Tlf. 922-609503. Profesor Titular Universidad, La Laguna.

*Tesis Doctoral*: "Variación y estandarización en el inglés moderno temprano: 1470-1540", Universidad de Oviedo, 1981.

*Publicaciones*:

- "Hobbes, Hombre de Letras". *Liminar*, 4-5, 1979. pp. 26-31.
- "Formas verbales de singular en ETH y (E)S en las novelas de Deloney". *RCEI*, 2, 1981. pp. 1-25.
- "Thomas Wolsey, Thomas More y la lengua estándar de su época". *RCEI*, 3, 1981. pp. 74-84.
- "Thomas Wyatt y el inglés estándar de su tiempo". *Homenaje a Esteban Pujals Fontrodona*, Publicaciones de la Universidad de Oviedo, 1981. pp. 200-216.
- "Inglaterra y los ingleses vistos por un español del siglo XVI". *RCEI*, 4, 1982. pp. 139-149.
- *Variación y estandarización en el inglés moderno temprano*. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1984.
- "Tradición e innovación en los estudios sobre el origen del inglés estándar moderno". *Actas del VIII Congreso de AEDEAN*. Universidad de Málaga, 1984. pp. 75-80.
- "La génesis del inglés estándar moderno: historia y estado actual de la cuestión". *RCEI*, 11, 1985. pp. 81-106.
- "La normalización lingüística en la época de Enrique VIII". En S. Onega (ed.): *Estudios Literarios Ingleses. Renacimiento y Barroco*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1986. pp. 19-44.
- "Copistas y cajistas en la etapa postmedieval inglesa". *Actas del IX Congreso de AEDEAN*. Universidad de Murcia, 1986. pp. 21-28.

**González Fernández de Sevilla, José Manuel**

Av. de Alcoy 115, Esc. 2ª 1º A. 03009-Alicante. Tlf. 96-5252398. Profesor Titular de Universidad, Alicante.

A.I.: Literatura inglesa medieval y renacentista. Siglo XX.

*Docencia*: literatura renacentista. Cursos de Doctorado: Bipolaridad verbal fundamental en la obra de W. Shakespeare; Metadramática shakespeariana; Hacia una reinterpretación de la historia en el teatro renacentista inglés; Estrategias políticas y reivindicaciones feministas en el teatro de

W. Shakespeare.

*Cursos de Doctorado*: Bipolaridad verbal fundamental en la obra de William Shakespeare; Metadramática shakespeariana; Hacia una reinterpretación de la historia en el teatro renacentista inglés. Publicaciones: -"El tema de la venganza en *Titus Andronicus* o el sinsentido trágico del existir". *RCEI*, 12, 1986. pp. 123-137.

-*Hacia una teoría lingüística y literaria en la obra de William Shakespeare*. Madrid: Editorial de la Universidad Complutense, 1987.

- "Ambientación alicantina para una tragedia jacobea: *The Changeling*". *Canelobre*, 9, 1987. pp. 124-128.

- "Teoría y práctica de la traducción en la Inglaterra isabelina". *RAEI*, 1, 1988. pp. 99-108.

- "El Mediterráneo en la literatura anglonorteamericana". *Canelobre*, 13, 1988. pp. 200-207.

- "*Don Quijote de la Mancha* en Inglaterra". *CEM*, 16, 1988. pp. 43-56.

- "Two Critical Aspects of *An Apology for Poetry*". *Atlantis*, XI, 1 y 2, 1989. pp. 39-54.

- "Lo español en *The Spanish Tragedy*". *RAEI*, 2, 1989. pp. 91-100.

- "Political Strategies of Drama in Renaissance England". En Javier Sánchez (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, I. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1990. pp. 95-104.

- "Tragedia, confusión y fracaso en *The Jew of Malta*". *Miscelánea*, 11, 1990. pp. 69-82.

- "Lo popular en el teatro de William Shakespeare". En S.G. Fernández-Corugedo et al. eds.): *Studia Patriciae Shaw Oblata*, I. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1991. pp. 307-315.

- "La poesía metafísica de John Donne y Fco. de Quevedo". *Neophilologus*, 75, 1991. pp. 161-170.

- "Existential Needs and Political Deeds in *Coriolanus*". En S.G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, II. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992. pp. 135-146.

- (Ed.) *Shakespeare en España. Crítica, traducciones y representaciones*. Zaragoza: Pórtico, 1993.

- "Vicisitudes y desventuras del Shakespeare español". *Idem*, pp. 17-38.

**González y Fernández-Corugedo, Santiago**

Dpto. de Filología Anglogermánica y Francesa, Facultad de Filología, Campus de Humanidades. 33071-Oviedo. Tlf.: (34) (8) 5104535. Profesor Titular de Universidad, Oviedo.

A.I.: Poesía y Retórica siglos XVI y XVII.

*Docencia:* Doctorado sobre "Literatura de pastores en la edad de oro inglesa y española".

*Publicaciones:*

—Amoretti & Epithalamion de Edmund Spenser. Edición bilingüe, introducción, traducción y notas. Madrid: Cátedra, 1983.

—"Edmund Spenser: la reina de las hadas y su poeta?" En S. Onega (ed.): *Estudios Literarios Ingleses: Renacimiento y Barroco*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1986. pp. 319-342.

—"Introducción a John Donne: Canciones y Sonetos". En *Scripta in Memoriam J.B. Alvarez-Buylla*. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1987. pp. 7-35. [En colaboración con J.L. Caramés Lage].

—"Ediciones de la poesía profana de Jorge de Montemayor". *Archivum* n° XXXVI, Oviedo, 1989 (1986). pp. 413-420.

—"Platonism and Love in Spenser's minor poetry". En Javier Sánchez (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, I. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1990. pp. 57-70.

—"Co-texts in *The Shepherd's Calendar*". En S.G. Fernández-Corugedo et al. (eds.): *Studia Patriciae Shaw Oblata*, III. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1991. pp. 172-192.

**Gregor, Graham Keith**

C/ Simón García, 30, 4º B. 30003-Murcia. Tlf. 968-220325. Profesor Asociado, Universidad de Murcia. Director de Grupo de Teatro.

A.I.: Crítica literaria, Literatura Renacentista.

*Tesis Doctoral:* "The Politics of Courtship: Structures of Social and Sexual Power in *Astrophil & Stella*".

*Publicaciones:*

—"The Death-Wound: Notes on a line by Sir Philip Sidney". *Actas del X Congreso de AEDEAN*. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1988. pp. 347-353.

**Guardia Massó, Pedro**

Pº San Gervasio, 10, 1º 3E. 08022-Barcelona. Tlf.: 93-2127963. Catedrático, Universidad de Barcelona, Central.

A.I.: Estudios medievales y renacentistas. Traducción.

*Tesis de Licenciatura:* "Estudio de *The Spanish Bawd* de James Mabbe, con una referencia a *La Celestina* en Inglaterra". Universidad de Barcelona, Central. 1962.

*Publicaciones:*

—James Mabbe, hispanista oxoniense del siglo XVII. *Personalidad literaria. Estudio de varios manuscritos inéditos y del The Spanish Bawd*. Universidad de Barcelona: Secretariado de Publicaciones, 1971.

—"James Mabbe en Oxford (I)". *ES*, 7, 1977. pp. 251-272.

—"The Rogue: Originalidad de las anotaciones marginales". *ADIUAB*, 3, 1980. pp. 5-14.

—"La primera traducción inglesa de *La Celestina*". *EFI*, 12, 1984. pp. 191-202.

—"The Spanish Bawd, Londres, 1631". En J.C. Santoyo & I. Verdager (eds.): *De clásicos y traducciones. Versiones inglesas de clásicos españoles (ss. XVI y XVII)*. Barcelona: PPU, 1987. pp. 129-146.

—"El Ms. 'Medicina Hispanica', traducción inédita del siglo XVII". En J.C. Santoyo et al. (eds.): *Fidus Interpres*, I. Universidad de León: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1987. pp. 75-82.

**Guerra Bosch, Teresa**

Bravo Murillo, 26. Las Palmas. Tlf.: 928-361540. Profesora Titular U., Departamento de Filología Moderna, Universidad de Las Palmas.

A.I.: Shakespeare; literatura comparada.

*Docencia:* Literatura Inglesa Medieval y Renacentista.

1ª Tesis Doctoral (1974): "Pío Baroja en sus *Memorias*". 2ª Tesis Doctoral (1989) "Humour in Literature: Three Levels".

*Publicaciones:*

—"The Nature of Shakespearean Tragedy". En S.G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, II. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992. pp. 147-156.

**Henríquez, Santiago**

Plza. Fuente Luminosa, 2, 12-A. "Edificio Granca". Las Palmas. 35004-Las Palmas de Gran Canaria. Profesor Universidad de Las Palmas de G.C.

A.I.: Literatura medieval y Renacentista.

**Hornero Corisco, Ana María**

Doctor Cerrada, 29, 7º D. 50005-Zaragoza. Tlf. 976-551647. Profesor Asociado U. Zaragoza.

A.I.: Lingüística Diacrónica (especialmente Inglés Medio).

**Hurtley, Jacqueline**

C/ Rafael Llopart, 74. 08870-Sitges (Barcelona). Tlf. 93-8948622. Catedrática de Universidad, Universidad Central de Barcelona.

A.I.: La prosa a partir del s. XVII; la traducción como fenómeno sociopolítico y cultural (anglo-española).

*Publicaciones:*

—"Thomas More and Jonathan Swift: the utopia as satire". En *Anuario de Filología*, 11. Universidad de Barcelona, 1985. pp. 393-399.

- "Erasmus, Moro y la 'Locura'". En *IV Seminari d'Aplicacions Didàctiques*. Departament de Història Moderna, Facultat de Filo. y LLetres, Tarragona. Universitat de Barcelona, 1986. pp. 83-97.
- "Mary y Elizabeth: de la desesperación a la esperanza." En *Actas de las Jornadas de Historia: Antoni Agustín (1517-1586) i el seu temps*". Tarragona, 1986.

**Krauel Heredia, Blanca**

Dpto. de Filología Inglesa, Facultad de Letras, Campus de Teatinos, Universidad de Málaga. 29071-Málaga. Tlf. 952-131791. Doctora.  
A.I.: literatura de viajes por España.  
*Publicaciones:*  
–"Events surrounding Thomas Malliard's Wiil, an English Merchant in Seville (1522-1523)". En S.G. Fernández-Corugedo: *Proceedings of SEDERI*, II. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992. pp. 157-166.

**López-Peláez Casellas, Jesús**

Av. de Madrid 68, P 2, 5º A. 23009-Jaén. Tlf. 953-229061. Licenciado en Filología Inglesa.  
*Publicaciones:*  
–"The Inevitable Death of Desdemona: the conflict between Will and Reason". En S.G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, II. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992. pp. 167-180.

**López-Peláez Casellas, María Paz**

Av. de Madrid 68, P 2, 5º A. 23009-Jaén. Tlf. 953-229061. Profesora Titular de Solfeo y Teoría de la Música, Conservatorio de Jaén.  
A.I.: Historia de la Música.

**López Román, Blanca**

C/ Melchor Almagro 16, 5º C, Esc. B. 18002-Granada. Tlf. 958-280530. Profesor Titular, Universidad de Granada.  
A.I.: Shakespeare y teatro inglés contemporáneo.  
*Docencia:* Shakespeare, Teatro Inglés.  
*Publicaciones:*  
–"El feminismo en Rosalind en el bosque de Arden". *EFI*, Vol. 6-7, 1979. pp. 105-119.  
–"Algunas consideraciones sobre las adaptaciones del drama de Shakespeare", *Atlantis*, Vol IX, nos. 1 y 2, 1987. pp. 63-72.  
–"Transformaciones neoclásicas del *Macbeth* shakespeariano". *RCEI*, 17, 1988. pp. 281-294.

- "Procesos de transformación de Shakespeare en la traducción de *Hamlet* de Moratín". *BELLS*, 1, 1989. pp. 117-123.
- "Transformaciones galoclásicas en el texto de la traducción de *Hamlet* de Moratín". *Actas del XI Congreso de AEDEAN*. Universidad de León: Secretariado de Publicaciones, 1989. pp. 119-126.
- "Transformaciones del *Macbeth* shakespeariano durante el siglo XIX". *Atlantis* (en prensa).
- "Transformaciones de las brujas de *Macbeth* desde Holinshed al collage neoyorkino de Marowitz". *Actas del XIII Congreso de AEDEAN*. Universidad de Tarragona, 1991. pp. 219-229.
- "Sir William D'Avenant's so-called improvements of *Macbeth* (1674)". En Javier Sánchez (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, II. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1990. pp. 211-222.
- "Biografías españolas de Shakespeare". En J.M. González (ed.): *Shakespeare en España*. Zaragoza: Pórtico, 1993. pp.137-160.

**Mairal Usón, Ricardo**

C/ Arenalón 5, Ático M. Las Rozas. 28030-Madrid. Tlf. 91-6360481. Profesor Asociado, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.  
A. I.: la lingüística.  
*Publicaciones:*  
–"The semantic field of 'Light' and 'Darkness' in *Paradise Lost*". En Javier Sánchez (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, I. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1990. pp. 191-210.

**Martínez López, Miguel**

C/ Obispo Hurtado 3, 2º D. 18002-Granada. Tlf. 958-520900. Doctor, Profesor Titular Universidad, Granada.  
A.I.: El *Dr. Faustus* de Ch. Marlowe y la literatura utópica inglesa.  
*Docencia:* Literatura Inglesa (hasta el s. XVIII); doctorado sobre "El tema del mal y la presencia diabólica en el *Dr. Fausto* de Ch. Marlowe" y seminario sobre "Utopías del Renacimiento"; "Técnicas de investigación: métodos y fuentes para el estudio de las literaturas en lengua inglesa".  
*Tesis Doctoral:* "Forms of Faustus' solitude: humanist themes and conventions of the Italian Renaissance in Ch. Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus*", dirigida por Vita Fortunati y Ezio Raimondi. Universidad de Bolonia, 1988.  
*Publicaciones:*  
–"Marlowe's Faustus at the crossroads: mediæval elements and diabolical games". Capítulo en *Literature, Culture and Society of the Middle Ages*, ed. with an introduction by Miguel Martínez. Barcelona: PPU, 1989. pp. 2639-2718.

–"Some Medieval Sources of Ch Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus*. A reappraisal". En *Actas del II Congreso Internacional de SELIM*. Universidad de Córdoba, 1989 (1993). pp. 126-132.

–"Principales resultados de un análisis semiótico del Texto-A (1604) de *The Tragical History of the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus*". En *Actas del III Simposio Internacional de la Asociación Andaluza de Semiótica*. Granada: Microfilms de la Universidad, 1990. 17 p.

–"The Philosophy of Death in Ch. Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus*". En Javier Sánchez (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, I. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1990. pp. 105-122.

–"The discovery of solitude and Ch. Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus*". En *Il Confronto Letterario*, VIII, 16. Padova, 1991. pp. 349-361.

–"The 'Domus Yspanica' and the English spirit of the medieval College: the Oxford and Cambridge models". En *Proceedings of the International Symposium "Bologna, Italian Culture and Modern Literature"*. University of Bologna. Ravenna: Longo Editore, 1992. pp. 109-122.

#### Martínez Lorente, Joaquín

Dpto. de Filología Inglesa, Facultad de Letras. C/ Sto. Cristo s/n. 30071-Murcia. Profesor Ayudante.

A.I.: Narrativa inglesa en general, literatura utópica.

*Tesina*: "Elementos utópicos en *Gulliver's Travels*". Universidad de Murcia.

*Tesis Doctoral*: "Literatura utópica inglesa y teoría de los géneros literarios. Estudio de *Utopía*, *New Atlantis* y *Gulliver's Travels* desde un punto de vista genérico". Universidad de Murcia.

#### Mele Marrero, Margarita

Dpto. de Filología Moderna-Inglés, Facultad de Filología (Campus de Guajara). 38071-La Laguna. Tenerife. Tlf. 922-609516. Profesor Asociado, Universidad de La Laguna.

#### Monnickendam, Andrew

Passatge Romaní 1, 17003-Girona. Tlf. 972-217386. Profesor Titular Universidad. Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona.

A.I.: Milton, Scottish literature, literary theory.

*Docencia*: The Metaphysical Poets and the Poetry of John Milton; Poetry, Politics and Puritans; Shakespeare.

*Publicaciones*:

–"Paradise Lost as a novel". En Javier Sánchez (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, I. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1990. pp. 179-190.

–"Fallen Fruit, Fallen Man and a Fallen State: Images in Marvell's Pastoral Poetry". En S.G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, II. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1991. pp. 180-192.

–"All About Eve". En Manuel Barbeito (ed.): *Paradise Lost: the World, the World, the Words*. Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, Cursos e Congresos, 1991. pp. 85-101.

#### Morillas Sánchez, Rosa María

Avda. Divina Pastora 9, Bl. 10, 2º F. 18002-Granada. Tlf. 958-209352. Ayudante LRU, Universidad de Granada.

A.I.: Poesía Americana, Estilística.

#### Muñoz Valdivieso, Sofía

C/ Almansa 14, Esc. A, 2º D. 29007-Málaga. Tlf. 95-2610873. Profesor Asociado, Universidad de Málaga.

A.I.: Crítica Literaria, Poesía Inglesa.

M.A. Thesis: "The Spanish Legend in Lord Byron's *Don Juan*". Temple University, Philadelphia PA, USA.

#### Murillo Murillo, Ana María

Avda. Clavé 47, 2º B. Zaragoza. Tlf. 976-282385.

*Publicaciones*:

–"The Spanish Jilt: the first English version of *La Pícaro Justina*". En Javier Sánchez (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, I. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1990. pp. 157-178.

–"Love and Chastity in Two Early English Versions of *La Celestina*". En S.G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, II. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992. pp. 193-206.

#### Olivares Merino, Eugenio Manuel

C/ Jesús y María 8, 1º C. Granada. Becario Investigación, Granada.

A.I.: Literatura medieval y Shakespeare.

#### Olivares Rivera, Carmen

Dpto. de Filología Inglesa y Alemana, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Universidad de Zaragoza. 50009-Zaragoza. Catedrático Universidad.

A.I.: Análisis contrastivo, Pragmática.

*Publicaciones*:

–"Romeo y Julieta como conversación". *CIF*, VII, 1981. p. 23-27.

#### Olivera Villacampa, Macario

Dpto. de Filología Inglesa y Alemana. Colegio Universitario. Pza. de la Universidad, 3. 22002-Huesca. Tlf. 974-221050, Ext. 214.



A.I.: Lengua y Lingüística inglesas, Estudios Renacentistas Ingleses.

*Tesina*: "Estudio comparado de actualización del lenguaje bíblico, inglés y español y sus denotaciones semánticas". Universidad de Zaragoza, 1979.

*Tesis doctoral*: "Dimensiones de la actualización del lenguaje y lingüística comparada en las biblias inglesa y española". Universidad de Zaragoza, 1981.

*Publicaciones*:

—"Las causas de divorcio en *Utopia*". *Miscelánea*, 6, 1985. pp. 45-56.

—"Uso actual de las formas en *thou*". *Didáctica de la Lengua y la Literatura*, II. Colegio Universitario de Huesca, 1985. pp. 25-34.

—"The birth of the Bible in English". En Javier Sánchez (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, I. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1990. pp. 37-44.

—"The allegory of the sower". En S.G. Fernández-Corugedo *et al.* (eds.): *Studia Patriciae Shaw Oblata*, III. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1991. pp. 333-340.

—"Providence and science in Bacon's *New Philosophy*". *Actas del XV Congreso AEDEAN*. Logroño, 1992. (en prensa)

—"Your Majesty, the Head of the Church of England". En S.G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, II. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992. pp. 207-216.

#### Otal Campo, José Luis

Dpto. de Filología Inglesa y Alemana. Facultad de Filosofía y Letras. 50009-Zaragoza.

#### Pacheco Lucas, Margarita

Primo de Rivera 1, 9º A. Cáceres. Tlf. 927-213327. Licenciada/Profesora Titular E.U. E.U del Profesorado de EGB, Cáceres.

A.I.: Literatura Inglesa y Norteamericana. Didáctica del Inglés.

*Publicaciones*:

—"Some Educational Aspects in England in the XVIth Century". En S.G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, II. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992. pp. 217-230.

#### Pajares Infante, Eterio

C/ Errekatziki, 17, 7º Dcha. 01003-Vitoria. Tlf. 945-278050. Doctor/profesor asociado. Facultad de Geografía e Historia y Filología. Universidad del País Vasco, Vitoria.

A.I.: Literatura comparada, traducción e inglés cinetífico-técnico.

*Docencia*: Literatura Inglesa (siglos XVII al XIX).

*Tesis doctoral*: Richardson en España.

#### Pando Canteli, María Jesús

Dpto. de Filología Inglesa. Facultad de Filosofía y Letras. Universidad de Deusto. 48080-Bilbao. Tlf. 94-4453100, Ext. 378. Becario de Investigación.

A.I.: Siglo XVII, Literatura Comparada.

#### Pérez Valverde, Mª Cristina

C/ Cruz 2, 4º F. 18002-Granada. Tlf. 958-261715. Estudiante Doctorado, Universidad de Granada.

#### Rodríguez Fernández, Carlos

C/ Atabalero, Blq. 1, 2º B. 29010-Málaga. Tlf. 952-392597. Licenciado.

A.I.: Literatura Isabelina y Jacobea.

Tesina sobre los Contemporáneos de Shakespeare (en preparación).

#### Rodríguez Palomero, Luisa Fernanda

Isabel la Católica 1, 1º izda. 47001-Valladolid. Tlf. 983-354473. Profesor Titular Universidad, León.

A.I.: El artista, teoría literaria.

#### Rusell, Elizabeth

Apartado 145, 08860-Castelldefels (Barcelona). Tlf. 93-6654842. Profesora Titular de Universidad, Facultad de Letras, Taragona.

A.I.: Teoría literaria feminista, estudios interdisciplinarios sobre la mujer.

#### Sáez González, Rosa

C/ Cuba, 1, 2º C. 06800-Mérida (Badajoz). Tlf. 924-373266. Licenciada en Filología Inglesa y MA in Foreign Languages and Literatures. Profesora de Escuela de Idiomas. Mérida

*Tesis*: "Bonds of Interest in The Merchant of Venice". University of Delaware. Newark: Delaware, 1989.

#### Sánchez Escribano, F. Javier

C/ Panamá 8, 1º 1ª. 50012-Zaragoza. Tlf. 976-332987. Profesor Titular de Universidad, Zaragoza.

A.I.: literatura inglesa medieval y renacentista; relaciones hispano-inglesas en el siglo XVII; teoría literaria: historicismo, estética de la recepción.

*Docencia*: Teatro Isabelino, Literatura Inglesa Medieval y Renacentista.

*Cursos de Doctorado*: Influencia literaria española en la Inglaterra de los siglos XVI y XVII; Literatura española en la Inglaterra de los siglos XVI y XVII: traducciones y traductores; Historia y Literatura: Teatro histórico renacentista inglés; Literatura pastoril en el renacimiento inglés.

*Tesina*: "Estudio de las fuentes de *The Tempest*". Universidad de Zaragoza, 1973.

*Tesis Doctoral*: "James Howell: un hispanista inglés del siglo XVII". Universidad de Zaragoza, 1979.

*Publicaciones*:

-"James Howell: un galés del siglo XVII, viajero por el País Vasco". *BSS*, XXIII, 1979. pp. 139-155.

-"James Howell: un hispanista inglés del siglo XVII. Universidad de Zaragoza: Secretariado de publicaciones, 1980. (Resumen Tesis Doctoral).

-"Tamburlaine y su teoría del poder". *Miscelánea*, 1, 1980. pp. 55-62.

-"La pronunciación del inglés según las gramáticas de James Howell. Sus fuentes". *Miscelánea*, 2, 1982. pp. 55-72.

-"The Tempest y dos novelas francesas: análisis temático". *Miscelánea*, 3, 1983. pp. 27-51.

-"Los diccionarios políglotos de James Howell: fuentes y aportaciones personales". *Atlantis*, 5, 1983. pp. 5-22.

-"Los dioses en Dido, Queen of Carthage". *Miscelánea*, 5, 1984. pp. 9-20.

-"Paremiología comparada: la primera colección de refranes españoles publicada en Inglaterra". *Actas del IV Congreso de AEDEAN*. Salamanca, 1984. pp. 183-196.

-"La unidad de tiempo en Romeo and Juliet". *Miscelánea*, 6, 1985. pp. 71-80.

-"Traducción de refranes españoles al inglés en el siglo XVII". *Actas de las Jornadas de Traducción*. Ciudad Real: Facultad de Letras, 1986. pp. 233-247.

-"La traducción de Le Cid de Corneille al inglés: un problema de fechas (Las traducciones de Joseph Rutter". *Actas de las I Jornadas Nacionales de Historia de la Traducción*. Universidad de León: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1987. pp. 277-282.

-"La versión inglesa de Hipólito y Aminta, de Francisco de Quintana: estudio bibliográfico". *Fidus Interpres: Actas del XI Congreso de AEDEAN*. Universidad de León: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1987. pp. 173-181.

-"La versión inglesa de Experiencias de Amor y de Fortuna, de Francisco de Quintana: aportaciones bibliográficas". En J.C. Santoyo e I. Verdaguer (Eds.): *De clásicos y traducciones. Clásicos españoles en versiones inglesas: los siglos XVI y XVII*. Estudios de Literatura Española y Comparada. Barcelona: PPU, 1987. pp. 189-204.

-"English translations from the Spanish through French in the 17th century". En Javier Sánchez (Ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, I. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1990. pp. 139-156.

-"The Spanish Match through the Texts: Jonson, Middleton and Howell". En S.G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, II.

Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992. pp. 230-246.

-"Bibliografía española sobre Shakespeare". (Con M<sup>a</sup> L. Dañobeitia) En J. M. González (ed.): *Shakespeare en España: crítica, traducciones y representaciones*. Zaragoza: Pórtico, 1993. pp.469-496.

**Sastre Colino, Concha**

C/ Velardes, 10, 2º B. 47002-Valladolid. Doctor. Profesor Asociado E.U. Profesorado EGB. Valladolid.

**Shaw Fairman, Patricia**

Yela Utrilla 2, B, 13º A. 33007-Oviedo. Tlf.98-5237637. Catedrático de Universidad, Oviedo.

A.I.: Lengua y Literatura Medieval Inglesa; Literatura y Lengua de los siglos XVI y XVII, Literatura Inglesa en general.

*Publicaciones*:

-"El Madrid y los madrileños del siglo XVII según los visitantes ingleses". *Anales del Instituto de Estudios Madrileños*, I. Madrid: CSIC, 1966. pp. 137-145.

-"Samuel Pepys y España." *Filología Moderna*, VI, 21-22, 1966. pp. 3-28.

-"Un turista inglés en España a principios del siglo XVII". *Homenaje al Profesor Alarcos*, II. Universidad de Valladolid, 1966. pp. 809-827.

-"Macbeth and the Critics". *Filología Moderna*, XIV, 50-51, 1974. pp. 203-231.

-"James Howell: un galés del siglo XVII curioso de las gentes y de las cosas de España". *Archivum*, XXVI. Universidad de Oviedo, 1976. pp. 403-419.

-"Noticias y conocimientos acerca de la lengua española en la Inglaterra del siglo XVII". *Estudios ofrecidos a Emilio Alarcos Llorach*. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1979. pp. 325-347.

-"Testimonios ingleses contemporáneos sobre la figura de Gondomar". *ES*, 9, 1979. pp. 109-132.

-"A Sixteenth Century Pamela: Gabriel Harvey's A Noble Mans Sute to a Cuntrie Maide." *Homenaje a Esteban Pujals*. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1981. pp. 367-383.

-"España vista por los ingleses del siglo XVII. Madrid: SGEL, 1981.

-"Calderón y la Corte de Calos II de Inglaterra". *Nueva Conciencia*. Mieres del Camino: Instituto "Bernaldo de Quirós", 1984. pp. 119-127.

-"Características de la narrativa isabelina en prosa". En S. Onega (ed.): *Estudios Literarios Ingleses. Renacimiento y Barroco*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1986. pp. 129-170.

- "Los aciertos dramáticos de Thomas Middleton". En R. Portillo (ed.): *Estudios Literarios Ingleses. Shakespeare y el teatro de su época*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1987. pp. 255-279.
- "The Miseries of Mavillia: a Miniature Novel of the Late Sixteenth Century". En *Scripta in Memoriam J.B. Alvarez-Buylla*, Universidad de Oviedo, 1987. pp. 267-277.
- "Ale-Wives, Old Wives, Widows and Witches: The Older Woman in English Renaissance Literature". En Javier Sánchez (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, I. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1990. pp. 9-36.
- "Philip II and Seduction a la española in an Elizabethan Roman à Clef". En S.G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, II. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992. pp. 289-302.
- "Valores literarios del madrigal inglés". *Programa de Conciertos en la Universidad: Música Coral Inglesa*. Universidad de Oviedo, 1992. pp. 9-12.
- "Estudio y docencia de Shakespeare en la Universidad Española". En J.M. González (ed.): *Shakespeare en España*, Zaragoza: Pórtico, 1993. pp. 95-118.

#### Shepherd, Robert Keir

Pasaje Conde de Belchite 3, 3º D. 28027-Madrid. Tlf. 91-7423343. B.A. Griego e Inglés (Canterbury, University of Kent), PhD en Literatura Anglo-irlandesa (Trinity College, Dublin), Profesor Asociado, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.  
 A.I.: Literatura comparada y modernismo, especialmente T.S. Eliot y Ezra Pound.  
*Docencia*: Curso de Doctorado "Influencia de teatro isabelino y jacobeo (Kyd Webster, Ford) en *The Waste Land*".  
*Publicaciones*:  
 - "Shakespeare's Henry V: person and persona". En S.G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, II. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992. pp. 303-312.

#### Sierra Ayala, Lina

C/ Corazón de María 41, 8º A, Es. dcha. 28002-Madrid. Tlf. 91-4132260. Profesora Titular E.U. Politécnica Universidad de Alcalá. Doctora.  
 A.I.: Francis Bacon.

#### Smale, Mervyn

Dpto. de Inglés. Facultad de Filosofía y Letras. Campus de Cartuja. 18017-Granada.

#### Suárez Lafuente, María Socorro

Cº de los Arces, Les Caserías, Somió. 33203-Gijón. Tlf. 98-5366984. Profesor Titular Universidad, Oviedo.  
 A.I.: literatura e historia inglesas.  
*Docencia*: Doctorados sobre la tradición faústica y Sir Walter Raleigh. Conferencias sobre King Lear, Marlowe, obras históricas de Shakespeare.  
*Publicaciones*:  
 - "Tradición e Historia en *Doctor Faustus* de C. Marlowe". *Archivum*, 1981-2. pp. 695-706.  
 - "Los héroes trágicos de Marlowe". En R. Portillo (ed.): *Estudios Literarios Ingleses: Shakespeare y el teatro de su época*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1987.  
 - "Dialectical Tension in Sir Walter Raleigh's life and work". (Con J.E. Tazón) En Javier Sánchez (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, I. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1990. pp. 45-56.  
 - "Blood, Love and Tears: Renaissance Entertainment". En S.G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, II. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992. pp. 313-320.

#### Tazón Salces, Juan Emilio

C/ Las Acacias, 33. Urb. "Soto de Llanera". 33192-Pruvia-LLanera. Asturias. Tlf. 98-5265771. Profesor Titular de Universidad, Oviedo.  
 A.I.: Literatura e Historia inglesas.  
*Tesis Doctoral*: "Presencia española en Irlanda en el siglo XVI". Universidad de Oviedo, 1985.  
*Publicaciones*:  
 - *R. Hakluyt: Principales viajes, expediciones, tráfico comercial y descubrimientos de la nación inglesa*. Vol. 1. Madrid: Edit. Atlas, 1988.  
 - "Politics, literature and colonization: A view of Ireland in the 16th century". *Dutch Quarterly Review*, vol. 18, 1988. (También publicado en C.C. Barfort and Theo D'haen (ed): *The Clash of Ireland: Literary Contrasts and Connections. D.Q.R. Studies in Literature*, 4).  
 - "Spain and Terra Australis: Early Voyages of Discovery". *Westerly*, 1, 1989. University of Western Australia.  
 - "Dialectical tension in Sir Walter Raleigh's life and work". (Con S. Suárez). En Javier Sánchez (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, I. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1990. pp. 45-56.  
 - "Caliban's choice in the 'Irish Tempest'". (Con U. Viñuela). En S.G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI*, II. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992. pp. 321-329.

**Tejera LLano, Dionisia**

C/ Manuel Allende, 19, 4º izda. Esc. 1. 48010-Bilbao. Tlf. 94-4211747.  
Catedrática, Universidad de Deusto, Bilbao.

A.I.: Literatura medieval y del siglo XVII.

Docencia: Literatura Inglesa del Renacimiento.

Publicaciones:

- "Thomas Gage". *Letras de Deusto*, nº 21, 1981.
- "Ediciones y Traducciones de The English American". *44th International Congress of Americanists*. Manchester, 1982.
- *Thomas Gage. Su personalidad y su obra*. Madrid: CSIC, 1982.
- "The English Survey, a political translation in the 17th century". *Primer Congreso de Traductores*. León.
- "Dos traducciones políticas del siglo XVII (1648 y 1663)". En J.C. Santoyo & al (eds.): *Fidus Interpres*, Vol. I. Universidad de León: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1987. pp.115-122.
- *Viajes por Nueva España y Guatemala*. Historia 16, Mayo, 1987.
- "The English American: la crónica de un hereje". *Hispania Sacra*. Centro de Estudios Históricos, CSIC, 1988.

**Torre Moreno, María José de la**

La Paz 57, 2º B. 23700-Linares (Jaén). Tlf. 953-696391. Becaria de Investigación, Universidad de Granada.

A.I.: Literatura Inglesa.

**Ungerer, Gustav**

Känelgasse 11. 3052 Zollikofe, Suiza. Tlf. 31 572094. Professor of modern English Literature, Englisch Seminar, Universität Bern.

A.I.: Shakespeare; Anglo-Spanish relations in the 16th cent.; 17th-century drama.

Publicaciones:

- *Anglo-Spanish Relations in Tudor Literature*. Bern: Francke, 1956. (rpt AMS Press, N.Y., 1972).
- "An Unrecorded Elizabethan Performance of *Titus Andronicus*". *Shakespeare Survey*, 14, 1961. pp. 102-109.
- "Two Items of Spanish Pronunciation in *Love's Labour's Lost*". *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 14, 1963. pp. 245-251.
- "The Printing of Spanish Books in Elizabethan England". *The Library*, 20, 1965. pp. 177-229.
- "Letters of Antonio Pérez to Don Juan de Zúñiga". *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et de Renaissance*, 27, 1965. pp. 672-81.

- "Bibliographical Notes on the Works of Antonio Pérez". *Cuadernos de Historia*, 16-18, 1963-5. 247-260.

- "Unamuno and Shakespeare". En Germán Bleiberg & E. Inman Fox. *Spanish Thought and Letters in the 20th century*. Nashville, 1966. pp. 513-532.

- "Lost Government Publications in Spanish and Other Languages (1597-1601)". *The Library*, 20, 1974. pp. 323-329.

- "The French Lutenist Charles Tessier and the Essex Circle". *Renaissance Quarterly*, 28, 1975. pp. 190-203.

- *A Spaniard in Elizabethan England: The Correspondence of Antonio Pérez's Exile*. Vol. I and II. London, 1975 y 1976.

- "Antonio Pérez' politische Aphorismen". En Gerhard Neumann: *Der Aphorismus. Zur Geschichte, zu den Formen und Möglichkeiten einer literarischen Gattung*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1976. pp. 427-51.

- "'My Lady's a Catayan, we are politicians, Maluolios a Peg-a-ramsie', *Twelfth Night*, II.iii.77-78". *Shakespeare Survey*, 32, 1979. pp. 85-104.

- "Roland du Jardin: Author of *A discourse of the Married and Single Life?*" *The Library*, Sixth Series, 2, 1980. pp. 211-216.

- *La defensa de Antonio Pérez contra los cargos que se le imputaron en el Proceso de Visita*. Temas Aragoneses, 29. Zaragoza, 1980.

- "Sir Andrew Aguecheek and His Head of Hair". *Shakespeare Studies*, 16, 1983. pp. 101-133.

- "The Viol da Gamba as a Sexual Metaphor in Elizabethan Music and Literature". *Renaissance and Reformation*, 1984. pp. 79-90.

- "Shylock's 'Gaping Pig'". *Liber Amicorum Willem Schrickx*. Ghent, 1985. pp. 267-76.

- "Edward Phillips's *The Mysteries of Love and Eloquence* (1658) and Its Shakespeare Allusions". *Seventeenth-Century News*, 43, 1985. pp. 38-42.

- "George Baker: Translator of Aparicio de Zubia's Pamphlet on the 'Oleum Magistrale'". *Medical History*, 30, 1986. pp. 203-211.

- "'The Equinoctial of Queubus'". *Shakespeare Studies*, 19, 1987. pp. 101-110.

- "Shakespeare in Rutland. Sir John Harington of Exton: Patron of the 1595/96 Christmas Festivities at Burley-on-the-Hill and of the Chamberlain's Man". *Rutland Record*, 7, 1987. 242-8.

- "Thomas Digges and Sancho de Londoño's Military Ordinances of 1568". En J.C. Santoyo et al. (eds): *Fidus Interpres*, I. Universidad de León: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1987. pp. 130-139.

—"The Alleged Milton Epitaph on Moll Cutpurse". *Milton Quarterly*, 1989.

—"Thomas Shadwell's The Libertine: A forgotten Restoration Don Juan Play". En Javier Sánchez (ed.): *Proceedings of SEDERI I*. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1990. pp. 223-240.

#### Verdaguer Clavera, Isabel

Pº San Gervasio 6, 2º 1ª. 08022-Barcelona. Tlf. 93-2128942. Profesora Titular de Universidad, Universidad de Barcelona.

A.I.: traducciones al inglés de los clásicos españoles.

*Tesis Doctoral*: "El Guzmán de Alfarache en Inglaterra". Universidad de Barcelona, 1981.

*Publicaciones*:

—"El Guzmán de Alfarache en Inglaterra: causas de su éxito." *Anuario de Filología*, 8, 1982. pp. 505-508.

—"Wordplay in *The Rogue*". *Actas del VI Congreso de AEDEAN*. Barcelona, 1984.

—"Traducciones al inglés del *Libro de la Vida*". *Actas del X Congreso de AEDEAN*. Zaragoza, 1986. pp. 497-502.

—J.C. Santoyo (ed.): *De Clásicos y Traducciones*. Barcelona: PPU, 1987.

—"Traducciones inglesas del *Libro de la Vida*". *Idem*, pp. 81-88.

—"Traducciones inglesas del *Guzmán de Alfarache*". *Idem*, pp. 115-128.

#### Viñuela Angulo, Urbano

Cº de los Arces, Les Caserías, Somió. 33203-Gijón. Tlf. 98-5366984. Profesor Titular Universidad, Oviedo.

A.I.: Literatura clásica norteamericana, Historia colonial norteamericana.

*Publicaciones*:

—J.E. Tazón: "Caliban's choice in the 'Irish Tempest'". En S.G. Fernández-Corugedo: *Proceedings of SEDERI*, II. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992. pp. 321-329.

#### Wallhead, Celia Margaret

"Las Celindas", Urb. Las Cruces, C/ Fortuny 9. Los Ogíjares. Granada. Tlf. 958-254065. Prof. Asociado de Universidad, Granada.

A.I.: Novela del siglo XX.

*Publicaciones*:

—"Two 16th Century Satires from the Public Record Office". *BHS*, LII. pp. 217-225.

#### ABREVIATURAS Y SIGLAS

A.I. Área de investigación.

AAFVT *Annals of the Archyve of Ferran Valls y Taberner*.

ADIUAB *Anuario del Departamento de Inglés*. U. Autónoma de Barcelona.

BELLS *Barcelona English Language and Literature Studies*. U. de Barcelona Central.

BHS *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*.

BSS *Boletín de la Institución "Sancho el Sabio"*. Vitoria.

CEM *Cuadernos de Estudios Murcianos*.

CIF *Cuadernos de Investigación Filológica*. U. de La Rioja.

ES *Publicaciones del Departamento de Inglés*. U. de Valladolid.

RAEI *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*.

RCEI *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*. U. de la Laguna.